

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE BINDING OF PAST TO PRESENT: A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON THE USE OF PAUL
IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

CAMERON EVAN FERGUSON

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2019

Copyright 2019 by Cameron Evan Ferguson
All rights reserved.

For Calvin

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Acknowledgments	vi
Chapter I: The Relationship of Mark to Paul	1
Part I: Historical Presuppositions and Scholarly Approach	7
Part II: Gustav Volkmar and Martin Werner—Settling the Question?	19
Part III: Joel Marcus—Reopening the Question	33
Part IV: The Synecdochical Poetics of Mark and Paul	36
Part V: Markan Etiological Hermeneutics	42
Part VI: Death in the Body of Paul and Salvation in the Body of Jesus	47
Chapter II: Baptism into Death	50
Excursus: Werner’s Understanding of Baptism in Mark and Paul	52
Part I: Baptism in Paul	57
Part II: Baptism for Mark	68
Part III: Anticipating the Baptism of Paul	84
Conclusion	95
Chapter III: The Body and the Blood	97
Excursus: Werner’s Understanding of Eucharist in Mark and Paul	99
Part I: Eucharist in Paul	102
Part II: The Eucharist in Mark	113
Part III: Anticipating the Eucharist of Paul	123
Excursus: The Cup of Blessing and the Cup of Wrath	142
Conclusion	145
Chapter IV: Death “in accordance with the Scriptures”	148
Part I: Scriptural Prefigurations of Jesus’ Death in Paul	152
Translation: The Suffering Servant	153
Translation: The Binding of Isaac	159
Translation: The First Passover	168
Part II: Scriptural Prefigurations of Jesus’ Death in Mark	175
Part III: Combining Pauline Types in the Markan Jesus	189
Conclusion	194
Chapter V: Summation and Implications	196
Summation	196
Implications	199
Dissertation Bibliography	221

List of Tables

Table 1: Mark 1:10-11 and Mark 15:38-9	78
Table 2: Genesis 22:2, Mark 1:11, and Psalm 2:7	83
Table 3: 1 Corinthians 11:23-26 and Mark 14:22-25	128
Table 4: 1 Corinthians 11:23-4 and Mark 14:22-23	130
Table 5: Galatians 3:8 and Genesis 12:3; 18:18; 22:18	163

Acknowledgments

As I write this note on a warm Sunday afternoon on the 14th of July, I find myself struggling to find words to articulate just how much the successful completion of my dissertation owes to my advisor, readers, teachers, friends, family, and classmates. I have been interested in, and casually thinking about, Paul's possible influence on Mark for the past 8 years (since I began my graduate work at the University of Chicago Divinity School), and I have been fortunate enough to make investigating that relationship my full-time job for the past three. I have never been a particularly systematic thinker, and, if I did not have the aid, support, criticisms, and care of all those others, my dissertation would look significantly different than it does today, and that is a scary thought indeed.

First and foremost, then, I express my gratitude to my doctoral advisor, Margaret M. Mitchell. Without her critical and indefatigable eye, my dissertation would be a lesser product, rife with errors both great and small. She devoted countless hours to the improvement of this work, from hermeneutical approach down to the placement of individual commas, and any errors that now remain I happily claim as my own. Second, I owe thanks to those others on my dissertation committee: Calvin Roetzel, Sofía Torallas Tovar, and Richard Rosengarten. Their suggested revisions have strengthened my arguments tremendously, and their reassurance and optimism buoyed me at my lowest points. I owe to each a debt I cannot repay.

Third, my thanks go out to those teachers and administrative colleagues with whom I have worked over the years: Profs. Hans-Josef Klauck, David Martinez, Jeffrey Stackert, and David Nirenberg; Deans of Students Josh Feigelson and Theresa Hord Owens; and administrators Sara Bigger, Joann Dowels, Dale Walker, Barbara Palmer-Bostick, Terren Wein, and Julia Woods. Not only have they aided my thinking in immeasurable and diverse ways, but

they have helped to make the Divinity School feel like my home. I will forever be grateful for that.

Fourth, I send love and gratitude to my parents and godparents (Tauron and Richard, Tom and Jeanne) my siblings (Renick and Brennan), and all of my extended family (too many to name here) for their support and encouragement throughout this long process. To friends made during my time at the Divinity School—Aaron, Kelli, Doug, Emily, Richard, Caroline, Nathan, Jonathan S., Jonathan W., Zach, Sam, Russell, Charissa, Kyle, Marisa, Christina, and so many others—perhaps the greatest gift I have received from the University of Chicago is all of you. And to those friends I have known forever (J.T., Hans, Shayna, Sean, Joe), thank you for always being there for me.

I conclude with a final note to Cal: when I met you as an undergrad some 13 years ago, I saw in you the person that I wanted to be. We began this journey together, and I am happy that we conclude this portion of it together. I dedicate this work, with love and admiration, to you.

Chapter I: The Relationship of Mark to Paul

As the theologians say, we “live from the end,” even if the world should be endless. We need ends and *kairoi* and the *pleroma*, even now when the history of the world has so terribly and so untidily expanded its endless successiveness. We re-create the horizons we have abolished, the structures that have collapsed; and we do so in terms of the old patterns, adapting them to our new worlds. Ends, for example, become a matter of images, figures for what does not exist except humanly. Our stories must recognize mere successiveness but not be merely successive...In the midst, we look for a fullness of time, for beginning, middle, and end in concord.¹

This dissertation tells the (hi)story of the relationship of the Gospel of Mark to the Apostle Paul. In the quote above, Frank Kermode, one of the great exemplars of twentieth-century literary criticism, speaks of modern fiction. It is unlikely he would admit that, for the evangelist or apostle, “time has so terribly and so untidily expanded its endless successiveness,” or that “Ends” are simply “figures for what does not exist except humanly.” Instead, for him, Mark and Paul’s conceptual horizon is that of apocalyptic, and their narrative constructions presume the imminent approach of the final moments of this world.² Yet, according to Kermode,

¹ Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1966), 58.

² According to Kermode, apocalyptic thought “belongs to rectilinear rather than cyclical views of the world... one has to think of an ordered series of events which ends, not in a great New Year, but in a final Sabbath. The events derive their significance from a unitary system, not from their correspondence with events from other cycles” (*Sense of an Ending*, 5). Kermode goes on to say that “Apocalypse depends on a concord of imaginatively recorded past and imaginatively predicted future, achieved on behalf of us, who remain ‘in the midst.’ Its predictions, though figurative, can be taken literally, and as the future moves in on us we may expect it to conform with the figures” (*Sense of an Ending*, 8). Though Kermode admits that early Christians had experiences of “disconfirmation” (that is, the end does not occur at its predicted moment), as evidenced in part by Mark’s own famous hedging—“Concerning that day [τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης] or the hour [τῆς ὥρας], no one knows, neither the angels in heaven nor the son, only the father [εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ]” (Mk 13:32; see *Sense of an Ending*, 24-5)—it is nevertheless clear that, for Kermode, Mark’s worldview, together with most early Christians, is that of “naïve apocalypticism,” where “literal disconfirmation is thwarted by typology, arithmology, and perhaps by the buoyancy of chiliasts in general” (*Sense of an Ending*, 9; see also 6-7, 14).

it is from such presumptions that Western fictions are born and upon such that they pattern themselves, consciously or otherwise. He explains,

We seek to repeat the performance of the New Testament, a book which rewrites and requites another book and achieves harmony with it rather than questioning its truth. One of the seminal remarks of modern literary thought was Eliot's observation that in the timeless order of literature this process is continued. Thus, we secularize the principle which recurs from the New Testament through Alexandrian allegory and Renaissance Neo-Platonism to our own time. We achieve our secular concords of past and present and future, modifying the past and allowing for the future without falsifying our own moment of crisis. We need, and provide, fictions of concord.³

According to Kermode, at a most basic level, modern humankind is no different than ancient. It is the universal experience of the sons and daughters of Adam to find themselves in the "middest," torn between bygone eras to which they do not have access and those murky futures played out in anticipation and imagination. Through recourse to narrative, human beings make consonance from distension, and they impose concordance upon an unstable and unpredictable world.⁴

In the case of the Gospel according to Mark, Kermode would say that the "rectilinear" narrative structure of the Bible is presumed—a structure which extends from one end of historical time to the other⁵—and Mark reworks and "requites" it in the service of a new

³ Kermode, *Sense of an Ending*, 59.

⁴ The (dis)tension between future, present, and past in human thought is famously engaged by Augustine in Book 11 of his *Confessions* (for a good translation, see Augustine, *The Confessions* [trans. Henry Chadwick; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008], 221-245), with whom Kermode himself is thinking (see *Sense of an Ending*, 44, 53). For Kermode, the formulation is as follows, "Men, like poets, rush 'into the midst,' *in medias res*, when they are born; they also die *in medias rebus*, and to make sense of their span they need fictive concords with origins and ends, such as give meaning to lives and to poems. The End they imagine will reflect their irreducibly intermediary preoccupations. They fear it, and as far as we can see have always done so; the End is a figure for their own deaths" (*Sense of an Ending*, 7).

⁵ Kermode, *Sense of an Ending*, 6-7.

apocalyptic vision.⁶ He is, in a general sense, an author concerned with the *longue durée*. Yet, practically speaking, his engagement with the Bible's narrative structure is witnessed within the *courte durée* of a sixteen-chapter narrative set only a few short decades prior to Mark's composition, one which must speak to a real community living in the shadow of that duration's impending end. This temporal positioning invites exploration of how Mark makes use of the limited time within the narrative to help make sense of the time *between* the narrative and his community, a time of "transition" (to use Kermode's terminology⁷) that does not belong to the End but immediately precedes it. One might label this the period of the mission, during which "it is necessary *first* [πρῶτον] that the gospel be proclaimed [κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον] amongst all the nations [εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη]" (Mk 13:10).⁸ If narrative concordance is to exist at the macro level of cosmogony and End, there should be some concordance at the micro-span that runs from the death of the Messiah to the Markan community, as well. Were it otherwise, one could not expect either Mark or his readers to admit a meaningful and active space for themselves *within* that narrative, as the words and deeds of its heroes would be unfamiliar to them, and they would be reckoned mere passive vessels in and for events, if any reckoning was made of them at all. In other words, for the community to put their hopes in the story as a whole (which runs from one end of time to the other), there must be some significant way(s) in which it speaks to them

⁶ That Mark's own text looks to an end times modelled upon Jewish prophecy and Second Temple apocalyptic need not be argued here, but it is worth stating that Mark's text also presumes the "beginnings" as narrated in Genesis, and it recapitulates them accordingly (see esp. Mk 1:12-13) to bring them into concord with the salvific work which Christ performs and the new end-times scenario that is to occur subsequently. For a thorough argument, see Joel Marcus, "Son of Man as Son of Adam," *RB* 110 (2003), 38-61, 370-86.

⁷ Kermode, *Sense of an Ending*, 12-13.

⁸ The Greek text of the New Testament used in this dissertation is taken from *Nestle-Aland: Novum Testamentum Graece* (28th edition; eds. Barbara and Kurt Aland, et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012). All translations of ancient languages (Greek, Latin, Hebrew) are my own, unless otherwise noted.

directly and intertwines with their own lived experiences. In what follows, I will suggest that it is precisely in the investigation of the limited period that Mark's relationship to Paul comes into full relief.

In his seminal article, "Mark—Interpreter of Paul," Joel Marcus makes the programmatic assertion that Mark's work is influenced by the thought of Saint Paul.⁹ To demonstrate this, Marcus suggests a list of potential theological, Christological, and ecclesiological overlaps between the two authors, and he then analyzes the apostle's and evangelist's shared emphasis on the cross.¹⁰ Interestingly, despite Marcus' provocative assertion, in his comprehensive *Mark* commentary—the first volume of which was published the same year as his article—only three short pages in his introduction discuss Mark's potential familiarity with Paul,¹¹ and an argument for dependence is never sustained. Moreover, Marcus nowhere claims that Mark had access to Paul's letters.¹² My dissertation will thus pursue what Marcus does not: a sustained case for the plausible literary dependence of the Gospel of Mark on the letters of the apostle Paul. I will suggest the historical possibility of Mark's and his community's knowledge of the person,

⁹ Joel Marcus, "Mark—Interpreter of Paul" in *New Testament Studies* 46 (2000) 473-87. All subsequent references to and citations of Marcus' article are taken from its updated publication in in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark* (ed. Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller; BZNV 199; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 29-49. The contents of this article will be discussed in more detail below.

¹⁰ Marcus' article will be discussed in more detail in Part III of this chapter.

¹¹ See Joel Marcus, *Mark: 1-8* (New York: Doubleday, 2000); and idem, *Mark 8-16* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009). His discussion of Pauline influence can be found on pages 73-5 of the first volume.

¹² Marcus, *Mark: 1-8*, 75: "The most reasonable conclusion would seem to be that Mark writes in a Pauline sphere of activity and shows some sort of Pauline influence in his thought, although he is not a member of a Pauline 'school' in the same sense that the authors of Colossians-Ephesians and the Pastorals are; unlike them, he has not studied, internalized, and imitated Paul's letters. But neither is he hermetically sealed off from the influence of Paul, and as a matter of fact in some ways is quite close to him."

teachings, and (select) epistles of the apostle, and I will argue that Mark has self-consciously anticipated Paul and his mission within his story.

To state my thesis forthrightly: I contend that Mark adopts what I am calling an “etiologically hermeneutic” vis-à-vis Paul. Mark’s story is a story of origins (see Mk:1:1: “The *beginning* [ἀρχή] of the gospel [τοῦ εὐαγγελίου] of Jesus Christ, the Son of God”), one which establishes continuity between the earthly life of Jesus, the contemporary situation of the Markan community, and the final ending of the world (see Mk 13). Between the life of Jesus and Mark’s historical moment, the evangelist knows that Paul is located, and I use “etiologically” to refer to the fact that one of Mark’s primary literary goals is to create, within his narrative of the earthly life of Jesus Christ, historical *precedent* for the mission and teachings of Paul that occur subsequently to the conclusion of his narrative but prior to his composition of it. The evangelist’s goal is not to repeat that which Paul has said (that is, to lift Paul from his letters and throw him some thirty years back into the past) but, rather, to *anticipate* him. Mark seeks to seed the apostle and his teachings into his text.

Mark’s project is therefore both proleptic and synecdochical: he always presumes, though he does not narrate in full, the entirety of a salvation-historical narrative that extends from one end of historical time to the other (the “gospel” [εὐαγγέλιον], an episodic narrative he shares with Paul¹³), and his purpose is to tell a story that anticipates and concordantly connects with episodes subsequent to his 16 chapters. Believing that the mission of Paul is a part of this narrative, Mark seeks to create logical and concordant episodic precursors that will bind the missionary activity of the earthly Christ to the eventual teachings of the itinerant apostle,

¹³ For discussion of the essential contents of Paul’s gospel narrative, see Part IV of this chapter. The temporal span it covers is witnessed in 1 Cor 15, where the story begins with Adam (1 Cor 15:21-22, 45), and it ends with God being “all in all” (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν [1 Cor 15:28]).

teachings that are themselves carried on within Mark's community. Depending on the particular Pauline phenomena Mark seeks to seed into his story, his literary strategies may be adapted, but his etiological hermeneutic remains fundamentally the same.

The remainder of this chapter will be dedicated to setting out the historical presuppositions and methodological underpinnings of my thesis. This dissertation will not contain a comprehensive *Forschungsbericht* that situates the question of Mark's dependence on Paul within its modern historical context,¹⁴ but I will offer a brief overview of the works of Gustav Volkmar and Martin Werner, two exegetes whose now-classic arguments have set the terms of the debate surrounding Mark's Paulinism for over a century.¹⁵ Following this review, I will chart a new path forward and build upon the contributions to Mark and Paul studies by C.H. Dodd, Richard B. Hays, Joel Marcus, and Margaret M. Mitchell. The hermeneutical road I propose to pave runs straight through Mark's perception of himself as one 'in the midst,' both at the macro level of universal (narrative) history, and at the micro level of transition. He is, on the one hand, a storyteller living in a moment postdating the earthly career of the Messiah and

¹⁴ Numerous surveys of the historical scholarship have recently been written. See, for example, the late Anne Vig Skoven, "Mark as an Allegorical Rewriting of Paul: Gustav Volkmar's Understanding of the Gospel of Mark," in Becker et al., *Mark and Paul*, 13-27; Heike Omerzu, "Paul and Mark—Mark and Paul: A Critical Outline of the History of Research," in Becker et al., *Mark and Paul*, 51-61; W.R. Telford, "Introduction: The Gospel of Mark," in *The Interpretation of Mark* (ed. William Telford; Philadelphia, Fortress, 1985), 20-27 (and idem, *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999], 164-9); Bartosz Adamczewski, *The Gospel of Mark: A Hypertextual Commentary* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014), 17-22; Johannes Wischmeyer, "Universalismus als Tendenz und Entwicklungsmoment. Die Frage nach Markus und Paulus in der historisch-kritischen Geschichtsschreibung des Urchristentums von 1850-1910," in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I, Two Authors at the Beginnings of Early Christianity* (eds. Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer; BZNW 198; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 19-42.

¹⁵ In addition, because some of the topics I investigate in this dissertation (baptism, Eucharist) have been engaged by Werner, I will begin the chapters in which those topics are discussed with a brief excursus that challenges Werner's interpretations of them.

the missionary activity of the apostle but *preceding* the fulfillment of that mission and the consummation of the End. On the other, he is a storyteller anticipating the End and beginning to see the limits of historical time collapse upon themselves. It is through the composition of his gospel that he seeks to bind together and to bring these tensive realities into a concordant and meaningful whole, and he does so, I suggest, by creating a retrospective narrative that *prospectively* engages the Pauline mission, anticipating the teachings of the apostle and seeding them into the earthly life of Christ.

Part I: Historical Presuppositions and Scholarly Approach

A) Presuppositions

Though Pauline letters and traditions were known throughout the ancient Mediterranean world at a very early date (before the middle of the second century C.E.),¹⁶ the extent to which

¹⁶ Within the New Testament, there is a huge selection of locatively disparate texts that betray familiarity with Paul's letters. Colossians, for example, is thought to have been written in Ephesus or the Lycus Valley as early as 70 or 80 C.E. (e.g. Paul Foster, *Colossians* [London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016], 61-80), with Ephesians written somewhere in western Asia Minor shortly thereafter (e.g. Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* [Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990], lxxiii-lxxxvii). Hebrews is thought to have been sent from (or to) Rome during the latter half of the first century (for good discussions of the options, see David A. deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], 20-23; William L. Lane, *Hebrews 1-8* [Dallas: Word Books, 1991], lviii-lxvi; Gareth Lee Cockerill, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012], 34-41). The Pastoral Epistles were composed at the beginning of the second century either in Ephesus or Rome (see Arland J. Hultgren, "The Pastoral Epistles," in *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* [ed. James D.G. Dunn; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003], 142-4; Raymond E. Collins, *I & II Timothy and Titus* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002] 3-11). Acts was written in Ephesus around 115 CE (Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* [Santa Rosa: Polebridge, 2006], *passim* and *Acts* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009], 5-7). Finally, James—whether one considers his letter anti-Pauline or not—may have been written from Antioch anytime between the last quarter of the first century to the first quarter of the second (see C. Freeman Sleeper, *James* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1998], 31-41; Martin Dibelius, *James* [trans. Michael A. Williams; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964], 45-7. On James' relationship to Pauline traditions, see Joachim Jeremias, "Paul and James" in *ExpTim* 66 [1955], 368-71; C. Ryan Jenkins, "Faith and Work in Paul and James" in *BSac* 159

those letters were disseminated prior to 69-71 C.E.—the period during which Mark is generally thought to have been composed¹⁷—is unclear, and final judgment upon Mark’s familiarity with Paul’s epistolary correspondence is dependent, at least in part, upon where one imagines Mark’s gospel was written. Scholars have argued for both the Eastern and Western halves of the Roman empire,¹⁸ but I am convinced by the contributions of Brian Incigneri¹⁹ and Michael P. Theophilos,²⁰ both of whom place the composition of Mark at Rome. Incigneri argues comprehensively that Mark’s rhetoric reflects a historical situation in which Vespasian rules the Roman empire and Titus has recently returned to the capital city carrying the spoils of the Second Temple (71 C.E.).²¹ Theophilos, building upon Incigneri’s work but dating the gospel

[2002], 62-78; Wiard Popkes, “Two interpretations of ‘Justification’ in the New Testament Reflections on Galatians 2:15-21 and James 2:21-25” *ST* 59 [2005], 129-46; and Margaret M. Mitchell, “The Letter of James as a Document of Paulinism?” in *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James* [ed. Robert L. Webb and John S. Kloppenborg; London: T & T Clark, 2007] 75-98).

¹⁷ Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 37-9 suggests that Jesus’ prophecy of the destruction of the Temple (Mk 13:1-2), together with his reference to an “abomination of desolation” (βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως) and the Judeans’ flight to the mountains (Mk 13:14), points to a date of composition for the Gospel of Mark sometime during the Jewish War of 66-73 C.E., very near to the fall of the Temple in 70 C.E.

¹⁸ For a good survey of the history of scholarship on this question, see John R. Donahue, “The Quest for the Community of Mark’s Gospel,” in *The Four Gospels: Festschrift for Frans Neirynck* (vol. 2; ed. F. van Segbroek, et. al.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991), 817-37. The major commentaries in the Hermeneia and Yale series both place Mark near Antioch (see Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007], 96-102 and Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 30-37).

¹⁹ Brian J. Incigneri, *The Gospel According to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark’s Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

²⁰ Michael P. Theophilos, “The Roman Connection: Paul and Mark,” in Oda Wischmeyer et al., *Paul and Mark*, 45-67.

²¹ See esp. Incigneri, *Gospel*, 59-207, where the author covers challenges to a Roman setting (chapter 2), makes a sustained case for the destruction of the Second Temple as having already occurred by the time Mark writes (chapter 3), and describes the “climate” of Rome shortly thereafter (Chapter 4—in my judgement, Incigneri’s most convincing analysis).

earlier (late 60s C.E.),²² emphasizes the number of Latinisms found in Mark (10 of 18, “a frequency which is higher than any other Greek literary text of the period”²³) and that several of those Latinisms are unattested in any Greek text prior to the first century.²⁴ He also underscores the observation made by Martin Hengel: only a Roman provenance would necessitate Mark’s designating the Gentile woman of Mk 7:26 a “Syrphoenician” (Συροφοινίκισσα) rather than simply a Phoenician (Φοῖνιξ), as it implies Mark’s making a clear distinction between eastern Phoenicians and the “Carthaginians” (Λιβυφοινίκες), with whom the Romans would have been more familiar.²⁵ In my judgment, the arguments of these scholars, coupled with the Patristic evidence,²⁶ suggests a Roman provenance for the composition of Mark’s gospel and the inauguration of the synoptic literary tradition.

²² Theophilus, “The Roman Connection,” 51-2.

²³ Theophilus, “The Roman Connection,” 50.

²⁴ Theophilus, “The Roman Connection,” 50-51.

²⁵ Martin Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1985), 28-30.

²⁶ Most important is the attestation of Clement of Alexandria (Eusebius, *H.E.* 6.14.5-6), who, writing in the last decades of the second century, says, “When Peter had preached the word publicly at Rome [ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον] and by the Spirit had proclaimed the gospel [τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐξεπιόντος], those present, who were many, exhorted Mark [παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον], as someone who had followed him from long ago [πόρρωθεν] and remembered the things he had spoken [μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων], to write down the things [Peter] had said [ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα]. And [Mark], having done so, handed the gospel over to those who asked it of him [τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ]” (τοῦ Πέτρου δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρύξαντος τὸν λόγον καὶ πνεύματι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐξεπιόντος, τοὺς παρόντας, πολλοὺς ὄντας, παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πόρρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα· ποιήσαντα δέ, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μεταδοῦναι τοῖς δεομένοις αὐτοῦ). The Greek text is taken from Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History, Books 6-10* (trans. J. E. L. Oulton; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932). See also Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3.1.1 and the testimony of Papias (Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.39.13). Though neither explicitly locate Mark’s composition at Rome, they both reflect a tradition that Mark is Peter’s interpreter, and it is likely that they imagine a Roman provenance for Mark’s scribal activity. Finally, the Anti-Marcionite prologue to Mark, composed as early as 160-180 C.E., introduces the gospel with the following words: “[Mark] was the interpreter of Peter [*Iste interpres fuit Petri*]. After the death of Peter himself, [Mark] wrote down this same gospel in the regions of Italy [*in partibus Italiae*].” (*Iste interpres fuit Petri. Post*

Should one adopt Rome as the place of composition for Mark's gospel, Mark's familiarity with Paul's letters circa 70 C.E. becomes significantly more probable, and it is possible that the evangelist has copies or knows the contents of as many as *three* Pauline epistles in the capital city: 1) Romans, 2) 1 Corinthians, and 3) Galatians. Rome is, of course, the destination of the first letter in this list (Rom 1:7), and it is a text with which Mark shares significant thematic overlap.²⁷ Clement of Rome, writing sometime around the end of the first or beginning of the

excessionem ipsius Petri descripsit idem hoc in partibus Italiae euangelium.) The Latin text is taken from Dom Donatien De Bruyne, "Les plus anciens prologues latins des Évangiles," *Revue Bénédictine*, XL [1928], 193-214.

²⁷ For a survey of the overlaps between the Gospel of Mark and Paul's letter to the Romans, see Theophilus, "The Roman Connection," 53-67. According to him, "Strong comparative points of influence between Romans and Mark [are] seen in: 1) the frequency, importance and meaning of the soteriological term εὐαγγέλιον; 2) the shared theological vision of the inclusion of the Gentiles in the evangelistic mission of the church; 3) Israel's chronological priority in the divine *Heilsgeschichte*; 4) the emphasis on the abrogation of food laws; 5) the distinctive hermeneutical employment of the Hebrew Bible in condemnation of continued Jewish obduracy [Theophilus here focuses on the fact that both Mk 4:10-12 and Rom 11:7-10 quote Isa 6:9-10]; 6) similar Christological outlook; 7) economic responsibility to the state; 8) the potential, yet elusive, personal ecclesiastical connection with Rufus; and 9) the similar kerygmatic elements of the theological meaning of the cross" ("The Roman Connection," 66-7).

second century,²⁸ had access to 1 Corinthians²⁹ (and Hebrews³⁰), which attests to the location of the second.³¹ (To be sure, Clement is writing some twenty years after Mark, but he nevertheless

²⁸ On Clement's date and provenance, see Andreas Lindemann, "The First Epistle of Clement" in *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction* (ed. Wilhelm Pratscher; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010), 64-5; Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 33-38. For a good argument problematizing the traditional dating of 1 Clement to the persecution of Domitian, see L. L. Welborn, "The Preface to 1 Clement: The Rhetorical Situation and the Traditional Date" in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement* (eds. Cilliers Breytenbach and Laurence L. Welborn; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 197-216.

²⁹ At 1 Clem 47.1-5, in his effort to shame the Corinthian community, not only does Clement mention Paul by name, he summarizes a portion of 1 Corinthians: "Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle [τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου]! What did he first write to you in the beginning of the gospel [ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου]? Truly, he instructed you spiritually about himself and Cephas and Apollo [περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλῶ], because even then you had become factional [προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι]. But that factionalism [ἡ πρόσκλισις ἐκείνη] had brought upon you less sin, for you had become factionalized [προσεκλίθητε] over esteemed apostles and a man who was approved by them [ἀποστόλοις μεμαρτυρημένοις καὶ ἀνδρὶ δεδοκιμασμένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς]. But now think about who has disturbed you and tarnished the reputation of your renowned love for others [τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς περιβοήτου φιλαδελφίας ὑμῶν]" (Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; Ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλῶ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι. Ἀλλ' ἡ πρόσκλισις ἐκείνη ἤττονα ἀμαρτίαν ὑμῖν προσήνεγκεν· προσεκλίθητε γὰρ ἀποστόλοις μεμαρτυρημένοις καὶ ἀνδρὶ δεδοκιμασμένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς. Νυνὶ δὲ κατανοήσατε, τίνες ὑμᾶς διέστρεψαν καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς περιβοήτου φιλαδελφίας ὑμῶν ἐμείωσαν). The Greek text is taken from *Clément de Rome: Épître aux Corinthiens* (ed. A. Jaubert; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971).

³⁰ A citation of Heb 1:3-5, 7, 13 appears to occur at 1 Clem 36:2-6. For a thorough discussion of the evidence, see Andreas Lindemann, *Die Clemensbriefe* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992), 17-20.

³¹ It is worth noting that Ignatius of Antioch, writing at a roughly contemporaneous historical moment to that of Clement, also had access to 1 Corinthians, and he presumes the Roman community's familiarity with it. In Ignatius' letter to that city, he explicitly mentions the person of Paul with words allusive of the structure and content 1 Cor 4:10-11: "I do not give you orders as Peter and Paul; they were apostles, I am condemned; they were free, but I am still now a slave" (Οὐχ ὡς Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν. Ἐκεῖνοι ἀπόστολοι. ἐγὼ κατάκριτος ἐκεῖνοι ἐλεύθεροι ἐγὼ δὲ μέχρι νῦν δοῦλος [Rom 4.3]; the Greek text is taken from *Ignace d'Antioche: Polycarpe de Smyrne. Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe* [4th ed.; ed. P.T. Camelot; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969]). Ignatius goes on to say, "I am ashamed to be counted amongst them! For I am not worthy [οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄξιός εἰμι], since I am the last of them [ἔσχατος αὐτῶν] and an abortion [ἔκτρομα]. But I have been shown mercy [ἠλέημαί] to be someone, if I should attain God" (Ἐγὼ δὲ αἰσχύνομαι ἐξ αὐτῶν λέγεσθαι· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄξιός εἰμι, ὢν ἔσχατος αὐτῶν καὶ ἔκτρομα

demonstrates the arrival of 1 Corinthians in the city at a very early date, and there is no reason to think it could not have been there earlier.³²) Galatians presents the greatest challenge. Though there is no explicit evidence for the letter's reception at Rome in the first century, Arland Hultgren, Thomas Tobin, and Calvin Roetzel have all suggested that Paul's letter to the Romans was written—at least in part—to correct Roman misunderstandings about what the apostle had said in his contentious correspondence with the Galatian communities.³³ If true, even without a copy of Galatians, Mark may have been sufficiently familiar with the letter's *contents* (or characterizations of its contents [see Rom 3:8; 6:15]) to incorporate elements of it into his

ἀλλ' ἠλέημαί τις εἶναι, ἐὰν θεοῦ ἐπιτύχω). These words clearly evoke Paul's own portrayal of himself in his gospel summary at 1 Cor 15:8-9. For good introductions to Ignatius and his familiarity with Pauline traditions, see William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 9-12; Hermut Löhr, "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch" in *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction* (ed. Wilhelm Pratscher; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010), 101; Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 166-75.

³² On this point, I am influenced by the hypothetical reconstruction of Harry S. Gamble: "To share a letter or to exchange letters with another community normally meant making copies... From an early time, then, the letters of Paul began to be known and read outside the churches to which they were originally sent. The very production of pseudonymous letters of Paul in the period after his death but before the emergence of the full-blown collection that included them, presupposes the (authentic) letters of Paul were in circulation among Christian communities other than those to which they had been sent by the apostle, that they were valued as authoritative instruction, and that therefore a previously unknown 'Pauline' letter could find a receptive readership. Only under such circumstances could a pseudonymous writer anticipate that his own 'Pauline' letter would not be an anomaly in the situation and liable to repudiation. It was by means of such circulation that small collections of Pauline letters probably began to emerge in some Pauline communities not long after Paul's death" (Harry Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995], 99-100). If one couple's Gamble's reconstruction with Paul's martyrdom in the capital city, which would have left the communities there bereft of one of their apostolic founders (more on this below), and with the testimony of Clement for 1 Corinthians's reception at Rome at an early date, the city of Rome becomes a prime candidate for earliest solicitation for and accumulation of copies of Paul's letters.

³³ Arland J. Hultgren, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 14-15; Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric in its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 53-78 esp. 70-8; Calvin J. Roetzel, *Paul: The Man and the Myth* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 121-5.

gospel. One should not underestimate Mark's potential knowledge of Paul disseminated through a variety of media, including summary, hearsay, or rumor.³⁴

If it is accepted that Mark is written in Rome circa 70 C.E., it would mean that seismic shifts had recently occurred upon the early Christian landscape both at home and abroad. Over the previous two decades, not only had Jewish Christ believers been driven out of and allowed to return to Rome³⁵ (with the process of reintegration perhaps a painful one³⁶), Roman Christians, as a whole, had been forced to endure a devastating persecution under Caesar Nero (65 C.E.)³⁷—a persecution which, according to tradition, claimed the lives of both Peter and Paul (Eusebius, *H.E.* 2.25.1-8; Ignatius, Rom 4.3; 1 Clem 5.4-6.1).³⁸ Moreover, in the east, the disciple James had been martyred (Acts 12:1-2; Eusebius, *H.E.* 2.9.1-4), as had James, the Lord's brother (Josephus, *A.J.* 20.9.1; Eusebius, *H.E.* 2.23). Finally, the Second Temple had most likely been

³⁴ Burton Mack has famously suggested that Mark was “composed at a desk in a scholar's study lined with texts and open to discourse with other intellectuals” (*A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988], 322-3). Though possible, for the purposes of this dissertation, I operate under the assumption that Mark's *community* had copies of Pauline letters, and that Mark became familiar with them through oral performance in the context of early worship. On the oral nature of epistolary exchanges and their reception by persons or communities, see Harry Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 82-143, esp. 95-102, 140-1. See also Colossians 4:15-16, which calls for the sharing and recitation of letters: “Whenever the letter is read by you [ἀναγνωσθῆ παρ' ὑμῶν], make sure that it is also read in the church of the Laodiceans [ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῆ], and that the [letter] from Laodicea you also read [καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε].” (See also 1 Thess 5:27: “I adjure you by the Lord that this letter be read [ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν] to all the brothers [πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς].”).

³⁵ Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25.3; Acts 18:2-3; Rom 12-16.

³⁶ See, for example, Wolfgang Wiefel, “The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity,” in *The Romans Debate* (ed. Karl P. Donfried; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 85-101; see also Francis Watson, “The Two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1-15:13,” 203-215 in the same volume.

³⁷ Suetonius, *Nero*, 16; Tacitus, *Annals*, 15.44.

³⁸ For the apocryphal accounts of Peter and Paul's death in Rome, see Wilhelm Schneemelcher (ed.), *New Testament Apocrypha, Volume Two: Writings Related to the Apostles; Apocalypses and Related Subjects* (revised edition; trans. R. McL. Wilson; Cambridge: James Clarke & Co. Ltd, 1992), 260-3, and 311-17.

razed to the ground and its spoils brought back to Rome for all to see.³⁹ This cataclysm—one that would have reverberated across the Mediterranean with eschatological implication⁴⁰—was the probable catalyst for Mark’s composition. The fall of the Second Temple would have been seen as an epiphany of God’s imminent second coming, and, in response to this imminence, Mark attempts to craft an epiphany of his own, one that combines traditional legends about Christ with the teachings of the apostle Paul in order to make manifest the truth of the gospel to which both bear witness but for which Paul is no longer available as an epiphanic stand-in.⁴¹ I will return to this suggestion in more detail below.

B) Methodological Approach

³⁹ See Incigneri, *Gospel to the Romans*, 116-155 for his comprehensive argument that Mark knows the Second Temple has fallen. In my own exegesis, I see additional evidence for the Temple’s destruction in Mark’s tiered prophecy/fulfillment schema that is integral to the gospel’s rhetorical strategy. To explain: in reading the gospel, one notices that there are prophecies made by Jesus that are fulfilled *within* the narrative (as, for example, his prediction that the disciples will find an upper room ready for Passover supper [Mk 14:12-16] or Jesus’ predictions of his impending passion and resurrection: Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-4); there are prophecies that are fulfilled externally to the narrative but *prior* to the composition of Mark’s gospel (most famously, Jesus’ resurrection appearances [Mk 14:28; 16:8]); and there are prophecies that *will be* fulfilled during the time of the Markan community (such as the end times [Mk 13]). This temporally variegated pattern is one of the means by which Mark demonstrates that Jesus is the Messiah: his prophecies have been and will continue to be fulfilled. On my reading, then, Jesus’ prediction of the Second Temple’s destruction should be understood as functioning like the prophecy of his resurrection appearances: it is an event external to the narrative but one which *has occurred* for Mark’s community, and it serves as further proof that that which Jesus has said is yet to occur (his parousia) *will* occur for those who believe.

⁴⁰ Prophecies that predict the destruction or replacement of the Jewish Temple as a necessary component of or prerequisite for the end times are well attested in Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish literature. See, for example, Dan 9:24-7; 11:31; Jer 7:3-15; 9:1-16; Ezek 40-43; Micah 3:11-4:8; 1 En 89.51-67; 90.20-29; Sibyl Or. 3.273-94; 4.115-129; Tob 14:3-7; Josephus, *B.J.*, 6.300-309.

⁴¹ This is, in essence, the thesis of Margaret M. Mitchell, “Epiphanic Evolutions in Earliest Christianity,” in *Paul and the Emergence of Christian Textuality* (Tübingen; Mohr Siebek, 2017) 237-55; repr. from *Illinois Classical Studies* 29 (2004), 183-204. See also Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* (trans. by James Boyce et al.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1969), 147, 216.

First and most important, I am a historical critic, and I analyze Mark and Paul using the comparative and philological tools of “historical criticism.”⁴² It is my assumption that there is a historical milieu from which Mark comes, there are historical figures about whom Mark writes, there are historical sources with which he interacts, and, because I am interested in *how* Mark (the author) fully absorbs and accommodates certain source materials (the Pauline letters), I assume that there is both a real author whom I can reconstruct with some accuracy, and that said author possesses creativity and exegetical autonomy of his own.⁴³

Second and relatedly, I presuppose that Mark’s composition is logical, consistent, and complete, and properly understanding the narrative requires interacting with it as such. To this end, my approach to the text is influenced by narrative critical methods.⁴⁴ I am attuned especially

⁴² I am thinking of historical criticism in light of John Barton’s nuanced discussion (*The Nature of Biblical Criticism* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007]). While Barton has some reservations about the usefulness of terminology such as “historical criticism” to describe the *essence* of biblical criticism (67-68, 80), he also does not deny that there is something fundamentally “historical” about the work that biblical critics do: “Criticism is a semantic operation, and grasping the macrosemantics of entire texts is not a task for which there is any method; it requires empathy and imagination. Of course, this does not mean on the other hand that it is simply a matter of unfocused emotion. Detailed attention to questions of *language, historical context, and authorship* is required” (66-67, emphasis added). He goes on to explain that “Biblical criticism is a semantic operation in that it is concerned with the meaning of words and phrases... words have meaning only in a particular context: a word does not have a timeless meaning that is independent of the historical setting in which it is uttered. To that extent and in that sense biblical criticism is inevitably a historical discipline” (*Biblical Criticism*, 102). For a useful summary of the various methods utilized in the interpretation of Mark throughout history, see Janice Capel Anderson and Stephen D. Moore, “Introduction: The Lives of Mark,” in *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies* (2nd ed.; edited by Janice Capel Anderson and Stephen D Moore; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 1-27.

⁴³ Barton, *Biblical Criticism*, 72-3, would not consider a quest for “authorial intent” fundamental to biblical criticism, but he does not deny its validity as a legitimate avenue of critical inquiry.

⁴⁴ Here, I am thinking of biblical narrative criticism as defined and demonstrated in such works David Rhoads, Joanna Dewey, and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012); Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, “Narrative Criticism: How Does the Story Mean?” in

to the internal coherence of the Markan plot, and I closely analyze its characters, settings, and rhetoric in an effort to grasp how the story constructs its meaning. It is only through such careful literary analysis that one can trace the threads of Paul woven throughout.

At the same time, there are certain ahistorical avowals of narrative criticism that I will not adopt for this dissertation. I do not share literary critics' concerns about the "intentional fallacy"⁴⁵ or their skepticism about one's ability to reconstruct of the historical situation of a real community,⁴⁶ and I will not take up Seymour Chatman's famous interpretive matrix consisting of "real author," "implied author," "implied reader," and "real reader," as Elizabeth Struthers

eadem, *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark's Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 1-40; and Robert C. Tannehill, "The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role," *JR* 57 (1977), 386-405.

⁴⁵ A concept made famous by W.K. Wimsatt, Jr. and Monroe C. Beardsley, *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry* (New York: The Noonday Press, 1954), 3-18.

⁴⁶ For a good introduction to reconstructing Mark's audience, see Robert M. Fowler, "Reader-Response Criticism: Figuring Mark's Reader," in Anderson and Moore, *Mark and Method*, 59-93.

Though I do not affirm Richard Bauckham's assertion that the gospels are written for all Christians (see Richard Bauckham, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?" in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* [ed. idem; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 9-49, esp. 44-9), and I am convinced by the comprehensive response of Margaret M. Mitchell ("Patristic Counter-Evidence to the Claim that 'the Gospels Were Written for All Christians,'" *NTS* 51 (2005), 36-79), I also suspect that Mark did not intend the impact of his story to be limited *solely* to Roman Christians. They are, to be sure, the primary referent, but, as Mk 13:10 shows—"And, first [πρῶτον], it is necessary that the gospel be proclaimed [δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον] to all the nations [εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη]"—Mark's gospel presumes an external (and universal) mission, and the imminent expectation or danger felt by the Roman community to which Mark responds could have held additional metaphorical resonances (of which Mark may have been aware) to external readers. On this point, see Troels Engberg-Pedersen, "Paul in Mark 8:34-9:1: Mark on what it is to be a Christian," in Becker, et al., *Mark and Paul*, 189-209. See also Mary Ann Beavis, *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4:11-12* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 167-73; cf. Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 28-29; Collins, *Mark*, 96-102, esp. 101-1; Incigneri, *The Gospel According to the Romans*, 30-31, 224; Nils Dahl, "The Purpose of Mark's Gospel," in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (ed. Nils Alstrup Dahl; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), 63-4.

Malbon has done.⁴⁷ Engaging Markan intent is essential to my project, and, as a result, though I am indebted to a narrative-critical method of reading, I do not affirm all of its hermeneutical presuppositions. On this point, I agree with the assessment of Incigneri:

The focus on the modern reader and on the text as an autonomous subject [in narrative criticism] has meant that the historical context has often been ignored or minimized. Unfortunately, the break from historical-critical methods by literary critics has led to an either/or perception, as many see a dichotomy between literary and historical criticism. There is no reason, however, why a study of the text cannot have a strong historical awareness without relying on diachronic methods, one that is fully cognizant of the social context, while being sensitive to literary and rhetorical considerations such as narrative construction, character portrayal, mood, point of view, and the reader responses that the author hoped to engender. This would provide a blend of historical and literary approaches that builds on the strength of the historical awareness and philological tools of historical criticism.⁴⁸

Third and finally, I presume that ancient Mediterranean society was saturated with performance in various forms,⁴⁹ and Paul's letters would not only have been read out loud in performance, but particular phenomena within his letters would have been recognized as ritual or typological performances of specific episodes of his gospel narrative (baptism, Eucharist, Scripture). Similarly, I presume that Mark's story would have been read and performed in front of his Roman community. Thus, I adopt many of the presuppositions of performance criticism,⁵⁰

⁴⁷ See Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978), 146-151 for this famous schematization and the reasoning behind it. See also Malbon, "How Does the Story Mean?" 7.

⁴⁸ Incigneri, *Gospel to the Romans*, 28-29

⁴⁹ Theatre, ritual, athletics, litigation, lecture, debate, etc. On Graeco-Roman performance culture generally, see Richard P. Martin, "Ancient Theatre and Performance Culture," in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre* (edited by Marianne McDonald and J. Michael Walton; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 36-54.

⁵⁰ On performance criticism, see David Rhoads, "Performance Criticism: An Emerging Methodology in Second Testament Studies—Part I," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 36 (2006), 118-133, and idem, "Performance Criticism: An Emerging Methodology in Second Testament Studies—Part II" *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 36 (2006), 164-184. On

and I focus especially on the ways in which performance has the “power to transform.”⁵¹

According to David Rhoads,

With performance we ask in fresh ways not only what a composition *means* but what it *does* in performance. What is the impact of performance in terms of persuasion—subversion of cultural values, transformations of worldview, impulse to action, change in behavior, emotional effect, ethical commitment, intellectual insight, political perspective, re-formation of community, the generation of a new world? Put another way, what does a story or letter lead the audience to *become*—such that they are different people in the course of and as a result of experiencing the performance? (emphasis original).⁵²

For the purposes of my dissertation, I define “performance” in the following broad terms:

any oral or embodied (re)telling of a tradition in the context of a gathered community by either trained or untrained performers.⁵³ I contend that Mark’s gospel is a carefully crafted textual performance that seeks to transform its readers and auditors. It plays on the features of tragic drama⁵⁴ to create an experience naively analogous to Aristotle’s famous and enigmatic assertion

Mark in performance, see Antoinette Clark Wire, *The Case for Mark Composed in Performance* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2011). On Pauline letters in performance, see Bernhard Oestreich, *Performance Criticism of the Pauline Letters* (translated by Lindsay Elias and Brent Blum; Eugene: Cascade Books, 2016). On the performance of scripture in early Christian worship more generally, see Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 203-31.

⁵¹ Rhoads, “Performance Criticism: Part 1,” 127.

⁵² Rhoads, “Performance Criticism: Part 1,” 130.

⁵³ Compare this with the definition of Rhoads, “Performance Criticism: Part 1,” 119: “I am defining performance in the broadest sense as any oral telling/retelling of a brief or lengthy tradition—from saying to gospel—in a formal or informal context of a gathered community by trained or untrained performers.” I add “embodied” to my own definition because, as will become clear, words need not be spoken for particular episodes of the gospel narrative to be “performed.” Regardless, this expansion does not strike me particularly divergent from Rhoad’s way of thinking about performance, as he will later suggest that the performer “embodies” the text or tradition he or she seeks to manifest and “*is the medium* that bears the potential meanings and impacts of the story upon the audience in a particular context” (“Performance Criticism: Part 1,” 128 [emphasis original]).

⁵⁴ Jeff Jay (*The Tragic in Mark: A Literary-historical Interpretation* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014]) has convincingly argued that Mark is written in a tragic “mode.” It is not by generic definition a “tragedy,” but it clearly plays upon the themes and motifs of tragedy in the unfolding of its plot.

that tragedy, “through pity and fear [δι’ ἐλέου καὶ φόβου], effects the catharsis [κάθαρσιν] of such emotions.”⁵⁵ In and through the performance of Mark’s gospel, the Markan audience would see the death of Christ (re)presented before their eyes, and they would experience the pain and fear elicited by that event from an external and (comparatively) safe vantage. As the story is not yet complete at Mk 16:8, however, that (re)presentation then necessitates the full recollection of the sacred story beyond its 16 chapters.⁵⁶ It is this process by which Kermode’s periods of “transition” and “End” are brought together, and Paul and his mission—seeded into Mark’s gospel—are validated within the minds of the Markan audience.

Part II: Gustav Volkmar and Martin Werner—Settling the Question?

Before advancing my thesis, I will take a step back and sketch the origins of the debate surrounding the Paulinism of the Gospel of Mark and its effects on modern scholarship. The story begins some 150 years ago, with the work of Gustav Volkmar, a 19th century German

⁵⁵ δι’ ἐλέου καὶ φόβου περαίνουσα τὴν τῶν τοιούτων παθημάτων κάθαρσιν (Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1449b27-8. The Greek text is taken from Aristotle, *Poetics* [trans. Stephen Halliwell; LCL; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995].) Modern scholarship tends to understand Aristotle to mean by these words that, because universal patterns of human action are represented in the theatre, tragic catharsis helps to train a person to “feel emotion in the right way, at the right time, towards the right object, with the correct motive, to the proper degree, etc.” (Richard Janko, “From Catharsis to the Aristotelian Mean,” in *Essays on Aristotle’s Poetics* [edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992], 346-7. See also, Martha C. Nussbaum, “Tragedy and Self-sufficiency: Plato and Aristotle on Fear and Pity,” in Rorty, *Essays*, 280-83; Stephen Halliwell, “Pleasure, Understanding, and Emotion in Aristotle’s *Poetics*,” in Rorty, *Essays*, 241-60; David Wiles, “Aristotle’s *Poetics* and Ancient Dramatic Theory,” in McDonald and Walton, *Greek and Roman Theatre*, 98-100. Cf. Jonathan Lear, “Katharsis,” in Rorty, *Essays*, 315-40). While not entirely separate, I take Mark’s intent to be more metaphysical. The pedagogical aspects of his gospel are directed towards recognizing Jesus as the messiah of the world and preparing his audience for the end times that will soon occur at his second coming.

⁵⁶ Margaret M. Mitchell, “Epiphanic Evolutions,” 246-8.

philologist and biblical critic.⁵⁷ Volkmar took up the subject of the relationship of Mark to Paul in two substantial monographs. The first, a popular work entitled, *Die Religion Jesu und ihre erste Entwicklung nach dem gegenwärtigen Stande der Wissenschaft*, was published in 1857 and introduced his thesis that Mark is a self-consciously crafted allegorical defense of Paul and his mission.⁵⁸ Volkmar's second work, *Die Evangelien, oder Marcus und die Synopsis der kanonischen und ausserkannonischen Evangelien nach dem ältesten Text mit historisch-exegetischem Commentar*, was published in 1870 as a comprehensive commentary that furthered his earlier thesis.⁵⁹

To understand Volkmar, one must recognize that, as the last great member of the Tübingen School, he was indebted to F.C. Baur's famous *Tendenzkritik* and his conviction that much of early Christian literature could be explained on the basis of the conflict(s) between a Petrine "Jewish Christianity" and a Pauline "Gentile Christianity."⁶⁰ Volkmar's particular contribution was to argue that that conflict began in earnest with the Book of Revelation. He

⁵⁷ For a survey of his life and intellectual background, see Bernd Wildemann, *Das Evangelium als Lehrpoesie: Leben und Werk Gustav Volkmar's* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1983); see also Vig Skoven, "Mark as Allegorical Rewriting," 13-16; Horton Harris, *The Tübingen School: A Historical and Theological Investigation of the School of F.C. Baur* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990), 127-133.

⁵⁸ Gustav Volkmar, *Religion Jesu und ihre erste Entwicklung nach dem gegenwärtigen Stande der Wissenschaft* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1857), passim, but see esp. 277-336.

⁵⁹ Gustav Volkmar, *Die Evangelien, oder Marcus und die Synopsis der kanonischen und ausserkannonischen Evangelien nach dem ältesten Text, mit historisch-exegetischem Commentar* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [R. Reisland], 1870).

⁶⁰ Volkmar, *Evangelien*, VIII-XI, Wildemann, *Lehrpoesie*, 8, 314. For a good introduction to Baur, see Harris, *Tübingen*, 10-54.

understood this text to be a challenge to Pauline Christianity and its message of salvation for all,⁶¹ and he considered the Gospel of Mark to be its direct, literary rebuttal.⁶²

At the same time, Volkmar was a committed Protestant, and his project had an overtly theological tone. For him, the gospel narratives were allegorical (German: “sinnbildlich”) models of the “one gospel” (“des Einen Evangeliums”)⁶³ of Jesus Christ and his apostle, Paul.⁶⁴ During the first two centuries, prior to the imposition of Catholic traditionalism, Volkmar assumed that early Christian authors were well aware of the true didactic content (“Lehrgehalt”) of the gospel stories; indeed, they were able to modernize while simultaneously remaining true to that content.⁶⁵ But, as time passed, this didactic material was buried, and the gospels increasingly came to be recognized as “historical narratives” (“Geschichts-Erzählung”) penned by the hands

⁶¹ “Eine Art Evangelium erzählender Form, jedenfalls eine erste umfängliche Schrift-Verkündigung des durch J. Chr. kommenden Gottesreiches ist die ‘Apokalypsis Jesu Christi’ an den Zebedaïden, den Donnersohn Johannes, der Ende 68 u.Z. die herrlichkeitszukunft erwartete zur Vernichtung der götzendienerischen Heidenwelt, und dabei den Heidenapostel ob seiner israëlwidrigen Lehre verwarf” (Volkmar, *Evangelien*, VIII).

⁶² “Das Ganze des Paulinischen Werkes ist ein Gegenstück zur Paulusfeindlichen Apocalypse, sowol als Nachbildung derselben, als im Gegensatz zu ihr” (Volkmar, *Evangelien*, 646); see also Wildemann, *Lehrpoesie*, 319.

⁶³ Volkmar defines this one gospel as follows: “Das Evangelium Jesu Christi is die Frohbotschaft der geistigen Erlösung, welche Jesus von Nazareth seit dem Ende Johannes des Täufers gebracht hat durch die Verkündigung und Begründung des genaheten Gottesreiches, das seine Wurzeln hat in der Gotteskindschaft und der vollen Gottes- und Bruder-Liebe” (*Evangelien*, VII).

⁶⁴ “Die Evangelienbücher sind sinnbildlich erzählende Ausführungen des Einen Evangeliums Jesu und seiner Apostel, oder Lehrschriften des wahren Christenthums auf Grund des Geschichlichen und weltgeschichtlichen Lebens Jesu, der vom Kreuz geistig auferstanden, in seinen Jüngern wirksam geblieben ist, aus der urchristlichen Zeit der Vermittlung zwischen Juden- und Heiden-Christenthum, nach 70 unserer Zeitrechnung, vor 175, vor dem Beginn der alkatholischen Bischofskirche” (Volkmar, *Evangelien*, VII).

⁶⁵ “In der urchristlichen Zeit hatte man noch ein so klares Bewusstsein von dem Lehrgehalt der evangelischen Erzählungen, dass man aufs freiste dieselben erneuerte oder veränderte, wie es der weitere Fortschritt erheischte, was noch Justin und Barnabas so auffallend thuen” (*Evangelien*, X).

of the apostles themselves, or, in the case of Mark, by an apostle's amanuensis.⁶⁶ Thus, they ceased to be primarily allegorical or figural and instead became historical. An awareness of the underlying spiritual sense ("geistigen Sinn") implicitly persisted alongside this external conception ("äusserlichen Auffassung"), however, and, with the coming of the Protestant reformers, the spiritual sense of the gospels was elevated to the surface once more.⁶⁷ Volkmar viewed his own project as contiguous with his Reformation predecessors: he sought to provide a means by which the gap between reason-based historical criticism and spirit-driven didactics could be bridged, and, in the process, the teachings of Protestant Christianity vindicated.⁶⁸

For Volkmar, then, the Gospel of Mark is not properly a "history." Rather, it is a "self-conscious didactic-poetic composition [Lehr-Poesie] on historical ground."⁶⁹ He explains,

[Mark's] whole work is an apology for the apostle to the Gentiles [eine Apologie des Heidenapostels], a defense [Vertheidigung] for the legitimacy [Rechtes] of the community of Gentiles in the name of Jesus Christ and the Old Testament, which is, through him, fulfilled and surpassed [erfüllt und übertreffen sei]...Indeed, throughout the whole gospel the life of Jesus, as

⁶⁶ "Allmählig aber verfestete sich der ursprüngliche Fluss, und gleichzeitig beginnt die Überschrift κατὰ Μαρθαῖον ct. so verstanden zu werden, dass die betreffende 'Geschichts-Erzählung' von dem genannten Apostel und Apostelschüler verfasst sei. Dies geschieht schon von Bischof Papias um 160-170...und vollzieht sich seit der Consecration der vier erwählten Schriften, durch die Väter der altkatholischen Kirche, Irenäus, Tertullian, Clemens, und Origenes" (*Evangelien*, X-XI).

⁶⁷ "Doch bewahren dieselben neben der äusserlichen Auffassung immer noch das Bewusstsein von dem geistigen oder lehrhaften, vorbildlichen Sinn, und je geistvoller im Besondern die Prediger durch das ganze Mittelalter hin wie in der Reformationzeit sind, ein Luther, ein Zwingli: um so mehr begegnet man bei ihnen den richtigsten Blicken in den geistigen Sinn der evangelischen Texte" (*Evangelien*, XI).

⁶⁸ Wildemann notes Volkmar's indebtedness to 19th Century Protestant idealism and neatly encapsulates his project as follows: "Das wesen des Christentums, wie es in Paulinismus am besten auf den Begriff gebraucht und in der Reformation erneuert worden ist, will in der Gegenwart durch die historisch-kritische Forschung erkannt und verteidigt werden" (*Lehrpoesie*, 10). For a more detailed overview of Volkmar's "sense of mission" (his "Sendungsbewusstsein"), see Wildemann, *Lehrpoesie*, 336-343.

⁶⁹ "Das Marcus-Ev. ist eine selbstbewusste Lehr-Poesie auf historischem Grunde" (Volkmar, *Die Evangelien*, 643).

also the life, work, and suffering of Paul, is in view [durch das ganze Ev. hin ist das Leben Jesu, wie das Leben, Wirken, und Leiden Pauli mit im Auge].⁷⁰

Volkmar thus imagined the Gospel of Mark to be a text in which spiritual truths were concealed within a historiographical “shell” (“Hülle”).⁷¹ The evangelist had access to oral traditions and various literary sources, including four of Paul’s letters,⁷² but Mark’s primary concern was to portray Christ as Paul’s revealed and ascended Son of God.⁷³ Thus, the historical traditions standing behind the narrative were transformed by the evangelist into allegories that

⁷⁰ “Sein ganzes Werk ist eine Apologie des Heidenapostels, eine Vertheidigung des Rechtes der Hedengemeinde in Namen Jesu Christi und des A.T., das durch ihm erfüllt und übertreffen sei...Ja durch das ganze Ev. hin ist das Leben Jesu, wie das Leben, Wirken, und Leiden Pauli mit im Auge” (Volkmar, *Die Evangelien*, 645).

⁷¹ A term used with some regularity throughout Volkmar’s work. See, for example, his exposition of Mk 4:1-9, where he asserts that, “Was der Lehrer [i.e. Mark] gleich mit dem ersten Worte andeutete ‘Höret! Siehe’, dass das Erzählte nicht zu sehen, sondern zu verstehen: das hebt er am Schlusse mit Betonung hervor...Ja wohl, antwortet Mc. Höre du, ganze christlichen Welt, was der Geist Jesu euch über Gottesreiches Wesen *unter sinnlicher Hülle* zu verstehen giebt! Verstehe man nur die alten sinnlichen Reden gründlich (und besser als Apoc. selbst)! Das ganze Ev. aber nach Mc. als sinnbildlichen Belehrung über das wahre Wesen des Christenthums sollte dieses Motto an der Stirn tragen!” (*Evangelien*, 278).

⁷² “Die Quellen des Buches sind das A.T., Paulus 4 Briefe [Romans, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians], mündliche Überlieferung aus dem Gemeindemund oder aus Palästina selbst über Jesu Leben, und die eigne kirchliche Erfahrung bis zu seiner Zeit, endlich vielleicht die ihm um 65 vorangegangne Geschichte des Apostel Paulus von Lucas, sicher aber das zuletzt ihm vorangegangne paulusfeindliche, und doch so allgemein imponierende schriftwerk der Apokalypsis, angeblich von J. Christi eigener Eingebung” (Volkmar, *Der Evangelien*, 646).

Volkmar lists the four specific letters of Paul to which Mark had access at *Evangelien* VII. On this page he also gives a bit more information about the “Geschichte des Apostel Paulus von Lucas”: “Die nachgefolgte Schrift des Pauliners Lucas über das Leben des grossen Apostels, wahrscheinlich alsbald nach seinem Tode u.Z. verfasst, ist uns nicht mehr in der ursprünglichen Gestalt erhalten, sondern von einem spätern Pauliner ‘nach Lucas’ überarbeitet.”

⁷³ “Unser Evangelist hat durch Alles dem Missverstand abgewehrt, als wolle er eine Biographie Jesu im prosaischen Sinne des Wortes geben. Er erneut die frohe Botschaft von Jesu als dem erschienenen Christus in dem höhern Sinne, dass Jesus Christus dies als Sohn Gottes, dass er der Geistesmessias für Alle sei und das hierin sein wahres Wesen, das Wahre Christenthum bestehe, wie es Christus selbst durch den Apostel des Geistes mit Wort und That so herrlich offenbart hat” (Volkmar, *Religion Jesu*, 263).

(re)present the theological convictions of Paul.⁷⁴ Anne Vig Skoven helpfully summarizes Volkmar's project as follows:

Mark's Gospel is to be seen as an odyssey in which the reader travels with the historical Jesus, with the Apostle Paul and with the risen Christ (or the Christ-Spirit)... Whereas the author of Luke and Acts chose to allocate these travel narratives to two separate volumes, Mark's single two-level story encompasses both. Volkmar regards the Markan Jesus as a literary character who is based upon several literary and historical figures—including, of course, the historical Jesus. However, when speaking of Christ, the author often has Paul in mind. Apparently, Mark has projected Paul and his Gentile mission—as we know it from Paul's letters and the Acts of the Apostles—back into Jesus' life.⁷⁵

On Volkmar's reading, then, Mark's layering of narratives necessitates the careful delineation of complex and ubiquitous external referents to what he believed were various Markan symbols. For example, in his discussion of Mk 9:33-50, which Volkmar takes to be superlative proof of Mark's Paulinism,⁷⁶ the German scholar asserts that the foreign exorcist

⁷⁴ "Historischer Hintergrund in Perikopen hindert nicht an ihrer sinnbildlichen Auslegung, da Mk jedenfalls nicht historische Nachrichten übermitteln, sondern Lehrzählung bieten will, d.h. er fasst ihm etwa überkommene historische Überlieferung in solche Worte, die das Geschehen auf seine Bedeutung für den Glauben hin transparent machen, und er tut das sehr oft durch den Gebrauch traditioneller atl Bilder und Vorstellungen" (Wildemann, *Lehrpoesie*, 346).

⁷⁵ vig Skoven, "Mark as Allegorical Rewriting of Paul," 21. See also Wildeman, *Lehrpoesie*, 319: "Es sind vor allem zwei exegetische Prämissen, die bei Volkmar seine These vom Paulinismus des MkEv tragen: 1. Er versteht das MkEv als eine Apologie des Paulus und des Paulinismus gegen die Angriffe der Apk. 2. Er versteht viele Perikopen des MkEv als absichtliche Rückprojizierung von Ereignissen und Taten aus dem Leben des Paulus in das Leben Jesu; diese Perikopen wollen den Leser in verhüllter, sinnbildlicher Sprache auf Paulus hinweisen und das Recht seiner Theologie auf das Wirken Jesu zurückführen. Bei dieser zweiten Prämisse geht es inhaltlich fast immer um den Gesichtspunkt der Heidenmission: Volkmar erkennt in einer grossen Anzahl der mk Perikopen eine Abbildung und eine Apologie der Missionsarbeit des Heidenapostels Paulus."

⁷⁶ The pericope is also given pride of place in his concluding list of proofs for the Paulinism of Mark's Gospel: "Ist nicht P. der 'Dämonenaustreiber, der nicht zu den 12 gehört', dem Johannes wehren wollte, wie schon Lc. und Mt. unverkennbar fanden? Ausdrücklich dabei der Schutz der klein geachteten 'Gläubigen an Christus' gegen das Vorrangsuchen des ältern Jüngerkreises" (*Evangelien*, 645; see also Wildemann, *Lehrpoesie*, 319).

must be a symbol for Paul on the basis of the following exegetical inferences: 1) the disciples' question "who is greater" (τίς μείζων [Mk 9:34]) refers not to an internal dispute but an external one (the disciples are judging themselves over and against outsiders); 2) the "child" (παίδιον [Mk 9:36]) that Jesus embraces stands as a symbol for the Gentiles who bear Christ's name (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου [Mk 9:37]); and 3) the exorcist is opposed by none other than John (Mk 9:38), the author of the book of Revelation and Paul's greatest opponent.⁷⁷ On the basis of these three speculative observations, Volkmar claims that Mk 9:33-50 is written in support of Paul and warns about the dangers of excluding Gentile converts from the early Christian mission.

In response to Volkmar, Martin Werner, a 20th century Protestant theologian, published a monograph in 1923 entitled, *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium: eine Studie zur neutestamentlichen Theologie*.⁷⁸ In addition to offering a thoroughgoing challenge to what he deemed the flawed and arbitrary allegorical approach of his German predecessor,⁷⁹ Werner sought to institute specific criteria and a stable method for comparing Mark to Paul.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Volkmar, *Evangelien*, 464-475, esp. 464-7.

⁷⁸ Martin Werner, *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium: eine Studie zur neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1923).

⁷⁹ According to Werner, what Volkmar compared with Paul "ist nicht der Markustext als solcher, sondern das, was er mit Hilfe einer kühn und geistreich durchgeführten Allegorese aus ihm herausliest. Und zwar ist diese Methode der Auslegung bei Markus nicht bloss erlaubt, sondern nach Volkmar's Auffassung geradezu geboten. Den Markus habe eben sein Evangelium als Lehrdichter geschrieben" (*Einfluss*, 8).

⁸⁰ Werner formulated his fundamental methodological question as follows: "Wir haben also in unserer Untersuchung die Priorität des Markus vorauszusetzen und die Hauptfrage so zu formulieren, *inwiefern berechtigerweise von Paulinismus des Markus gesprochen werden könne lediglich auf Grund des Vergleichs der paulinischen Briefe mit dem Evangelium selbst*" (*Einfluss*, 7 [emphasis added]).

Instead of relying on Markan symbols, Werner compared the apostle and evangelist on essential themes that could be considered expressly “Pauline.”⁸¹

As might be expected, Werner’s hermeneutic differed significantly from that of Volkmar.⁸² Indebted for his thought to the work of Albert Schweitzer⁸³ (to whom his monograph is dedicated⁸⁴), Werner formed a part of the so-called “first quest” for the historical Jesus (*Leben-Jesu-Forschung*), and his early monograph on Mark should be considered a contribution to that research.⁸⁵ For Werner, as for Schweitzer, the best hermeneutic for understanding the development of early Christianity was a “Consistent-Eschatological” (“Konsequent-Eschatologische”) one, an approach that “seek[s] to interpret the essentials of the teaching of Jesus, of the first apostles, and of Paul...consistently from the viewpoint of that sense of eschatological expectancy, current in late-Jewish apocalyptic, which dominated the whole of Primitive Christianity.”⁸⁶

⁸¹ Werner built upon topics investigated in the Tübingen school that he understood to be fundamental to Paul’s Christ-centered worldview (*Einfluss*, 31), and his own investigation goes on to compare Mark and Paul, “wo sich wirkliche Vergleichspunkte finden in der Christologie, in den Gedanken über Gesetz, Evangelium, Glauben, Sünde, Fleisch und Geist, Taufe und Abendmahl, Eschatologie, in der Beurteilung der Urapostel, des Judenvolkes und der Heiden” (*Einfluss*, 32).

⁸² In his *The Formation of Christian Dogma: A Historical Study of its Problem* (trans. S.G.F. Brandon; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), Werner attacks at the sort of Protestant theological readings of which Volkmar is representative: “The traditional explanation of reforming Protestantism, namely, of the emergence of the Catholic Church as an ‘apostasy’ from the original Christian Faith, an event which must have occurred sometime towards the end of the Apostolic period, was in fact a dogmatic judgement and not an historical insight into the true meaning of the great transformation which had then taken place” (3).

⁸³ Especially Albert Schweitzer’s *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1906). For an English translation, see idem, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* [ed. John Bowden; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

⁸⁴ Werner, *Einfluss*, IV.

⁸⁵ See Werner, *Einfluss*, V-VI

⁸⁶ Werner, *Formation*, 9.

