# THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW AND OTHER ESSAYS

*STUDIES IN HONOR OF*

WILLIAM FRANKLIN STINESPRING

*Edited by*

JAMES M. EFIRD

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
*Durham, N. C. 1972*


L.C.C. card no. 70-185463
I.S.B.N. 0-8223-0288-8

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Composition by Maurice Jacobs, Inc.

# THE OLD TESTAMENT IN MARK'S GOSPEL

HUGH ANDERSON

I count it a privilege to contribute to the honor being paid to my former colleague, Dr. W. F. Stinespring. Having been closely associated with him for almost a decade particularly on many Ph.D. examination committees at Duke University, I came to respect and admire both the range and rigor of his scholarship. I continue to cherish his friendship from across the seas.

The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are generally held to subscribe to a "promise-fulfillment" schema: they regard the events they relate about Jesus Christ as fulfillment of corresponding earlier events or of prophetic predictions witnessed to in the Old Testament. This schema is especially evident in Matthew's Gospel, but in Luke's as well.

Matthew has by far the greatest number of "fulfillment" מָלָא–πληροῦν phrases among the Evangelists. These phrases occur mainly in Matthew's so-called "formula quotations" (1:22 f.; 2:15; 2:17 f.; 2:23; 3:3; 4:14 f.; 8:17; 12:17 ff.; 13:14 f.; 13:35; 21:4 f. [26:56]; 27:9). In his "formula quotations" Matthew reveals a profound concern for the precise fulfillment of certain Scripture passages understood as predictions, and even allows one proof-text at least (Zech. 9:9) to provide circumstantial detail about the presence of two beasts in his account of the Triumphal Entry (Matt. 21:1–7).

Unlike Matthew, Luke rarely cites actual Scripture prophecies, as in the opening sermon of Jesus in Capernaum (Luke 4:17–21). Nevertheless for Luke too the "fulfillment of prophecy" motif is very significant, as may be gathered from his highly articulated "philosophy of the Resurrection" in the Emmaus story. "And beginning with Moses and all the prophets he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24:27). With Luke the Christ appears not only as the consummation of the entire Scripture but as the mediator of its meaning as a whole. The things concerning Jesus which took place in Jerusalem in





those days are the culmination of the plans and promises God initiated long ago with Israel.

What then of Mark? Since Mark's Gospel also is liberally sprinkled with references to the Old Testament, should we without any ado team him with Matthew and Luke as sharing their promise-fulfillment categories and as believing in the divine scheme of salvation which he finds in searching the Scripture? One or two preliminary considerations suggest that we should not judge the matter too hastily. First, in direct contrast with Matthew's Gospel, there is a very low incidence of fulfillment מָלָא–πληροῦν phrases in Mark: if we exclude 15:28 as *falsa lectio*, he has only two, in 1:15 and 14:49. Second, in Mark it is always Jesus or some other character in the narrative who cites or refers to Scripture. There is only one notable exception. Only at the very beginning of his Gospel does *Mark himself* quote Scripture and come near to the Matthaean type of formula quotation. Third, it is worth noting that in a recent full-scale study of Mark's use of the Old Testament, Alfred Suhl has denied altogether to Mark any promise-fulfillment schema.[1]

Within the limited scope of this paper our purpose is to examine the main features of Mark's use of the Old Testament and to enquire to what extent, if any, this bears upon his aim and intention in his overall portrayal of Jesus Christ.

Most critics would agree that, as with Matthew and Luke, the beginning and ending of Mark's Gospel ought to provide the surest clues to his own intent and design. But the trouble with Mark is that the opening and close of his Gospel, assuming that it ends with 16:8, are typically condensed. Mark's Easter record is short and sharp, relates no appearance of the risen Jesus, and is somewhat cryptic. Lohmeyer's view that Mark means to point to Galilee as the scene of the eschatological fulfillment of the Parousia has found little favor. But what is of interest to us here is that Mark makes no reference to the Old Testament in 16:1–8. Surely very few would be prepared to follow those imaginative typologists who link the stone at the door of the tomb in Mark 16:4 with Jesus' words in Mark 11:23 about the mountain "being

1. Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965).

taken up and cast into the sea," connect these in turn with the prophecy of the clearing of the Mount of Olives in Zech. 14:4, and see in "the stone rolled back" of Mark 16:5 a symbol of the removal of the whole structure of Pharisaic legal righteousness.[2]

Mark's Easter report in 16:1–8 contains in fact no express allusion to Scripture prophecy, but rather only a retrospective glance in 16:7 at the earlier *prophecy of Jesus* himself: "After I am raised up, I will go before you to Galilee" (Mark 14:28). Very different is it with Luke whose Emmaus story, as we have seen, depicts the risen Christ pointing to himself as the sum of all the Scripture's meaning.

As to the opening of Mark's Gospel, nowhere else is there an explicit *Marcan* quotation of Scripture (Mark 1:2–3). The complex problems of the composite citation in these verses from Mal. 3:1 and Isa. 40:3 have been much debated. Since both together are assigned in Mark to Isaiah, can we regard the words from Malachi in Mark 1:2 as genuine, or are they an early gloss or interpolation? The main argument for the genuineness of the Malachi quotation has been that Mark could have taken over the two texts from an oral or written collection of testimonies, in which they had already been combined under the name of one author, perhaps because of the appearance of the same phrase פִּנָּה דֶּרֶךְ in both. Against its genuineness the strongest argument has been that, if Mal. 3:1 had stood in Mark, its omission from the parallel contexts in Matt. 2:3 and Luke 3:4 is most puzzling.[3] The arguments on either side are hardly decisive. Possibly, therefore, some weight may be given to Professor Krister Stendahl's proposal to forsake the testimony hypothesis of such a composite quotation for the simpler view that, since they have to do with John the Baptist, both prophecies may have been taken over into the Gospels from the disciples of John the Baptist *in the form used by them.*[4] The Qumran Sect also used the prophecy of Isa. 40:3, but the sect followed the form of the Hebrew text and so made it apply

2. See, for example, A. G. Hebert, "The Resurrection-Narrative in St. Mark's Gospel," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 15 (Mar., 1962), 66 ff.

3. Mal. 3:1 is of course cited later in a different context in Matt. 11:10 and Luke 7:27, but its inclusion there does not really help to explain its omission in Matt. 3:3 and Luke 3:4, if it stood in Mark 1:2.

4. Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1954), pp. 50 ff., 215 f.



to the life and activity of its own desert community of the Elect in the Last Days: "Prepare in the desert Yahweh's way" (IQS 8:14). The followers of the Baptist, on the other hand, adopted the LXX form of the Isa. 40:3 text (on which the New Testament also in turn relied) and applied it to their own "wilderness-preacher-leader," "the voice in the wilderness." Could they have done so in direct opposition to Qumran?

