ABSTRACT OF THESIS

This thesis addresses the paradoxical image of Mark's Gospel in contemporary criticism by an attempt to follow a tradition-oriented approach informed by the "oral-formulaic theory" of oral literature. Mark is at once a loosely organized collection of traditionally shaped units and a coherent narrative with distinct literary qualities. Current critical approaches have difficulty with these contrary features of the Gospel.

The oral-formulaic theory, developed in the field of Homeric studies, is able to account for the units of tradition, their combination and use in extended narratives, and the literary characteristics of such oral compositions. Oral narratives are re-composed in each "performance" through the use of "formulaic" diction and of "thematic" narrative units fashioned in the tradition. These texts, if recorded, can be compared and contrasted with written literature by their formulaic and thematic characteristics. Discussion of oral-formulaic theory in folkloristics and related studies provides general support for its description of the traditional process of oral composition, and enables its application to non-poetic oral narratives.

This account of the nature and literary potential of oral composition makes significant form-critical principles outmoded, particularly the ideas of fixed and fragmentary transmission, which are also essential to redaction criticism. Oral-formulaic theory provides an alternative framework within which to understand features of Mark identified by form and redaction criticism. Accordingly, the hypothesis of the oral composition of Mark is tested in the second part of the thesis on the basis of oral-formulaic criteria.

The "formulaic analysis" of Mark 1:1-45 faces uncertainties regarding the identification of formulaic expressions in prose. Even so, a proportion sufficient to satisfy this criterion for orality appears formulaic. The "thematic analysis" describes a network of similar scenes which covers most of the Gospel. These scenes display structural characteristics predicted by oral-formulaic theory and were used in Mark according to recognized oral techniques.

Results of the oral-formulaic analysis of Mark are positive: the hypothesis is not proven but is worthy of further consideration, and justifies continued use of a tradition-oriented approach to the Gospel. Oral traditional composition provides a framework which comprehends both the traditional and the literary characteristics of Mark and offers to resolve its paradoxical image.
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PREFACE

Professor Hugh Anderson set me on the path that led to this thesis. While I was in the process of struggling with redaction-critical analysis of the early chapters of Mark's Gospel, he lent me a book edited by one of his former students, which contained an article by Albert B. Lord on the Gospels as oral traditional literature. I would like to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to Professor Anderson, for sensing my interest in methodological matters, for allowing me the freedom to follow this lead, and for his warm encouragement of my research.

There are other persons and institutions whose invaluable assistance I would like to acknowledge. Mr. Iain Hope of New College Library, Edinburgh has been a dependable helper and contact, despite my distance from Edinburgh over the past three years. Professor John MacQueen of the School of Scottish Studies at the University of Edinburgh was kind enough to read an earlier draft of the first two chapters. He was most encouraging, and offered several helpful suggestions from a folklorist's perspective—not all of which I was able to put to use, unfortunately. I only wish that circumstances had allowed me to take up his gracious offer to provide more active supervision of my research. My friend and colleague, Dr. George Lyons, of Olivet Nazarene College, also read sub-
stantial portions of the thesis and provided helpful criticism at several points. These and others have provided needed encouragement and feedback at various stages of my research and writing.

Besides the library of New College and the main University of Edinburgh library, I would like to thank the School of Scottish Studies for making their fine collection of folklore literature available. The John Rylands University Library of Manchester University was a hospitable "home" for a two year period, and went beyond the call of duty in granting me borrowing privileges. The Joseph Regenstein Library of the University of Chicago and the library of the Catholic Theological Union of Chicago also allowed access to their collections over the past few months.

The reader will notice that the Greek typing element used in preparing this thesis lacked a final sigma. It did not possess a full upper case alphabet or a full set of Greek diacritical marks, either. For the sake of consistency no Greek upper case letters were used. I have endeavored to supply diacritical marks to Greek terms used in the text. I have not as a rule done this in figure 4.1 or in appendix 2, in which the addition of these marks would have proven more confusing than helpful. The Greek text used is consistently that of the twenty-sixth edition of the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece, and reference may be made to it should more clarity on these matters for some reason be needed. I beg the reader's
indulgence for this deficiency.

Finally, I would like to express my loving gratitude to my family for their support, encouragement, and patience. Over the past few months, my daughter Christa has had to deal with an increasingly part-time Daddy; that is now to end. I hope to reward her patience. Over the past five years, my wife Marilyn has been a faithful helper in countless ways: most recently as decipherer of my handwriting and as typist. I believe that the joint experience of writing this thesis has actually contributed to the growth of our relationship. Nevertheless, we are ready to grow in other ways now! In tribute to her wisdom, longsuffering, and her many efforts on my behalf, I would like to dedicate this thesis to Marilyn:

Give her of the fruit of her hands;
let her own works praise her in the gates.
INTRODUCTION

The state of contemporary criticism of the Gospel of Mark is equally as fascinating and full of paradox as the Gospel itself. Three major avenues of approach to the Gospel and its composition dominate current thinking: form criticism, redaction criticism, and literary criticism. In practice all three are often used together, but the differences between them are more than merely a matter of emphasis. Each has certain methodological underpinnings which challenge the validity of the others. At the same time, each form of criticism has its share of useful results. This thesis is an attempt to provide a theory for the origin and composition of Mark's Gospel which may offer a means of synthesizing these three approaches, while suggesting certain alterations to each.