As Werner saw it, the great benefit to viewing early Christianity through this lens was, on the one hand, that it contextualized Jesus within, and understood him to be representative of, Second Temple Jewish apocalyptic and eschatology.⁸⁷ On the other, and consequently (if not a bit circularly), exegetes could have a “high confidence” in the trustworthiness of the synoptic tradition that depicted Jesus in such a manner.⁸⁸ Indeed, in Werner’s judgement, analyzing the synoptic gospels through the lens of “Consistent-Eschatology” not only preserved the historicity of the narratives, it provided a means by which a reader could make sense of literary problems he or she might encounter in the course of reading one of the texts.⁸⁹

An essential consequence of engaging the gospels from this “Consistent-Eschatological” point of view was that the direction of influence had to run *from* the gospels *to* Paul and not the other way around.⁹⁰ For Werner, to invert that sequence would be to call the entire hermeneutic

⁸⁷ “The ‘Consistent-Eschatology’ proceeds from the fact that, according to the statements transmitted by the [synoptic gospels] relative to place and time, the career of Jesus lay within the period of the rise of late-Jewish apocalyptic literature. Comparison, particularly between the original Synoptic representation of Jesus and the Daniel-Enoch apocalyptic, renders the personality of Jesus recognizable as a phenomenon of late-Jewish apocalyptic. Jesus himself represents with a peculiar distinction the apocalyptic-eschatological conviction concerning the future reconstitution of the world, especially in a form of urgent expectancy” (Werner, *Formation*, 13).

⁸⁸ Werner, *Formation*, 12-13.

⁸⁹ For example, by reading in this way, Werner is able to affirm the essential historicity of the messianic secret: “the supernatural concepts which Jesus held of the Messiah, of the Kingdom and of its supernatural realization in the near future converge in his utterance about the Daniel-Enoch ‘Son of Man’, [and] the apocalyptic sense of the Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus reveals itself. Accordingly, the historicity of those Dominical sayings is assured in which he understands his Messianic office as being in the future and is concerned, therefore, to preserve it as a secret from the public. Those statements of Jesus, in which he publicly describes himself before the Passion, while in his present natural human form of being, as already the ‘Son of Man’, are to be considered as inaccurately recorded” (Werner, *Formation*, 18-19).

⁹⁰ For example, Werner asserts that, “If one belongs to the New Age, to the perfect ordering of God’s Kingdom in a completely supernatural new mode of being, then for this ‘eternal life’ all prescriptions of the Old Testament, which

into question. Paul did not know the historical Jesus (see Gal 1:15-17), and, were he shown to have had a significant influence on synoptic literary tradition, the historical character of those texts would become far more difficult to discern.

Thus, in 1923, Werner published a book that systematically refuted Volkmar's claims. Reading through a "Consistent Eschatological" lens, Werner sought to demonstrate that there was no rhyme or reason to Volkmar's allegories, on the one hand, and that Volkmar had consistently misread or distorted the real historical data provided by biblical texts, on the other. As a result, Werner came to the exact opposite conclusion of Volkmar on nearly every point. At the close of the monograph, he summarizes his findings as follows:

1. Where Mark agrees with Paul, it is always a matter of general early Christian assumptions [um allgemein-urchristliche Anschauungen].
2. Where, in the letters, beyond this common ground [über diese gemeinsame Basis], characteristically Pauline assumptions happen to emerge [charakteristisch paulinische Anschauungen zutage treten], either Markan parallels are entirely lacking [fehlen... vollständig], or Mark represents downright opposite attitudes [geradezu entgegengesetzte Standpunkte].
3. Thus, the argument [die Rede] for an influence of Pauline theology on the Gospel of Mark [einem Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium] cannot in the least be sustained.⁹¹

have been valid heretofore, inevitably lose their relevance and, therefore, also their validity (Mk xii, 28ff.; Mt xxii, 23 ff.). If Jesus then expected, towards the end of his public career, as Mt xxvi, 64 suggests together with other utterances, his ultimate Return and therewith the End of the World in the context and because of his own Death (and his Resurrection), the presupposition was thereby provided for the logical conclusion drawn by the Apostle Paul, that Christ through his Death had also become the End of the Law" (*Formation*, 20). As this quote clearly demonstrates, Werner is reading Paul's theological insights through the lens of synoptic tradition.

⁹¹ "Mag der Markus unseres zweiten Evangeliums mit dem Begleiter des Paulus zu identifizieren sein oder nicht, die Vergleichung seiner Schrift mit den heute within als echt anerkannten paulinischen Briefen zeigt folgendes:

1. Wo Markus mit Paulus übereinstimmt, handelt es sich immer um allgemein-urchristliche Anschauungen.
2. Wo in den Briefen über diese gemeinsame Basis hinaus besondere, charakteristisch paulinische Anschauungen zutage treten, da fehlen entweder bei Markus die Parallelen vollständig, oder Markus vertritt geradezu entgegengesetzte Standpunkte

For nearly 100 years, these conclusions, with a few exceptions,⁹² have largely been accepted by scholars, and they are still regularly assumed or explicitly (re)affirmed today.⁹³ Yet Werner's monograph displays the tendency to read the evidence one-sidedly in an effort to

-
3. Von einem Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium kann daher nicht im geringsten die Rede sein" (Werner, *Der Einfluss*, 209; see also Marcus, "Interpreter of Paul" 32.).

These concluding inferences are anticipated throughout his monograph (see, for example, 44-5, 54-5, 68, 74-5, 91-3, etc.).

⁹² In the intervening period between Werner and Marcus, there have been occasional authors who have suggested Mark's close relationship to Paul, but none of their arguments have carried the day. See, for example, Benjamin W. Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1925); J.C. Fenton, "Paul and Mark," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Honor of R.H. Lightfoot* (ed. by D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 89-112; Marxsen, *Mark*, 117-150; Joseph B. Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark," *JBL* 80 (1961), 261-8; Michael D. Goulder, "Those Outside (Mk 4:10-12)," *NT* 33 (1991), 289-302; Wolfgang Schenk, "Sekundäre Jesuanisierungen von primären Paulus-Aussagen bei Markus," in Van Segbroek et al., *The Four Gospels*, 2.877-904; and C. Clifton Black, "Christ Crucified in Paul and Mark: Reflections on an Intracanonial Conversation," in *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish* (edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. and Jerry L. Sumney; Nashville; Abingdon, 1996), 184-206.

⁹³ Werner's conclusions are taken for granted by Markan commentators who do not engage Mark's Paulinism at all (see, for example, the introduction to Collins' commentary [*Mark*, 1-125], where Paul plays no significant role in her lengthy discussion, but Mark's access to early Jesus traditions is assumed), or, where the debate is entered and Pauline influence found wanting, it is presumed that Werner's judgments about a common tradition are, in the main, correct (see, for example, Michael Kok, "Does Mark Narrate the Pauline *Kerygma* of 'Christ Crucified?' Challenging an Emerging Consensus on Mark as a Pauline Gospel," *JSNT* 37 [2014], 139-157. See also those scholars who disagree with Marcus in the de Gruyter volumes: Omerzu, "Paul and Mark—Mark and Paul," 51-61; Ole Davidsen, "Adam-Christ Typology in Paul and Mark: Reflections on a *tertium Comparationis*," in Becker et al., *Mark and Paul*, 243-272; Jan Dochorn, "Man and the Son of Man in Mark 2:27-28: An Exegesis of Mark 2:23-28 Focusing on the Christological Discourse in Mark 2:27-28 with an Epilogue Concerning Pauline Parallels," in Becker et al., *Mark and Paul*, 147-168; Kasper Bro Larsen, "Mark 7:1-23: A Pauline Halakah?" in Becker et al., *Mark and Paul*, 167-187 [though he disagrees with Werner's own reading of the passage under discussion]; Florian Wilk, "'Die Schriften' bei Markus und Paulus," in Wischmeyer et al., *Paul and Mark*, 189-211; Oda Wischmeyer, "Konzepte von Zeit bei Paulus und im Markusevangelium," in Wischmeyer et al., *Paul and Mark*, 361-89; Andreas Lindemann, "Das Evangelium bei Paulus und im Markusevangelium," Wischmeyer et al., *Paul and Mark*, 313-356).

preserve historical Jesus traditions from subsequent and external Pauline theological reflection.⁹⁴ For example, using the Parable of the Vineyard (Mk 12:1-11), Werner reasons that the death of Christ in Mark runs directly contrary (“direkt zuwiderlaufend”) to God’s divine plan.⁹⁵ This implies, according to Werner, that the gospel presents a Jesus whose earthly actions demonstrate his divinity despite his death and resurrection rather than because of it, which contrasts sharply with Paul for whom Christ’s messianism is dependent upon the crucifixion.⁹⁶ Yet, *pace Werner*, for Mark, the event towards which all those others build, and in light of which they must be

⁹⁴ This has been rightly noted by both Marcus, “Interpreter of Paul,” 29-49 and Vig Skoven, “Mark as Allegorical Rewriting,” 25.

⁹⁵ Werner’s full analysis runs as follows: “Der Weinbergbesitzer hat einen υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν. Diesen ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτοὺς (sc. Zu den Weingärtnern) λέγων ὅτι ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. Der Sohn (Messias) wird hier nicht gesandt, damit er sterbe. Er hat vielmehr im Weinberg einen Auftrag auszurichten, an dem ihn der Tod nur hindern könnte. Er hat den dem Vater zukommenden Teil des Weinbergertrags einzufordern. Die γεωργοὶ widersetzen sich aber und töten den Sohn. Hier erscheint der Tod des Messias nicht nur als gänzlich unvorhergesehen, sondern geradezu als der Absicht Gottes und dem Zweck der Sendung des Messias direkt zuwiderlaufend. Man vergleiche hiermit die paulinische Aussage: ὅς (sc. ὁ θεός) γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν... (Rom 8.32), dann wird man auch hier wieder an den bereits aufgewiesenen Gegensatz erinnert, wonach Markus das ganze irdische Leben Jesu unter dem Gesichtspunkt des messianischen Wirkens wertet, während Paulus nur dem Tod Heilswert zuschreibt” (Werner, *Einfluss*, 61-2).

⁹⁶ Werner, *Einfluss*, 62. There are a few other places Werner emphasizes this sort of contrast. See, for example, 49-50: “Man kann die beidseitigen Eigentümlichkeiten folgendermassen formulieren: Bei Markus wird ein Mensch zum Messias. Bei Paulus wird der Messias (zeitweise) Mensch. Bei Markus wird die Messianität in das Bild einer menschlichen Existenz eingezeichnet, bei Paulus die Episode einer menschlichen Existenz in die Geschichte eines himmlischen, messianischen Wesens...das Wunder, das für Markus an Jesus geschieht, heisst Vergöttlichung; das Wunder, das für Paulus am Christus geschieht, heisst Vermenschlichung. Damit ist konstantiert dass die Christologie des Markus im Grundzug durchaus verschieden ist von der Christologie des Paulus.” See also *Einfluss*, 51, where Werner, citing the work of Richard Drescher (“Das Markusevangelium und seine Entstehung,” *ZNW* 17 [1916], 231), says, “Schon in seinem erdenleben hat sich Jesus als der Retter der Endzeit, als Messias erwiesen, und um jeden Zweifel daran zu zerstreuen und so die Christen in ihrem Glauben fest zu machen, hat Markus sein Evangelium geschrieben.”

understood, is Christ's death (see Mk 2:18-20; 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-3, 45).⁹⁷ A good reading of the text must deal both with Jesus' messianic demonstrations during his earthly life and the absolute salvation-historical necessity of the cross, and Werner has attempted to make the two Markan ideas mutually exclusive.⁹⁸

Interestingly, amongst the various reactions to Werner that have arisen in the wake of Marcus' work (more on his article below), methods of reading that bear some similarity to Volkmar's allegorical exegesis have seen a resurgence, perhaps due to William R. Telford's provocative suggestion in 1999 that, "With the development of narrative-critical tools and an increasing sensitivity on the part of scholars to the nuances of narrative theology, Volkmar's original suggestion that Mark is an allegorical presentation of Pauline teaching in the form of a narrative may be due, therefore, for a comeback."⁹⁹ Scholars who adopt such an approach generally make use of the intertextual methods of Gérard Genette, W.G. Müller, or Dennis R. MacDonald,¹⁰⁰ and they analyze the ways in which the Gospel of Mark (a "hypertext") has systematically transformed and incorporated select Pauline epistles ("hypotexts") into its

⁹⁷ The famous formulation of Martin Kähler, that the gospels are "passion narratives with extended introductions" (*The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic, Biblical Christ* [trans. Carl E. Braaten; Philadelphia, Fortress, 1964], 80 n.11) is particularly true of the Gospel of Mark, where the cross is again and again emphasized.

⁹⁸ For a fuller discussion of Werner's one-sided focus on Markan Christology, see Marcus, "Interpreter of Paul," 34-43. As will become clear in the chapters that follow, Werner's one-sided readings are not limited to Markan Christology.

⁹⁹ Telford, *Theology of the Gospel of Mark*, 164-5.

¹⁰⁰ Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: La Littérature Au Second Degré* (Paris: Seuil, 1982); W.G. Müller, "Interfiguralité: A Study on the Interdependence of Literary Figures," in *Intertextuality* (edited by H. E. Plett: Berlin, de Gruyter, 1991), 101-121; Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000); idem, *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer: Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003).

body.¹⁰¹ These approaches to Mark's Paulinism have not persuaded the majority of the scholarly community, however. Because an exegete adopting a hypertextual reading might claim that, if there is clear thematic overlap between the two texts under examination, it is because the hypertext is commenting in a relatively straightforward fashion upon the hypotext; and, alternatively, if there are tensions or disagreements between the two writings, it is because the hypertext has *transformed* the hypotext, the interpretive malleability of their intertextual methods shield these scholars from critical examination.¹⁰² Rather than counter-evidence leading to the questioning of starting assumptions, that counter-evidence is incorporated and transformed into evidence *for* the starting assumptions.

Thus, though Werner's conclusions are increasingly recognized as flawed, a sustained and convincing assessment of Mark and Paul's relationship still remains a *desideratum*. That assessment must provide, on the one hand, a clear and historically plausible account of Mark's approach to Pauline materials while, on the other, presenting a replicable methodological model for testing its conclusions. At the same time, it must avoid overly symbolic readings, and it must challenge Werner's recourse to "general early Christian assumptions" (allgemein-urchristliche Anschauungen) that can be used to explain away any overlaps. As I will demonstrate, reading

¹⁰¹ The most prolific scholarly advocate of this reading is Bartosz Adamczewski (*Gospel of Mark*; see also idem, *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels* [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2013]; idem *The Gospel of Luke: A Hypertextual Commentary* [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2016]), but he is by no means the only proponent. Similar approaches to Mark's gospel have adopted up by Paul Nadim Tarazi, *The New Testament Introduction: Paul and Mark* (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1999); Tom E. Dykstra, *Mark, Canonizer of Paul* (St. Paul: OCABS Press, 2012); and Thomas P. Nelligan, *The Quest for Mark's Sources: An Exploration of the Case for Mark's Use of First Corinthians* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2015).

¹⁰² See, for example, the critical review of Adamczewski's *The Gospel of Luke: A Hypertextual Commentary* by Dieter T. Roth in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1 (2018), 57-9. See also Margaret M. Mitchell, "Homer in the New Testament?" *JR* 83 (2003), 244-260, esp. 251-4.

Mark's gospel as an etiological narrative goes far in satisfying these requirements. Mark is not writing an allegory for the apostle; rather, he is writing a historically circumscribed portion of the gospel narrative that he and Paul share. Because the story he tells is not the whole story, however, he is careful to anticipate (not "incorporate") those episodes that will occur after the conclusion of his 16 chapters, one of which is Christ's revelation to Paul himself.

Part III: Joel Marcus—Reopening the Question

No scholar has done more to reinvigorate the question of Mark's Paulinism than Joel Marcus. His essay, "Mark—Interpreter of Paul," is now generally accepted as the catalyst for a new investigation into the relationship between the two authors.¹⁰³ Recognizing the great challenge posed by Werner's assertion that a common tradition stands behind the evangelist and apostle, Marcus attempts to refute Werner's claim by comparing Mark with idiosyncratic or characteristically Pauline teachings. According to Marcus, the strongest case for establishing Mark's dependence on the apostle is made by demonstrating that the evangelist agrees with the apostle at points where others on the early Christian landscape would not,¹⁰⁴ and he suggests that fruitful areas of potential investigation include Paul's theological use of the term "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον), his insistence on the crucifixion as the apocalyptic turning point of the ages, his negative portrayal of the pillar apostles, his dualistic understanding of "faith," his insistence on the priority of the Jews (Ἰουδαίῳ πρῶτον [Rom 1:16]), his apocalyptic reformulation of the law,

¹⁰³ Virtually every author in Becker et al., *Mark and Paul*, gives some credit to Marcus, and such a formative influence is explicitly reflected in the editors' introductory statement: "In his seminal essay, 'Mark—Interpreter of Paul,' Joel Marcus brought the Mark/Paul debate to scholarly attention once again" (Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Mogens Müller, "Mark and Paul—Introductory Remarks," in Becker et al., *Mark and Paul*, 3 [emphasis added]).

¹⁰⁴ "If Paul was a lonely and contentious figure rather than a universally approved one, it is more remarkable than it would otherwise be that Mark frequently agrees with him" (Markus, "Interpreter of Paul," 30).

his emphasis on the “ungodly sinners,” Christ’s victory over the demonic in death, and Christ as a “new Adam,” all of which Marcus suggests are (re)presented in Mark’s narrative.¹⁰⁵

For the purposes of his article, Marcus focuses narrowly on how Paul and Mark understand the cross. Marcus not only highlights the problematic bifurcation Werner creates on the subject of crucifixion theology (discussed above); he also demonstrates that Mark and Paul share a belief that the death of Christ is the turning point of the ages, and it necessitates the adoption of a new epistemology that sees God’s eschatological power and glory displayed in the form of human flesh and weakness.¹⁰⁶ Because there is evidence within Paul’s letters that these beliefs are not, in fact, universally accepted at the time of the earliest mission,¹⁰⁷ Marcus suggests that Werner’s argument for a common tradition standing behind the two authors cannot be sustained.

I am indebted to Marcus both for the attention he has drawn to the flawed conclusions of Werner and the comprehensive list of themes shared by Mark and Paul that require further investigation, and one of the goals of this dissertation will be to build upon Marcus’ work in positive new directions. His investigation into the evangelist’s and apostle’s theology of the cross has correctly identified significant overlap between the two authors, and he offers plausible reasons for why Mark might elect to combine Pauline theology with Jesus traditions in narrative

¹⁰⁵ Marcus, “Interpreter of Paul,” 31-2. For a similar and even expanded list of overlaps, see Theophilos, “The Roman Connection” 53-61. See also Telford, *Theology of the Gospel of Mark*, 169.

¹⁰⁶ Marcus, “Interpreter of Paul,” 36-38.

¹⁰⁷ Marcus (“Interpreter of Paul,” 38-41) points to the pre-Pauline traditions preserved in Paul’s letters (which generally do not emphasize Christ’s crucifixion), Paul’s opponents (“who take their cues from the glory and strength of the resurrected Christ rather than from the lowliness and weakness of the Crucified One” [Marcus, “Interpreter of Paul,” 39]), and the ways in which the other gospels seek to attenuate the weakness of Christ as it is portrayed in the latter half of Mark’s gospel (particularly the Garden of Gethsemane [Mk 14:32-42; cf. Matt 26:36-46; Lk 22:40-46; Jn 18:1; Jn 12:27] and the cry from the cross [Mk 15:34; cf. Lk 23:46; Jn 19:28-30]).

form.¹⁰⁸ That said, Marcus does not explore Mark's broader hermeneutics vis-à-vis Paul, and he provides no explication of *how* Mark envisions the shared themes he has identified interacting with one another. This is the goal of my dissertation. I contend that Mark's literary purpose in integrating Pauline theology into his narrative is consistent and methodologically predictable: Mark looks to establish literary continuity between the missions of Christ and Paul, both of which form a part of the same gospel narrative that the evangelist and apostle share. Mark thus tells a story that is self-consciously crafted to anticipate episodes of the gospel that occur subsequently to his 16 chapters, within which Paul and his mission must be included.¹⁰⁹

Importantly, I am not suggesting that Mark's project functions *solely* to anticipate Paul. An etioloical approach to the mission and teachings of the apostle is, rather, an aspect of a much grander literary project. The Markan community lives in the period of the mission to the

¹⁰⁸ See Marcus, "Interpreter of Paul," 34, where he suggests Mark's motivations may be apologetic. He concedes, however, that his goal "is not to argue strongly for any particular explanation, but merely to suggest that a Pauline disciple might have had plausible reasons for doing what Paul did *not* do, namely, to incorporate the Jesus tradition into his kerygma" (Marcus, "Interpreter of Paul," 34 [emphasis original]).

¹⁰⁹ This line of thinking finds limited parallel Jesper Svartvik's "East is East and West is West: The Concept of Torah in Paul and Mark," in Wischmeyer et al., *Paul and Mark*, 157-185. At the conclusion of his investigation, Svartvik asserts, "Mark famously introduces his Gospel by stating that this is 'the beginning of the gospel' (1:1; ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου). Innumerable readers have read this, but not everyone has reflected on how long this beginning is. Where does ἡ ἀρχὴ end? We would argue that his entire narrative, all its sixteen chapters, constitute the beginning. By the time of his writing his narrative account, everyone knew the end—the death of Jesus on the cross and the inclusion of the Gentiles—but the question that he wishes to give a lengthy answer to is how it all began. That is why Mark describes his narrative as 'the beginning of the gospel.' Paul had already explained and emphasized the end and the ending of the gospel, i.e. how it ended and the τέλος. He famously wrote that Christ was the τέλος νόμου, which we interpret as the culmination of the Torah. We constantly have to keep in mind that the Pauline Gentile mission had been going on for some twenty years before Mark wrote his narrative presentation of the life and works of Jesus of Nazareth. This is the *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel of Mark" (184-5). Thus, according to Svartvik, "Being a narrator, Mark emphasizes *causality*; this is not equally important to Paul, who emphasizes *finality*" (174, emphasis added).

ends of the earth that immediately precedes the end times (Mk 13:10), and, in the wake of a persecution that claimed the life of Paul and the war in Judaea that razed the Second Temple to the ground, Mark composes that portion of the gospel narrative wherein the earthly Jesus can be encountered—a figure who, like Paul, experienced rejection, suffering, and death and who forecasted a vision of the world’s ending—in order to provide an epiphanic bridge between the period of the charismatic authority of the apostle and the final ending of this world. It is to an explanation of this larger project that I now turn.

Part IV: The Synecdochical Poetics of Mark and Paul

For Paul, the “gospel” (εὐαγγέλιον) is an episodic narrative that tells the story of the life, death, resurrection, and second coming of Jesus Christ “in accordance with the Scriptures” (see 1 Cor 15:3-8). This was first outlined by C.H. Dodd in his important monograph, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*,¹¹⁰ wherein Dodd compared narrative elements in the letters of Paul to the speech complexes of Acts in an effort to triangulate back to and reconstruct the earliest apostolic kerygma.¹¹¹ Though Paul nowhere lays out his gospel in all its episodic detail, Dodd established its skeletal outline by culling from Paul’s letters its central episodes. The following is the narrative he was able to reconstruct:

- 1) The prophecies are fulfilled, and the new age is inaugurated by the coming of Christ.
- 2) He was born of the seed of David

¹¹⁰ C.H. Dodd’s *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments: Three Lectures* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1937).

¹¹¹ Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, 1-49. Due to Act’s late date and dependence upon both Paul’s letters (Pervo, *The Dating of Acts*, 51-147) and the gospel of Mark, I am hesitant to ascribe to Acts a kerygma distinct from, but shared in common with, Paul. Should one conclude that the episodes are shared in common, however, the ways in which Paul interfaces with that story throughout his letters are uniquely his own, and I will argue that they have had a profound effect on the way Mark has composed his story, as well.

- 3) He died according to the Scriptures, to deliver us out of the present evil age.
- 4) He was buried.
- 5) He rose on the third day according to the Scriptures.
- 6) He is exalted at the right hand of God as Son of God and Lord of quick and dead.
- 7) He will come again as judge and savior of men.¹¹²

This outline provided by Dodd is revealing, though it is noteworthy that Jesus' resurrection appearances are not included, as they are explicitly presented as episodes of Paul's kerygma (1 Cor 15:5-8), as Dodd himself notes.¹¹³ Because it is through the experience of the risen lord that Paul comes to believe he is entrusted with stewardship of the Gentile mission (see Gal 1:15-6; 2:7, 9), the resurrection vision of Christ is crucial to Paul's gospel: it provides the warrant for the Gentile mission he takes to be an essential element of the story (Rom 11:11-32). I will return to this omission below.

Building upon Dodd's work, Richard B. Hays has suggested that "any attempt to account for the nature and method of Paul's theological language must reckon with the centrality of *narrative* elements in his thought" (emphasis original).¹¹⁴ In his provocative and influential work, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*, Hays affirms that Paul's letters allude to and reflect a gospel which originates as a "sacred story"—a story about the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ—and he argues that it is upon the "foundational substructure" of that narrative that Paul's occasional arguments build. The episodes of the sacred story are the "constant" elements within the framework of which Paul's

¹¹² Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, 18.

¹¹³ Dodd calls the appearance to Peter an explicit portion of "that which [Paul] had preached at Corinth" (Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, 7. See *Apostolic Preaching*, 2-3, where Dodd equates "preaching" in the ancient church with gospel proclamation).

¹¹⁴ Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Gal 3:1-4:11*, (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 6. For his indebtedness to Dodd, see pgs. 60-64 (all citations reference the second edition).

“variable” elements (his historical and rhetorical circumstances) must be interpreted, and the letters that the apostle writes reflect the apostle’s attempts to draw out the theological, Christological, and ecclesiological significances of that story for his scattered communities.¹¹⁵

Margaret M. Mitchell has since expanded upon the work of the above scholars by composing two interrelated essays that argue Paul employs a “synecdochical hermeneutic” in relation to the gospel story.¹¹⁶ Like Hays and Dodd before her, Mitchell contends that the “gospel” (εὐαγγέλιον) is, for Paul, an episodic narrative only partially represented through the apostle’s occasional letters, and the parts that are represented are always rhetorically determined.¹¹⁷ She builds upon their insights, however, by arguing that, through the use of ancient rhetorical shorthand (βραχυλογία), Paul “is able to allude to the gospel and incorporate it

¹¹⁵ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 6-7. In his introduction to the second edition, Hays articulates the project of his book as follows: “This is a book about the narrative elements that undergird Paul’s thought. Despite its title, the book is *not* just a discussion of how to translate the contested expression πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ...this problem of translation plays a subsidiary role in the larger argument. The central thesis of this book is stated forthrightly in the opening pages and reiterated in the concluding chapter: *a story about Jesus Christ is presupposed by Paul’s argument in Galatians, and his theological reflection attempts to articulate the meaning of that story*. Thus, the book’s subtitle is a better guide to its content than the main title (Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, xxiv [emphasis original]).

¹¹⁶ Margaret M. Mitchell, “Rhetorical Shorthand in Pauline Argumentation: The Functions of ‘the Gospel’ in the Corinthian Correspondence,” in eadem, *The Emergence of Christian Textuality*, 111-132; repr. from *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker* (ed. by L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 63-88; and eadem, “Epiphanic Evolutions,” 237-55.

¹¹⁷ Putting Paul in conversation with Pseudo-Demetrius’ *De elocutione*, Mitchell notes the role that genre plays in this: “The choice of shorthand is due to the literary/rhetorical genre of the writer. If one is not writing a narrative but something else...one will not recite the entire narrative, because that will interfere with the chosen rhetorical genre and purpose, and will take the forcefulness out of the new literary creation...Paul does not write narratives, but letters. Those letters address complex issues in his churches through involved argumentation. By means of the title phrase τὸ εὐαγγέλιον and other partial references to the narrative which suggest the whole, Paul is able to construct new texts which incorporate the authority of the underlying gospel narrative through pointed, carefully chosen shorthand references to it” (“Rhetorical Shorthand,” 115).

into particular argumentative contexts without reciting the whole all over again each time.”¹¹⁸ For example, in 1 Cor 1:17-2:5, where Paul seeks to combat the factionalist boasting of the Corinthians by claiming that his own weak demeanor is exemplary of Christomorphic humility, the apostle appeals to the gospel narrative and pulls forward the cross (“the word of the cross [ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ]” [1 Cor 1:18]) as a means to undermine Corinthian posturing. Paul clearly assumes (and expects his readers to assume) the whole story, but, for the purposes of his argument, he underscores what he considers its most important episode in modelling upright behavior for God’s eschatological community: Jesus’ humble, obedient, and humiliating death upon a cross.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ Mitchell, “Rhetorical Shorthand,” 112. Indeed, the term εὐαγγέλιον is itself a “‘superabbreviation’ of the whole, functioning as a title which both characterizes its full contents and interprets its meaning for the hearer” (Mitchell, “Rhetorical Shorthand,” 112).

¹¹⁹ “The idea here is not that Paul preached to the Corinthians a gospel without resurrection (as 15:1-11 shows very clearly), but rather that the whole of the gospel can be alluded to by reference to one of its parts. The choice of which part depends in each case on Paul’s particular argument. Here, where Paul seeks to combat Corinthian self-aggrandizement, he turns to the gospel and its preaching as the standard for Christian life and in so doing elevates the foolish, utterly defeated-looking *crucifixion* to set the ‘worldly standards’ (which the Corinthians are emulating) on their heads” (Mitchell, “Rhetorical Shorthand,” 117).

According to Mitchell, Paul’s gospel is not only “contracted” in this way; the apostle is also able to *expand* the gospel by composing new “episodes” that answer questions arising as a result of believers attempting to live their lives in accordance with the sacred narrative. This is the case, for example, with 1 Cor 15:23-28 (and 15:51-55), where Paul responds to members of the community who have “put the very gospel in question (v.12)” (Mitchell, “Rhetorical Shorthand,” 119). Because Paul had provided few concrete details about the resurrection of the body when he first preached in Corinth, in 1 Cor 15, the apostle takes it upon himself to unpack that future and compose an expanded narrative of the endtimes to combat those who had come to question it (Mitchell, “Rhetorical Shorthand,” 120). Thus, while a certain narrative scaffolding of the gospel subsists (death, resurrection, and resurrection appearances, second coming, etc.), upon that scaffolding new episodes can and are constructed as a part of Paul’s theological and poetic method. For a fuller discussion of this type of expansion in a different letter, see Mitchell, “1 and 2 Thessalonians,” in Dunn, *Cambridge Companion to Saint Paul*, 51-63.

Additionally, Paul's ability to evoke the narrative synecdochically is not limited to epistolary argumentation. The apostle also asserts that he *embodies* the narrative, taking his person to be a "rhetorical abbreviation" of the gospel.¹²⁰ Mitchell analyzes the interpretive difficulties associated with Paul's claim in Galatians that God revealed his Son ἐν ἐμοί (Gal 1:16), and she points out that, on the one hand, ἐν ἐμοί could be translated "to me," thereby making Paul the recipient of an epiphany. On the other, it could be translated "in me," with Paul then understanding himself to be "*the epiphanic medium through whom God's son, Jesus, is revealed to others*" (emphasis original).¹²¹ Mitchell argues that the *double entendre* is deliberate, and Paul presents himself as a walking synecdochical epiphany of the deity.¹²² When Paul claims at various points throughout the letter to embody the death of Christ (Gal 3:1; 2:19-20; 4:14; 6:17), he is, in fact, presenting himself as an icon of Jesus Christ crucified and facilitating an epiphanic encounter with the deity via the recollection of the whole gospel story through the synecdochical manifestation of one of its parts.¹²³ Through the (re)presentation of a particular episode, there occurs an autonomous "filling in" of the remainder of the narrative, which serves

¹²⁰ Mitchell, "Rhetorical Shorthand," 123; see also Paul Brooks Duff, "Apostolic Suffering and the Language of Processions in 2 Cor 4:7-10," *BTB* 21 (1991) 158-65; idem, "Metaphor, Motif, and Meaning: The Rhetorical Strategy Behind the Image 'Led in Triumph' in 2 Corinthians 2:14," in *CBQ* 53 (1991), 79-92.

¹²¹ Mitchell, "Epiphanic Evolutions," 241-2. For a similar conclusion regarding Paul's self-perception, see Morna Hooker, "A Partner in the Gospel: Paul's Understanding of His Ministry," in *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish* (eds. Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. and Jerry L. Sumney; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 83-100.

¹²² For the purposes of her argument, Mitchell defines "epiphany" (ἐπιφάνεια) broadly to mean "a mediated manifestation of the deity" ("Epiphanic Evolutions," 240).

¹²³ According to Mitchell, "Paul saw himself as a one-man multi-media presentation of the gospel of Christ crucified. The message (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) and the messenger (Paul the ἀπόστολος) were indivisibly united in representing to the audience an aural-visual icon of Christ crucified, which is the gospel" ("Epiphanic Evolutions," 242-3).

to confirm the story and validate the apostle's authority. This process is articulated explicitly at 2 Cor 4:10: Paul carries around the “dying process of Jesus” within his body (τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι [2 Cor 4:10]), in order that the “life of Jesus” might also be made manifest in his body (ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῆ [2 Cor 4:10b]). According to Mitchell, “Paul contends that the necrotic epiphany currently on display in his body actually signals the resurrection epiphany to come.”¹²⁴ Thus, an essential element in the Pauline epiphanic experience is this synecdochical process by which the whole sacred story is recalled via the iconic display of one of its parts.

Importantly, this epiphanic process is also key to understanding the Gospel of Mark.¹²⁵ Though it is a fuller narrative in both form and purpose, Mitchell argues that Mark is, nevertheless, synecdochical: it presumes the whole sacred story, but it only tells a portion of it (the missionary activity and death of Jesus Christ) and points to the remainder through prophetic prediction (Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-4, 45; 13; etc.).¹²⁶ Neither Jesus' resurrection, nor his

¹²⁴ Mitchell, “Epiphanic Evolutions,” 244. See also her fuller exposition of this passage: “It is precisely here that we see how the visual and verbal clearly come together in the Pauline gospel, for these two epiphanic events (death, life) correspond precisely with the two main episodes of the narrative proclamation about Jesus which Paul calls “the gospel” (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον). The gospel story that Paul orally proclaimed to the Corinthians, and all others he encountered, had a simultaneous visual counterpart in Paul's own physical self as participating in and replicating the dying (“co-crucifixion”) and, by the logic of replication of the narrative, the promise of living (“co-resurrection”) in the gospel story of Jesus” (“Epiphanic Evolutions,” 244-5).

¹²⁵ “The term εὐαγγέλιον, which as we have seen was for Paul an oral account indivisibly linked with the living, somatic testimony of the apostle, becomes located, no longer in any individual purveyor of the tale, but in a written text” (Mitchell, “Epiphanic Evolutions,” 246).

¹²⁶ “Pauline ‘synecdochical hermeneutics’ vis-à-vis the gospel—such that one event, most often the cross, can be used to evoke logically the whole (sc. ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ in 1 Cor 1:18)—is also key to Mark's enigmatic ending in 16:8, which has caused no end of conversation and controversy. The episodic passion predictions of 8:31; 9:31 and 10:33-34, prophetic plot summaries from the reliable voice of Jesus, have already told the reader that he will rise

resurrection appearances, are narrated. They are prophesied, but it is up to Mark's audience to recall them as a part of the larger story. Similarly, the miraculous events occurring throughout the narrative (baptismal and transfiguration epiphanies [Mk 1:10-11; 9:2-9], nature miracles, healings, exorcisms; etc.)—are also synecdochical. At the level of the story, characters consistently encounter yet do not comprehend Jesus' true identity, but, because Mark's audience knows the full gospel plot, they are able to import that external knowledge into the text.¹²⁷ Thus, the Gospel of Mark, by knowing and making use of the same theological poetics as Paul, functions as a literary epiphany: "The oral gospel has become text, a literary icon of the crucified messiah. Mark (the text) is (incorporeal) Paul for all time: Jesus Christ crucified can be seen there."¹²⁸ Based upon Paul's unique religious logic of mediated epiphanies of Jesus Christ crucified, Mark has crafted an extended episodic narrative deliberately designed to be a literary medium for epiphanic display of the crucified Lord.

Part V: Markan Etiological Hermeneutics

The etiological hermeneutic I am suggesting Mark employs vis-à-vis Paul should be considered a feature of this larger synecdochical hermeneutic Mitchell argues that the evangelist and apostle share. Mark's text is designed to facilitate an epiphanic encounter with the crucified and resurrected messiah through his audience's recollection of the full sacred story via the narrativization of a circumscribed portion of it. Because, for Mark, Paul and his mission are a part of the gospel narrative, the evangelist has composed his story such that the teachings of the

from the dead. Hence *the whole work*, by the same narrative logic Paul embodied, points to the resurrection even without narrating it" (Mitchell, "Epiphanic Evolutions," 246-7.)

¹²⁷ Mitchell, "Epiphanic Evolutions," 247-8.

¹²⁸ Mitchell, "Epiphanic Evolutions," 194.

apostle are anticipated within his narrative in order to facilitate their inclusion by his audience in the synecdochically evoked remainder.

Thus, my dissertation argues that Mark's consistent hermeneutical principle vis-à-vis Paul is etiological: the evangelist seeks to seed the apostle and his teachings into his text. Mark's goal is to anticipate Paul, and his project is both proleptic and synecdochical: he always presumes, though he does not narrate in full, the entirety of the gospel of which Paul and his mission form a part, and his purpose is to tell a story that logically anticipates and concordantly connects with episodes subsequent to his 16 chapters.

In order to demonstrate this, I will use the arguments of Mitchell as a starting point, but I will expand upon them in two important ways. First and most important, as I have already suggested, I assume not only that Mark and Paul share the same sacred story, but that their common narrative shares an all-important *episode*, the epiphany of Jesus Christ to Paul himself:

3. For I have handed over to you in the first place [ἐν πρώτοις] that which I also received: that Christ died on behalf of our sins [Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν] in accordance with the scriptures [κατὰ τὰς γραφάς], 4. and that he was buried [ἐτάφη], and that he was raised on the third day [ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ] in accordance with the scriptures [κατὰ τὰς γραφάς], 5. and that he appeared to Cephas and then to the twelve [ὤφθη Κηφᾶ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα]. 6. Then he appeared to over 500 brothers at once [ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ], of whom the majority live to this day, but some have fallen asleep [ἐκοιμήθησαν]. 7. Then he appeared to James [ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ] and then to all of the apostles [τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν]. 8. Last of all [ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων], as if to an abortion [ὡσπερὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι], *he appeared also to me* [ὤφθη καὶ μοί] (1 Cor 15:3-8).

1 Cor 15:3-8 is the fullest recitation of the gospel narrative that is to be found in any one place in Paul's letters,¹²⁹ and, in its final verse, Paul writes himself into and understands his

¹²⁹ See Mitchell, "Rhetorical Shorthand," 111-112.

person and his mission to be constitutive episodes of the sacred story.¹³⁰ If Mark shares this narrative with Paul, it has profound implications for how he engages Paul and his teachings and how he tells the story about Jesus. In narrating more fully the gospel of Jesus Christ crucified—known to him in and through Pauline theological poetics—Mark must deal with the place of Paul within it.

Second, I suggest that the media by which the death of Christ is made manifest for Paul can be expanded. Mitchell focuses upon the epiphanic manifestations of Christ's death that occur in Paul's person, but there are other epiphanic media to be found in Paul's letters: the death of Christ made manifest for Paul in baptism, in the Last Supper celebration, and in the communal performance of select scriptural passages. To see Paul, read scripture, or participate in one of these rites is to encounter an epiphanic performance of the cross that synecdochically evokes the apostle's whole gospel plot.

Beginning, then, with the thematic overlap with which Marcus began—the “extraordinary stress” Mark and Paul lay upon the cross¹³¹—I will test my thesis by exploring the ways in which Jesus' death is constructed and epiphanically performed in Pauline communities, on the one hand, and how Mark has sought to anticipate and justify those Pauline performances within his own story, on the other. I contend that Mark has not only crafted a narrative that is dependent

¹³⁰ This reading is corroborated, for example, by David C. Sim, “The Family of Jesus and the Disciples of Jesus in Paul and Mark: Taking Sides in the Early Church's Factional Dispute,” in Wischmeyer, et al., *Paul and Mark*, 73-97. He argues that Paul's most complete recitation of his “gospel” (1 Cor 15:3-8) implicitly suggests that the apostle was not originally included in an official list of witnesses to the resurrection of Christ (76). Instead, the apostle adds himself, and, because he is “last of all” (ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων [1 Cor 15:8]) in the temporal sequence, he effectively becomes the final revelatory word, immune to those who might claim “that they were later visited by Jesus who communicated a message that differed from that of the apostle” (77). At the conclusion of this dissertation, I will have opportunity to expand upon Sim's provocative conclusion regarding Paul's final apostolic authority.

¹³¹ Marcus, “Interpreter of Paul,” 36.

upon and functions as a Pauline mediated epiphany, but that Mark has taken up those mediated epiphanies of Christ's death found within Paul's letters to which he is indebted for the creation of his own story and adapted them to his narrative. For example, Christ's baptism by John proleptically performs Jesus' death, something to which the reader is queued by the epiphanic manifestation of God's voice from heaven and the typological association of Jesus with the binding of Isaac (Mk 1:9-11; see also Gen 22:2, 12, 16). Similarly, the Eucharist proleptically performs the cross, signaled overtly by Jesus' prophetic words (Mk 14:22-5) and subtly by Mark's associating the messiah with the Passover lamb (see Mk 14:12). Even the manifestation of Christ crucified in Paul's person finds itself incorporated into and adapted to Mark's story: Jesus proleptically performs the effects of his sacrificial death in and through his various healings and exorcisms.

In the chapters that follow, I will demonstrate that, for both Paul and Mark, performances of the cross are synecdochical and proleptic, but the purpose and referent of the prolepsis predictably differs as a result of their different genres (letters vs. narrative) and the historical perspective they adopt in relation to the events. If, for Paul, a performance of the death of Christ is not *itself* an episode of the gospel that predates the cross, but it is rather a new medium subsequent to Jesus' death by which the gospel is epiphanically made manifest (e.g. the death of Christ displayed in Paul's person or the death and resurrection of Christ performed by believers in baptism), Mark's concern is to establish sufficient literary precedent within his own story to create concordance between the episodes of Jesus' mission, his death upon the cross, and the unique significances attached to the new performances of that death by the apostle. Alternatively, if, for Paul, a particular performance of Christ's death *is* a part of the sacred story prior to the cross (e.g. typological manifestations of Jesus' death within Scripture or the episode containing

the Last Supper), Mark's project is more synthetic: he both includes within his narrative those performances Paul has assumed, and he adapts them so as to accommodate the unique significances Paul has attached to them. Taking the Eucharist as an example, it is, on the one hand, a gospel episode anterior to and anticipatory of the cross in Paul's thinking (see 1 Cor 11:23), and, as such, Mark incorporates the episode into his narrative with little literary modification. On the other, as a new and timeless rite celebrated by early Christian communities and a retrospective performance of Jesus' death to which Paul attaches a particular ecclesiological significance (namely, communal unity), Mark anticipates that significance by embedding within his narrative logical literary precursors for it (in this case, the miraculous feeding narratives).

The chapters that follow will explore each of the media by which the cross of Christ is performed in Paul's letters and the means by which that performance is adapted to and anticipated in the Gospel of Mark, beginning with baptism, then examining the Eucharist, and concluding with scripture. This sequence allows me, on the one hand, to follow the emplotted order of Mark. On the other, it results in the systematic backwards movement through the temporal perspectives Pauline performances adopt in relation to the cross. For Paul, baptism is a retrospective performance of the death and resurrection of Christ that has prospective consequences for the baptizend (past death to sin and proleptic resurrection in imitation of the messiah [Rom 6:4-5]); Eucharist, as a timeless rite performed by Pauline communities, is retrospective, but, as itself an episode of the gospel narrative that proleptically performs Jesus' impending death ("the night on which the Lord was handed over" [1 Cor 11:23]), it is prospective and communally unifying; finally, scriptural exemplars, as biblical witnesses to and proofs of the cross, are always prospective and proleptic literary performances, but they can only

be recognized as such from the retrospective vantage of one who believes that the cross is the hermeneutic key to unlocking the meaning of Scripture. Each of these observations will be unpacked in detail in the pages that follow, but, before doing so, I will conclude this chapter with a brief example, one for which the necessary foundation has already been laid in the analyses I have set out above.

Part VI: Death in the Body of Paul and Salvation in the Body of Jesus

It has been argued, on the one hand, that Paul saw himself as the iconic manifestation of the death of Jesus Christ (“a one-man multi-media presentation of the gospel of Christ crucified”¹³²), and, on the other, that Mark is a book of “secret epiphanies.”¹³³ That is, the “private epiphany” that occurs at Jesus’ baptism in Mk 1:9-11 is “a textual epiphany to the knowing reader who will subsequently from a superior vantage point be treated to episode after episode in which people (crowds, followers, nefarious religious opponents) encounter Jesus but do not comprehend his true identity.”¹³⁴ Despite his miraculous actions, Jesus’ identity is consistently misunderstood at the level of the characters within the story. For the knowing audience, however, Jesus is recognized as the savior of the world, the messiah of Israel who must die and rise for the sake of the many (Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-4, 45) in order that the people’s sins might be forgiven (see Mk 1:4; 2:1-12), and believers attain the resurrected life (see Mk 12:18-27).

If Paul claimed to be the walking iconic embodiment of the death of Christ, and his person created an epiphanic encounter with the deity through the synecdochical (re)presentation

¹³² Mitchell, “Epiphanic Evolutions,” 242.

¹³³ Mitchell, “Epiphanic Evolutions,” 238; she is here citing the formulation of Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. B. L. Woolf; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1934), 230.

¹³⁴ Mitchell, “Epiphanic Evolutions,” 248.

of one of the parts of his gospel, then the same poetic operation is at work within the person of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark. The miracles that Christ performs iconically and synecdochically manifest the salvation he has come to offer through his death upon the cross. This is most clearly perceived in the language Mark uses to characterize the effect of Jesus' various healings.

When the Markan Christ performs a curative action in the gospel, the evangelist regularly uses one of the following verbs to describe the event: σώζω (“save” [Mk 3:4; 5:23, 28, 34; 6:56; 10:52]), ἐγείρω (“raise” [Mk 1:31; 2:9, 11-12; 5:41; 9:27]), or ἀνίστημι (“arise” [Mk 5:42; 9:27]). In addition, there is only ever one prerequisite for effective healing—πίστις (“faith” [Mk 2:5; 5:34, 36; 9:23-4; 10:52; cf. 6:5-6¹³⁵]). In the raising of Jairus' daughter and the intercalated story of the hemorrhaging woman (Mk 5:22-43), Mark uses all of this language in close proximity. When Jesus travels to Jairus' home and the cloak of his garment is surreptitiously grasped along the way, the verb σώζω occurs twice: first, in the hemorrhaging woman's internal justification for her action (“If I but touch his garments, I will be saved [σωθήσομαι]” [Mk 5:28]) and, second, in Jesus' authoritative pronouncement, “Daughter, your faith [ἡ πίστις σου] has saved you [σέσωκέν σε]” (Mk 5:34). In this latter verse, πίστις also occurs. Then, when Jesus' company arrives at the home of Jairus, and the death of his daughter is announced (Mk 5:35), πίστις occurs again, this time as a verbal command on the lips of Jesus: “Do not be afraid; only have faith [μόνον πίστευε]!” (Mk 5:36). Finally, when Jesus interacts with the little girl, ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι both occur in quick succession: upon expelling all but his picked disciples and the girl's parents from the home (Mk 5:37-40), Jesus speaks to the body of the child and says, “Little

¹³⁵ So central is faith that, where it is not to be found, Jesus' spectacular powers fail, as occurs within his hometown: “And he was not able to do any powerful deed [οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν] there, only when he had set his hands on a few people with fever [ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις] did he effect healing [ἐθεράπευσεν]. And he was marveling on account of their unbelief [διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν]” (Mk 6:5-6).

girl, I say to you, rise up [ἔγειρε]!” (Mk 5:41), and, the reader is informed that “the little girl immediately arose [ἀνέστη] and walked about” (Mk 5:42).

Importantly, Mark self-consciously employs *all* of this language to describe resurrection and eschatological deliverance. Σώζω is Mark’s preferred term for the end-times salvation of all believers (see Mk 8:35; 10:26; 13:13; 13:20), while ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι describe both the resurrection of Jesus (ἀνίστημι: Mk 8:31; 9:9-10, 31; 10:34; ἐγείρω: Mk 16:6¹³⁶) and the general, future resurrection of all believers that will occur at his second coming (ἀνίστημι: Mk 12:25; ἐγείρω: Mk 12:26). Thus, for Mark, the same theological poetics embodied in the person of Paul are now embodied in the character of the Jesus: he is the walking synecdochical epiphany of the effects of his cross. *Pace* Werner, the faith-based miracles that the messiah performs within the narrative do not demonstrate Jesus’ status despite the cross. Rather, they point *to* it and proleptically anticipate the salvation that comes through it (see Mk 10:45), but it is only the Markan audience (and not the characters within the story) that recognize this, as it is only they who know the full story and are able to recall the whole through the iconic manifestation of its part. Through the use of Paul’s theological poetics, Mark has adapted a body of miracle traditions about Jesus to create gospel concordance between the earthly life of the messiah and a particular element of the missionary activity of the apostle. The death of Christ iconically made manifest in the body of Paul now has historical antecedent in the salvation made manifest in the body of Jesus. As I will demonstrate in the chapters that follow, the creation of literary precursors that bind the earthly life of Jesus concordantly with the mission and teachings of Paul is a fundamental aspect of Mark’s project. Indeed, it can be seen in the very first episode of Mark’s gospel: the baptism of Jesus by John.

¹³⁶ The verb ἐγείρω is also used to describe John the Baptist’s rumored resurrection at Mk 6:14, 16.

Chapter II: Baptism into Death

In the middle of the 20th century, Willi Marxsen demonstrated that Mark's understanding of "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον)—the term the evangelist uses to categorize his narrative (Mk 1:1)—bears a remarkable similarity to Paul's. According to him, it is not a technical label denoting a literary genre *per se*; rather, it refers to content. The εὐαγγέλιον is the proclamation of Jesus Christ that "actualizes" the messiah for the listening audience.¹

In the previous chapter, I argued that the content of this gospel is, for both Mark and Paul, an episodic narrative that covers of the life, death, resurrection, post-resurrection appearances, and second coming of Jesus Christ "in accordance with the scriptures" (see 1 Cor 15:3-8), and the messiah is "actualized" for the community in the synecdochical evocation of the whole story through the iconic manifestation of one or more of its parts. I also suggested that Mark makes use of this synecdochical poetics to anticipate and justify the mission and teachings of the apostle (constitutive episodes of the gospel narrative [see 1 Cor 15:8]). Mark's hermeneutical approach to Paul is, in other words, etiological. The goal of this chapter is to

¹ According to Marxsen, "For Mark the gospel is that present factor which represents the Lord. We use the word 'represent' in that dual sense peculiar to it. On the one hand, for Mark the gospel is the (or a) form in which Jesus is made present. For this reason, Mark inserts the term wherever Jesus is mentioned [conjoined with ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ; see Mk 8:35; 10:29; 13:9-10]. On the other hand, the (proclaimed) gospel is Jesus' representative. It thus reflects a feature which all but eliminates historical distance, but by emphasizing and retaining the historical reference. Not only in Jesus' lifetime could a person undertake something for his sake. He can do so today, as well, and in fact when he undertakes it for the gospel's sake" (*Mark*, 128-9). Marxsen thus argues that, for both Mark and Paul, to proclaim the "gospel" is to proclaim Jesus Christ. He is both subject and object of the gospel. "Through the event of this proclamation the Risen Lord actualizes himself... In and by his gospel, the Risen Lord re-presents his own life on this earth. And the goal is that he himself becomes contemporaneous with his hearers in the proclamation" (*Mark*, 131; see also 136-8).

demonstrate that Mark's etiological project is operative in the very first episode of his story: Jesus' baptism by John in the Jordan River (Mk 1:4-11).

This chapter falls into three parts. First, I will establish that baptism for Paul is the synecdochical evocation of his entire gospel narrative through the retrospective performance by the believer of Christ's death and resurrection. In undergoing the rite, believers symbolically put themselves to death and proleptically anticipate their coming salvation (see Rom 6:3-8). Through it, their lives are grafted onto the "meta-plot"² of Christ's death and resurrection, and, as a result, they are incorporated into the gospel narrative and become a part of the communal body of Jesus Christ (they have "put on" Christ [Gal 3:27-8]).

Second, I will show that, for Mark, John's "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sin" (Mk 1:4) is a rite that looks forward to and proleptically performs a key episode of the gospel narrative—Jesus' death "on behalf of the many" (*ἀντὶ πολλῶν* [Mk 10:45])—and that the forgiveness sought through John's baptism is anticipatory of the forgiveness and salvation Jesus offers through the cross. At the same time, I will suggest that Jesus' baptism in Mark is also synecdochical. In order to recognize the prolepsis inherent to John's baptism, readers must know and recall later episodes within the story (Mk 10:38-9; 12:6-8; 15:37-9). Without doing so, the full significance of John's baptism cannot be perceived.

Third and finally, I will argue that Mark has deliberately composed his narrative such that literary concordance is established between the baptismal experience of Jesus, his death upon the cross, and a rite that is performative of that death within the Pauline mission. To anticipate the conclusions of this chapter: if Paul looks back to the cross in order to establish the patterning of

² This is the language of Mitchell ("Epiphanic Evolutions," 245 n.27), who, in speaking of the means by which Pauline communities could embody that which Paul claimed he embodied, says, "Baptism is the lynchpin by which individual 'life narratives' become grafted onto the meta-plot of Christ's death and resurrection."

believers' fates on that of their messiah, and, through the performance of Jesus' death, Paul claims that believers have been gifted with the Spirit, adopted as sons and daughters of God (Rom 8:15-17; Gal 3:27-4:6), and proleptically anticipate their coming resurrections (Rom 6:5, 8), then Mark's story claims that Paul's rite and its attendant significances have historical precedent within the earthly life of Christ. In undergoing "a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (Mk 1:4), Jesus too performs his own death, albeit proleptically. For Mark, through Jesus' death, which the messiah conceptualized *as* baptism (Mk 10:38-9; 15:38-9), that which *was* localized in Jesus at baptism prior to his death (sonship, Spirit [Mk 1:9-11]) becomes accessible to all Pauline believers in their retrospective performances of the cross that occur in their own ritualized washings (Rom 6:3-8; 8:15; see also Gal 3:27-4:6). The baptism Christ undergoes is a proleptic performance of the cross, the baptisms in which believers participate are retrospective performances of it, and the patterning of the life narrative of the believer onto the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ becomes all the more acute, as a result.

Excursus: Werner's Understanding of Baptism in Mark and Paul

Regarding Mark's baptismal narrative, Werner's concludes that the evangelist has not retrojected back into the life of Christ words or beliefs of a later Christian community. The baptismal tradition, as represented in Mark, is essentially pure. Werner comes to this conclusion by means of the following exegetical arguments. First, he focuses on Mk 1:4-8, and he contends that John's "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν [Mk 1:4]) speaks against using Mark as a reliable point of reference for understanding later Christian baptisms. According to him, it would make little theological sense for Mark to ascribe the power of forgiveness to John's person, so it is likely constitutive of the historical

Baptist's initial movement.³ Werner bolsters this claim by arguing that there are individual differences between the Christian sacrament and John's description of the workings of the "stronger one" (ὁ ἰσχυρότερος) who will follow after him (Mk 1:7-8). For example, by the time of Mark's community, baptism would not have been *through* Jesus ("durch den Messias Jesu") but "in his name" ("auf seinen Namen").⁴ Alternatively, the Christian sacrament would not have been a baptism solely of Spirit, but a baptism of *water* and Spirit.⁵ Thus, at Mk 1:8, the evangelist has in mind something akin to the Pentecostal moment of Acts 2:1-13 (see also Acts 1:5; 11:16), where believers are infused with Spirit and able to perform miracles, rather than the Christian baptismal ritual itself.⁶

Second, Werner challenges Volkmar's contention that, in Mk 1:9-11, both the baptism of Jesus and the baptism of believers (who pattern their baptism upon Jesus' own) are in view.⁷ Instead, Werner suggests that, as soon as Jesus was accepted by a believing community as messiah, the date of his reception of spiritual authority had to be fixed, whether that be at his

³ "...man nun annimmt, es habe im Urchristentum eine Art Rivalität bestanden zwischen den Anhängern des Täufers und den Christusgläubigen... ohne diese Hypothese ist es nicht klar, was für ein Interesse das Urchristentums daran gehabt haben sollte, fälschlicherweise der Johannestaufe Wirkungen zuzuschreiben, um deretwillen man doch eben das eigene christlichen Taufsakrament hochschätzte. Man wird daher das εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν als richtige Beschreibung des Effekts, den der Täufer dem von ihm gehandhabten Sakrament (denn um ein solches handelte es sich doch wohl tatsächlich bei seiner Taufe, nicht bloss um eine symbolische Handlung) zuschrieb, gelten lassen müssen" (Werner, *Einfluss*, 133).

⁴ Werner, *Einfluss*, 134.

⁵ "Von der christlichen Taufe konnte man auch zur Zeit des Markus nicht sagen: sie ist eine Taufe nicht mit Wasser, sondern mit Geist. Diese war vielmehr eine solche mit Wasser und Geist" (Werner, *Einfluss*, 134).

⁶ "An was man nun in Wahrheit im Urchristentum bei dieser Täuferweisagung gedacht hat, zeigt ein Blick in die Apostelgeschichte... Es existiert augenscheinlich kein Grund gegen die Annahme, die fragliche Weissagung sei im Urchristentum allgemein in diesem Sinne Verstanden werden, und so habe auch Markus bei seiner Wiedergabe des Täuferspruches 1:8 lediglich an jene Geistesausgiessung von Act 2:1ff. gedacht" (Werner, *Einfluss*, 135).

⁷ Werner, *Einfluss*, 13; see also Volkmar, *Evangelien*, 40.

birth or at his baptism.⁸ Mark's episode is merely the narrative representation of the bestowal of messianic glory ("der messianischen Würde") upon Jesus, and to read anything else into it would be to destroy the text's internal logic.⁹ That certain elements of the narrative (esp. the reception of the Spirit) end up being exemplary for later Christian communities should not be taken as evidence for direct literary dependence of Mark on Paul but, rather, as evidence for an early common tradition shared by the two.¹⁰

Third and finally, Werner analyzes Mk 10:38-9. He claims that Mark's narrative is about walking with Jesus to martyrdom, and "baptism" (βάπτισμα) is to be understood as a Hebrew Bible metaphor for death (see Isa 21:4 LXX).¹¹ Alternatively, Paul conceives of baptism as a "sacramental procedure" ("sakramentalem Vorgang") wherein the death of the believer is an outcome or effect of that procedure.¹² According to Werner, Paul does not in any way have in

⁸ Werner, *Einfluss*, 136.

⁹ "Danach ist die Geistbegabung Mc 1:9-11 sachlich lediglich gleichbedeutend mit der Verleihung der messianischen Würde und der Ausrüstung zum messianischen Amt, und damit ist die vollständige Erhebung Jesu über das gewöhnliche Menschenwesen gegeben. Die Unterschiebung, Markus denke nun bei der Taufe Jesu zugleich an die Tatsache, dass ja auch die Christen in der Taufe den Geist empfangen, zerstört aber geradezu diese innere Logik der Taufgeschichte" (Werner, *Einfluss*, 136).

¹⁰ "Nicht bloss wie, sondern auch weil Jesus hier in der Taufe mit dem Geist begabt, und dadurch der Messias wird, even deshalb erhalten nun auch die Gläubigen in der Taufe den Geist, so ist damit doch noch nicht das Mindeste für den Paulinismus des Markus erwiesen. Denn die Idee vom Geistesempfang in der Taufe ist keine speziell paulinische, sondern eine allgemein-urchristliche, und die dem Markus mit Hilfe der dargelegten Eintragung zugeschriebene Ableitung der christlichen Taufe aus der Taufe Jesu ist dem Paulus überhaupt unbekannt" (Werner, *Einfluss*, 136).

¹¹ Werner, *Einfluss*, 137.

¹² "Mc 10:39 ist gemeint die Nachfolge der Jünger ins Martyrium. Und dies Martyrium wird mit einer auch dem AT bekannten Metapher eine Taufe genannt. Ganz anders steht die Sache bei Paulus. Dort ist vielmehr unter 'Taufe' das wirkliche Taufsakrament zu verstehen und als eine seiner Wirkungen wird das Sterben mit Christus angegeben. Dieses Sterben mit Christus hat für Paulus mit Martyrium nichts zu schaffen...Er denkt bei dem Sterben der

view the martyrdom of individual persons. Ironically, Werner concludes his exposition of Mk 10:38-9 with a quip about how equally absurd it would be to imagine that Mark's "to drink the cup which I drink" (πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω [Mk 10:38]) refers to the Eucharist.¹³ I will contest this claim in my next chapter.

The problems with Werner's exegetical conclusions are multiple. First, his analysis of Mk 1:4 (John's baptism for the forgiveness of sins) is contradictory to his analysis of Mk 1:7. In this latter verse, Werner presumes that, for the historical John the Baptist, "the stronger one" (ὁ ἰσχυρότερος [Mk 1:7]) could not have referred to Jesus. Rather, Jesus as "stronger one" is the subsequent understanding of Mark and his community.¹⁴ Yet, if Mark or his community was capable of reading "stronger one" in reference to Jesus, why should they not also be able to understand "for the forgiveness of sins" (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν [Mk 1:4]) in light of the Christ event, as well? Werner has one-sidedly presumed that the Markan community could read into one verse an external referent (Jesus as the "stronger one"), but they could not read an external referent into another (the cross as the true locus for the forgiveness of sins).

Second and relatedly, Werner presumes that it is Pentecost upon which Mark and his audience would have projected John's prophetic words, "he will baptize you in Holy Spirit" (βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ [Mk 1:8]). Yet Pentecost is an event with which the Markan text demonstrates no familiarity, and, indeed, it necessitates projecting *back* onto Mark a later

Gläubigen in der Taufe an einen geheimnisvollen, sakramentalen Vorgang, der keine Schmerzen verursacht und keine Selbstüberwindung kostet" (Werner, *Einfluss*, 137).

¹³ "Das βάπτισμα Mc 10:38 auf die christlichen Taufe zu deuten, wäre genau so läppisch gewesen wie eine Deutung des πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω auf das Abendmahl."

¹⁴ "Handlet es sich um die geschichtliche Frage, ob dies die Auffassung des Täufers selbst gewesen sie, so hat man triftigen Grund, dies interpretation zu bezweifeln. Steht nur die Auffassung des Markus in Frage, so ist sie unstrittig richtig. Für ihn ist zweifellos der Christus Jesus das Subjekt zu βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ" (Werner, *Einfluss*, 134).

narrative (Luke/Acts) that is itself using and making changes *to* Mark. It is equally probable that the direction of influence is reversed, and Luke has constructed the Pentecostal narrative to account for John's prophecy and fill in what he perceives to be a gap in the Markan narrative ("baptism in Holy Spirit").

Third, in his one-sided focus on Jesus' baptism as a bestowal of messianic glory ("der messianischen Würde"), Werner never asks the question *why* Mark has chosen this episode, and not a birth narrative, to elevate the messiah to his messianic office. Indeed, if Werner can presume that Mark knew about Pentecost, why should he not presume that Mark knew a birth narrative, as well? And, if Mark did know a birth narrative, why did he not begin there? An obvious answer to this question (and one I will expand upon in the body of this chapter) is that it is at baptism that one becomes a child of God and is grafted into the salvation-historical story, and thus it is fitting to fix the beginning of Jesus' mission and his acknowledgment as God's beloved Son at this moment. Yet, admitting that believers might see in the baptism of Jesus an anticipation of their own baptisms, where they too receive the Spirit and are acknowledged as children of God, would bring Mark more in line with Paul than Werner is willing to allow. Werner admits the reception of the Spirit, but he chocks this up to common tradition, and he ignores how readers might understand God's "You are my Son, the beloved" (σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός [Mar 1:11]) in light of their own baptismal experiences.

Fourth and finally, Werner reads Mk 10:38-9 in a similarly one-sided fashion. He understands Jesus' words as pointing forward, to the eventual deaths of James and John, but he does not ask why either "baptism" (βάπτισμα) or "cup" (τὸ ποτήριον, to which I return in my next chapter) are *the* metaphors Mark has chosen to evoke their fates, especially given their

obvious ritual significance in the self-identity of early Christ believers. As I will demonstrate, Mark's choice of these metaphors is deliberate and Pauline in nature.

Thus, as with Markan Christology, Werner erroneously drives a wedge between Mark and Paul in order to bolster his larger hermeneutic assumption about Mark's preservation of historical traditions about Jesus Christ. This then results in a misreading of the available evidence. In the pages that follow, I will show that Mark is far closer to Paul on the matter of baptism than has heretofore been recognized.

Part I: Baptism in Paul

Baptism is, for Paul, a complex ritual performance replete with eschatological significance. It is, first and foremost, a ritualized (re)presentation of the gospel narrative: in baptism, believers are symbolically put to death, buried, and, in their emerging from the waters, proleptically raised to walk about in the newness of life (see Rom 6:4-8). This is done in imitation of their messiah who has also died, been buried, and raised to eternal life (1 Cor 15:3-4). Through this gospel performance, the baptizand is infused with the Spirit and transformed into a child of God and sibling to Christ (see Gal 3:26-4:6). Thus, by becoming coheir with the messiah (see Rom 8:15-17), the believer is incorporated into the sacred story of Christ's death, resurrection, and second coming, infused with eschatological energy (see 1 Cor 12:3-7), and promised his or her future attainment to eternal life (Rom 6:22-3).

Paul's conception of baptism as a ritualized performance of Christ's death is expressed most clearly in his letter to the Romans. As a part of a larger discussion about believers' new life in Christ (Rom 5:1-8:39), Paul dilates on the redemptive work of the messiah for the whole human race (Rom 5:12-21).¹⁵ During this discussion, Paul claims that grace triumphs over sin in

¹⁵ For a good discussion of the general context of Rom 6, see Hultgren, *Romans*, 197-99, 241-2.

and through the salvific action of Jesus (Rom 5:17-19), but because he also makes the astounding assertion that, where there was sin, grace abounded all the more (Rom 5:20-21¹⁶), the apostle asks of himself an ostensibly logical question: “What then will we say? Should we persist in sin in order that grace may abound [χάρις πλεονάσῃ]?” (Rom 6:1; see also Rom 6:15).¹⁷ Paul’s answer resounds in the negative (μὴ γένοιτο! [Rom 6:2]). For him, “those who have died do not live in sin and, consequently, do not behave in sinful ways.”¹⁸ To demonstrate this, the apostle launches into a point by point exposition of the baptismal rite:

3. Or do you not know that, as many of us as were baptized into Christ Jesus [ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν], we have been baptized into his death [εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν]? 4. We have therefore been buried together with him [συνετάφημεν... αὐτῷ] through baptism into death [διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον] so that, just as Christ has been raised from the dead [ὡςπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν] through the glory of his father, we too will walk about in the newness of life [ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν]. 5. For, if we have become united to the likeness of his death [σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ], we will also be [united to the likeness] of his resurrection [τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα], 6. since we know the following: that our old person [ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος] has been co-crucified [συνεσταυρώθη] so that the body of sin might be brought to nothing [καταργηθῆ] in order that we no longer slave away to sin [δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ]. 7. For the one who has died [ἀποθανών] is made righteous from sin [δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας]. 8. And if we have died with Christ [ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ], we believe that we will also live with him [συζήσομεν αὐτῷ], 9. because we know that Christ, having been raised from the dead [ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν], no longer dies [οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει]; death no longer lords it over him [αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει] (Rom 6:3-9).

