


Bartosz Adamczewski

The Gospel of Mark

A Hypertextual Commentary



**European Studies in Theology,
Philosophy and History of Religions**

Edited by Bartosz Adamczewski



PETER LANG
EDITION

Introduction

This commentary greatly differs from other modern commentaries on the Gospel of Mark. The difference results from the particular methodological approach which has been adopted therein. Instead of explaining the Marcan Gospel in historical-critical terms as a result of redactional use of earlier sources or traditions, in narratological terms as a set of narrative-organizing devices, etc., this commentary aims at explaining it as a result of a sequential hypertextual reworking of three Pauline letters: to the Galatians, the first to the Corinthians, and to the Philippians.

This methodological approach, unlike many others, does not originate from any particular literary theory. It rather reflects the recent discovery of the phenomenon of the sequential hypertextual reworking of earlier texts in numerous biblical writings. This phenomenon occurs in the writings of both the Old and the New Testament: Gen, Exod-Lev-Num, Deut, Sam-Kgs, Chr; Mt, Mk, Lk, Jn, Acts, Rom, Gal, Eph, 2 Thes, Hebr, 2 Pet, and Rev.¹ These writings, taken together and measured by their extent, constitute almost a half of the Christian Bible.

Accordingly, it is fully justified to perform a thorough analysis of the Marcan Gospel, taking this important literary discovery into full consideration.

A record of Palestinian oral traditions?

The understanding of the Gospel of Mark as a result of a sequential hypertextual reworking of Paul's letters is particularly hindered by the widespread tendency

1 See B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q? The So-Called Triple, Double, and Single Traditions in the Synoptic Gospels* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 227-399, 419-430; id., *Heirs of the Reunited Church: The History of the Pauline Mission in Paul's Letters, in the So-Called Pastoral Letters, and in the Pseudo-Titus Narrative of Acts* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 83-132; id., *The Gospel of the Narrative 'We': The Hypertextual Relationship of the Fourth Gospel to the Acts of the Apostles* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2010), 39-121; id., *Constructing Relationships, Constructing Faces: Hypertextuality and Ethopoeia in the New Testament Writings* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2011), 55-66, 79-86, 99-103, 117-119, 129-163; id., *Retelling the Law: Genesis, Exodus-Numbers, and Samuel-Kings as Sequential Hypertextual Reworkings of Deuteronomy* (EST 1; Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2012), 25-280; id., *Hypertextuality and Historicity in the Gospels* (EST 3; Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2013), 14-62.

to explain the *origin* of the Marcan work in terms of the evangelist's use of early Christian oral traditions concerning Jesus.

This tendency goes back to the *patristic views* concerning the origin of the Marcan Gospel. This anonymous literary work, which evidently reflects the main principles of Paul's theology, but also narratively highlights the importance of Peter, was probably in the mid-second century AD attributed to Mark (cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.10.5; 3.11.8; 3.16.3), the person who was mentioned in the Pauline letters (Phlm 24; cf. Col 4:10; 2 Tim 4:11), but also in a letter attributed to Peter (1 Pet 5:13).

However, while the reference to Mark in Phlm 24 can be regarded as historically reliable, the remark concerning Mark in 1 Pet 5:13 has a clear ethopoeic function. It is aimed at presenting the person of Peter as generally agreeing with Paul: in the final travel to Rome (presented in 1 Pet as 'Babylon', the place of exile of the pious Jew: 1 Pet 5:13; cf. 1 Pet 1:1.17; 2:11; cf. also Acts 2:10-11; 12:17),² in the submissive instructions concerning civil authorities (1 Pet 2:12-17; cf. Rom 12:18-13:8),³ in numerous references to Isaiah and to other prophets and psalms (cf. esp. Rom 9-11), and in references to those Pauline co-workers who bore Latin names, namely *Silvanus* and *Marcus* (1 Pet 5:12-13; cf. 1 Thes 1:1; 2 Cor 1:19 and Phlm 24).⁴

Therefore, the ethopoeic 'adoption' of Mark by Peter, which consisted in presenting the historical Paul's co-worker named Mark as also Peter's 'son' (νίος: 1 Pet 5:13; cf. also Acts 12:12), reflects the early Christian desire to reconcile in a rhetorical-literary way the theological heritage of Paul with the ethopoeic image of Peter. Consequently, it does not reflect any historical link between Peter and Mark.⁵