From such an estimate of the situation important results would follow. First, it would offset the form critics' judgment that the picture of the Baptist as a wilderness preacher is a purely *Christian* invention based solely on the Isa. 40:3 prophecy. Second, we could not so readily assume that the texts had undergone christological adaptation in their fusion in the Marcan context. In this regard, in any case, it is difficult to say whether, with the *Kyrios* of Isa. 40:3, Mark has Yahweh or perhaps the Messiah in view, although it is certainly noteworthy that elsewhere in the Gospel *Kyrios* is not for Mark a christological title.

The abruptness of Mark's beginning, however, makes it difficult for us to gauge how the Old Testament prophecies of Mark 1:2 f. function for him. This question is moreover closely linked with the rather acute problems of the meaning and scope of the title of Mark 1:1 (presuming from the anarthrous ἀρχή that it is a title and that it is Mark's title) and of the place and connections of Mark 1:14 f.

It is now commonly recognized that there is no great gap between Mark 1:8 and 1:9, as Westcott and Hort's spacing of the text might have encouraged us to believe, and that Mark's introduction extends from 1:1 to 1:13. Accordingly the consensus is that with his opening words: "The beginning of the Good News of Jesus Christ the Son of God," Mark means to describe not merely the appearance of the Baptist as the punctiliar starting-point of the Gospel. Rather, he intends his title to refer to the whole story of Jesus he is going to tell—Jesus and his work (and of course the Baptist and his work as forerunner) are of the very stuff of the Gospel for Mark and constitute its ἀρχή or "beginning."

But how does Mark understand this beginning? Does his "prologue" reveal any biographical intent? It is at this point that the interpretation of the Marcan summary statement in 1:14 f. becomes crucial. The words of Mark 1:14 f. are usually taken as a

preface to the section of the Gospel ending with 3:6 and relating the first stage of the Galilean ministry. In that case the tendency arises to regard chronology as Mark's primary concern in the passage. Vincent Taylor, for example, holds that Mark fastens on to the arrest of John (1:14) as the precise moment of division between the work of John, now over, and the work of Jesus just getting under way. On the other hand he concedes that "Mark's chronology is controlled by the preaching praxis of the church" (as evidenced in Acts 10:37 and 13:14–15).[5] But should we not then give up the term *chronology* altogether as being quite alien to Mark's purpose here? To say simply that Mark wants to stress the instant "when Jesus appeared in Galilee as a new star" (as Johannes Weiss)[6] because he remembers Peter's teaching on the matter is to fail to distinguish between the function of the tradition at its pre-Marcan stage and the aim Mark pursues in using it. And there is really little indication that Mark's aim is to show how Jesus reckoned inwardly that the Baptist's fate must be the signal that his own hour had struck.[7] Matthew's account hereabout, it is true, seems to have a more biographical flavor inasmuch as it gives some prominence to Jesus' personal response to the news of the Baptist's arrest: "When he *heard* that John had been arrested, he withdrew into Galilee" (Matt. 4:12). But we should not interpret Mark by Matthew.

That Mark's treatment of both John and Jesus in his opening verses is dominated by kerygmatic or theological considerations may be borne out in various ways. The absolute use of παραδοθῆναι in Mark 1:14 ("after John was delivered up") implies for Mark a "delivering up" *that is God's will* (compare 9:31). Accordingly 1:14 does not necessarily denote for Mark the first level of a new historical development. Rather there seems to be already a hint of the Passion of Jesus and "what Mark has done is to set the preaching and the summons of Jesus into the divinely willed deathward work of John."[8] The theme of the conformity

5. Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London: Macmillan, 1952), p. 165.

6. Johannes Weiss, *Das Markusevangelium*, 3rd ed. rev. W. Bousset (Göttingen, 1917), p. 136. See also Taylor, p. 165.

7. See W. F. Howard, "John the Baptist and Jesus: A Note on Evangelic Chronology," *Amicitiae Corolla* (R. Harris *Festschrift*), (London, 1933), pp. 119 f.

8. L. E. Keck, "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel," *NTS*, 12 (July, 1966), 360. Keck makes a good case for regarding 1:14 f. as tied up with vv. 1–13.



with the divine will of Jesus' work (and John's), constitutive of the Gospel's ἀρχή, appears in fact to be one of the chief preoccupations of Mark's introduction. When, in terms of the Marcan précis of his message, Jesus says that "the time is fulfilled," the time spoken of is the time "willed by God." Similarly, when at the Baptism of Jesus the heavenly voice declares him to be the messianic Son of God in language echoing several Old Testament passages (e.g. Gen. 22:2; Isa. 42:4; Ps. 2:7; Isa. 42:1 and 44:2), Mark is much less interested in divulging the messianic self-consciousness of Jesus than in informing the reader that he is the One singled out directly by the express wish and action of God and his Spirit.[9]

In agreement with all this is also Mark's apparent unconcern, unlike Matthew and Luke, with pointing to John as an independent historical figure, a great champion of social righteousness in his own right, although almost certainly Mark had the requisite information at hand (see Mark 2:18 and 11:32). Mark focuses upon John only on the one hand as the Elijah-like forerunner of the Stronger One (Mark 1:6–7), and on the other hand as the forerunner of the Old Testament prophecies (Mark 1:2 f.). John thus becomes in Mark's presentation the link between the promises of God in Scripture and Jesus the Messiah. It is in such broad terms that we should speak of Mark's intention here, inasmuch as he is not at all inclined to draw out any exact correspondence between *events* surrounding the Baptist and *historical details* lying further back in the Old Testament (although to be sure the prophecies of 1:2 f. enable him to locate the Baptist's activity in the wilderness).

Accordingly there is a grain of truth in Alfred Suhl's contention that in the καθὼς γέγραπται formula of Mark 1:2, "καθώς does not as yet say much for Mark."[10] Certainly it does not quite measure up to Matthew's rabbinic principle of Scripture interpretation whereby he seeks in general to show how the letter of the Old Testament is fulfilled this way or that.[11] And here in particular Matthew employs a more specific formula of citation

9. See D. E. Nineham, *St. Mark*, Pelican Gospel Commentaries (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963), pp. 61 f.