¹⁶ “And the law came in [νόμος δὲ παρεισήλθεν] in order that transgression might abound [πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα]. And where sin abounded [ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἀμαρτία], grace abounded all the more [ὑπερπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις] in order that, just as sin ruled in death [ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ], so too might grace rule through righteousness [ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης] unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

¹⁷ Though Paul’s question is a function of his dialectical style of argumentation, it is also probable that this question echoes a real slogan Paul was thought to have affirmed (see Rom 3:8: “And why not say—just as we are slandered [βλασφημούμεθα], and some say that we say—‘Let us do evil [ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά] in order that good might come [ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθά]’?”).

¹⁸ Hultgren, *Romans*, 243.

Though the above presumes that the Roman communities practiced baptism, Paul has here expanded the significance of that rite.¹⁹ Through the apostle’s teaching, the Romans are to recognize that to be baptized is to be baptized “into Christ’s death” (εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ), which means, on the one hand, that they perform retrospectively the death, burial, and resurrection of the messiah—three key episodes of Paul’s gospel narrative (1 Cor 15:3-4)—while, on the other (and at the same time), they effect their own deaths and burials, and they proleptically perform their future resurrections. The idea of imitation is essential. Because the messiah has been raised, and the gospel promises that believers are conformed to his type as

¹⁹ The apostle’s interpretation of baptism as a ritualized performance of Christ’s death and resurrection is generally thought to be something the Roman community had not heard before. See, for example, Alain Gignac (*L’Épître aux Romains* [Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2014], 248): “Paul part d’une pratique connue pour proposer une analogie et réfléchir sur la dynamique <<mort/vie>> de la vie chrétienne, mais le discours se détache du baptême, au fur et à mesure qu’il progresse. Or, ce faisant, *le texte propose une nouvelle interprétation du baptême*, qui permet de passer d’un baptême <<purification>>, bain pour le lavement des péchés, à un baptême <<noyade>> participation à la mort/resurrection du Christ” (emphasis added). See also Hans Dieter Betz “Transferring a Ritual: Paul’s Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6” in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (ed. Troels Engberg-Pederson; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 110: “The concept of dying and rising together with Christ in baptism is not found prior to Romans. Rather, Paul connects death and resurrection together with Christ with his own apostolic existence, which serves as the paradigm for the church to imitate.” For others who share this opinion, see Leander E. Keck, *Romans* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2005), 159; Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996) 189-90; and Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of Saint Paul* (trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray; New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), 33. For contrasting opinions, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 431; C.K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans* (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), 122; Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 164-5; Hultgren, *Romans*, 242, 44. Walter Schmithals (*Der Römerbrief: ein Kommentar* [Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1988], 189) takes a moderate position. On the one hand, he allows that the vivid imagery of being “buried” (συνετάφημεν) and “co-crucified” (συνεσταυρώθη) with Christ may have been creative expansions by Paul, but, on the other, he believes the community would have already been aware of a “dying” and “rising with” pattern in baptism.

adopted brothers and sisters (see Rom 8:14-17; Gal 3:27-4:6; 1 Cor 15:14-22²⁰), the resurrections they proleptically anticipate at baptism are assured. The ritual is thus an embodiment of Paul’s larger theological poetics: a portion of the story is put on display, the rest is evoked synecdochically, and, in the course of one’s “filling in” that narrative, the believer experiences an epiphanic and transformative encounter with the deity.

That baptism is, in fact, a transformative experience is confirmed by the role that the Holy Spirit plays within it. Paul claims that, through the rite, a decisive rupture from one’s former life occurs (Rom 6:6-11),²¹ and those once enslaved to sin (δοῦλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας [Rom

²⁰ The necessity for the conformity of believers’ fates to that of Christ is laid out in fullest detail in 1 Cor 15. In that chapter, Paul seeks to bolster his community’s faith in the coming resurrection that had come to be doubted, and, in a lengthy series of conditionals, he excoriates the Corinthians for supposing that there might not be a general resurrection for all: “14. If Christ has not been raised, then our kerygma [τὸ κήρυγμα] is empty [κενόν]; and empty is your faith [κενή καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν]! 15. And we are also found false witnesses of God, because we testified against God [κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ] that he raised Christ [ἤγειρεν τὸν Χριστόν], whom he did not raise, if, indeed, the dead are not raised [εἴπερ ἄρα νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται]. 16. If the dead are not raised, neither has Christ been raised [οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται]; 17. and if Christ has not been raised, your faith is vain [ματαιά]; you are still in your sins. 18. Then even those who have fallen asleep in Christ [κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ] have been destroyed. 19. If we have been hoping in this life in Christ alone, we are more to be pitied than all humanity [ἐλλεινότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων]. 20. But now Christ *has* been raised from the dead [ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν]—the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep [ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων]. 21. Because death came through a man [δι’ ἀνθρώπου θάνατος], so too does resurrection of the dead come through a man [δι’ ἀνθρώπου ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν]. 22. For just as in Adam all die [ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν], so too in Christ will all be made alive [ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται] (1 Cor 15:14-22). For good discussions of these verses, see Anthony Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1214-29; Roy E Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 753-64; David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003) 701-703.

²¹ This rupture is aptly summarized by Fitzmyer: “For Paul baptism tears a person from one’s native condition (‘in Adam’), from one’s native proclivity (‘in the flesh’), and from one’s ethnic background (‘under the law’). It thus incorporates the person of faith ‘into Christ’ so that one lives ‘in Christ’ and ‘for God’ in order that one may be one day ‘with the lord’ (1 Thess 4:17)” (*Romans*, 430). See also Schnackenburg, *Baptism*, 8-39; Keck, *Romans*, 160;

6:20]) are liberated as they await the final ending of the world. This liberation is granted by the Spirit, which transforms believers into adopted “children of God” (τέκνα θεοῦ [Rom 8:16]). Though Paul does not mention either “Spirit” (πνεῦμα) or “adoption” (υιοθεσία) in Rom 6, in Rom 8, where baptism serves as a backdrop to Paul’s extended discussion of the Spirit’s eschatological power (esp. Rom 8:12-17),²² the apostle makes the connection explicit: “For as many as are led by the Spirit of God [πνεύματι θεοῦ], these are sons of God [υιοὶ θεοῦ]. For you did not receive the spirit of slavery [leading] again into fear, but you received the Spirit of adoption [πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας] in which we cry out, ‘Abba! Father! [αββα ὁ πατήρ]’” (Rom 8:14-5). The cry, “Abba! Father!” is a baptismal one; it signals the ritual’s successful transformation of a believer into a son or daughter of God.

The connection between baptism, spiritual insorcism, and adoption that is assumed in Romans is fleshed out more fully in Paul’s letter to the Galatians. In that contentious epistle, Paul finds himself struggling to justify a Gentile mission that has come under attack by the pillar apostles or those who claim their authority.²³ For his opponents, part of what it means to be a Christ believer is to be law observant, with particular emphasis placed on the necessity for circumcision (see Gal 2:3; 5:2-3, 6, 11; 6:12-13, 15; see also Gal 2:11-14; 4:9-10). These Judaizing interlocutors have managed to convince Paul’s communities that, to be true heirs to the promises of Abraham, they must be circumcised and adopt a Jewish mode of life. Thus, in Gal 3, the apostle finds himself exegeting anew the Abrahamic narrative. Paul’s counter-claim is that it

Byrne, *Romans*, 189; Robert Jewett, *Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 383; Alain Gignac, *L’Épître aux Romains* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2014), 248.

²² See Hultgren, *Romans*, 310-17.

²³ For a good general introduction to the structure and purpose of Paul’s letter to the Galatians, see Bruce Longenecker, “Galatians,” in Dunn, *Cambridge Companion to Saint Paul*, 64-73.

is the faith(fulness)²⁴ demonstrated by the patriarch *prior* to circumcision that secures for him God’s blessing (Gal 3:6-9, 16-18; see also Gen 12:1-3; 15:1-6). Subsequent to the Christ event, the obligation to emulate Abraham does not go beyond imitating his initial trust in God’s promise. Baptism is introduced into Paul’s argument in order to demonstrate that the adoption occurring during that rite counters his rivals’ claims to additional ritual or practical requirements for election. Paul argues as follows:

27. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ [εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε], you have put on Christ [Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε]. 28. There is neither Jew or Greek, slave or free, male or female; for you all are one in Christ Jesus [ὅμοις εἶς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ]. 29. But if you belong to Christ [εἰ δὲ ὅμοις Χριστοῦ], then you are the seed of Abraham [Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα

²⁴ There is debate about what, exactly, Paul means when he says that, “Abraham believed in God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness” (Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην [Gal 3:6]). The debate is perhaps most famously encapsulated in the skirmish between Richard B. Hays and James D.G. Dunn (see Richard Hays, “πίστις and Pauline Christology: What is at Stake?” and James D.G. Dunn, “Once More, πίστις Χριστοῦ,” in *Pauline Theology Volume IV: Looking Back, Pressing On* [ed. E. Elizabeth Johnson and David M. Hay; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997], 35-60 and 61-81). Hays has provocatively suggested that, for Paul, Abraham’s faithfulness is primarily a type of Christ’s, and, just as Abraham trusted in God (καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ [Gal 3:6a]), so too did the messiah, with the result that justification was reckoned to both (ἐλογίσθη...εἰς δικαιοσύνην [Gal 3:6b]). For Hays, Abraham is “a typological foreshadowing of Christ himself” and he functions in Galatians as a “subversive counterreading” to the Abraham story as deployed by Paul’s adversaries (Hays, “πίστις and Pauline Christology,” 47). Dunn, on the other hand, counters that, if Abraham functions synonymously in Romans and Galatians, one runs into an insoluble problem: in Romans 4, Paul is *attacking* the traditional Jewish understanding of Abraham as the archetypal model of faithfulness. As such, Gen 15:6 has to be understood as prior to and independent of later exemplary representations of Abraham’s obedience to God (see Gen 17, 22). Thus, πίστις does not refer to Abraham’s faithfulness in Paul’s thinking. Rather, it refers to his *faith*; that is, his naked trust in God’s promise (Dunn, “Once More, πίστις Χριστοῦ,” 75-6). In response to criticisms of his reading of Gal 3:6, Hays maintains that Abraham is a representative figure “in whom” scripture blesses his children (Gal 3:8-9), but he also concedes “those who are his children stand in this relationship to him precisely insofar as they share his orientation toward God in faith (3:6-7),” and thus “there is a sense in which Abraham is the prefiguration both of Christ and of those who are in Christ” (“πίστις and Pauline Christology,” 52). This dissertation does not seek to determine whether it is more accurate to speak of the “faith” or “faithfulness” of Abraham. Neither choice will negatively affect my conclusions, so I present both here as equal interpretive possibilities.

ἐστέ], heirs according to the promise [κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι.]... 4. And when the fullness of time came, God sent his own son, born from a woman, born under the law, 5. in order that he might redeem those under the law [τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ], in order that we might receive adoption [τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν]. 6. And since you are sons [Ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί], God sent the Spirit of his Son [τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ] into our hearts crying out, “Abba! Father!” [αββα ὁ πατήρ]. 7. And so, you are no longer a slave but a son [οὐκέτι εἶ δούλος ἀλλὰ υἱός]. And if you are a son, you are also an heir through God [κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ] (Gal 3:27-9; 4:4-7).²⁵

According to Paul, baptism is the process of “putting on” Christ (Gal 3:27-8).²⁶ Through identification with Christ, and in imitation of Christ, baptizands become the “seed of Abraham” (Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα) and “heirs according to the promise” (κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι [Gal 3:29]). It is “in Christ Jesus” (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [Gal 3:28]) that the promises to Abraham find their fulfillment.²⁷ Because the neuter singular participle κρᾶζον can only refer to the neuter and accusative singular noun πνεῦμα, the Greek syntax of Gal 4:6 requires that the Spirit is directly

²⁵ There is broad agreement amongst commentators that these verses harken back to and expand upon the shared baptismal experience of the Galatians communities. See, for example, Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979], 181-5; J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 378-83; Frank J. Matera, *Galatians* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 145-7; Hans Lietzmann, *An die Galater* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1932), 23; Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011) 243-4; Robin Scroggs and Kent I. Groff, “Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ” *JBL* 92 (1973) 538-9; cf. James D.G. Dunn, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (London: A&C Black, 1993), 203-4.

²⁶ While the precise signification of Paul’s metaphorical “putting on” Christ (Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε [Gal 3:27]) is debated, there is general scholarly consensus on its outline. From a practical standpoint, “putting on” may evoke the baptizand’s clothing himself in fresh white garments after submersion (Scroggs and Groff, “Baptism,” 537-40), but, more abstractly, it signifies being incorporated into Christ’s body and being transformed into a new being (Betz, *Galatians*, 187; Martyn, *Galatians*, 382-3; Matera, *Galatians*, 146; Lietzmann, *Galater*, 23-4). As Dunn rightly notes, it is the “action by means of which [believers’] lives and destinies and very identities become bound up with Christ” (*Galatians*, 203).

²⁷ For Paul, Christ is Abraham’s true heir: “The promises have been spoken to Abraham and to his seed [τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ]. It does not say, “to his seeds [τοῖς σπέρμασιν], as if to many, but as if to one [ὡς ἐφ’ ἑνός]: ‘and to your seed’ [τῷ σπέρματι σου], who is Christ [ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός]” (Gal 3:16). For a good discussion of this verse and its context, see Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, 135-8.

responsible for the baptismal cry, rather than the believer: “God sent the Spirit of his Son [τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ] into our hearts, crying out [κράζον], ‘Abba! Father! [αββα ὁ πατήρ].”

The agency of the individual baptizand is thus momentarily subsumed as he or she is incorporated with the Spirit of Christ,²⁸ and, in assigning such autonomous activity to that Spirit, Paul’s insistence on a singular transformative moment of entry into the community is complete. The Spirit’s cry to the father affirms both for the baptizand and all who are present that the believer truly has become coheir with Christ (see Rom 8:17). In Galatians, then, the baptismal ritual is far more than the (re)presentation of individual episodes of Paul’s gospel narrative. In the course of this performance, divine energy seizes control of baptizand’s bodies and iconically displays for all who are present (including the participant) the eschatological promises of that narrative.

Finally, it is important to note for a comparison with Mark’s gospel that, after believers’ performance of Christ’s death and resurrection, during which they are transformed into sons and daughters of God through the incorporation of the Spirit, that Spirit remains active throughout the remainder of their lives. Indeed, it is the means by which God (and his salvific activity in the

²⁸ As Martinus C. de Boer (*Galatians: A Commentary* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011], 266) has suggested, “By attributing the exclamation directly to the Spirit in v.6, Paul also makes clear the act of addressing God as ‘Abba’ and/or as ‘Father’ is not an action thought up by human beings themselves, but a human action wrought by God. It is a mark of God’s beneficially invasive presence and activity whereby God liberates human beings from slavery, so that they are in a position to recognize God as their caring ‘father’ (see 1:1-4; 4:4-5).” To be sure, there is some debate regarding when, precisely, a Christ believer receives the Spirit. Martyn, for example, is hesitant to link one’s spiritual infusion explicitly with baptism; instead, he implies that the Spirit of God invades the hearts of believers when Paul first *preached* to them, long before baptism would have occurred (*Galatians*, 284; see also de Boer, *Galatians* 265). I, however, concur with Lietzmann’s judgment, “Bei der Taufe wird also ‘Christus angezogen’, ein anderer Ausdruck für das λαμβάνειν πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας Rm 8.14 ff.” (*Galater*, 23 [emphasis added]; see also Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 98-99; Matera *Galatians*, 143-7). True spiritual infusion, where the believer is transformed into a child of God, occurs for Paul with the reception of the Spirit at baptism.

world through Christ’s death and resurrection) is able to be understood. In the second chapter of 1 Corinthians, Paul makes this idea clear:

10. For the Spirit searches into all things [τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐραυνᾷ], even the depths of God [τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ]. 11. For who of men [ἀνθρώπων] knows the affairs of man [τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] except the spirit of man [τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] which is in him [τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ]? So too, no one know the matters of God [τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ] except the Spirit of God [τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ]. 12. But we have not received the spirit of the world [τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου] but the Spirit which comes from God [τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ] in order that we might know the gifts given to us by God [τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν] (1 Cor 2:10-12).²⁹

For Paul, the cross puts on display a massive paradox. It shows the humiliating and mortal death of God’s eternal Son (see 1 Cor 8:6; Phil 2:6-11). As a result, it is a scandal to Jews (Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον) and folly to Gentiles (ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωρίαν [1 Cor 1:23]),³⁰ groups who have tried and failed to understand God through human wisdom alone (see 1 Cor 1:21a: “the world did not come to know God through wisdom [διὰ τῆς σοφίας]”).³¹ Paul claims, rather, that God’s activity is perceived in folly (“through the foolishness of the gospel proclamation [μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος], God thought it good to save those who believe [μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος]” [1

²⁹ Though I would prefer to translate this passage with inclusive language (“humanity” rather than “man”), Paul’s shifting between the singular and plural (ἀνθρώπων/ ἀνθρώπου), together with his use of the masculine pronoun (τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ), makes rendering the passage this way difficult. On the rhetorical context of Paul’s extended discussion of wisdom and Spirit (1 Cor 2:6-16), see Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians, and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 41-3.

³⁰ For Thiselton, this section sets the “framework” for Paul’s later material on the Holy Spirit in 1 Cor 12-14 (*Corinthians*, 256). According to him, “All of this talk of ‘wisdom,’ ‘secrets,’ and ‘being spiritual,’ [Paul] says, amounts to little or nothing—*unless you are open to reappropriate the message of the cross in your innermost being*. Here lies the key to the ‘secret’ of God’s being and ‘wisdom,’ which can be apprehended *only* as his Holy Spirit shows you Christ (2:16-3:3). That gives you the kind of “secret” which makes status-seeking out of place and draws you anew to the cross” (Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 259-60 [emphasis original]).³⁰

³¹ For a good discussion, see Joseph Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 157.

Cor 1:21b]), and, as a result, he makes it clear that proper recognition of that activity is dependent upon the deity's intervention in the believer through the Spirit.³²

In addition, the baptismal Spirit is the means by which believers occupy different offices within the eschatological community. This is again apparent in 1 Corinthians, where a major point of contention is the diversity of spiritual gifts.³³ The purpose of Paul's argument in 1 Cor 12, in which he employs the famous "body metaphor" of antiquity,³⁴ is to establish distinct yet functionally equivalent positions for the various charisms within the church. Paul claims that the confession the believers share—"Jesus is Lord" (Κύριος Ἰησοῦς [1 Cor 12:3])³⁵—is born of the Holy Spirit, and the eschatological powers they manifest are the products of the same Spirit and

³² So Hans-Josef Klauck (*1 Korintherbrief* [Würzburg: Echter Verlag GmbH, 1984] 30): "Der Geist, dessen Allgegenwart an die Funktion der Weltseele in der Stoa erinnert, ist zugleich Offenbarungspotenz und Erkenntnismittel, dem auch die vieldimensionale Wirklichkeit des verborgenen Gottes nicht unzugänglich bleibt. Paulus untermauert diese theologische Erkenntnistheorie mit einem anthropologischen Vergleich von der Selbsterkenntnis des Menschen her. Gleiches kann nur durch Gleiches erkannt werden, so lautete ein verbreiteter philosophischer Lehrsatz der Antike. Die einschränkende Folgerung daraus hinsichtlich der Möglichkeit von Gotteserkenntnis wird insofern partiell durchbrochen, als Gott den Menschen das mit menschlichen Fähigkeiten nicht Erreichbare von sich aus schenken kann."

³³ See Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 171-5, 279-80.

³⁴ For a comprehensive discussion of Paul's use of this rhetorical commonplace, see Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation* 157-165 and 267-70.

³⁵ Paul includes this confession in an opening proposition with which he assumes the Corinthians will agree and before which their individual differences are levelled: "Therefore I make known to you that no one speaking with the Spirit of God [οὐδεὶς ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλῶν] says, 'Jesus is accursed [Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς]!' and no one is able to say, 'Jesus is lord [Κύριος Ἰησοῦς]!' unless with the Holy Spirit [ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ]" (1 Cor 12:3). Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 455 calls 1 Cor 12:1-3 the "fundamental thesis about the role of the Spirit...the three verses are united by an epistemological theme, which must be rightly understood. They are followed in vv. 4-11 by a sober discussion of the various gifts that come from the one Spirit. Thereafter, in chap. 12, Paul teaches that the many gifted members all form one body, 'the body of Christ,' which is the church" (see also Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 267).

work together for the common good of all (πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον [1 Cor 12:7]).³⁶ Indeed, according to Paul, these various charisms represent the unity of the communal body that is established through faith and baptism “in” or “with” one Spirit (ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι [1 Cor 12:13]).³⁷

Thus, when one weaves together the baptismal teachings in Paul’s letters to the Romans, Galatians, and Corinthians—all three of which the Markan community may have possessed³⁸—one gains a panoramic sense of what baptism means and entails for the apostle. It is, first and foremost, a ritual performance of his gospel narrative. Through the (re)presentation of Christ’s death and resurrection in the baptismal waters, believers simultaneously put themselves to death and synecdochically evoke the remainder of the gospel narrative through the proleptic anticipation of their future resurrections (Rom 6:3-8). This mimetic and epiphanic experience effects the transformation of believers into sons (and daughters) of God (and members of the communal body of Christ) through the insorcism of the Spirit (Gal 4:4-7; Rom 8:14-17). This

³⁶ In his list of spiritual offices, Paul is careful underscore that all charisms serve to build up the community, and, though distinct from one-another, no one of them can claim superiority: “7. But to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit [ἡ φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος] for the common good [πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον]. 8. For to one, through the Spirit [διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος], is given a word of wisdom [λόγος σοφίας], but to another a word of knowledge [λόγος γνώσεως] according to the same Spirit [κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα]. 9. To another is faith(fullness) [πίστις] in the same Spirit [ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι], and to another are gifts of healing [χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων] in the one Spirit [ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ πνεύματι]. 10. And to another are the workings of powers [ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων], and to another the gift of prophecy [προφητεία], and to another the discernment of spirits [διακρίσεις πνευμάτων], to another types of tongues [γένη γλωσσῶν], and to another the interpretation of tongues [ἐρμηνεῖα γλωσσῶν]” (1 Cor 12:7-10). For a good discussion of each of these spiritual abilities individually, see Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 466-71.

³⁷ “For, with one Spirit [ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι], we all [ἡμεῖς πάντες] have been baptized into one body [εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν]—whether Jew or Greek; whether slave or free—and we all [πάντες] have been given to drink one Spirit [ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν].” I have chosen to translate this prepositional phrase as instrumental rather than locative, but this is a contested point. Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 997-8, argues that linguistic specificity here is less the point than Paul’s deep concern that, by virtue of being baptized by (or in) one Spirit, there can no longer be any “categorization or elitism” within the church.

³⁸ See Chapter I, Part I for my argument.

Spirit then remains with believers throughout their lives, gifting them with the necessary intellectual capacity to understand the paradox of the cross (1 Cor 2:10-12) and distributing to them the spiritual abilities required to hold various spiritual offices within the church (1 Cor 12).

Part II: Baptism for Mark

Because Mark's gospel is not an occasional epistle but an extended episodic narrative telling the story of Jesus' earthly mission, the evangelist communicates his understanding of baptism differently than does Paul, who presumes the baptismal rite and unpacks its various significances according to the rhetorical needs of the moment. Though Mark teaches about the nature of Jesus and God, proper or necessary ritual praxis, discipleship, the limits of the mission, and so forth, his teachings are *shown* through the larger unfolding of his plot as often as (if not more often than) they are told. The significance of this fact should not be underestimated. Mark's narrative is logical, consistent, and complete, and that which opens the story stands in a concordant literary relationship to those episodes that follow. Understanding the full significance of Jesus' baptism in the Jordan River thus requires reading it in relation to the larger narrative of which it forms an integral part.

In what follows, I will argue that Mark tells a story that presumes John's baptisms are proleptic enactments of the deaths of those who come to him and acknowledge their sins in the face of God's coming judgement (Mk 1:4). For the evangelist, these are acts of self-abasement before the deity during which forgiveness is asked, but it is not (yet) granted. When Mark's Jesus is finally baptized by John, the epiphany that occurs there—Jesus' reception of the Spirit and acknowledgement as God's beloved child (Mk 1:9-11)—is the proleptic manifestation both of Jesus' death and of the deity's assent. The mission of Jesus Christ, the Son of God who will

“give his soul as a ransom for many [λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν]” (Mk 10:45),³⁹ has officially begun. When Jesus later speaks of the baptism he *will* undergo (Mk 10:38-9), his language is self-consciously intended to point back to his baptism in the Jordan River and forward to the cross. Just as Jesus underwent a symbolic death (physical baptism) at the beginning of the story as the inaugural act of his salvific mission, his physical death (symbolic baptism) must occur for his mission to be complete and forgiveness to be granted at the story’s end (see Mk 15:38-9).

At the opening of Mark’s text, John the Baptist is introduced with the following words:

2. As it stands written in the book of Isaiah the Prophet, “Behold! I am sending my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way” [see Ex 23:20; Mal 3:1]; 3. the voice of one shouting in the wilderness, “Prepare the way of the Lord! Make his paths straight!” [Is 40.3 LXX], 4. John the Baptist was in the wilderness and proclaiming baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins (βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν [Mk 1:4]). 5. And all the land of Judea and all the people of Jerusalem [πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται πάντες] went out to him, and they were baptized by him in the Jordan river as they confessed their sins [ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν] (Mk 1:2-5).

The aggregated scriptural citation of Mk 1:2-3, together with the description of John’s dress (Mk 1:6), is a clear signal to the evangelist’s audience that John occupies the role of Elijah, the prophetic forerunner to the messiah (see Mk 9:11-13; Mal 3:22-4; 2 kgs 1:8). Yet, if “baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins” (βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν [Mk 1:4]) is

³⁹ “For the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve [διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι] and to give his life as a ransom for many [λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν].” On the centrality of this verse for Mark, see Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 757: “The ransom saying, with which [Mk 10:35-45] concludes (10:45b), is of central importance in Mark’s narrative because it is the clearest Markan reflection on the saving purpose of Jesus’ death (cf. 14:24). That death is to be a ‘ransom,’ a payment of the price that the ‘many’ are unable to pay themselves. The servitude imagery of the previous verses and the use of *diakonein* in the present context favor the view that this ransom is conceived as a slave price: Jesus sells himself into slavery in order to liberate his brothers and sisters from bondage...[the] passage ends with an allusion to Isaiah 52-3, which speaks of the Lord’s righteous Servant, who pours out his soul unto death to atone for the iniquity of the ‘many.’”

taken to mean that John had an *actual* ability to forgive sin, contradictions quickly arise within the Markan narrative. At the level of Christology, Jesus' participation in a rite that washes sins away would seem to imply that the messiah is initially sinful and in need of repentance and forgiveness.⁴⁰ This is difficult to reconcile with the evangelist's statements elsewhere that forgiveness of sins is what Jesus has come to offer (see Mk 2:5-12; 10:45; 14:24), and with Mark's subtle but consistent way of presenting Jesus as a divine figure throughout the text, a literary feature of the Gospel of Mark that scholarship has increasingly come to recognize.⁴¹

More immediately, Mark's audience would see in the unfolding of Mark's plot that the acceptance of John's authority to forgive sins stands in direct conflict with the rejection of Jesus' authority to do the same. At Mk 1:5, the evangelist makes clear that the baptizer is respected by all, authority and subject alike. The whole Judean countryside (πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα [Mk 1:5]) and the entirety of the Jerusalem populace (οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται πάντες [Mk 1:5])—a description that, while hyperbolic, should not be taken to preclude the Jerusalem intelligentsia⁴²—has come out to the Jordan to be baptized by him. A little later in the narrative, it is learned that Herod also

⁴⁰ It is clear that, as early as Matthew, Mark could be read in this way. Aside from containing a separate birth narrative that makes Jesus' exalted status unambiguously clear (Matt 1:18-21), Matthew redacts Jesus' baptism as follows: "Then Jesus, from Galilee, was present at the Jordan with John in order to be baptized by him [τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ]. But John was preventing him [διεκώλυεν αὐτὸν], saying, 'I have need of being baptized by you [ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι], and you come to me?' And, answering, Jesus said to him, 'Let it be for now [ἄφες ἄρτι]. For it is thus fitting for us to fulfill all righteousness [πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην]'" (Matt 3:13-15). Regardless of what one makes of the phrase "to fulfill all righteousness" (πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην), it is clear that Matthew has expanded the Markan narrative so as to exclude any implication that Jesus might be in need of personal repentance.

⁴¹ For a recent and nuanced treatment of Markan high Christology, see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016), 61-78.

⁴² See Collins, *Mark*, 142; Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 156.

fears and protects John as a holy man (Mk 6:14-16; 6:20⁴³). If Mark understands John's baptism to bring about actual forgiveness of sins, and he portrays him as a respected figure for doing so, there should be little problem with Jesus' ability to forgive sins less than a chapter later (Mk 2:5-12), especially when that forgiveness is accompanied by a clear miraculous sign (the paralytic's restored ability to walk [Mk 2:10-12]), something which does not occur, so far as the narrative relates, with John's baptisms (excluding, of course, the epiphany to Jesus himself [Mk 1:9-11]).⁴⁴

⁴³ "For Herod was afraid of John, knowing that he was a man just and holy, and he was watching over (συνετήρει) him, and when he listened to him, he was completely perplexed [πολλὰ ἠπόρει], and he listened to him gladly [ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν]" (Mk 6:20).

⁴⁴ There is a potential objection to my claim that John is a figure respected by the Jerusalem authorities. In an argument with the chief priests, scribes, and elders (οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι) during Jesus' final kerygmatic activity in Jerusalem, the baptism of John becomes the subject of debate (Mk 11:27-33). It is demanded of Jesus that he explain on what authority he does what he does (Mk 11:28). Jesus responds by saying that, should the authorities tell him whence comes the baptism of John, he will give them the information they seek: "And Jesus said to them, 'I will ask you one question [λόγον], and [if] you answer me, I also will tell you on what authority I do these things: the baptism of John, was it from heaven or from human beings? Tell me'" (Mk 11:29-30). Jesus' interlocutors find themselves caught in a rhetorical snare. On the one hand, should they say "from heaven," Jesus will attack them as hypocrites for not believing the baptizer (διὰ τί [οὐ] οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; [Mk 11:31]). On the other, should they attribute his baptism strictly to a human source, the crowds, who believe John to be a prophet, would themselves attack: "they were afraid of the crowd, for they all held John was truly a prophet [τὸν Ἰωάννην ὄντως ὅτι προφήτης ἦν]" (Mk 11:32). The implication seems to be, then, that the Jerusalem authorities do not accept the baptizer's authority, or they would be able to admit its heavenly source without fear of reprisal.

But Mark is not saying that the authorities reject John's message *per se*. Rather, they reject the idea that the "stronger one" (ὁ ἰσχυρότερός [Mk 1:7]) points to Jesus. Though Mark typologically identifies John the Baptist with Elijah (see Mk 1:6 [comp. 2 Kgs 1:8]; Mk 9:13), and he makes it clear that Jesus is superior to this figure (see Mk 9:4-7), at the level of the *characters* within Mark's story, there is confusion about the person with whom Elijah is to be identified (some identify Elijah with John the Baptist [see Mk 6:15], others with Jesus [see Mk 8:28]), assuming he is to be identified with any earthly figure at all (see, for example, Mk 15:35-6, where the crowds watching Jesus' crucifixion look for direct intervention from a heavenly Elijah [see also Mk 9:4-5]). I suggest, then, that, at the level of the narrative, the authorities (or, at the least, the scribes [see Mk 9:11: "The scribes say the it is necessary [δεῖ] for Elijah to come first"]) take John to be speaking about an eschatological, *heavenly* Elijah at Mk 1:7. Thus, it is not John's call for repentance in the face of the coming kingdom that is at issue; rather, it is Jesus' embodying the role

Yet Christ's accruing this authority to himself is precisely what provokes the ire of certain members of the scribal class (τινες τῶν γραμματέων), who complain that such power is reserved for God alone (εἷς ὁ θεός [Mk 2:7]).⁴⁵

It is therefore unlikely that either Mark or his audience thought of John's "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν [Mar 1:4]) as entailing *actual* forgiveness. Rather, they perceived of it as entirely symbolic, which invites a different interpretation that neither undermines Mark's subtle high Christology nor disrupts the episodic concordance of his narrative. Some scholars who have noted the Christological and narrative contradictions associated with John's ritual suggest that Jesus' undergoing a "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" is done "in solidarity with sinful humanity."⁴⁶ That is, in Jesus' case, no actual forgiveness is effected. Alternatively, others have proposed that, from

of the "stronger one" (ὁ ἰσχυρότερός) that they reject. For the authorities, it is Elijah, not Jesus, who will be the herald of the end times (Mal 3:23-4). For similar readings, see Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 797, 799-800; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 231; Ludger Schenke, *Das Markusevangelium: literarische Eigenwart—Text und Kommentierung* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005), 271.

⁴⁵ "Why does this man speak in such a way? Who is able to forgive sins except God alone [εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός]?" One might counter here that, whereas Jesus claims the authority to forgive sins *for himself* in Mk 2:1-12, in Mk 1:4-11, John effects forgiveness of sin *on behalf of* God. There is nothing in the text, however, that suggests the actual power of forgiveness is being displaced from John to God, and a stronger exegetical argument can be made for interpreting John's actions as purely symbolic from the perspective of Mark and his community.

⁴⁶ This language comes from M. Eugene Boring (*Mark: A Commentary* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006], 44): "It is...surprising that the one announced in 1:8 as the baptizer in the Holy Spirit is baptized and receives the Holy Spirit rather than dispenses it... Without a word of explanation, Jesus takes his place in the line of repentant humanity preparing for the eschatological act of God. Jesus' initial appearance in Mark is *in solidarity with sinful humanity*. The one we readers have heard of addressed in 1:2 as belonging to the transcendent world appears in this world as one of us" (emphasis added). See also John R. Donahue and Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2002), 64-5; Ulrich W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* (London: SCM Press, 1963) 94-5; R.T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 76.

the viewpoint of the evangelist and his community, “John’s baptism was only a proleptic cleansing from sinfulness, since the true remission resulted from Jesus’ death as a ‘ransom for many’ (10:45).”⁴⁷ In this case, the preposition εἰς in “baptism of repentance for [εἰς] the forgiveness of sins” (Mk 1:4) does not imply purpose but, rather, something like a “goal.”⁴⁸

Both suggestions have merit, but neither is fully satisfying. One might ask, for example, on what exegetical grounds the case should be made for Mark’s portraying a Jesus “in solidarity” with sinful humanity, or, alternatively, why it is necessarily the case that a proleptic “cleansing” is the only symbolic act that is in view. In the paragraphs that follow, I will attempt to

⁴⁷ Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 156. The fuller context for this citation is as follows: “The rite of baptism itself suggests cleansing and therefore forgiveness, but the rite might merely be intended to foreshadow a remission of sins that will take place in the eschaton...John associated the future coming of the “stronger one” with the advent of the Spirit (Mark 1:7-8), and the Spirit is often linked with forgiveness in OT prophecy and Jewish apocalyptic texts (Ezek 36:25-26; Zech 12:10-13:1; 1QS 4:20-21), where forgiveness is not so much a possibility for everyday life as it is a hope for the eschatological future...In any case, in *Mark’s* understanding, John’s baptism was only a proleptic cleansing from sinfulness, since the true remission resulted from Jesus’ death as a ‘ransom for many’ (10.45)” (emphasis original). See the similar interpretation of Schenke, *Markusevangelium*, 51-2: “Gegenüber der Person und dem Wirken des Kommenden ist Johannes zweitrangig: Seine Taufe ist lediglich Wassertaufe. Somit kan 1,4 nicht so gemeint sein, dass Johannes hier seine eigene Taufe verkündet, sondern die wirksame Taufe des Kommenden, die in der Umkehr besteht (vgl 1,15) und Sündenvergebung bewirkt (vgl 2,1-12; 10,45). Die Taufe des Johannes führt auf diese wirksame Taufe hin, indem sie das Bekenntnis der Sünden voraussetzt (1,5); sie nimmt die kommende Taufe in Heiligem Geist aber nicht vorweg, sie bereitet nur den Boden dafür. Wer seine Sünden bekannt hat, ist bereit zur Umkehr und kann Vergebung der Sünden und den Heiligen Geist empfangen. Doch solche Wirkungen gehen erst von den Stärkeren aus.” See also Robert A. Guelich (*Mark 1-8:26* [Dallas: Word Books, 1989], 20), who compares the Baptism of John with the *miqvot* of Qumran and comes to the conclusion that “John’s baptism had repentance...as its focus. Like Qumran’s lustrations, John’s baptism signified one’s readiness to repent and offered the certainty of God’s acceptance of a candidate’s repentance. Unlike Qumran where the community screened one’s repentance and the accompanying forgiveness of sins as measured by one’s life lived under the scrutiny of the Community, John called for repentance and its corresponding conduct and offered a confirming baptism as the necessary prerequisite for the ‘forgiveness of sins’ that was yet to come.”

⁴⁸ See Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* [Harvard University Press, 1984], 376, §1686d.

supplement these good suggestions, and I will argue that, for the evangelist, it is not the case that persons undergoing John's baptism are undergoing a rite that necessarily washes away their sins. Rather, they are undergoing a rite that symbolically puts them to death in the hopes that that cleansing might eventually be effected.

In all of Mark's gospel, the noun "baptism" (βάπτισμα) is found in a total of four verses (Mk 1:4; 10:38, 9; 11:30) and forms of the verb "baptize" (βαπτίζω) in a total of nine (Mk 1:4, 5, 8, 9; 6:14, 24; 7:4; 10:38, 9). The majority of these occurrences carry little explanatory force for understanding the symbolism of John's baptism, as they are either titles for John (e.g. Mk 6:14, 24), or the term's meaning is already assumed in the reference (e.g. Mk 1:4, 8,⁴⁹ 9; 11:30). That said, a couple of Mark's usages warrant further investigation. The first is Mk 7:4, where, in an explanatory gloss to the Markan audience about Jewish purification practices, the evangelist uses the verb βαπτίζω to mean "wash": "and when they come from the agora, they do not eat if they do not wash themselves [βαπτίσωνται]." Yet it is noteworthy that, in the same verse, Mark uses the accusative plural of the masculine noun, *baptismos* (βαπτισμός) to describe the washing of various vessels, rather than the accusative plural of the neuter noun, *baptisma* (βάπτισμα), which he consistently uses for the baptismal rite. Though certainty is precluded, it is possible that, for Mark, there is a semantic difference between the two nouns.⁵⁰ If this is the case, the verb βαπτίζω

⁴⁹ John's prediction that the stronger one will come and "baptize you with Holy Spirit [βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ]" is interesting. On the one hand, what it means to "baptize with the Holy Spirit" is assumed rather than explained. On the other, there is here striking overlap with Paul's own formulation, "with one spirit [ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι] we have all been baptized into one body [ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν]" (1 Cor 12:13). It may be that Mark quite directly evokes Pauline baptismal experience in this verse.

⁵⁰ Contrast Mark's usage, for example, with the author of Colossians, who does use the masculine noun for the ritual at Col 2:11-12: "In [him] you were also circumcised with a circumcision not made by hands, in the stripping of the body of the flesh through the circumcision of Christ, buried together with him in baptism [συνταφέντες αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτισμῷ], in which you were also raised up with him [συνηγέρθητε] through faith in the power of God who raised

has a broader range of meanings than does the noun, and one must be cautious about presuming that Mk 7:4 is a linguistic key to unlocking the meaning of John's "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" at Mk 1:4.

The second important case is Mk 10:38-9. There, both the noun βάπτισμα (twice) and verb βαπτίζω (four times) are placed on the lips of Jesus. When James and John come to the messiah to ask for positions of privilege in the eschatological kingdom, Jesus responds with his allusive question, "are you able to drink the cup which I drink [τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω] or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized [τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι]?" (Mk 10:38). When James and John respond that they are, Jesus repeats his words, this time as a prophecy: "The cup which I am drinking you will drink [τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω πίεσθε], and the baptism with which I am baptized you will be baptized [τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε]" (Mk 10:39). Context necessitates that both the metaphors of cup and baptism refer to Christ's impending death. Consensus amongst biblical critics is that the "cup" to which Jesus alludes is the biblical "cup of wrath" (τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ θυμοῦ [Is 51:17 LXX]).⁵¹ That is, Jesus has taken upon himself the vengeance of the deity in order to expiate the

him from the dead [διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν]." Interestingly, given how closely this passage echoes Rom 6:4-8, it is noteworthy that Paul there uses the neuter noun βάπτισμα rather than the masculine noun βαπτισμός.

⁵¹ Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 747; 752; Collins, *Mark*, 496; Moloney, *Mark*, 205; Sherman E. Johnson, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Mark* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 179; France, *Mark*, 416; C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 337-8; William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 380; Walter Klaiber, *Das Markusevangelium* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010), 201; Wilfried Eckey, *Das Markusevangelium: Orientierung am Weg Jesu* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1998), 343; Joachim Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (2 vols.; Solothurn und Düsseldorf: Benziger Verlag, 1994), 1.101-2. I will discuss the cup metaphor in more detail in Chapter III, Part III.

sins of the masses.⁵² Alternatively, “baptism” (τὸ βάπτισμα) most probably alludes to the shared biblical and Graeco-Roman metaphor of “drowning” in overwhelming troubles.⁵³ As early as the 7th-6th century B.C.E., the verb βαπτίζω is already a common term used in descriptions of death by drowning,⁵⁴ and, by the Second Temple period, the translator of Isaiah can use the verb

⁵² On the predicted death of the disciples, Collins suggests an implicit distinction between the significance of Jesus’ death and that of James and John. She explains, “One way to read Jesus’ question in v.38 is to infer that no one else can drink the cup and be baptized in the way that Jesus will, namely, as an act that is ἀντὶ πολλῶν (‘in place of many’ or ‘in behalf of many’ [cf. v. 45]). If such is the case, then the statement of Jesus in v. 39, ‘You will drink the cup which I am about to drink and you will be baptized with the baptism with which I am about to be baptized’... would mean that they will share in the *form* of Jesus’ death, but not in the *meaning*. It seems more likely that they share in its meaning, as well, though in a limited way. According to 8:34-35, the true followers of Jesus are those who take up their crosses and follow him, who are willing to die for his sake and for the sake of the Gospel” (Collins, *Mark*, 497). Comparing Mk 10:38-9 with Col 1:24, Collins supposes that the deaths of martyrs work on behalf of the mission and the church. While perhaps not properly “for the many,” there is nevertheless contained within Jesus prophecy of James’ and John’s deaths a sense of suffering for the sake of others.

⁵³ See, for example, Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 747-8, who provides an important list of metaphorical *comparanda*: “In nonbiblical Greek, words of the *bapt-* group are used figuratively for the immersion of people in various sorts of evils (see e.g. Josephus, *War* 4.137, Libanius, *Orations* 18.286...) and in the OT and Jewish texts water and flood imagery are deployed in a similar way (see, e.g. Ps 42:7; Isa 43:2; 1QH 11[3]:28-36). Sometimes, as in 1QH 11(3):28-36, the overflowing evil is eschatological in nature, and this eschatological sense carries over to the figurative uses of *baptisma* and *baptisthēnai* in Luke 12:50, as the highly apocalyptic context of that saying shows.” For a fuller list of comparisons that takes into account variant readings in both the Aquila and Symmachus versions of the Septuagint, see Hans F. Bayer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus, 2008), 376. The idea of “drowning” in troubles without either using “baptism” or “baptize” is also not uncommon. See, for example, Psalm 41:8 (LXX), which reads, “Abyss [ἄβυσσος] calls upon abyss at the sound of your cataracts [εἰς φωνὴν τῶν καταρρακτῶν σου]. All of your upswells and your waves [πάντες οἱ μετεωρισμοὶ σου καὶ τὰ κύματά σου] have passed over me [ἐπ’ ἐμὲ διήλθον]” (ἄβυσσος ἄβυσσον ἐπικαλεῖται εἰς φωνὴν τῶν καταρρακτῶν σου πάντες οἱ μετεωρισμοὶ σου καὶ τὰ κύματά σου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ διήλθον).

⁵⁴ A farcical example occurs in Aesop’s Fable 75. There, a monkey survives a shipwreck and is carried upon a dolphin’s back to Athens. When the two near Piraeus, the dolphin asks the monkey if he knows the port, but the monkey, mistaking the dolphin to be referring to a man, claims Piraeus to be an old friend. In response to the deception, the dolphin chokes the monkey “by submerging him” (βαπτίζων αὐτὸν ἀπέπνιξεν [*fab. Aes.* 75.14-15]).

βαπτίζειν to capture the sense of an overflowing torrent of lawlessness: “My heart is being led astray, and lawlessness drowns me [με βαπτίζει]. My soul has come into terror” (Isa 21:4 LXX).⁵⁵ Similarly, Josephus uses the term of Zion’s acceptance of robbers into its indomitable walls, an act that would eventually “drown the city” (ἐβάπτισεν τὴν πόλιν [Josephus *B.J.* 4.135-7]) with destruction.⁵⁶ Like the cup (ποτήριον), then, baptism (βάπτισμα) in Mk 10:38-9 points forward to and functions as a metaphor for the death that Jesus will undergo for the sake of the people (see Mk 10:45; 14:24).

At the same time, Jesus’ metaphorical baptism must have also evoked for Mark’s audience John’s physical baptism at the opening of the narrative. The rarity of the term in Mark’s gospel (Mk 1:4; 10:38, 9; 11:30), coupled with the fact that the baptismal rite was one in which all of the Markan community would have participated,⁵⁷ invites this association. In addition,

The Greek text is taken from Augustus Hausrath and Herbert Hunger, *Corpus Fabularum Aesopiarum* (vol 1.1; 2nd edition; Leipzig: Teubner, 1970).

⁵⁵ ἡ καρδία μου πλανᾶται καὶ ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐφέστηκεν εἰς φόβον.

⁵⁶ “But the guards of the cities, partly by hesitation to suffer evil and partly by hatred for the nation, were aiding little or not at all those who were suffering [τοῖς κακουμένοις] until the robber-chiefs of the troop contingents everywhere [οἱ τῶν πανταχοῦ συνταγμάτων ἀρχιληστῶν], having been gathered together by the chorus of despoliations throughout the land [μέχρι κόρυ τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἀρπαγῶν ἀθροισθέντες], and having become a mass of wickedness [πονηρίας στίφος], stole into the heart of Jerusalem, a city lacking a general, and which, by ancient custom, receives all fellow tribesman without precaution. And [it did so] because, at that time, everyone was imagining that all those allies streaming in came with good will [ἀπ’ εὐνοίας ἦκειν]. It was this which [ὁ δὲ], even apart from sedition, later *drowned the city* [ἐβάπτισεν τὴν πόλιν]” (Οἱ φρουροὶ δὲ τῶν πόλεων τὰ μὲν ὄκνω τοῦ κακοπαθεῖν, τὰ δὲ μίσει τοῦ ἔθνους οὐδὲν ἢ μικρὰ προσήμνον τοῖς κακουμένοις, μέχρι κόρυ τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἀρπαγῶν ἀθροισθέντες οἱ τῶν πανταχοῦ συνταγμάτων ἀρχιληστῶν καὶ γενόμενοι πονηρίας στίφος εἰς τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα παρεισφθείρονται, πόλιν ἀστρατήγητον καὶ πατρίῳ μὲν ἔθει πᾶν ἀπαρτηρήτως δεχομένην τὸ ὁμόφυλον, τότε δ’ οἰομένων ἀπάντων τοὺς ἐπιχειρομένους πάντας ἀπ’ εὐνοίας ἦκειν συμμαχούς. ὁ δὲ καὶ δίχα τῆς στάσεως ὕστερον ἐβάπτισεν τὴν πόλιν). The Greek text is taken from Josephus, *The Jewish War: Books III-IV* (trans. H. ST. John Thackeray; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927).

⁵⁷ This is also noted by, amongst others, Marcus, *Mark* 8-16, 752-4; Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 311; France, *Mark*, 416-17; Collins, *Mark*, 496-7; Moloney, *Mark* 205.

John the Baptist’s ostensible goal is to help the masses attain forgiveness (Mk 1:4), and this is precisely what Jesus’ death—his impending “baptism”— accomplishes (Mk 10:45; 14:24; see also Mk 2:1-12). Thus, Mk 10:38-9 both points forwards and backwards. It looks towards the cross while simultaneously evoking Jesus’ baptism in the Jordan River.

The connection I am suggesting Mark invites his audience to draw between Jesus’ baptism in the Jordan River and his death upon the cross at Mk 10:38-9 is, in fact, confirmed by the language Mark uses to describe the two events. If one sets the description of Jesus’ physical baptism (Mk 10-11) side by side with Mark’s description of the immediate aftermath of Jesus’ death at the end of the gospel (Mk 15:38-9), a linguistic mirroring appears:

Table 1: Mark 1:10-11 and Mark 15:38-9

<p>Mk 1:10-11 10. And, immediately, ascending from the waters, [Jesus] saw the heavens ripped apart [σχιζομένους] and <i>the Spirit</i> [τὸ πνεῦμα], as a dove descending into him [καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν]. 11. And a voice came from the heavens: “You are <u>my Son</u> [ὁ υἱός μου], the beloved, in you I am well pleased.”</p>	<p>Mk 15:38-9 38. And the veil of the temple was ripped [ἔσχισθη] in two from top to bottom. 39. And the centurion who was standing there opposite [Jesus], once he saw that he had thus breathed out <i>his Spirit</i> [ἐξέπνευσεν], said, “Truly this man was a <u>son of God</u> [υἱός θεοῦ]”</p>
---	---

The parallelism between these two episodes is clear. First, just as, at baptism, the heavens are ripped apart (σχιζομένους [Mk 9:10]) and the inbreaking of the kingdom begins, so too is the temple veil ripped apart (ἔσχισθη [Mk 15:38]) at the cross, and God’s presence loosed upon the world.⁵⁸ Second, as the Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα [Mk 9:10]) enters into Jesus at baptism, so too is it breathed out again (ἐξέπνευσεν [Mk 15:39]) at his crucifixion. Third, as Christ is acknowledged as God’s beloved child (ὁ υἱός μου [Mk 1:11]) at the inauguration of his missionary career, so too is he (ironically?) acknowledged as such (υἱός θεοῦ [Mk 15:39]) by the centurion at his

⁵⁸ A connection rightly noted by Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 65; France, *Mark*, 77; M. Eugene Boring, *Mark: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 45.

death. Thus, the language and sequence of events Mark uses in the description of Jesus' death at Mk 15:38-9 mirrors the language and sequence of events of Christ's baptism at Mk 1:10-11. The two episodes are linked together, and the entire missionary activity of Christ is intercalated between them. Christ's baptism in the beginning and his "baptism" at the end are linguistically bound.

The binding of Mk 1:10-11 to Mk 15:38-9 has implications for how one should understand the purpose of John's baptism at Mk 1:4. If the linguistic connection between Mk 1:10-11 and Mk 15:38-9 makes it clear that Jesus' death is somehow associated with John's baptism, then Christ's metaphorical imagery of baptism-as-death at Mk 10:38-9 helps delineate the semantic possibilities of the term "baptism" (βάπτισμα) itself within the gospel. Because Jesus' "baptism" at Mk 10:38-9 not only refers to the cross (as a metaphor for death), but it also invites recollection of Jesus' physical baptism in the Jordan River (through word association and the fact that Jesus' death accomplishes that which John's baptism foretells), Mark's audience is encouraged to see death as operative in John's baptism, as well. On this point, Walter Klaiber's reading of Mk 1:4 is illustrative:

To be submerged in water in the Old Testament means to be overwhelmed by the floods of judgment [Fluten des Gerichts] (compare Ps 42:8; 88:8; Jonah 2:4). Jesus himself incorporates this image when, in Mk 10:38f., he speaks about the baptism with which he will be baptized in light of his own death. To confess his sins and to allow himself to be baptized by John means allowing warranted judgment [verdiente Gericht] to be executed upon himself so as to be saved through judgment and to be freed to new life. In baptism, in being submerged by John, repentance [Umkehr] and forgiveness of sins [Vergebung der Sünden] occurs. The symbolism of baptism thus represents not only a 'cleansing' [reinwaschen] of sin (compare Ps 51:4), but also the processing of guilt [die Verarbeitung der Schuld] through the symbolic anticipation of judgment [die zeichenhafte Vorwegnahme des Gerichts].⁵⁹

⁵⁹ "Ins Wasser untergetaucht zu werden, bedeutet im Alten Testament von den Fluten des Gerichts überwältigt zu werden (vgl. Ps 42,8; 88,8; Jona 2,4). Jesus selbst nimmt dieses Bild auf, wenn er in Mk 10:38f im Blick auf seinen

In this citation, Klaiber is reconstructing the symbolic actions of what he believes to be the *historical* John the Baptist. He is thus comfortable hypothesizing both John's real claim to forgive sins and the historical Jesus' actual participation in the rite.⁶⁰ As discussed above, I find it unlikely that either Mark or his community would have understood actual forgiveness of sins to occur in Mk 1:4-11. Nevertheless, Klaiber has rightly connected the symbolism of Mk 10:38-9 with John's ritual action. In the inaugural episode of his gospel narrative, Mark presumes that all who participate in John's baptisms symbolically die as they are "overwhelmed by the floods of judgment [Fluten des Gerichts]." At the level of the narrative, it is the means by which Mark's Judeans represent their sinfulness, on the one hand, and perform their readiness to accept any punishment the deity deems fit to impose, on the other. At the same time, their hope is that, through this demonstration, they might move God to pity and secure forgiveness for their sins.

The strengths of this interpretation for understanding Mark's larger literary project are multiple. Not only does it create symbolic parallelism between Jesus' baptism at the beginning of the gospel and his "baptism" at the end that couples with the already established linguistic parallelism between the two episodes, it also provides narrative reason for the prolepsis associated with John's baptism and for Jesus' participation in the rite at all. The implicit claim of Mark's gospel is that, when Jesus comes to John, he does so not only to demonstrate his solidarity with sinful humanity; he comes to *conclude* John's activity. By participating in John's

Tod von der Taufe spricht, mit der er getauft werden wird. Seine Sünde zu bekennen und sich von Johannes untertauchen zu lassen bedeutet, das verdiente Gericht an sich vollziehen zu lassen und so durch das Gericht hindurch gerettet und zu neuem Leben befreit zu werden. In der Taufe, im Untergetauchtwerden durch Johannes, geschehen Umkehr und Vergebung der Sünden. Die Symbolik der Taufe weist also nicht nur auf ein 'reinwaschen' von der Sünde (vgl. Ps 51,4), sondern auf die Verarbeitung der Schuld durch die zeichenhafte Vorwegnahme des Gerichts" (Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 22; see also pg. 201 for his discussion of Mk 10:38-9).

⁶⁰ See Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 26.

rite, the knowing viewer recognizes that Jesus has anticipated his own crucifixion, and all that Judea has been seeking will shortly come to pass. Jesus' baptism is, in other words, the synecdochical manifestation of his salvific death for those with the eyes to perceive it. The self-abasement of the individual is no longer necessary, as the self-abasement of Christ will once and for all atone for the sins of the people.⁶¹

Further support for this reading can be found in the direct address of God at Jesus' baptism (Mk 1:11). Upon arising from the waters of the Jordan, Jesus is infused with the Spirit ("he saw...the Spirit [τὸ πνεῦμα], as a dove, descending into him [καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν]" [Mk 1:10]), the power by which he is able to perform his various miracles throughout the narrative.⁶² Immediately afterwards, Jesus is recognized as God's beloved Son by a voice from heaven: "You are my Son [σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου], the beloved [ὁ ἀγαπητός], in you I am well pleased [ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα]" (Mk 1:11). Though these words are often taken to allude to Ps 2:7 ("You are my son

⁶¹ Jesus is here analogous to the biblical scapegoat, and Mark's audience may have been invited to associate Jesus' baptism with the scapegoat ritual, as well. Compare Lev 16:21-2 LXX: "And Aaron will set his hands upon the head of the living he-goat [τοῦ χιμάρου τοῦ ζῶντος], and he will recite over him all the lawless actions of the sons of Israel [πάσας τὰς ἀνομίας τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ] and all their injustices [πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν] and all their sins [πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν], and he will set them upon the head of the living he-goat, and he will send it forth through a prepared man into the wilderness [εἰς τὴν ἔρημον (see Mk 1:12!)]. And the he-goat will take upon itself their injustices [τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν] into an inaccessible land, and he will send the he-goat into the wilderness" (καὶ ἐπιθήσει Ααρων τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ χιμάρου τοῦ ζῶντος καὶ ἐξαγορεύσει ἐπ' αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς ἀνομίας τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ καὶ πάσας τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν καὶ πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπιθήσει αὐτὰς ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ χιμάρου τοῦ ζῶντος καὶ ἐξαποστελεῖ ἐν χειρὶ ἀνθρώπου ἐτοίμου εἰς τὴν ἔρημον καὶ λήμψεται ὁ χίμαρος ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν εἰς γῆν ἄβατον καὶ ἐξαποστελεῖ τὸν χίμαρον εἰς τὴν ἔρημον).

⁶² There is broad consensus amongst commentators that Jesus' ability to perform miracles in the narrative comes from his insorcism with the Holy Spirit at baptism. Collins' words are representative: "As Aesop was given gifts of wise speech by Isis and the Muses, Jesus is endowed with the divine Spirit on this occasion, the power *that enables him* to teach with authority, to heal and to cast out demons" (*Mark*, 147 [emphasis added]). See also Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 165; Guelich, *Mark*, 35; France, *Mark*, 77; Boring, *Mark*, 45; Moloney, *Mark*, 36-7; Schenke, *Markusevangelium*, 54.

[υἰός μου εἶ σύ]. Today I have begotten you [σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε]),⁶³ there is a growing consensus amongst biblical critics that an additional referent is Gen 22:2: “Take your son [τὸν υἰόν σου], the beloved [τὸν ἀγαπητόν], whom you love [ὃν ἠγάπησας].”⁶⁴ For scholars who

⁶³ υἰός μου εἶ σύ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. See, amongst others, Marcus, *Mark*, 163; Collins, *Mark*, 150; France, *Mark*, 79-83; Donahue and Harrington, *Mark* 66-9; and Ernst Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966), 54-55. On the interpretation of the Psalm itself, see Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms 1-50* (New York: Doubleday, 1965), 7-14; Gnllka, *Markus*, 1.52-3. Though the content of Ps 2:7 makes one wonder whether Mark has an adoptionist Christology, it is important to recognize that the evangelist has changed the words of the Psalm from “Today I have begotten you” (σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε) to “in you I am well pleased” (ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα [Mk 1:11]). This alteration substantially modulates its adoptionist implications. Indeed, Mark may have decided to alter the words based upon the larger context of the psalm itself. The Greek version of Ps 2 does not make clear when the “begetting” takes place. For instance, Ps 2:6-7 LXX reads, “But I *have been* established by him as king upon Zion [ἐγὼ δὲ κατεστάθην βασιλεὺς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Σιών], his holy mountain, proclaiming the commandment of the Lord. The Lord *said* to me [εἶπεν πρὸς με], “You are my son [υἰός μου εἶ σύ]; today I have begotten you [σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε]” (ἐγὼ δὲ κατεστάθην βασιλεὺς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Σιών ὅρος τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ διαγγέλλων τὸ πρόσταγμα κυρίου κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με υἰός μου εἶ σύ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε). Through the use of aorist verbs, the Psalm speaks of events that have either already occurred in the past, or, if understood as gnomic, have not necessarily occurred in historical time at all. One suspects that Mark has used this passage as a proof text for Jesus’ messianism because of its wider context (it speaks of God’s “anointed one” [ὁ Χριστός] against whom the rulers of the earth have aligned themselves [Ps 2:2] but for whom the nations [ἔθνη] *will* inevitably become an inheritance [Ps 2:8-9, future tense]), and he excises the line about begetting because, if placed within his narrative, its implications would run counter to those of the Psalm itself, which speaks of the begottenness of the son in the past or outside of historical time entirely. Thus, the judgement of France (*Mark*, 82-3) on Mk 1:11 is most probably correct: “The divine declaration and the whole experience of which it forms a part is not phrased in such a way as to suggest that Jesus at this point becomes something which he was not before...Jesus does not have to wait until the resurrection to become God’s son; he is so already, and there is no hint that even at his baptism this is a new factor. What is new here is launching into the public exercise of the role for which he, as Son of God, is thus prepared.”

⁶⁴ λαβὲ τὸν υἰόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν ὃν ἠγάπησας. See Boring, *Mark*, 45-6; Marcus, *Mark* 1-8, 162; Jon Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993) 202; Camille Focant, *L’Évangile selon Marc* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2010), 69-70; Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 27-8; Eckey, *Markusevangelium*, 76-77. For a good general discussion of “beloved” in these verses, see Simon Légasse, *Naissance du Baptême* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993), 59-63. It is also sometimes suggested that Isa 42:1’s “[in whom] my soul delights [יְשׁוּבָהּ נַפְשִׁי]” is in view in Mk 1:11. Collins, for example, has suggested that “beloved” (ἀγαπητός) was “inspired by the other passage that is

adopt this position, the use of the affectionate “beloved” (ἀγαπητός) invokes that other and most famous “beloved” son of the Jewish scriptures, Isaac, who is nearly immolated by his father at God’s command.⁶⁵ Indeed, it is not just a single word, ἀγαπητός, but a word *cluster* that binds the texts together. Mark’s divine disclosure follows the word order of Gen 22:2.

Compare:

Table 2: Genesis 22:2, Mark 1:11, and Psalm 2:7

Gen 22:2 LXX λαβὲ τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν	Mk 1:11 σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός	Ps 2:7 LXX υἱός μου εἶ σύ _____
---	---	---

In both Gen 22:2 and Mk 1:11, “son” is the object that follows the verb governing its case (accusative and nominative, respectively), with the dependent adjective “beloved” then following the noun and connected by the definite article. Sandwiched in the middle of this noun phrase is the possessive pronoun (σου/μου). The overlapping order does not preclude reference to Ps 2:7, of course, but it does mean that there are stronger linguistic grounds than often recognized for seeing a double allusion in God’s words to Jesus. In the divine epiphany the messiah experiences at the Jordan River, Mark’s audience hears an echo of the binding of Isaac—an echo that is heard

actualized or fulfilled in the speech of the divine voice, Isa 42:1, the first part of which reads, ‘Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights [יְשׁוּבָה נְהַלְכֵנִי].’ The authors of Mark and Matthew may have known a text of Isa 42:1 in which the word ‘beloved’ occurred” (*Mark*, 150-151). That said, Isa 42.1 LXX reads quite differently than the Masoretic Text that Collins cites: “Jacob is my servant, I will aid him [ἀντιλήμγομαι αὐτοῦ]; Israel is my elect; my soul *welcomes him* [προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν]” (Ἰακωβ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήμγομαι αὐτοῦ Ἰσραηλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἢ ψυχὴ μου). While it is possible that Mk 1:11 alludes to Isa 42:1, I do not presume Mark knows Hebrew. The simpler solution is that there are two biblical passages primarily in view—Gen 22:2 and Ps 2:7—while Isa 42:7 may function as a tertiary and entirely contextual referent. The assumption that Mark and Matthew had access to a different textual version of Isaiah is unnecessary.

⁶⁵ See, for example, Simon Légasse, *L’Évangile selon Marc* (2 vols.; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1997), 1.91:

“...*agapētos*, quand il traduit l’hébreu *yahîd* in l’Ancien Testament, est toujours en rapport avec la mort d’un fils ou d’une fille unique, la premier en liste étant Isaac.”

again in the Parable of the Vineyard (Mk 12:1-9), where the beloved son (υἱὸς ἀγαπητός [Mk 12:6] is killed by tenant farmers—and this, in turn, strengthens the associations between baptism and death that I have argued are contained within the actions of the baptizer and operative throughout Mark’s gospel. Through one short phrase, Mark brings the whole of Isaac’s binding before the mind’s eye of his audience via the synecdochical poetics he shares with Paul.⁶⁶

To conclude: I have tried to demonstrate that John’s baptism in Mark’s gospel does not function as a ritual cleansing of sin. Rather, John’s baptisms are symbolic performances of drowning that signal to the deity the repentance of the masses. Associations between baptism and death are to be found within Jesus’ baptism itself (the allusion to Gen 22 at Mk 1:11) and in episodes subsequent to it (Mk 10:38-9; Mk 12:6-9; 15:37-9). Jesus’ baptism in the Jordan River is thus the proleptic enactment and synecdochical manifestation of his sacrificial death, and it signals the end of John’s baptismal performances, as “baptisms of repentance” cease to be necessary once the messiah, who will die for the people’s sins (Mk 10:45), has come upon the stage. Mark’s audience sees this confirmed in the disclosure of Jesus’ messianic status: first, in his insorcism with the Spirit that will grant him his miraculous powers and, second, through his explicit designation as God’s beloved Son by the voice from heaven. In the final section of this chapter, I will demonstrate how Mark has self-consciously constructed his narrative so as to anticipate Paul’s baptismal ritual within his own story.

Part III: Anticipating the Baptism of Paul

The parallelism between Paul and Mark on baptism-as-death can now be summarized. For both, baptism is a synecdochical ritual performance of dying (and rising) during which the baptizand is insorcised with Spirit and transformed into (or recognized as) a child of God. As the

⁶⁶ I will discuss the Aqedah in more detail in Chapter IV.

parentheses in the previous sentence make clear, however, this parallelism is not perfect. In Mark's gospel, Jesus is not baptized "into Christ" (εἰς Χριστόν), as Paul imagines Christ believers to be (Gal 3:27; Rom 6:3). Nor is there any overt indication that, in rising from the waters, Jesus proleptically anticipates his resurrection, as Pauline baptizands do (Rom 6:4-5, 8). Alternatively, Mark does not say anything about adoption, as Paul does (Gal 4:4-6; Rom 8:15). Indeed, Mark's changing Ps 2:7 from "today I have begotten you [σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε]" to "in you I am well pleased [ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα]" (Mk 1:11), speaks against seeing adoption in Jesus' baptism at all. The result is that the symbolism of the Pauline and Markan baptismal rites seems to differ in some significant ways.

One can account for these apparent discrepancies, however, by presuming a Markan etiological hermeneutic vis-à-vis Paul and his mission. Baptism is, for Paul, the "lynchpin by which individual 'life-narratives' become grafted onto the meta-plot of Christ's death and resurrection."⁶⁷ Through the retrospective performance of Christ's death and resurrection, the baptizand dies to his or her past in order to be adopted by God and attain resurrection and eternal life (Rom 6:3-11). Because the baptizand's fate is conformed to Christ's, an essential principle of the believer's new life in Christ is imitation—both of Paul (see 1 Cor 4:16; Phil 3:17) and of the messiah whom Paul imitates (see 1 Cor 11:1; 1 Thess 1:6).⁶⁸ In this section, I will argue that Mark anticipates Paul's baptismal ritual, and reinforcing Pauline mimesis is an essential aspect of his etiological project. Like Paul's baptizand, Jesus' (narrated) life begins with baptism, and

⁶⁷ Mitchell, "Epiphanic Evolutions," 245 n.27.