Nevertheless, the particular idea that the Gospel of Mark should be regarded as closely related to the authority of Peter, an idea which is in fact highly implausible in view of the very negative presentation of Peter in the Marcan Gospel (Mk 8:22-23; 9:5-6; 14:29-30.37.66-72 etc.), was later developed in the so-called 'testimony of Papias'. This text is contained in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15-16,

2 Cf. O. Zwierlein, *Petrus in Rom: Die literarischen Zeugnisse: Mit einer kritischen Edition der Martyrien des Petrus und Paulus auf neuer handschriftlicher Grundlage* (UALG 96; de Gruyter: Berlin · New York 2009), 7-12.

3 Cf. K. M. Schmidt, *Mahnung und Erinnerung im Maskenspiel: Epistolographie, Rhetorik und Narrativik der pseudepigraphen Petrusbriefe* (HBS 38; Herder: Freiburg [et al.] 2003), 235-241.

4 Cf. U. Schnelle, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (UTB 2917; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2007), 577-578.

5 Cf. J. C. Fenton, 'Paul and Mark', in D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels*, Festschrift R. H. Lightfoot (Basil Blackwell: Oxford 1955), 89-112 (esp. 111); B. Adamczewski, *Q or not Q?*, 230; id., *Constructing*, 111.

and it is traditionally dated to the beginning of the second century AD, although this dating is by no means certain.⁶

According to this patristic text, the Gospel of Mark was based on oral traditions which had been handed down to the evangelist by the apostle Peter. Precisely for this reason, the Gospel of Mark was for centuries regarded as a predominantly 'Petrine' work, which had been based on Peter's oral catecheses (cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.1.1; 3.10.5 etc.), and which had been generally uninfluenced by the Pauline literary and theological heritage.

However, a close analysis of the composition of the so-called 'testimony of Papias' reveals that this text was not primarily concerned with the sources of the material which is contained in the Gospel of Mark and in other Gospels, because in such a case it would have referred to the origin of all four canonical Gospels, and not just two of them. In fact, the bipartite structure of this patristic text reveals that it was only aimed at explaining the differences between the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, as well as the striking features of the Matthean Gospel.

The author of the so-called 'testimony of Papias' rightly perceived the Gospel of Matthew as having two apparently contradictory features. On the one hand, this Gospel seems to be a result of literary enhancement and rhetorical improvement of the relatively short and simple Gospel of Mark. On the other hand, in difference to the Gospel of Mark, the Gospel of Matthew, with its particular wording and theological stance, seems to be a very 'Hebrew', so apparently primitive Gospel. Consequently, it is reasonable to ask whether the Matthean Gospel should be regarded as written after or before the Gospel of Mark.

The so-called 'testimony of Papias' presents an early Christian attempt to answer this difficult literary-theological question, which in fact constitutes one of the most important elements of the so-called synoptic problem.

According to the 'testimony of Papias', the Marcan Gospel originated from a set of Peter's oral catecheses, and therefore, as the patristic text repeatedly stresses, it was not well organized in terms of a carefully composed literary work (οὐ... τάξει, οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15).⁷ The patristic text further suggests that as a consequence of this fact, 'so then (μὲν οὖν) Matthew arranged the [Lord's] oracles [...] in an orderly way' (συνετάξατο: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16). Accordingly, the so-called 'testimony of Papias', through its

6 Cf. U. H. J. Körtner, 'Papiasfragmente', in U. H. J. Körtner and M. Leutzsch (eds.), *Papiasfragmente, Hirt des Hermas* (SUC 3; Wissenschaftliche: Darmstadt 1998), 1-103 (esp. 30-31).

7 Cf. D. Farkasfalvy, 'The Papias Fragments on Mark and Matthew and Their Relationship to Luke's Prologue: An Essay on the Pre-History of the Synoptic Problem', in A. J. Malherbe, F. W. Norris, and J. W. Thompson (eds.), *The Early Church in Its Context*, Festschrift E. Ferguson (NovTSup 90; Brill: Leiden · Boston · Köln 1998), 92-106 (esp. 93-97).

correlated references to the Gospels of Mark and Matthew, explained the evident posteriority of the apparently 'Hebrew' Gospel of Matthew against the apparently 'Gentile' Gospel of Mark in terms of necessary literary improvement of the allegedly poorly organized Gospel of Mark.