10. Suhl, p. 137.

11. See Oscar Cullmann, *Salvation in History*, trans. S. G. Sowers and the editorial staff of the S.C.M. Press (London: S.C.M. Press, 1967), p. 134.

in introducing the Baptist when he says of him: "This is he who was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah when he said. . . ." (Matt. 3:3). Further, in contrast with Mark, Matthew relates the appearance of Jesus in Galilee directly to the data provided by the Scripture text of Isaiah (Isa. 9:1–2; see Matt. 4:12–16). We might say that in this context at any rate Matthew is "controlled" more by the Old Testament, whereas Mark turns the searchlight more on the essential "newness" of the event of Jesus Christ. In other words, it is not altogether correct to suggest that Mark makes the Old Testament his starting point in the same way as does Matthew.[12]

However, the element of newness in Mark's opening portrayal should not be overemphasized. One cannot easily follow Suhl when he denies to Mark any interest whatever in promise-fulfillment. In rather uncritical dependence on Willi Marxsen's arguments that Mark's view is purely existentialist, that the Gospel is simply addressed to the churches of Mark's time, and that its whole meaning is "I (Christ) am coming soon,"[13] Suhl contends that Mark appeals to the Old Testament only to stamp this contemporaneous address of the Gospel as conforming with the Scripture in the broadest sense.[14] But why then conformity with the Scripture at all? Why bother with relating Jesus to the Old Testament *via* John? We should perhaps rather see Mark trying to persuade his readers that the Gospel's ἀρχή resides not in the post-Easter faith or in the mind of the apostles but in the event of Jesus Christ.[15] The pastness and primacy of this event he secures, in part at least, not by concern with the letter of the Old Testament and its fulfillment, but by connecting it in a profounder way with the will of God expressed in the Old Covenant.

As we observed at the outset, Mark 1:2 f. is the only explicit quotation made by Mark in his own name. Everywhere else in the Gospel, references to the Old Testament by citation or by

12. Matthew exhibits a stronger interest in OT events (e. g. 4:12–16) and in the exact correspondence of the NT events with them for the sake of the events themselves. See C. F. D. Moule, "Fulfilment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse," *NTS*, 14 (Apr., 1968), 297.

13. Willi Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, n.f. 49, 2nd ed. (Göttingen, 1959), p. 89.

14. Suhl, *passim*.

15. Keck, p. 366.



allusion are on the lips of a speaker, most frequently Jesus himself. These could be investigated in various ways, either by simply tracing them through the Gospel chapter by chapter or alternatively by dealing with them according to the level of the Gospel tradition in which they occur, for example, the Passion story, the *logia*, the pre-Marcan units or the units built up by the redactor, Mark himself. But the method we shall adopt here is to treat Old Testament usages and references throughout Mark's Gospel under two broad categories: 1) the Old Testament in eschatology; and 2) the Old Testament in parenesis or teaching.

## The Old Testament in Eschatology

Some years ago, in examining explicit Old Testament citations in the Qumran literature and in the New Testament, J. A. Fitzmyer described four classes of Old Testament usage, and two of these, namely "eschatological usage" and "modernizing usage," properly fall under the above broad heading.[16] The distinction between them will become evident as we proceed.

Texts labeled "eschatological" normally express in the Old Testament a promise or threat about some thing to be accomplished in the *eschaton*, and the Qumran or New Testament writer then makes the text refer to the new *eschaton* of which he is speaking. We have a good example in Rom. 11:26–27 where Paul quotes Isa. 59:20–21 and 27:9 to support his view that despite Israel's erstwhile rejection of the Christ, all Israel will at last be saved in accordance with Isaiah's prophecy: "The deliverer will come from Zion, he will drive all ungodliness away from Jacob and this will be my agreement with them, when I take away their sins." In the pre-Passion narrative of Mark one text that may belong to this order is the citation on the lips of Jesus of Isa. 56:7 and the allusion to Jer. 7:11 within the context of Jesus' visit to the Temple for its "cleansing" (Mark 11:15–18): "And he taught, and said to them, 'Is it not written, "My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations"? But you have made it a den of robbers.' " (Mark 11:17).

16. J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS*, 7 (July, 1961).

Within the scope of this paper it is impossible to discuss in any detail the complexities of the cleansing of the Temple. There is no good reason to question the historicity of Jesus' appearance and action in the Temple, although Mark's very condensed account really does not allow us to say whether Jesus' expulsion of the Temple merchants was intended as a social protest, a gesture of Zealot insurrectionism, a blow at the sacrificial system, or whether it was the symbolic act of the eschatological renewer of the cultus. Our primary concern is with the "teaching" of Jesus ascribed to the Temple episode and recorded in Mark 11:17. The indications are that, even if the *logion* of Mark 11:17 were original to Jesus, it could scarcely belong only to the incident of the expulsion of the Temple dealers: the confusion surrounding the expulsion would not easily have provided the setting for such teaching, and additionally, the stylized introductory formula of Mark 11:17 as well as the obscurity of those addressed as "them" and "you" suggests that the saying was a separate unit. In that case, what might have been its *Sitz im Leben*? Mark alone among the Evangelists retains the words "for all the nations" of the Isaianic prophecy, and it has been held that the universalism expressed here must have had its setting in the preaching or apologetic of the Gentile Christian churches. For Mark, as R. H. Lightfoot argues, the Temple would have been the setting for that activity of the messianic king by which the gathering of the Gentiles into the life and worship of the people of God prophesied in Isa. 56:7 was now on the way to being fulfilled.[17]

However, we should possibly think of a quite different *Sitz im Leben* for the saying of Mark 11:17. In the context of Isa. 56:7 "all the nations" refers specifically to those converted pagans who would come on pilgrimage to offer sacrifices in the Jerusalem Temple restored at the End. Now there is nothing Gentile Christian in the idea of a universal pilgrimage to a restored Temple, and it may be that Matthew and Luke have suppressed the words "for all the nations" because for them they could have applied only to the Christian Church and not to the Temple. Nor could Mark, in view of his hostility to the Temple, have wanted

17. R. H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1950), pp. 60 ff.



to glorify it in this way. Consequently E. Trocmé has recently proposed that we should seek a *Sitz im Leben* for the saying of Mark 11:17 in the early debates of the primitive Jewish-Christian communities about how the Temple courts and particularly the Court of the Gentiles ought to be used. The debates would have been responsible for appending the saying to the incident of the expulsion of the Temple dealers as an explanatory comment showing how the commercial transactions in the Court of the Gentiles were tantamount to rebellion against the divine will.[18] Probably Mark sees in these verses and especially in 11:17 Christ's judgment upon the Temple which in actual practice was promoting a false sense of security and stood in stark contrast to the plans God had for it. By inserting the Temple pericope between the two parts of the enigmatic fig tree story, Mark seems to reveal that for him the Temple is synonymous with Jewish life and religion, both in their fruitlessness now calling down God's *ultimate* judgment upon Israel.[19] Possibly in Mark's understanding the pronouncement of 11:17 is not unrelated to Jesus' words about the coming destruction of the Temple in 14:58.[20] But, however Mark 11:17 is construed, perhaps enough has been said to show that it may be included in the class of eschatological texts.