⁶⁸ In addition to explicit calls for imitation, Paul calls for believers to model their actions on Christ implicitly. At Rom 12:1, for example, Paul writes, "I exhort you, brothers and sisters, through the mercies of God, present your bodies as a living sacrifice [θυσίαν ζῶσαν], holy, pleasing to God, your rational service [τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν]." The language of sacrifice here evokes the sacrificial language the apostle regularly uses to describe Jesus' own death (see Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 5:7; 11:24-5; etc.).

he is recognized as God's child therein. Like Paul's baptizand, Jesus is gifted with the Spirit that will allow him to perform his various spiritual abilities. Like Paul's baptizand, after participation in the rite, Jesus' existence is a liminal one in which his past is irrelevant, and his future is consistently and imminently before him. Finally, like Paul's baptizand, Jesus is baptized "into death." In each case, however, Mark anticipates and interconnects with Paul's significances rather than duplicates them. I will take a brief look at each of these correspondences in turn.

First, Mark's etiological approach elucidates why the gospel begins where it does. Pauline baptism, as the inaugural act of one's life "in Christ Jesus" (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [Gal 3:28]), finds itself anticipated by Jesus' baptism, the inaugural act of his missionary career. Mark's opening not only binds the beginning and end of his narrative together (see Mk 1:9-11; Mk 15:37-9); it binds the beginning of Jesus' mission with the beginning of believers' new lives in Christ. For Mark, those transformed in the (Pauline) baptismal waters and born to new life are to recognize that their messiah also underwent a similarly transformative experience at the outset of his career. Within the first episode of the narrative, Mark's audience would see that their lives *in Christ* mirror the beginning of Mark's life *of Christ*,⁶⁹ thereby reinforcing Paul's insistence on the centrality of mimesis for all who put their faith in the messiah.

Relatedly, Mark's etiological hermeneutic explains the language of adoption that occurs in Jesus' baptism. Though adoption is constitutive of the Pauline ritual (Rom 8:15; Gal 4:4-6), Paul also believes that Jesus is God's trueborn and preexistent Son (see Rom 8:3; 32; Phil 2:3-7)

⁶⁹ Indeed, Mark subtly emphasizes the necessity of imitation throughout his gospel. This is done via his consistent use of the verb "to follow" (ἀκολουθέω) as a metaphor for discipleship (Mk 1:18; 2:14; 8:34; 10:21, 28; 52; etc.). Mk 8:34, in which Jesus says, "if someone wishes to follow me, let him deny himself [ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν] and take up his cross [ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ] and follow me [ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι]," is particularly evocative, as Christ, too, has denied himself (see Mk 3:32-5) and dies upon a cross (Mk 15:37-9). For a good discussion of the metaphorical nature of Mk 8:34 and the verses that follow, see Pedersen, "Paul in Mark in 8:34-9:1," 189-209.

and the first of many brothers and sisters (Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 15:20). The tensive combination of these two assumptions—Christ as trueborn child and Christ as adoptive sibling—is operative in Mark’s gospel, as well, and the evangelist is careful to construct the scene of Jesus’ acknowledgment as God’s beloved Son such that it is both evocative of and divergent from Pauline baptismal expectations. On the one hand, the Pauline baptizand, once infused with the Spirit, is compelled *by* that Spirit to exclaim his or her transformation into God’s child (τὸ πνεῦμα ... κρᾶζον· ἀββα ὁ πατήρ [Gal 4:6; see also Rom 8:15]). On the other, during his baptism by John, the Markan Jesus is infused with the spirit and recognized as the beloved Son *by* God (“You are my Son [σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου], the beloved [ὁ ἀγαπητός]” [Mk 1:11]). The direction of recognition is inverted: the Father first speaks to the Son (Mark), and then the Son, through the body of the baptizand, speaks (back) to the Father (Paul). Mark has thus made Jesus’ divine filiation interlock with the adoption of Pauline baptism by creating a (literal) dialogue between the two. At the same time, by establishing Christ as the only baptizand to whom God speaks directly, he maintains an ontological distinction between messiah and believer.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ The dialogue between father and son that I am suggesting occurs in baptism may find some additional support in an unexpected place: Gethsemane. While Paul’s baptismal cry of “Abba! Father!” does not occur within Mk 1:9-11, the evangelist employs the same language at Mark 14:36. During his vulnerable moment in the garden, Jesus’ prayer that he be spared his impending death is written as follows: “Abba, Father [ἀββα ὁ πατήρ], all things are possible for you; take this cup [τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο] from me. But not what I wish, but what you [wish].” It is surprising that so few exegetes read this language as reminiscent of baptism, despite its being combined with a reference to cup, thereby forming a close parallel with Mk 10:38. (Commentators generally read ἀββα ὁ πατήρ at Mk 14:36 as underscoring Jesus’ unique and intimate connection to God. See, for example, Boring, *Mark*, 399; France, *Mark*, 584, Schenke, *Markusevangelium*, 326; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 978. Gnllka, *Markus*, 2.260.) Both verses occur within pericopes framing the final and ill-fated proselytizing activity of Jesus in Jerusalem, and both evoke the language of rituals patterned on the death of Christ in order to foreshadow that death. Mk 10:38 does so by means of metonymy, making the ritual titles sobriquets for the cross. Mk 14:36 follows this same pattern vis-à-vis “cup,” but, with baptism, the evangelist surprisingly elects to evoke a *moment* of the baptismal experience. The result is that the

Second, on the subject of the Spirit, Mark informs his audience that Jesus, like Paul's believer, is suffused with divine energy in baptism. As a result, Jesus is able to manifest charismatic abilities throughout the gospel, and the charisms Jesus puts on display cohere in striking ways with what Paul expects of his own baptizands. To take one example, in 1 Cor 12, after concluding his use of the body metaphor, Paul establishes the following hierarchy:

And regarding those whom God appointed in the church, first are apostles [ἀποστόλους], second prophets [προφήτας], third teachers [διδασκάλους], then powers [δυνάμεις], then gifts of healing [χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων], helpful deeds [ἀντιλήμψεις], administrations [κυβερνήσεις], [and] the types of tongues [γένη γλωσσῶν] (1 Cor 12:28).

What is noteworthy about this hierarchy is that the opening five spiritual offices map precisely onto the actions Mark ascribes to Jesus immediately after his reception of the Spirit at baptism. First, he is described as “proclaiming the gospel of God” (κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ [Mk 1:14]), just as an apostle would.⁷¹ Second, he *prophesies* the coming kingdom (“The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God has drawn near!” [Mk 1:15]). Third, after having called Simon, Andrew, James, and John (Mk 1:16-20), Jesus teaches [ἐδίδασκεν] in a synagogue at Capernaum (Mk 1:21-22). Fourth, he performs a deed of power by driving an unclean spirit from a man (Mk 1:23-26). Fifth and finally, he heals the mother-in-law of Simon, bedridden by fever (Mk 1:29-31). At the first opportunity Mark has to introduce the spiritual abilities of Christ, Jesus embodies the very same and most important spiritual performances Paul has established—apostleship, prophecy, teaching, deeds of power, and healings—in the very same order that Paul

baptismal dialogue is already present in full in the Markan narrative, but its ultimate significance is not. At this literary moment, because Christ has not died and been raised, an expression of despair stands in for an expression of ecstasy. Only when Christ's salvific activity on earth is concluded and God's love vindicated will it be appropriate for the baptizand, conjoined with the Spirit, to cry out to his or her adoptive Father in joy.

⁷¹ See, for example, Rom 1:1; 1 Cor 15:1-8; 2 Cor 11:5-7; Gal 1:1, 6-8; 1 Thess 2:7-8; Acts 8:14; etc.

presents them. Not only would Mark’s audience perceive that their abilities imitate those of their messiah, but they would see that the actions of Jesus narratively confirm the charismatic schema established by Paul.⁷²

In addition, Paul and Mark not only agree on what one can do while “in the Spirit,” they share similar opinions about what one *cannot* do, as well. For example, in Mark’s episode with the foreign exorcist, when John and the other disciples prevent an outsider from casting out demons in Jesus’ name (Mk 9:38), the messiah responds by saying, “Do not hinder him. For there is no one who will perform a powerful deed [δύναμιν] in my name [ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου] and [then] swiftly be able to curse me [κακολογήσαί με]” (Mk 9:39). This statement presumes that the spiritual abilities a person manifests by invoking the “name” of Christ (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου) stem from a place of true belief. Were it otherwise, such a person would also be able to “curse” (κακολογέω⁷³) the messiah, but Jesus precludes this as a possibility.⁷⁴ Similarly, at 1 Cor

⁷² There is an item in the apostle’s list which does not find home in the Gospel of Mark: glossolalia, the speaking in tongues. Its omission is due most likely to the fact that glossolalia is a contentious spiritual ability in the early church (for discussion, see Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 508-9; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 233-4), and Paul both thoroughly challenges its benefits (1 Cor 14, esp. vv. 1-6, 14-17, 21-25) and relegates it to a subordinate position in his own charismatic hierarchy (Klauck, *1 Korintherbrief*, 91-2. See also Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 483-4). By not mentioning it, Mark allows Paul to claim the ability to speak in tongues for himself (“I give thanks to God [that] I speak in tongues [γλώσσαις λαλῶ] more than all of you [ὑμῶν μᾶλλον]” [1 Cor 14:18]) without risk of his doing so contradicting the teachings of the messiah.

⁷³ On κακολογέω, see Focant, *Marc*, 362: “Employé seulement ici et dans une citation en 7,10...le verbe κακολογέω a pour substrat le plus fréquent le verbe hébreu *qll* lorsqu’il est employé dans la LXX, ce qui invite à lui donner le sens de blasphémer ou de maudire...Donc l’enjeu n’est sans doute pas une simple atteinte à la réputation de Jésus, mais le rejet de sa personne et de son message.”

⁷⁴ Moloney, *Mark*, 189 offers the following insightful analysis of Jesus’ words: “Whoever does things *in the name of Jesus* must be allowed to proceed. Evil words will not come from a person driving out demons in the name of Jesus, as a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand (9:39; see 3:24). There can be no half measures in the Kingdom of God. People are either for or against Jesus (v. 40), and those who do good to members of Jesus’ community, simply

12:3, Paul opens his discussion of spiritual gifts with the following words: “I make known to you that no one speaking with the Spirit of God [οὐδεὶς ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλῶν] says, ‘Jesus is accursed [Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς]!’ And no one is able to say, ‘Jesus is lord [Κύριος Ἰησοῦς]!’ unless with the Holy Spirit [ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ].” Both the Markan Jesus and Paul operate with a similar presupposition: a person who has the Spirit of God cannot deny the messiah. The infusion with the one makes the other impossible.

Indeed, not only are the suppositions the same, but the Markan Jesus’ and Paul’s apparent reasonings for this presupposition are similar. At 1 Cor 2:9-12, the apostle informs the Corinthians that a person can only comprehend the paradox of the cross via the reception of the Spirit. Without its infusion, God’s salvific intervention in the world through the death of his child remains inscrutable (see 1 Cor 1:19-24; 2:6-8, 13-15). Once one has come to recognize the truth through the reception of the Spirit, however, Paul presumes that that person is incapable of denying it (1 Cor 12:3). The Markan Jesus’ rationale is analogous, albeit exemplified in negative terms. Upon the messiah’s return to Capernaum after naming the twelve (Mk 3:16-20), Jesus’ family tries to seize him (κρατῆσαι) because they believe he has lost his mind (ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη [Mk 3:21]). At the same time, scribes from Jerusalem descend upon the home where he is staying and claim that he drives out demons through the power of Beelzebul (Mk 3:22). Jesus responds by speaking “in parables” (ἐν παραβολαῖς [Mk 3:23]), first about divided motivations (Mk 3:23-26), and then about robbing the house of a stronger man (Mk 3:27), and he concludes with the following warning:

Truly I say to you that all sins will be forgiven the sons of men [πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἀμαρτήματα] as well as their blasphemies, however often they blaspheme [καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἐὰν

because they bear the name of Christ, are ‘for Jesus’ and will not lose their reward (v. 41)” (emphasis original; see also France, *Mark*, 377).

βλασφημήσωσιν]; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit
[βλασφημία εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον], he does not attain forgiveness forever
[οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα], as he is guilty [ἔνοχός] of an eternal sin
[αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος] (Mk 3:28-9).⁷⁵

Commentators generally find satisfactory explanation for this declaration by linking it to Jesus' mission: to blaspheme against the Spirit is to reject the power with which Jesus is filled, thereby rejecting the legitimacy of the messiah's salvific activity on earth.⁷⁶ On this reading, the Spirit is both the means by which Christ casts out demons, and the source of the signs through which a person recognizes the activity of God in the world. If, for Paul, to receive the Spirit is to be granted the power to recognize the salvation God offers through Christ, the evangelist anticipates the apostle by taking his logic one step further at Mk 3:28-9. Mark's claim is that, because the Spirit is the means through which true knowledge is granted, to blaspheme it is to categorically reject the possibility of *ever* attaining that knowledge. Here again, a Markan etiological hermeneutic creates literary concordance between Paul's understanding of the purpose and function of the baptismal Spirit with Christ's use of and teachings about it within the Gospel of Mark. Not only do community members imitate the spiritual gifts of their messiah; they see a shared set of presuppositions about the nature of those gifts in Jesus and Paul.

Third, it has long been recognized that Pauline believers find themselves living in a liminal state. As they await the continued unfolding of the gospel narrative, the "now" and the

⁷⁵ For a more detailed analysis of the context of this pericope than I have provided, see Collins, *Mark*, 226-35.

⁷⁶ So Marcus, *Mark* 1-8, 284: "In the Markan context, blasphemy against the Spirit means the sort of total, malignant opposition to Jesus that twists all the evidence of his life-giving power into evidence that his is demonically possessed (see 3:22, 30)...in Mark's view, the true source of Jesus' exorcistic and miracle working power is not an unclean spirit but the Holy Spirit, the power of God's new age." See also Collins, *Mark*, 234-5; Boring, *Mark*, 175; Focant, *Marc*, 150; Moloney, *Mark*, 83; Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991) 117.

“not yet” stand in tension with one another.⁷⁷ In the baptismal instruction of Rom 6, for example, this is perceived clearly. The apostle speaks, on the one hand, about what *has* happened to Christ: Christ has died (Rom 6:3, 7; see also 1 Cor 15:3), he has been buried (Rom 6:4; see also 1 Cor 15:4), and he has been raised (ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς [Rom 6:4; see also 1 Cor 15:4]). On the other, according to Paul, believers have died (ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ [Rom 6:9; see also 6:3, 5-6]), they have been buried (συνετάφημεν... αὐτῷ [Rom 6:4]); but they *will* be raised (τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα [Rom 6:5]), and they *will* walk about in the newness of life (ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν [Rom 6:4]).⁷⁸ Because believers die to the past but proleptically anticipate their resurrections, the time that intervenes is a liminal one in which the Spirit is active within the church.

The tensive now-but-not-yet quality of believers’ baptisms and their subsequent lives “in Christ” finds itself once again anticipated in Mark’s gospel. Jesus’ baptism in the waters of the Jordan inaugurates his mission and signals the forgiveness of which John and his baptizands ask,⁷⁹ but, at the same time, true forgiveness is only effected from the cross (Mk 10:45), and the

⁷⁷ This process is articulated well by James R. Edwards, *Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992) 162: “Authentic Christian existence always stands with one foot in the old life and one in the new. The Christian life is one of tension between Adam and Christ, sin and Grace, flesh and Spirit, death and life. Fallen human nature, which is with us from birth to death, pulls in one direction, and the regenerated life in Christ, which extends from conversion to eternity, pulls even more powerfully in the other.”

⁷⁸ For select commentators who recognize the liminal nature of Romans 6, see Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 434; Keck, *Romans*, 161-2; Jewett, *Romans*, 402; Hultgren, *Romans*, 247-8, Schmithals, *Römerbrief*, 188. Gignac, *Romains*, 247.

⁷⁹ The decisiveness of Jesus’ break with his past may also be evoked in the language Mark uses to describe the baptismal event. The verb, σχιζέειν (“he saw the heavens being torn apart [σχιζομένουσ]” [Mk 1:10]), is unusual imagery to describe an epiphany in biblical narrative, a fact well recognized amongst commentators (see Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 166; Collins, *Mark*, 148; France, *Mark*, 77; Boring, *Mark*, 45; Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 26; Guelich, *Mark*, 32; Moloney, *Mark*, 36; Gnllka, *Markus*, 1.51-2). The revelation of the divine from the heavens is more often

messiah's salvific work remains incomplete until that moment. In the interim, Jesus is no longer the carpenter (ὁ τέκτων [Mk 6:3]) but the earthly Christ, and his biological family is replaced with a new, social one (see Mk 3:33-5).⁸⁰ His impending death is ever before his eyes (Mk 1:11; 2:18-20; 3:6; 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-3, 38-9, 45; 14:1-2; etc.), and he synecdochically manifests the future salvation he will offer through his miraculous healings and exorcisms.⁸¹ In the pages of Mark's gospel, then, Jesus embodies liminality, and the liminality the Pauline baptizand experiences during his or her life after participation in the baptismal rite finds literary anticipation in Mark's gospel. Pauline mimesis is again affirmed, this time by believers recognizing that the liminal state into which they enter at baptism is preceded by the liminal state into which Jesus entered at his own.

Fourth and finally, by having Jesus baptized into the “floods of judgment” (Mk 1:4), Mark both roots Paul's ritual performance in the past and anticipates its associated blessings. If, for Paul, dying with Christ in baptism is to die to one's past sins and be born again to new life on the pattern of Christ (Rom 6:3-11), Mark constructs his own baptismal story to explain why this

described using the verb “open” (ἀνοίγω). This is the case, for example, with Ezek 1:1: “I was in the midst of a host of captives at the river Chorab and the heavens were opened [ἠνοίχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί], and I saw visions of God [ὀράσεις θεοῦ]” (ἐγὼ ἤμην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Χοβαρ καὶ ἠνοίχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί καὶ εἶδον ὀράσεις θεοῦ [see also Gen 7:11 LXX; Isa 24:18 LXX; Isa 63:19 LXX; Matt 3:16; Lk 3:21; Rev 4:1]).

Because Mark's choice of this verb demonstrates that “heaven itself has drawn near, the barrier between it and earth has been ripped apart, [and] the power of the new age has begun to flood the earth” (Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 166), it may well be that Mark envisions a horizontal dimension associated with this vertical inbreaking. So cataclysmic is the inbreaking of the Kingdom of God that everything prior to that moment ceases to be of any importance.

⁸⁰ “And having answered [Jesus] says to them, ‘Who is my mother and my brothers [τίς ἐστὶν ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί [μου]]?’ And having looked around at those sitting around him in a circle, he says ‘Behold my mothers and my brothers [ἴδε ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου]. For whoever does the will of God [ὅς [γάρ] ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ], this one is my brother and my sister and my mother [οὗτος ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν].’”

⁸¹ For a fuller discussion, see Chapter I, Part IV.

is so. John's "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" signals to Mark's audience that Jesus has come to take upon himself a curse for the sake of the many (Mk 10:38-9, 45; see also Gal 3:13). In dying upon the cross (Mk 15:37-9), Christ expiates the sins of the people, and that curse is transformed. As a result, believers can recognize that their baptismal "deaths" are not only patterned upon Christ's death and resurrection; they are anticipated by his physical baptism in the Jordan River. Indeed, though the significance is different, Mark's audience could not have failed to recognize that, just as their baptisms were ritualized deaths, so too was Christ's. Christ "died" in the Jordan River in solidarity with sinful human beings who metaphorically put themselves to death in order to acknowledge that sinfulness and embody their merited punishment (Mk 1:4; 9-11). Jesus then dies at the end of the gospel (Mk 15:37-9)—an event he refers to *as* baptism (Mk 10:38-9)—in order to expiate those sins by taking the punishment human beings deserve upon himself. Mark's community is thus to see that the baptism of Jesus by John in the Jordan anticipates their own ritual performances, and the mimetic significances Paul has attached to the rite are reinforced once again.

To conclude: Mark has anticipated within his story the major elements of Pauline baptism (death, adoption, Spirit). Because mimesis is central to Paul's baptismal thinking—believers become sons and daughters as Christ is *the* Son (Gal 3:27-4:6), and believers die and (proleptically) rise in baptism just as Christ died and rose from the dead (Rom 6:3-9)—mimesis is also an essential element in Mark's etiological project vis-à-vis Pauline baptism. Indeed, it helps to bind together the Markan variations I have here presented. Mark's story begins with baptism because that is where believers' stories "in Christ" begin. Mark has Jesus receive the Spirit during the ritual because that is when believers receive the Spirit. The Markan narrative depicts Jesus living in a liminal state after the rite because liminality is an essential characteristic

of Christ believers' existence after baptism. Finally, though the significances may differ, Mark depicts Jesus as metaphorically dying in his baptism because Pauline believers do. Yet Mark does not comprehensively incorporate Paul's ritual; instead, he takes those elements that are essential to it (death, adoption, Spirit), and he seeds them into his narrative, reinforcing Paul's emphasis on the patterning of believers' lives on the life of the messiah.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have sought to demonstrate that Mark, through his etiological hermeneutic, works to anticipate the baptismal teachings of Paul. He and his community presume the whole sacred narrative of which the apostle and his mission form a part, and one of his purposes is to create clear and concordant literary progression between the life of Jesus and the teachings of the apostle. Thus, Mark has taken the epiphanic and transformative experience of Pauline baptism and seeded it into his story. All of the major significances Paul associates with the rite—death, sonship, Spirit—are found in Mark's narrative, but they are also deliberately crafted to appear anterior to Paul's teachings and reinforce his insistence on the patterning of believers' lives on that of the messiah. Because Jesus receives the Spirit and is acknowledged as God's beloved son at baptism (Mk 1:10-11), Pauline believers receive the Spirit and acknowledge God as father at their own (Rom 8:15-17; Gal 3:27-4:6). Because the baptismal Spirit received by Jesus allows him to execute a variety of different charismatic offices (eg. Mk 1:14-31), that same Spirit allows Pauline believers to do likewise (1 Cor 12). (And, because the Markan Jesus makes a categorical prohibition against blaspheming the Holy Spirit [Mk 3:28-9], Paul elucidates that prohibition by teaching that the Spirit is the vehicle by which God is able to be recognized [1 Cor 2:9-12; see also 1 Cor 12:3].) Because Jesus' life after baptism is a liminal period of earthly mission, the Pauline believer lives a liminal period of expectation before the second coming of the messiah.

Finally and most important, Mark anticipates Paul's baptism as a retrospective performance of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. John's "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (Mk 1:4) is not understood by either Mark or his community to entail actual forgiveness. Rather, John's baptism is the symbolic performance of death that petitions the deity *for* the remission of sin, and the epiphany that occurs at Jesus' baptism in Mark suggests to his audience that these petitions have been heard. John's ritualized executions come to an end as Jesus proleptically performs his own death and inaugurates his mission to "give his life as a ransom for the many" (Mk 10:45). That act of ransom, which Jesus conceptualizes *as* baptism (Mk 10:38-9), then transforms what the rite of baptism means and entails. What once was the embodiment of wrath and destruction has come to be the embodiment of hope and life through Jesus' salvific act. Mark has thus taken Paul's epiphanic ritual performance and crafted his story to show its evolution. That which was localized in Jesus at his actual baptism (sonship, Spirit [Mk 1:9-11]), through his metaphorical "baptism" upon the cross (Mk 15:37-9; 10:38-9), has become accessible to all believers through the retrospective performance of the messiah's death that occurs in their own performances of the rite (Rom 6:3-9).

Chapter III: The Body and the Blood

In the last chapter, I sought to demonstrate that Mark anticipates Pauline baptism within his story and bolsters its associated significances, namely, Paul's insistence on the patterning of believers' lives on the life of Christ. In this chapter, I will demonstrate that the epiphanic performance of Christ's death (re)presented in the Pauline Eucharistic meal also finds itself anticipated in Mark's Gospel, and, once again, Pauline significances are anticipated. This time, however, Mark does not focus on Christomorphic mimesis; rather, he picks up the theme of unity that Paul underscores in his rhetorical engagements with the rite.

As before, this chapter falls into three parts, and I begin with Paul. First, as an *episode* of Paul's gospel narrative (the meal "on the night on which he was handed over" [1 Cor 11:23]), the Eucharist is prospective. It looks towards the cross as an event that is subsequent to the historical meal, and it proleptically performs it through the breaking of the bread (Christ's body) and the pouring of the wine (Christ's blood). Second, as a *rite* celebrated within the Paul's church, it is, on the one hand, a retrospective performance of Jesus' final meal and his death that follows it and, on the other, a prospective anticipation of the second coming of the messiah (see 1 Cor 11:26). Finally, I will show that, for Paul, it is through the consumption of the Eucharistic bread that believers acknowledge their membership in one body (into which they were incorporated through baptism [see Gal 3:27-8]) and their subsequent equality in the eyes of the Lord (see 1 Cor 10:16-17; 12:12-27).

Following my analysis of Paul, I turn to the Gospel of Mark. For the evangelist, the Eucharist is also a rite (Paschal supper) that looks forward to and proleptically performs Jesus' death. Insofar as it alludes to Jesus' exalted status (see Mk 14:25: "...until that day when I drink it anew in the kingdom of God"), it also evokes, by way of synecdoche, the whole gospel plot. At

the same time, Mark employs the elements of the Eucharist to underscore a broader argument for unity. Through his miraculous feeding narratives that take place within both Jewish (Mk 6:30-44) and Gentile (Mk 8:1-9) territory, Mark demonstrates that the body given up “for the many” (Mk 10:45; see also Mk 14:24) is distributed *to* the many, both Jew and Gentile alike. For Mark, then, bread-as-body functions as a symbol for the unification of the Jewish and Gentile missions.

Finally, I will argue that Mark deploys the Eucharist self-consciously to anticipate Paul. First, because the Eucharist is a timeless memorial rite for the death of Jesus Christ to which Paul attaches substantial ecclesiological significances, Mark threads references to the Eucharist into his text in order to anticipate and bolster those significances. Mark composes his story such that the bread that is given to the thousands (both Jews and Gentiles) evokes the language of the last supper—a ritual that, for both Mark and Paul, performs Christ’s death—and this, in turn, confirms for Mark’s community that, when they consume Christ’s body, they are acknowledging and affirming Paul’s universal and unified community into which they have entered through Jesus’ death upon the cross.

Second, I will compare the language of Mark’s and Paul’s Last Supper scenes. Throughout this dissertation, in order to circumvent any inference that Mark anachronistically lifts Paul from his letters and throws him back into the past, I have avoided the term “incorporation” when describing Mark’s etiological project. There is, however, a condition under which such language is appropriate: if an event occurring during the earthly of Christ is already *for Paul* an episode of the gospel narrative, Mark is free to incorporate it into his story. Because the Eucharist, as the inaugural event of a timelessly performed ritual, is an *episode* of the gospel for the apostle (it is the meal “on the night on which he was handed over” [1 Cor 11:23]), Mark includes that episode within his story. At the same time, I will suggest that Mark recognizes

Paul's Eucharist to be rhetorically contingent, and, as a result, he composes an idealized account that appears anterior to, and anticipatory of, the Eucharist that Paul presents.

Excursus: Werner's Understanding of Eucharist in Mark and Paul

Werner acknowledges that the Eucharists of Mk 14:22-25 and 1 Cor 11:23-26 are quite similar. For example, both emphasize the (new) covenant established by Jesus' death, and both conclude with eschatological proclamations.¹ Werner argues, however, that these overlaps can be explained by Paul's dependence upon the Markan formula, rather than the other way around (and neither can be traced back to the earthly Christ himself²). This conclusion is born from the following exegetical inferences: 1) a later commentator is more likely to say "on behalf of you" (ὕπερ ὑμῶν [1 Cor 11:24]) than "on behalf of many" (ὕπερ πολλῶν [Mk 14:24]),³ and 2) a later commentator would more likely add "new" to covenant (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη [1 Cor 11:25]) for explanatory purposes, or "do this in my memory" (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν [1 Cor 11:24]) for liturgical ones, than delete them.⁴ Any overlaps that occur in terms of covenant and eschatology are therefore to be explained on the basis of a common tradition. Though both Mark and Paul agree that a (new) covenant is formed as a result of Jesus' death, Werner claims that the

¹ Werner, *Einfluss*, 140, 142.

² Werner, *Einfluss*, 141-142.

³ Werner (*Einfluss*, 70) justifies this claim by pointing out that Paul nowhere uses the expression "on behalf of many" (ὕπερ πολλῶν) but instead uses "on behalf of us" (ὕπερ ἡμῶν [Rom 5:8; 2 Cor 5:21; Gal 3:13]), "on behalf of all" (ὕπερ πάντων [2 Cor 5:14, 15]), "on behalf of all of us" (ὕπερ ἡμῶν πάντων [Rom 8:32]), and "on behalf of you" (ὕπερ ὑμῶν [1 Cor 1:13; 11:24]). For him, this suggests that Paul has taken a general proclamation from the tradition and applied it to specific groups of people within his epistolary correspondence, including himself (see Gal 2:20: "on behalf of me" [ὕπερ ἐμοῦ]).

⁴ Werner, *Einfluss*, 139.

two authors conceive of the events surrounding Jesus' end differently:⁵ the death of Jesus is secondary in Mark,⁶ it is essential and thoroughgoing in Paul;⁷ and, whereas Christ's death effects the forgiveness of sins for both,⁸ there is no trace in Mark of Paul's idiosyncratic interpretation ("eigentümlichen Deutung") that Christ's crucifixion is the result of, and final victory over, the spirits of this age (see 1 Cor 2:8).⁹ While Mark and Paul both close their Eucharists with an "eschatological word" ("eschatologischen Wort" [see Mk 14:25; 1 Cor 11:26]), their language differs so significantly that it precludes Mark's dependence upon Paul.¹⁰ Finally, Werner notes that the idea of drinking the cup or eating the bread as a means of being in "fellowship" (κοινωνία) with Christ's body or blood (1 Cor 10:16-17) is nowhere found in Mark.¹¹ He thus concludes that Mark contains the older account, and, if there is dependence, it is Paul's narrative that is derived from Mark's.¹²

⁵ Werner does not unpack the differences in this section of his monograph. Instead, he directs his reader back to his chapter on the death of Christ ("Der Tod des Christus" [*Einfluss*, 60-72]).

⁶ Werner admits the divine necessity of Jesus' death, but he argues that Mark only comes to this affirmation late (Mk 8:31), and its significance is realized incrementally (*Einfluss*, 62-3).

⁷ Werner, *Einfluss*, 60-62.

⁸ Werner, *Einfluss*, 64-5.

⁹ Werner, *Einfluss*, 66-69.

¹⁰ Werner, *Einfluss*, 142 reasons as follows: "Spielt hier [1 Cor 11:26] der Parusiegedanke in die Gemeindefeier herein, so bei Markus in das historische Abendmahl. Denn wenn auch bei Markus vom Reich die Rede ist und vom kommenden messianischen Mahl, so liegt dich hier der Parusiegedanke unausgesprochen im Hintergrund. Denn das Reich kommt für Markus mit der Parusie. Jedenfalls ist das messianische Mahl nicht ohne diese Voraussetzung denkbar. In dieser Verbindung des Abendmahls mit dem Parusiegedanken konstatieren wir also eine Übereinstimmung zwischen Markus und Paulus. Von paulinischen Einfluss lässt sich dabei freilich nicht reden. Die Formulierungen sind bei beiden so eigenartig wie möglich."

¹¹ Werner, *Einfluss*, 142-3.

¹² "Wo die Differenzen also einen Schluss auf die Priorität zulassen, erscheint durchweg der Markustext als der ursprünglichere, der paulinische als der abgeleitete" (Werner, *Einfluss*, 139-40).

As with baptism, Werner comes to some problematic exegetical conclusions in his readings of the Eucharists of Mark and Paul. First, regarding the question of “fellowship” (κοινωνία), Werner does not consider Mark’s broader deployment of the Eucharist in his narrative. Concord is the primary motivation for Paul’s evocative use of “fellowship” in the Corinthian correspondence, and Mark also uses bread and cup as a part of a larger argument for unity in his miraculous feeding miracles (Mk 6:32-44; Mk 8:1-8; 14-21). If there is a mystical component to Paul’s language, its lack in Mark is to be explained by the fact that, as Werner rightly notes, the (new) covenant and its benefits are contingent upon Jesus’ *death*, which has yet to happen in Mark’s gospel. To see the post-resurrection effects of the consumption of Jesus’ body and blood in Mark’s gospel would be anachronistic. Instead, any such effects are anticipated in Mark’s persistent claim that the Eucharist is (or will be) the means by which Jews and Gentiles affirm their bondedness in a single, international community.

Second, though I do agree with Werner that the phrases “on behalf of *you*” (ὕπερ ὑμῶν), “new” (καινή), and the *anamnesis* formulae are more likely to be enhancements to the Markan formula than deletions of it, I do not concur with his conclusion that this necessarily means Paul’s Eucharist is derived from Mark’s. In the pages that follow, I will explore the question of whether or not Mark might have recognized Paul’s language to be rhetorically contingent. That is, is it possible that Mark takes Paul’s narrative of the Eucharist to be a paraphrase of the Last Supper that has been adapted to the Corinthian’s factionalist situation? If the question can be answered in the affirmative, one might offer the opposite suggestion to that of Werner: Mark has deliberately crafted his story of the Last Supper to appear older than Paul’s and as something from which the apostle’s narrative could appear to derive. Thus, Werner’s challenges to Mark’s

dependence upon Paul's Eucharist can again be resolved if one presumes the evangelist adopts an etiological hermeneutic vis-à-vis the apostle.

Part I: Eucharist in Paul

Paul's sustained engagement with the Eucharist occurs in his first letter to the Corinthians. At some point in the mid 50's C.E., the apostle learns by various reports (both oral and written) that his Corinthian community is plagued by factionalism and beginning to fracture. There is debate over apostolic allegiance (1 Cor 1:12-17), disagreement about proper sexual activity and gender roles (1 Cor 5:1-13; 7:1-16; 11:2-17), disregard for the weak and less educated (1 Cor 8:7-13; 10:19-33), abuses of wealth (1 Cor 11:17-22), hierarchization born from diversity in charismatic gifts (1 Cor 12-14), and doubts about the nature of the resurrection (1 Cor 15).¹³ In the latter half of the letter, where issues of the community's "coming together" predominate (1 Cor 11:2-14:4),¹⁴ Paul discusses the Last Supper, with the tradition he (re)produces functioning as a corrective to those celebrating the Lord's Supper (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον [1 Cor 11:20]) without the remainder (and perhaps majority) of their brothers and sisters (see 1 Cor 11:21-22).¹⁵ At 1 Cor 11:23-26, Paul thus tells the divided community the following story:

¹³ For a concise introduction to 1 Corinthians and the various challenges Paul finds himself facing in this letter, see Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "1 and 2 Corinthians" in Dunn, *Cambridge Companion*, 75-83. For longer introductions, see Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 1-52 and Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 19-91. For a discussion of the compositional unity of 1 Corinthians and the rhetorical tactics Paul employs against the Corinthians' various forms of factionalist behavior, see Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 184-295.

¹⁴ As Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 258-60 labels this section. See also, Murphy-O'Connor, "1 and 2 Corinthians," 79-82.

¹⁵ "For in eating [ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν] each one takes his own supper first [τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει], and one hungers and the other is drunk [καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ ὃς δὲ μεθύει]. Do you not have homes for the purpose of eating and drinking

23. For I have received from the Lord that which I have handed on to you [Εγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν]: that the Lord Jesus, on the night on which he was handed over [ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδετο], took bread [ἔλαβεν ἄρτον] 24. and, once he had given thanks [εὐχαριστήσας], he broke it [ἔκλασεν] and said, “This is my body [Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα], the one for you [τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν]. Do this in my memory [τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν]. 25. In the same way also [he did with] the cup [ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον] after the dinner [μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι], saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood [Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι]. Do this, as often as you drink, in my memory [τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν]. 26. For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes [τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ].”

The story Paul summarizes here is an episode of the gospel narrative he claims to have received “from the Lord” (ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου [1 Cor 11:23]), and he maintains that it is a reproduction of the tradition with which the Corinthian community is already familiar (“I handed it over to you” [ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν]). It is also a complex layering of perspectival orientations to the cross. On the one hand, the story is retrospective. During the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, Paul’s community looks back, to “the night on which [Jesus] was handed over [ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδετο]” (1 Cor 11:23)—words which, when coupled with Paul’s “on behalf of you”

[εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν]? Or do you despise the church of God [τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονεῖτε], and do you put to shame those who have nothing [καταισχύνετε τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας]? What should I say to you? Should I praise you? In this I do not praise you.” For discussion of the causes of this separation, see Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 264; Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *St. Paul’s Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (GNS 6; Wilmington: Glazier, 1983), 153-61; Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (trans. J.H. Schütz; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 145-74; Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (2nd edition; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 67-8; Ben Witherington III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 247-9. For a more recent analysis and comprehensive survey of the available evidence and exegetical arguments, see Barry D. Smith, “The Problem with the Observance of the Lord’s Supper in the Corinthian Church” *BBR* 20.4 (2010), 517-44.

(τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν [1 Cor 11:24]), echo the suffering servant motif of Isa 53:12¹⁶—and, in its ritualized performance, the community (re)presents both Jesus’ final meal and the cross, as it is there that the metaphorical “brokenness” of Jesus’ body for the community is summoned, and the blood of the new covenant is shed (1 Cor 11:24-5; see also Ex 24:5-8; Jer 38:31-2 LXX).¹⁷

¹⁶ See Witherington III, *Conflict & Community*, 250; Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 877; Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 436, 440; Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Louisville: John Knox, 1997) 198. To be sure, an allusion to the suffering servant in 1 Cor 11:23-26 is debated. I survey the evidence here, and I will offer a more comprehensive analysis of Paul’s use of Isa 53 in my next chapter. Isa 53:12 reads as follows: “For this reason he will inherit many and he will divide the spoils of the strong because [ἀνθ’ ὧν] his life [ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ] was handed over [παρεδόθη] unto death, and he was reckoned amongst the lawless [ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη]. And he himself took up [ἀνήνεγκεν] the sins of many [ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν], and, for the sake of their sins [διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας], he was handed over [παρεδόθη]” (διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα, ἀνθ’ ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη· καὶ αὐτὸς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη). It would not be an exaggeration to say that, for Paul, the suffering servant of Isaiah is a decisive proof-text for his salvation-historical narrative. Paul famously cites Isa 53:1 at Rom 10:16 (κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν), and he alludes to the chapter throughout his letters (Isa 53:5, 8 at 1 Cor 15:3; Isa 53:10-12 at Rom 5:15, 19; Isa 53:12 at Rom 4:25; etc). At Rom 4:24-5, for example, after speaking of the justification reckoned to Abraham by God (see Rom 4:22), Paul claims that believers in Christ share in that justification on account of the fact that they have faith “in the one who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was handed over for the sake of our trespasses [ὄς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν], and who has been raised [ἠγέρθη] for the sake of our justification [διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν].” Paul’s description of Jesus as the one “who was handed over for the sake of our trespasses” (ὄς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν) closely echoes Isa 53:12: “he was handed for the sake of their sins” (διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη [for a good discussion of this verse, see Hultgren, *Romans*, 191-2]). Alternatively, at 2 Cor 5:21, Paul says of God’s actions vis-à-vis Christ, “The one who did not know sin he made sin on our behalf [ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν] in order that we might become the righteousness of God in him,” which may reflect Isaiah 53:12’s “He was reckoned amongst the lawless [ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη]” (see also Rom 8:3). Despite the paucity of clear parallels within his Eucharistic pericope (linguistic: παρεδίδοτο/παρεδόθη; conceptual: ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν/διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν), Isa 53 should nevertheless be considered a backdrop to Christ’s words of institution. The apostle’s use of παρεδίδοτο (“handed over”) with agent unexpressed (a divine passive?) at 1 Cor 11:23, together with his description of Jesus’ death “for you” (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν), signals this.

¹⁷ Regardless of the normality of a thanksgiving for and breaking of the bread before the Jewish Passover meal (see Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 436-7), I am in agreement with the assessment of Hays, *Corinthians*, 199-200: “The proclamation of the Lord’s death occurs not just in preaching that accompanies the meal; rather, the community’s

On the other hand, this event is prospective and synecdochical. As an *episode* of the gospel narrative (“the night on which [Jesus] was handed over [ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδετο]”), it proleptically performs the messiah’s death (“This is my body, the one for you [τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν]” [1 Cor 11:24]; “This cup is the new covenant *in my blood* [ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι]” [1 Cor 11:25]), and it looks forward to a future liturgical context in which the Last Supper is celebrated by a community of believers (“Do this in my memory [τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν]” [1 Cor 11:24, 25]). At the same time, as a timeless *rite* celebrated by the Corinthian community, it looks forward to Christ’s second coming (“For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes [ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ]”). Thus, the *episode* proleptically performs Jesus’ death through the breaking of his body and pouring out of his blood, and, via the memorialization of that death through the performance of the *rite*, the end of the gospel is synecdochically proclaimed. In the context of Paul’s post-resurrection communities, the Last Supper *qua* episode coalesces with the Last Supper *qua* rite, and Paul’s synecdochical hermeneutic is operative at both the level of gospel story and the level of liturgical praxis.

In light of the complex perspectival orientations summarized above, and in anticipation of arguments to follow in this chapter, Paul’s claim to reproduce a rite that the Corinthians already know (“that which I handed on to you [ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν]” [1 Cor 11:23]) must be investigated. There is some reason to doubt the veracity of this declaration. It appears, for example, that Paul has separated the elements of the Eucharist. It is unlikely that the wine that is drunk “after the dinner” (μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι [1 Cor 11:25]) is a part of the tradition he or the

sharing in the broken bread and the outpoured wine is itself an act of proclamation, an enacted parable that figures forth the death of Jesus ‘for us’ and the community’s common participation in the benefits of that death.” (emphasis original). For Paul, the actions of breaking bread and pouring wine have accrued to themselves additional significances; namely, they (re)present the crucifixion of Jesus Christ for the community.

Corinthians know. Rather, Paul separates the elements in order to force the community to gather and share in the Lord's Supper together. As Mitchell has suggested, "Possibly to counter the προλαμβάνειν of 11:21, Paul urges the order of the bread, meal, and cup with μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι in the tradition (11:25) to end the separatism by the preliminary (not so) common meal."¹⁸

Similarly, albeit more controversially, there is reason to doubt the traditional nature of Paul's famous *anamnesis* formula, "Do this in my memory [τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν]" (1 Cor 11:24, 5). Paul's key to solving the problem of the Corinthians' factionalism vis-à-vis communal meals is the call to remembrance. As David E. Garland explains,

What is to be remembered, as far as Paul is concerned, is that the "crucified one" gave his body and sacrificed his blood in an expiatory death that brings the offer of salvation to all persons...By partaking of the bread and the cup, [the Corinthians] recall that sacrifice and symbolically share in its benefits. This conscious imitation of the Last Supper expressed in this liturgical formula allows [Paul] to make his point forcefully; they are to imitate Christ's example of self-giving. Everything they do in their meal should accord with his self-sacrifice for others. They should be prepared to give of themselves and their resources for others.¹⁹

¹⁸ Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 265; see also Smith ("Lord's Supper," 528-32), who makes a sustained and largely convincing argument for this position.

¹⁹ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 548. Thiselton (*Corinthians*, 880), through a much more comprehensive explication, comes to much the same conclusion: "Remembrance of Christ and of Christ's death (i) retains the biblical aspect of a *self-involving remembering in gratitude, worship, trust, acknowledgment, and obedience...* (ii) It also carries with it the experience of *being 'there' in identification with the crucified Christ who is also 'here' in his raised presence.* However, still further, it embraces (iii) *a self-transforming retrieval of the founding event of the personal identity of the believer (as a believer) and the corporate identity of the church (as the Christian church of God)* as well as (iv) *a looking forward to the new 'possibility' for transformed identity opened up by the eschatological consummation* (v.25). All of this is gathered together in Paul's point that such remembrance constitutes a *self-involving proclamation of Christ's death* through a life and lifestyle which derives from understanding our identity as Christians in terms of sharing the identity of Christ who is for the 'other'" (emphasis original). See also Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 440-1.

Garland emphasizes that the meal is the solemn commemoration of and identification with the death of Christ, and Paul's call to recollection reorients believers to a state of service and selflessness precisely in a setting in which these qualities are not being displayed (1 Cor 11:21-2).²⁰ To be sure, Garland takes the *anamnesis* formula to be a part of the tradition that Paul has received. Yet, given the rhetorical aptness of the call to remembrance as it occurs in 1 Corinthians, it is worth considering whether or not these words are, in fact, Pauline expansions upon the tradition.²¹

Finally, there is reason to question the historicity of "new" in Paul's covenant (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη [1 Cor 11:25]). It is rhetorically expedient for Paul to underscore the "newness" of the covenant for his Corinthian believers, as the factionalist behavior within the church is, in fact, undermined by Jeremiah's prophecy itself. A few verses after the prophet's famous, "'Behold! Days are coming,' says the Lord, 'and I will establish [διαθήσομαι] in the house of Israel and in the House of Judah a new covenant [διαθήκην καινὴν]'" (Jer 38:31 LXX),²² to which 1 Cor 11:25 alludes,²³ Jeremiah prophesies what that new covenant will entail. He says,

²⁰ As Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 882 explains, "It was precisely because of a self-centered concern for honor, status, or peer group society, and because of disregard for 'the weak,' the despised, or 'the other,' that the Lord's Supper had come to defeat its very purpose (11:17). For remembrance of Christ and of Christ's death 'for others' entailed identification with the Christ who had denied himself for others... Since this remembrance is not mere mental recollection, but a living out of this Christomorphic individual and corporate identity, the collapse of this Christian identity undermines what it is to share in ['my body'] in such remembrance."

²¹ For his part, though Fitzmyer believes that Paul's initial call to remembrance (1 Cor 11:24) likely predates the apostle (though it nevertheless "may represent a secondary feature in the early tradition" [*Corinthians*, 440]), he does suggest that, when one gets to the *anamnesis* formula in 1 Cor 11:25, "More than likely, Paul is responsible for the repetition of the memento directive in this verse, and the sense in which he understands it is expressed in v. 26" (*Corinthians*, 444).

²² ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται φησὶν κύριος καὶ διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰουδα διαθήκην καινὴν.

²³ See Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 442-4.

And each one shall not teach [οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν] his fellow citizen [τὸν πολίτην αὐτοῦ], each one [shall not teach] his brother [τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ], saying, ‘Know the lord!’ [γνῶθι τὸν κύριον] because all will know me [πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με], from their little to their big [ἀπὸ μικροῦ αὐτῶν καὶ ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν], because I will be merciful towards their injustices [ἴλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν], and I shall remember their sins no more [ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι] (Jer 38:34 LXX).²⁴

It is possible that, through the synecdochical utilization of the *καινή*, Paul musters Jeremiah to aide in the battle against Corinthian factionalism, as the prophet himself could be taken to be chastising claims to superiority.²⁵ If the Corinthian community was sufficiently familiar with Jeremiah’s prophecy, Paul’s “new” covenant may also not have formed a part of the tradition that Paul had first “handed on.” Instead, Paul has inserted a subtle allusion to it into the story in order to chastise the Corinthians’ behavior.

Importantly, none of the changes I have suggested are intrinsically unlikely. “After supper” (μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνησαι [1 Cor 11:25]) is so subtle that Paul could profess its presence in the tradition while simultaneously claiming its suspension during his missionary activity in the city

²⁴ καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πολίτην αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ λέγων γνῶθι τὸν κύριον ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με ἀπὸ μικροῦ αὐτῶν καὶ ἕως μεγάλου αὐτῶν ὅτι ἴλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ ἔτι.

²⁵ If true, one might be tempted to accuse Paul of hypocrisy here. He, as an apostle, is doing precisely that which Jeremiah claims should no longer occur. Yet charges of hypocrisy against Paul are not uncommon (nor are his claims that others are guilty of it [see Gal 2:11-15]), and it would not be long before he is accused of such by the Corinthians themselves (see 2 Cor 1:17-20; 2 Cor 10:10). Moreover, Paul is aware of the fact that his authority rests on certain self-contradictory claims (his bodily weaknesses reveal his authority [Gal 4:13; 6:17; 2 Cor 11:23-33]; he is a devout Jewish man [2 Cor 11:22; Phil 4:3-6] who can be “all things to all people” [τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα] for the sake of the gospel [1 Cor 9:19-23]; his authority to preach Jesus Christ crucified is valid even though he never knew the earthly Christ [Gal 1:15-17; 1 Cor 10:1-4]; and so forth). Paul may recognize that he is walking a tightrope here, but he is also confident that his status as an apostle, validated by the existence of his baptized believers (see 1 Cor 9:1-2; 2 Cor 3:1-4), gives him the special dispensation to teach and guide the Corinthians as a parent his or her child (see 1 Cor 3:1-3; 2 Cor 11:2). For a good discussion of Paul’s dealings with charges of hypocrisy by the Corinthian community, see Mitchell, *Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*, 58-78.

of Corinth. The *anamnesis* formulae and reference to “new” covenant, on the other hand, draw out that which is already implied in the performance of the rite: the Eucharist is a memorial that makes present for the community the crucified messiah, and the covenant established through Christ’s death is definitionally “new,” as any covenant made between God and humanity posterior to Sinai would be. Thus, though certainty remains elusive, exegetes must be cautious about presuming that the tradition Paul “has received” (1 Cor 11:23) is necessarily fixed in the apostle’s mind.

Regardless of what one makes of the traditional nature of Paul’s words, it is the case that, as with baptism, Paul presumes the performance of the Eucharist is epiphanic. An encounter with the deity is thought to occur via the consumption of Jesus’ body and blood. Paul’s shocking warning that immediately follows his narration of the Last Supper story attests to this:

But let each man examine himself [δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν], and then let him eat from the bread and drink from the cup. For the one eating and drinking eats and drinks judgment [κρίμα ἑαυτοῦ] upon himself if he does not discern the body correctly [μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα]. For this reason [διὰ τοῦτο] many amongst you are weak and with fever [ἄρρωστοι], and some number sleep [κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί] (1 Cor 11:28-30).

Whatever Paul imagines occurring at the moment of its consumption, it is clear that partaking of the Eucharist unworthily results in spiritual reproach. If the community is not properly disposed, the bread and cup are not only able to make believers physically ill, they have the power to kill (“some number sleep [κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί]” [1 Cor 11:30]). The rite that (re)presents Jesus’s final meal, his death upon the cross, and proleptically looks toward and proclaims his second coming is thus infused with spiritual power. Because the Corinthians are

acting in a fashion that is undeserving of the bread and wine, Paul claims that the spiritual energies contained within the elements are inflicting sickness and death upon them.²⁶

Finally, I note that Paul's Eucharist is not limited to 1 Cor 11:17-34. Echoes of the rite are heard throughout the letter. For example, by evoking the oneness of the community created through the consumption of its elements (1 Cor 10:16-17), Paul corrects community members who disregard the significance of meats sacrificed to idols (1 Cor 10:19-33).²⁷ Similarly, he uses the Eucharist to bring low those spiritualists who have elevated themselves above their peers (1 Cor 12-14), recalling for them their shared baptismal experience and the cup from which they drink, binding them all together as equals in the Lord (1 Cor 12:12-13).²⁸

²⁶ For discussion of these verses, see Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 446-8; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999) 435-41; Hans-Josef Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1982), 323-9, esp. 327; Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch, *Social Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 111; Witherington III, *Conflict & Community*, 252; Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1991), 162-3.

²⁷ “The cup of blessing [ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας] which we bless, is it not fellowship [κοινωνία] with the blood of Christ [τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ]? The bread which we break, is it not fellowship with the body of Christ? [οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν]? Since the bread is one [ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος], we, the many, are one body [ἐν σῶμα], for we all partake [μετέχομεν] of the one bread [ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου]” (1 Cor 10:16-17). For more detailed discussion, see Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 142, 254-6; Witherington III, *Conflict and Community*, 224-6; Collins, *Corinthians*, 379-80; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 476; Craig S. Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 87-8; Lietzmann, *An die Korinther* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1969), 48; Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 391-2.

²⁸ See esp. 1 Cor 12:13: “For in one spirit [ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι] we all have been baptized into one body [εἰς ἐν σῶμα], whether Jew or Greek, slave or free, and we all have been given to drink [ἐποτίσθημεν] one Spirit [ἐν πνεύμα].” There is debate regarding the relationship of these words to the Eucharist. Collins (*Corinthians*, 458), makes a connection explicit: “A twofold reference to the ‘one Spirit’ links baptism and eucharist to the charisms about which he had written in 12:4-11.” More often, however, commentators see an implicit linkage. See, for example, Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 103; Lietzmann, *Korinther*, 63; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 212 n.17; Klauck, *1 Korintherbrief*, 89; Horsley, *Corinthians*, 171; cf. Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 591-2. The connection is generally drawn

For Paul, then, the Eucharist is the means by which believers affirm their bondedness: “Since there is one bread [εἷς ἄρτος], we, the many, are one body [ἐν σῶμα], because we have all partaken of that one bread [ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν]” (1 Cor 10:17). The one bread (ἄρτος [see 1 Cor 11:23]) of which believers partake allows Paul to claim that there is one body in which all participate: “For just as the body is one [τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστίν] and has many members

through Paul’s negative analogy at 1 Cor 10:1-4, where the Israelites consume the same spiritual bread (τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα [1 Cor 10:3]) and drink the same spiritual drink (τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν...πόμα [1 Cor 10:4]). In these verses, one sees baptism, (spiritual) bread, and (spiritual) drink all connected: “1. I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers and sisters, that all our forefathers [οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες] were under the cloud, and they all [πάντες] passed through the sea, 2. and they all [πάντες] were baptized [ἐβαπτίσθησαν] into Moses [εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν] in the cloud and in the sea, 3. and they all [πάντες] ate the same spiritual food [πνευματικὸν βρῶμα], 4. and they all [πάντες] drank [ἔπιον] the same spiritual drink [τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν...πόμα]” (1 Cor 10:1-4). Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 138 and 252 refers to the spiritual food and drink as “sacraments” and notes at 253-4 that, “The emphasis in the verses which set up the analogy is most pronounced: *all* Israel was unified in the beginning in *common* baptism, *common* experiences and *common* spiritual food and drink. But despite the auspicious beginning, tragedy befell the community when factions appeared and sought their own advantage over that of all Israel...The application to the Corinthians will be made explicit in 10:14-17 (it is, however, already very present in this passage in 10:6, 11). Like Israel, despite common founding experiences, common baptism (8:6; later 12:13) and unifying cultic practices of shared food and drink, the Corinthians too are in danger of being divided by factions on these same issues and thus risking the very survival of the community” (emphasis original; see also the good discussions in Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 379-380; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 165-7; Klauck, *1 Korintherbrief*, 70-71). The negative example of 1 Cor 10:1-4, the language of which 1 Cor 12:13 echoes, underscores the broader unifying significance the celebration of the Eucharist has for Paul.

Additionally, one can find evidence supporting a connection between Eucharist and “drinking the Spirit” (1 Cor 12:13) in the Didache, where “spiritual food” and “spiritual drink” are synonymous with the Eucharistic elements: “You, almighty Lord, have established all things for the sake of your name [ἐνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου], and you gave food and drink for the sons of men [τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων] for enjoyment, in order that they might give thanks to you [σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν]. And you gifted us [ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσω] spiritual food and drink [πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτόν] for eternal life through Jesus, your Son [εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου]” (Σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἐνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, τροφήν τε καὶ ποτόν ἔδωκας τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν, ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφήν καὶ ποτόν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου [Didache 10:3]).

[μέλη πολλά ἔχει], and all the members of the body, though they are many, are one body [ἓν ἔστιν σῶμα], so too is Christ [οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός]” (1 Cor 12:12). Paul thus uses the Eucharist and its shared bread to uphold both variation and interconnectedness within the eschatological community. It is through the consumption of the bread and wine that believers acknowledge their incorporation into the one body of Jesus Christ. The specific role each plays within the body is (in theory) irrelevant for the purposes of status. Rather, all are essential to the proper functioning and identification of the body of the messiah (see 1 Cor 12:14-27).²⁹

To conclude: for Paul, the Eucharist is a flexible rite that is, first, a complex of perspectival orientations to the cross. As an *episode* of the gospel narrative, it is prospective: it proleptically performs Jesus’ death and synecdochically evokes the remainder of the gospel

²⁹ The connectedness Paul represents in his famous body metaphor reads as follows: “14. For also the body [τὸ σῶμα] is not one member but many [οὐκ ἔστιν ἓν μέλος ἀλλὰ πολλά]. 15. If the foot should say, ‘I am not a hand; I am not a part of the body [ἐκ τοῦ σώματος],’ it is not, for this reason [παρὰ τοῦτο], not a part of the body [οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος], is it? 16. If the ear should say, ‘I am not an eye; I am not a part of the body,’ it is not, for this reason, not a part of the body, is it? 17. If all the body is an eye, where is the sense of hearing [ἡ ἀκοή]? If the whole thing is the sense of hearing, where would be the sense of smell [ἡ ὄσφρησις]? 18. But now God has established the limbs [ἔθετο τὰ μέλη], each one of them in the body just as he wished. 19. If the whole thing were one limb [ἓν μέλος], where would be the body? 20. But now the limbs are many [πολλά μὲν μέλη], but the body is one [ἓν δὲ σῶμα]. 21. The eye is not able to say to the hand, ‘I do not have need of you,’ nor again the head to the foot, ‘I do not have need of you’ 22. Indeed, by how much more [ἀλλὰ πολλῷ μᾶλλον] are the limbs of the body that seem to be weaker [τὰ δοκοῦντα μέλη τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενέστερα ὑπάρχειν] necessary [ἀναγκαῖα]! 23. And those members of the body that we think to be with less honor we gird with abundant honor [τιμὴν περισσοτέραν], and our unseemly members [τὰ ἀσχήμονα ἡμῶν] have abundant seemliness [εὐσχημοσύνην περισσοτέραν]. 24. Our seemly members have no need [of this]; but God has composed the body, giving abundant honor to the part that lacks [τῷ ὑστερουμένῳ] 25. in order that there not be schism in the body [χίσμα ἐν τῷ σώματι], but that the limbs might have the same care for one another [τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων μεριμνῶσιν τὰ μέλη]. 26. And if one member suffers [εἴτε πάσχει ἓν μέλος], all the members suffer together [συμπάσχει]; and if one member is glorified [εἴτε δοξάζεται ἓν μέλος], all the members rejoice together [συγχαίρει]. 27. Now, you are the body of Christ [ὁμοῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ], and its members individually [ἐκ μέρους]” (1 Cor 12:14-27). For discussion of these verses and their importance in Paul’s argument against factionalism, see Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 157-164.

narrative. As a timeless *rite* celebrated by the community, however, it is the retrospective performance of both the Last Supper and Jesus' death, and, through its performance, the gospel narrative, as a whole, is recalled and proclaimed (1 Cor 11:26). Second, the Eucharist is the means by which believers continuously affirm their incorporation into the body of Christ and the communal unity that (should) exist as a result. Though the body may contain many members, because those members make up one body, they are all equal in the eyes of the Lord.

Part II: The Eucharist in Mark

The narrative context for the Eucharist in the Gospel of Mark is as follows: two days before Passover (Mk 14:1), Jesus is anointed by an anonymous woman (Mk 14:3-9), whose episode, together with that of the poor woman at the well (Mk 12:41-44), frames Jesus' long eschatological discourse (Mk 13). The anointing woman's actions are so exemplary that Jesus announces to his disciples, "Truly I say to you, wherever the gospel is proclaimed in the whole world [ὅπου ἂν κηρυχθῆ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον], what she has done will also be told in memory of her [εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς]" (Mk 14:9).³⁰ The anointing woman's story is itself then framed by two narratives of wicked men: the plot by the chief priests and scribes to kill Jesus (Mk 14:1-2), and Judas' agreement to "hand [Jesus] over to them" (αὐτὸν παραδοῖ αὐτοῖς [Mk 14:10]) in exchange for silver (Mk 14:10-11).³¹ Mark then presents the events that

³⁰ These words are, of course, characteristically and famously ironic, as a person who is afforded no name in Mark's gospel is also the person whose actions will be remembered eternally.

³¹ See Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "The Major Importance of the Minor Characters in Mark," in eadem, *In the Company of Jesus*, 215-21, for a concise and masterful summary of this pericope. She concludes her discussion of the episode with the following words, "The story of the anointing woman is a striking example of how one passage functions in multiple ways: it is a reverse parallel to the Judas story, together with which it is framed by the reverse parallels of the Passover preparations of the chief priests and scribes and of Jesus and the disciples; it is echoed by the story of the would-be anointing women at the empty tomb (also minor characters), and, along with the story of

occur on the eve of Passover itself (Mk 14:12).³² Jesus first predicts the location of his meal (Mk 14:12-16), and later, as the disciples recline and eat the Passover supper (ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιόντων [Mk 14:18]), he prophesies the betrayal that must occur in accordance with the scriptures: “One of you will hand me over [εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με]...because the Son of Man departs just as it is written about him [καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ]” [Mk 14:18, 21].³³ After this troubling prediction, Mark presents his version of the Eucharist:

22. And while they were eating, [Jesus], after taking bread [λαβὼν ἄρτον], once he had blessed it [εὐλόγησας], he broke it [ἔκλασεν], and he gave it to them [ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς], and he said [καὶ εἶπεν], “Take, this is my body [τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου].” 23. And after taking the cup [λαβὼν ποτήριον], once he had given thanks [εὐχαριστήσας], he gave it to them, and they all drank from it. 24. And he said to them, “This is my blood of the covenant [Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης], that which is poured out on behalf of many [ὑπὲρ πολλῶν]. 25. Truly I say to you that I shall not ever drink from the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew in the Kingdom of God [ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ] (Mk 14:22-25).

Mark’s story of the Last Supper is a prospective one; it points forward to and performs Jesus’ death, and it synecdochically evokes the gospel episodes that follow. The broken bread (Mk 14:22) (re)presents Jesus’ broken body. The wine (Mk 14:24) (re)presents his shed blood that establishes a new covenant upon the model of the old (see Ex 24:5-8, esp. 24:8: “Behold! The blood of the covenant” [ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης]). “On behalf of the many” (ὑπὲρ πολλῶν [Mk 14:24]), when coupled with the language of Mk 14:18 and 21 (“will hand over

the poor widow, it sets off a narrative unit (chapter 13) by encircling it by stories focused on minor characters” (216).

³² Literally: “on the first day of unleavened bread [τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων], when they sacrifice the Passover [ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον].” There is a calendrical difficulty here that I will discuss in more detail in my next chapter.

³³ See Moloney, *Mark*, 282: “There is a paradoxical connection between Judas’ action and God’s design; the passion predictions have already said that Jesus *must* (δεῖ, 8:31) be handed over (παραδίδοται, 9:31; παραδοθήσεται, 10:33).”

[παραδώσει]...as it is written [καθὼς γέγραπται]”), proleptically fulfills the prophecy of Isa 53:12, where the suffering servant is said to be handed over (παρεδόθη) for the sake of the people’s sins (διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας).³⁴ Finally, the “Kingdom of God” evokes the gospel’s end and the final consummation of the world.³⁵ Though scripture serves as the typological backdrop for the majority of Mark’s words, it witnesses authoritatively to that which has *yet* to occur, and it forces Mark’s audience to look ahead to the cross and beyond.

The Eucharist is also utilized by the evangelist for missionary purposes. Scholars have long recognized that the Gospel of Mark has in view the evangelization of the nations (Mk 13:10; see also 7:24-30), but the extent to which that mission is a recurrent theme within the

³⁴ On Mk 14:18, see Markus, *Mark 8-16*, 950. As is often noted amongst commentators, Mk 14:24 recalls Mark’s mission statement at 10:45: “For the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve and to give his life [δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν] as a ransom for the many [ἀντὶ πολλῶν]” (Collins, *Mark*, 656-7; Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 396; C.S. Mann, *Mark* [New York: Doubleday, 1986] 416-20; France, *Mark*, 570-571; Moloney, *Mark*, 285-6; Lane, *Mark*, 507; Eckey, *Markusevangelium*, 453; Dom Benoît Standaert, *Évangélie selon Marc: commentaire* [3 vols.; Pendé: J. Gabalda, 2010], 3.1010-11; Robert H. Stein, *Mark* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008] 652; Focant, *Marc*, 527; Schenke, *Markusevangelium*, 320; Gnllka, *Markus*, 2.245-6). Importantly, Mk 10:45 bears a remarkable conceptual similarity to Isaiah 53:12’s “because [ἀνθ’ ὧν] his life [ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ] was handed over [παρεδόθη] unto death...and he took up the sins of the many [ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν]” (ἀνθ’ ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ... καὶ αὐτὸς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν). An incomplete list of commentators who hear the Suffering Servant echoed at Mk 10:45 includes Collins, *Mark*, 500-4, Lane, *Mark*, 383-4; France, *Mark*, 420-21; Eckey, *Markusevangelium*, 346; Mann, *Mark*, 416; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 755-6; Benoît Standaert, *Marc*, 2.773; Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 315; Stein, *Mark*, 488-9; Schenke, *Markusevangelium*, 252; cf. Focant, *Marc*, 402-3. For a sustained argument that Isa 53 stands as a typological backdrop for Mark’s gospel, see Rikki E. Watts, “Jesus’ Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited” in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins* (eds. William H. Bellinger Jr. and William R. Farmer; Harrisburg: Trinity International Press, 1998), 125-52; see also Joel Marcus, “Mark and Isaiah,” in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebrating His Seventieth Birthday* (ed. A.B. Beck et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 449-66; cf. C.K. Barrett, “The Background to Mark 10:45,” in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Honour of T.W. Manson* (ed. A.J.B. Higgins; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 1-18.

³⁵ On the eschatology of the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, see Collins, *Mark*, 154-5.

story is debated.³⁶ I side with those who take the mission to the Gentiles to be something to which Mark consistently refers.³⁷ Jesus' travels are not the result of disordered traditions about the messiah;³⁸ rather, they are the consistent and self-conscious literary (re)presentation of Christ's universal mission. The borderless mission of Jesus is paradoxically represented *within* the borders of Palestine, and it is denoted by subtle, but extremely important, internal narrative clues.³⁹ The phrase "to the other side" (εἰς τὸ πέραν [Mk 4:35, 5:21; 6:45; 8:13]), for example, serves as a boundary marker, delineating Jesus' activity in Jewish and then Gentile territory on

³⁶ For example, Collins takes a more conservative position and says of the Syro-Phoenician episode that "the evangelist portrays Jesus here as moving from Galilee to the region around Tyre and as engaging in a *reluctant* mission to the Gentiles" (*Mark*, 365, emphasis added).

³⁷ Indeed, it may be referenced as early as Mk 3:7-8, where the audience is informed that "A great crowd from Galilee [ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας] and from Judea [ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας] [followed], and from Jerusalem [ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων] and from Idumea [ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας], and from across the Jordan [πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου] and [from] around Tyre and Sidon [περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα] a great multitude, having heard all that he was doing [ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίει] came to him." On the universality of these locations, see Moloney, *Mark*, 75, France, *Mark*, 154.

³⁸ A suggestion that goes all the way back to the second century Bishop of Hierapolis, Papias (preserved in Eusebius, *H.E.*, 3.39.15): "Because Mark had become an interpreter of Peter [ἐρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου], as many things as he remembered, he recorded accurately [ἀκριβῶς], yet the things said or done by the Lord are not in order [οὐ...τάξει]. For [Mark] neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but later, as I said, he [followed] Peter, who composed his teachings [ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας] for particular needs [πρὸς τὰς χρείας] but who did not compose them as an ordered account of the Lord's discourses [σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν...λογίων], with the result that Mark has not erred at all [οὐδὲν ἤμαρτεν] in so writing some things as he remembered them. For he had forethought for one thing only: that he not leave off any of the things which he heard or falsify anything in them" (Μάρκος μὲν ἐρμηνευτῆς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα. οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσεν τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δὲ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρω· ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἤμαρτεν Μάρκος οὕτως ἕνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν. ἐνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσεν παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθαί τι ἐν αὐτοῖς).