In order to lend credence to this thesis, the author of the 'testimony of Papias' argued that the things which could be rearranged in the Marcan Gospel, without compromising the truth of them, were the Lord's and Peter's allegedly isolated oracles or discourses (λόγια: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15-16).⁸ In this way, the surprising idea that the Gospel of Mark should be regarded as a combination of mutually independent fragments which originated from oral tradition, and not an internally coherent literary-theological work, came into being.

Accordingly, the suggestion that the Gospel of Mark had its origin in some orally transmitted discourses or oracles (λόγια: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15) evidently functioned in the 'testimony of Papias' only as a secondary, in fact merely postulated element of the principal rhetorical argument concerning the necessity to rearrange the contents of the Gospel of Mark into the better-organized Gospel of Matthew.

However, this suggestion had great consequences for Christian exegesis and theology. Christian commentators were henceforth encouraged to interpret the Gospel of Mark as a set of loosely interrelated, allegedly historical sayings of the Palestinian Jesus, and not as an internally coherent, narrative, christological-ecclesiological treatise which reflected the most important features of the Pauline theology of law-breaking mission among unclean Gentiles, which was based on the faith in Christ's salvific suffering and resurrection.⁹

The evident common features of the Marcan Gospel and the Pauline letters are usually explained by modern scholars by means of the hardly verifiable hypothesis of Mark and Paul's *common use of early Christian traditions*, liturgical formulae, etc.¹⁰ It is usually suggested, rather than proved, that it were oral traditions, and not written texts, that widely circulated among early Christian communities

8 The author of the so-called 'testimony of Papias' evidently recognized the fact that the canonical Gospels, with all the differences between them, cannot be regarded as strictly historical in their variegated presentations of Jesus' life and activity. However, he tried to defend the reliability of the Gospels by suggesting that they contain discourses (λόγια) of the historical Jesus.

9 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Hypertextuality*, 125-127.

10 Cf. e.g. A. Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, ed. H. W. Attridge (Hermeneia; Fortress: Minneapolis, Minn. 2007), 678-679 as concerns the use of the same, complex, Greek-Aramaic phrase 'abba, the Father' (αββα ὁ πατήρ) in both Rom 8:15; Gal 4:6 and Mk 14:36.

across the Mediterranean. The scholars who espouse this hypothesis do not explain why it would have been easier to pass over from one community to another oral traditions rather than written texts, for example those of the Pauline letters. In fact, Paul's letters demonstrate that even if short pieces of information could be transmitted orally (1 Cor 1:11), extensive instructions and discussions concerning the main features of Christianity were usually transmitted with the use of written media of communication (1 Cor 5:9.11; 7:1; 2 Cor 2:3-4.9; 7:12; Rom 15:15; Phlp 3:1 etc.).

At times, scholars even try to reconstruct the extent of the oral traditions which were allegedly used by Mark, and which should be regarded as historically reliable. For example, Adela Yarbro Collins has recently made a list of six events which were allegedly contained in such a hypothetical pre-Markan 'chronicle'. A half of these events refer to the relationship between Jesus and John the Baptist.¹¹

However, in reconstructing the postulated pre-Markan 'chronicle', which allegedly reflected Palestinian oral traditions concerning Jesus, Yarbro Collins, like many other scholars, has uncritically assumed that John the Baptist baptized Jesus, and that John was executed before Jesus' death.¹² The American scholar has based her claims on the postulated date of the execution of John the Baptist 'in 28 or 29 C.E', supporting her view in a footnote: 'On the date of John's execution, see P. W. Hollenbach, "John the Baptist," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D. N. Freedman; 6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 3:887'.¹³ When a curious reader follows the reference to Hollenbach's allegedly detailed discussion on the subject, he or she merely finds the following general statement concerning John the Baptist: 'His popularity and the revolutionary possibilities of his message of social justice led to his arrest, imprisonment and execution by Herod Antipas, probably in A.D. 28 or 29.'¹⁴ In fact, the execution of John the Baptist in the Transjordanian fort of Machaerus took place c. AD 36 (Jos. *Ant.* 18.116-119),¹⁵ so most probably almost a decade after the death of Jesus in Jerusalem (c. AD 26-27; cf. Jos. *Ant.* 18.63-64 [in its original form]),¹⁶ and consequently it is quite possible that they never met each other.