Mark's Gospel, like the rest of the New Testament, appears to be lacking in instances of the eschatological use of the Old Testament. The inference drawn by Fitzmyer and others from the dearth of eschatological texts in the New Testament and their relative abundance in the Qumran documents is that "Christian writers were more often looking back at the central event in which salvation had been accomplished rather than forward to a deliverance by Yahweh, which seems to characterize the Qumran literature."[21]

To what extent, we have now to ask, is this generalizing comment about the difference between Qumran and the New Testament true of Mark in particular? How strong is the backward

18. Etienne Trocmé, "L'Expulsion des Marchands du Temple," *NTS*, 15 (Oct., 1968), 12–15.
19. Nineham, pp. 300 f.
20. Eduard Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, no. 1 (Göttingen, 1967), p. 131.
21. Fitzmyer, p. 329. See also Moule, pp. 310 f.

look or the sense of eschatological completeness in Mark? We should try to assess this by investigating those Old Testament quotations and references in Mark that might be described as "modernizing usage." Fitzmyer explains that a "modernized text" is one taken over from an analogous situation in the Old Testament and made to speak with a deeper significance to the new situation in Qumran or the early Church. What is important for our purpose is that he includes among such texts the *pesher*-type citations in Matthew and takes especial note of the strong sense of completeness or fulfillment in Matt. 4:15–16 and Luke 4:16–21. In the latter Christ's commentary on Isa. 61:1–2 begins: "This passage of Scripture has been fulfilled here in your hearing today." New meaning is given to the words of Isaiah by the event.[22]

Neither Mark himself nor Mark's Jesus, I think it may be claimed, makes the Old Testament text and the situation it reflects point with the same completeness or directness to the new situation that *has come to prevail* in Jesus. Even in passages where Mark might appear to subscribe to the notion of the literal realization of prophecy in the past situation that had arisen with Jesus, there is in fact a movement toward a near future that is still expected. This is true of the three places in Mark's Passion narrative where there is explicit reference to Scripture. In the story of the betrayal Jesus says: "For the Son of man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed!" (Mark 14:21). Here the καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ does not imply the completion or verification in the events of Christ's ministry of the details of any particular Scripture prediction. The Johannine verb ὑπάγει ("goes") (e. g., John 8:14, 21 f.; 13:3, 33; 14:4, 28) has the meaning of "going, toward death and through death to the Father," and "as it is written of him" indicates that the Son of man's way to death is in conformity with the purpose of God.[23] The betrayer's irresponsible use of his freedom in a gross act of perfidy brings down the final judgment of God upon him ("woe to that man"), and can neither offset nor arrest God's final plan and purpose for the Son of man.

In Mark 14:27 we find the only express quotation of words of Scripture in Mark's Passion narrative:

22. Fitzmyer, p. 316.
23. M. D. Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark* (London: S.P.C.K., 1967), p. 159.



> And when they had sung a hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives [v. 26]. And Jesus said to them, "You will all fall away; for it is written, 'I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered' [v. 27]. But after I am raised up I will go before you to Galilee" [v. 28]. Peter said to him, "Even though they all fall away, I will not" [v. 29]. And Jesus said to him, "Truly I say to you, this very night, before the cock crows twice, you will deny me three times" [v. 30]. But he said vehemently, "If I must die with you, I will not deny you." And they all said the same. [v. 31]

The seams of this little composition are badly joined. When Peter speaks in verse 29 he takes no notice either of the prediction of Jesus in verse 28 or of the Scripture quotation in verse 27b, but refers back only to Jesus' simple statement in verse 27a: "You will all fall away." Again, the change from the imperative of the Hebrew, Targum, Old Testament Peshitta, and almost all Septuagint texts to the first person indicative of the verb παταξω in the Marcan text (14:27b) makes the sense more difficult insofar as the subject of the next verb προαξω is Jesus himself. Even so we really think of God as the subject of παταξω and not of Jesus as "the smiter" and Peter as "the smitten shepherd." Moreover, the cursory mention of the Resurrection (μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με) in Jesus' forecast that he would "go before to Galilee" (v. 28) plus the fact that the forecast is matched by Mark 16:17 prompt the conclusion that verse 28 is a Marcan insertion. It is tempting, therefore, to bracket off verses 27b and 28, for without them we have a clear and unified account of Peter's denial. Following this line, Barnabas Lindars maintains that the Zech. 13:7 testimony of Mark 14:27b can be viewed in isolation, but perhaps also in relation to the flight of the disciples. The original application of Zech. 13:7, however, according to Lindars, was not the flight of the disciples, but the Crucifixion: seen within its whole context in Zechariah and in the light of the comparison of Zech. 13:6 with Zech. 12:10, it could readily be applied to the sufferings of Jesus. Only when the verse had been torn from its context could there arise specific identification of the shepherd with Jesus and of the scattered sheep with the fleeing disciples. The verse on its own would then have found its way into the Gospel tradition as show-

ing that what happened with the flight of the disciples had already been predicted in Scripture; it would have furnished an apologetic for the disciples' shameful dereliction as something already foreseen in God's plan.[24]

But does Mark so understand the testimony? Possibly the emphasis lay for him not on detailed proof from prophecy but on Jesus' own prophetic foreknowledge. In verse 28 Jesus himself predicts that he will "go before to Galilee." In verse 27a he foretells his coming lonely ordeal. And the words from Zechariah confirm his own prediction of coming tribulation as being in conformity with Scripture and so in line with God's will. So Mark is trying to convince his readers in these few verses that the *divinely willed* way of Christ (and indeed of the Church which Mark is addressing and keeps close in his sights) is the way ahead through humiliation (v. 27) to vindication in the Resurrection (v. 28).[25]

It may of course be objected that since Matthew has faithfully transcribed these Marcan verses without any deviation (see Matt. 26:30–35) both Mark and he should have had the same understanding of this unit. But that does not inevitably follow. In fact Matthew shows his own hand elsewhere in his Passion narrative, and reveals his own greater inclination to reflect on past events surrounding Jesus as the precise working out of details predicted in Old Testament texts. For instance, in the account of the purchase of the potter's field with the betrayal money, Matthew affirms: "Then was fulfilled what had been spoken by the prophet Jeremiah saying, 'And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him on whom a price had been set by some of the sons of Israel, and they gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord directed me'" (Matt. 27:9–10). Also in regard to the arrest of Jesus Matthew himself reports: "But all this has taken place, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled" (Matt. 26:56). By contrast, in the parallel passage in Mark it is Jesus who says merely: ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί (Mark 14:49). The phrase

24. Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1961), pp. 129 ff.