³⁹ On Jesus' various journeys, see Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, 66-9; Malbon, "How does the Story Mean?" 42-54. Moloney, *Mark*, 13; James R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Leicester: Apollos, 2002), 18; Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 21, 260-61, 335.

the western and eastern sides of the sea of Galilee. During his activity on one “side” or the other, contextual elements within the setting signal for Mark’s audience the ethnicity of the recipients of the proclamation. For example, after traveling from Capernaum (for this location, comp. Mk 2:1, 13 with Mk 4:1) “to the other side” (εἰς τὸ πέραν [Mk 4:35]), Mark twice makes it clear that the exorcism of the Gerasene demoniac occurs in Gentile territory. First, the healing takes place in, and the demoniac subsequently proclaims what Jesus has done to, the Decapolis (Mk 5:1, 20), a center of Greek culture in Palestine.⁴⁰ Second, he tells his audience that “there was a great herd of pigs [ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη] feeding next to the mountain” (Mk 5:11), which one would not expect to find in Jewish territory. Despite the subtlety of Mark’s clues,⁴¹ the universality of Jesus’ mission is methodically (re)presented. If a Jewish demoniac is exercised (Mk 1:23-8), so too is one on “the other side” (Mk 5:1-13); if a healing occurs amongst the Jews (Mk 1:29-30), it will not be long until such occurs amongst Gentiles (Mk 7:31-7); if a daughter is restored to her Jewish father (Mk 5:35-43), a daughter will be restored to her Gentile mother (Mk 7:24-30); and, if thousands are fed on one shore (Mk 6:35-44), thousands will be sated on its opposite (Mk 8:1-9). Importantly, these types of messianic demonstrations are always witnessed by the Jew *first* (πρῶτον [see Mk 7:27]).

Thus, by the time Mark’s audience hears Jesus’ proclamation at Mk 13:10—“And it is necessary [δεῖ] that the gospel be proclaimed first amongst all the nations [εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη]”—they are well prepared for it. The eschatological work of Christ is not confined within a

⁴⁰ See Malbon, “Narrative Criticism,” 25-6. On the Decapolis, see Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 168; Guelich, *Mark*, 286.

⁴¹ Some contextual clues are less subtle than others. For example, in the regions of Tyre and Sidon at Mk 7:26, Mark explicitly narrates a Gentile healing: “The woman was Greek [ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἦν Ἑλληνίς], a Syro-Phoenician by birth [Συροφοινίκισσα τῶ γένει].”

geographical territory or delineated along particular ethnic lines. The inclusion of the nations is a fundamental and thoroughgoing element in the salvation-historical narrative.⁴² It is enacted in Christ's ministry, written upon his lips, and, ultimately, effected from the cross.

In the service of this mission, Mark employs the language of the Eucharist. After the episode with the Gerasene demoniac (Mk 5:1-20), Jesus goes back “to the other side” (εἰς τὸ πέραν [Mk 5:21]), back to Jewish territory. The change in ethnic focus is signaled for Mark's audience by the synagogue leader who immediately solicits Jesus for aid (Mk 5:21-3, 35-43) and then by Jesus' return to his “homeland” (εἰς τὴν πατρίδα [Mk 6:1], presumably Nazareth [see Mk 1:9]). After Jesus' unsuccessful missionary activity there (Mk 6:2-6), and the sending of the twelve in which is intercalated the death of John the Baptist (6:7-13, 14-29, 30-32), Jesus and his disciples take a boat to a “deserted place” (ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον [Mar 6:32]). Importantly, Jesus and his disciples do not travel “to the other side” [εἰς τὸ πέραν] at this moment). This is the context for Jesus' first feeding narrative, a story replete with Jewish themes.⁴³ The crowds that follow Jesus are made to sit down, and the messiah, “after taking the five loaves [λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους] and two fish, and having looked up into heaven, blessed [εὐλόγησεν] and broke the loaves [κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους], and he gave them to his disciples

⁴² The articulation of Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 250 is apt: “Bevor [das Ende und die Zeichen] hereinbrechen werden, muss *zuerst* das Evangelium allen Völkern verkündigt werden. Dieses *muss* steht parallel zu der Aussage von v. 7. Nicht nur die Krise der menschlichen Gemeinschaft, sondern auch die Verkündigung des Evangeliums an alle Menschen gehört zu den Dingen, die nach Gottes Plan geschehen müssen und geschehen werden” (emphasis original). See also, Eckey, *Markusevangelium*, 421-2; Focant, *Marc*, 489-80; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 883, 886; Collins; *Mark*, 606-7.

⁴³ Moloney, *Mark*, 146: “that narrative [Mk 6:34-44] was heavily marked by Jewish themes: the desert location (vv 31, 35), the shepherd [Ps 23:1] (v.34), the sitting in companies (vv. 39-40 [reflecting the companies on the march in the desert at Ex 18:21-5; Num 31:14; Deut 1:15]), connections with Ps 23 (vv 34, 39, 42), bread in the desert (v.41), and the collection of the fragments into twelve baskets (v.43)” (see also his full discussion of this pericope at 121-133). See also, Guelich, *Mark*, 343-4.

[ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς] to set before them [ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς]” (Mk 6:41). This language closely parallels Mark’s description of Jesus’ action vis-à-vis the bread in the Last Supper: “After taking bread [λαβὼν ἄρτον], once he had blessed it [εὐλόγησας], he broke it [ἔκλασεν], and he gave it to them [ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς]” (Mk 14:22). In both the Eucharist and the first feeding miracle, Jesus “takes” bread (λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους/ λαβὼν ἄρτον), “blesses” it (εὐλόγησεν/ εὐλόγησας), “breaks” it (κατέκλασεν/ ἔκλασεν), and he distributes it to his disciples (ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς/ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς). The one scene clearly intends to recall the other.

The second miraculous feeding occurs at Mk 8:1-8, this time in Gentile territory. Immediately prior to the episode, Jesus encounters the Syro-Phoenician woman in Tyre (Mk 7:24-30). From there, in perhaps his most convoluted geographical expedition, Jesus heads north, passing through Sidon (διὰ Σιδῶνος), to get to the sea of Galilee among the districts of the Decapolis (εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὀρίων Δεκαπόλεως [Mk 7:31]). Jesus has, in other words, gone strait north, then east, and then south in order to go south east. As a historical journey, this itinerary makes no sense. That said, Mark’s concern is not historical but literary. His goal is to make it clear that the second feeding occurs in Gentile territory by piling up geographical references to Gentile locations.⁴⁴ Seeing the crowd’s hunger (Mk 8:2-3), Jesus

⁴⁴ Additionally, there is no explicit scriptural allusion as in the previous feeding miracle (see Mk 6:34: “And [Jesus] took pity on them, because they were as sheep without a shepherd [ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα]” [comp. Nu 27:17: ὡσεὶ πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν; Jdth 11:19]). Rather, Jesus pities them for their hunger and fears that they might collapse upon the road should he send them home (Mk 8:2-3). That said, it is possible that, instead of evoking the wilderness generation of Exodus (see Mk 6:32, 4), in Jesus’ statement that “Some of them have come from far away [ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἦκασιν]” (Mk 8:3), Mark evokes a passage like Isa 60:3-4 (LXX): “And kings [βασιλεῖς] will go to your light [τῷ φωτί σου] and nations [ἔθνη] to your brilliance [τῇ λαμπρότητί σου]. Lift your eyes round about [ἄρον κύκλω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς] and behold your children having been gathered together [συνηγμένα τὰ τέκνα σου]! Behold, all your sons have come from far away [ἦκασιν πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ σου μακρόθεν], and your daughters will be lifted on [their] shoulders!” (καὶ πορεύσονται βασιλεῖς τῷ φωτί σου καὶ ἔθνη τῇ

asks them to recline, “and after taking the seven loaves [λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους], once he had given thanks [εὐχαριστήσας], he broke them [ἔκλασεν] and gave them to his disciples [ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς] to set them out [ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν]” (Mk 8:6). Again, the resonances with Mark’s Eucharist are obvious: Jesus “takes” bread (λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους/λαβὼν ἄρτον), “gives thanks” (εὐχαριστήσας [see Mk 14:23]), “breaks” it (ἔκλασεν), and he distributes it to his disciples (ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς/ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς). The one notable variation is Jesus’ “giving thanks” (εὐχαριστήσας) over the bread, which is the action he performs over the cup in the Last Supper (Mk 14:23). It is possible that Mark is self-consciously evoking the Eucharist’s second element via his poetics of synecdoche here. By combining the first element of the Last Supper with the thanksgiving over the second, he simultaneously brings to his audience’s mind both. That said, one should be cautious about reading too much significance into this divergence, as “blessing” and “giving thanks” are interchangeable ritualized actions in an ancient meal context,⁴⁵ and the logic of Mark’s theological poetics does not require that the cup come into

λαμπρότητί σου. ἄρον κύκλω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου καὶ ἰδὲ συνηγμένα τὰ τέκνα σου ἰδοὺ ἤκασιν πάντες οἱ υἱοὶ σου μακρόθεν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες σου ἐπ’ ὤμων ἄρθήσονται). This prophecy would have been easily read by early Christ believers as referring to the Gentile nations, and Mark may thus intentionally echo it. For a good discussion of this pericope, see Moloney, *Mark*, 152-156 (and 115-16); see also, Guelich, *Mark*, 390-399; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 492; France, *Mark*, 305-309. Collins, *Mark*, 369 incorrectly assumes that the healing of the deaf mute in Mark 7:31-7 takes place in Jewish territory, thereby also suggesting (378, 383) that the second feeding story also takes place in Jewish territory.

⁴⁵ Collins discusses the difference between these verbs throughout her commentary (*Mark*, 325, 379 n. 18, 655-6), but her ultimate conclusion is that their variation is “compatible with the practice of prayers before and after meals among Jews in the late Second Temple period” (379), and that the terms are relatively interchangeable. See also Guelich, *Mark*, 405-6; Johnson, *Mark*, 231. Importantly, neither Mark nor Paul is consistent in his usage. Mark, as noted, uses εὐχαριστέω in reference to the bread in the second feeding miracle (Mk 8:6) and in reference to the wine in the Eucharist (Mk 14:23), while he uses εὐλογέω vis-à-vis the bread in the first miracle (Mk 6:41) and over the bread in the Last Supper (Mk 14:22). Alternatively, Paul uses εὐχαριστέω over the bread in the Eucharist at 1 Cor

view explicitly. If Mark's lexical variation is deliberate, it is likely because he seeks to emphasize the connection, but this assumption is not necessary. By recalling the bread of the Eucharist, the cup is brought along with it.

Mark's Eucharist thus demonstrates narratively the universality of Jesus' mission. When Jesus speaks of his death as a "ransom for the many" (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν [Mk 10:45]), the feeding miracles help to show that the "many" includes both Jews and Gentiles. This is precisely what the disciples do not understand at Mk 8:14-21.⁴⁶ Jesus' warning about the leaven (beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod [βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρώδου] [Mk 8:15]) refers to halakhic exclusivity, as his words, together with his questioning of the hardness of the disciples' hearts ("do you have a hardened heart [πεπωρωμένην...τὴν καρδίαν]?" [Mk 8:17]), evoke the words of Mk 3:1-6 (see also Mk 6:52), where the Pharisees keep watch over Jesus to see if he will heal a man with a withered hand on the Sabbath (Mk 3:1-2). There, when Jesus asks, "is it permitted to do good or ill on the Sabbath?" (ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι [Mk 3:4]), he receives no answer, and, "grieving at the hardness of their hearts [ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν]" (Mk 3:5), Jesus proceeds to effect the healing. The Markan audience is then informed that "the Pharisees [οἱ Φαρισαῖοι] immediately begin taking counsel with the Herodians [μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν] as to how they could destroy him [ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν]" (Mk 3:6). Mk 3:1-6

11:24 and εὐλογέω over the cup at 1 Cor 10:17, but given the implications of ὡσαύτως at 1 Cor 11:25, it seems he imagines εὐχαριστέω being used over the cup instead of εὐλογέω.

⁴⁶ See Werner H. Kelber, *Mark's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1979), 30-42, esp. 40-41. See also Jeffrey B. Gibson, "The Rebuke of the Disciples in Mark 8:14-21" *JSNT* 27 (1986), 31-47. Though I agree with the thrust of the latter's thesis, he does misread some of the evidence. For example, he claims that that the first feeding miracle (Mk 6:32-44) takes place in Gentile territory ("Rebuke," 33), but this is difficult to justify exegetically.

thus anticipates Mk 8:14-21. The attenuation of rigid halakhic observation creates space for Gentile inclusion, and Jesus' warning to the disciples at Mk 8:15 is a call to reject the sort of obstinate adherence of which the Pharisees are exemplary and the Herodians enforcers.⁴⁷ The bread that the disciples have brought with them (singular, like the bread of the Eucharist [see Mk 14:22]) is sufficient for all. This is what the multiplication of the loaves and the leftover fragments demonstrate.

To conclude: the Markan account of the Last Supper is a prospective performance of the death of Jesus Christ occurring in a ritual context (the Passover meal) that synecdochically evokes the remainder of the whole gospel story (it looks ahead to the full realization of the Kingdom of God [Mk 14:25]). At the same time, Mark deploys the Eucharist as a symbol for unity. The language of Jesus' final meal is utilized by Mark in his miraculous feedings to embody narratively the mission to the Gentiles that Jesus says must ($\delta\epsilon\iota$) occur before the final consummation of the world (Mk 13:10). In the next section, I will argue that Mark has found precedent for using the Eucharist to this rhetorical end in Paul, and he uses it not only to reinforce Paul's argument against factionalism, but to underscore the equality of the Jewish and Gentile missions that Paul so adamantly maintains.

⁴⁷ On the Herodians, their connection to Herod, and Mark's historical perception of them, see Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, 249-50. He suggests, "Herod's grandson and great-grandson Agrippa I and II had more impressive Jewish credentials than he and Antipas had; they were descendants of Herod's union with the Jewish Hasmonaean princess Mariamne, and this branch of the family identified with the Israelite side of its ancestry and was zealous for Jewish concerns—including persecution of at least one prominent Christian (see Acts 12:2-3 and cf. 26:3 and Josephus *Ant.* 19.331; 20.139...). The two Agrippas were popular with the Pharisees' successors, the rabbis (see e.g. *m. Soṭa* 7:8), who were not always successfully in distinguishing between them, and this popularity may go back to pre-70 Pharisees...Mark's report about the allegiance between the Pharisees and the Herodians, therefore, may reflect the situation in his own time rather than in the time of Jesus."

Part III: Anticipating the Eucharist of Paul

In the final section of this chapter, I will suggest that Mark has crafted his narrative in order to anticipate Paul. On the one hand, Mark deploys the elements of the Eucharist in the service of an argument for unity, albeit at an international rather than local level. Taking inspiration from Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians, Mark reinforces Paul's claims for the equality of a mission to both Jews and Gentiles. At the same time, using the Eucharist in this way creates an *a fortiori* justification for Paul's rhetoric in the letter: if the Eucharist binds together believers globally, it can bind together believers within a local congregation, as well.

On the other hand, Mark crafts his account of the institution itself to appear both concordant with, and anterior to, Paul's. Because Mark assumes Paul's words to be as much a summary of the tradition as they are a (re)presentation of it, he attempts to compose an idealized version of the story from which that summary might seem to derive. In other words, Mark perceives that Paul's Eucharist is rhetorically contingent, and he deliberately presents a Last Supper that appears to be older and more stable, as a result.

First, Mark's story, as a whole, is the literary anticipation of Paul's vision: "the gospel [τὸ εὐαγγέλιον]...is the power of God for salvation to all those who believe [παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι], to the Jew first and also to the Greek [Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἑλληνι]" (Rom 1:16; see also Rom 2:9-10). Throughout the narrative, Jesus performs miracles, preaches, and symbolically represents his sacrificial death to the Jew first and then to the Gentile.⁴⁸ Mark thus agrees with Paul that there is one universal mission with two coequal branches (Jew and Gentile), and he seeds both into his narrative through the missionary activity of the earthly

⁴⁸ It should be noted that the Jew "first" pattern is not only found in Romans. It also occurs 1 Corinthians (1:22-4; 1 Cor 10:32; 12:13) and Galatians (Gal 3:28), two other letters to which it is likely Mark had access.

Christ. Mark's using the "oneness" of the Eucharistic bread (Mk 14:22: ἄρτος [sg.]; Mk 8:14: εἷς ἄρτος) as the primary metaphor for justifying this mission not only creates a historical precedent for Paul's universalism, it does so in thoroughly Pauline fashion. For Paul, through the consumption of the Eucharist, believers acknowledge and reaffirm their unity within the one body of Jesus Christ into which they have all been baptized (see Gal 3:27-8): "Since there is one bread [εἷς ἄρτος], we, the many, are one body [ἐν σῶμα], because we have all partaken of that one bread [ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν] (1 Cor 10:17; see also 1 Cor 12:12-13). Mark has taken Paul's rhetorically contingent argument and applied it to the whole world. At the same time, by narrativizing Pauline Eucharistic unity within a story about the earthly mission of Christ, Mark simultaneously anticipates and justifies Paul's position vis-à-vis the Corinthian church. The argument Paul makes for unity through the consumption of bread now appears as if it is drawn from Jesus' miraculous feeding miracles during his earthly life and the broader unity those miracles represent.

Second, Mark has crafted his Last Supper to appear anterior to the last supper tradition as represented in Paul.⁴⁹ This claim necessitates turning to a sustained linguistic investigation of

⁴⁹ For a good discussion of the Last Supper tradition across the Gospels and Paul, see Rudolph Pesch, *Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis* (Breisgau: Herder, 1978), 21-53. Interestingly, Pesch argues that the Markan Eucharist (Mk 14:22-25) is older than the Paul's (1 Cor 11:23-26), and he thinks that the apostle's words could have derived from the formula as found in Mark, though he does not believe the evangelist and apostle are related to one another in any direct way. He explains, "Die berichtende Erzählung der Mk-Fassung erweist sich im Vergleich mit der kultätiologischen Erzählung der Paulus-Fassung als durchweg älter, ursprünglicher, in sprachlicher und sachlicher Hinsicht. Ja, die kultätiologie ist aus dem erzählenden Bericht ableitbar. Sie scheint auf der Basis des erzählenden Berichts zu selbständigem, kontextunabhängigem Gebrauch angefertigt zu sein. Die Mk-Fassung erzählt von der einmaligen Handlung der Todesdeutung Jesu beim Paschamahl mit den Zwölfen in der Nacht seiner Auslieferung. Die Paulus-Fassung erzählt von der einmaligen Stiftung der wiederholbaren Herrenmahls, das zum Gedächtnis Jesu und zur Verkündigung seines Todes gefeiert wird. Eine zusammenhängende Interpretation, die Analyse der Herkunft der Kultätiologie und ihrer Rezeption bei Paulus können die im Vergleich gewonnenen

Mark's and Paul's Eucharist(s) (Mk 14:22-5; 1 Cor 11:23-6). Before doing so, however, it is important to recognize that Mark's awareness of the context-specific nature of Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians and the apostle's freedom to adapt or modify the Eucharist tradition is not as unlikely as it may, at first, appear. Already at the end of the first century, Clement of Rome recognizes 1 Corinthians as a contextual argument against factionalism (albeit with universal significance), and he appeals to it to undermine the infighting he sees occurring in the Corinthian church of his own day.⁵⁰ If Clement had a sense of the ecclesiological problems in Corinth in the mid-50's C.E., there is no reason to suppose that Mark or his community did not. This awareness has implications for how one understands Mark's treatment of Paul's "tradition," especially when it is also remembered that Eucharistic narratives are not fixed in the first or early second

Einsichten bestätigen. Für die Rückfrage nach dem Todesverständnis Jesu bietet sich allein die älteste Quelle unter den Abendmahlstraditionen, das berichtende Erzählstück aus der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte Mk 14, 22-25, als Ausgangspunkt an" (*Abendmahl*, 51, emphasis added). The formula Paul uses is based on a "Kultätologie" that predates him but is posterior to the formula in Mark, as the formula in Mark is a part of the pre-Markan passion narrative ("Passionsgeschichte") that has been included in his text (on this passion narrative, see Pesch, *Abendmahl*, 69-89). For a sustained argument that Mark's passion narrative is the evangelist's own composition, see Mack, *Myth of Innocence*, 288-312.

⁵⁰ 1 Clem 47.1-5: "Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle [τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου]! What did he first write to you in the beginning of the gospel [ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου]? Truly, he instructed you spiritually about himself and Cephas and Apollos [περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλῶ], because even then you had become factional [προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι]. But that factionalism [ἡ πρόσκλισις ἐκείνη] had brought upon you less sin, for you had become factionalized [προσεκλίθητε] over esteemed apostles and a man who was approved by them [ἀποστόλοις μεμαρτυρημένοις καὶ ἀνδρὶ δεδοκιμασμένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς]. But now think about who has disturbed you and tarnished the reputation of your renowned love for others [τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς περιβοήτου φιλαδελφίας ὑμῶν]" (Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; Ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπολλῶ, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι. Ἀλλ' ἡ πρόσκλισις ἐκείνη ἤττονα ἁμαρτίαν ὑμῖν προσήνεγκεν· προσεκλίθητε γὰρ ἀποστόλοις μεμαρτυρημένοις καὶ ἀνδρὶ δεδοκιμασμένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς. Νυνὶ δὲ κατανοήσατε, τίνας ὑμᾶς διέστρεψαν καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν τῆς περιβοήτου φιλαδελφίας ὑμῶν ἐμείωσαν). This text is also cited in Chapter I, n. 29.

centuries. The Didache, for example, a handbook of early Christian teaching generally thought to have been compiled in the late decades of the first or early decades of the second century C.E.,⁵¹ presents a very different version of the Last Supper—one that begins with the cup and contains almost no emphasis on Christ’s death⁵²—than does Paul or the Synoptic gospels. More important, the Synoptic gospels themselves, which are *dependent* upon one another, present strikingly different versions of the same event. Luke, for example, combines Mark’s text with

⁵¹ For a concise introduction to the Didache, see Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Apostolic Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 334-343. For a more thoroughgoing discussion, see Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 1-52, esp. 49-52; Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 1-54, esp. 42-54.

⁵² The Eucharist of the Didache reads as follows: “And concerning the Eucharist [περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας], give thanks [εὐχαριστήσατε] in the following manner: First [πρῶτον], concerning the cup [περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου] [say], ‘We give thanks to you [Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι], our Father, for the holy vine of David [ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυίδ], your child, which you made known [ἐγνώρισας] to us through Jesus, your child. To you is the glory forever [εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας].’ Concerning the bread fragment [κλάσματος] [say], ‘We give thanks to you [εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι], our Father, for the life and knowledge which you made known [ἐγνώρισας] to us through Jesus, your child. To you is the glory forever [εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας]. Just as this bread fragment [τοῦτο <τὸ> κλάσμα] was scattered upon the mountains [διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων] and became one [ἐγένετο ἓν] once it had been gathered together [συναχθὲν], so too let your church [σου ἡ ἐκκλησία] be gathered together [συναχθῆτω] from the ends of the earth into your kingdom [εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν], because yours is the glory and the power forever [εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας]” (Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε· πρῶτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου· Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαυίδ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος· Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ὡσπερ ἦν τοῦτο <τὸ> κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἓν, οὕτω συναχθῆτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. [Didache 9.2-4]). The Greek text of the Didache has been taken from Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 334-369. Importantly, though the Didachist, like both Mark and Paul, presents a Eucharist that symbolizes unity on a universal scale, he does not route that unification through the death of Christ. The eating of the bread and drinking of the wine does not symbolize the consumption of Jesus’ body and blood, and this, in turn, suggests that there is no transformation of the believer, through that consumption, into a member of the “body” of Jesus Christ.

Paul’s Eucharist to create a literary hybrid between the two.⁵³ For my purposes, however, the changes wrought by Matthew, a “tradition-oriented author” who reproduces all but four pericopes of Mark and follows his narrative sequence from chapter 12 onwards,⁵⁴ are the most relevant. In this account, Matthew adds an additional imperatival command to Jesus’ words over the bread: “Take, *eat*” (λάβετε φάγετε [Matt 26:26]; comp. Mk 14:22), and he turns Mark’s description of the disciples’ action vis-à-vis the cup—“and they all drank from it” (καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες [Mk 14:23])—into a command on the lips of Jesus: “Drink from it, all of you” (πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, [Matt 26:27]). He inserts *περὶ πολλῶν* (“for the many”) between the definite article and participle “poured out” (τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον) rather than after it (comp Mk 14:24: τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν). He adds the explanatory “for the forgiveness of sins” [εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν [Matt 26:28]] after Jesus’ words over the cup, and, finally, he adds “with you” (μεθ’ ὑμῶν [Matt 26:29]) to Jesus’ prophecy of the eschatological banquet. Though minor, these changes indicate that even a staunch traditionalist like Matthew does not consider Jesus’ actions and words over bread and cup to be linguistically fixed, and, if a “tradition-oriented author” can make such adaptations, Mark ought to be capable of doing the same. If it can be demonstrated that divergences in Mark’s Eucharist from the Pauline account are not changes that undermine but support Paul’s positions, the possible dependence of the one author upon the other should not be dismissed on the grounds of linguistic deviation.

By way of introduction to my comparative analysis of the Eucharists as presented in Mark and Paul, then, I here set the accounts side by side and highlight their relevant overlaps through typographical emphases:

⁵³ See Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 64-7.

⁵⁴ Ulrich Luz, “Matthew the Evangelist: A Jewish Christian at the Crossroads,” in idem, *Studies in Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 5

Table 3: 1 Corinthians 11:23-26 and Mark 14:22-25

<p>1 Cor 11:23-26 23. For I have received from the Lord that which I have handed on to you: that the Lord Jesus, on the night in which he was handed over, took bread [ἔλαβεν ἄρτον] 24. and, once he had given thanks [εὐχαριστήσας], he broke it and said [ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν] “This is my body [Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα], the one for you [τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν]. Do this in my memory. 25. <i>In the same way also [he did with] the cup</i> [ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον] after the dinner, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood [Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι]. Do this, as often as you drink, in my memory. 26. For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes.”</p> <p>23. Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον 24. καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 25. <i>ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι·</i> τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 26. ὡσάκις γὰρ ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ.</p>	<p>Mk 14:22-25 22. And while they were eating, [Jesus], after taking bread [λαβὼν ἄρτον], once he had blessed it [εὐλογήσας], he broke it [ἔκλασεν], and he gave it to them, and he said [καὶ εἶπεν], “Take, this is my body [τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου].” 23. And <i>after taking the cup</i> [λαβὼν ποτήριον], <i>once he had given thanks</i> [εὐχαριστήσας], he gave it to them, and they all drank from it. 24. And he said to them, “This is my blood of the covenant [Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης], that which is poured out on behalf of the many [ὑπὲρ πολλῶν]. 25. Truly I say to you that I shall not ever drink from the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it anew in the Kingdom of God.”</p> <p>22. Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23. καὶ <i>λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς,</i> καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. 24. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν· 25. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.</p>
---	---

In terms of lexical and syntactical parallelism, there are striking points of contact between the two Last Suppers. First is the boldfaced type: “He took bread and, once he had given thanks, he broke it and said...” (ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν [1 Cor 11:23]), and “after taking bread, once he had blessed it, he broke it...and said...” (λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν... καὶ εἶπεν [Mk 14:22]). The phrases use the same verb (λαμβάνω), placed in the aorist tense, with the same accusative object, ἄρτον, which comes after the verb in both instances.

There is then an interchangeable aorist participle of prayer (offered before meals [εὐχαριστήσας/εὐλογήσας]) modifying the ἄρτον, ἔκλασεν with the object ἄρτον ellipsed, and finally an introduction to direct speech with καὶ εἶπεν. The only significant difference between the phrases is Mark's insertion of "and he gave it to them..." (καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς) and Paul's use of καὶ linking ἄρτον with the thanksgiving.

Second, the bold underlined "This is my body" (Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα [1 Cor 11:24]) and "this is my body" (τοῦτό ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμά μου [Mk 14:22]) mirror each other almost exactly. The only variation is the placement of the μου. Whereas it comes at the beginning of Jesus' quoted speech in Paul, it comes at the end of Jesus' words in Mark. Nevertheless, the object upon which both depend (τὸ σῶμα) is the same.

Third, the italicized words read as follows: "Once he had given thanks...In the same way also [he did with] the cup..." (εὐχαριστήσας... ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον [1 Cor 11:25]) and "having taken the cup, once he had given thanks..." (λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας [Mk 14:23]). If the ὡσαύτως ("in like manner") of 1 Cor 11:25 is understood to have its logical meaning of "in the same way,"⁵⁵ then Paul imagines a close parallelism in Jesus' *actions* over

⁵⁵ This correlative adverb could have a variety of nuances, ranging from a simple and relatively casual "likewise" to the denotation of exact patterning. Ultimately, Paul's intended meaning is less important than what Mark thought Paul meant by using it. There is some significant biblical precedent for his taking the position that Paul had in mind exact repetition. In perhaps the most famous articulation of *lex talionis* in the Hebrew Bible, Lev 24:19-21 LXX states, "And if someone should inflict a blemish [δῶ μῶμον] upon his neighbor, *in the same manner* [ὡσαύτως] as he did to the other [ὡς ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ], it will be done in return to him [ἀντιποιηθήσεται αὐτῷ]: fracture [σύντριμμα] for fracture, eye [ὀφθαλμὸν] for eye, tooth [ὀδόντα] for tooth. In whatever manner [καθότι ἂν] he inflicts a blemish upon a person, thus it will be inflicted upon him [δοθήσεται αὐτῷ]. Whoever strikes a person and he dies, let that person be put to death [θανάτῳ θανατούσθω]!" (καὶ εἴαν τις δῶ μῶμον τῷ πλησίον ὡς ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὡσαύτως ἀντιποιηθήσεται αὐτῷ σύντριμμα ἀντὶ συντριμματος ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος καθότι ἂν δῶ μῶμον τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ οὕτως δοθήσεται αὐτῷ ὡς ἂν πατάξῃ ἄνθρωπον καὶ ἀποθάνῃ θανάτῳ θανατούσθω).

bread and cup, just as Mark narrates. Mark writes at Mk 14:22: “after taking the bread, once he had blessed it, he broke it and gave it to them,” (λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς). At Mk 14:23, he writes, “After taking the cup, once he had given thanks, he gave it to them” (λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς). With the exception of a single καὶ and ἔκλασεν (which one cannot do with a cup) the syntax used of Jesus’ actions is exactly the same (aorist participle of λαμβάνω, accusative object, interchangeable aorist participles of mealtime prayers, aorist indicative of δίδωμι, and the dative plural, αὐτοῖς).⁵⁶ What Paul describes as happening in shorthand form by means of the correlative ὡσαύτως, Mark tells in full. For the sake of visual clarity, I have written out the (hypothetical) words of Paul’s ὡσαύτως and I set them side by side with Mark:

Table 4: 1 Corinthians 11:23-4 and Mark 14:22-23

<p>1 Cor 11:23-4 ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν... ἔλαβεν τὸ ποτήριον [μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι] καὶ εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν...</p>	<p>Mk 14:22-23 λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν... λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς... καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς...</p>
---	---

The apostle uses a single adverb, ὡσαύτως, to evoke a complete recitation of actions he has just narrated, and Mark, perceiving this rhetorical maneuver, reads the ὡσαύτως literally. Thus, with only minimal modifications to Paul’s bread formulation, Mark narrates in full Paul’s assumed actions over the cup.

Fourth, one finds the double underlined, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood” (Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι [1 Cor 11:25]), and “This is my blood of the covenant” (Τοῦτό ἐστὶν τὸ αἶμά μου τῆς διαθήκης [Mk 14:24]). For the moment, it is enough to note that these phrases contain many of the same lexemes (Τοῦτο, διαθήκη, εἰμί,

⁵⁶ See Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 966 (figure 45) for a similar schematization of actions (and words) over bread and cup.

ἐγώ, αἵμα). Though the verses also present substantial verbal and syntactical variation, I will argue below that these variations can similarly be explained by Paul's use of ὡσαύτως and Mark's literal reading of it.

Fifth and finally, both 1 Cor 11:24 and Mk 14:24 utilize "on behalf of" (ὕπερ) plus a genitive plural to describe the salvific nature of Christ's death. Jesus has given his life "on behalf of" others. For both Mark and Paul, the climactic effects of the entire salvation-historical drama are condensed within and synecdochically evoked through a single prepositional phrase.

To be sure, for all the linguistic similarities between Mark's and Paul's Eucharists, there are also some notable discrepancies. The most important divergences are the following: Paul's using a second person plural, ὑμῶν ("you" [1 Cor 11:24]), instead of Mark's πολλῶν ("the many" [Mk 14:24]) and his affixing "on behalf of you" (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν) to the bread instead of the cup (1 Cor 11:24); Paul's *anamnesis* formulae (1 Cor 11:24, 25); his cup being drunk *after* the meal (μετὰ τὸ δειπῆσαι [1 Cor 11:25]); the lexical variation between Mk 14:24 and 1 Cor 11:25, particularly Paul's cup being that of the *new* covenant (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη [1 Cor 11:25]); and, finally, Paul's "proclaiming the death of the Lord until he comes" (τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ [1 Cor 11:26]), which is nowhere found in Mark.⁵⁷ I will analyze each of these divergences in turn.

First, there is no significant conceptual difference between Paul's "on behalf of you" (ὕπερ ὑμῶν [1 Cor 11:24]) and Mark's "on behalf of the many" (ὕπερ πολλῶν [Mk 14:24]). Though the objects differ, the lack of a second person plural personal pronoun is not unexpected in the context of the Markan narrative. Whereas Paul is speaking explicitly to individuals circumscribed within a geographically delineated community (albeit with universal significance

⁵⁷ For a similar listing, see Collins, *Corinthians*, 426.

still in view⁵⁸), Mark's language at Mk 14:24 is self-consciously formulated to embrace more than those disciples present at the Last Supper in Jerusalem, and it therefore evokes Christ's words at Mk 10:45 and the broadly redemptive significance contained therein: "For the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom *for many* [ἀντὶ πολλῶν]." Moreover, both Mark and Paul are referentially equivalent. As noted in Part I of this chapter, there is good reason to believe that 1 Cor 11:23-4 ("handed over... 'for you'" [παρεδίδετο... ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν]) evokes Isa 53:12's "he was handed over for the sake of their sins" (διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη). Paul's Eucharist thus calls to mind the same prophetic text as Mk 14:24.⁵⁹ Through the synecdochical evocation Isaiah's suffering servant, both Mark and Paul express the universal significance of Christ's death in the Last Supper.

Second, there is the transposition of Mark's ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, placed after the cup (Mk 14:24) instead of after the bread (1 Cor 11:24). This is a simple correction on the part of Mark. For both the evangelist and apostle, Christ's *blood* is the covenant sacrifice ("the new covenant [ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη] in my blood [ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι]" [1 Cor 11:25]; "my blood [τὸ αἷμά μου] of the covenant [τῆς διαθήκης]" [Mk 14:24]), and each uses language evocative of Exodus 24:8 to

⁵⁸ On the universal significance of Paul's words of institution, see Klauck, *1 Korintherbrief*, 83: "'Für euch' beim pln/lk Brotwort, das ein älteres 'für die vielen' an gleicher Stelle (anders mk/mt) ersetzt, hat eminent soteriologische Bedeutung. Es bezieht die Mitfeierenden in die Selbsthingabe Jesu als Heilsereignis ein." For further discussion, see Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 546-8; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 552-3; Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 439-40; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 198; Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 878. See also Standaert, who, in speaking about Mk 10:45, uses Paul to illuminate the meaning of the passage: "L'idée que le Christ s'est 'livré pour nous' ou 'pour tous', voire 'pour la multitude' est très régulièrement attestée dans les écrits pauliniens: voir 1 Co 6,20; 7,23; Ga 1,4; 2,20; 3,13; 4,5; Rm 3,24s., etc." (*Marc*, 2.773).

⁵⁹ For scholars who note an allusion to Isa 53 in Mk 14:24, see Collins, *Mark*, 657; Standaert, *Marc*, 3.1010; France, *Mark*, 570; Moloney, *Mark*, 286 n.52; Lane, *Mark*, 507; Eckey, *Markusevangelium*, 453; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 958; Gnllka, *Markus*, 2.245-6; Stein, *Mark*, 652. For a discussion of Mk 14:24's connection to Mk 10:45, which alludes more directly to Isa 53:12, see Part II, note 34 of this chapter.

express this.⁶⁰ In placing “for the many” (ὕπὲρ πολλῶν [Mk 14:24]) after the cup, Mark accomplishes two things: first, “for the many” is now associated with that element of the Eucharist that establishes a covenant “for the many” in the biblical narrative. It is not the body of the sacrificial animals that seals God’s covenant with the Israelite people (ὁ λαός [Ex 24:7]); it is the blood.⁶¹ Second, the change allows Mark to expand the parallelism of action over bread and

⁶⁰ Exodus 24:8 LXX reads as follows: “And Moses, having taken the blood [λαβὼν...τὸ αἷμα], poured [κατεσκέδασεν] it upon the people, and he said, ‘Behold! The blood of the covenant [τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης] which the Lord has established for you...’” (λαβὼν δὲ Μωϋσῆς τὸ αἷμα κατεσκέδασεν τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ εἶπεν ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς). The list of scholars who note that Mark or Paul (or both) draw on Ex 24:6-8 could be expanded indefinitely. I note only the following: Moloney, *Mark*, 286; Collins, *Mark*, 656-7; France, *Mark*, 570; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 958, 966; Cranfield, *Mark*, 427; Lane, *Mark*, 507; Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 273; Eckey, *Markusevangelium*, 453; Gnllka, *Markus*, 2.245; Standaert, *Marc*, 3.1009; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 552; Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 98; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 547; Lietzmann, *Korinther*, 57; Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 443; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 199 n.73; etc. On the narrative warrant Mark may derive from Ex 24:3-11 for the consumption of blood, see Jeffrey Stackert, “‘This is the Blood of My Covenant’: The Markan Last Supper and the Elohistic Horeb Narrative” *BR* 62 (2017), 48-60.

⁶¹ Incidentally, this correction also explains Mark’s use of τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον (“poured out” [Mk 14:24], not found in 1 Cor 11:23-26). For both Mark and Paul, Christ’s blood not only evokes the covenant sacrifice; it evokes the suffering servant of Isaiah who dies for the sake of the people’s sins (διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν [Isa 53:12]). The association between the two is facilitated by the fact that the suffering servant is himself likened to a sacrificial animal: “as a sheep [πρόβατον] he was led to slaughter [ἐπὶ σφαγῆν]” (ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγῆν ἤχθη [Isa 53:7 LXX], discussed in more detail in my next chapter). Unlike Paul, however, whose conflation of covenant sacrifice and suffering servant is presumed rather than articulated, Mark utilizes the language of Christ’s blood “pouring out” (τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον [Mk 14:24]) to make this linkage clear. At Gen 9:6, where God establishes his first covenant with Noah, murder is prohibited with the following words, “The one who pours out the blood of a human being [ὁ ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρώπου] will be poured out [ἐκχυθήσεται] in exchange for that person’s blood [ἀντὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ] because I have made humanity in the image of God” (ὁ ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρώπου ἀντὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ἐκχυθήσεται ὅτι ἐν εἰκόνι θεοῦ ἐποίησα τὸν ἄνθρωπον [see also Ezekiel 22:6, 9, 12]). Blood’s being “poured out” (ἐκχέω) is thus a famous metaphorical image for murder in the Septuagint, and Mark here overtly intertwines the referents Paul assumes (covenant sacrifice [Ex 24:6-8] and manslaughter [Isaiah 53:12]) via the imagery of Christ’s blood being “poured out” (τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον). As Collins, *Mark*, 657, has rightly suggested, “The naming of Jesus’ death as a ‘pouring out of his blood for many’ may result from the combination of the terminology of sacrifice with the poem about the suffering servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53.”

cup that he perceives in Paul’s ὡσαύτως. It now includes the words, as well. It is only after Jesus blesses, distributes, and says “this is my body/blood” (τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά/τὸ σῶμά μου [Mk 14:22, 4]) that Mark expands the words of institution with additional explication (more on this below).⁶²

Paul’s *anamnesis* formula, “do this in remembrance of me (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν [1 Cor 11:24, 25]), is not found in Mark because the evangelist does not take it to be narratively appropriate to the story that he tells. He presumes (perhaps rightly) that Paul has composed and inserted the calls to remembrance into his Eucharist for the purposes of his argument. Paul’s *anamnesis* formulae contain the critically important τοῦτο ποιεῖτε (“do this” [1 Cor 11:24, 25]), words signaling a timeless institution, directed to celebrants presuming the repeated consumption of Christ’s body and blood with full retrospective knowledge of its salvific significance.⁶³ As I argued above, the historical event that is “the night on which he was handed over” (ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἧ̅ παρεδίδοτο [1 Cor 11:23])—an *episode* of the gospel narrative that, for Paul, looks towards the cross—is simultaneously a timeless *rite* celebrated by the community that

⁶² Despite Mark’s displacement, I add that Christ’s death “for the many” is conveyed implicitly through the breaking of bread, as well. Many commentators presume this (see, for example, Stein, *Mark*, 650; Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 395; Collins, *Mark*, 655-6; Mann, *Mark*, 577; Marcus, *Mark 8-16*; 964; Eckey, *Markusevangelium*, 452; Johnson, *Mark*, 231; Moloney, *Mark*, 285-6; Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 272). “Bread” (ἄρτος) is synecdochical. Insofar as the breaking of the bread symbolizes Jesus’ body, beaten and then broken upon a cross (see Mk 14:65; 15:16-20, 24, 34-7), Mark presumes his audience will recall, through that ritual action, what Jesus’ body is for: salvation “for the many” (ὕπὲρ πολλῶν).

⁶³ So Pesch, *Abendmahl*, 49: “Die Anamnesisbefehle...schließlich, die nur in der Paulus-Fassung begegnen, zielen mit den Imperativen τοῦτο ποιεῖτε eindeutig auf eine wiederholbare liturgische Handlung, die zum Gedenken an Jesus (εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν...) vorgenommen werden soll; ihr Zuwachs im kultätiologischen Text ist leicht erklärbar, eine Streichung in der berichtenden Erzählung, die keinen Platz für die Befehle hat (da sie nicht auf Jesu Tod zurückschaut, sondern von der Situation vor seinem Tod erzählt), unwahrscheinlich ist.” See also, Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 440.

looks back to and recalls Jesus' death. Paul's retrospective and prospective perspectives on the Eucharist thus overlap and blend together, and Paul capitalizes on this temporal fusion by inserting the call to remembrance to underscore for the Corinthian community that the factionalism they manifest contrasts starkly with the humility and self-sacrifice of Jesus. Because Mark's text is synecdochical, and it anticipates and evokes later Pauline rituals rather than repeats them, he is unwilling to collapse the distance between the historical and liturgical events. Mark's inserting an *anamnesis* formula into his Eucharist would be anachronistic and unnecessary. At the level of Mark's audience, the memorial quality of the Last Supper—indeed, of the gospel as a whole⁶⁴—is recognized irrespective of an appeal to treat it as such. Mark's narrative thus assumes the eventual memorialization of the Last Supper, but the evangelist leaves it to the apostle to make the connection explicit.

Relatedly, Mark interprets Paul's sharing of the cup "after dinner" (μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι [1 Cor 11:25]), which results in the elements of the Eucharist being split over the course of the meal, as another apostolic innovation resulting from the factionalist situation at Corinth. Because he does not take the Pauline structure to be normative, Mark includes the breaking of bread and the sharing of the cup *during* Passover supper ("and *while* they were eating [καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν]..." [Mk 14:22]). As one might expect, in a story presenting the rite's inauguration, Mark shows events unfolding in their idealized form: the Eucharist is not divided; it takes place amongst equals at a shared meal (indeed, even Judas is included in the sharing [Mk 14:18-21; cf. Matt 26:25, where Judas is singled out for ironic identification [σὸ ἔϊπας]).

⁶⁴ On this point, see Marxsen, *Mark*, 129-131; see also Elizabeth V. Dowling, "'Do This in Remembrance of Me': Last Supper Traditions in Paul and Mark," in Wischmeyer et al., *Paul and Mark*, 234-9.

On the problem of linguistic and syntactical deviation between Mk 14:24 and 1 Cor 11:25, Paul’s ὡσαύτως is again explanatory. As noted, Mark finds warrant for creating parallel *actions* over the elements of the Eucharist through Paul’s use of the adverb. Seeing as it is demonstrably not the case that Paul’s Jesus does anything “ὡσαύτως” vis-à-vis his *words* over cup and bread,⁶⁵ however, Mark corrects and composes the perfectly balanced “this is my body” (τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου [Mk 14:22]) and “this is my blood” (τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου [Mk 14:24]). Instead of drawing explicit attention to the timeless rite *as such* (“do this in remembrance of me”) within a historical narrative that purports to provide its etiology, Mark cues the reader to its future legacy by using balanced and (possibly) liturgical language.⁶⁶ This change has the added benefit of clarifying Paul’s account. What the apostle means by marking “cup” (τὸ ποτήριον) as the new covenant “in my blood” (“This cup is [ἐστιν] the new covenant [ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη] in my blood [ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι]” [1 Cor 11:25]) is now clear: it is not the cup itself that symbolizes the covenant; it is the blood which rests inside (“This is my blood of the covenant [τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης]” [Mk 14:24]).⁶⁷

⁶⁵ The potential for verbal parallelism is quickly ruptured when the apostle employs “cup” (τὸ ποτήριον) at 11:25 as the correlate to “body” (τὸ σῶμά) at 11:24, rather than the more natural “blood.” Other significant discrepancies occur between the two clauses, as well, including placement of the copula and the lack of a possessive pronoun at 11:25 (replaced instead by a possessive adjective).

⁶⁶ It is because of the careful parallelism that scholars such as Cranfield, *Mark*, 426-7 suggest the Pauline formulation is older. For him, Mark represents a liturgical formula, and it is difficult to imagine Paul disrupting it. Therefore, Paul must be working with the older tradition. This judgment is, I suspect, largely correct. My contention is only that Mark’s liturgical formulae could grow out of a familiarity with Paul’s Eucharist tradition and then inflect the subsequent narrative he tells

⁶⁷ Many commentators perceive some conceptual difference between Mark and Paul’s formulations on this point. Conzelmann, for example, suggests that, “The corresponding formula is not bread and wine, but bread and cup. Thus, the interpretation attaches not to the elements as such, but to the act of administration” (*1 Corinthians*, 199). Alternatively, Horsley (*Corinthians*, 161) argues that “While Mark’s words have the more explicit citation of ‘blood

Regarding Paul’s “new” covenant (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη [1 Cor 11:25]), I have already suggested that there is reason to believe it to be another Pauline modification of the tradition. Should it belong to the tradition Paul knows, however, it is nevertheless the case that any covenant established between humanity and God via the medium of Christ assumes newness and need not be stated. Mk 14:24’s “my blood of the covenant” (τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης) may lack the word, but, as R.T. France points out,

It is impossible to draw out that symbolism implied by the echo of Ex 24:8 without using such language [as καινή] and thus bringing to mind the prophecy of a new covenant in Jer 31:31-4 [Jer 38:31-4 LXX], and it seems likely that both Jesus and Mark would have understood Jesus’ conventional language in that light.⁶⁸

Thus, Mark’s last supper looks towards the cross, and he presumes his audience will recognize the newness of the covenant established through the blood that is shed there. Explicit designation of it as such is unnecessary.

Finally, Paul’s statement at 1 Cor 11:26—“For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord [τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε] until he

of the covenant’ from Ex 24:8, Paul’s ‘new covenant in my blood’ suggests more that ‘the Lord Jesus’ constituted the sacrifice that generated the blood by which God and the people were bound, by analogy with the covenant ceremony in Ex 24:5-8.” For additional readings, see Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 552; Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 442; Luise Schottroff, *Der erste Brief an die Gemeinde in Korinth* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013), 234; and Marion L. Soards, *1 Corinthians* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), 241. On this point, however, I agree with the assessment of Cranfield, *Mark*, 427: “the Markan and Pauline forms of the cup saying have essentially the same meaning. As the Old Covenant had been ratified by the sprinkling of sacrificial blood (Exod xxiv. 6-8), so God’s New Covenant with men is about to be established by Jesus’ death, and the cup (i.e. the wine it contains) makes those who share it partakers of the benefits and the obligations of this new covenant. The drinking of the wine is analogous to being sprinkled with the blood in Exod xxiv.”

⁶⁸ France, *Mark*, 570; see also Collins, *Mark*, 656; Lane, *Mark*, 507. Other Markan scholars do not cite Jeremiah 38:31 LXX as a background text, but they nevertheless seem to assume it. For example, Johnson, *Mark*, 231 writes, “A new relationship is to be inaugurated, or an old relation restored, between men and God.” (emphasis added).

comes [ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ]”—requires comment. The explanatory γάρ and the movement from Christ speaking in the first person (1 Cor 11:24-5) to his being spoken about in the third (1 Cor 11:26) signals a change in speaker.⁶⁹ Paul here resumes his teaching, unpacking the significance of the Eucharist and evoking, by way of synecdoche (“you proclaim the *death* of the lord [τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου]”), the gospel narrative in which all Corinthians have come to hope and believe.

Because the voice of the epistolary Paul is resumed at 1 Cor 11:26, its omission in Mark is unsurprising. That said, Paul’s “until he comes” (ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ) is noteworthy. The language is plainly eschatological, as many commentators have noted,⁷⁰ and it can be compared fruitfully with the eschatological prediction Jesus makes at the end of the Markan Eucharist. Mark 14:25’s “Truly I say to you that I shall not ever drink from the fruit of the vine until that day [ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης] when I drink it anew in the Kingdom of God [ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ]” imagines the full inbreaking of the messianic kingdom.⁷¹ “Kingdom of God” (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ) is a Markan synecdochical designator: it looks towards the conclusion of the gospel narrative, and it is a shorthand form for the final intervention of God in human history (see, for example, Mk 1:15; 9:1).⁷² Only *after* the second coming and the establishment of divine sovereignty will Jesus taste the fruit of the vine once more. Jesus’ words are thus conceptually similar to Paul’s. Both the evangelist and apostle close their Eucharist(s) with a clear look to the

⁶⁹ Rightly noted by Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 886.

⁷⁰ Collins, *Corinthians*, 434; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 553-4; Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 98; Witherington III, *Conflict and Community*, 250-1; Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 887-8; Klauck, *1 Korintherbrief*, 83; etc.

⁷¹ The similarity to the Pauline proclamation is explicitly noted by Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 967-8. For other scholars who hear eschatological overtones in Mark, see Collins, *Mark*, 657; Johnson, *Mark*, 232; Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 98; Lane, *Mark*, 508; Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 274; France, *Mark*, 571-2; Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 399-400.

⁷² On the eschatological undertones of the phrase “the Kingdom of God” (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ), see Collins, *Mark*, 154-5.

end, synecdochically evoking not only the death of Christ, but the very last episodes of the gospel narrative: the second coming of the messiah and the final consummation of the world.⁷³

All of the changes I have described to this point can be summarized as follows: Mark presumes that Paul has presented a Eucharist to his Corinthian community that is flexible and rhetorically contingent. Mark thus incorporates into his story the tradition Paul references (the night “on which [Jesus] was handed over” [1 Cor 11:23]), but he adapts it, presenting an idealized version of the story from which the Pauline tradition might seem to derive. Thus, the core of the Last Supper scenes of Mark and Paul remain consistent: there are parallel actions over bread and up, the elements are taken to be (re)presentations the sacrifice of Christ “for the many,” the covenant that is established is patterned on the covenant of Ex 24:3-11, and, through the performance of the Eucharist, the end of the gospel is synecdochically recalled. Alternatively, anything that Mark takes to be a secondary modification by Paul in the service of his argument

⁷³ It can be added that the imminent eschatological expectation one sees present in Mark and Paul’s Eucharist is noticeably altered in other Eucharistic accounts. It is not found at all in the tradition of the Didachist (*Didache* 9:2), and Matthew and Luke both soften the eschatological dimension. For example, Matthew adds μεθ’ ὑμῶν at 26:29, which, when coupled with sayings of Jesus at Matt 18:20 and Matt 28:20, suggests a continual presence of Jesus with his followers after his death: “While Matthew knows that a time will come in which Jesus will no longer be with his disciples (9:15; 26:11), he also knows that the earthly Immanuel who has celebrated his last meal as a fellowship meal ‘with’ his disciples (26:18, 20) will be ‘with’ his church as the risen lord ‘always’ until the end of the world” (Ulrich Luz, *Matthew* [3 vols.; trans. James E. Crouch; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001-2007], 3.383; see also John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005, 1084-5]). Luke conceives of the Kingdom of God similarly. He displaces the eschatological proclamation to Lk 22:16-18, and the proclamations contained there may refer as much to the celebratory meals of the early Lukan communities as they do to the final consummation (see Lk 24:25-31, 41-48. For more on this, see I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* [Eerdmans, 1978] 396-9; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, [Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991] 337, 341-2; cf. Francois Bovon, *Luke* [3 vols.; trans. Christine Thomas et al; Minneapolis, Fortress, 2012]; 3.157-8 and idem, *Luke* 2 [trans. Donald Deer; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013] 297; Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1996, 313]).

for unity is either excised or adapted: Paul’s reference to the covenant as “new” and the anamnesis formulae are cut, the bread and cup are consumed together rather than split, Jesus’ words—like his actions—over the elements are balanced, and the significance of the blood as that which establishes the new covenant on the pattern of the old is brought forth. The cumulative effect of these changes is the transformation of the “tradition” Paul hands on to the Corinthians into a paraphrase.⁷⁴ Mark wants his audience to recognize that the original Last Supper differed from Paul’s presentation of it, but Paul’s account nevertheless remains fully concordant with that original scene. I suggested in Part I of this chapter that Paul adds to the tradition “after dinner” (μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι [1Co 11:25]), the *anamnesis* formulae (1 Cor 11:24, 25), and “new” (καινή [1 Cor 11:25]), all of which are inserted to bolster the apostle’s argument for concord. A Markan auditor might now add to this list Paul’s “on behalf of you” (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν

⁷⁴ On paraphrase in the ancient world, see the discussion of the late first century rhetor Theon: “Paraphrase (*paraphrasis*) consists of changing the form of expression while keeping the thoughts. It is also called metaphrase’ There are four main kinds: variation in syntax, by addition, by subtraction, and by substitution, plus combinations of these:

Syntactical paraphrase: we keep the same words but transpose the parts, which offers numerous possibilities.

By addition: we keep the original words and add to them; for example, Thucydides (1.142.1) said, ‘in war, opportunities are not abiding,’ while Demosthenes (4.37) paraphrased this, ‘opportunities for actions do not await our sloth and evasions.’

By subtraction: speaking in an incomplete way, we drop many of the elements of the original...

By substitution: we replace the original word with another; for example, a *pais* or *andrapodon* for *doulos* (slave), or the proper word instead of a metaphor or a metaphor instead of a proper word, or several words instead of one or one instead of several.” The translation is taken from *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (trans. George A. Kennedy; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 70. See also Quintilian, *Instituto Oratoria*, 10.5.4-11. As I argued in Part I, the Eucharist Paul presents in 1 Cor 11:23-26 is a rhetorically determined paraphrase along the lines of what Theon suggests. What I add now is that Mark has recognized it as such, and he attempts to compose for his community that event of which he takes Paul’s story to be a summary.

[1 Cor 11:24]) placed after the bread instead of the cup. For him or her, it would appear to be another means by which Paul accentuates his argument for unity. Just as the *anamnesis* formulae underscore Jesus' self-abasement and serve as a foil to the Corinthians' factionalist behavior, so too does attaching "on behalf of you" to the Eucharist's first element. The body of which all partake, and in which all participate, is the same body that is humbly given up for the sake of all.⁷⁵

To conclude: I have argued, first, that Mark has universalized Paul's argument. The consumption of Christ's body and blood within the Corinthian church signifies, for Paul, the community's affirmation that they have been baptized into and are now members of one body, that of Jesus Christ. Mark takes the cup and bread and uses it in an argument for universal unity, the unity of the missions to Jews and Gentiles. By making this change, Paul's Gentile mission is anticipated and justified within Mark's gospel, and Paul's rhetorical tactic of using the Eucharist as a symbol for unity within a local setting has historical precedent. If the Eucharist brings

⁷⁵ This latter point is important to counter the critique of circularity in my argument. That is, if Paul has paraphrased the Eucharist in his presentation at 1 Cor 11:23-26, and Mark presents a version of the Eucharist without Paul's expansions, who is to say that Mark has not simply reproduced an older (common) tradition to which both Mark and Paul are independently indebted? I offer two responses to this critique. First, while it is possible that Paul has moved "on behalf of you" (ὕπερ ὑμῶν) from the cup to the body in the course of his *παράφρασις*, exegetical grounds for making this argument are not especially strong. Mark's transposition therefore still requires Paul's Eucharist as a *Vorlage*. If Mark does know and provide a tradition that is older than Paul's, he has nevertheless harmonized that tradition with Paul's words.

Second (and more important), as this chapter has demonstrated, the rhetorical ends to which the words of institution are deployed in Mark and Paul are extraordinarily similar. Through the ritualized performance of Jesus' death in the Eucharist, Christ believers affirm their (universal) unity within the body of Jesus Christ. This idea is seeded into Mark's gospel through the feeding narratives, and it is articulated explicitly in Paul's argument to the Corinthians. A (common) tradition from which Mark and Paul independently draw for their words of institution cannot easily accommodate this larger thematic overlap.

together peoples across the globe into one body, it should be more than capable of bridging the factionalist divide in the city of Corinth, as well.

Second, I have sought to show that the Last Supper scenes presented in Paul and Mark are, despite linguistic and syntactical variation, concordant. By the end of the first century, 1 Corinthians is already recognized as a highly context-specific argument against factionalism (Clement of Rome), and verbal discrepancies between Eucharist accounts cannot be taken as *a priori* evidence for different traditions, as there are discrepancies amongst Eucharists even when the texts are dependent upon one another (Matthew and Luke on Mark). Mark could thus be fully aware of Paul's Eucharist "tradition" in 1 Cor 11:23-26 and still adapt it for reasons of his own. In the service of presenting a Last Supper that appears to be idealized and from which Paul's might appear to derive, I suggest that Mark has modified Paul's story. That which he takes to be essential he keeps, and that which is unnecessary or anachronistic he excises. The cumulative effect of these changes is to create the impression that Paul's words at 1 Cor 11:23-26 are not to be read as a (re)presentation of the Last Supper; instead, they are to be taken as a rhetorically determined paraphrase of it.

Excursus: The Cup of Blessing and the Cup of Wrath

I have shown in the analysis that Mark and Paul employ the bread of the Eucharist as a symbol for unity. The cup also functions as such for both authors, but it is never given the same attention as is Christ's body-as-bread, particularly in the Gospel of Mark. The reason for Mark's omission is likely due to his interest in telling the story of how Paul's "cup of blessing" (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας [1 Cor 10:16]) was once the biblical "cup of wrath" (ποτήριον τοῦ θυμοῦ [see Isa 51:17 LXX]) that has been transformed through Jesus' death upon the cross. Because

Mark's primary goal in presenting this transformation is not to bolster Paul's argument for concord (though it does not contradict it), I present my reading of the materials here.

At 1 Cor 10:16a, Paul asks, “the cup of blessing [τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας] that we bless, is it not fellowship [κοινωνία] with the blood of Christ?” Though Paul does not explain what “fellowship” (κοινωνία) means (contrast with 1 Cor 10:16b-17, where Paul first speaks of the fellowship [κοινωνία] that occurs through the breaking of the bread, and then he explains that that fellowship is rooted in the oneness of the bread), it is probable that Paul has in mind a biblical passage like Ps 115:3-4 LXX (Ps 116:12-13 MT): “What can I give back [ἀνταποδώσω] to the Lord for all those things [περὶ πάντων ὧν] he has given back to me [ἀνταπέδωκέν μοι]? I shall take the cup of salvation [ποτήριον σωτηρίου], and I shall call upon the name of the Lord!”⁷⁶ The cup, for Paul, underscores the shared means by which believers remember Christ's death and affirm the salvation that has come to them through it.

A little later in the same letter, Paul says, “For with one Spirit [ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι] we all [ἡμεῖς πάντες] have been baptized [ἐβαπτίσθημεν] into one body [εἰς ἓν σῶμα], whether Jew or Greek, slave or free, and we all have been given to drink [ἐποτίσθημεν] one Spirit [ἐν πνεύμα]” (1 Cor 12:13). Earlier in this chapter, I argued that Paul implicitly recalls the Eucharistic cup through the language of “drinking” the Spirit (πάντες ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν [see 1 Cor 10:2-4]).⁷⁷ This creates an association between Eucharist and baptism, where the Spirit also features prominently (ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες... ἐβαπτίσθημεν). Within Paul's larger argument for concord, then, the cup points forward to the salvation that all believers will attain as a result of

⁷⁶ τί ἀνταποδώσω τῷ κυρίῳ περὶ πάντων ὧν ἀνταπέδωκέν μοι ποτήριον σωτηρίου λήμψομαι καὶ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ἐπικαλέσομαι. See Collins, *Corinthians*, 379; Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 757-60; Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 87; Ciampa and Rosner, *Corinthians*, 552.

⁷⁷ See Part I, note 28 of this chapter.

Christ's death, and it points back to the baptismal ritual that (re)presents that death and incorporates believers into the body of their messiah.

In the Gospel of Mark, the evangelist also uses the cup to evoke baptism. He makes an overt connection between the two at Mk 10:38 (“Are you able to drink the cup [τὸ ποτήριον] which I drink, or [are you able] to be baptized [βαπτισθῆναι] with the baptism [τὸ βάπτισμα] with which I am baptized [βαπτίζομαι]?”), and he makes an implicit one at Mk 14:36 (“Abba [αββα], Father, all things are possible for you. Take this cup [τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο] from me”).⁷⁸ For Mark, cup and baptism point forward to Jesus' impending suffering and death. In the same way that Jesus' baptism proleptically enacts God's judgment,⁷⁹ the cup is the proleptic enactment of God's wrath.⁸⁰ It recalls a biblical passage like Isa 51:17: “Wake up! Wake up! Arise, Jerusalem, you who drinks the cup of wrath [ποτήριον τοῦ θυμοῦ] from the hand of the Lord. For you drank from the cup of calamity [τὸ ποτήριον...τῆς πτώσεως], the goblet of wrath [κόνδου τοῦ

⁷⁸ I argued in the previous chapter that the reference to Αββα ὁ πατήρ in Mark 14:36 should be taken to recall baptism, due to the parallel phrasing of Mark 10:38-9, where baptism and cup are explicitly linked. Given that Matthew and Luke are both reading the pages of Mark and could have easily replicated it, it is noteworthy that the connection between cup and baptism is not preserved in the other synoptic gospels. In the Matthean and Lukan parallels to Mk 10:38-9, Matt 20:22 is missing baptism (“And answering, Jesus said, ‘You do not know what you are asking. Are you able to drink the cup which I am about to drink [πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ μέλλω πίνειν]?’ They said to him, ‘we are able [δυνάμεθα]’”), whereas Luke 12:50 is missing the cup (“But I have a baptism to be baptized [βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι], and how I am constrained until it has been accomplished [πῶς συνέχομαι ἕως ὅτου τελεσθῆ]!” In the synoptic parallels to Mark 14:36, Matt 26:39 and Lk 22:42 are both missing reference to the baptismal cry, αββα ὁ πατήρ (see Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15). Instead, Matt 26:39 reads, “My father” (πάτερ μου), while Lk 22:42 says simply, “Father” (πάτερ). It is probable that Mark creates an association between cup and baptism on the model of Paul that Matthew and Luke either miss or ignore.

⁷⁹ See Chapter II, Part II for my full argument.

⁸⁰ Many commentators note a connection with the biblical “cup of wrath.” See, for example, Collins, *Mark*, 496, 680; Johnson, *Mark*, 179, 236; France, *Mark*, 416, 585; Cranfield, *Mark*, 337, 433; Lane, *Mark*, 380, 517; Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 201, 280; Eckey, *Markusevangelium*, 343, 461-2.

θυμοῦ], and you emptied [it] out [ἐξεκένωσας].”⁸¹ Jesus’ death upon the cross is here represented by Mark as the outpouring of God’s anger and judgment upon the messiah who has willingly elected to suffer vicariously for the many.

But how does one get from the image of a “cup of wrath” in Mark to the “cup of blessing” (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας) in Paul? I suggest that Mark is familiar with both cups, and he attempts to show how the one has been transformed into the other. Just as Jesus’ baptism (Mk 1:9-11) proleptically anticipates Jesus’ taking upon himself the floods of judgment, and, through his death upon the cross, the significance of the rite is transformed, so too does Jesus drink the cup of wrath at his death, and its contents are changed thereby. Through Jesus’ self-sacrifice, that which once represented a curse has become its opposite, and, in partaking of the cup, believers acknowledge their blessed state through the (re)performance of the event that created it. To the degree that recognizing the roots of Paul’s “cup of blessing” bolsters arguments for concord, Mark’s story about the cup could be taken to be in the service of them. That said, I suspect Mark’s primary goal is not in bolstering Pauline arguments for unity *per se*. Rather, he seeks to create historical precedent for a reference with obscure origins.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have explored the Eucharists of Mark and Paul, both their perspectival orientations to the cross and the language they use in their Last Supper scenes and beyond. I have sought to show that Paul’s Eucharist is, on the one hand, a ritual (re)performance of the cross that is a complex blending of perspectives. As an *episode* of the gospel narrative (the night “on which [Jesus] was handed over”), the scene prospectively performs Jesus’ impending

⁸¹ ἐξεγείρου ἐξεγείρου ἀνάστηθι Ἱερουσαλημ ἢ πιούσα τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ θυμοῦ ἐκ χειρὸς κυρίου τὸ ποτήριον γὰρ τῆς πτώσεως τὸ κόνδυ τοῦ θυμοῦ ἐξέπιες καὶ ἐξεκένωσας.

crucifixion. As a *rite* that is a timeless memorial and (re)presentation of Jesus' death that looks towards his second coming (1 Cor 11:26), the Eucharist is primarily retrospective—it looks back to and performs Jesus' final meal and the cross. Regardless of the perspective, however, the Eucharist remains synecdochical: through the performance of one episode, the rest of the narrative is recalled within the mind of the reader, and an epiphanic encounter with the deity is thought to occur as a result.

On the other hand, Mark's Eucharist is, by virtue of being a narrative set during the earthly life of Christ, prospective. It is the proleptic performance of the cross that synecdochically evokes the conclusion of the gospel narrative through Jesus' prophecy of the eschatological banquet (Mk 14:25). Once again, the performance of the scene would invite Mark's audience to recall the entirety of the gospel narrative, one that extends well beyond Mark's 16 chapters and, as is the thesis of this dissertation, numbers Paul and his mission within its episodes.