11 Ead., 'Mark and the Hermeneutics of History Writing', in E.-M. Becker and A. Runesson (eds.), *Mark and Matthew II: Comparative Readings: Reception History, Cultural Hermeneutics, and Theology* (WUNT 304; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2013), 231-244 (esp. 235).

12 Ibid.

13 Ibid. 234 n. 21.

14 P. W. Hollenbach, 'John the Baptist', in *ABD*, vol. 3, 887-899 (here: 887).

15 Cf. W. Eckey, *Das Markusevangelium: Orientierung am Weg Jesu: Ein Kommentar* (2nd edn., Neukirchener: Neukirchen-Vluyn 2008), 228; B. Adamczewski, *Hypertextuality*, 17-18, 61, 100-101.

16 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Constructing*, 27-29. For a recent discussion concerning the authenticity of a part of Jos. *Ant.* 18.63-64, see id., *Hypertextuality*, 86-88.

Similar reservations should be voiced as concerns the historical reliability of the allegedly pre-Markan traditions concerning Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God, as well as Jesus' performance of disruptive acts in the Jerusalem temple,¹⁷ for both these ideas are not attested outside the Gospels.

Consequently, the only historically reliable element of the oral tradition which was allegedly used by Mark, as it is postulated by Yarbrow Collins, is Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection.¹⁸ However, it is evident that Mark could have borrowed the basic data concerning Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection from the letters of Paul the Apostle.¹⁹ Accordingly, the hypothesis of Mark's use of early Christian oral traditions concerning Jesus is in fact unverifiable, if not entirely implausible.²⁰

As concerns the *literary genre* of the Marcan work, Eve-Marie Becker has recently argued that the Gospel of Mark has numerous features of a historiographic work.²¹ However, as the German scholar has rightly noted, the formal features of the Marcan Gospel as a historiographic work do not necessarily prove that the content of this Gospel is historical from the modern point of view.²² The parahistorical Pentateuchal narratives evidently show that in biblical literature there are numerous literary works which have the formal features of historiographic works, and nevertheless their truly historical value cannot be simply taken for granted on the basis of their literary genre, but it should be assessed with the use of various methods of historical verification.²³

In particular, the structural literary and conceptual parallels between the references to the destruction of Jerusalem in Mk 13:14-27 and in Jos. *B.J.* 6.271-315, which have been noticed by Becker,²⁴ do not necessarily prove the historical value

17 Cf. A. Yarbrow Collins, 'Mark and the Hermeneutics', 235.

18 Cf. *ibid.*

19 It should be noted that in her detailed commentary on the Gospel of Mark, A. Yarbrow Collins has referred to a number of possible background texts for the Marcan Gospel, but she has almost never analysed in this role the letters of Paul the Apostle.

20 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Hypertextuality*, 71-76.

21 E.-M. Becker, *Das Markus-Evangelium im Rahmen antiker Historiographie* (WUNT 194; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2006), *passim*.

22 Cf. *ibid.* 393-396, esp. 396: 'Als *historischer Kernbestand* von [...] Mk 10,46ff lassen sich [...] der Gang Jesu nach Jerusalem und seine dortige Hinrichtung wahrscheinlich machen'.

23 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Retelling*, 25-223.