25. Fitzmyer classifies Mark 14:27 as an "eschatological text" pointing ahead to a coming trial as does the comparable usage of Zech. 13:7 in MS. B of the *Damascus Document* (19:7–9). Lindars, on the contrary, regards it as a *pesher*-type citation of the "modernizing" kind. See Fitzmyer, p. 326; Lindars, p. 131.



is not in Mark's usual manner and so is sometimes held to be a later scribal insertion. If the words are Mark's they should probably be translated as in the RSV.: "But let the scriptures be fulfilled." The difficulty of the phrase is not to be overcome by understanding here something like Matthew's γέγονεν, "all this has taken place that,"[26] for it is not apparently Mark's way, as it is Matthew's, to reflect on past events as the exact fulfillment of Old Testament predictions. For the same reason we should not say either that Mark has thrown the phrase in here for good measure simply because "by the time Mark wrote, it had become a fixed dogma of the Church that all the events of the Saviour's Passion, even down to the details, happened 'according to the scriptures,' and the phrase *that the scriptures might be fulfilled* might be introduced even though there were no very particularly apt passage of scripture to be adduced."[27] On the contrary, just because no particular passage of Scripture appears to be in view here, the phrase on Jesus' lips may have been for Mark the equivalent of "let God's will be done: let there come upon me what God has in store for me."

Our investigation of the three explicit references to Scripture in Mark's Passion story suggests that there are within them elements of futurity, incompleteness, or suspension. They fall, with Mark, into the category of eschatological usage more than of modernizing usage. The same is, I think, true also of earlier indirect scriptural references and citations in Mark's pre-Passion narrative. We have first to consider Mark 9:9–13:

> And as they were coming down the mountain, he charged them to tell no one what they had seen, until the Son of man should have risen from the dead [v. 9]. So they kept the matter to themselves, questioning what the rising from the dead meant [v. 10]. And they asked him, "Why do the scribes say that first Elijah must come?" [v. 11]. And he said to them, "Elijah does come first to restore all things; and how is it written of the Son of man, that he should suffer many things and be treated with contempt? [v. 12]. But I tell you that

26. Mark 14:49 is so understood by Taylor; see p. 561.

27. A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, Westminster Commentaries, 7th ed. (London: Methuen, 1949), p. 214.

Elijah has come, and they did to him whatever they pleased, as it is written of him" [v. 13].

These verses have been a battleground of debate ever since Wrede saw in them the main clue to understanding of the "messianic secret" in Mark's Gospel. We cannot here canvass all the many intricate questions involved. Clearly verses 9–10 connect the section with the Transfiguration story (9:2–8). Beyond that, however, critics have been so worried by the abruptness of the question about Elijah in verse 11 and the interruption of the Elijah theme (resumed in v. 13) with the other question about the Son of man in verse 12b that they have resorted to various rearrangements of the text. But theories of dislocation are perhaps needless if it is at all possible to make sense of Mark's arrangement, no matter how awkward it is. The very awkwardness and tentativeness of the Marcan formulation, seemingly pieced together from several independent strands of tradition, may be the best argument for taking it as it stands. For it may well reflect a church trying, as R. H. Lightfoot described it, "to construct some kind of philosophy of history, in the light of its convictions about the person and office of its Master, and of his work and its results."[28]

In the Transfiguration the disciples are given an anticipatory glimpse of the final vindication and victory of Christ (Mark 9:2–8). On the descent from the mountain silence is enjoined on them about what they had seen until that final vindication should have come to pass in and through the Resurrection of the Son of man (Mark 9:9). Their uncertainty about what "rising from the dead" might mean (Mark 9:10) then leads not unnaturally to their concern about what part Elijah would play in the events preceding the coming of the reign of God referred to in Mark 9:1. The disciples' question to Jesus, "Why do the scribes say that first Elijah must come?" (9:11) has as its background Mal. 4:5: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes." In his reply Jesus in the first instance embraces the traditional expectation of Elijah come back as forerunner of God's reign, based on Malachi: "Elijah does come first to restore all things" (9:12a). But immediately in 9:12b the

28. R. H. Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), p. 92.



disciples are also challenged to recognize that alongside the traditional expectation of Elijah as "restorer" (*ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα*), founded on Mal. 4:5, stands the much more unexpected word of the prophetic Scriptures about the Son of man's suffering being "set at nothing" (*ἐξουδενηθῇ*). And finally in verse 13 scriptural evidence is adduced against scriptural evidence to reshape the scribal picture of Elijah as the restorer. For Elijah, now in fact identified in a thinly-veiled way with John the Baptist, has already come and has suffered in conformity with the Scriptures, so that his suffering is the framework for the suffering of the Son of man. Thus in a twofold way, by reference to the will of God for the Son of man himself and for Elijah, it is confirmed that there is no other way toward the Son of man's ultimate vindication and triumph save the way of humiliation.[29]

The foregoing interpretation allows us to make the following comments. First, the statement of Mark 9:12b was most probably an independent statement issuing from the debates of the Christians with the Jews on the fulfillment of scriptural prophecies.[30] However, as Mark has incorporated it in the section 9:9–13, his idea is not to show that Jesus (or in the case of verse 13, Elijah) did certain things and their occurrence proved that the Scripture was exactly fulfilled. The emphasis is rather on what Jesus (and Elijah) suffered, and their *suffering* is held to be in conformity with the Scripture, that is, in accordance with the will of God revealed therein.[31] Mark's aim is to clarify and illustrate the messianic *ἐξουσία* of Jesus, and this he does by pointing up the contrast between scribal passivity before the Old Testament and the creative grasp that enables Jesus to lift up as crucial the less agreeable or harsher promises of God.

29. For recent defences of the logic of Mark's arrangement in 9:9–13, see H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. D. M. Barton (London: S.C.M. Press, 1965), pp. 194 ff.; Hooker, pp. 129 ff.

30. See Tödt, p. 196.

31. The difference between actions initiated by Jesus and events experienced or suffered by him and its importance for our notions of "fulfillment" is stated by James Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1966), p. 138. On the view we have taken, we can leave open the much debated questions of what OT texts lie behind the pronouncements about the sufferings of the Son of man and the maltreatment of Elijah. For the former the main proposals have been: (*a*) the Servant Songs of Isaiah especially Isaiah 53; (*b*) the "stone testimony" of Ps. 118:22; (*c*) Daniel 7; and for the latter: (1) a lost apocryphal book; (2) I Kings 19:2–10.

Mention has previously been made of the tentativeness of Mark's formulation and of the fact that in verse 13 the allusion to John the Baptist is partly veiled. In his own rearrangement of the Marcan text, Matthew has articulated his train of thought more clearly and decisively and in particular has made the identification of the suffering of the Baptist with the suffering of Elijah *redivivus* fully explicit. So Matthew appears to have dwelt more on actual fulfillment by highlighting the past fate of the Baptist as the decisive argument against the scribes' objection: "Then the disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist" (Matt. 17:13).

Second, though Jesus "speaks with authority" over against scribal understandings of Scripture (Mark 9:9–13), his authority is nevertheless that of one who must suffer many things and be treated with contempt (9:12b). Mark 9:12–13 is complementary to Mark 1:2 ff. in that here once again the coming Passion of Jesus, Son of man, is set down as parallel to the "passion" of the Baptist. Thus there is reaffirmed Mark's desire, from the very beginning of his Gospel and all through, to let the tradition about Jesus fall under the shadow of the Cross that looms ahead.