Thus, Mark has again taken one of Paul's performances of the death of Christ and seeded it into his narrative. For Paul, the Eucharist ritually affirms the incorporation of all believers into the body of Jesus Christ. Mark recognizes this significance, and he employs the Eucharist to underscore Paul's larger theological and ecclesiological project: the inclusion of the Gentile nations within salvation history as a result of the death of Christ. At the same time, this modification bolsters the apostle's context-specific argument. If the bread of the Eucharist symbolizes unity at a universal level, it *a fortiori* symbolizes the same within a local ecclesiastical setting. Regarding the language of the Last Supper, Mark has, rightly to my mind, recognized that Paul does not present at 1 Cor 11:23-6 a word-for-word recitation of that Eucharist he first preached to the Corinthians. Instead, Paul has rhetorically adapted the Last

Supper. This allows Mark significant freedom in his incorporation of it, and he compose an idealized account from which Paul's language can be thought to derive.

Chapter IV: Death “in accordance with the Scriptures”

In investigating the various “performances” of Christ’s death that are found in Paul’s letters and the means by which they are seeded into Mark’s gospel, I have demonstrated, first, that Paul’s imagination of himself as an embodied “icon” of Jesus Christ crucified is anticipated in the Markan Jesus, a figure who iconically and proleptically manifests his salvific death through the miracles of his earthly life (Chapter I). Second, I have shown that Mark’s baptismal narrative anticipates Paul’s baptism into the “death” of Christ (Rom 6:3), reinforcing Paul’s insistence on the mimetic patterning of the believer on the person of the messiah (Chapter II). Third, I have argued that Paul’s Eucharist, which performs the Last Supper and Jesus’ crucifixion, is both incorporated into and anticipated by Mark’s gospel through linguistic modification, on the one hand, and the universalizing of Paul’s rhetorical claims, on the other (Chapter III). In this chapter, I will attend to Mark and Paul’s use of scripture, particularly the prefigurative performances of Jesus’ death that they find contained within it.¹

In her *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*, Francis Young made the important observation that typology is a modern scholarly category. That is, it is unrecognized by any ancient interpreter.² There are, however, “types” (τύποι) that prefigure later realities in early Christian thought (e.g. Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 10:6, 11; 1 Pet 3:20-1; Ep. Barn. 7.7, 10, 11; etc.),³ and

¹ On the centrality of Scripture in early Christian thought, see Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 23-32. See also, Margaret M. Mitchell, “The Emergence of the Written Record,” in eadem, *The Emergence of Christian Textuality*, 1-18; repr. from *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Volume 1, Origins to Constantine* (ed. by Margaret M. Mitchell and Francis M. Young; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 177-194.

² Francis Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 152, see also 193 n.20.

³ For good discussion, see Robert M. Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1957), 137-9.

she helpfully suggests how ancient biblical exegesis involving such “types” might be defined.⁴ She notes, first, that types have a mimetic quality: past narratives anticipate present realities, present conditions point to future states, past events are proleptic of future experiences, and so forth.⁵ Second, she points out that, though types are often found in biblical narrative, ancient interpreters perceived them elsewhere (e.g. in ritual or nature), so a “type” need not necessarily be “historical.”⁶ For my purposes, because Paul’s “in accordance with the scriptures” (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς [1 Cor 15:3, 4]) enfolds both narrative and prophecy,⁷ the conceptual framework

⁴ Her main conversation partners in this discussion are Northrop Frye’s *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1981), and Tibor Fabiny’s *The Lion and the Lamb: Figuralism and Fulfilment in the Bible, Art and Literature* (London: Macmillan, 1992).

⁵⁵ “Usually types and antitypes contribute to the prophetic understanding of scripture, and so past narratives points to present fulfillment, or present instance is prophetic of future reality. To that extent, ‘types’ usually relate to the Christian sense of a providential history leading to a denouement...The word *typos* may be used for any ‘model’ or ‘pattern’ or ‘parable’ foreshadowing its fulfilment, whether an event or an oft-repeated ritual, It is not its character as historical event which makes a ‘type’; what matters is its mimetic quality” (Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 153).

⁶ Young (*Biblical Exegesis*, 157) also notes that, because “types” exist both within and outside of historical time, they have a “curious simultaneity as well as a fulfillment pattern.” The “type” to some degree maintains its own autonomy and integrity even as it points to something else.

⁷ The blurring of the lines between prophecy and typology occurs throughout Paul’s letters. For example, at Gal 3:8 Paul writes, “Scripture [ἡ γραφή], foreseeing [προϊδοῦσα] that God justifies the Gentiles by faith [ἐκ πίστεως], announced the gospel message beforehand to Abraham [προεσηγγερίσατο τῷ Ἀβραάμ], saying: ‘All the nations will be blessed in you’” (Gal 3:8; see also Gen 12:3; 18:18; 22:18). This pronouncement is both prophetic and typological. It is prophetic insofar as Paul appears to circumvent Isaac entirely as the recipient of the promises at Gal 3:16: “To Abraham [τῷ δὲ Ἀβραάμ] and to his seed [τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ] the promises have been spoken. It [i.e. scripture] does not say, ‘to your seeds [ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν],’ as if to many, but as to one [ὡς ἐφ’ ἑνός], ‘to your seed [καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου],’ which is Christ [ὃς ἐστὶν Χριστός].” Here, one might argue that Paul reads scripture according to a prophecy-fulfillment pattern wherein the prophecy is fulfilled through the Christ event that occurs externally to the narrative. That said, this ‘prophecy’ simultaneously (and paradoxically) takes place and is concluded *within* the biblical narrative, with the result that Paul also reads Isaac as a type. In Paul’s famous “allegory” of Gal 4:21-31 (“these things are to be interpreted allegorically [ἀλληγορούμενα]” [Gal 4:24]), Isaac is designated as the (or a) child of the promise: “you, brothers and sisters, are children of the promise [ἐπαγγελίας τέκνα], just as Isaac [κατὰ Ἰσαάκ]” (Gal 4:28). If Isaac does not stand as a type of Christ for Paul (though I will argue in this chapter that he

provided by Young's definition is a useful one. The scriptural passages investigated in this chapter, when *performed* within Paul's and Mark's communities, would have been received as prefigurations of Jesus' death by their audiences. They are all "types" (τύποι), according to Young's definition, that (re)present for the audience, in various different ways and with varying nuance, the crucifixion of the messiah.⁸

As in previous chapters, this chapter will be divided into thirds. I will begin with Paul. For him, Jesus' death is paradigmatically prefigured in at least three biblical exemplars: the death of the suffering servant (Isa 52:13-53:12 [hereafter, Isa 53]), Abraham's near slaughter of his son (Gen 22), and the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb (Ex 12). Each of these stories is seen as a typological precursor to Jesus' death "in accordance with the scriptures" (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς [1 Cor 15:3, 4]). At the same time, because Paul's consistent hermeneutical principle vis-à-vis scripture is that its full significance is only disclosed in and through the Christ event, in the act of performing one passage or another, Jesus' death and the promises associated with the full gospel narrative are brought forward. In other words, scriptural performances of Jesus' death synecdochically evoke all of salvation history.

does), he at least stands as type (τύπος) for all believers (see Rom 9:7-10; see also Dunn, *Galatians*, 255-6; Martyn, *Galatians*, 348, 443-4; Matera, *Galatians*, 177-9; Betz, *Galatians*, 249). Interestingly, Paul concludes his Galatians allegory by taking a command that is rooted and resolved within the narrative ("but what does scripture say [τί λέγει ἡ γραφή]? Drive out [ἐκβαλε] the maid servant and her son; for the son of the maid servant will never inherit with the son of the free woman" [Gal 4:30; see also Gen 21:10, 14]), and he applies it prophetically to the current Galatian situation. That which was spoken "then" is, in fact, "now" spoken directly to the community ("ἐκβαλε" [2nd, sg., aor., act., imperative]). Prophecy and "type" are thus inextricably bound in Paul's mind. Each, as means by which the Christ event is perceived in biblical texts, is enfolded within Paul's "in accordance with the scriptures" (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς [1 Cor 15:3,4]).

⁸ On the liturgical reading of scripture in early Christian communities, see Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 211-231, esp. 211-16.

Second, I will show that for Mark, too, three essential typological precursors to Jesus' death are, once again, the servant that is handed over (Isa 53), the son that is bound (Gen 22), and the lamb that is slaughtered (Ex 12). These prefigurations are understood by Mark to be prospective and proleptic performances of Christ's death that synecdochically evoke the whole gospel plot. They form a part of the scriptural substructure to Mark's "passion narrative with an extended introduction."⁹

Finally, I will conclude by arguing that Mark has crafted his gospel such that the scriptural types of Jesus' death that Paul draws upon are harmoniously combined within a single figure, the earthly Jesus. What are ostensibly (though not necessarily) distinct typologies in Paul's letters, Mark has drawn together in his narrative of the death of Christ through their shared associations with a lamb that is slaughtered for the sake of the people (πρόβατον [Gen 22:7-8; Ex 12:3-5; Isa 53:6-7]). If, in the previous chapters, Mark's concern was to bolster Paul's rhetorical claims of his person, the importance of *imitatio Christi*, and the oneness of the people of God, this chapter shows how Mark confirms the scriptural witnesses Paul uses to demonstrate the salvation-historical necessity of the cross.¹⁰

⁹ Kähler, *The So-Called Historical Jesus*, 80 n.11.

¹⁰ Importantly, I am not claiming that this chapter presents an exhaustive investigation into the typological prefigurations of Jesus' death that Mark and Paul find in scripture. For example, both Paul and Mark also presume a Davidic Christology (see Rom 1:3; Mk 10:47-48) wherein the experiences of the sufferer in the Psalms of Lament typologically prefigure the suffering and death of Jesus. This is apparent at both Mk 15:34, where the evangelist puts Ps 22:2 (21:2 LXX) on the lips of Jesus, and at Rom 15:3, where Paul does the same with Ps 69:10 (68:10 LXX). An investigation into Mark's understanding of and potential engagement with Paul's Davidic Christology is beyond the scope of the current investigation. Instead, I have selected a thematically interrelated and linguistically overlapping complex of scriptural witnesses to the death of Christ that Paul presumes and Mark attempts to synthesize within his narrative. I do not wish to foreclose on the possibility of Mark's or Paul's using additional scriptural types to elucidate the meaning of Jesus' death, but I do contend that there is an interconnectedness between Isa 53, Ex 12, and Gen 22 in the thought of Paul and Mark that warrants their shared investigation. For Mark's use of Ps 22 in his

Part I: Scriptural Prefigurations of Jesus' Death in Paul

In his classic work, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, Richard B. Hays argues that Paul's scriptural approach is "ecclesiocentric" rather than "Christocentric." That is,

What Paul finds in Scripture, above all else, is the prefiguration of the *church* as the people of God...Paul uses Scripture primarily to shape his understanding of the community of faith; conversely, Paul's experience of the Christian community—composed of Jews and Gentiles together—shapes his reading of scripture. In short, Paul operates with an ecclesiocentric hermeneutic (emphasis original).¹¹

Given the nature of Paul's correspondence—epistolary arguments written to correct factionalist behavior, alleviate doubts about apostolic authority, foster hope and endurance, and so forth—it is unsurprising that Paul does not often employ Christological readings of scripture to demonstrate that Jesus is the messiah who died and was raised on behalf of the many.¹² Instead, he is able to take it as given, as 1 Cor 15:3,4's "according to the scriptures" (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς) clearly demonstrates. Recognizing that, there is nevertheless some content to Paul's assumptions that can be reconstructed from the laconic scriptural allusions in his letters.¹³ In the pages that follow, I will explore what Paul takes to be scriptural prefigurations of the cross, and I

passion narrative, see the good discussion of Holly J. Carey, *Jesus' Cry from the Cross: Towards a First-Century Understanding of the Intertextual Relationship between Psalm 22 and the Narrative of Mark's Gospel* (London: T&T Clark, 2009). For an analysis of Mark's use of the Psalms of Lament more generally, see Stephen P. Ahearne-Kroll, *The Psalms of Lament in Mark's Passion: Jesus' Davidic Suffering* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). On Paul's use of Ps 68:10 LXX at Rom 15:3, see, for example, Jewett, *Romans*, 879-80.

¹¹ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 86. See also his thoroughgoing analysis of Paul's use of Scripture in Romans, where he makes this case fully (34-83).

¹² Or, as Hays says, "Perhaps the genre of Paul's surviving writings obviates overt attention to Christological prophecy: he writes pastoral letters to Christian communities, not evangelistic or apologetic treatises. Paul's readers do not need to be convinced that Jesus was and is the messiah. In that case, the messianic exegesis might be assumed as the presuppositional background to Paul's interpretations" (*Echoes of Scripture*, 86).

¹³ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 84-6 notes Paul's allusions to Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:6 in 1 Cor 15:25-7, amongst others.

will argue that, for him, three essential witnesses are Isa 53 (the death of the Suffering Servant), Ex 12 (the slaughter of the Paschal lamb), and Gen 22 (the aborted immolation of Isaac).¹⁴ These stories would have been performed in the context of early Christian worship, and they would have fostered for the listening community an epiphanic encounter with the deity through the use of Paul’s gospel poetics. Because scripture is to be read in light of the Christ event, any engagement with it necessarily recalls the full gospel narrative.

*Translation: The Suffering Servant*¹⁵

13. Behold! My servant [ὁ παῖς μου] will understand, and he will be exalted and glorified exceedingly. 14. In the same way [ὁν τρόπον] that many will be amazed at you [ἐπὶ σέ]—your appearance [τὸ εἶδος σου] will be held in such low esteem amongst humanity [ἀδοξήσῃ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων], your glory [ἡ δόξα σου] [absent] from humanity—15. so too will many nations [ἔθνη πολλά] be astonished [θαυμάσονται] at him [ἐπ’ αὐτῷ], and kings [βασιλεῖς] will shut their mouths, because they, to whom no report was brought concerning him [οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ], will see [ὄψονται], and those who have not heard [οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν] will understand [συνήσουσιν]. 1. Lord, who has believed our report [τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν], and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed? 2. He rose up before him as a child [ἀνέτειλεν μὲν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον]; as a root in a thirsting land there is no form nor glory in him, and we saw him [εἶδομεν αὐτόν], and he did not have form or beauty [κάλλος]. 3. But his form was despised [ἄτιμον], failing beyond all humanity [ἐκλείπον παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους], being a man in abuse [ἐν πληγῇ] and knowing how to bear weakness [μαλακίαν], because his person has been rejected [ἀπέστραπται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ]. He was dishonored and reckoned of no account [ἠτιμάσθη καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη]. 4. This man bears our

¹⁴ Interestingly, Hays alludes to Gen 22 and Isa 53 as scriptural types of Jesus’ death, but he interprets them as embedded within Paul’s larger ecclesiological argument about the suffering the community undergoes in the period before the end (see Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 61-3). The community’s suffering is modelled upon the suffering of the messiah as a vicarious means to bring redemption to others. Though Hays does not mention the allusion to Passover explicitly, in the course of his monograph, he does direct his readers’ eye to 1 Cor 5:13: “Drive out the sexual malfasant (τὸν πονηρόν) from among you!” (Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 97-8; see also Deut 17:7). This allusion occurs within an argument over purity, wherein, once again, a Christological reading of scripture is assumed and utilized in furtherance of Paul’s claims: “Christ, our Passover [τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν], has been sacrificed [ἐτύθη]” [1 Cor 5:7]). I will discuss this in more detail below.

¹⁵ In the pages that follow, I translate afresh the passages under discussion from the Septuagint. It is important that these texts are before the eye of the reader both for the purposes of comparison and exegetical transparency.

sins [οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει], and he suffers pain for us [περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται], and we reckoned him to be in pain [πόνῳ] and abuse [πληγῇ] and oppression [κακώσει]. 5. He was wounded [ἐτραυματίσθη] for the sake of our lawlessness [διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν], and he was made weak [μεμαλάκισται] for the sake of our sins [διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν]. The lesson of our peace [παιδεία εἰρήνης ἡμῶν] is upon him [ἐπ' αὐτόν]; by his wound we have been healed [τῷ μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν]. 6. All of us, as sheep [ὡς πρόβατα] have gone astray [ἐπλανήθημεν]; [each] man has strayed in his own way [τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπλανήθη], and the Lord handed him over for our sins [κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν]. 7. And he, because of his mistreatment [διὰ τὸ κεκακῶσθαι], does not open his mouth [οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ]. As a sheep he was led to slaughter [ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη]; and, as a lamb is silent before its shearer [ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος], he does not open his mouth [οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ]. 8. In his humiliation [ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει], his judgment was taken away [ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη]. Who will describe his generation [τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγῆσεται]? For his life is taken from the earth [αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ]. As a result of the lawlessness of my people [ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου], he was led to death [ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον], 9. and I will put the wicked opposite his tomb [δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ] and the wealthy opposite his death [τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου], because he committed no lawlessness [ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν], nor was any deceit discovered in his mouth [οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ]. 10. And the Lord wills to cleanse him from his abuse [καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς]. If you (pl.) offer for sin, your soul will see long-lived seed [σπέρμα μακρόβιον]. And the Lord wills to take away 11. from the toil of his soul [ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ], to show him light, to mold him with understanding, to justify [δικαιῶσαι] the just one [δίκαιον] who serves the many well [εἰς δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς], and he himself will bear their sins [τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει]. 12. For this reason he will inherit many and he will divide the spoils of the strong, because [ἀνθ' ὧν] his life [ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ] was handed over unto death [παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον], and he was reckoned amongst the lawless [ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη]. And he himself took up [ἀνήνεγκεν] the sins of many [ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν], and, for the sake of their sins [διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν], he was handed over [παρεδόθη] (Isa 52:13-53:12).¹⁶

¹⁶ 13. ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα 14. ὄν τρόπον ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ πολλοὶ οὕτως ἀδοξήσει ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὸ εἶδος σου καὶ ἡ δόξα σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων 15. οὕτως θαυμάσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ ἐπ' αὐτῷ καὶ συνέξουσιν βασιλεῖς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν ὅτι οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ ὄφονται καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν συνήσουσιν. 1. κύριε τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη; 2. ἀνέτειλεν μὲν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὡς παιδίον ὡς ρίζα ἐν γῆ διψώση οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα καὶ εἶδομεν αὐτόν καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος. 3 ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἄτιμον ἐκλείπον παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἄνθρωπος ἐν πληγῇ ὢν καὶ εἰδὼς φέρειν μαλακίαν ὅτι ἀπέστραπται τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἠτιμάσθη καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσθη 4. οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας

Interpretive challenges of individual verses aside (how, for example, might Paul have understood the sudden shift into second person singular in Isa 52:14 or second person plural at Isa 53:10?), Isaiah’s suffering servant plays no small part in Paul’s thinking.¹⁷ Indeed, he quotes it explicitly at Rom 10:16: “For Isaiah says, ‘Lord, who has believed our report [τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν]?’” (Isa 53:1). This citation occurs within the masterful climax of Paul’s letter (Rom 9-11),¹⁸ a rhetorical tour de force in which the apostle and his gospel dances between Jews and Gentiles, seeking to accommodate both groups in the salvation history of God. Yet, due to its

ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει. 5. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν παιδεῖα εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τῷ μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν. 6. πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπλανήθη καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν. 7. καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τὸ κεκακῶσθαι οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη καὶ ὡς ἄμνος ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. 8. ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἢ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγῆσεται ὅτι αἶρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἢ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον. 9. καὶ δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὗρεθι δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. 10. καὶ κύριος βούλεται καθαρῶσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς ἐὰν δῶτε περὶ ἀμαρτίας ἢ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὄψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελεῖν. 11. ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ δεῖξει αὐτῷ φῶς καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέσει δικαιοῦσαι δίκαιον εὖ δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς καὶ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει. 12. διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα ἀνθ’ ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἢ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη καὶ αὐτὸς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.

¹⁷ Indeed, not only Isaiah’s suffering servant, but all of Isaiah serves as an essential scriptural backdrop to Paul’s thought. On Paul’s extensive use of Isaiah in Romans, see J. Ross Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul “in Concert” in the Letter to the Romans* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

¹⁸ I concur with Fitzmyer who sees chapters 9-11 as the rhetorical climax towards which Paul is working (*Romans*, 541); Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric*, 352 limits chapter 11 to climactic status; cf. Heinrich Schlier, *Der Römerbrief* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1977), 282, who says, “Wenn man auch nicht von einem Exkurs reden kann, so ist doch zu bedenken, dass es, während der zweite Teil des Römerbriefes (5,1-8,39) formal und inhaltlich als Konsequenz des ersten (1,8-4,25) eng mit diesem verbunden ist, zwischen dem dritten und zweiten Teil keinen ausgesprochen Zusammenhang gibt.”

seemingly incidental nature, the relationship of Paul’s citation of Isa 53:1 to this broader argument, on the one hand, and Jesus’ death, on the other, needs to be unpacked.

Paul’s argument in Rom 10-11 runs as follows:¹⁹ Paul moves from proper Jewish “zeal” (ζήλος) for but improper “knowledge” (ἐπίγνωσις) of the deity (Rom 10:2-3) to an assertion that there is no distinction (διαστολή,) between Jews and Gentiles (an earlier theme of the letter [see Rom 3:22, 29]), as it is the same Lord who is ultimately over all (Rom 10:12). He next admits that only a “remnant” (λειμμα) of Jews have come to believe (Rom 11:4-5)—the majority have been “hardened” (ἐπωρώθησαν) by divine intention (Rom 11:7-8)—but this allows him to make a transition from a notion of Gentile salvation as a merciful outpouring of God’s love to Gentile salvation as a deliberate moment in God’s plan to “provoke” (παραζηλώσαι) his chosen people to jealousy (Rom 11:11). Paul claims that the hardening (πώρωσις) of the hearts of the Jews has always been intended for the good of the Gentiles, since it is during its duration that space has been allotted by God for their “fullness” (πλήρωμα) to enter in (Rom 11:25). Then, upon the completion of one epoch, there begins another: the salvation of *all* Israel (πᾶς Ἰσραήλ [Rom 11:26]). In the end, in a spectacular paradox, Paul exclaims that all have been made to disbelieve in order that all can come to believe and be shown the immeasurable mercy of God (Rom 11:32). At this moment, when he has exhausted the limits of dialectic and finds himself staring into the depths of God’s unfathomable will, Paul leaves off exposition and resorts to doxology: “O depth of wealth and wisdom and knowledge of God! etc.” (Rom 11:33-36).

Within this larger argument, Paul introduces his quotation of Isa 53:1 at Rom 10:16a with the following words: “But not all have obeyed [ὕπήκουσαν] the gospel [τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ].” To

¹⁹ For a similar summary, see Roetzal, *Man and the Myth*, 126-9. For a comprehensive treatment, see Wagner’s extensive investigation of Paul’s use of Isaiah in Rom 9-11 (*Heralds of the Good News*, 43-305).

understand the role of the Suffering Servant in Rom 9-11, one must remember that, for Paul, the gospel's primary episode is Jesus' crucifixion in expiation for the sins of others ("Christ died [ἀπέθανεν] on behalf of our sins [ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν]" [1 Cor 15:3]). It is, moreover, the humiliating death of Christ that Paul labels the "stumbling block" (σκάνδαλον [1 Cor 1:23]) for the Jewish people: "We proclaim Christ *crucified* [Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον], a stumbling block for Jews [Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον] and folly to Gentiles [ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωρίαν]" [1 Cor 1:23]). For Paul, Isa 53 thus functions as a scriptural witness to that death that has caused the Jewish people such distress, and his evocation of it at Rom 10:16 with the words, "Lord, who has believed our report [τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν]?" (Isa 53:1) serves as a subtle reminder to his audience that that which the Jewish people have rejected, that which has effected the hardening (πώρωσις) of their hearts, is prefigured within the scriptures themselves (see esp. Isa 53:6, 12).²⁰

The prefigurative status of Isa 53 is seen most clearly in Rom 4:23-5. At the end of Paul's extended discussion of Abraham's faith (Rom 4), wherein its exemplary nature apart from circumcision and the law is framed by citations of Gen 15:6 ("Abraham believed in God [ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ], and it was reckoned to him as righteousness [ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην]" [Rom 4:3; 22]),²¹ Paul drives home the lesson of the patriarch with the following words:

23. But it was not written for his sake alone [δι' αὐτὸν μόνον] that 'it was reckoned to him [ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ]'; 24. but also for our sake [δι' ἡμᾶς], to whom it is about to be reckoned [μέλλει λογίζεσθαι], [we] who believe in the one who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead [τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν], 25. who was handed over for the sake of our sins [παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν], and who was

²⁰ On this, see Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 178-80.; see also Jewett, *Romans*, 640-1.

²¹ For good discussion of Rom 4 generally, see Hultgren, *Romans*, 178-92.

raised for the sake of our justification [ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν] (Rom 4:23-25).

As commentators rightly note, Paul’s language at Rom 4:25 evokes the description of the suffering servant at Isa 53:12.²² The prophet’s words, “He was handed over for the sake of their sins [διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη],” map closely onto Paul’s “he was handed over for the sake of our trespasses [παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν]” (Rom 4:25). There is linguistic variation, but no difference in action (“handed over”) or significance (redemption).

Moreover, Isa 53 may have influenced the logic underlying Paul’s argument in Rom 4 in some fundamental ways. If Abraham’s faith is intended to create space for Gentiles to be incorporated into Paul’s gospel narrative on the basis of faith, Isaiah’s claim that “many nations will marvel” at the servant, and that they will “see” (ὄψονται) and “understand” (συνήσουσιν [Isa 52:15]), must have served as a scriptural warrant for that Gentile mission. Paul’s later citation of Isa 52:15 as justification for his continued mission to Spain (see Rom 15:21) confirms this.²³ Similarly, if Paul intends to demonstrate that God justifies on the basis of faith rather than works (see esp. Rom 4:5-8; 4:13-16), the justification that the servant receives (Isa 53:11) may have been taken to anticipate God’s subsequent justification of all believers through the faithfulness of, and faith in, Jesus Christ (see Rom 3:22; Gal 2:16). That is, for Paul, Christ is justified as a result of his faithfully dying for the sins of the many, and this, in turn, opens the way for others to be justified by faith in him.

²² Hultgren, *Romans*, 191-2; Jewett, *Romans*, 342-4; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 389-90. For an alternative position and survey of the background to the language of Isa 53 LXX, see Cilliers Breytenbach, “The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 53 and the Early Christian Formula, ‘He was Delivered for Our Trespasses,’” *NT 51* [2009], 339-351.

²³ See Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News*, 332-6.

In the end, then, there can be little doubt that the fourth Servant Song is essential to Paul's Christological thinking. It stands in the background of his gospel narrative at 1 Cor 15:3 (Christ died "on behalf of our sins" [ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν]),²⁴ his Eucharist at 1 Cor 11:23-6 ("he was handed over [παρεδίδοτο]...on behalf of you [ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν]" [1 Cor 11:23-4]),²⁵ in his justification for the primacy of faith (Rom 4), and in Paul's argument for the temporary hardening of the Jewish people's hearts (Rom 9-11). Though Paul never explicates it as a scriptural witness to Christ's death, he assumes it (and his audience's familiarity it), and he allows it to inform the arguments he makes. For Paul, Isa 53 is a typological prefiguration of Jesus' death that occurs "in accordance with the scriptures" (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς [1 Cor 15:3, 4]).

Translation: The Binding of Isaac

1. And it came about after these words that God tested Abraham [ὁ θεὸς ἐπείραζεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ], and he said to him, "Abraham, Abraham!" and he said, "Behold! I am here." 2. And he said, take your son, the beloved whom you love [λαβὲ τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν ὃν ἠγάπησας], Isaac, and go into the high land and offer him there [ἀνένεγκον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ] as a whole burnt offering [εἰς ὄλοκάρπωσιν] upon one of the mountains, whichever I say to you. 3. And Abraham, arising early, loaded up his ass and took with him two servants and Isaac, his son, and, after having split wood for the whole burnt

²⁴ Breytenbach ("The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 53," 348 n.39) suggests that there is no reason to see Isaiah 53 standing behind 1 Cor 15:3 due to the fact that, in the former, the Servant dies "because of their sins" (διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν [Isa 53:12]), while, in the latter, Christ dies, "on behalf of" (ὑπὲρ) the people's sins. This reading, however, too strongly fixes the semantic range of διὰ to a causal "because." As is well known, when paired with the accusative, it can convey a broader range of meanings, which includes both causality ("because of" or "on account of") and purpose ("for the sake of" [see Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 375, §1685b-c]), and the multi-valency of διὰ would have easily allowed Paul to read Isa 53:1-12 messianically ("for the sake of"). Moreover, "for the sake of," "because of," and "on behalf of" form a network of interconnected descriptions of the purpose of Jesus' death in Paul's thought. They should not be taken to be mutually exclusive. It is a part of Paul's divine economy that Christ is sent *because of* the rampant sin that has consumed the world, and he comes in order to free humanity from its bondage by paying the ultimate price *on their behalf* (see Rom 7:7-8:4). In other words, Christ dies both because of and on behalf of the sins of the people. Drawing stark dividing lines does not do sufficient justice to the flexibility of Paul's rhetorical poetics.

²⁵ For fuller discussion, see Chapter III, Part I of this dissertation.

offering, he arose and departed and came on the third day [τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τῆ τρίτῃ] to the place which God had said to him; 4. and Abraham, having lifted his eyes, saw the place from afar. 5. And Abraham said to his servants, “Sit here with the ass, and I and the little boy [τὸ παιδάριον] will go through hither [διελευσόμεθα ἕως ὧδε], and, once we have worshipped, we will return to you. 6. And Abraham took the wood of the whole burnt offering and he set it upon Isaac, his son [ἐπέθηκεν Ἰσαακ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ], and he took also with his hand the fire and the sword [τὸ πῦρ μετὰ χειρα καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν], and the two proceeded together. 7. And Isaac spoke to Abraham, his father, saying, “Father,” and he said, “What is it, child?” “Behold the fire and the wood; where is the sheep [τὸ πρόβατον], the one for the whole burnt offering? 8. And Abraham said, “Child, God will see to a sheep for a whole burnt offering for himself [ὁ θεὸς ὄψεται ἑαυτῷ πρόβατον εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν].”

And the two, proceeding together, 9. came to the place which God said to him, and Abraham built there an altar [θυσιαστήριον], and set upon it [ἐπέθηκεν] the wood, and, having bound the feet of Isaac, his son [συμποδίσας Ἰσαακ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ], he set him upon the altar above the wood [ἐπέθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπάνω τῶν ξύλων]. 10. And Abraham stretched out his hand to take the sword to slaughter his son [ἐξέτεινεν Ἀβρααμ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μάχαιραν σφάζαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ], 11. And an angel of the Lord called him from heaven and said, “Abraham, Abraham!” and he said, “Behold, I am here.” 12. And he said, “Do not lay your hand upon the little boy [μὴ ἐπιβάλῃς τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπὶ τὸ παιδάριον], nor do anything to him, for now I know that you fear God [φοβῆ ἃ τὸν θεὸν σὺ], and you did not spare your son, the beloved, for my sake [οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι’ ἐμέ]. 13. And Abraham, having lifted his eyes, looked, and behold! a ram held in a Sabek plant by its horns [κρίδις εἰς κατεχόμενος ἐν φυτῷ σαβεκ τῶν κεράτων]. And Abraham went and took the ram and offered it as a whole burnt offering instead of Isaac, his son [ἀντὶ Ἰσαακ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ]. 14. And Abraham called the name of that place “the Lord has Seen [κύριος εἶδεν]” in order that [people] might today say, “on the mountain the Lord has been seen [ἐν τῷ ὄρει κύριος ὤφθη].”

15. And the angel of the Lord called Abraham a second time from heaven, 16. saying, “I have sworn by myself [κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ὥμοσα],’ says the Lord, ‘because [οὐ εἶνεκεν] you have done this thing [τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο], and you did not spare your son, the beloved, for my sake [οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι’ ἐμέ], 17. truly blessing I will bless you [εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε], and multiplying I will multiply your seed [πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου]; as the stars of heaven and as the sand that is along the shore of the sea, your seed will inherit the cities of its enemies [κληρονομήσει τὸ σπέρμα σου τὰς πόλεις τῶν ὑπεναντίων], 18. and all the nations of the earth will be blessed in your seed [ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου πάντα τὰ

ἔθνη τῆς γῆς] because you have obeyed my voice [ἀνθ' ὧν ὑπήκουσας τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς].” 19. And Abraham returned to his servants.²⁶

As with the Suffering Servant, the Binding of Isaac (the Aqedah) forms an important Christological backdrop to Paul’s thinking about the salvation-historical necessity of the cross. At the same time, because Paul assumes its importance and his communities’ familiarity with it, he never explicates his allusions fully. For example, though Abraham and Isaac play important

²⁶ 1. καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς ἐπείραζεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Ἀβραάμ Ἀβραάμ ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ἰδοὺ ἐγώ 2. καὶ εἶπεν λαβὲ τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν ὃν ἠγάπησας τὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ πορεύθητι εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ὑψηλὴν καὶ ἀνένεγκον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν ἐφ’ ἑν τῶν ὁρέων ὧν ἂν σοι εἴπω 3. ἀναστὰς δὲ Ἀβραάμ τὸ πρωὶ ἐπέσαξεν τὴν ὄνον αὐτοῦ παρέλαβεν δὲ μεθ’ ἑαυτοῦ δύο παιδῶν καὶ Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ σχίσας ξύλα εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη καὶ ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον ὃν εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός 4. τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τῆ τρίτῃ καὶ ἀναβλέψας Ἀβραάμ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶδεν τὸν τόπον μακρόθεν 5. καὶ εἶπεν Ἀβραάμ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ καθίσατε αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῆς ὄνου ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὸ παιδάριον διελευσόμεθα ἕως ὧδε καὶ προσκυνήσαντες ἀναστρέψωμεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς 6. ἔλαβεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ τὰ ξύλα τῆς ὀλοκαρπώσεως καὶ ἐπέθηκεν Ἰσαὰκ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἔλαβεν δὲ καὶ τὸ πῦρ μετὰ χεῖρα καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν οἱ δύο ἅμα 7. εἶπεν δὲ Ἰσαὰκ πρὸς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ εἶπας πάτερ ὁ δὲ εἶπεν τί ἐστὶν τέκνον λέγων ἰδοὺ τὸ πῦρ καὶ τὰ ξύλα τοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ πρόβατον τὸ εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν 8. εἶπεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ ὁ θεὸς ὄψεται ἑαυτῷ πρόβατον εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν τέκνον πορευθέντες δὲ ἀμφοτέρω ἅμα 9. ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον ὃν εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν ἐκεῖ Ἀβραάμ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἐπέθηκεν τὰ ξύλα καὶ συμποδίσας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπάνω τῶν ξύλων 10. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν Ἀβραάμ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μάχαιραν σφάζει τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ 11. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀβραάμ Ἀβραάμ ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ἰδοὺ ἐγώ 12. καὶ εἶπεν μὴ ἐπιβάλῃς τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπὶ τὸ παιδάριον μηδὲ ποιήσης αὐτῷ μηδὲν νῦν γὰρ ἔγνω ὅτι φοβῆ τὸν θεὸν σὺ καὶ οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι’ ἐμέ 13. καὶ ἀναβλέψας Ἀβραάμ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ εἶδεν καὶ ἰδοὺ κριὸς εἷς κατεχόμενος ἐν φυτῷ σαβεκ τῶν κεράτων καὶ ἐπορεύθη Ἀβραάμ καὶ ἔλαβεν τὸν κριὸν καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν αὐτὸν εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν ἀντὶ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ 14. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀβραάμ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου κύριος εἶδεν ἵνα εἴπωσιν σήμερον ἐν τῷ ὄρει κύριος ὤφθη 15. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἄγγελος κυρίου τὸν Ἀβραάμ δευτέρω ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ 16. λέγων κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ὡμοσα λέγει κύριος οὗ εἶνεκεν ἐποίησας τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο καὶ οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι’ ἐμέ 17. ἢ μὴν εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τοὺς ἀστέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τὴν παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ κληρονομήσει τὸ σπέρμα σου τὰς πόλεις τῶν ὑπεναντίων 18. καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς ἀνθ’ ὧν ὑπήκουσας τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς 19. ἀπεστράφη δὲ Ἀβραάμ πρὸς τοὺς παιδᾶς αὐτοῦ.

roles in Galatians as both types of believers and of Christ,²⁷ the Aqedah is rarely recognized as forming a scriptural backdrop to the letter. The primary issue in Galatians is obedience to the law, particularly the necessity of circumcision (see Gal 5:1-13). It seems that Paul's opponents have introduced Gen 17:1-14, where God commands circumcision for Abraham and all his descendants, in order to bolster their calls for its adoption.²⁸ In scripting his counter argument, Paul presumes his communities' familiarity with a variety of scriptural exemplars upon which he draws and to which he alludes. At Gal 3:6-14, where Paul musters biblical witnesses to demonstrate the truth of his assertion that righteousness is attained through faith rather than works of the law,²⁹ Paul "quotes" scripture with the following words: "All the nations will be blessed in you" (ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη [Gal 3:8]).³⁰ This language finds no exact parallel in the Septuagint.³¹ Though exegetes usually consider it a conflation of Gen 12:13 and 18:18,³² it is more probably the promise of the Aqedah (Gen 22:16-18) that is in view. I here place the passages side by side for comparison:

²⁷ Hays has argued in his "πίστις and Pauline Christology," 35-60 that Abraham's faithfulness is simultaneously a type of the faithfulness of Christ and believers. For a fuller discussion of his argument, see Chapter II, note 24. On Isaac as a type of Christ, see this chapter, note 7.

²⁸ Hays, "πίστις and Pauline Christology," 47. For other scholars who take a similar interpretive stance, see Betz, *Galatians*, 142; Martyn, *Galatians*, 117-126 (esp. 125), 297-306; Dunn, *Galatians* (London: A&C Black, 1993), 15-17; Sam K. Williams, *Galatians* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 86-7; Matera, *Galatians* 122; Simon Légasse, *L'Épître de Paul aux Galates* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000), 220-22; cf. PHEME PERKINS, *Abraham's Divided Children: Galatians and the Politics of Faith* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001), 65-7; Alfred Loisy, *L'Épître Aux Galates* (Paris: E. Nourry, 1916), 144-5; Wilfried Eckey, *Der Galaterbrief: ein Commentar* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010), 188-9.

²⁹ See Betz, *Galatians*, 137-54.

³⁰ So Légasse, *Galates*, 227, who suggests, "Le text est introduit sans formule de citation, mais par une phrase qui indique le register dans lequel Paul entend conduire ses lecteurs."

³¹ Betz, *Galatians*, 142; Martyn, *Galatians*, 301; Eckey, *Galaterbrief*, 194; Matera, *Galatians*, 118; Dunn, *Galatians*, 164.

³² Dunn, *Galatians*, 164; Martyn, *Galatians*, 301; Matera, *Galatians*, 118.

Table 5: Galatians 3:8 and Genesis 12:3; 18:18; 22:18

<p>Gal 3:8 “<u>All the nations</u> will be blessed in you”</p> <p>ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη</p>	<p>Gen 12:3 “All the tribes of the earth will be blessed in you.”</p> <p>ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς</p>	<p>Gen 18:18 “<u>All the nations</u> of the earth will be blessed in him.”</p> <p>ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς</p>	<p>Gen 22:18 “<u>All the nations</u> of the earth will be blessed in your seed”</p> <p>ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς</p>
---	--	--	---

It is easy to see why commentators select Gen 18:18 as the second passage with which Gen 12:3 is combined. After all, it looks as if Paul has merely exchanged “all the tribes of the earth” (πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς) for “all the nations” (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη). This reading, however, does not take into account the wider context of Paul’s discussion. For Paul, the “in you” (ἐν σοὶ) of Gen 12:3 has a very particular referent. At Gal 3:16 the apostle asserts: “But to Abraham and to his seed [τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ] the promises have been spoken. It does not say, ‘and to his seeds [τοῖς σπέρμασιν],’ as if to many, but as if to one [ὡς ἐφ’ ἑνός]: and to your seed [τῷ σπέρματι σου], which is Christ [ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός].” Nils Dahl has rightly pointed out that Paul is making an exegetical inference by analogy here.³³ Just as the “seed” (τὸ σπέρμα) of David (see 2 Sam 7:12³⁴) is understood messianically in the early Jesus movement,³⁵ so too is Paul claiming that

³³ Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 130.

³⁴ “And I will raise up your seed [τὸ σπέρμα σου] after you, who will be from your womb, and I will prepare his kingdom [ἐτοιμάσω τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ]” (ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σέ ὃς ἔσται ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου καὶ ἐτοιμάσω τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ).

³⁵ Davidic Christologies are peppered throughout New Testament Texts. See, for example, Rom 1:3: “from the seed of David” (ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ); Mk 10:47: “Jesus, son of David [υἱὲ Δαυίδ], have mercy on me!” (see also Mk 11:10); Matt 1:1: “A Book of the origin of Jesus Christ, son of David [υἱοῦ Δαυίδ], son of Abraham;” Lk 1:32: “This one will be great and he will be called the son of the Highest, and the Lord God will give to him the throne of David, his father [τὸν θρόνον Δαυίδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ];” 2 Tim 2:8: “Remember Jesus Christ who has been raised from the dead, from the seed of David [ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ], in accordance to my gospel”; etc.

Abraham’s “seed” must be understood: the “in you” refers to the *seed* (τῷ σπέρματί) of Abraham, and that seed is Jesus Christ.

If the “in you” (Gal 3:8) is the “seed” (Gal 3:16a), and the “seed” is Jesus Christ (Gal 3:16b), Paul’s initial invocation of Abraham’s blessing at Gal 3:8 must be the combination of Gen 12:3 and Gen 22:18. The promise contained within the Aqedah is not only the earliest moment at which “all the nations” (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) are blessed in Abraham’s “seed,”³⁶ but the locution used there, “in your seed” (ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου [Gen 22:18]) mirrors Paul’s language at Gal 3:16 almost exactly: “to your seed” (τῷ σπέρματί σου).³⁷ Because the “in him” (ἐν αὐτῷ) of Gen 18:18 refers grammatically to Abraham and not to Isaac,³⁸ it is at Gen 22:18 that Paul finds clear scriptural warrant for interpreting the ἐν σοί of Gen 12:3 messianically.

Importantly, Paul does not evoke the near sacrifice of Isaac simply to provide scriptural warrant for reading the blessing that occurs in Abraham as referring to Christ. Rather, he

³⁶ While the words τῷ σπέρματί occur with some regularity in God’s promises to Abraham, it is almost always linked with the reception of *land*, not with the blessing of nations (e.g. Gen 12:7; 13:15; 15:18;17:8). The next reference to the blessing of the nations as occurring in the seed of Abraham is found at Gen 26:4.

³⁷ For scholars who also hear an echo of the Aqedah in either Gal 3:8 or 3:16 or both, see Nils Alstrup Dahl, *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977), 130-131; idem, “The Atonement: Adequate Reward for the Akedah?” in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (ed. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969), 23; Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 180; Sigve K. Tonstad, “Inscribing Abraham: Apocalyptic, the Akedah, and “Abba! Father!” in Galatians,” in *Galatians as Examined by Diverse Academics in 2012* (ed. Heerak Christian Kim; Newark: The Hermit Kingdom Press, 2013), 18; Scott W. Hahn, “Covenant, Oath, and the Aqedah: Διαθήκη in Galatians 3:15-18,” in *CBQ* 67 (2005), 90-4; Hans Joachim Schoeps, “The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul’s Theology,” in *JBL* 65 (1946), 391; Calvin J. Roetzel, *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context* (5th edition; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009), 50; and Jon Levenson, *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 212-13.

³⁸ “And Abraham will truly become a great and mighty nation, and all the tribes of the earth will be blessed in him” (Αβρααμ δὲ γινόμενος ἔσται εἰς ἔθνος μέγα καὶ πολὺ καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς).

perceives (and he expects his audience to perceive) a typological prefiguration of the crucifixion of the messiah within the Aqedah. Essential to Paul’s argument for justification by faith in Gal 3 is the fact that Christ *dies*. At Gal 3:13, Paul equates Christ’s death with a curse—“cursed [ἐπικατάρατος] is everyone who hangs upon a tree [ἐπὶ ξύλου]” (see Deut 21:23³⁹)—and he claims that, because Christ became a “curse” on behalf of others (ὕπερ ἡμῶν κατάρα), he is able to redeem others from the “curse of the law” (Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου). According to Paul, it is Christ’s death that allows the blessing of Abraham to come to the nations, which they are then able to receive through faith (λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως [Gal 3:14]). Paul thus evokes the Aqedah in Gal 3 because, as type of Christ’s death, it prefigures two of his essential claims: 1) that the Gentiles will be blessed in Abraham, and 2) that blessing is rooted within and contingent upon death and sacrifice. Indeed, there may be an association in Paul’s mind between Christ’s hanging “upon the tree” (ἐπὶ ξύλου Gal 3:13) and Isaac’s being set “upon the wood” (ἐπάνω τῶν ξύλων [Gen 22:9]) that helped to facilitate Paul’s allusion to Deut 21:23 at Gal 3:13.⁴⁰

When Paul composes his letter to the Romans some years later, the Aqedah appears once more. While more than one passage in that epistle has been thought to recall Isaac’s binding,⁴¹

³⁹ “Every person hanging upon a tree [κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου] is cursed by God [εκατηραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ]” (κεκατηραμένος ὑπὸ θεοῦ πᾶς κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου).

⁴⁰ So Hahn, “Covenant, Oath, and the Aqedah,” 93; see also Dahl, “The Atonement,” 23.

⁴¹ Dahl, “The Atonement,” 24-27, for example, suggests that ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον (Rom 3:25) could be rendered as something like, “whom God appointed (designed, purposed) to be an expiation,” which then may recall Abraham’s “God will see to the sheep for the whole burnt offering for himself” (ὁ θεὸς ὄψεται ἑαυτῷ πρόβατον εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν [Gen 22:8]). To bolster this claim, he suggests Paul’s use of ἱλαστήριον has its closest analogy in 4 Mac 17.22, where the deaths of the martyrs are seen as being in imitation of Isaac.

none has garnered as much support as Rom 8:32.⁴² Paul’s allusion comes at the end of a major block of material (Rom 5:1-8:39) throughout which the apostle consistently circles back to the idea that there is now freedom for believers: “freedom from the wrath of God in chapter 5 (5:9-11); freedom from the power of sin in chapter 6 (6:14); freedom from the law in chapter 7 (7:4-6); and freedom from death in chapter 8 (8:9-11; 37-9).”⁴³ In his discussion of freedom from death, Paul touches upon sonship and inheritance, the sustaining power of the Spirit, and the anticipated (or “hoped for” [see Rom 8:20, 24-25]) liberation of the whole cosmos that will occur in accordance with God’s will (see esp. Rom 8:14-30). Paul concludes his discussion by arguing that nothing will be capable of separating believers from the love of God (Rom 8:31-9). He initiates this bold claim with a rhetorical question: “If God is for us [ὕπερ ἡμῶν], who can be against us [καθ’ ἡμῶν]?” (Rom 8:31).⁴⁴ Then, on the heels of this first question, he asks a second: “He who did not even spare [ἐφείσατο] his own son [τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ], but he handed him over [παρέδωκεν αὐτόν] on behalf of us all [ὕπερ ἡμῶν πάντων], how will he not also freely give [χαρίσεται] to us everything [τὰ πάντα] along with him?” (Rom 8:32). Because God has already offered that which is beyond human comprehension (his own son [τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ]), Paul’s claim

⁴² Scholars who hear at least some echo of the binding of Isaac in Rom 8:32 include (but are not limited to) Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 221-2; Dahl, “The Atonement,” 16-20 and passim, Schoeps, “The Sacrifice of Isaac,” 390; Barrett, *Romans*, 172; Käsemann, *Romans*, 247; Simon Légasse, *L’Épître de Paul aux Romains* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002), 549-50; Gignac, *Romains*, 330; Michael Theobald, *Der Römerbrief* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000), 175; Dunn, “Once More, πίστις Χριστοῦ,” 76; Schmithals, *Römerbrief*, 307-8; cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 531-2; Jewett, *Romans*, 536-8; Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 277.

⁴³ Hultgren, *Romans*, 197.

⁴⁴ Hultgren has suggested that “God is for us” refers not only to the contents of Chapter 8, but it is “a massive summary of what has been said in the previous chapters. God is for us, Paul can say, because we are justified, reconciled, saved from the wrath of God, and freed from the power of sin, the law, and death itself (Rom 5:1-8:30)” (Hultgren, *Romans*, 336-7).

is that believers should be confident that God stands with them (indeed, with *all* creation [Rom 8:22: *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις*]), and that he will deliver on his promises.

The language Paul uses at Rom 8:32 clearly evokes Gen 22:16: “Because [*οὗ εἵνεκεν*] you have done this thing [*τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο*], and you did not spare [*οὐκ ἐφείσω*] your son [*τοῦ υἱοῦ σου*], the beloved [*τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ*]...” (see also Gen 22:12). Together with the larger thematic connection that sees father offer son upon the altar (see Gen 22:9-10), there are verbal associations that bind the two texts together. On the one hand, both share the same verb in the same tense (*φείδομαι*) with an emphasized “son” (*τοῦ...υἱοῦ*) as the genitive object. On the other, both underscore the familial relationship between son and father.⁴⁵ The Aqedah does so through the use of a personal pronoun (*σου*) and the use of the affectionate title, *ἀγαπητός*. Paul does so through the possessive adjective (*ἴδιον*).⁴⁶

As in Galatians, Paul here presumes that the near sacrifice of Isaac prefigures God’s action taken vis-à-vis Christ, and, as before, Paul evokes the Aqedah as scriptural witness to the universal access to salvation granted through Christ’s death. In the biblical narrative, “because of” (*οὗ εἵνεκεν* [Gen 22:16]/*ἀνθ’ ὧν* [Gen 22:18]) Abraham’s obedient but aborted sacrifice, the

⁴⁵ In his discussion of Abraham in this chapter, Levenson (*Death and Resurrection*, 221-2) also suggests that there may lie behind Paul’s belief that, “for those who love God [*τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν*], all things work together for good [*πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν*]” (Rom 8:28) the tradition of Abraham as the archetypal lover of God, who willingly chooses love of God over love of son (see Jub 17.16; 18) and receives a nation in return.

⁴⁶ Additionally, though Paul never uses the adjective *ἀγαπητός* to describe Christ, it is likely that, for him, Christ is God’s beloved child. At Rom 5:8, Paul says, “But God commends [*συνίστησιν*] his love for us [*τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς*] because, while we were still sinners [*ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν*], Christ died on our behalf [*Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν*].” According to the apostle, Christ is the expression of God’s love made manifest. *Mutatis mutandis*, the depthless love God has for humanity as adopted siblings of Christ probably extends to and encompasses that eldest child. Indeed, within Pauline epistolary literature, it will not be long before this connection is made explicit: “...[the Father], who rescued us from the power of darkness and transferred us into the kingdom of his beloved son [*τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ*]...” (Col 1:13).

covenant between God and Israel is established. Since Rom 8 opens with a discussion of freedom from the law (Rom 8:1-4; comp. Gal 3:10-14,) and continues with a discussion of the power of the baptismal Spirit that makes all believers children of God, regardless of ethnic background (Rom 8:9-11, 14-17; comp Gal 3:26-4:6), it comes as little surprise that Paul’s allusion to the Aqedah at Rom 8:32 again recalls God’s promise to Abraham at Gen 22:16-18 (“because you obeyed this command and did not spare your son, the beloved...all the nations of the earth [πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς] will be blessed in your seed [ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου]” [Gen 22:16, 18; see Gal 3:8]). Within the larger context of Paul’s argument to the Romans, it appears that the apostle has inferred from the Abraham cycle that the patriarch’s initial worthiness to attain “the oracles of God” (τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ) has resulted in a certain “advantage” (τὸ περισσόν) to the Jewish people (see Rom 3:1-2; 4:11-12). In the wake of Christ’s completed sacrifice, however, the advantage to the Jewish people as “first” (πρῶτον [Rom 3:2; see also 1:16; 2:9-10]) remains, but the blessings that come to Abraham’s biological seed, and the divine commandments (e.g. circumcision) imposed as a result, are transformed (see Rom 3:21-30). Like in Galatians, then, the Aqedah is assumed to be a typological prefiguration of the cross that anticipates Gentile salvation. In the story’s antitype, however, where God takes on the role of Abraham, the sacrifice is carried through to the end, and it results in expiation and access to salvation on a universal scale. As Jon Levenson has suggested of Rom 8:32, “the new aqedah, which is the crucifixion of Jesus, has definitively and irreversibly secured the blessings of which the angel there spoke.”⁴⁷

Translation: The First Passover

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses and Aaron in Egypt, saying, 2. “This will be the beginning of months for you [ὕμῖν ἀρχὴ μηνῶν]; it will be for you first in the months of the year [πρῶτός ἐστιν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς μηνσὶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ]. 3. Speak to all the congregation of the sons of Israel [πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν υἱῶν

⁴⁷ Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 222.

Ισραηλ], saying, ‘On the tenth of this month [δεκάτη τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου], let them, each person, take a sheep [πρόβατον] in accordance with paternal houses [κατ’ οἴκους πατριῶν], each person a sheep for each house [ἕκαστος πρόβατον κατ’ οἰκίαν]. 4. And, if those in the household are so few [ὀλιγοστοί] that they are not sufficient for a sheep [ὥστε μὴ ἰκανοὺς εἶναι εἰς πρόβατον], one will take with himself his nearby neighbor in accordance with the number of souls [κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ψυχῶν]; each person will reckon for himself what is sufficient for a sheep [ἕκαστος τὸ ἀρκοῦν αὐτῷ συναριθμήσεται εἰς πρόβατον]. 5. Your sheep will be perfect [τέλειον], a male that is a year old [ἄρσεν ἐνιαύσιον]; you will take it from the lambs and the kids. 6. And it will be for you preserved [διατετηρημένον] until the fourteenth of this month [ἕως τῆς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου], and all the multitude of the gathering of the sons of Israel will slaughter it [σφάζουσιν αὐτό] at evening [πρὸς ἑσπέραν]. 7. And they shall take from the blood [λήμψονται ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος], and they will set it upon the two doorposts and upon the lintel in whichever of the homes they eat [ἐν οἷς ἐὰν φάγωσιν αὐτὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς]. 8. And they will eat the flesh on this night, roasted in fire [ὄπτα πυρί], and they will eat unleavened bread with bitter herbs [ἄζυμα ἐπὶ πικρίδων ἔδονται]. 9. You shall not eat from it raw [ὠμόν] or boiled in water but, rather, roasted in fire, the head with the feet and the entrails. 10. You will not leave anything from it until morning [οὐκ ἀπολείψετε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἕως πρωῒ], and you will not break a bone from it [ὄστον οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ], and that which is left over from it until morning [τὰ καταλειπόμενα ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἕως πρωῒ] you will burn with fire.

11. In the following manner you will eat it [οὕτως φάγεσθε αὐτό]: your loins girded [αἰ ὀσφύες ὑμῶν περιεζωσμένοι], sandals upon your feet [τὰ ὑποδήματα ἐν τοῖς ποσίν ὑμῶν], and staffs in your hands [αἰ βακτηρία ἐν ταῖς χερσίν ὑμῶν], and you will eat it with haste [μετὰ σπουδῆς]. It is a Passover for the Lord [πασχα ἐστὶν κυρίῳ]. 12. And I will pass through the land of Egypt [διελεύσομαι ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ] on this night, and I will strike down every firstborn in the land of Egypt [πατάξω πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ], from human being to animal, and upon all the gods of the Egyptians I will execute vengeance [ποιήσω τὴν ἐκδίκησιν]. I am the Lord [ἐγὼ κύριος]. 13. And the blood will be a sign for you [τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐν σημείῳ] upon the homes where you are, and I will see the blood [ὄψομαι τὸ αἷμα], and I will protect you [σκεπάσω ὑμᾶς], and there will not be among you a blow that destroys [οὐκ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῶν πληγὴ τοῦ ἐκτριβῆναι], whenever I strike in the land of Egypt [ὅταν παίω ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ].

14. And this day will be for you a memorial [μνημόσυνον], and you shall celebrate it as a feast for the Lord through all your generations [ἐορτάσετε αὐτὴν ἐορτὴν κυρίῳ εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν]; you shall celebrate it as an eternal precept [νόμιμον αἰώνιον]. 15. Seven days you will eat unleavened bread [ἄζυμα], and from the first day you will remove leaven from your homes [ἀφανιεῖτε ζύμην ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν ὑμῶν]. Everyone, whoever eats leaven [πᾶς ὃς ἂν φάγη ζύμην], that soul will be utterly destroyed

[ἐξολεθρευθήσεται] from Israel, from the first day until the seventh day [ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς πρώτης ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἐβδόμης]. 16. And the first day will be called holy [κληθήσεται ἁγία], and the seventh day will be called holy [κλητὴ ἁγία] for you. You will not do any servile work [πᾶν ἔργον λατρευτὸν] on them except so many things as must be done by every person [ὅσα ποιηθήσεται πάση ψυχῇ]; this alone will be done by you. 17. And you will guard this commandment, for on this day I will lead out your host from the land of Egypt [ἐξάξω τὴν δύναμιν ὑμῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου], and you will keep this day throughout your generations as an eternal precept [νόμιμον αἰώνιον]. 18. Beginning on the fourteenth day of the first month [τῇ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ πρώτου], from evening you shall eat unleavened bread until the evening of the twenty-first day [ἕως ἡμέρας μιᾶς καὶ εἰκάδος]. 19. For seven days leaven will not be found in your homes [ζύμη οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις ὑμῶν]; whosoever eats [something] leavened, that soul will be utterly destroyed from the congregation of Israel [ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ συναγωγῆς Ἰσραὴλ], both amongst the sojourners [ἐν τοῖς γειώραις] and those born of the land [αὐτόχθοσιν τῆς γῆς]. 20. You will not eat anything leavened, and in every one of your dwelling places you will eat unleavened bread [ἄζυμα].”

21. Moses called the whole elder council of the children of Israel and he said to them, “Upon leaving, take for yourselves a lamb [πρόβατον] for each of your families [κατὰ συγγενείας ὑμῶν], and sacrifice the Passover [θύσατε τὸ πασχα].”⁴⁸

⁴⁸ 1. Αἰγύπτῳ εἶπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν καὶ Ααρων ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου λέγων 2. ὁ μὴν οὗτος ὑμῖν ἀρχὴ μηνῶν πρῶτος ἐστὶν ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς μηνσὶν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ. 3. λάλησον πρὸς πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ λέγων τῇ δεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου λαβέτωσαν ἕκαστος πρόβατον κατ’ οἴκους πατριῶν ἕκαστος πρόβατον κατ’ οἰκίαν. 4. ἐὰν δὲ ὀλιγοστοὶ ᾧσιν οἱ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ὥστε μὴ ἰκανοὺς εἶναι εἰς πρόβατον συλλήμψεται μεθ’ ἑαυτοῦ τὸν γείτονα τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ψυχῶν ἕκαστος τὸ ἀρκοῦν αὐτῷ συναριθμήσεται εἰς πρόβατον. 5. πρόβατον τέλειον ἄρσεν ἐνιαύσιον ἔσται ὑμῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρίφων λήμψεσθε 6. καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν διατετηρημένον ἕως τῆς τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου καὶ σφάζουσιν αὐτὸ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος συναγωγῆς υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς ἐσπέραν 7. καὶ λήμψονται ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος καὶ θήσουσιν ἐπὶ τῶν δύο σταθμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν φλὴν ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις ἐν οἷς ἐὰν φάγωσιν αὐτὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς 8. καὶ φάγονται τὰ κρέα τῆ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ὅπτα πυρὶ καὶ ἄζυμα ἐπὶ πικρίδων ἔδονται. 9. οὐκ ἔδεσθε ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὠμὸν οὐδὲ ἠψημένον ἐν ὕδατι ἀλλ’ ἢ ὅπτα πυρὶ κεφαλὴν σὺν τοῖς ποσὶν καὶ τοῖς ἐνδοσθίοις. 10. οὐκ ἀπολείπετε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἕως πρωὶ καὶ ὄστον οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τὰ δὲ καταλειπόμενα ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἕως πρωὶ ἐν πυρὶ κατακαύσετε. 11. οὕτως δὲ φάγεσθε αὐτὸ αἰ ὀσφύες ὑμῶν περιεζωσμένοι καὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ βακτηρίαι ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἔδεσθε αὐτὸ μετὰ σπουδῆς πασχα ἐστὶν κυρίῳ 12. καὶ διελεύσομαι ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ καὶ πατάξω πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ποιήσω τὴν ἐκδίκησιν ἐγὼ κύριος. 13. καὶ ἔσται τὸ αἷμα ὑμῖν ἐν σημεῖῳ ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκιῶν ἐν αἷς ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐκεῖ καὶ ὄψομαι τὸ αἷμα καὶ σκεπάσω ὑμᾶς καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν πληγὴ τοῦ ἐκτριβῆναι

The clearest reference to Christ as Passover Lamb in Paul’s letters comes at 1 Cor 5:7, where Paul says, “Christ, our Passover [τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν] has been sacrificed [ἐτύθη]” (see Ex 12:21: “Sacrifice the Passover” [θύσατε τὸ πασχα]). These words are spoken in the course of Paul’s attempt to correct what he considers a particularly dangerous type of aberrant behavior within the Corinthian church: sexual malfeasance (πορνεία [1 Cor 5:1a]). One of the believers is sleeping with his own stepmother (“someone has the wife of his father [γυναϊκά τινα τοῦ πατρὸς]” [1 Cor 5:1b]).⁴⁹ Equally problematic, the community has arrogantly condoned this

ὅταν παῖω ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτω. 14. καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἡμέρα ὑμῶν αὕτη μνημόσυνον καὶ ἐορτάσετε αὐτὴν ἐορτὴν κυρίω εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν νόμιμον αἰώνιον ἐορτάσετε αὐτήν 15. ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἄζυμα ἔδεσθε ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς πρώτης ἀφανιεῖτε ζύμην ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν ὑμῶν πᾶς ὃς ἂν φάγη ζύμην ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκεῖνη ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς πρώτης ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἑβδόμης 16. καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ πρώτη κληθήσεται ἁγία καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἑβδόμη κλητὴ ἁγία ἔσται ὑμῶν πᾶν ἔργον λατρευτὸν οὐ ποιήσετε ἐν αὐταῖς πλὴν ὅσα ποιηθήσεται πάση ψυχῇ τοῦτο μόνον ποιηθήσεται ὑμῶν 17. καὶ φυλάξεσθε τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ἐξάξω τὴν δύναμιν ὑμῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου καὶ ποιήσετε τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην εἰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν νόμιμον αἰώνιον. 18. ἐναρχομένου τῆ τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ πρώτου ἀφ’ ἑσπέρας ἔδεσθε ἄζυμα ἕως ἡμέρας μιᾶς καὶ εἰκάδος τοῦ μηνὸς ἕως ἑσπέρας 19. ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ζύμη οὐχ εὑρεθήσεται ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις ὑμῶν πᾶς ὃς ἂν φάγη ζυμωτὸν ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκεῖνη ἐκ συναγωγῆς Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τε τοῖς γειώραις καὶ αὐτόχθοσιν τῆς γῆς. 20. πᾶν ζυμωτὸν οὐκ ἔδεσθε ἐν παντὶ δὲ κατοικητηρίω ὑμῶν ἔδεσθε ἄζυμα. 21. ἐκάλεσεν δὲ Μωϋσῆς πᾶσαν γερούσιαν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀπελθόντες λάβετε ὑμῶν ἑαυτοῖς πρόβατον κατὰ συγγενείας ὑμῶν καὶ θύσατε τὸ πασχα

⁴⁹ As commentators rightly note, it is improbable that Paul is here referring to a concubine. Because prostitution was not illegal in the ancient world, Paul’s statement that the type of sexual malfeasance under discussion is something that does not even occur among the Gentiles (καὶ τοιαύτη πορνεία ἤτις οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν [1 Cor 5:1]) must have a different referent. Intercourse with one’s mother or stepmother was universally prohibited. In the early third century C.E., Aelian notes that even beasts do not willingly copulate with their own mothers (*De natura animalium*, 3.47), while the second century C.E. Roman jurist, Gaius, says the following about marrying one’s stepmother: “moreover, it is not permitted to take a wife who was for me, at one time, a mother-in-law or daughter-in-law or stepdaughter or stepmother [*nouerca*]” (*Item [uxorem ducere non licet] quae mihi quondam socrus aut nurus aut priuigna aut nouerca fuit. [Institutiones 1.63; see also Inst. 1.59 for his prohibition of marriage between direct biological relations]*). Alternatively, in Jewish thought, the prohibition against sexual intercourse with one’s mother or stepmother is articulated explicitly at Lev 18:17-8 (“You shall not reveal the shame [i.e. nakedness] of your mother [ἀσχημοσύνην μητρός]...you shall not reveal the shame of your father’s wife [ἀσχημοσύνην γυναικὸς πατρός σου])

action (they have become “puffed up [πεφυσιωμένοι]” [1 Cor 5:2]).⁵⁰ After Paul provides an unequivocal judgment on the matter—“hand this man over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh [εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός] so that the Spirit might be saved [τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῆ] on the day of the Lord” (1 Cor 5:5)⁵¹—he makes a transition into Paschal imagery:

6. Your boasting [τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν] is not a good thing. Do you not know that a little leaven [μικρὰ ζύμη] leavens the whole lump [τὸ φύραμα]? 7. Clean out [ἐκκαθάρατε] the old leaven [τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην] in order that you become a new lump [νέον φύραμα], as you really are unleavened [ἄζυμοι]. For Christ, our Passover [τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν], has been sacrificed [ἐτύθη]. 8. So let us celebrate [ἐορτάζωμεν] not with old leaven [ἐν ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ], nor leaven of evil and wickedness [ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας], but with unleavened bread of sincerity and truth [ἐν ἄζυμοῖς εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας] (1 Cor 5:6-8).

This excerpt is replete with references to, or assumptions about, the Passover celebration.

Beyond the obvious use of *πάσχα*, the Corinthians are called to “celebrate” (ἐορτάζω) with unleavened bread, as are the Israelites (Ex 12:14-15), and the idea that the old leaven must be

and Deut 27:20 (“Cursed is the one who lies with his father’s wife” [ἐπικατάρατος ὁ κοιμώμενος μετὰ γυναῖκος τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ]). For good discussions of the *πορνεία* that is occurring amongst the Corinthian community, see Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 385-7; Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 233-5.

⁵⁰ Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 229 suggests that this is, in fact, the larger problem: “[Paul] is annoyed that the Corinthian Christian church has tolerated such a situation in its midst. Paul is not reacting so much against what the individual Corinthian Christian has done as against the image that the Corinthian community is projecting on itself.” See also Michel Quesnel, *La première épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2018), 124.

⁵¹ What Paul means by “the Spirit might be saved [τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῆ]” is debated. On the one hand, it could refer to the Spirit of the individual (Malina and Pilch, *Letters of Paul*, 80; Witherington III, *Conflict and Community*, 158-9; Calvin J. Roetzel, *Judgment in the Community: a Study of the Relationship between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul* [Leiden: Brill, 1972], 115-16). On the other, it could refer to the Spirit of the community (Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 239-40; Collins, *Corinthians*, 212-13; Dale Martin, *The Corinthian Body* [New Haven: Yale University Press], 168-174). Given that Paul will quickly turn his attention to the effects that sexual malfeasance has on the community as a whole (1 Cor 5:6-8), the latter interpretation is perhaps the more likely. In the end, however, I agree with those who emphasize that both the preservation of the community *and* the salvation of the individual are in view. τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῆ encloses both the semantic possibilities (for good discussions, see Garland, *Corinthians*, 169-77, esp. 174-7; Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 395-400).