24 E.-M. Becker, *Markus-Evangelium*, 89-92.

of the Marcan Gospel in the modern sense of this word,²⁵ for it seems that the Gospel of Mark is literarily dependent on the works of Flavius Josephus.²⁶

Likewise, Detlev Dormeyer's hypothesis that the Gospel of Mark resembles Hellenistic ideal biographies, and that it has much in common with the Old Testament ideal biographies of Elijah (1 Kgs 17:1-19:21; 2 Kgs 1:1-2:18 etc.) and David (1 Sam 16:1-23 etc.),²⁷ is certainly insightful. However, the German scholar failed to recognize the fact that these Old Testament ideal biographies are the results of the sequential hypertextual reworking of the structurally corresponding sections of Deuteronomy.²⁸ Consequently, if it can be argued that the Marcan work formally resembles these Old Testament biographies,²⁹ it should also be argued that it likewise resulted from a sequential hypertextual reworking of earlier texts, in this case of the letters of Paul the Apostle (Gal, 1 Cor, and Phlp).³⁰

Consequently, the Marcan work can be categorized as scriptural biography because of its authoritative status for the believers, its sequential hypertextual use of earlier theological texts, its apparently biographic form, and its very loose connection with the historical facts.³¹

Mark and Paul

The problem of the relationship between the Gospel of Mark and the letters of Paul the Apostle has a long history in modern scholarship. Although the Marcan work was traditionally related to the Petrine area of influence, many scholars detected theological, and at times also literary links between the Marcan Gospel and the Pauline epistolography.

- 25 Cf. *ibid.* 90: 'Die Auswertung dieser *Motivparallelen* zwischen Josephus und Mk 13 macht ihren *historischen Wert* sichtbar [...]'.
- 26 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Hypertextuality*, 100-102.
- 27 D. Dormeyer, *Das Markusevangelium als Idealbiographie von Jesus Christus, dem Nazarener* (SBB 43; Katholisches Bibelwerk: Stuttgart 1999), 38, 88-102.
- 28 Cf. B. Adamczewski, *Retelling*, 232-260, 263-271.
- 29 Cf. also T. L. Brodie, *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings* (Sheffield Phoenix: Sheffield 2004), 148-153; T. Dykstra, *Mark, Canonizer of Paul: A New Look at Intertextuality in Mark's Gospel* (OACB: St Paul, Minn. 2012), 207-210.
- 30 For this reason, it was not Philo of Alexandria, with his allegorical biographies of the scriptural figures, who paved the way for the Marcan 'allegorical-biographizing' presentation of Christ-figures, as it has been argued by H. Tronier, 'Markusevangeliet Jesus som biografiseret erkendelsesfigur: "Ny skabelse" fra Paulus til Markus', in T. L. Thompson and H. Tronier (eds.), *Frelsens biografisering* (FBE 13; Museum Tusculanum: København 2004), 237-271.
- 31 Cf. T. Dykstra, *Mark*, 201-220, who argues for the genre of 'scriptural historiography'.

The German scholar *Gustav Volkmar* was the first modern exegete who argued that the Gospel of Mark in a symbolic-narrative way praised and defended not so much the Petrine tradition, but rather the Pauline teaching and activity among the Gentiles.³² Although Volkmar's analysis of the presence of distinctively Pauline motifs in the Marcan work was rather selective, he paved the way for the understanding of the earliest Gospel as closely related to Paul's theological and literary heritage.

Somewhat later, the German scholar *Moritz Hermann Schulze* supported Volkmar's ideas and argued that the Gospel of Mark had been composed as an apology for the person and life of Paul, so that the whole life of Paul agrees in it with the narrated life of Jesus.³³

In opposition to Volkmar's ideas, the Swiss scholar *Martin Werner* strongly argued that the differences between the theological ideas, as well as vocabulary, of Mark and Paul are too significant to allow for a theological influence of Paul on Mark. Moreover, in Werner's opinion Paul and Mark share general early Christian ideas, rather than the particularly Pauline viewpoints.³⁴

However, at the end of his influential book the Swiss theologian explained his basic methodological presuppositions, which also reveal the methodological shortcomings of his work.

Werner's first presupposition consisted in his deliberate, in fact fundamentalist, rejection of Volkmar's method of the analysis of possible allusions to Paul's letters in the Gospel of Mark. According to the Swiss theologian, Volkmar's method should be regarded as allegorizing, and consequently presumably non-scholarly.³⁵ However, such a view evidently involves a highly problematic decision about what 'scholarly' truly means.