Third, in Mark 9:1 Jesus promises that God's reign is very near at hand. Forthwith in the Transfiguration the disciples are granted a foretaste of the coming vindication of the Christ. Then in the section 9:9–13 it is made plain that the indispensable precondition of the coming of the kingdom and of Messiah's vindication is the suffering and rejection of Jesus. And the references to Scripture in Mark 9:12–13, so far as Mark is concerned, do not so much denote correspondence between the data of Old Testament texts and past New Testament events as illumine the truth that it is in line with the *express purpose of God* that the kingdom will only come in this way.[32]

The "stone testimony" from Ps. 118:22–23 that comes at the close of the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen in Mark 12:1–11 exhibits a similar concomitance of "rejection" and "vindication." "The very stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner; this was the Lord's doing and it is marvelous in

32. See Hans Conzelmann, "Gegenwart und Zukunft in der synoptischen Tradition," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 54 (1957), 290.



our eyes" (12:10–11). Whereas conceivably Jesus may have cited this passage on a separate occasion, it hardly fits in with the parable itself until a moment when by way of allegorical interpretation the son who is killed at the end of the story (12:8) has become equated with Jesus.[33] As this Scripture stands in Mark, there is an element of futurity in it for him, for as verse 12 ("And they tried to arrest him") and other Marcan phrases in this section of the Gospel indicate, Mark is preparing us for the dénouement and pointing the way forward to the Cross and subsequent vindication of Christ.

Our discussion so far has moved in the direction of showing that in his usage of the Old Testament in eschatology Mark is but little concerned to demonstrate that this and this event in the ministry of Jesus matches this and this event that is told already in the Scripture. Instead, his primary concern is with the will of God witnessed to in Scripture, that will of God under which the Christ goes forward through suffering and death to eventual vindication and victory.

Arguably, such usage is in agreement with the "detainment motif" that is so prominent a feature of Mark's whole Gospel. The detainment motif, by which in Mark's Gospel the Passion of Christ and the final unveiling and consummation of God's reign are permitted to cast their gleam back over all the tradition but are nonetheless held in suspension, figures in the recurrent commands to silence that accompany Jesus' exorcisms and healing miracles (the so-called messianic secret). It figures also in Mark's so-called parable theory in 4:10–12. Mark 4:12 echoes the words of Isa. 6:9–10, which describe those people whose sin and ignorance make it impossible for them to absorb the word of God through the prophet and who are in fact condemned by it. In Mark's view verses 10–12 appear then to regard the teaching of Jesus in parables as a means of carrying over God's will and design toward the *ultimate* division between those who are not destined for salvation and so cannot bear the truth, and the elect to whom the mystery of the kingdom is revealed. By these detaining corrections Mark is able to bring the tradition of Jesus under the control of the coming Passion (and vindication) or to point

33. See Nineham, p. 313.

toward the climax that can only be reached with the Cross and Resurrection.[34] One is inclined to accept Hans Conzelmann's view that some such detainment or secret motif is in any case the indispensable hermeneutical presupposition for the writing of a gospel since this is the "messianic" interpretation of the tradition inherent in the material itself.[35] But there is another side to the picture, and it comes out especially in the thirteenth chapter of Mark, which has been all too frequently overlooked in estimates of Mark's purpose in his Gospel. Mark 13 consists largely of a series of predictions in the style and language of Old Testament prophecies and covered over here with a thin apocalyptic veneer.[36] Beyond the woes and supernatural portents and the gathering of the elect before the Last Days, Mark looks further into the future, to the Parousia itself which will usher in the expected consummation (13:14–32)—but these things shall not be except for the disciples' suffering and endurance for the sake of the Gospel (13:9–13). Mark has his sights firmly on the church of his time that needs to be instructed about its posture as it faces the delay of the Parousia and incipient persecution as well. That the final manifestation of Jesus' messianic authority as the Son of God has to be held back until the Cross is reached has paradigmatic significance for the church of Mark's day, for which discipleship inevitably means the constructive "waiting" that consists of suffering and service and alone leads to the End.

It remains for us to consider at this point the δεῖ that occurs in Mark only in the first of the three Passion predictions at 8:31: "And he began to teach them that the Son of man *must* suffer many things . . ." (italics mine). We can, I think, reject the view of Bultmann, that the δεῖ is an incomprehensible divine "must" applied to the horrible and puzzling event of the Passion which the community at first simply could not understand. Our grounds for doing so are concisely stated by Heinz Eduard Tödt: "The announcements of suffering are not concerned with the enigma of God's will as seen apart from the Scriptures."[37] If, however, we

34. Heinz-Dieter Knigge, "The Meaning of Mark," *Interpretation*, 22 (Jan., 1968), 69 f.
35. Conzelmann, pp. 294 f.
36. See Hooker, pp. 128 ff.
37. Tödt, p. 191.



accept that the δεῖ is related to Scripture, we are at once confronted with the problem of what particular Old Testament text prescribes beforehand the *necessity* of Christ's or rather the Son of man's sufferings. The Servant Songs of Isaiah, the "stone" passage of Ps. 118:22, and Daniel 7 have each in particular had their recent advocates.[38] But more likely than not Mark for his part did not begin with a specific Old Testament text and think of it as having mapped out already the course that Christ *must* follow. He was too much aware that with the Christ-event he had something *new* to say for that, and too sensitive to the immediacy of God's presence for Jesus (as in the Baptism and Transfiguration). Consequently none of the passages mentioned above would have stood alone in describing and determining the necessity of the Messiah's suffering. Rather, the δεῖ of Mark 8:31 would have to do with a whole set of Old Testament ideas concerning the persecution of God's true servants and ambassadors by his impenitent people; it would have to do not with *proving* anything from the Old Testament texts but with the paradoxical will of God expressed in Scripture.[39]

Nevertheless the meaning of the δεῖ is not exhausted out of what is given in the Old Testament. The δεῖ of Mark 8:31 has in fact a rich background in the apocalyptic literature, and when we couple that with Mark's twofold use of it in his thirteenth chapter (13:7, 10), it becomes clear that it contains an element of detainment or futurity and relates also to the "apocalyptic law of suffering."[40] God's will stretches out toward certain future events including the coming suffering of the Son of man, by which alone his redemptive purpose for this his world can be brought to final fruition. That the δεῖ of 8:31 should have this kind of futurity for Mark would be in accord with his usage of the Old Testament in eschatology as we have reviewed it.[41]