“cleaned out” (ἐκκαθαίρω) is precisely what the Passover celebration accomplishes (see Ex 12:19).⁵² Indeed, so evident is the overlap that, when coupled with Paul’s “I will come to you soon” (ἐλεύσομαι δὲ ταχέως πρὸς ὑμᾶς [1 Cor 4:19]) and his statement that, “I will remain in Ephesus until Pentecost” (ἐπιμενῶ δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς [1 Cor 16:8]), some have suggested that Paul may have written his letter during the Passover season.⁵³

Regardless of when in the year one places the composition of Paul’s letter, it is clear that Paul is here using the Passover lamb as a type of Christ’s death. Just as the blood of the Passover sacrifice, when splashed upon the doorposts and lintels of the Israelite homes (Ex 12:7, 13, 22-3), protects the Jewish people from the destroyer and grants them freedom from bondage in Egypt (Ex 12:17, 31-2), so too does the blood of Christ, poured out upon the cross, grant access to freedom from the bondage of sin and death for all who were once enslaved to it (Rom 6:20; see also 1 Cor 7:22-23). Though the procedure may be inverted—that is, the Israelites have to clean out leaven from their homes in order to celebrate the Passover, while, for the Corinthians, the sacrifice has already been completed, and the unleavened Corinthians are called to clean out any fresh corrupting influences⁵⁴—it is nevertheless clear that Paul sees in the Passover of Ex 12 Christ’s death on the cross prefigured. In a manner analogous to the Israelite’s wilderness experiences prefiguring the situation of the Corinthian community (see 1 Cor 10:1-13; comp. Ex

⁵² Leaven is not the same thing as yeast. Rather, a piece of dough was held over from one week’s baking to the next. It was then stored away in fermenting juices and used in the new dough as a rising agent. This practice ran the risk of contamination, however, as bacteria and disease could be passed on from week to week. Part of Passover’s purpose, then, was to begin the cycle all over again with fresh, unleavened bread (for further discussion, see Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 400-1, Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 240-41).

⁵³ So Klauck, *1 Korintherbrief*, 43; see also Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 407-8. For a more recent argument, see Michael A. Daise, “‘Christ Our Passover’ (1 Corinthians 5:6-8): The Death of Jesus and the Quartodeciman Pascha,” *Neot* 50.2 (2016), 507-526, esp. 517-520.

⁵⁴ Astutely noted by Fitzmyer, *Corinthians*, 241-2.

13:21; 14:21-31; 16:4, 14-18; 17:6; 32:6; Num 20:7-13; 25:9; etc.), that which was a salvific event for one nation, in its performance in Paul's lifetime, has become a salvific event for all.

To conclude: the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53, the Aqedah of Genesis 22, and the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb in Exodus 12 are all scriptural prefigurations of Jesus' death for Paul. They proleptically manifest for the believing community the salvific crucifixion of the messiah. Paul presumes these types, and he alludes to them in the course of his arguments without ever fully explicating their significance. A few logical inferences can be made on the basis of these conclusions. First, presuming these passages form a part of a network of interconnected scriptural witnesses that Paul shares with his communities (thus his ability to assume their knowledge), the allusions Paul makes in the composition of his letters are recognizable *because* the passages under discussion are performed in early communal worship.⁵⁵ There was no written gospel in Paul's day; instead, scripture was read, and the (oral) story of Christ's death was discussed and interpreted in light of it. Second, though Hays rightly suggests that Paul's reading of scripture is primarily ecclesiological, it is nevertheless also Christological in the broader sense that all scripture points to or anticipates the Christ event and realities subsequent to it. To understand scripture properly requires reading it in light of the story of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ that occurs "in accordance with the scriptures" (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς [1 Cor 15:3, 4]). Thus, these scriptural types are necessarily synecdochical: they require the full recollection of the gospel plot to be understood fully. Third and finally, in light of my arguments in the previous chapters, together with the fact that the recitation of scripture in the

⁵⁵ On the communal performance of texts generally in the ancient world, see Pieter J.J. Botha, *Orality and Literacy in Early Christianity* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2012), 89-112. On the possible means by which scripture was performed in early Christian worship, see Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 224-231.

ancient world is thought to have had a “numinous” quality,⁵⁶ it can be hypothesized that, in the synecdochical evocation of the whole through the performance of one of its parts, Paul believes that an epiphanic encounter with the deity takes place. The reading of scripture in a Pauline community, as baptism or the consumption of the Eucharist, is presumed to be an epiphanic experience.

Part II: Scriptural Prefigurations of Jesus’ Death in Mark

In what follows, I will argue that, as with Paul, three essential prefigurations of Christ’s death upon which the Markan narrative is constructed are the Suffering Servant of Isa 53, the Aqedah of Gen 22, and the Paschal sacrifice of Ex 12. For Mark, these texts serve as scriptural witnesses to, and proleptic manifestations of, the crucifixion of the messiah. At the same time, because scripture is interpreted through the lens of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (see Mk 8:31: “it is necessary [δεῖ]”⁵⁷), these stories are synecdochical. In the (re)presentation of one

⁵⁶ This is the language of Richard A. Horsley, *Text and Tradition in Performance and Writing* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2013), 5-7, 38-42. In their discussion of the difference between the prophet and the scribe, William Doan and Terry Giles (*Prophets, Performance, and Power: Performance Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* [New York: T&T Clark, 2006], 29) make the following incisive suggestion: “The prophet *himself* was the presence through which God appeared to the people of Israel. This was more than a linguistic moment; it was a moment of full sensory engagement for both the prophet and the spectators. The scribe, both as writer and speaker of the prophetic text, cannot create that moment. He must impersonate the prophet by creating the prophetic character, in order to create the illusion of the prophetic experience. In this sense he creates the prophetic drama. He impersonates the prophet in order to bring forth the presence of God. Though the scribe writes, ‘Thus says the LORD,’ his words are meant to be spoken and heard; the prophet is brought forth so that God can be made present” (emphasis original; see also their discussion of “scribe as performer” at 30-33). This understanding of the scribal activity nicely reflects my claim. The reading of scripture in the ancient world is not solely for the purposes of instruction or entertainment; in the act of its performance, the presence of the deity is elicited, and, in the act of listening, the audience is made to experience it.

⁵⁷ Recently, Peter-Ben Smit (“Questioning Divine δεῖ: On Allowing Texts *not* to Say Everything” *NovT* 61 [2019], 40-54) has sought to challenge the consensus that “it is necessary” (δεῖ) refers to God’s predetermined plan for

type (τύπος) or the other, the passion of Jesus and the whole remainder of salvation history is brought before the eye of the viewer.

It has long been recognized that Jesus' mission statement at Mk 10:45 alludes to the story of the suffering servant of Isa 53.⁵⁸ Jesus' claim that, "the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve [διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι], and to give his life [δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ] as a ransom for many [λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν]," bears close conceptual similarity to Isaiah 53:12:

For this reason he will inherit many and he will divide the spoils of the strong,
because [ἀνθ' ὧν] his life [ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ] was handed over unto death
[παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον], and he was reckoned amongst the lawless [ἐν τοῖς

salvation that is mapped out within scripture in the Gospel of Mark. He argues that such a reading goes beyond what the text itself indicates (49). His argument, however, contains some logical difficulties and self-contradictions. Smit suggests that, if a statement of necessity such as that found in Mk 8:31 is a post-Easter formulation, "it becomes more attractive to view δεῖ as an indication of a divine plan that, having been unrolled now, can be seen in retrospect and Jesus can be made to speak accordingly" (50). But the Gospel of Mark *is* a post-Easter narrative. Though the traditions Mark incorporates and adapts may predate him, they are all read in light of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. One cannot know what the historical Jesus meant when (or if) he made a statement like "it is necessary that the Son of Man suffer greatly..." (Mk 8:31), but, for the evangelist and his audience who are reflecting on the significance of the Christ event well after the fact, it almost certainly would have evoked God's divine plan. Indeed, when one looks at the other evidence that the Gospel of Mark provides, an interpretation of this sort is confirmed. France (*Mark*, 334), in speaking about Mk 8:31, rightly notes that "The basis for this necessity (δεῖ) is not spelled out here, but in 9:12; 14:21, 49 it is traced explicitly to what 'is written', and the same thought surely underlies this and Jesus' other predictions of his passion." (Interestingly, this passage is quoted by Smit [pg. 49, n. 35], but it is quickly dismissed on the grounds that "France does not comment on the occurrence of δεῖ in chs. 9 and 13 of Mark.") Taking one of France's examples, Jesus says at Mk 14:21, "The Son of Man goes just as it is written concerning him [καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ], but woe to that man through whom [δι' οὗ] the Son of Man is handed over [παραδίδοται]. It would be better for that man if he had not been born." The death of Jesus is here clearly in view, signaled by Mark's use of παραδίδοται (see also παραδίδοται in Mk 9:31; παραδοθήσεται/παραδώσουσιν in Mk 10:33). More important, Jesus' "handing over" is explicitly related to scriptural fulfillment ("The Son of Man goes *just as it is written* concerning him [καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ]"). Smit is certainly correct to caution against narrowly reading all uses of δεῖ in Mark as conveying divine necessity, but this should not be taken to mean that Mark does *not* use δεῖ in this way. When one considers the broader evidence that Mark's gospel provides, it seems that the opposite is the case.

⁵⁸ For bibliography, see Chapter III, note 34.

ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη]. And he himself took up [ἀνήνεγκεν] the sins of many [ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν], and, for the sake of their sins [διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν], he was handed over [παρεδόθη].

To be sure, there are scholars who argue that Isa 53 neither stands behind Mk 10:45 nor the gospel narrative more broadly, but their arguments place undue weight on the lack of explicit verbal parallels between Mark 10:45 and Isaiah 53:12, or they read the passage too narrowly within its immediate literary context (or both).⁵⁹ Mk 10:45 is a summary of Jesus' purpose on earth, and the gospel of Mark, *as a whole*, is the story of Mk 10:45. The sentence stands in a synecdochical relationship to the whole narrative. In order to determine whether Isa 53 functions as a typological backdrop to Mark's gospel, one must investigate whether the Markan narrative broadly reflects the literary contours of the fourth Servant Song. As I will demonstrate below, this can be answered in the affirmative.

First, both the Gospel of Mark and Isa 53 presume an encounter with Gentile nations. Isa 52:15a says, “Many nations [ἔθνη πολλά] will marvel [θαυμάσονται] at him,” while Mk 13:10 says, “It is necessary [δεῖ] that the gospel first be proclaimed [κηρυχθῆναι] to all the nations [εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη].” Isaiah, as scripture, anticipates the mission that Mark assumes must occur in accordance with scripture. The prophet then goes on to say that those, “to whom it has not been proclaimed concerning him [οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ], will see [ὄψονται],” and “those who have not heard [οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν] will understand [συνήσουσιν]” (Isa 52:15b). The dénouement of the theme of misunderstanding in Mark's gospel (encapsulated in Mark's paraphrase of Isa 6:9-10—“so that seeing they might see and not perceive [βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν], and hearing they might hear and not comprehend [ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν], lest they turn and it be

⁵⁹ See, for example, Morna Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament* (London: S.P.C.K., 1959), 62-102, esp. 74-9. See also Barrett, “The Background to Mark 10:45,” 1-18; Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 86-7.

forgiven them” [Mk 4:12; comp Isa 6:9-10; see also Mk 6:42; 7:14, 18; 8:17, 21; etc.]—is thus anticipated in the fourth Servant Song. For Mark, human misunderstanding is only resolved after the messiah’s death and resurrection (see Mk 14:28; 16:7) wherein full comprehension of these events (see Mk 9:9-10), together with Jesus’ purpose on earth (Mk 10:45), is finally attained (cf. Mk 8:31-8). It is no coincidence that Christological comprehension coincides with the commission to the Gentile nations (Mk 13:10), which formally begins (i.e. as an institutional program facilitated by early missionaries) after Jesus’ expiration. For an interpreter like Mark, Isaiah’s story of the suffering servant affirms that it is only in the wake of the messiah’s suffering and violent death that the nations will see and understand. In other words, the mission to the Gentiles, as an activity that entails the proclamation of Jesus Christ *crucified*, finds its scriptural warrant in the servant of Isa 53. It is proof that the death of Christ and the mission to the Gentile nations is “necessary” (δεῖ).

Second, Isaiah’s insistence that the Servant is “handed over” (παραδίδωμι) for the sake of the sins of others⁶⁰—both actively (“The Lord [κύριος] handed him over for our sins [παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν]” [Isa 53:6]) and passively (“...because his soul was handed over to death [παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον]... “for the sake of their sins [διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν] he was handed over [παρεδόθη]” [Isa 53:12])—is pervasively represented in Mark’s gospel.⁶¹ Mark, like

⁶⁰ As I argued in regards to Paul earlier in this chapter (Part I, note 24), I do not take the objective and causal translations of *διὰ* to be mutually exclusive. Mark most likely imagines that Jesus Christ both dies “because of” the sins of humanity and “for” the sins of humanity. Indeed, both senses are implied in Mark’s use of “ransom” (λύτρον [Mk 10:45]). The “ransom” is that which is paid to redeem someone or something from debt (that is its *purpose*), but it would not need to be paid at all if the debt had not been accrued in the first place (it is paid *because* of the debt). For a good discussion of *λύτρον*, see Collins, *Mark*, 500-504. Mark’s awareness that *διὰ* is multivalent is additionally suggested by the fact that he uses the preposition to express both causality (eg. Mk 2:4; 6:14) and purpose (e.g. Mk 2:27; 13:20) at different points in his narrative.

⁶¹ On the centrality of the forgiveness of sins in Mark, see Mk 1:4-5; 2:1-12; 10:45; 14:24.

Isaiah, represents Jesus’ “handing over” in the active (Mk 3:19; 10:33; 14:10-11, 18; 21, 42, 44; 15:1, 10, 15) and in the passive (Mk 9:31; 10:33; 14:21). Moreover, Mark not only affirms Isaiah’s attribution of the servant’s “handing over” to God (Isa 53:6), but he clarifies the ambiguous roles that human beings appear to play in that process (see Isa 52:14; 53:5, 7, 9). Because Mark takes the messiah’s death to be anticipated in scripture, ultimate responsibility for it rests with the deity (see Mk 14:21: “just as it is written [καθὼς γέγραπται] concerning him...the Son of Man is handed over [παραδίδοται]”). Yet, because Mark’s story tells the earthly mission of the Jewish savior of the world, a figure whose death occurs within a human sphere of activity that includes individual persons, communities, and institutions, he fills out Isaiah’s suggested but undetermined roles for human agents (see Judas [Mk 3:19; 14:10-11, 18, 42, 44]; the ruling authorities [Mk 15:1, 10, 15]).⁶² Jesus Christ, savior of the human race who dies for the forgiveness of sins, is thus handed over actively and passively, by human beings and by God. For Mark, Isa 53 again serves as scriptural proof that Jesus’ death for the forgiveness of sin was “necessary” (δεῖ).

Finally, it is regularly noted that Jesus’ silence before the chief priests and Sanhedrin during the first trial scene of Mk 14:55-65 (“And he was silent [ἔσιώπα] and saying nothing [οὐκ ἀπεκρίνατο οὐδέν]” [Mk 14:61; see also Mk 15:5]) may echo Isa 53:7: “And he, because of his

⁶² This fact raises questions about the historical existence of Judas. Paul regularly ascribes Jesus’ death to God rather than human beings (Rom 4:25; 8:32; 1 Cor 11:23 [?]; cf. Gal 2:20, which describes Jesus as giving *himself* up: “...the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me [παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ]”). A possible exception may be found in 1 Thess 2:14-16, but this passage is often considered an interpolation (see Birger A. Pearson, “1 Thessalonians 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation,” *HTR* 64 (1971) 79-94). Given that Paul may be unaware of the figure of Judas (he refers to the apostles as “the twelve” [1 Cor 15:5], and he gives no indication that one of the members may have been replaced [cf. Acts 1:12-26]), the question of whether or not Judas is a fictional creation on the part of Mark must remain open.

mistreatment [διὰ τὸ κεκακῶσθαι], does not open his mouth [οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ]... as a lamb is silent before its shearer [ὡς ἄμνὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφρονος], he does not open his mouth [οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ].”⁶³ What is not often perceived, however, is the larger thematic mapping of the trial of Mk 14 onto Isa 53.

In describing the events leading up to Jesus’ execution, Mark is careful to highlight the centrality of deceit (δόλος; see Mk 14:1: “And the chief priests and scribes were seeking how, once they had caught him by deceit [αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες], they might kill him”). The deceit by which the authorities seek to destroy Jesus is a consistent theme throughout chapter 14 (see Mk 14:1-2, 10-11, 18-20, 44), and it recurs in the false testimony brought against Jesus by the chief priests and Sanhedrin at his first trial (Mk 14:55-59). After Jesus’ (apparent) silence during their lies and the High Priest’s initial line of inquiry (Mk 14:60-61), Jesus finally responds to the question of his messianic status with a striking declaration, “I am [ἐγὼ εἰμι]” (Mk 14:62), a possible signal of his divine status (comp. Ex 3:14; see also Gen 17:1; 31:13; Ex 3:6; etc.).⁶⁴

⁶³ See, for example, Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983), 148-151; see also Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1004; Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 422; Gnllka, *Markus*, 2.281. (For his part, Focant, *Marc*, 567 hears the echo of the Servant’s silence at Mk 15:5, where it also fits.) Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 86 counters claims that the silence of the suffering servant is heard in Mark by suggesting that, “any possible parallel is compromised by the fact that as the scene unfolds, Jesus *does* speak emphatically in the very next verse, declaring himself to be the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One and the Son of Man who will be seated in glory at the right hand of God (Mk 14:62).” This reading, however, does not take into consideration the iterative nature of the imperfects (ἐσιώπα; ἀπεκρίνατο), which suggests an extended period of silence. Moreover, it is a highly literalist reading of the narrative context (surprising, given the body of work of the exegete who makes the claim!), and one that does not sufficiently address the question of whether or not there are additional echoes of Isa 53 in this scene that might facilitate such an association.

⁶⁴ Commentators generally do not go so far as to see Jesus’ statement as an unqualified assertion of his divinity (see, for example, Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 423; Moloney, *Mark*, 304 n.144; Collins, *Mark*, 704 n.60), though it must remain a possibility. For an entirely different reading of the passage, see Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1005-1006.

Whereas the witnesses have lied about what Jesus has done so as to foreshadow what will occur (the destruction and resurrection of his body after three days [Mk 14:58]), Jesus (finally) speaks the unadulterated truth about his messianic status (he is the Christ, the Son of God, who will sit at the right hand of the deity and will return with the clouds of heaven [Mk 14:61-2]) to persons who are all but guaranteed to take him for a liar. The scene is masterfully ironic, and it draws on the fourth Servant Song for more than just the silence motif. At Isa 53:9, the prophet claims that the servant is without deceit (δόλος): “nor was any deceit discovered in his mouth [οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ].” When coupled with Isaiah’s prediction that the wicked and powerful will take a central role in the servant’s death (“and I will put the wicked opposite his tomb [δώσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταφῆς αὐτοῦ] and the wealthy opposite his death [τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου]” [Isa 53:9]), which results in his being “reckoned amongst the lawless” (ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη [Isa 53:12]), there is strong reason to believe that more of Isa 53 stands behind Jesus’ trial(s) than has heretofore been noticed. Jesus is famously counted amongst the lawless (he is associated with Barabbas, an “insurrectionist” [στασιαστής; Mk 15:7], and he is crucified with two “brigands” [λησταί; Mk 15:27]),⁶⁵ and those who are responsible for the crucifixion are the wicked and wealthy ruling classes of Palestine (the chief priests and Sanhedrin [Mk 14:55]; the scribes and council of elders [Mk 15:1], Pilate [Mk 15:15]; the soldiery of the praetorium [Mk 15:16]; etc.). That which Isa 53 predicts in general terms, Mark weaves into his story and fleshes out with specific details.

Of course, Isa 53 is not the only scriptural prefiguration of the death of Christ in Mark. An equally important witness is the Aqedah of Gen 22. In chapter two of this dissertation, I argued that a verbal echo of the binding of Isaac is present in Jesus’ baptism. I suggested that

⁶⁵ On the meanings of these terms, see Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1029-30 and 1043-4.

God’s words, “You are my son [σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου], the beloved [ὁ ἀγαπητός], in you I am well pleased [ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα]” (Mk 1:11) not only recalls Ps 2:7; they recall Gen 22:2. There, God says, “Take your son [λαβὲ τὸν υἱόν σου], the beloved [τὸν ἀγαπητόν], whom you love [ὄν ἠγάπησας].”⁶⁶ Through the self-conscious connection of “beloved” (ἀγαπητός) with “son” (υἱός), Mark evokes the entirety of the Aqedah by way of synecdoche. In so doing, Mark invites his audience to read his story of the mission and death of Jesus Christ in light of Gen 22 (see also Mk 12:6-9),⁶⁷ and, because Mark maps the sequence of events at Jesus’ death (Mk 15:37-9) upon

⁶⁶ See Chapter II, Part II for the full discussion.

⁶⁷ This invitation may find additional support in the episode that immediately follows Jesus’ baptism in the Jordan river. After Jesus is identified as the beloved son (Mk 1:11), he is cast out (ἐκβάλλει) into the wilderness (Mk 1:12). There, he spends the next 40 days of his life, tested continuously (πειραζόμενος) by the devil (Mk 1:13). For its part, the Aqedah opens as follows: “And it came to pass after these things [that] God tested [ἐπείραζεν] Abraham...” (καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ὁ θεὸς ἐπείραζεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ.... [Gen 22:1]). To be sure, the primary biblical model for Jesus’ wilderness testing is Adam, who was tempted by the serpent, found disobedient to God, and expelled from Paradise (see Joel Marcus, “Son of Man as Son of Adam,” *Revue Biblique* 110 [2003], 55-6, 371-7; see also idem, *Mark 1-8*, 167-71; Collins, *Mark*, 153; France, *Mark*, 85-7; Haenchen, *Weg*, 64-5; cf. Boring, *Mark*, 47-8). Yet the first use of “test” (πειράζω) in the Septuagint occurs at Gen 22:1. Though the primary purpose of Jesus’ temptation in the wilderness is to replay and overturn Adam’s initial disobedience in order to prepare the way for his trials and victory yet to come, the evangelist’s choice to use the participle πειραζόμενος (“being tested”) invites his audience to recall the binding of Isaac. πειραζόμενος, like “you are my son, the beloved” (σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός), is doubly allusive. It is an accurate description of Adam’s and Eve’s experience in the garden (though nowhere is the word used in that story), and it evokes God’s first explicit “test” in the scriptures—Abraham’s commanded immolation of his beloved son. Because the story does not end with Christ’s victory over Satan at Mk 1:12-13, Mark’s audience is called to look beyond it, to that which will be Christ’s final victory: his death and resurrection upon the cross.

On this reading, one cannot help but wonder whether Mark, like Paul, takes “death” to be a hypostasized entity that must be defeated (see 1 Cor 15:26: “The last enemy [ἔσχατος ἐχθρός], death [ὁ θάνατος], is abolished [καταργεῖται]). Rhoads et al. understand Mk 1:12-13 as follows: “The resolution of the conflict with Satan occurs in the testing at the beginning of the story. While there are escalations within specific episodes of exorcism, there is no developing conflict with the demons across the story. Subsequent exorcisms are simply a consequence of the initial resolution, a mopping-up operation. Thus in Mark’s depiction, Satan is not the last enemy to be defeated but the first” (*Mark as Story*, 82-83). If Satan is the “first” enemy to be defeated in Mark’s gospel, is death the last?

the baptismal sequence (Mk 1:9-11),⁶⁸ the Aqedah, recalled at Mk 1:11, logically stands in the background of Mk 15:37-9, as well.

That said, unlike Isaac's binding, Jesus' sacrifice is not aborted; it is carried through to the end. Mark's passion narrative is peppered with possible allusions to and reversals of the Aqedah,⁶⁹ but the most important occurs on the cross itself: Jesus *dies*. In the Genesis narrative, Abraham acts unhesitatingly to take the life of his son. He wordlessly comes to the allotted place, builds the altar, sets the wood upon it, binds the feet of Isaac, and takes the knife to slaughter his child (Gen 22:9-10). If the reader is to expect God's imminent intervention in the sacrifice (see Abraham's ironic statement, "God will see to the sheep for the whole burnt offering" [Gen 22:8]), the characters at the level of the story are not. That intervention does occur, however—"an angel of the Lord called him out from heaven and said to him, 'Abraham! Abraham!... Do not cast your hand against your little boy [τὸ παιδάριον]!'" (Gen 22:11-12)⁷⁰—and Abraham is informed that it is "because of" (οὗ ἕνεκεν [Gen 22:16]; ἀνθ' ὧν [Gen 22:18]) his obedient action that "all the nations of the earth will be blessed in your seed" (ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς [Gen 22:18]).

There may not be enough evidence to make a certain determination, but, at the least, there is nothing in Mark that precludes such a reading. This, in turn, may bring Mark close to Paul once again.

⁶⁸ See Chapter II, Part II.

⁶⁹ Possible reversals include the following: Abraham leaves dutiful servants to await his return (Gen 22:5, 19), but Christ's disciples turn and flee, and the reader is left to wonder about their ultimate fate (Mk 14:50; 16:7); Abraham and Isaac's purpose in their sacrifice is to render obeisance (προσκυνήσαντες) to God (Gen 22:5), but Christ, as sacrifice, is object of mock obeisance (προσεκύνουν) by the soldiers (Mk 15:19; see also Mk 14:65; 15:29-32); Isaac bears his own vehicle of sacrifice (Gen 22:6), but Christ is incapable of doing the same (Mk 15:21); etc.

⁷⁰ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀβρααμ Ἀβρααμ...μὴ ἐπιβάλῃς τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπὶ τὸ παιδάριον (Gen 22:11-12).

In the Markan crucifixion, one sees this scene inverted. The audience knows that there is to be no rescue from the cross—Mark has repeatedly made it clear that “it is necessary” (δεῖ [Mk 8:31]) that Christ die—but the witnesses within the story (mockingly?) expect an intervention of the sort that occurs in Gen 22. Immediately after Christ’s cry of dereliction (Mk 15:34; comp. Ps 22:2), Mark says,

And some of those who were standing there [τινες τῶν παρεστηκότων] when they heard, were saying, “Look! He calls Elijah [ἴδε Ἡλίαν φωνεῖ].” And someone, having run and filled a sponge with sour wine, after setting it upon a reed, was attempting to give him drink, saying, “Leave him [ἄφετε]!”⁷¹ Let us see if Elijah is coming to take him down [ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας καθελεῖν αὐτόν]” (Mk 15:35-6; see also Ps 69:22).⁷²

This expectation for aid is, of course, disappointed. In the very next verse, Mark’s audience is told that Jesus has died (“And Jesus, having let out a loud cry [ἄφεις φωνήν μεγάλην], breathed out his Spirit [ἐξέπνευσεν]” [Mk 15:37]), and the temple veil is rent in two (“the veil of the temple was torn in two [ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο] from top to bottom” [Mk 15:38]). This “rending” marks an epochal shift in salvation history. God’s presence ceases to be located in the temple and a new and universal access to redemption becomes available. Eugene Boring nicely

⁷¹ ἄφετε—the Greek here is famously problematic. I prefer the translation of France, *Mark*, 654 n.51, who concisely explains, “it is possible to take ἄφετε not as a request to leave Jesus alone but as introducing the deliberative subjunctive ἴδωμεν (so BDF, 364[2]) so that the whole phrase means ‘let us see’...though the only NT parallel to use ἀφίημι [in this way] is the singular ἄφες ἐκβάλω in Matt 7:4/Lk 6:42. Mark is certainly capable of redundancy, but where the imperative has an appropriate sense of its own in the context this interpretation seems unnecessary.” To further his point, though Matthew can use the word to introduce a deliberative subjunctive, in the Matthean parallel to Mk 15:35 (Matt 27:49), the first evangelist seems not to do so. Instead, he changes Mark’s text to have the crowds watching the crucifixion be the speakers, and he changes what is said to a second person singular (“And the remainder were saying, ‘leave him!’” [οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔλεγον· ἄφες...] [Matt 27:49]). Logically, then, the crowd seems to be trying to *stop* the one with the sponge from giving Jesus drink.

⁷² For discussions of the expectation of Elijah in Second Temple apocalyptic thought, see Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 644; cf. Collins, *Mark*, 4:29-30.

summarizes Mark's symbolism with the following words: "Jesus' death is the removal of a barrier, the opening of the way into God's presence for both Jews and Gentiles, as the eschatological temple not made by hands becomes a house of prayer for all nations."⁷³

If this reading is correct, the reprisal of the narrative of Isaac's slaughter is an essential component in Mark's justification for the Gentile mission. The death of the messiah fulfills that which was prefigured in the Abrahamic narrative: the blessing of all nations in Abraham's seed. For Mark, the promises of God that were originally gifted to Israel as a result of the near sacrifice of Isaac have become universalized through the death of God's own beloved child upon the cross. Fulfilling the sacrifice is the necessary modification of the type that results in the antitype's expansion to the Gentile nations. What was true of Paul is thus equally true of Mark: "the new aqedah, which is the crucifixion of Jesus, has definitively and irreversibly secured the blessings of which the angel there spoke."⁷⁴

Finally, as with the Aqedah and Isa 53, the slaughter of the Paschal lamb (Ex 12) also stands behind the crucifixion in the Gospel of Mark. To be sure, within the canonical gospels, it is John who most clearly maps Christ's sacrifice onto that of Ex 12.⁷⁵ (If the fourth evangelist

⁷³ Boring, *Mark*, 432. He continues: "Mark may have thought of this as a barrier being removed, so that Gentiles now have access to the presence of God...Alternatively, the tearing of the curtain may signal the departure of God from the earthly temple, which is no longer the place where Gentiles must seek God...In either case, the curtain is not so much to let people in *as to let God out*—the divine presence is not localized, either in an earthly holy place or in the heavens" (*Mark*, 432 [emphasis added]); see also Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1066-7; Focant, *Marc*, 583-4; Klaiber, *Markusevangelium*, 308.

⁷⁴ Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 222.

⁷⁵ Jesus is designated as the "Lamb of God" (ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ) at Jn 1:29, 36. The Last Supper takes place on the day *before* the Day of Preparation (it occurs "before the feast of the Passover [πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα]" [Jn 13:1]), rather than on it (see Mk 14:12). As with the Paschal lamb, Jesus dies prior to the official beginning of the holiday (see Jn 19:14, 31); and, in accordance with God's injunction at Ex 12:10, 46, none of Jesus' bones are broken ("These things occurred in order that scripture might be fulfilled [ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῆ]: 'his bone will not be

was familiar with the Gospel of Mark, however, it may be that he drew out and embellished the allusions to Passover he perceived in Mark's narrative.⁷⁶) Nevertheless, Mark also presumes that the Paschal sacrifice prefigures the death of Christ, an association first signaled through the evangelist's labeling Christ's death a "ransom for the many" (λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν [Mk 10:45]). In the Septuagint, the noun "ransom" (λύτρον) and its corresponding verb "to redeem" (λυτρόω) are regularly connected with the freeing of the Israelites from slavery in Egypt. Early in the Exodus narrative, for example, God commands Moses to "Go, speak to the children of Israel, saying, 'I am the Lord, and I will lead you from the tyranny of the Egyptians, and I will rescue you from slavery [ρύσομαι ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῆς δουλείας], and I will redeem [λυτρόσομαι] you with an uplifted arm and great judgment" (Ex. 6:6; see also Ex 15:13; Deut 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 15:15; 2 Sam 7:23; etc.). In response to this redemption, the Israelites are then obligated to sacrifice the firstborn male of all their flocks, and they are told that they must redeem their firstborn sons:

13. ... You will redeem [λυτρόση] every firstborn person among your sons [πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἀνθρώπου τῶν υἱῶν σου]. 14. And if your son should ask you afterwards, saying, "Why is this [τί τοῦτο]?" you will also say to him, "With a strong hand the Lord led us out of Egypt [ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς κύριος ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου], out of the house of bondage [ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας]. 15. And when Pharaoh hardened [himself] against sending us away, [God] killed every firstborn in Egypt [ἀπέκτεινεν πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ], from the firstborn of human beings to the firstborn of beasts. Because of this, I am sacrificing to the Lord everything that opens the womb [θύω τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν], the males, and I will redeem [λυτρόσομαι] every firstborn

broken [ὅστοῦν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ]" [Jn 19:36]). For a good discussion, see Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 206-10.

⁷⁶ On the potential dependence of John upon Mark, see Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah from Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* [2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1994], 1.75-77; M.E. Glasswell, "The Relationship between John and Mark" *JSNT* 23 [1985], 99-115; Ian D. Mackay, *John's Relationship with Mark: an Analysis of John 6 in Light of Mark 6-8* [Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2004]; cf. Robert Fortna, "Jesus and Peter at the High Priest's House: A Test Case for the Question of the Relation between Mark's and John's Gospels" *NTS* 24 [1978], 371-83).

of my sons [πᾶν πρωτότοκον τῶν υἱῶν μου]” (Ex 13:13-15; see also Ex 34:18-20; Num 3:11-13).⁷⁷

One is thus invited to relate Mk 10:45 to a constellation of themes found in the Passover narrative. Sacrifice, redemption, and the firstborn male have all become associated with the person of Jesus Christ. For Mark, he is the messiah, God’s only (and therefore “firstborn”) child, who will soon supplant the sacrificial lamb in order to redeem the many from the bondage of sin.

This invitation to thematic mapping is confirmed when Jesus dies on Nisan 15, the day of the Passover celebration. At Mk 14:12, the evangelist says that the first day of Unleavened Bread coincides with the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb (“And on the first day of Unleavened Bread [τῆ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων], when they sacrifice the Passover [τὸ πάσχα]...”). There is a calendrical difficulty here. Conventionally, Jews of the Second Temple period would have reckoned days from evening to evening rather than from morning to morning. For them, then, the slaughter of the Paschal lamb would have occurred on the day *before* the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread rather than upon it (afternoon of Nisan 14 = Day of Preparation; evening of Nisan 15 = first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread)).⁷⁸ Mark, however, appears to be

⁷⁷ 13. πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἀνθρώπου τῶν υἱῶν σου λυτρώσῃ 14. ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσῃ σε ὁ υἱός σου μετὰ ταῦτα λέγων τί τοῦτο καὶ ἐρεῖς αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς κύριος ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας 15. ἡνίκα δὲ ἐσκλήρυνεν Φαραὼ ἐξαποστεῖλαι ἡμᾶς ἀπέκτεινεν πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ ἀπὸ πρωτοτόκων ἀνθρώπων ἕως πρωτοτόκων κτηνῶν διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ θύω τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν τὰ ἀρσενικά καὶ πᾶν πρωτότοκον τῶν υἱῶν μου λυτρώσομαι.

⁷⁸ See the helpful summary of Collins (*Mark*, 646-7): “The confusion [between the Day of Preparation] and [the eating of unleavened bread] may arise from the tension between the biblical day, or the day of ancient Israel, and the day as calculated in the late Second Temple period. The biblical day was reckoned from morning to morning. At some point after the end of the monarchy, Jews began to reckon the day from evening to evening. If the days are reckoned from evening to evening, the day of preparation is Abib/Nisan 14 and the first day of the feast is Abib/Nisan 15. But if the days are reckoned from morning to morning, the day of preparation and the eating of the Passover meal with unleavened bread could appear to occur on the same day.” See also Focant, *Marc*, 519-20.

counting days from morning to morning, which results in his claiming that the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb, which occurs in the afternoon, takes place on the same day as the feast of Unleavened Bread, which begins at sundown. After Jesus' prayer at the Garden of Gethsemane (Mk 14:32-4), his betrayal and arrest (Mk 14:43-52), and his first trial (Mk 14:53-65), the day is concluded, and Jesus is handed over to Pilate on the following morning (see Mk 15:1: "and immediately in the morning [καὶ εὐθὺς πρωῒ]...").⁷⁹ This is Nisan 15, the day that Passover is celebrated. Mark here makes it unequivocally clear that the redemption the Passover recalls coincides with the day on which Jesus is crucified.

Jesus' death on Passover suggests that, though John may map the figure of Jesus on the Passover lamb more accurately than does Mark, the typological logic of the two evangelists is the same. The slaughter of the lamb that results in the redemption of the Israelites from Egypt prefigures the shedding of the blood of the messiah in expiation for the sins of the many. The sacrifice and consequence of the one prefigures the sacrifice and consequence of the other.

To conclude: I have argued in this section that three essential scriptural types prefiguring the death of Jesus in Mark are the Suffering Servant (Isa 53), the binding of Isaac (Gen 22), and the Paschal sacrifice (Ex 12). These stories are assumed by the evangelist and his community to bear witness to Jesus' death that must happen in accordance with the scriptures (Mk 8:31: "it is

⁷⁹ Marcus (*Mark 8-16*, 932-3, 1070) has provocatively suggested that Mark has even shifted the traditional date of Jesus' crucifixion from Nisan 14 to Nisan 15. He uses Mk 15:42 as evidence, which states, "And when evening had come, since it was the day of preparation [ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή]—that is, the day before the Sabbath [ὃ ἐστὶν προσάββατον]..." This verse occurs just after Jesus' death and just prior to Joseph of Arimathea's seeking the body of Jesus from Pilate (Mk 15:43). Notably, Mark inserts an editorial gloss that translates "day of preparation" (παρασκευή) as "the day before the Sabbath" (προσάββατον), rather than as the day before the Passover, which it also could mean (see Jn 19:14). According to Marcus, it is possible that Mark has transposed Jesus' death from the Day of Preparation *for* Passover to the day of Passover itself, and he then interprets παρασκευή in a more general way.

necessary” [δεῖ]). Presuming that these stories were read in worship, they would have synecdochically evoked in their auditors Jesus’ crucifixion and the larger gospel narrative of which the cross is an episode. I suggest, then, that Mark, in composing his story of the mission and death of Jesus Christ, has attempted to weave references to these witnesses into his narrative in order to demonstrate that what the community has come to believe scripture prefigures is, in fact, fulfilled in the person of the messiah.

Part III: Combining Pauline Types in the Markan Jesus

In this final section, I will demonstrate that the three scriptural prefigurations of Jesus’ death shared by Mark and Paul (Isa 53; Gen 22; and Ex 12) are the result of the former’s dependence upon the latter. Mark seeks to show within his story that the disparate biblical types (τύποι) of the crucifixion to which Paul alludes are simultaneously and harmoniously fulfilled within the person of Jesus Christ. Through the use of an etiological hermeneutic, Mark seeds into his story the biblical prefigurations of Christ’s death that Paul understands scripture to provide, and, by (re)presenting their fulfillment within his story of the mission and death of the messiah, Mark affirms the gospel “in accordance with the scriptures” (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς [1 Cor 15:3, 4]) that Paul presumes.

Importantly, the harmonization that Mark creates is built upon more than just the biblical interpretation of Saint Paul. Other Second Temple exegetical traditions also play important roles in his construction. For example, ancient Jewish interpreters had already come to associate the Aqedah with Paschal sacrifice in order to demonstrate that God’s redemptive process worked consistently across biblical narratives. On this reading, the firstborn son, Isaac, who takes the place of the lamb (Gen 22:7-8), is understood to be redeemed for the cost of a ram (Gen 22:13),

which prefigures God's redemptive action in Exodus.⁸⁰ At the same time, as Jews reflected upon recent and horrific experiences of persecution and death in the lives of their people, the narrative of Isaac's binding also came to be linked with expiation. Because the Temple Mount, where atonement sacrifices were offered, was already linked to Mount Moriah (see 2 Chr 3:1;⁸¹ see also Jubilees 18.13; Josephus, *A.J.* 1.226), the narrative of the Aqedah could readily be connected with the expiatory system of ancient Israel. Isaac's aborted sacrifice thus came to be seen as a type of atonement sacrifice, one which found its fulfillment in the subsequent martyrdoms of the

⁸⁰ See, for example, the 2nd century B.C.E *Book of Jubilees* (17-18), which, through a carefully choreographed chronology, argues that the Aqedah takes place at the same time of the year as the Passover, thereby making the one an etiology for the other (for discussion, see Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 176-7; see also, James C. VanderKam, "The Aqedah, Jubilees, and PseudoJubilees," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* [ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon; Leiden: Brill, 1997], 244-8; Stanislas Lyonnet and Léopold Sabourin, *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study* [Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970], 265). Similarly, throughout Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (1st century C.E.), one finds scattered references to the Aqedah (LAB 18.5; 32.2-4; 40.2), and the themes emphasized therein strongly echo those running throughout the Passover narrative (lamb sacrifice, redemption, the fourteenth of the month; etc.), which underscores the proleptic redemptive significance of that story (on Pseudo-Philo, see Bruce N. Fisk, "Offering Isaac Again and Again: Pseudo-Philo's use of the Aqedah as Intertext," *CBQ* 62 [2000] 481-507; Frederick James Murphy, *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1993]; Howard Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation* [2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1996]; Christian Dietzfelbinder, *Pseudo-Philo: Antiquitates Biblicae* [Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1975]). Later, in Rabbinic thought, lines of continuity are again drawn between Isaac's (near) sacrifice and the slaughter of the Paschal lamb. See, for example, Pisha 7 of *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael* (ed. Jacob Z. Lauterbach; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2004, 40), where Isaac's blood preserves the Israelites and Jerusalem from the wrath of the destroyer (see also Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 180). In each case, what stands behind the association is the idea that the Aqedah proleptically manifests God's redemptive process: "the Father's refusal to spare his son has become a paradigm of the saving act, and the Paschal lamb has become a cipher for the beloved son" (Levenson, *Death and Resurrection*, 180).

⁸¹ The Chronicler writes at 3:1: "And Solomon began to build the house of the Lord [בְּיַת־יְהוָה] in Jerusalem on the hill of Moriah [בְּהַר הַמֹּרְיָהוּ]."

sons and daughters of Israel, persons whose self-sacrifices were capable of washing away the sins of the people.⁸²

Both of these interpretive traditions likely informed Mark's thought. Indeed, they may have also informed Paul's. As I argued in Part I of this chapter, the child whom Paul says God did not "spare" (οὐκ ἐφείσατο [Rom 8:32]) evokes the son whom Abraham did not "spare" (οὐκ ἐφείσω) at Gen 22:12, 16. Paul's saying that God "handed him over" (actively: παρέδωκεν αὐτόν), however, may echo Isa 53:6, where God hands over the servant (κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτόν). If this is the case, it is possible that, undergirding Paul's conviction that Isaac's binding is a prefiguration of the death of Christ, is the Second Temple interpretive tradition that associates the Aqedah with expiation.

Regardless, because the gospel narrative "in accordance with the scriptures" (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς [1 Cor 15:3, 4]) is already assumed within Paul's epistolary correspondence, the apostle feels no need to explain how Christ can at the same time be antitype to the suffering servant, Isaac, and the Paschal sacrifice. In a story that presents the mission and death of Jesus Christ

⁸² Nowhere is this clearer than in the 1st century C.E. document 4 Maccabees. Throughout the text, the Maccabean martyrs understand their deaths to be a means of atoning for the sins of the people (see, for example, 4 Macc 6:27-29; 9:23-5; 12:16-17; 17:20-22). Indeed, at 4 Macc 17:22, ἰλαστήριον is used to describe the sacrifice of martyrs, a word which translates "mercy seat" (הַכִּפֹּרֶת), the gold slab covering the Arc of the Covenant that is cleaned with blood on the Day of Atonement. At the same time, they understand their deaths to be patterned upon the willing sacrifice of Isaac (see 4 Macc 7:13-14; 13:12-13; 16:20). For the author of 4 Maccabees, then, the willing death of the beloved son functions as a type of martyr's death on behalf of the people's sins. Though the slaughter of Isaac, as Abraham's seed (σπέρμα [see Gen 22:17]), would ostensibly preclude the fulfillment of God's covenantal promises with Abraham, in 4 Maccabees it is the beloved son's willingness to die that has, in fact, established them, and it is the Maccabean martyrs' willingness to do the same that preserves them. The author of 4 Maccabees takes the view that the Aqedah has proleptically anticipated expiation on behalf of the people. For good introductions to 4 Maccabees, see David A. DeSilva, *4 Maccabees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 11-28; Hans-Josef Klauck, *4 Makkabäerbuch* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1989) 647-680; Jan Willem van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviors of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 58-82.

wherein those types are fulfilled, however, some meaningful attempt at their synthesis must be made. Mark's gospel does precisely this, and he uses the associations already established in the Second Temple period between the Aqedah and redemption and the Aqedah and expiation, on the one hand, and the language of the sacrificial "sheep" (πρόβατον) that appears in all three witnesses (Gen 22:7-8; Ex 12:3-5; Isa 53:7), on the other, to bind the types together.

I argued in the previous section that, for Mark, Christ is a new Isaac, and his death fulfills the aborted sacrifice that occurs in Gen 22. At the same time, because Mark narrates Jesus' death as occurring on Nisan 15, the evangelist designates him as the new Passover that redeems the many from bondage. Since the Aqedah was already thought to prefigure the Paschal sacrifice in Second Temple exegetical tradition, Mark's suggestion that both stories find their typological fulfillment within a single antitype would have seemed a logical exegetical inference. Similarly, because Isaac's near sacrifice had come to be associated with atonement, the human self-sacrifice it was taken to prefigure, and the human sacrifice Isa 53 prophesies, could also be seen as fulfilled within the death of Jesus Christ (an exegetical inference Mark may have shared with Paul [Rom 8:32]). For Mark, this triangle of biblical types is chained together by their shared language. Isaac takes the place of the sacrificial sheep (πρόβατον [Gen 22:7-8]) and is then redeemed for the cost of one (κρίός [Gen 22:13]). Each firstborn son of Israel in Egypt is redeemed for the cost of a sheep (πρόβατον [Ex 12:3-5]), and the suffering servant is likened to one (πρόβατον [Isa 53:7]) in the course of his dying for the sins of the many.⁸³ If the Aqedah is

⁸³ An association between the suffering servant and the Paschal lamb may appear, at first, problematic, as the servant of Isa 53 is far from the perfect lamb (πρόβατον τέλειον) that Moses is commanded to sacrifice (Ex 12:5). (On the inappropriateness of the suffering servant's death as a temple sacrifice, see Jeremy Schipper, "Interpreting the Lamb Imagery in Isa 53" *JBL* 132 [2013] 315-25.) Nevertheless, because Mark is reading Isa 53 through the lens of the death of Jesus Christ, whom he no doubt understands to be perfect, the evangelist may have understood the

the anchor to which the themes of expiation (Isa 53) and redemption (Ex 12) are tied, the sacrificial sheep that Gen 22, Isa 53, and Ex 12 all share is the metaphorical image upon which Mark reflects in order to put forth Christ as the single eschatological antitype to them all.

Narratively, the fulfillment of the three types occurs in the unfolding of Mark's plot. Mark begins by associating the mission of Jesus with Isaac's (near) slaughter by designating the messiah as God's beloved son (Mk 1:11; see also Gen 22:2; Mk 12:6-9). Mark then associates Jesus with Isa 53 through literary echoes of the servant's mission and experiences (Mk 10:45; 14:24, 61; etc.). Finally, he maps the death of the messiah that occurs on Passover back onto the sequence of baptism wherein Jesus' sonship is disclosed (comp. Mk 1:9-11 with Mk 15:38-9). Three of the chief scriptural witnesses to the cross that Paul invokes are thus enfolded within one coherent plot, with the underlying narrative progression seeming to work as follows: the sheep (πρόβατον) that the beloved son (Isaac) replaces (Gen 22:7-8) is now replaced by a new beloved son (Mk 1:11). This son (Jesus) is simultaneously the suffering servant who, like the sheep (πρόβατον [Isa 53:7]), must be slaughtered (Mk 15:37-9). The slaughter of this servant/beloved son effects a new redemption for the many (Mk 10:45) on the pattern of the redemption from Egypt that the slaughter of a sheep secured (πρόβατον [Ex 12:3-5]).

Importantly, as a result of Jesus' death "for many" (ἀντὶ πολλῶν [Mk 10:45]/ὕπὲρ πολλῶν [Mar 14:24]), the rhetorical and theological ends towards which Paul deploys his scriptural witnesses to the cross (esp. to establish the validity of the Gentile mission [see Part I above]) are affirmed in Mark's gospel. The evangelist shows narratively that Jesus' Passover sacrifice, which effects redemption from sin, expands God's promises—once restricted to Israel

blemishes upon the person of the servant to be indicative of the new standards of perfection that result from Christ's death setting worldly standards upon their heads (comp. Mk 2:16-17; see also 1 Cor 1:27-30).

as a result of Abraham's near-sacrifice of Isaac—to all who choose to believe in the messiah. Mark, in threading throughout his text those scriptural performances of Jesus' death that he and Paul share, creates additional narrative precedent for Paul's universal claims. The significances Paul derives from scriptural witnesses to the death of Christ are now echoed within the narrative (re)presentation of the messiah's earthly career.

Conclusion

Throughout his letters, Paul presumes scriptural prophecies about, or typological prefigurations of, Jesus' death. In this chapter, I have attempted to unearth some of those witnesses. The three paradigmatic examples I analyzed are the suffering servant of Isa 53, the binding of Isaac at Gen 22, and the slaughter of the Paschal lamb at Ex 12. Because Paul assumes rather than explicates the scriptural types with which he works, the stories in which these prefigurations are contained must have represented some of the narratives that were performed within Pauline communal worship. Moreover, because they would have been understood in relation to the Christ event, they necessarily (and synecdochically) evoke the entirety of the gospel narrative of which they are a part. They thus operate using the same epiphanic logic as the other phenomena discussed in this dissertation: they bring the death of the messiah before the eyes of the community. In this case, however, they function as the "literary icons" of Jesus Christ crucified (to use the language of Mitchell⁸⁴) prior to the composition of Mark's gospel.

Mark, then, in composing his own literary icon, seeds within his narrative those scriptural witnesses to Jesus' death that Paul presumes. Three of the same proleptic manifestations of the crucifixion found in Paul (Isa 53, Gen 22, and Ex 12) reappear in Mark's

⁸⁴ Mitchell, "Epiphanic Evolutions," 194.

story. The evangelist goes further than the apostle, however, as he attempts to show *how* these prefigurations are fulfilled within the person of Jesus, on the one hand, and he affirms the significances Paul has attached to them for the believing community, on the other. Thus, Mark tells a story in which God's replaying the sacrifice of Isaac results in a new and universal access to deliverance because Christ has died in order that the many might be redeemed. Jesus, as scriptural antitype, unlocks the mission to the Gentile nations through his death.

Chapter V: Summation and Implications

Summation

The goal of this dissertation has been to make a plausible case for the literary dependence of the Gospel of Mark on the letters of the apostle Paul. Taking as a starting point the incisive observations of Joel Marcus—the range of theological, Christological, and ecclesiological overlaps shared between the evangelist and apostle, and his own conclusions vis-à-vis the centrality of the cross for each—I have sought to explore the ways in which Jesus’ death is constructed and performed in Pauline communities, on the one hand, and the ways in which Mark attempts to anticipate and justify those Pauline performances within his own story, on the other.

With Dodd, I agree that Paul’s “gospel” (εὐαγγέλιον) is an episodic narrative that covers the life, death, resurrection, and second coming of Jesus Christ “in accordance with the scriptures,” and with Hays, I presume that, to understand Paul’s theological argumentation, one must recognize that this narrative undergirds all of Paul’s thought. It is the foundation upon which Paul’s variable elements (determined by his rhetorical or historical circumstances) are built. Finally, with Mitchell, I concur that Mark and Paul interface with that gospel narrative via a shared theological poetics.¹

¹ To recap Mitchell’s argument (for fuller discussion, see Chapter I, Part IV): Paul employs what she calls a “synecdochical hermeneutic.” The apostle evokes the gospel narrative through the naming or narrativizing of one of its parts without telling the whole story all over again each time (e.g. 1 Cor 1:18), and Paul’s ability to evoke the narrative synecdochically is not limited to epistolary argumentation. He also claims that he embodies the narrative within his person, presenting himself as an icon of Jesus Christ crucified (e.g. Gal 6:17). Through the iconic *manifestation* of this one episode in his body, the remainder of the story is simultaneously recalled. In these instances, the apostle claims to act as a walking synecdochical epiphany of his gospel.

Similarly, though the Gospel of Mark is a fuller narrative in both form and purpose, Mitchell argues that it, too, is synecdochical. The evangelist presumes the whole sacred story, but he only tells a portion of it (the

My dissertation has expanded upon the contributions of these scholars by arguing that Mark and Paul not only share a theological poetics; they share the same sacred story. That is, their shared narrative shares an all-important episode: the epiphany of Jesus Christ to Paul himself (1 Cor 15:8). Paul has written himself into and understands his person and his mission to be constitutive episodes *of* the gospel. This, in turn, has a profound effect on how Mark engages Paul and his teachings and how he tells the story about Jesus. I have sought to demonstrate how, in narrating more fully the gospel of Jesus Christ crucified—known to him in and through Pauline theological poetics—Mark deals with Paul’s place within it.

Thus, my thesis has been that Mark’s consistent hermeneutical principle vis-à-vis Paul (as a character within the sacred story of which he tells a portion) is etiological, and the evangelist, who shares his gospel with the apostle, seeks to seed the apostle and his teachings into his text. Mark’s goal is not to repeat that which Paul has said (i.e. to lift Paul from his letters and throw him some thirty years back into the past) but, rather, to *anticipate* him. Mark’s project is both proleptic and synecdochical: he always presumes, though he does not narrate in full, the entirety of the gospel of which Paul and his mission form a part, and his purpose is to tell a story that seamlessly connects with episodes subsequent to his 16 chapters. Knowing that the mission of Paul is a part of the gospel, Mark seeks to create logical and concordant episodic precursors that bind the missionary activity of the earthly Christ to the eventual teachings of the itinerant apostle.

missionary activity and death of Jesus Christ), and he points to the remainder through prophetic prediction (Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:32-3, 45; 13; etc). By making use of the same theological poetics as Paul, Mark’s text functions as a literary epiphany. To read it, as to encounter Paul, is to see the crucified Lord before one’s eyes.

In order to demonstrate this, I examined select media by which the death of Christ is performed in Pauline communities. In addition to Paul's person, the death of Christ is iconically displayed in baptism, in the Eucharist, and in scripture. To see Paul, read scripture, or participate in one of these rites is to witness an epiphanic performance of the cross that synecdochically evokes the whole gospel narrative. I then analyzed how Mark anticipates the various mediated epiphanies of Jesus' death that are found within Paul's letters. For the evangelist, performances of the cross are also synecdochical and proleptic, but the purpose and referent of the prolepsis (predictably) differ as a result of his working in a different literary genre (narrative) and as a result of the historical perspective he adopts in relation to the events. Thus, I have shown that when, for Paul, a performance of the death of Christ is not *itself* an episode of the gospel that predates the cross, but it is rather a new medium subsequent to Jesus' death by which the gospel is epiphanically made manifest (the death of Christ displayed in Paul's person [Chapter I] or the death and resurrection of Christ performed by believers in baptism [Chapter II]), Mark attempts to establish sufficient literary precedent within his own story to create concordance between the episodes of Jesus' mission, his death upon the cross, and the unique significances attached to the new performances of that death by the apostle. Alternatively, if, for Paul, a particular performance of Christ's death *is* a part of the sacred story prior to the cross (e.g. the episode containing the last supper [Chapter III] or typological manifestations of Jesus' death within scripture [Chapter IV]), I have sought to demonstrate that Mark's project is a composite one. On the one hand, he includes and adapts those performances Paul assumes, but, on the other, he anticipates the unique significances Paul attaches to them. For example, the Eucharist is a gospel episode anterior to and anticipatory of the cross in Paul's thinking (see 1 Cor 11:23), and, as such, Mark incorporates the episode into his narrative with little literary modification. That said,

it is also a new rite celebrated by early Christian communities and a retrospective performance of Jesus' death to which Paul attaches particular ecclesiological significances (namely, communal unity). As a result, Mark anticipates those significances by embedding within his narrative logical literary precursors for them (in this case, the feeding narratives).

In sum, then, my dissertation contends that Mark's project vis-à-vis Paul is the creation of historical precedent for the apostle's claims of himself and his mission. This occurs as a result of Mark's sharing with Paul a theological poetics that necessarily references the whole by way of the part. Mark tells a partial narrative that evokes the whole, and because Paul is an essential component of that whole that it evokes, Mark seeds this figure into his story.

Implications

My argument for Mark's dependence on Paul has significant implications for the study of the Gospel according to Mark, as well as for the study of the New Testament and early Christian literature more broadly. First, my work contributes to the longstanding debate about the Paulinism of Mark's gospel, and it opens a new avenue of inquiry that has heretofore been unexplored: Mark as etiology. This is not a generic classification and should not be overstated. As noted in my introduction, I take Mark's project to be the crafting of a literary epiphany that combines traditional legends about Christ with the teachings of the apostle Paul in order to make manifest the truth of the gospel to which both bear witness but for which Paul is no longer available as an epiphanic stand-in. The seeding of Paul and his mission is thus an essential aspect of Mark's literary project, one that is born of the fact that Mark's understanding of the nature and significance of the Christ event has occurred within the context of a Pauline community (most probably in Rome), but I do not take Mark's sole purpose in his composition to be the justification of Paul or the creation of an etiology for Paul's missionary journey.

Because Mark and Paul share numerous theological, Christological, and ecclesiological themes that resist simple classification as part of a general early Christian “common tradition,” however,² their overlaps require credible explanation, and the approach I advocate in this dissertation provides this. Take, for example, the negative characterization of the disciples in Mark’s narrative.³ The evangelist’s problematic portrayal of these figures has been a locus of scholarly controversy for many years. In particular, exegetes debate whether Peter, James, and John are persons with whom the Markan audience is supposed to sympathize, or against whom they ought to position themselves.⁴ Especially if the evangelist composes his story at Rome, the location at which both Peter and Paul lost their lives (according to tradition),⁵ one might wonder why Mark would draft a narrative that seems so overtly hostile to Peter within a city and at a time at which the pillar apostle was likely elevated to the status of apostolic hero. Mark’s use of an etiological hermeneutic vis-à-vis Paul provides an answer: Mark does not seek to reject Peter’s authority *per se*; rather, his goal is to make clear that whatever authority Peter does have rests upon the vision he received from the resurrected Christ, irrespective of his familiarity with the earthly messiah. In other words, Mark has, in attempting to seed Paul and his mission into his story, sought to level the apostolic playing field and set the authority of Peter and Paul upon the same epiphanic foundation.

² See my discussion of Joel Marcus in Chapter I, Part III.

³ Noted in Marcus’ list of thematic overlaps shared by Mark and Paul (see “Interpreter of Paul,” 31-2).

⁴ Among important contributions, see Werner H. Kelber, “Mark 14:32-42,” 166-87; idem, *Story of Jesus*, 30-42; Robert C. Tannehill, “The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role” *JR* 57 (1977) 386-405; Tyson, “The Blindness of the Disciples,” 261-8; Goulder, “Those Outside,” 289-302; Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, “Texts and Contexts: Interpreting the Disciples in Mark” in eadem, *In the Company of Jesus*, 100-130, esp. 114-124; Telford, *Theology of the Gospel of Mark*, 127-37; Rhoads, et al., *Mark as Story*, 123-129.

⁵ For discussion, see Chapter I, Part I above.

To demonstrate this, I will analyze two incisive but incompatible studies on Mark's characterization of the disciples, and I will suggest that their seemingly incongruous theses can be brought together if one presumes Mark's goal is to anticipate Paul as a part of a larger story within which Peter and the other disciples play important roles. First, Finn Damgaard, in his "Persecution and Denial—Paradigmatic Apostolic Portrayals in Paul and Mark,"⁶ argues that the negative portrayal of Peter in Mark is, in fact, based upon Paul's negative portrayal of himself. He explains,

Mark might have focused especially on Peter's failings because he wanted to create a paradigmatic apostolic portrayal comparable to Paul's self-portrayal... For all his criticism of the disciples and Peter in particular, Mark actually employed the figure of Peter to connect the gospel to an apostolic authority. In so doing, he probably rescued his gospel from just being absorbed into Matthew, Luke and John and thereby consigned to oblivion.⁷

Damgaard admits that Peter is portrayed negatively throughout Mark's gospel (he is called Satan [Mk 8:32]; he misjudges the transfiguration [Mk 9:1-13]; he falls asleep at Gethsemane [Mk 14:32-42]; etc.), but he also argues that Peter is, through this, turned into a "rounder" character, one who "encourages the audience to construct him as an individual."⁸ Insofar as he is said to have a mother in law and a home [Mk 1:29-30], and he is given a special name [Mk 3:16], Peter becomes a person with whom Mark's audience can identify. This allows Damgaard to claim that "though Mark's portrayal of Peter primarily focuses on his mistakes, the narrator does not turn his readers against Peter, nor does he portray Jesus as someone who parts company with Peter."⁹

⁶ Finn Damgaard, "Persecution and Denial—Paradigmatic Apostolic Portrayals in Paul and Mark," in Becker, et al., *Mark and Paul*, 195-210.

⁷ Damgaard, "Persecution and Denial," 310.

⁸ Damgaard, "Persecution and Denial," 300.

⁹ Damgaard, "Persecution and Denial," 301.

Instead, Damgaard suggests that Mark has based his characterization of Peter upon the literary model of Paul.¹⁰ Damgaard points out that crucial to Paul's self-understanding is a then and now dichotomy in which Paul was *once* a persecutor but is *now* an apostle, imbued with Spirit and bearing divine authority (Gal 1:23; see also Gal 1:13-16; Phil 3:6-11; 1 Cor 15:9-10).¹¹ This "biography of reversal" eventually becomes a model for all Christians to follow (witnessed elsewhere in the New Testament, as, for example, at 1 Tim 1:16¹²), and, according to Damgaard, Mark adapts Peter's story to this same narrative structure. Because Peter could not be portrayed as a persecutor of the church, Mark portrays him as a dullard and coward, and he creates a "Petrine version" of the Pauline biography of reversal.¹³ Damgaard thus concludes that "Mark may have been a Paulinist...but if he was, it was in spite of Paul's negative attitude to Peter. Instead, it was under the influence of Paul's complicated portrayal of himself."¹⁴

Alternatively, David C. Sim, in his "The Family of Jesus and the Disciples of Jesus in Paul and Mark: Taking Sides in the Church's Factional Dispute," contends that Mark is overtly hostile to Jesus' family and the disciples, reflecting Paul's antagonistic relationship with the Jerusalem apostles.¹⁵ Sim argues that Paul's subversive title for them in Galatians (the "so-called" pillars [οἱ δοκοῦντες στῦλοι εἶναι] [Gal 2:2, 6, 9]), coupled with his accusation against Peter of outright hypocrisy (Gal 2:14), and his calling those affiliated with Jerusalem "false

¹⁰ Damgaard, "Persecution and Denial," 301.

¹¹ Damgaard, "Persecution and Denial," 302.

¹² "But, for this reason, I was shown mercy in order that, in me *first* [ἐν ἐμοὶ πρώτῳ], Christ Jesus might show forth total forbearance [τὴν ἅπασαν μακροθυμίαν] as an *example* [πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν] for those who are about to believe in him [τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ] for eternal life."

¹³ Damgaard, "Persecution and Denial," 305.

¹⁴ Damgaard, "Persecution and Denial," 310.

¹⁵ David C. Sim, "The family of Jesus and the Disciples of Jesus in Paul and Mark: Taking Sides in the Church's Factional Dispute," in Wischmeyer, et al., *Paul and Mark*, 73-97..

brothers” (ψευδαδέλφους [Gal 2:4]), “provides clear evidence that in the late 40’s and the early 50’s Paul’s relationship with the Jerusalem authorities, especially James and Peter, was one of bitter conflict.”¹⁶ Indeed, based upon the (unknown) fate of Paul’s collection to Jerusalem, Sim suggests that the rift between Paul and the Jerusalem church was never bridged.¹⁷

Because this apostolic conflict is not resolved within the lifetime of Paul, Sim claims that later Christian authors were forced to align themselves with one figure or the another, and he argues that Mark chooses to position himself with Paul. Sim first looks at Mark’s attitude towards Jesus’ family. At Mk 3:20-35, which opens with Jesus’ returning “home” (ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον [Mk 3:20], likely a reference to the place he was staying at Capernaum [see Mk 2:1]), Mark informs his audience that Jesus’ family (οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ) attempted to restrain him (κρατῆσαι αὐτόν) because they believed he was “out of his mind” (ἔλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη [Mk 3:21]). Sim takes Mark’s use of ἐξέστη (“out of his mind”) to imply that Jesus’ family believed him to be possessed by a demon.¹⁸ Because the Beelzebul controversy with the scribes (Mk 3:22-30) immediately follows, Sim infers that, with his pronouncing blasphemy against the Holy Spirit an eternal sin (Mk 3:29), Jesus implicitly declared his family guilty of the same sin as the scribes. By calling him mad, they have blasphemed the Holy Spirit within his person.¹⁹

Sim next looks at the characterization of the disciples, and he claims that they are predominantly identified by their various shortcomings: their lack of faith (e.g. 4:35-51); their

¹⁶ Sim, “Family of Jesus,” 82-3.

¹⁷ Sim, “Family of Jesus,” 83-4.

¹⁸ “The relatives of Jesus believe him to be possessed by a demon...in the ancient world insanity was often associated with demon-possession (cf. the close connection in John 10:20), and the charge of demonic influence almost certainly underlies this tradition” (Sim, “Family of Jesus,” 86-87).

¹⁹ Sim, “Family of Jesus,” 88.

exclusion of children (Mk 10:13-16); their rejection of the foreign exorcist (Mk 9:38-41); their persistent inability to understand (e.g. Mk 4:10-13; 6:51-52; 8:32-33); their cowardice (Mk 14:50); Peter's denial (Mk 14:66-72); and so forth.²⁰ So comprehensive are their failings that, at the conclusion of the gospel, where the youth at the tomb predicts a reunion between the twelve and Jesus (Mk 16:7), Sim argues that such a reunion never takes place.²¹ On Sim's reading, like the family of Jesus, the disciples of Jesus have severed themselves entirely from the messiah. For Mark, it is Paul, and Paul alone, who propagates the true message of Jesus Christ.

In my judgment, presuming Mark's use of an etiological (and synecdochical) hermeneutic, the evangelist's reason for portraying the disciples in the way that he does lies somewhere between the poles of Damgaard's and Sim's theses. On the one hand, *pace* Damgaard, the idea that Mark seeks to portray Peter as a new Paul is difficult to establish on exegetical grounds. On the other, *pace* Sim, it goes too far to say that Mark categorically rejects the authority of Peter and the other disciples, given that the disciples are expected to encounter the risen messiah in Galilee (see Mk 14:28; 16:7). Instead, Mark attempts to demonstrate that the authority of the disciples does not rest upon their knowledge of the earthly Christ. They, like Paul, must first encounter the risen lord.

²⁰ Sim, "Family of Jesus," 91-2.

²¹ "Even though the angel [sic] states that Jesus will go to Galilee to meet with the disciples, there is no indication in the narrative that this meeting ever takes place. In fact the opposite is implied in so far as the women who run from the tomb say nothing of their experience or the angelic message: the implication is that the disciples never receive this instruction to return to Galilee and so never meet the risen Christ" (Sim, "Family of Jesus," 93). The problem with this reading is that the disciples *do* receive this instruction at Mk 14:28: "but after I have been raised [μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με], I will go before you into Galilee [προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν]." Jesus' prophecies that this will occur, and Mark consistently makes clear that Jesus' prophecies ultimately come true (for fuller discussion, see Chapter I, note 39).