Werner's second presupposition consisted in his assumption that the original Pauline ideas should be extracted from the body of general, early Christian ideas which are allegedly contained in Paul's letters.³⁶ After almost a century of critical reflection on Paul's literary-theological heritage, it is evident that such a

32 G. Volkmar, *Die Evangelien oder Marcus und die Synopsis der kanonischen und ausserkanonischen Evangelien nach dem ältesten Text mit historisch-exegetischem Commentar* (Fues's (R. Reisland): Leipzig 1870), viii, 644-646 *et passim*.

33 M. H. Schulze, *Evangelientafel als eine übersichtliche Darstellung des gelösten Problems der synoptischen Evangelien in ihrem Verwandtschaftsverhältnis zu einander verbunden mit geeigneter Berücksichtigung des Evangeliums Johannes zum Selbststudium für die academische Jugend und zur Unterlage für Vorlesungen wie für Forschungen geordnet* (2nd edn., A. Dieckmann: Dresden 1886), iv, x-xxvi.

34 M. Werner, *Der Einfluß paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium: Eine Studie zur neutestamentlichen Theologie* (BZNW 1; Alfred Töpelmann: Gießen 1923).

35 Ibid. 210.

36 Ibid.

procedure also presupposes a particular, in fact highly problematic, definition of what should be regarded as 'originally Pauline', and what should be regarded as 'generally Christian'.

Following Werner's way of argumentation, other modern scholars in the twentieth century also noted the absence of important Pauline theological themes, such as justification by faith, union with Christ by faith, life according to the Spirit, soteriological value of Jesus' resurrection, etc., in the Gospel of Mark.³⁷

More recently, however, a number of scholars have tried to interpret the Gospel of Mark as a post-Pauline, rather than post-Petrine or generally Christian work.

For example, the British scholar *Michael D. Goulder* has argued that the Marcan stories about the conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees in fact reflect the controversies between Paul and his Jacobite opponents which were recorded in the Pauline letters.³⁸

Coming down to the linguistic level, *Wolfgang Schenk* has argued that numerous Pauline words and phrases were used in the Marcan Gospel. The German scholar has noted that a number of them (ἄββά, ἀδιμονέω, ἀκυρώω, ἀλαλάζω, ἀμάρτημα, ἀσύνετος, ἄτιμος, ἀπροσύνη, etc.) can be found, as concerns the New Testament, exclusively in Paul's letters and in the Gospel of Mark (and at times also in the parallel texts of Luke and Matthew), a fact which strongly suggests Mark's indebtedness to Paul's literary heritage.³⁹

On a theological level, in opposition to the conclusions of Martin Werner, *John Painter* has argued that Paul and Mark have important ideas in common: concentration on the passion of Jesus, a critique of law, the use of 'gospel' language, not observing the Sabbath, invalidating Jewish food and purity laws, etc.⁴⁰

Likewise, *William R. Telford* has argued that Mark and Paul share a number of ideas and literary motifs: a tension with the Jerusalem church; a similar attitude to the Law, table fellowship, and the food laws; a common strategy in regard to dealings with the Roman state; the rejection of 'Son of David' christology; regarding the title 'Son of God' as of supreme importance; the theology of the cross, the salvific death of Jesus, and the universality of salvation engendered by it; the importance of faith in Jesus for appropriating his divine power; the distinc-

37 See e.g. K. Romaniuk, 'Le problème des paulinismes dans l'évangile de Marc', *NTS* 23 (1977) 266-274 (esp. 273).

38 M. D. Goulder, 'A Pauline in a Jacobite Church', in F. van Segbroeck [et al.] (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992*, Festschrift F. Neirynck (BETL 100; Leuven University and Peeters: Leuven 1992), [vol. 2,] 859-875.

39 W. Schenk, 'Sekundäre Jesuanisierungen von primären Paulus-Aussagen bei Markus', in F. van Segbroeck [et al.] (eds.), *Four Gospels*, 877-904.