38. Joachim Jeremias and Walther Zimmerli, *The Servant of God* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1957), p. 90; Tödt, pp. 161 ff.; Hooker, pp. 108 ff.
39. See Erich Fascher, "Theologische Beobachtungen zu δεῖ," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, Beihefte zur Z.N.T.W., 21 (Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1954), 228–54.
40. Ernst Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus*, H. A. W. Meyer's Handkommentar z. N.T. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1937), vol. 1, pt. 2, 10 aufl.
41. The contrast between Mark and Luke here is striking. Luke uses the "must" in Luke-Acts forty-one times. If Conzelmann is right in attributing this frequency to Luke's desire to apply the "must" to certain situations within salvation-history (*The*

## The Old Testament in Parenesis and Teaching

The majority of Mark's references to the Old Testament in his pre-Passion narrative fall in the above category, e. g., 2:23 ff., 7:6–8, 7:10, 10:3 ff., 10:19, 12:18–27, 12:29 ff., 12:36 f. All of these references occur in the context of the Marcan *Streitgespräche*, which may in general be said to reflect a church rejoicing in its liberation from the Law. In the "conflict stories" Jesus is portrayed as the one who exhibits an intuitive and unrestricted attitude toward the scriptural commands and exercises a sovereign freedom over against them.

It is true that in at least one instance, the Sadducees' question about resurrection in Mark 12:18–27, Jesus' freedom appears as the freedom to be on occasion orthodox in the sense that he here employs the same rabbinic exegetical method as his opponents in order to turn the matter against them. When the Sadducees argue that what the Law says about levirate marriage is incompatible with resurrection (Mark 12:19–23), Jesus first challenges their knowledge of Scripture and of the power of God. He then outsmarts them with an argument that runs against the original sense of Exod. 3:6—since the Law says: "I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," (italics mine), and the "I *am*" applies to a time when they were no longer alive, then they must be alive in a life beyond death. The argument is of course a plea for life beyond death as a life of unbroken communion with God and not for resurrection strictly speaking. Although some commentators would want to replace the strange Pharisaic argumentation of Mark 12:26–27 with a more typical terse pronouncement of Jesus, it may be that beyond the apparent "orthodoxy" in exegesis of these verses, Mark saw something of profound didactic significance for the Gentile church, namely instruction in a more spiritual and refined as against a crudely materialistic view of resurrection.[42]

Again in the scribe's question about the first commandment of

*Theology of St. Luke*, trans. G. Buswell [London: 1960], p. 153), and we are right in thinking of the solitary "must" of Mark 8:31 as possessing something of the character of an apocalyptic-eschatological "must" formula, then the difference between Mark and Luke is indeed notable.

42. See Nineham, p. 321.



all and Jesus' reply that the whole Law is summed up in love to God and love to neighbor (Mark 12:29 ff.), Jesus seems on the face of it to accept the absolute supremacy of the Law's commands (Deut. 6:4–5 and Lev. 19:18) without any demur. Assuming that the words of Mark 12:29–31 were spoken by Jesus and not by the scribe as in Luke's version (10:27), we need not here discuss to what extent their summing up of the distilled essence of the Law represented a unique creative insight on Jesus' part or had been anticipated by the rabbis near his time. Presumably from the evangelist's standpoint the way the spirit of the Law is highlighted in Jesus' summary implied a critique of and disregard for the letter of the Law and its manifold injunctions. So for Mark Christ's authority over the Law shines forth.

In Mark 2:23 ff. when the Pharisees protest about the disciples breaking the sabbath by plucking ears of grain, Jesus meets them with an argument in the normal rabbinic style about the precedent set by the good and pious King David: even he had transgressed the Law (I Sam. 21:1–6 and II Sam. 8:17), under the constraint of hunger by eating the shewbread. So far what is substantiated is the familiar enough rabbinic principle that in exceptional circumstances of great human need the Law may have to give way. But Mark, probably taking over an earlier comment of the church, administers the coup de grâce to any such rabbinic principle as the true norm of this section in verse 28. Christ's lordship or authority over the sabbath is the real justification for his disciples' freedom to break it (2:28).[43]

The section of the Gospel 7:1–23 presents enormous difficulties, not least in respect to Mark's evidently erroneous views of prevailing Jewish custom. These difficulties we cannot even touch here. Mark 7:1–23 consists of three segments, on handwashing (1–8), on Corban (9–13), and on food laws or ritual defilement (12–23). It is by no means easy to trace the various stages by which these segments and their parts were built up into a unified discourse, or to decide how much of the composition in its present form we owe to the Evangelist himself.[44]

43. This freedom so constituted may be the ground for Mark's silence about any physical need on the disciples' part (Mark 2:23). Matthew says openly, on the contrary: "the disciples were hungry" (12:1).

44. See Taylor, pp. 334 ff.; Nineham, pp. 187 ff.; Ernst Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu*

In the first segment, the Pharisees notice that Jesus' disciples eat without ritual cleansing of the hands (v. 2) and this leads to the broad question of why the disciples do not in general conform to the tradition of the elders, i. e. the oral law that had grown up through the discussions of rabbis or scribes over many years alongside the written Law (v. 5). Jesus' response comprises first a citation from Isa. 29:13 introduced with a rather elaborate formula, "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written," and then a charge against the Pharisees that they follow the oral tradition to the neglect of the "commandment of God." The form of the quotation of Isa. 29:13 deviates extensively from the Hebrew and follows the LXX with one or two minor modifications. In this Greek form it could hardly have come from the lips of Jesus and probably has its *Sitz* in the polemic of Gentile Christians against Jews. Precisely at the point where it departs most significantly from the Hebrew does it possess its relevance to the Marcan context: "The doctrines they teach are nothing more than human precepts."[45] And this affords a clue as to how the quotation functions here: it is hardly a "proof from prophecy" marking out the Pharisees as the very hypocrites described far in advance by Isaiah,[46] but rather functions as a description of Jesus' opponents whose activity now brings them under condemnation. The problem Jesus' reply in verses 6–8 leaves us with is that the Pharisees of his day certainly did not think of the oral tradition as opposing or negating the Law but as making possible its more exact performance.

The segment that follows on Corban (9–13) in a sense compounds the problem because, whereas it purports to provide a concrete illustration of how the Pharisees let their oral tradition take precedence over Moses or the Torah, what it really does is to show Jesus opposing the practice of obeying one provision of the written Law on oaths (Deut. 23:21–23; Num. 30:2) by canceling out another provision on filial responsibilities (Exod. 20:12; Deut. 5:16; etc.). What particular Jewish practice of the day is

(Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1966), pp. 260 ff. Possibly v. 14, vv. 17–18a and 20–23 are Marcan since they reflect Mark's parable theory and include the Marcan-style private interpretation of a parable in vv. 20–23.

45. Nineham, pp. 194 f.

46. See Suhl, p. 81.



reflected in the reference to the Corban vow (v. 11) it is not easy to say. At all events the equation of the commandment of the Law on oaths with the tradition of men and of the commandment on filial responsibility possibly implied for Mark at least that the Pharisees were failing to grasp the true essential spirit of the Law and so were guilty of moral insensitivity in the all important sphere of human relationships (now they are "hypocrites" and now "lacking in filial responsibility").