Thus, despite the disciples' occasional exemplary action (such as Simon [Peter] and Andrew immediately dropping their nets to follow Jesus [Mk 1:16-18]), Sim is right to argue that Mark's characterization of these men during the period of Jesus' earthly mission is an emphatically negative one, and, when one compares the evangelist's characterization of the disciples with the requirements for praise (ἐγκώμιος/*laus*) and vituperation (ψόγος/*vituperatio*) in ancient rhetorical theory, Mark's negative portrait is confirmed.²² One sees, for example, Peter rebuke (ἐπιτιμάω) Jesus and be called "Satan" (σατανᾶ [Mk 8:32-3]) for doing so, suggest the construction of tents for spirits (Mk 9:5), make a declaration he fails to keep (Mk 14:29²³), show an inability to stay awake in the garden (Mk 14:33-8), flee with the other disciples (Mk 14:50), and, in the end, deny Jesus during the trial before the Sanhedrin (Mk 14:66-72).²⁴ Similarly,

²² Importantly, characters within narratives were expected to participate in and conform to these requirements. For example, in his lecture "On Narrative" (Περὶ Διηγήματος), Aelius Theon (a rhetorical teacher of the late first or early second century), claims that stories should make clear whether an action (πρᾶγμα) is just or unjust (δίκαιον ἢ ἄδικον), or honorable or dishonorable (ἔνδοξον ἢ ἄδοξον [Theon, *Progym.* 78]). (All Greek citations are taken from Theon, *Progymnasmata* [trans. Michel Patillon and Giancarlo Bolognesi; Paris: Belles Lettres, 1997]. The previous reference can be found on pages 38-9 of this edition). He then connects the causes (αἰτία) of actions with human motivations, and he claims that a narrative should make clear whether an action is undertaken for the sake of the good (ἔνεκεν ἀγαθῶν) or rescue from evil (χάριν κακοῦ ἀπαλλαγῆς), or whether it is done on account of the passions (διὰ τὰ πάθη), such as anger (θυμὸν), desire (ἔρωτα), hatred (μῖσος), envy (φθόνον), and so forth (Theon, *Progym.* 79 [Patillon, 39-40]). For Theon, then, subjects of narrative (διήγημα, used interchangeably with διήγησις [for a later attempt at disambiguation, see Aphthonius, *Progym.* 2]) must be presented in such a way as to be judged according to the prevailing ethical standards of the day, and the causes of their actions must be attributed to human motivations such that they can be categorized as either virtuous or reprobate. For a brief introduction to Theon, see George Alexander Kennedy, *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), xii, 1-3.

²³ "Even if all will be made to stumble [εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται], not I [οὐκ ἐγώ]!"

²⁴ Additionally, should one posit that episodes focusing on Peter in the other gospel narratives contain traditional materials to which Mark may have had access but chose not to use, it is worth noting that Peter is not the "rock" upon which the church is founded (see Matt 16:18), nor is he the one who draws his sword in defense of Jesus (see Jn 18:10).

James and John are shown unable to understand the transfiguration (Mk 9:2-10, esp. 9:5-6, 10), and they too fall asleep at Gethsemane (Mk 14:33-41). Moreover, John, speaking for all the disciples, rejects the authority of the foreign exorcist on the grounds that “he does not follow us” (οὐκ ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν [Mk 9:38]), and James and John together inappropriately ask to be given positions of authority on the right and left of Jesus “in his glory” (ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου [Mk 10:36]),²⁵ a clear embarrassment to Matthew, who puts the request on the lips of their mother instead (see Matt 20:20-21).

All of these failures are exemplary of traits considered worthy of reproach in ancient rhetorical theory.²⁶ The flight from Gethsemane and Peter’s threefold denial demonstrates cowardice (*ignavia*/ δειλία²⁷). Foolishness (ἄφροσύνη, contrary to wisdom [*prudentia*/φρόνησις]²⁸) is displayed in Peter’s words at the transfiguration. Peter’s rebuke of Jesus, and James and John’s request for glorification, show presumptiveness (*audacia*²⁹).

²⁵ When James and John return to the other disciples, and it is discovered what they had done, the other disciples become “indignant” (ἀγανακτεῖν [Mk 10:41]) at their actions.

²⁶ The list of parallels that follows is drawn primarily from Cicero’s *De Inventione*, a work that represents a conventional ancient Graeco-Roman rhetorical curriculum close to the time of Mark’s composition. According to H. M. Hubbell (introduction to *De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica*, by Cicero [trans. H. M. Hubbell; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949], vii), it is “hardly more than an elaborate note-book in which he recorded the dictation of his teacher.” The various virtues and vices I discuss are pulled from Cicero’s discussion of deliberative rhetoric [*deliberatio*], but they should not be thought exclusive to this rhetorical genre (for discussion of the overlaps in *topoi* in the various types of speech, see Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.4.12-16). All subsequent citations of Cicero’s Latin are taken from the Hubbell edition.

²⁷ See Cicero, *Inv.* 2.54.165; For his discussion of courage (*fortitudo*), see *Inv.* 2.54.163. See also Aristotle’s discussion of virtues and their corresponding vices at *Rhet.* I.9.1366b.

²⁸ On prudence (*prudentia*), see Cicero, *Inv.* 2.53.160; see also Theon, *Progym.* 110 (Patillon, 74-5).

²⁹ See Cicero, *Inv.* 2.54.165.

Meanness of spirit (μικροψυχία, contrary to generosity [μεγαλοφροσύνη]³⁰) is seen in John's rejection of the foreign exorcist, and falsehood (*mendacium*, contrary to truth [*veritas*]³¹) is presumed in Peter's failed vow. Sim is correct, then, to find in Mark's characterization of the disciples a deep suspicion of their authority, particularly that of Peter, James, and John. During the earthly mission of the messiah, Mark depicts their actions as thoroughly ignoble.

Yet, as noted above, Mark also presumes that the disciples will encounter the risen lord (Mk 14:28; 16:6-7), a presumption rooted, I suggest, in Mark's sharing his gospel narrative with Paul. The revelation of the messiah to Peter and the other disciples is an episode that must be anticipated if the whole story is to be evoked synecdochically (see 1 Cor 15:5-7). To the degree that Mark takes for granted the disciples' encounter with the risen Christ, then, Damgaard's "biography of reversal" carries a certain descriptive force. Within the larger story of the disciples that continues beyond Mark's 16 chapters, proper understanding of the nature and purpose of Jesus' mission is attained, and a turning from past mistakes is effected.

I stop short, however, of suggesting that Mark intends perfect apostolic parity. Mark's Peter is not the rock upon which the church is founded (see Matt 16:18), and he is not the first to evangelize the nations (see Acts 10). Paul still remains, for Mark, the "last of all" (ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων [1 Cor 15:8]) to whom the resurrected Christ appears. If the authority of the disciples is dependent upon the same revelation as is Paul's, Paul, by virtue of his position in the gospel narrative, functions as the final arbiter of God's salvific story.³²

³⁰ Generosity is one of the ethical virtues (ἠθικά) singled out by Theon in his lecture, "On Praise and Vituperation" (Περὶ Ἐγκωμίου καὶ Ψόγου). See Theon, *Progym.* 110 (Patillon, 75); see also Aristotle, *Rhet.* I.9.1366b.

³¹ Cicero, *Inv.* 2.53.161.

³² An interpretation I share with Sim, who suggests that, because Paul describes himself as "last of all" (ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων [1 Cor 15:8]), the apostle effectively becomes the final revelatory word, immune to those who might claim

Thus, Mark does not reject the authority of the disciples. He attempts to level the apostolic playing field and grant to Paul a status of first amongst equals. Presuming Mark wrote at Rome, and presuming Peter's death also took place there, it may be that Mark's negative characterization of Peter is the result of some within the Markan community aligning themselves with Peter over Paul (see 1 Cor 1:10-17) on the grounds that the former knew the earthly Christ.³³ Mark's etiological approach is thus carefully calibrated to recognize subsequent disputes over Pauline authority and to enshrine within his story Paul's own solution to them. For

“that they were later visited by Jesus who communicated a message that differed from that of the apostle” (“Family of Jesus,” 77).

³³ An interesting (though much later) text that may provide an analogue is the third century *Kerygmata Petrou*. In that document, “Peter” attempts to undermine Paul's apostolic authority on the grounds that he does not act in accordance with the teachings of the earthly Christ. Pseudo Peter says, “But how can someone think that, on account of a vision [δι’ ὄπτασίαν], he has been educated for the purpose of instruction [πρὸς διδασκαλίαν σοφισθῆναι]? And if you will say, ‘it is possible,’ then why did the teacher [i.e. Jesus] associate with those who are awake, remaining with them for a whole year [ὅλω ἐνιαυτῷ ἐρηγορόσιν παραμένων ὠμίλησεν]? And if it is the case that he appeared to you [κἂν ὅτι ὤφθη σοι], how will we even believe you on this point [πῶς δέ σοι καὶ πιστεύσομεν αὐτὸ]? And how could he even have appeared to you [πῶς δέ σοι καὶ ὤφθη], when you think things that are exactly opposite to his teaching [αὐτοῦ τὰ ἐναντία τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ φρονεῖς]? But if you had been visited and taught by that man for even one hour [ὕπ’ ἐκείνου μιᾶς ὥρας ὀφθεῖς καὶ μαθητευθεῖς], then be an apostle [ἀπόστολος ἐγένου]! Proclaim his words [τὰς ἐκείνου φωνὰς κήρυσσε]! Exound his teachings [τὰ ἐκείνου ἐρμήνευε]! Love his apostles [τοὺς ἐκείνου ἀποστόλους φίλει]! Do not battle against me, who lived with him [ἐμοὶ τῷ συγγενομένῳ αὐτῷ μὴ μάχου]! For you have set yourself in opposition against me, the firm rock, the foundation of the church [πρὸς γὰρ στερεὰν πέτραν ὄντα με, θεμέλιον ἐκκλησίας, ἐναντίος ἀνθέστηκάς μοι]!” (εἴ τις δὲ δι’ ὄπτασίαν πρὸς διδασκαλίαν σοφισθῆναι δύναται; καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐρεῖς· Δυνατὸν ἐστίν, διὰ τί ὅλω ἐνιαυτῷ ἐρηγορόσιν παραμένων ὠμίλησεν ὁ διδάσκαλος; πῶς δέ σοι καὶ πιστεύσομεν αὐτὸ κἂν ὅτι ὤφθη σοι; πῶς δέ σοι καὶ ὤφθη, ὅποτε αὐτοῦ τὰ ἐναντία τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ φρονεῖς; εἰ δὲ ὑπ’ ἐκείνου μιᾶς ὥρας ὀφθεῖς καὶ μαθητευθεῖς ἀπόστολος ἐγένου, τὰς ἐκείνου φωνὰς κήρυσσε, τὰ ἐκείνου ἐρμήνευε, τοὺς ἐκείνου ἀποστόλους φίλει, ἐμοὶ τῷ συγγενομένῳ αὐτῷ μὴ μάχου· πρὸς γὰρ στερεὰν πέτραν ὄντα με, θεμέλιον ἐκκλησίας, ἐναντίος ἀνθέστηκάς μοι). The Greek text is taken from Ps. Clement, *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien* (2nd ed.; ed. Johannes Irmscher, Georg Strecker, et al.; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969).

Mark, as for Paul, what makes an apostle is a resurrection appearance (see 1 Cor 3:18-23; 9:1-8; 1 Cor 15:1-11; see also Gal 1:1, 13-24; 2 Cor 11:21-12:5).³⁴

Additionally, my dissertation contributes to ongoing discussions about Mark's literary genre. Over the past 150 years, scholars have debated whether Mark's narrative is more properly a biography,³⁵ history,³⁶ or a work that is some form of *sui generis* literary hybrid.³⁷ Recently, it has been suggested that Mark's gospel is not a narrative (διήγησις) at all. Matthew Larsen, in his *The Gospels before the Book*, contends that Mark is, rather, *hypomnēmata* (ὕπομνήματα); that is, it is a collection of unfinished notes.³⁸ This thesis, largely incompatible with my own,³⁹ has garnered significant scholarly attention,⁴⁰ and its claims must be investigated carefully. In the following paragraphs, I will challenge Larsen's readings of select Markan passages (readings that occupy only 21 pages of a 154-page monograph⁴¹) that are taken by him to be exemplary of

³⁴ Presuming Mark's familiarity with the famous food fight at Antioch (see Gal 2:11-21), it is probable that, like Paul, the evangelist understood this event to be an example of Peter's holding too firmly to old (earthly) misconceptions and forgetting the spectacular eschatological revolution that been effected as a result of the death and resurrection of Christ.

³⁵ For example, Richard A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (2nd edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).

³⁶ See, for example, Eve-Marie Becker, *The Birth of Christian History: Memory and Time from Mark to Luke-Acts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), who understands the gospels to add a new "subgenre" to the field of history-writing (71-72).

³⁷ Collin's understanding of Mark as an "eschatological historical monograph" (*Mark*, 42-3) can be taken as exemplary of this approach.

³⁸ Matthew D.C. Larsen, *The Gospels before the Book* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

³⁹ Not only is Mark "finished" on my reading, but I argue that Mark's story presumes and self-consciously evokes a larger narrative of which it forms an integral and seamless part.

⁴⁰ On its back cover, one eminent scholar lauds the work as "the best book on the Gospel of Mark and the synoptic Gospels in general, since they were written" (!).

⁴¹ Larsen, *Gospels before the Book*, 107-8, 114-120 [focusing on Mark's endings], 128-35, 138-44. Indeed, Larsen states that a close reading of Mark is not the project of his monograph: "An entire book would be needed to do a

significant internal tensions within Mark's text and, therefore, demonstrative of the fact that Mark is an unfinished work.⁴² Having done so, I will return (briefly) to a broader discussion of Mark's literary genre and offer a different way of conceptualizing it.

closer reading of the whole Gospel according to Mark from the perspective of an unfinished note collection. But for the present it is sufficient to note that once one is dislodged from presupposing narrative logic as the only possible form of organization, a different kind of logic emerges within the Gospel according to Mark" (135). Outside of the fact that this quote contradicts Larsen's own language on the facing page, where he explicitly states that Mark has "some narrative logic to it" (134), I will demonstrate that, had Larsen pursued the project his quote invites, the claim that Mark is a collection of ὑπομνήματα is untenable.

⁴² Larsen's monograph in fact has problems at interpretive levels beyond the exegetical. For example, his work lacks hermeneutical clarity. Larsen says that he is not making a claim about the nature of the Gospel of Mark *per se*: "My claim is more modest: the Gospel of Mark was regularly described and received by its earliest readers and users as less finished, more rough, open, revisable, unpublished, and not very 'bookish' (122). As such, Larsen invites his readers to *approach* Mark as an unfinished collection of notes ("I have argued it is productive to approach the text we now call the Gospel according to Mark in a way analogous to the way its earliest readers and users approached it—as an unfinished note collection" [149]). Yet, despite his claim to the contrary, Larsen also has ideas about what Mark *is*. In his view, it is not simply hermeneutically fruitful to think about it *as* a collection of notes in order to gain insight into how some early Christian thinkers might have engaged it; the Gospel of Mark *is* notes: "I have argued that the Gospel according to Mark was unfinished, fluid, and prone to alteration" (151); "the producer(s) of the textual tradition we now call the Gospel according to Mark seems (seem) to have collected sets of notes to be mediated upon, to be reread, to be rewritten, to be used, to be taught and preached" (147). Larsen wants his readers to think of Mark *as* notes because he takes it to *be* notes, but he does not state this forthrightly. What may have been true of some circles of Markan readers in the first and second centuries has become normative of all Markan readers of the period and down to the present day. While imagining that some readers might have understood Mark to be a collection of unfinished notes opens up some interesting interpretive possibilities, claiming that Mark was originally composed *as* notes cannot be sustained upon careful investigation of the Markan narrative.

In addition, many of the exegetical conclusions Larsen derives from his comparative methodology are problematic. I judge there to be interpretive errors across chapter 5, where Larsen engages patristic understandings of Mark, but I highlight one example as representative. Larsen claims that Mark is not a "narrative," referencing the Greek word διήγησις (see pgs. 133-134). To support this contention, he goes to the Gospel of Luke. According to Larsen, Mark must be considered one of Luke's sources (the author of Luke's preface is "the earliest known reader of the textual tradition we now call the Gospel according to Mark" [86]), but Luke is also unsatisfied with Mark because, "for the writer of the preface, previous attempts to write the story of Jesus were failed attempts. They were failures because they, like *hypomnēmata*, were not careful enough (*akribēs*), did not follow things from the

beginning in an orderly fashion, and did not discuss the topics customarily expected by ancient readers in stories about a person” [86]). Yet Larsen glosses the fact that Luke refers to Mark *as* a “narrative” (διήγησις), precisely that which Larsen claims the second gospel is not. Lk 1:1 reads, in part, “Inasmuch as many have tried to arrange in order the narrative [διήγησιν] of the things that have been fulfilled among us...” It is particularly glaring that, in his translation of Luke’s preface on pg. 84, not only does Larsen choose to render διήγησις as “story” instead of “narrative,” but he does not provide a transliteration of the Greek word.

Similarly, in his chapter on the earliest “users” of Mark (chapter 6), Larsen claims that Mark is a collection of unfinished notes because Matthew “clarifies” Mark at certain points, a procedure that, according to him, should not be necessary of polished narrative. Larsen argues, for example, that Mark’s statement, “the disciples did not understand about the loaves [ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις] because their hearts were hardened” (Mk 6:52), which occurs within the story of Jesus’ walking on water (Mk 6:46-52), is unexpected. According to him, “nothing in the story is about bread, so the comment hangs there without explanation,” and this results in Matthew’s clarifying the narrative by removing the bread entirely (113; see Matt 14:22-33). The problem is that Larsen has divorced this story from its immediate literary context. To be sure, there is nothing about bread in Mk 6:46-52 (other than Jesus’ statement, of course), but the story that *immediately* precedes it is the feeding of the five thousand (Mk 6:34-45), where bread plays an immensely important role (see Mk 6:38, 41-2). Similarly, based on his reading of Jesus’ return to his hometown (Mk 6:1-6), Larsen claims that “Matthew 13:58...clarifies what was unclear in Mark 6:5: that his inability to do a miracle was not a question of Jesus’s power but of Jesus’s response to his hometown’s unbelief” (113). *Pace* Larsen, this is not a clarification by Matthew. In the very next verse (Mk 6:6), Mark says what amounts to the same thing: “and he was amazed at their unbelief [τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν].” Larsen’s failure to observe this is especially surprising given that he brings that exact verse (Mk 6:6) into his argument at a later point in his monograph (pg. 141, discussed in the body of this chapter). One cannot help but wonder if *a priori* assumptions about the nature of Mark have allowed Larsen to read Markan stories and even individual verses divorced from their wider literary context whenever including them would undercut his thesis.

Finally, at certain points, Larsen appears to represent his scholarly materials inaccurately. He says of Martin Kähler, for example, that “Labeling everything up to the passion narrative ‘an extended introduction’ was a clever way of saying that all the stories from the beginning of the text to the passion do not hang together in any kind of obvious narrative way” (127). This statement is difficult to countenance. Kähler’s point is rather the opposite. All of the evangelists write from the perspective of their understanding of the crucified and resurrected lord, and that knowledge infuses every episode of their texts: “They show us only a sovereign Jesus, master of himself and therefore the quick and unfailing master of every situation, a man who lives life to the full, no longer assimilating from but only contributing to his environment and intent on fulfilling his calling and consummating his destiny” (Kähler, *The So-Called Historical Jesus*, 94; for Kähler’s full summary of the contents of the gospels, see *The So-Called Historical Jesus*, 92-4). It is not that literary episodes prior to the passion do not cohere with one another; it is that their coherence is indelibly linked to the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Even if one does

In the seventh chapter of his monograph, Larsen admits that Mark's text has "some narrative logic" to it,⁴³ but he nevertheless argues that it contains competing Christologies that speak against its having narrative concordance. He explains, "In some stories, Jesus does things that many first century Jewish readers would have associated with the activity of the God of Israel alone; in others, Jesus flatly denies his divinity."⁴⁴ According to Larsen, Jesus' walking on

not logically follow upon another (and it is not clear to me that Kähler would grant this concession), there is nevertheless narrative unity insofar as all direct the reader's eye forward to the cross.

⁴³ Larsen says, "Of course, while a note-like organization pervades the text, the Gospel according to Mark does in fact have some narrative logic to it. That is, while it lacks the narrative elements present in the Gospel according to Matthew, and especially the Gospel according to Luke, like stories about parents, childhood, teaching, things after death and so forth (see chapters 5 and 6), it nonetheless has a clear beginning and a middle and an end. Jesus's death is foreshadowed early in the text (2:20; 3:6) and Jesus's impending execution remains a recurring theme from 8:31 onward. In fact, it has concentric circles of narrative logic, with each set of notes having its own narrative logic, and the five sets of notes possessing a narrative logic. So while the Gospel according to Mark is not a narrative (*diēgesis*), it does have a narrative logic to it" (*Gospels before the Book* 134). This quote is remarkable. One wonders at what point the "concentric circles of narrative logic" attains enough continuity to be considered "narrative" (διήγησις). While it may not follow the structure of conventional Graeco-Roman *bioi*, Larsen admits that it nevertheless has a literary concordance.

Interestingly, earlier in his monograph (*Gospels before the Book*, 80-81), Larsen attempts to argue against the possibility that Mark is a *sui generis* narrative: "A genre consisting of only one example is [sic] contradiction, because to belong to a genre is to belong to an already existing, recognizable group" (*Gospels before the Book*, 81). This argument is a facile one (Larsen ignores, for example, the degree to which something that is *sui generis* is nevertheless the product of a larger literary culture, drawing upon and adapting conventional literary forms for its own ends), but I raise his critique because, ironically, his own argument could be turned against him here: given its complex "narrative logic," could one not argue that Mark is utterly unique as "notes" (ὑπομνήματα)? Is "an unfinished collection of notes with narrative logic" (*Gospels before the Book*, 134 [emphasis original]) not itself *sui generis*? Larsen even admits that, "The bracketing of a set of keywords and ideas with parallel stories is unique to the Gospel according to Mark, to my knowledge, when compared to other *hypomnēmata*, but it fits with the logic of grouping stories and anecdotes by keywords and themes for later use and meditation" (*Gospels before the Book*, 129). Presuming one agrees with Larsen's claim about Mark's uniqueness excluding its classification as a literary genre, one should also be able to here claim that its uniqueness excludes its classification as "unfinished notes."

⁴⁴ Larsen, *Gospels before the Book*, 138.

water and nearly “passing by” (παρελθεῖν) his disciples (Mk 6:45-52; see also Ex 33:19, 22), his using the phrase “I am” (ἐγώ εἰμι [Mk 6:50; 13:6; 14:62; see also Ex 3:14]), his stilling of the storm (Mk 4:35-45; see also Ps 107:25-30), his performance of a miraculous feeding in the wilderness (Mk 6:32-44; see also Ex 16), and his ability to forgive sins (Mk 2:1-12) all bear witness to Jesus’ “functioning as a divine figure.”⁴⁵ At the same time, Larsen points out that “Jesus claims that he is not God,”⁴⁶ and he uses Mk 10:18—“no one is good except God alone” (οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἶς ὁ θεός)—as his proof text.⁴⁷

Here, Larsen’s interpretation is linguistically and exegetically imprecise. He draws a false equivalence between “God” (θεός) and “divine” (θεῖος), and it is this slippage that creates incongruities in Mark’s Christology that would not appear otherwise. Nowhere in Mark does Jesus state that he is the God of Israel (nor does Mark unambiguously characterize him as such), and nowhere does Jesus flatly deny his divinity (in the sense of his being a divine figure distinct from God). The Jesus that Mark (re)presents for his audience is the Spirit-infused beloved *Son* of God (see Mk 1:9-11, 24; 3:11; 5:7; 9:7; 12:6; 15:39; etc.), a figure who is both distinct from, yet indelibly connected with, the God of Israel. Because those passages wherein Jesus seems to take on the role of the deity are so allusive, there is no reason to suppose that Mark is calling for his audience to imagine a one-to-one correspondence between the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the messiah Jesus Christ. Thus, though Christ, like God, may have the power to forgive sins, this does not mean that he and God are one and the same (indeed, part of the purpose of Mk 2:1-12 is to show that someone *else* has the power to forgive sins), and Jesus’ directing the

⁴⁵ Larsen, *Gospels before the Book*, 138-9.

⁴⁶ Larsen, *Gospels before the Book*, 139.

⁴⁷ Larsen, *Gospels before the Book*, 139.

attribution of “good” (ἀγαθός) from himself to God (Mk 10:18) is not in any significant tension with the larger picture of the messiah that Mark presents.⁴⁸ Mark’s Jesus may not be God (θεός), but that does not mean he is not divine (θεῖος).⁴⁹ The tensions Larsen sees in Mark’s Christology are more the result of the imprecise application of his theological categories than they are the result of Mark’s unreflective combination of disparate source materials.

⁴⁸ Larsen (*Gospels before the Book*, 139) attempts to argue that, because the scribes use the language “God alone” in Mk 2:1-12 (εἷς ὁ θεός [Mk 2:7]), it can be taken as evidence of Christological contradiction since, at Mk 10:18, Jesus redirects praise from himself to God using the same language. *Pace* Larsen, Jesus does not claim to be God in Mk 2:1-12. Rather, Jesus is forced to demonstrate to the scribes that there is another who has the power to forgive sins: “In order that you know that the Son of Man [ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] has authority [ἐξουσίαν] to forgive sins upon the earth [ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς]...’ he says to the paralytic, ‘I say to you, get up! Take your mat and go into your home.’” (Mk 2:10-11).

⁴⁹ Additionally, that Larsen presumes Mark’s status as “narrative” (διήγησις) is contingent upon the story’s having a relatively systematic Christology is also problematic. Whatever theologizing Mark does in his narrative is done in a narrative mode. His concern is not to parse out the precise nature of Christ’s divinity (a theological question that would ultimately take centuries to resolve) but, rather, to show *through* his story that Christ is both divine and human. One might here point out that Paul’s theology is done in much the same mode. The apostle does not use philosophical categories to articulate Christ’s nature; he tells stories. Though it is possible that Paul equates Christ with God (see Rom 9:5: “...from whom is Christ according to the flesh [ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα], the one who is over all [ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων], God, blessed forever [θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας]”), he, like Mark, shows little interest in delving into the complex metaphysical calculus necessary to explain how the two might be one or how it can be that the preexistent and eternal (son of) God was able to die a humiliating and mortal death upon the cross. Rather, Paul fully embraces the paradoxes created by the Christ event, and he uses narrative to present them to others.

Jesus’ deflection at Mk 10:18 thus likely works analogously to Paul’s statement at 2 Cor 5:21: “The one who did not know sin [τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν] he [God] made sin on our behalf [ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν], so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.” It is not the case that, for Paul, the earthly Jesus was sinful; rather, the messiah temporarily embodies a lower position in the created order (one dominated by sin) in order to effect salvation for all through his innocent death upon the cross (see Phil 2:6-11). For Mark, too, Jesus’ deflecting praise to the God above while he walks upon the earth as a human being is a means by which his (temporary) occupation of an inferior position in cosmos is signaled.

Similarly, Larsen claims that Mark is inconsistent in his portrayal of Jesus' ability to perform miracles: sometimes Jesus is able to effect them (with or without his knowledge), sometimes he is not, and there is "no apparent attempt to massage them all into one unitary meaning."⁵⁰ Larsen uses the trio of stories found in Mk 5:21-6:6—the raising of Jairus' daughter [Mk 5:21-4, 35-43], the hemorrhaging woman [Mk 5:25-34], and Jesus' unwelcome reception in his hometown (Mk 6:1-6)—to make his case. In the raising of Jairus' daughter, Larsen explains, Jesus is able to perform a miracle *despite* the fact that he is "mocked," "ridiculed," and encounters "disbelief." Alternatively, in his hometown, so comprehensive is the disbelief that Jesus *cannot* perform miracles (see Mk 6:5-6).⁵¹ Finally, in the case of the hemorrhaging woman, Larsen claims that Jesus does not seem to have any control over his miraculous powers at all.⁵² Once again, these incongruities, in Larsen's view, are to be taken as evidence that Mark is not a narrative (διήγησις) but a collection of unfinished notes (ὑπομνήματα).

In the case of this series of examples, Larsen has simply misread Mark's text. Though he is correct to point out that belief or disbelief plays a vital role in Jesus' ability to perform miracles, Mark nowhere implies that, with a critical mass of disbelieving persons around Jesus, his miraculous power suddenly becomes ineffective. Jesus encounters disbelief throughout the narrative, and Mark repeatedly makes it clear that healing is accomplished on the basis of the belief of the *individual* who is asking for it, whether for his or her own sake (Mk 5:34; 10:52), or for the sake of others (Mk 2:5; 5:36; 9:23-4; see also Mk 7:24-30⁵³), regardless of how many

⁵⁰ Larsen, *Gospels before the Book*, 140-141.

⁵¹ According to Larsen, "the function of the doubt of those around Jesus in 6:1-6a stands in almost incompatible contrast to the doubt and ridicule of those around Jesus in 5:35-43" (*Gospels before the Book*, 141).

⁵² Larsen, *Gospels before the Book* 141-2.

⁵³ In the episode with the Syro-Phoenician woman, neither the noun πίστις ("faith") or the verb πιστεύω ("believe") occur, but it is clear from the woman's actions that she embodies faith and belief.

disbelieving persons might be in the immediate vicinity. It is therefore irrelevant whether or not the people in Jairus' home believe in Jesus; it only matters whether or not Jairus *himself* believes in the messiah (“Do not be afraid [μὴ φοβοῦ]. Only believe [μόνον πίστευε]” [Mk 5:36]).

Similarly, when Jesus comes to his hometown, it is not that their collective disbelief (ἀπιστία) is so overwhelming that he cannot perform a deed of power (δύναμις). Rather, the problem is that there are so few there who have the necessary faith to receive it. Importantly, however, there are a few who do, and this is why Mark adds, “[Jesus] healed a few people sick with fever [ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις...ἐθεράπευσεν]” (Mk 6:5).

In the case of the hemorrhaging woman (whose restoration also operates on this faith-to-healing template), *pace* Larsen, the manner in which she is healed is not unique. Healings resulting from Jesus' being touched by a believer (with or without his knowledge) occur at Mk 3:10 (“... with the result that they fell upon him in order that, as many as had afflictions [ὅσοι εἶχον μάστιγας] might touch him [αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται]...”), Mk 6:56 (“and they were beseeching him in order that they might even touch the fringe of his garment [κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται]. And so many as touched him [ὅσοι ἂν ἤψαντο αὐτοῦ] were saved [ἐσώζοντο]”), and, possibly, Mk 8:22 (“And they carried to him a blind man and were beseeching him in order that he might touch him [ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψηται]”⁵⁴). Within the larger context of Mark's narrative, then, the manner of the woman's healing is unsurprising. Jesus is a fount of divine energy that provides healing to all who come to him in faith. Far from being incongruous, these stories stand in continuity with and add texture to the how and why of miracles across Mark's narrative.

⁵⁴ The Greek is here ambiguous. Jesus could either be the subject or the object of the purpose clause. If he is the latter, it is the blind man who is brought to touch *him*.

The evidence from Mark's gospel that Larsen has mustered to argue for the text's being classified as "unfinished notes" (ὑπομνήματα) is, therefore, unconvincing. Rather, when Larsen's passages are set within their larger literary context, Mark is seen to be a carefully crafted and internally consistent narrative (διήγησις). Whatever else it may be (history, biography, or something *sui generis*), Mark is not *hypomnēmata*. In my judgment, Mark ought to be classified as the evangelist himself classifies it: it is "gospel" (εὐαγγέλιον [Mk 1:1]). That is, though the story shares some generic features with historiography and biography, with Willi Marxsen, I take Mark's primary literary purpose to be a textualization of the proclamation by which "the Risen Lord re-presents his own life on this earth."⁵⁵ Mark's principal goals are not historical or biographical; they are kerygmatic and theological. He presents a portion of the gospel narrative (the story of the life, death, resurrection, and second coming of Jesus Christ in accordance with the scriptures [1 Cor 15:3-8]) that, when perceived by a receptive audience, results in an epiphany of the deity. The Gospel of Mark is a narrative that expands upon the sacred story that Paul presumes, and it participates in its same theological poetics. Thus, the genre of Paul's gospel and the genre of Mark's are one and the same.

Finally, my dissertation furthers scholarly inquiry into the nature of early Christian hermeneutics. Not only does it carry forward the project of Mitchell, but it expands upon it by underscoring that Mark's gospel, like Paul's, has a combined historical and fictive nature. Mark self-consciously adapts and composes episodes about the earthly life of Jesus (healing narratives, missionary journeys, etc.) in order to bind the past concordantly with his present moment. The past that is presented in Mark is thus chronology blended with imagination in order to respond to

⁵⁵ Marxsen, *Mark*, 131.

the need of his present moment.⁵⁶ Such a recognition invites further inquiry into the ways in which other early Christians authors conceptualized time and their positions within it, on the one hand, and the extent to which they then shaped past events and created stories so as to speak meaningfully to their own particular social and historical locations, on the other.

I began this dissertation with Frank Kermode's claim that "In the midst, we look for a fullness of time, for beginning, middle, and end in concord."⁵⁷ Mark is, in my judgment, one "in the midst." He is a writer alive at the ending of the world, and he seeks to bring (for himself and for his community) the past into concord with his present in anticipation of that future he knows will soon appear on the horizon with the clouds and great power and glory (see Mk 13:26). By way of ending, then, I return briefly to the idea of the "midst." In conceptualizing the process by which the past is bound concordantly with the present in Mark and in the other synoptic gospels, I have found the hermeneutical procedure Paul Ricoeur labels threefold mimesis particularly illuminating.⁵⁸ According to Ricoeur, "the composition of plot is grounded

⁵⁶ Here, I stand close to Becker. Though I am not convinced that it is proper to speak of Mark as a "history," or that Mark's aim is to produce "a 'real' and 'trustworthy' story which is verifiable (Lk 1:1-4) on the basis of sources and witnesses" (*Birth of Christian History*, 92), I do agree with her more general observation that "historiographical accounts per se are a narrative blend of factual and fictional elements, as historiographical epistemology in general is based on prefiguration, by which references to the past are affected and interpreted" (*Birth of Christian History*, 86).

⁵⁷ Kermode, *Sense of an Ending*, 58.

⁵⁸ See Paul Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative* (3 vols.; trans. Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983). Indeed, the gospel of Mark makes for an interesting conversation partner with Ricoeur in a variety of different ways. For example, the second gospel occupies an intermediary space between the two ancient figures Ricoeur places in dialogue in the first volume of his *Time and Narrative* that sets up his entire project (Augustine [chapter 1]; Aristotle [chapter 2]). Not only is Mark written in the first century, right in the middle of the temporal divide that separates the philosopher (4th century B.C.E.) from the theologian (4th-5th century C.E.), but it is a Greek (i.e. Eastern) narrative written in the western half of the Roman empire, it draws upon tragedy for its themes without being tragedy (as a literary genre) or tragic (as a descriptive adjective for its final

in a preunderstanding of the world of action, its meaningful structures, its symbolic resources, and its temporal character” (mimesis one).⁵⁹ This preunderstanding is then imaginatively (re)configured by an author and mediated through emplotted narrative (mimesis two)⁶⁰ to readers who “receive it according to their own receptive capacity” and integrate it into own their lived experiences (mimesis three).⁶¹ On my reading, Mark has also taken a “preunderstanding of the world of action” (to use Ricoeur’s language), one that is informed by his familiarity with and particular conception of Paul’s gospel narrative, traditional stories about Jesus, the various exigencies of his community at the time of his composition, and so forth, and he has configured a narrative about the earthly mission of the messiah that both participates in and reconfigures that world for the needs of his community living at a particular historical moment (with one of those

sequence of events [i.e. though Christ dies, his resurrection is nevertheless assured [Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-4; 14:28; etc.], and it self-consciously invites the “filling in” or retelling of the narrative as a result of its abrupt ending (something which doubtlessly encouraged Matthew’s and Luke’s own reworkings). In other words, the ideas of the figures Ricoeur juxtaposes in order to lay the foundation for his theory of threefold mimesis find a certain synthesis in the Gospel of Mark, and this, in turn, invites further exploration of the ways in which Mark may be used to elucidate the thought of Ricoeur and vice versa. I am indebted to Prof. Richard Rosengarten for these insights. Any errors or oversimplifications are my own.

⁵⁹ Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 1.54.

⁶⁰ Mimesis 2 “has an intermediary position because it has a mediating function. This mediating function derives from the dynamic character of the configuring operation that has led us to prefer the term emplotment to that of a plot and ordering to that of a system. In fact all the concepts relative to this level designate operations. The dynamism lies in the fact that a plot already exercises, within its own textual field, an integrating and, in this sense, a mediating function, which allows it to bring about, beyond this field, a mediation of a larger amplitude between the preunderstanding and, if I may dare to put it this way, the postunderstanding of the order of action and its temporal features” (Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 1.65; for his fuller discussion of Mimesis 2, see *Time and Narrative*, 1.64-70).

⁶¹ Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 1.70-87. The partial citation is taken from *Time and Narrative*, 1.77, which reads in full: “What is communicated, in the final analysis, is, beyond the sense of a work, the world it projects and that constitutes its horizon. In this sense, the listeners or readers receive it according to their own receptive capacity, which itself is defined by a situation that is both limited and open to the world’s horizon.”

needs being an elucidation of the connection between the person of Jesus and the teachings of the apostle Paul). Mark's story, then, does not attempt to (re)present the "that" of history (i.e. that which actually happened); rather, the "that" of the past has been fictively transformed for a community whose interests reside in the present and who look expectantly to the future. Ultimately, when that future does not arrive, the process begins again.⁶² Matthew and Luke, from their different geographic locations and at their different historical moments, take up Mark's narrative, and, understood in relation to their own preunderstandings of the world, they configure the story anew. The end result is that the gospel that Paul proclaimed, reconfigured by Mark, is interwoven into their own gospels in profound and unexpected ways, but that, of course, is the subject of a different study.

⁶² This renewal is what Ricoeur refers to as the hermeneutic spiral: "That the analysis is circular is indisputable. But that the circle is a vicious one can be refuted. In this regard, I would rather speak of an endless spiral that would carry the mediation past the same point a number of times, but at different altitudes" (Ricoeur, *Time and Narrative*, 1.72).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Aelian. *On Animals*. Translated by A.F. Scholfield. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2014.
- The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Translated by Michael W. Holmes. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Aphthonius. *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*. Edited by Hugo Rabe. Leipzig: Teubner, 1926.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Translated by Stephen Halliwell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric*. Translated by John Henry Freese. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- Augustine. *The Confessions*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977.
- Cicero. *De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica*. Translated by H.M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.
- Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum*. Edited by Augustus Hausrath and Herbert Hunger. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner, 1970.
- Demetrius. *On Style*. Edited by Doreen C. Innes. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History* trans. Kirsopp Lake and J.E.L Oulton. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926-32.
- Gaius, *The Institutes*. Translated by W.M. Gordon and O.F. Robinson. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Josephus. *The Jewish War*. Translated by H. St. John Thackeray. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities*. Translated by H. St. John Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, and Louis H. Feldman. 9 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Josephus. *The Life, Against Apion*. Translated by H. St. John Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Ignace d'Antioche, Polycarpe de Smyrne. Lettres. Martyre de Polycarpe*. Edited by P.T. Camelot. 4th ed. Sources Chrétiennes 10. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1969.
- Irenaeus of Lyons*. Translated by Robert Grant. London: Routledge, 1997.

- Libanius. *Selected Orations*. Translated by A. F. Norman. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Translated by W.H. Fyfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael*. Edited by Jacob Z. Lauterbach. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2004.
- New Testament Apocrypha*. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. 2 vols. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co. Ltd, 1991-1992.
- Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th ed. Edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruze M. Metzger. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.
- Philo*. Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929-1962.
- Pliny. *Letters*. Translated by Betty Radice. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Translated by George A. Kennedy. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Pseudo Clement. *Die Pseudoklementinen I: Homilien*. Edited by Johannes Irmischer, Georg Strecker, Franz Pashke, and Bernhard Rehm. 2nd ed. *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 42; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1969.
- Pseudo Philo. *Les Antiquités Bibliques*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Sources Chrésiennes 229. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976.
- Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. Translated by Donald A. Russell. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Septuaginta*. Edited by Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars*. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997-8.
- Tacitus. *Annals*. Translated by M. Hutton, W. Peterson, Clifford H. Moore, and John Jackson. Revised by R.M. Ogilvie, E.H. Warmington, and M. Winterbottom. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937-1970.
- Theon. *Progymnasmata*. Translated by Michel Patillon, and Giancarlo Bolognesi. Collection des Universités de France. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1997).

Secondary Sources

Adamczewski, Bartosz. *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2013.

----- *The Gospel of Luke: A Hypertextual Commentary*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2016.

----- *The Gospel of Mark: A Hypertextual Commentary*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2014.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Anderson, Janice Capel and Stephen D. Moore. "Introduction: The Lives of Mark." Pages 1-27 in *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Janice Capel Anderson and Stephen D Moore. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Barrett, C.K. "The Background to Mark 10:45." Pages 1-18 in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Honour of T.W. Manson*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959.

----- *The Epistle to the Romans*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Barton, John. "The Canonical Approach." Pages 77-88 in *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*. Edited by John Barton. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

----- *The Nature of Biblical Criticism*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.

Bauckham, Richard. "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?" Pages 9-48 in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Bayer, Hans F. *Das Evangelium des Markus*. Historisch Theologische Auslegung 5. Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus, 2008.

Beavis, Mary Ann. *Mark's Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4:11-12*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.

Becker, Eve-Marie. "Earliest Christian *Literary Activity*: Investigating Authors, Genres, and Audiences in Paul and Mark." Pages 87-105 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.

----- *The Birth of Christian History: Memory and Time from Mark to Luke-Acts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.

Becker, Eve-Marie, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Mogens Müller. "Mark and Paul—Introductory Remarks." Pages 1-10 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against*

- Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Behr, John. *The Way to Nicaea*. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- "Transferring a Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6." Pages 84-118 in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pederson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Black, C. Clifton. "Christ Crucified in Paul and Mark: Reflections on an Intracanonial Conversation." Pages 184-206 in *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. and Jerry L. Sumney. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- Boring, M. Eugene. *Mark: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Botha, Pieter J.J. *Orality and Literacy in Early Christianity*. Biblical Performance Criticism 5. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2012.
- Bovon, Francois. *Luke*. Translated by Christine M. Thomas, Donald Deer, and James Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002-2013.
- *Luke the Theologian*. 2nd ed. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006
- Breytenbach, Cilliers. "The Septuagint Version of Isaiah 53 and the Early Christian Formula, 'He was Delivered for Our Trespases.'" *Novum Testamentum* 51 (2009): 339-51.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah from Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Bultman, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.
- Bundy, Walter E. "The Meaning of Jesus' Baptism." *The Journal of Religion* 7 (1927): 56-71.
- Burridge, Richard A. *What are the Gospels: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Byrne, Brendan. *Romans*. Sacra Pagina 6. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Carey, Holly J. *Jesus' Cry from the Cross: Towards a First-Century Understanding of the Intertextual Relationship between Psalm 22 and the Narrative of Mark's Gospel*. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Ciampa, Roy E. and Brian S. Rosner. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

- Cockerill, Gareth Lee. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- “Mark and the Hermeneutics of History Writing.” Pages 231-44 in *Mark and Matthew II: Comparative Readings: Reception History, Cultural Hermeneutics, and Theology*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 304. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Collins, Raymond E. *I & II Timothy and Titus*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Sacra Pagina 7. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *I Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.
- “The Atonement—Adequate Reward for the Akedah?” Pages 15-29 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969.
- “The Purpose of Mark’s Gospel.” Pages 52-65 in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*. Edited by Nils Alstrup Dahl; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976.
- Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms 1-50*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Daise, Michael A. “‘Christ Our Passover’ (1 Corinthians 5:6-8): The Death of Jesus and the Quartodeciman Pascha,” *Neotestamentica* 50.2 (2016): 507-526.
- Damgaard, Finn. “Persecution and Denial—Paradigmatic Apostolic Portrayals in Paul and Mark.” Pages 195-210 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Davidson, Ole. “Adam-Christ Typology in Paul and Mark: Reflections on a *Tertium Comparationis*.” Pages 243-272 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- de Boer, Martinus C. *Galatians: A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2011.

- de Bruyne, Dom Donatien. "Les plus anciens prologues latins des Évangiles." *Revue Bénédictine*, XL (1928): 193-214.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Literature in Secret." Pages 119-158 in idem, *The Gift of Death and Literature in Secret*. Translated by David Wills. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- DeSilva, David A. *4 Maccabees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews."* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Dibelius, Martin. *James*. Translated by Michael A. Williams. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964.
- *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by B. L. Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.
- Dietzfelbinder, Christian. *Pseudo-Philo: Antiquitates Biblicae*. Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit II.2. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1975.
- Doan, William and Terry Giles. *Prophets, Performance, and Power: Performance Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Dochorn, Jan. "Man and the Son of Man in Mark 2:27-28: An Exegesis of Mark 2:23-28 Focusing on the Christological Discourse in Mark 2:27-28 with an Epilogue Concerning Pauline Parallels." Pages 147-158 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 199*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Dodd, C.H. *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments: Three Lectures*. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1937.
- Donahue, John R., S.J. "The Quest for the Community of Mark's Gospel." Pages 817-37 in vol. 2 of *The Four Gospels: Festschrift for Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. van Segbroek, C.M. Tucker, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden. 3 vols. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991.
- Donahue, John R., S.J. and Daniel J. Harrington, S.J. *The Gospel of Mark*. Sacra Pagina 2. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2002.
- Dowling, Elizabeth V. "'Do This in Remembrance of Me': Last Supper Traditions in Paul and Mark." Pages 221-241 in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I, Two Authors at the Beginnings of Early Christianity*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 198*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Drescher, Richard. "Das Markusevangelium und seine Entstehung." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 17 (1916): 228-256.

- Duff, Paul Brooks. "Apostolic Suffering and the Language of Processions in 2 Cor 4:7-10." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 21 (1991): 158-65.
- "Metaphor, Motif, and Meaning: The Rhetorical Strategy Behind the Image 'Led in Triumph' in 2 Corinthians 2:14." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 53 (1991): 79-92.
- Dunn, James D.G. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A&C Black, 1993.
- "Once More, πίστις Χριστοῦ." Pages 61-81 in *Pauline Theology Volume IV: Looking Back, Pressing On*. Edited by E. Elizabeth Johnson and David M. Hay; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- "The New Perspective on Paul." Pages 183-214 in *Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990. Repr. and expanded from *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 65 (1983): 95-122.
- Dykstra, Tom E. "From Volkmar to Tarazi and Beyond: Mark as an Allegorical Presentation of the Pauline Gospel." Pages 99-120 in *Festschrift in Honor of Professor Paul Nadim Tarazi*. Edited by Bradley Nassif. 2 vols. New York: Peter Lang, 2015.
- Dykstra, Tom E. *Mark, Canonizer of Paul*. St. Paul: OCABS Press, 2012.
- Eckey, Wilfried. *Das Markusevangelium: Orientierung am Weg Jesu*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1998.
- *Der Galaterbrief: ein Kommentar*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010.
- Edwards, James R. *Romans*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament 6. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992.
- *The Gospel According to Mark*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Leicester: Apollos, 2002.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. "Paul in Mark 8:34-9:1: Mark on what it is to be a Christian." Pages 189-209 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II; For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014).
- Fenton, J.C. "Paul and Mark." Pages 89-112 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Honor of R.H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Fisk, Bruce N. "Offering Isaac Again and Again: Pseudo-Philo's use of the Aqedah as Intertext." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62 (2000): 481-507
- Fiske, G.C. *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1971.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *First Corinthians*. Anchor Bible 32. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans*. Anchor Bible 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Focant, Camille. *L'évangile selon Marc*. Commentaire Biblique: Nouveau Testament 2. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2010.
- Fortna, Robert. "Jesus and Peter at the High Priest's House: A Test Case for the Question of the Relation between Mark's and John's Gospels." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 371-83.
- Foster, Paul. *Colossians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.
- Fowler, Robert M. "Reader-Response Criticism: Figuring Mark's Reader." Pages 59-93 in *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Janice Capel Anderson and Stephen D Moore. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- France, R.T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Friedrich, Gerhard. "εὐαγγέλιον." Pages 721-737 in vol. 2 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians*. Anchor Bible 32a. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Gamble, Harry. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Garland, David E. *I Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsestes: La Littérature Au Second Degré*. Paris: Seuil, 1982.
- Gibson, Jeffrey B. "The Rebuke of the Disciples in Mark 8:14-21." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27 (1986): 31-47.
- Gignac, Alain. *L'Épître aux Romains*. Commentaire Biblique: Nouveau Testament 6. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2014.
- Glasswell, M.E. "The Relationship between John and Mark." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23 (1985): 99-115
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. 2 vols. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Solothurn und Düsseldorf: Benziger Verlag, 1994.
- Goulder, Michael D. "Those Outside (Mk 4:10-12)." *Novum Testamentum* 33 (1991): 289-302.
- Grant, Robert M. *The Letter and the Spirit*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1957.
- Guelich, Robert A., *Mark 1-8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary 34a. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.

- Haenchen, Ernst. *Der Weg Jesu: eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen*. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966.
- Hahn, Scott W. "Covenant, Oath, and the Aqedah: Διαθήκη in Galatians 3:15-18." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 67 (2005): 79-100.
- Halliwel, Stephen. "Pleasure, Understanding, and Emotion in Aristotle's *Poetics*." Pages 241-60 in *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*. Edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Harris, Horton. *The Tübingen School: A Historical and Theological Investigation of the School of F.C. Baur*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016.
- *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- *First Corinthians*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox, 1997.
- "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ and Pauline Christology: What is at Stake?" Pages 35-60 in *Pauline Theology Volume IV: Looking Back, Pressing On*. Edited by E. Elizabeth Johnson and David M. Hay; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Gal 3:1-4:11*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Hengel, Martin *Judaism and Hellenism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 1985.
- Hooker, Morna D. "A Partner in the Gospel: Paul's Understanding of His Ministry." Pages 83-100 in *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. and Jerry L. Sumney. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.
- "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ." *New Testament Studies* 35 (1989): 321-42
- *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- "'Who died for our sins, and was raised for our acquittal': Paul's Understanding of the Death of Christ." *Svensk exegetisk årsbok* 68 (2003): 59-71.
- Horsley, Richard A. *1 Corinthians*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1991.
- *Text and Tradition in Performance and Writing*. Biblical Performance Criticism 9. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2013.

- Huizenga, Leroy A. *The New Isaac: Tradition and Intertextuality in the Gospel of Matthew*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 131. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- "The Pastoral Epistles." Pages 141-155 in *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*. Edited by James D.G. Dunn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Incigneri, Brian J. *The Gospel According to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel*. Biblical Interpretation Series 65. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Jacobson, Howard. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Janko, Richard. "From Catharsis to the Aristotelian Mean." Pages 341-58 in *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*. Edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Jay, Jeff. *The Tragic in Mark: A Literary-historical Interpretation*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Jenkins, C. Ryan. "Faith and Work in Paul and James." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 159 (2002): 62-78.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Paul and James." *Expository Times* 66 (155): 368-71.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Johnson, Sherman E. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Harper's New Testament Commentaries 2. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.
- Kähler, Martin. *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic, Biblical Christ*. Translated by Carl E. Braaten. Philadelphia, Fortress, 1964.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. *Fear and Trembling*. Translated by Alastair Hannay. London: Penguin Books, 1985.
- Keck, Leander E. *Romans*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2005.
- Keener, Craig S. *1-2 Corinthians*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Kelber, Werner H. "Mark 14:32-42: Gethsemane; Passion Christology and Discipleship Failure." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 63 (1972): 166-187.
- *Mark's Story of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Kermode, Frank. *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1966.

- Klaiber, Walter. *Das Markusevangelium*. Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2010.
- *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2011.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *4 Makkabäerbuch*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1989.
- *I Korintherbrief*. Neue Echter Bibel 7. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1989.
- *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1982.
- Kok, Michael. "Does Mark Narrate the Pauline *Kerygma* of 'Christ Crucified?' Challenging an Emerging Consensus on Mark as a Pauline Gospel." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 37 (2014): 139-157.
- Ahearne-Kroll, Stephen P. *The Psalms of Lament in Mark's Passion: Jesus' Davidic Suffering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Lane, William L. *Hebrews 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary 47a. Dallas: Word Books, 1991.
- *The Gospel According to Mark*. New International Commentary on the New Testament 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Larsen, Kasper Bro. "Mark 7:1-23: A Pauline Halakah?" Pages 169-88 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Larsen, Matthew D.C. *The Gospels before the Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Lear, Jonathan. "Katharsis." Pages 315-40 in *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*. Edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Légasse, Simon. *L'Épître de Paul aux Galates*. Lectio Divina Commentaires 9. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2000.
- *L'Épître de Paul aux Romains*. Lectio Divina Commentaires 10. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2002.
- *L'Évangile de Marc*. 2 vols. Lectio Divina Commentaires 5. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1997.
- *Naissance du Baptême*. Lectio Divina 153. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993.
- Levenson, Jon. *The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Lietzmann, Hans. *An die Korinther I/II*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1969.
- *An die Galater*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 10. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1932.

- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary 42. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990.
- Lindemann, Andreas. "Das Evangelium bei Paulus und im Markusevangelium." Pages 313-359 in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I, Two Authors at the Beginnings of Early Christianity*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 198. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- *Die Clemensbriefe*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.
- "The First Epistle of Clement" Pages 47-70 in *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*. Edited by Wilhelm Pratscher. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010.
- Löhr, Hermut. "The Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch" Pages 91-116 in *The Apostolic Fathers: An Introduction*. Edited by Wilhelm Pratscher. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Colossians and Philemon*. Translated by William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Loisy, Alfred. *L'Épître Aux Galates*. Paris: E. Nourry, 1916.
- Longenecker, Bruce. "Galatians." Pages 64-73 in *The Cambridge Companion to Saint Paul*. Edited by James D.G. Dunn. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew*. Translated by James E. Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001-2007.
- "Matthew the Evangelist: A Jewish Christian at the Crossroads." Pages 3-17 in *Studies in Matthew*. Edited by Ulrich Luz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Lyonnet, Stanislas and Léopold Sabourin. *Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970.
- MacDonald, Dennis R. *Does the New Testament Imitate Homer: Four Cases from the Acts of the Apostles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.
- *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Mack, Burton L. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Mackay, Ian D. *John's Relationship with Mark: an Analysis of John 6 in Light of Mark 6-8*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 182. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. *Mark's Jesus: Characterization as Narrative Christology*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- "The Major Importance of the Minor Characters in Mark." Pages 185-225 in *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark's Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000. Repr. from pages 58-86 in *The New Literary Criticism*

- and the New Testament*. Edited by Elizabeth Struthers Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1994.
- “Narrative Criticism: How Does the Story Mean?” Pages 1-40 in *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark’s Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000. Repr. from pages 23-49 in *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Janice Cape Anderson and Stephen D. Moore. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- “Texts and Contexts: Interpreting the Disciples in Mark.” Pages 100-130 in *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark’s Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000. Repr. from *Semeia* 62 (1993): 81-102.
- Mann, C.S. *Mark*. Anchor Bible 27. New York: Doubleday, 1986.
- Marcus, Joel. “Mark and Isaiah,” Pages 449-66 in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by Astrid B. Beck, Andrew H. Bartelt, Paul R. Raabe, and Chris A. Franke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- *Mark: 1-8*. Anchor Bible 27. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- *Mark 8-16*. Anchor Bible 27a. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- “Mark—Interpreter of Paul” Pages 29-49 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- “Son of Man as Son of Adam.” *Revue Biblique* 110 (2003): 38-61, 370-86.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Martin, Richard P. “Ancient Theatre and Performance Culture.” Pages 36-54 in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*. Edited by Marianne McDonald and J. Michael Walton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians*. Anchor Bible 33. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Marxsen, Willi. *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel*. Translated by James Boyce, Donald Juel, William Poehlmann, and Roy A. Harrisville. Nashville: Abingdon, 1969.
- “Repräsentation im Abendmahl?” in *Monatsschrift für Pastoraltheologie* 41 (1952): 69-78.
- Matera, Frank J. *Galatians*. Sacra Pagina 9. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Mauser, Ulrich W. *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*. London: SCM Press, 1963.

- Mauss, Marcel. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. Translated by W.D. Halls. New York: W. W. Norton, 1990.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. "1 and 2 Thessalonians." Pages 51-63 in *The Cambridge Companion to Saint Paul*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- "Epiphanic Evolutions in Earliest Christianity" Pages 237-255 in *Paul and the Emergence of Christian Textuality*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 393. Tübingen; Mohr Siebek, 2017). Repr. from *Illinois Classical Studies* 29 (2004): 183-204.
- "Homer in the New Testament?" *Journal of Religion* 83 (2003): 244-260.
- "Patristic Counter-Evidence to the Claim that 'the Gospels Were Written for All Christians.'" *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005), 36-79.
- *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- *Paul, the Corinthians, and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- "Rhetorical Shorthand in Pauline Argumentation: The Functions of 'the Gospel' in the Corinthian Correspondence." Pages 111-132 in *Paul and the Emergence of Christian Textuality*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 393. Tübingen; Mohr Siebek, 2017. Repr. from pages 63-88 in *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*. Edited by L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- "The Emergence of the Written Record." Pages 1-18 in *Paul and the Emergence of Christian Textuality*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 393. Tübingen; Mohr Siebek, 2017. Repr. from pages 177-194 in *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Volume 1, Origins to Constantine*. Edited by Margaret M. Mitchell and Francis M. Young. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- "The Letter of James as a Document of Paulinism?" Pages 75-98 in *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James*. Edited by Robert L. Webb and John S. Kloppenborg. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of Mark*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983.
- Müller, W.G. "Interfiguralität: A Study on the Interdependence of Literary Figures." Pages 101-121 in *Intertextuality*. Edited by H. E. Plett. Berlin, de Gruyter, 1991.
- Murphy, Frederick James. *Pseudo-Philo: Rewriting the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "1 and 2 Corinthians." Pages 74-90 in *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*. Edited by James D.G. Dunn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. Good News Studies 6. Wilmington: Glazier, 1983.
- Nelligan, Thomas P. *The Quest for Mark's Sources: An Exploration of the Case for Mark's Use of First Corinthians*. Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2015.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. *2 Peter, Jude*. Anchor Bible 37. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- Niederwimmer, Kurt. *The Didache*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. "Tragedy and Self-sufficiency: Plato and Aristotle on Fear and Pity." Pages 261-90 in *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*. Edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Oestreich, Bernhard. *Performance Criticism of the Pauline Letters*. Translated by Lindsay Elias and Brent Blum. Biblical Performance Criticism 14. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2016.
- Omerzu, Heike. "Paul and Mark—Mark and Paul: A Critical Outline of the History of Research." Pages 51-61 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Orr William F. and James Arthur Walther. *1 Corinthians*. Anchor Bible 32. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Pearson, Birger A. "1 Thessalonians 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation." *Harvard Theological Review* 64 (1971) 79-94.
- Perkins, Pheme. *Abraham's Divided Children: Galatians and the Politics of Faith*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- Perrin, Norman. *What is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Perrot, Charles and Pierre-Maurice Bogaert. *Les Antiquités Bibliques II: Introduction Littéraire, Commentaire, et Index*. Sources Chrétiennes 230. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1976.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Acts*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.
- *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa: Polebridge, 2006.
- Pesch, Rudolph. *Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis*. Breisgau: Herder, 1978.

- Popkes, Wiard. "Two interpretations of 'Justification' in the New Testament Reflections on Galatians 2:15-21 and James 2:21-25." *Studia Theologica* 59 (2005): 129-46.
- Porter, Stanley E. *The Letter to the Romans: A Linguistic and Literary Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2015.
- Quesnel, Michel. *La première épître aux Corinthiens*. Commentaire Biblique. Nouveau Testament 7. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2018.
- Reicke, Bo. *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*. Anchor Bible 37. New York: Doubleday, 1964.
- Rhoads, David, Joanna Dewey, and Donald Michie. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
- Rhoads, David. "Performance Criticism: An Emerging Methodology in Second Testament Studies—Part I." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 36 (2006): 118-133.
- "Performance Criticism: An Emerging Methodology in Second Testament Studies—Part II." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 36 (2006): 164-184.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative*. Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. 3 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983-5.
- Roetzel Calvin J. *2 Corinthians*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2007.
- *Judgment in the Community: a Study of the Relationship between Eschatology and Ecclesiology in Paul*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- *Paul: The Man and the Myth*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
- *The Letters of Paul: Conversations in Context*. 5th ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009.
- Roth, Dieter T. Review of B. Adamzciewski, *The Gospel of Luke: A Hypertextual Commentary*. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1 (2018), 57-9.
- Schenk, Wolfgang. "Sekundäre Jesuanisierungen von primären Paulus-Aussagen bei Markus." Pages 877-904 in vol. 2 of *The Four Gospels: Festschrift for Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. van Segbroek, C.M. Tucker, G. van Belle, and J. Verheyden. 3 vols. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1991.
- Schenke, Ludger. *Das Markusevangelium: literarische Eigenwart—Text und Kommentierung*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005.
- Schipper, Jeremy. "Interpreting the Lamb Imagery in Isa 53." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132 (2013): 315-25.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Römerbrief*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1977.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Der Römerbrief: ein Kommentar*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1988.

- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Baptism in the Thought of Saint Paul*. Translated by G.R. Beasley-Murray. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.
- Schoedel, William R. *Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim. "The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 65 (1946): 385-92.
- Schottroff, Luise. *Der erste Brief an die Gemeinde in Korinth*. Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2013.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1906.
- *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by John Bowden. Translated by W. Montgomery, J. R. Coates, Susan Cupitt, and John Bowden. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
- Scroggs, Robin and Kent I. Groff. "Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 531-48.
- Sim, David C. "The Family of Jesus and the Disciples of Jesus in Paul and Mark: Taking Sides in the Early Church's Factional Dispute." Pages 73-97 in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I, Two Authors at the Beginnings of Early Christianity*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 198. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Skoven, Anne Vig. "Mark as an Allegorical Rewriting of Paul: Gustav Volkmar's Understanding of the Gospel of Mark." Pages 13-28 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Sleeper, C. Freeman. *James*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- Smith, Barry D. "The Problem with the Observance of the Lord's Supper in the Corinthian Church." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 20.4 (2010): 517-44.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Soards, Marion L. *1 Corinthians*. New International Biblical Commentary 7. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. "'This is the Blood of My Covenant': The Markan Last Supper and the Elohist Horeb Narrative." *Biblical Research* 62 (2017): 48-60.
- Standaert, Dom Benoît. *Évangile selon Marc: commentaire*. 3 vols. Études Bibliques 61. Pendé: J. Gabalda, 2010.
- Stein, Robert H. *Mark*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Translated by Scrott J. Hafemann. Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Svartvik, Jesper. "East is East and West is West: The Concept of Torah in Paul and Mark." Pages 157-185 in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I, Two Authors at the Beginnings of Early Christianity*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 198. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *Luke*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- "The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role." *The Journal of Religion* 57 (1977): 386-405.
- Tarazi, Paul Nadim. *The New Testament Introduction: Paul and Mark*. New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1999.
- Telford, W.R. "Introduction: The Gospel of Mark." Pages 1-41 in *The Interpretation of Mark*. Issues in Religion and Theology 7. Edited by William Telford. Philadelphia, Fortress, 1985.
- *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Theissen, Gerd. *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*. Translated by Francis McDonagh. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Translated by J.H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Theobald, Michael. *Der Römerbrief*. Erträge der Forschung 294. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000.
- Theophilus, Michael P. "The Roman Connection: Paul and Mark," Pages 45-71 in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I, Two Authors at the Beginnings of Early Christianity*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 198. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Thiselton, Anthony. *First Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thornton, L.S. *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*. London: Dacre Press, 1950.
- Tobin, Thomas H., SJ. *Paul's Rhetoric in its Contexts: The Argument of Romans*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Tonstad, Sigve K. "Inscribing Abraham: Apocalyptic, the Akedah, and "Abba! Father!" in Galatians." Pages 15-27 in *Galatians as Examined by Diverse Academics in 2012*. Edited by Heerak Christian Kim. Newark: The Hermit Kingdom Press, 2013.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80 (1961): 261-8.

- van de Sandt, Huub and David Flusser. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum III.5. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- van Henten, Jan Willem. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 57. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- VanderKam, James C. "The Aqedah, Jubilees, and PseudoJubilees." Pages 241-61 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- *The Book of Jubilees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield; Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Volkmar, Gustav. *Die Religion Jesu und ihre erste Entwicklung nach dem gegenwärtige Stande der Wissenschaft*. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1857.
- *Die Evangelien, oder Marcus und die Synopsis der kanonischen und ausserkanonischen Evangelien nach dem ältesten Text mit historisch-exegetischem Commentar*. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag [R. Reisland], 1870.
- Wagner, J. Ross. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "in Concert" in the Letter to the Romans*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Watts, Rikki E. "Jesus' Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited." Pages 203-215 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William H. Bellinger Jr. and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg: Trinity International Press, 1998.
- Watson, Francis. "The Two Roman Congregations: Romans 14:1-15:13." Pages 203-215 in *The Romans Debate*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Welborn, L.L. "The Preface to 1 Clement: The Rhetorical Situation and the Traditional Date." Pages 197-216 in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and Laurence L. Welborn. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 53. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Werner, Martin. *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium: eine Studie zur neutestamentlichen Theologie*. Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1923.
- *The Formation of Christian Dogma: An Historical Study of its Problem*. Translated by S.G.F. Brandon; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- White, Hayden. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination of 19th Century Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.
- Wiefel, Wolfgang. "The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity." Pages 85-101 in *The Romans Debate*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Wildemann, Bernd. *Das Evangelium als Lehrpoesie: Leben und Werk Gustav Volkmar's*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1983.

- Wiles, David. "Aristotle's *Poetics* and Ancient Dramatic Theory." Pages 92-107 in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*. Edited by Marianne McDonald and J. Michael Walton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Wilk, Florian. "'Die Schriften' bei Markus und Paulus." Pages 189-220 in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I, Two Authors at the Beginnings of Early Christianity*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 198. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Williams, Sam K. *Galatians*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.
- Wimsatt W.K., Jr., and Monroe C. Beardsley. *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. New York: The Noonday Press, 1954.
- Wire, Antoinette Clark. *The Case for Mark Composed in Performance*. Biblical Performance Criticism 2. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2011.
- Wischmeyer, Johannes. "Universalismus als Tendenz und Entwicklungsmoment. Die Frage nach Markus und Paulus in der historisch-kritischen Geschichtsschreibung des Urchristentums von 1850-1910." Pages 19-44 in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I, Two Authors at the Beginnings of Early Christianity*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 198. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Wischmeyer, Oda. "Konzepte von Zeit bei Paulus und im Markusevangelium." Pages 361-392 in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I, Two Authors at the Beginnings of Early Christianity*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer, David C. Sim, and Ian J. Elmer. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 198. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- "Romans 1:1-7 and Mark 1:1-3 in Comparison: Two Opening Texts at the Beginning of Early Christian Literature." Pages 121-146 in *Mark and Paul: Comparative Essays Part II, For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark*. Edited by Eve-Marie Becker, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, and Mogens Müller. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 199. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.