40 J. Painter, *Mark's Gospel: Worlds in Conflict* (NTR; Routledge: London · New York 1997), 5-6.

tion between the 'flesh' and the 'spirit'; similar catalogues of vices; the motif of 'hardness of heart'; the use of the word 'gospel' (εὐαγγέλιον) to denote the proclamation of the message of salvation; etc.⁴¹

In his introductory commentary on the Gospel of Mark, *Paul Nadim Tarazi* has interpreted the Marcan 'gospel story' as a reflection of the 'gospel story' which was earlier presented in Paul's letters (especially in the letters to the Galatians and to the Philippians) and which followed the major contours of Paul's life and activity as an apostle. According to the Orthodox scholar, such a reworking of the 'gospel story' of Paul the Apostle into a 'gospel story' concerning Jesus was justified by the practical equivalence between the person of Jesus and the words of the gospel concerning him in the letters of the Apostle. Moreover, it followed the pattern of the hypertextual reworking of prophetic writings in the historical books of the Old Testament, so that the image of Paul shows through in Mark's portrayal of Jesus, just as the image of Jeremiah shows through in the Pentateuch's depiction of Moses.⁴²

Likewise in opposition to Werner's conclusions, *Joel Marcus* has argued for a Pauline influence on Mark in a number of ideas: the centrality of the term εὐαγγέλιον in his theology, the significance of Jesus' crucifixion as the apocalyptic turning point of the ages, Jesus' victory over demonic powers, Jesus' advent as the dawn of the age of divine blessing prophesied in the Scriptures, the portrayal of Jesus as a new Adam, the importance of faith in Jesus and in God, negative views about Peter and about members of Jesus' family, the inclusion of ungodly sinners and the Gentiles in the sphere of Jesus' salvific activity and atoning death, an abrogation of the Old Testament food laws, etc.⁴³

Jesper Svartvik has similarly argued that Mark shares with Paul the interest in the importance of the cross, a profound critique of the twelve disciples, and the problem of Christian commensality.⁴⁴ The Swedish scholar has summarized his conclusions in the simple statement, 'Mk may be understood as a Pauline Gospel'.⁴⁵ More precisely, 'the Gospel of Mark may best be described as a narrative presentation of the Pauline Gospel'.⁴⁶

41 W. R. Telford, *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark* (NTTheol; Cambridge University: Cambridge · New York · Melbourne 1999), 164-169.

42 P. N. Tarazi, *The New Testament: An Introduction*, vol. 1, *Paul and Mark* (St Vladimir's Seminary: Crestwood, NY 1999), 127-132.

43 J. Marcus, 'Mark – Interpreter of Paul', *NTS* 46 (2000) 473-487 (esp. 475-476, 486-487).

44 J. Svartvik, *Mark and Mission: Mk 7:1-23 in its Narrative and Historical Contexts* (ConBNT 32; Almqvist & Wiksell International: Stockholm 2000), 345-346, 402; id., 'Matthew and Mark', in D. C. Sim and B. Repschinski (eds.), *Matthew and His Christian Contemporaries* (LNTS 333; T&T Clark: London · New York 2008), 27-49 (esp. 31-33).

45 Id., *Mark and Mission*, 346. Cf. id., 'Matthew and Mark', 33.

46 Id., *Mark and Mission*, 403. Cf. id., 'Matthew and Mark', 34.

In a more cautious and general manner, *John R. Donahue* and *Daniel J. Harrington* have noted intriguing contacts between Mark and Paul or the Pauline tradition, especially as they are present in the Letter to the Romans. According to these American scholars, there are striking similarities between Mark and Paul in terminology and theology, community concerns, and the structures of the community.⁴⁷

Troels Engberg-Pedersen has interpreted the paraenesis which is contained in the Marcan Gospel as an indirect, narrativized, in fact biographized version of the paraenesis which can be found in the Pauline letters.⁴⁸

In a rather circumspect manner, *Oda Wischmeyer* has argued that Mark's overall conception of εὐαγγέλιον and his use of the Jewish Bible, of Isaiah in particular, his interest in the topic of purity (Mk 7), as well as the apocalyptic horizon of his interpretation of the figure of Jesus, traces back to Jewish origins as well as to Christian education in a community that was influenced by Pauline theology.⁴⁹

On the other hand, *Tom Dykstra* has recently argued that the primary purpose for writing the Gospel of Mark was to defend the vision of Christianity championed by Paul the Apostle against his 'Judaizing' opponents.⁵⁰ In the opinion of the American scholar, the distinctively Pauline traits of the Gospel of Mark include defending the Gentile mission, presenting Jesus as the crucified one, discrediting Jesus' disciples and family, alluding to Paul in the main parables and the ending of the Gospel, as well as appropriating Paul's language and example.⁵¹