The crux of Mark 7:1–23 lies in the parabolic saying of verse 15: "There is nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him; but the things which come out of a man are what defile him." The radicality of the saying with its severe blow at the Law's written commands is in rather stark contrast with the positive appeal to Moses against the Jews in verses 9 f. And it is very questionable whether the bold and broad pronouncement of verse 15 could go back to Jesus in that form: if Jesus had so unambiguously swept aside large areas of the written Law, it is hard to see why the early church, with such an absolute word of the Lord to guide it, should have continued to engage in disputes about the Law's validity.[47] We ought possibly to regard the saying of verse 15, coupled with the explanation of verses 18–19, as representing for Mark the final solution to the church's controversies over the keeping of the Law. Such a final solution need not of course have been inconsistent with the original attitude of Jesus himself, since Jesus may well on particular occasions and specific issues have upheld the primacy of *moral* probity over the Law's injunctions to ritual cleanliness.[48]

Comparison of Mark 7:1–23 with the Matthaean parallel (15:1–20) is instructive. Neither there nor elsewhere does Matthew appear to place a higher estimate than Mark upon the observance of all the scriptural food laws. But by the same token neither does he take up and repeat those unequivocal Marcan statements that simply throw out or abandon the biblical commands (e. g., Mark 7:19c). In the section Mark 7:1–23 there is no overt reference to Jesus' messiahship, and D. E. Nineham is quite right to point out that in this passage neither Mark nor his sources gives any hint

47. See recently C. E. Carlston, "The Things that Defile," *NTS*, 15 (Oct., 1968), 95.

48. See Nineham, p. 191.

that Jesus felt free to abrogate the Law "*because he was Messiah.*"[49] However, if indeed Jesus' messiahship is not the ground of the freedom he here assumes over against the Law, we may say that in the Marcan understanding and presentation this same freedom points to and is the ground of the messianic ἐξουσία of Jesus. The same can be said of the Marcan pericope on divorce (10:2–12). In the corresponding passage in Matthew (19:3–12) the atmosphere is more casuistic (e. g., the much debated exceptive clause in verse 9), and Jesus merely brings together the Old Testament texts of Deut. 24:1 and Gen. 1:27; 2:24. In Mark, on the contrary, Jesus virtually overthrows Moses by appealing from the concession made by Moses to the hard hearts of the Jewish people in Deut. 24:1–4 to God's original design in so ordering the creation of the race ("God made them male and female" [10:6]) as to ensure the indissolubility of marriage. Although in the use he makes of Gen. 1:27 and 2:24 Jesus may be said to follow the rabbinic mode of interpretation, in his rejection of Deut. 24:1 he has "taken up a position which virtually abrogated a Pentateuchal Law"[50] and to that extent has gone far beyond the rabbis. Once again the supreme freedom that Jesus assumes over against the Scripture is consonant with the Marcan emphasis on his messianic ἐξουσία.[51]

On balance the Jesus of Mark's Gospel appears as one who in his teaching supersedes and transcends Scripture more than as one who makes the Scripture point to himself as its fulfillment.[52] Indeed the relative lack of testimonies is a feature of Mark's Gospel. It is sometimes attributed to the influence of external circumstances upon Mark at the time when he wrote his Gospel. It is suggested, for example, that Mark did not employ testimonies like Matthew

49. *Ibid.*, p. 192.
50. Rawlinson, p. 134, n. 2.
51. The messianic ἐξουσία of Jesus is reflected again in Mark 11:10.
52. *Mark's Jesus* hardly lends support to C. H. Dodd's tentative proposal that it was our Lord himself whose own creative mind singled out those passages of Scripture which would become the foundation of the Church's testimony-oriented theology. See *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet and Co., 1952), p. 110. See also Lindars, p. 30: "On the whole one gains the impression that Jesus used the Bible or referred to it as occasion arose, but generally preferred to teach in terms of real-life situations without appealing to the written word. This may well have contributed to the impression of authority which distinguished his preaching from that of the scribes (Mark 1:22)."



because his work was written for Gentiles. On the other hand John Bowman maintains that Mark simply *presupposes* the testimonies either because his Gospel "represents a stage in the tradition when the scaffolding of 'that it might be fulfilled', 'as it is written' is mainly dismantled or because it belongs to an early period when the Jewish Christians being well versed in the Scriptures did not need the Old Testament prophecies fulfilled, to be pointed out."[53]

None of these explanations seems very satisfactory. Just as likely is it that the relative dearth of testimonies in Mark was conditioned by inner theological or christological convictions on his part. Mark gives the impression of being acutely conscious of having something new to say: the Christ he portrays is one whose words and work cannot be fully explained out of the Old Testament. Mark's Gospel is oriented toward that future in which the *as yet undisclosed* secret of who Jesus really is will be finally revealed. In short Mark's comparative neglect of testimonies may well have to do with the detainment motif by which he seeks to hold up the disclosure until the *Cross* reveals what it means to be the Christ promised by God and to follow him as his disciple.

However, when all this is said, we have still to account for the fact that there is also considerable recourse to the Old Testament in Mark. The Gospel opens with a formula-quotation; "that it might be fulfilled" and "as it is written" occurs in the Passion narrative, which in fact as a whole is painted in Old Testament colors[54] (as of course also is chapter 13 with its catena of biblical phrases). Mark obviously valued the Old Testament highly enough to be unable to present Christ as altogether a *novum*: rather for him Christ's historical appearance and destiny are in conformity with the will of God revealed in Scripture, so that the event of Jesus Christ is thus stamped with an objective priority to the inward imagination and faith of the disciples.

We may think of Mark as standing, *vis-à-vis* Matthew and Luke, at a rudimentary stage of the Christian community's apolo-

53. John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark, The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), pp. 19 f.
54. C. H. Dodd finds seventeen certain or probable references to *testimonia* from the OT in Mark's Passion narrative; see *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1963), pp. 31 f.

getic endeavors to demonstrate from the Old Testament the relations between Jesus and that which is the messianic vocation. The development of the notion of fulfillment in Matthew and Luke reflects not so much that they inhabit a different world of thought from Mark but rather, no doubt, that they are moved by the developing interest of apologetic.[55]

The main intent of this essay has been to show that only with qualifications and reservations can we regard Mark and Matthew and Luke as all subscribing to the same degree and in the same way to a promise-fulfillment schema. We should take seriously C. F. D. Moule's recent timely reminder that we should aim at much greater precision in our use of the promise-fulfillment category.[56]

55. See Erich Grässer's critical review of Suhl, *Die Funktion* in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 91 (1966), 667–69.
56. Moule, p. 320.