

Bartosz Adamczewski

"Paul and Mark : comparative Essays
Part I: Two Authors at the Beginnings
of Christianity", Oda Wischmeyer,
David C. Sim, Ian J. Elmer,
Berlin-Boston 2014 : [recenzja]

The Biblical Annals 5/1, 235-239

2015

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Oda Wischmeyer – David C. Sim – Ian J. Elmer (eds.), *Paul and Mark. Comparative Essays Part I: Two Authors at the Beginnings of Christianity* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 198; Berlin – Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2014). Pp. 709 + IX. \$ 182. € 129.95. ISBN 978-3-11-027279-6.

BARTOSZ ADAMCZEWSKI

Faculty of Theology, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw
address: Zamiejska 6, 03-580 Warsaw, Poland; e-mail: b.adamczewski@uksw.edu.pl

In the past few years, the issue of the Pauline influence upon the Gospel of Mark again became a burning issue in biblical scholarship. The present volume presents papers offered by German-speaking and English-speaking (mainly Australian) scholars who try to reopen a serious discussion on this apparently solved problem.

After an introduction by Oda Wischmeyer (pp. 1-15), Johannes Wischmeyer (pp. 19-42) offers a summary of 19th-century research on the Pauline-Markan connection. He rightly concludes that the discussion thereon was given up not due to disproving the arguments of the proponents of such a connection (G. Volkmar, K. Holsten, O. Pflieger et al.), but because of a change in the overall interpretative paradigm.

Michael P. Theophilus (pp. 45-71) points to a number of common elements which suggest a connection between the Letter to the Romans and the Gospel of Mark: 1) the importance of the term εὐαγγέλιον; 2) the inclusion of the Gentiles; 3) the priority of the Jews in God's salvific plan; 4) the abrogation of food laws; 5) the use of Isaiah to explain Jewish obduracy; 6) similar Christological themes; 7) the command to pay taxes; 8) references to Rufus; and 9) redemptive significance of the cross. He also notes a common sequence of themes in both writings: paying taxes (Rom 13:6-7; Mk 12:12-17) followed by the love of the neighbour regarded as the fulfilment of the Law (Rom 13:10; Mk 12:31). The close proximity of not only subject matter and vocabulary, but also arrangement, in fact suggests not only a thematic connection between Romans and Mark, as it is argued by Theophilus, but also some kind of literary dependence.

David C. Sim (pp. 73-99) generally correctly, on the basis of not only Galatians but also 1 Cor 15:3-8, reconstructs the dismissive attitude of the emissaries and followers of James towards Paul and his mission, although he uncritically

accepts the unlikely hypothesis of Paul's three visits to Jerusalem. Sim also rightly argues that the Marcan Gospel is thoroughly Pauline in its narrative presentation of both Paul's theological concepts and Paul's major opponents. However, in his analysis of the Marcan depiction of James, Sim fails to understand the disparaging function of the Marcan character of James the son of Zebedee.

Nina Irrgang (pp. 103-156) compares the narrative-semantic presentations of Judaism in Mark and Paul, arguing that whereas Mark described the Palestinian Judaism in a fairly detailed way, Paul concentrated his presentation on the divine-human relationship. Alas, she gives no comparative analysis of the particular issues of Pharisaism, halachic purity regulations, attitude to the Gentiles, travelling to Jerusalem, etc.

Jesper Svartvik (pp. 157-188) analyses the concept of Torah in Paul and Mark. His interpretation of Paul's theology of the Torah contains no diachronic considerations, as though Paul's theologizing did not develop in the course of his turbulent missionary career. On the other hand, he rightly points to Marcan symbolism in the depictions of two different sides of the Sea of Galilee and of two bread miracles, as illustrating in a narrative way the Pauline principle: "to the Jews first and also to the Gentiles" (Rom 1:16).

Florian Wilk (pp. 189-220) argues that the Pauline-Markan similarities in the choice of Scripture citations and allusions, their textual form, and their hermeneutic function imply that both authors used the same early Christian, probably Syrian theological tradition. Wilk is strangely reluctant to interpret the Pauline-Markan connections in the use of Lev 19:18 as the summary of the whole Law (Rom 13:9; Mk 12:31), Exod 20:13-15 with no reference to the first 'tablet' of the Decalogue (Rom 13:9; Mk 10:19), Ps 110[109]:1 (1 Cor 15:25; Mk 12:36) as Marcan corrective (also in terms of similarity to the Scriptural model) adaptations of the corresponding Pauline citations.

Elisabeth J. Dowling (pp. 221-241) argues that the Marcan Last Supper story (Mk 14:22-25) and the story of a woman anointing Jesus, which includes a 'remembrance' theme (Mk 14:3-9), originate from a source which was similar to 1 Cor 11:23-26. She offers, however, no explanation for the Marcan motifs of blessing, giving and taking, drinking, pouring out, and future drinking, as well as the omission of the motif of remembering Jesus' death (Mk 14:22-25), which in fact convey the Pauline idea of hopeful sharing (cf. Phlp 1:18-19b). On the other hand, she rightly notes that the non-Pauline phrase 'the blood of the covenant' (Mk 14:24) originates from Exod 24:8.

Michael Theobald (pp. 243-282) axiomatically postulates the existence of a pre-Markan passion and resurrection story, but rightly argues that it is not possible to demonstrate that Paul used such a story in his references to Jesus' death and resurrection.