Somewhat similarly, *Petr Pokorný* has recently argued that the Pauline influence on Mark can be detected in Mark's use of the Pauline soteriological concepts of the death of Jesus on the cross, the relativization of all the dietary regulations of the Jewish tradition, the solution to the problem of the common Table of the Lord for Christians of Jewish origin and Christians of non-Jewish origin, and the use of the term εὐαγγέλιον as denoting the content of the post-Easter salvific proclamation, especially Jesus' death on the cross and resurrection.⁵²

47 J. R. Donahue and D. J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark* (SP 2; Liturgical: Collegeville, Minn. 2002), 40.

48 T. Engberg-Pedersen, 'Biografisering: Teologi og narration i Markusevangeliet kap. 8-10', in T. L. Thompson and H. Tronier (eds.), *Frelsens biografisering*, 177-189.

49 O. Wischmeyer, 'Forming Identity Through Literature: The Impact of Mark for the Building of Christ-Believing Communities in the Second Half of the First Century C. E.', in E.-M. Becker and A. Runesson (eds.), *Mark and Matthew I: Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in their First-Century Setting* (WUNT 271; Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2011), 355-378 (here: 365).

50 T. Dykstra, *Mark*, 23, 38.

51 Ibid. 69-157.

52 P. Pokorný, *From the Gospel to the Gospels: History, Theology and Impact of the Biblical Term euangelion* (BZNW 195; De Gruyter: Berlin · Boston 2013), 118-141, 196-197.

Accordingly, Werner's arguments against any Pauline theological and literary influence on the Marcan Gospel have been countered by a number of strong counterarguments. However, it is also hard to avoid the conclusion that the kind of arguments which have been hitherto used in this discussion cannot be regarded as decisive. If some scholars point to a number of theological and linguistic differences between Paul's letters and the Marcan Gospel, other scholars point to a number of similarities between them. The problem consists in the fact that both groups of scholars refer to isolated words or ideas, and consequently the only way of solving the problem would have to consist in describing more elements than the opponents do.

Therefore, a way out of the impasse can only be found in a more systematic approach to the problem. If it is demonstrated that Mark used not only isolated Pauline words or ideas, but also Paul's letters in their entirety, then the theological differences between Paul and Mark can be attributed to Mark's creative reworking of the Apostle's theological views. In fact, the demonstration of the fact that Mark creatively but systematically used Paul's entire letters has been made possible thanks to recent analyses of the phenomenon of sequential hypertextuality in biblical writings.

Sequential hypertextuality

The notion of sequential hypertextuality adequately reflects the kind of reworking of the Pauline letters which can be traced in the Gospel of Mark.

The term *intertextuality* is widely used in modern biblical scholarship. It is usually understood as denoting a dialogical relationship between texts, as was suggested by the Bulgarian scholar Julia Kristeva and other literary theorists. In line with this idea of 'dialogical intertextuality', the canon of Scripture is regarded as a mutually interpreting or dialogical collection of texts.⁵³

However, other scholars have argued that such a 'synchronic', 'spatial', or 'hard' intertextual theory in fact does not provide much new insight into specific

53 S. Moyise, 'Intertextuality, Historical Criticism and Deconstruction', in T. L. Brodie, D. R. MacDonald, and S. E. Porter (eds.), *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations in Theory and Practice* (NTM 16; Sheffield Phoenix: Sheffield 2006), 24-34 (esp. 25). Cf. also T. R. Hatina, 'Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?', *BibInt* 7 (1999) 28-43; S. Alkier, 'Die Bibel – das Buch der Bücher: Kanongeschichtliche, theologische, intertextuelle und poetologische Anmerkungen zu einem Bestseller', in S. Alkier and R. Hays, *Kanon und Intertextualität* (Kleine Schriften des Fachbereichs Evangelische Theologie der Goethe-Universität Frankfurt/Main 1; Otto Lembeck: Frankfurt am Main 2010), 11-52 (esp. 43-49).