Udo Schnelle (pp. 283-311) argues that the close correspondences between Paul and Mark in their understanding of the role of 1) the earthly Jesus, 2) the gospel, 3) the cross, 4) faith, and 5) the law originate from Mark's acquaintance with the Pauline theology in Rome. He does not explain, however, why in such a case Mark would not know at least Paul's letter to the Romans.

Andreas Lindemann (pp. 313-359) notes that the first occurrence of the word εὐαγγέλιον in singular in the meaning 'a piece of good news' in Greek literature can be found in 1 Thes 1:5 etc. He also argues that Mk 1:1 presupposes the implied reader's knowledge of this particular word in this meaning. Nevertheless, he surprisingly suggests that it is not possible to prove that Mark was directly dependent on Paul.

Oda Wischmeyer (pp. 361-392) rightly argues that in comparison to Paul the temporal focus in Mark is shifted from the time of the risen Lord and the Apostle to the time of Jesus and his disciples. However, such a thesis can obscure the fact that Paul presents his own activity as revealing the features of Jesus Christ, and Mark presents Jesus as dealing with the problems of the early Church, so that in both Paul and Mark the two periods of time thematically overlap.

Eve-Marie Becker (pp. 393-422) argues that since Mark, in difference to Paul, chose the literary genre of hetero-referential historiography, he must have used some historical sources of information. Such a logical passage from the form to the content is, however, highly questionable, as the Old Testament 'historical' narratives clearly show.

William Loader (pp. 423-464) largely follows Martin Werner in his analysis of the similarities and differences between the Marcan and Pauline concepts of faith. Loader is certainly right in pointing to significant differences in pneumatology, but his thesis that Mark and Paul perceived the ethical commandments in very different ways is unsatisfactory, since they both stressed the guiding role of the main commandments, as fulfilled in brotherly love, in Christian ethics (cf. 1 Cor 6:9-10; Rom 7:3; 13:8-10; Mk 10:19-21 etc.). The same concerns the thesis that the soteriological differences between Paul and Mark are much greater than those between Paul and the Pastorals.

Thomas Söding (pp. 465-503) rightly argues that the main differences between Mark and Paul in their attitudes to the love commandment (Lev 19:18) lie in the Marcan combination of loving the neighbour with loving God, and in placing this commandment on the lips of Jesus. However, it is questionable whether, as Söding suggests, such an expansion and ethopoeic adaptation precludes Mark's dependence on Paul's letters.

Lorenzo Scornaienchi (pp. 505-526), after a good methodological introduction, repeatedly states that it seems to him that the Pauline thesis concerning

the general purity of all foods (Rom 14:14) was partly based on a logion of Jesus, which can also be traced in Mk 7:15. Alas, he offers no convincing arguments for his suggestion.

John Painter (pp. 527-553), in response to the books of J. G. Crossley and M. F. Bird, argues that the statements Mk 7:15.18-19a.20-23.27 betray the influence of the Pauline mission upon the Marcan Gospel. He also suggests that the order of the Marcan stories: first an intra-Jewish dispute (Mk 7:1-23) and then an encounter with a Gentile (Mk 7:24-30) illustrates Paul's theological-missionary principle expressed in Rom 1:16.

Alan H. Cadwallader (pp. 557-587) argues that the section Mk 10:1-31, containing instructions concerning marriage, children, and wealth, opposes Gentile family values (cf. Mk 10:32-45) promoted by the Roman propaganda ('*Ara Pacis Augustae*') and the Colossian household code (Col 3:18-4:1). The suggestion that Mk 10:11-12 offers a critique of marriage is however strange, especially given the obligation for both sides to remain in the marital relationship in Mk 10:11-12, in difference to 1 Cor 7:10-11.27-28.39; Rom 7:2-3 (cf. Deut 24:1).

David C. Sim (pp. 589-615) rightly notes that Paul was a widely known and highly contentious figure, so it is quite probable that Matthew at least indirectly knew some Pauline letters. On the other hand, the thesis that Matthew was vehemently anti-Pauline, so that he omitted or corrected Pauline ideas from Mark, is too simplistic because it neglects the Pauline ideas e.g. in the presentation of the Law and its commandments as fulfilled in brotherly love (Mt 5:17-48; cf. Rom 13:8-10).

Lukas Bormann (pp. 617-646) argues that Luke used the Gospel of Mark, but he did not use the Pauline letters, because there are some relatively long (6-20 words) philological agreements between Luke and Mark, but there is only one such agreement between Luke and Paul. This kind of linguistic argumentation, however, does not do justice to Lucan literary creativity, which can be observed, as Bormann rightly notes, e.g. in the Lucan reworking of the Marcan passion narrative.

Wilhelm Pratscher (pp. 647-670) notes a number of thematic and motivic parallels between Paul and John, and between Mark and John, but in both cases he argues against literary dependence because of the presence of significant differences as well. In this logic, literary dependence is alas perceived as precluding any significant literary creativity.

Ian J. Elmer (pp. 671-698) points to a number of problems related to the origin, dating, reliability, and interpretation of the so-called 'testimony of Papias', which presents Mark as a follower and interpreter of Peter. In consequence, Elmer argues that the link between Mark and Peter is most likely fictitious.

In sum, the book is certainly worth reading. Alas, it follows the 19th-century pattern of comparing selected themes in Paul and Mark, with the well-known result that there are some similarities and some differences between them. It lacks serious methodological considerations concerning possible creative literary use of the Pauline letters in the Marcan Gospel.