It is almost universally agreed in contemporary Biblical criticism that the core of the material of the Gospel of Mark and the other Synoptic Gospels was provided by an oral tradition about Jesus. The idea of a primitive oral gospel proclaiming "Jesus the Messiah" was first advocated by Johann Gottfried Herder in 1796.¹ Not sur-

prisingly, Herder was also a student of other sorts of oral, "folk" traditions, both ancient and modern.\textsuperscript{2} In contemporary criticism, concern with comparative study of oral tradition is most focussed in the form-critical method pioneered by the Old Testament scholar Hermann Gunkel, and applied to the Synoptic Gospels by his students, Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Martin Dibelius, and Rudolf Bultmann.\textsuperscript{3}

The work of these three scholars has exercised an enduring influence upon Gospel criticism, and will be called "standard" form criticism in this thesis, for in spite of their differences on many points there is an overriding agreement on issues to be considered here, in particular on the nature of oral tradition. Standard form

first work on the subject was entitled \textit{Vom Erlöser der Menschen. Nach unseren drei ersten Evangelien}, 1796.


criticism begins with the belief that oral tradition arises first in simple, primitive "forms", or types of expression, which gradually evolve and grow with the passage of time. A fundamental interest of form criticism is this "literary history" (Literaturgeschichte) of the traditional material, that is, "the history through which the forms have passed".4

The standard form-critical view of the Gospels is that they simply represent a developmental stage in this literary history, and that the evangelists were no more than unliterary "collectors" of individual, fragmentary traditions. Therefore the composition of the Gospels, especially Mark's, introduced nothing essentially new into the traditional process.5 A corollary of this conclusion is that one should be able to isolate the very texts of the earlier traditions from their present contexts in the Gospels,6 and thus to have direct access to earlier stages


5Dibelius, FTG, pp. 2f.; Bultmann, HST, pp. 321, 350, 368f., 373f.

in the development of the tradition. Were the Gospels not "unliterary" and were their authors more than "collectors", the form-critical enterprise would become quite difficult, especially if the authors had literally reworked their traditions, so that these were no longer clearly defined.

Redaction criticism is based on the form-critical analysis of the Gospels. More significance is given to the motives and the theological character of the "collection" of the traditional material in the Gospels, however. This results in important alterations of two related factors in the form-critical approach. First, the evangelists are no longer mere collectors, but active and creative individuals who may even be seen over against the tradition. Secondly, in consequence, it must be said that the evangelists did introduce the new into the tradition. This possibility of creative bias on the part of the evangelist must raise the question of how much he has


affected the traditions as he ostensibly received them.

Theodore J. Weeden put this problem well:

The redaction-critical premise that Mark exercised an author's freedom and creativity in composing the Gospel is a sound postulate with which to begin a Markan study. ... [But] no longer can the pieces of the Markan puzzle be so easily delineated and differentiated. ... The lines which are drawn by form criticism between Markan created material and Markan received material look less sharply defined, the distinctions less assured. 9

The problem may be seen most clearly as a result of E. J. Pryke's attempt to isolate a "redactional text" of Mark. On the basis of an eclectic canon of Markan "redactional" phraseology and vocabulary, Pryke sought to determine those parts of the Gospel which the evangelist has himself composed.10 About half of the Gospel is finally held to be the evangelist's composition, and the remaining "source" material is quite fragmentary. This has led reviewers of Pryke's book to question whether the text of any distinct source material is really to be filtered out of Mark at all.11

The net effect of redaction criticism may be to call the entire form-critical enterprise into question.12

9Weeden, Mark, pp. 1f.


12This is certainly the view of Erhardt Göttingmanns, Candid Questions Concerning Gospel Form Criticism,
If the evangelist is creative and his Gospel more than a collection, can the text of the traditional forms he used be identified with any degree of confidence? But if form criticism is jeopardized, then so is redaction criticism itself, because of their intimate relationship. For example, one of the first principles of redaction criticism is the ability to separate "tradition" from "redaction". This may not now be so straightforward as it once sounded, especially in the case of Mark, the first Gospel, for which there are no extant sources. Perhaps nothing definite can be said of the oral tradition which lay before the redactor, making it impossible now to tell where "redaction" begins and ends.

The interest of redaction criticism in the Gospels as wholes has gradually awakened an interest in literary criticism of, particularly, Mark. From this perspec-

---

13 The notion of the text of the traditional material is important, for it is on this basis that the "history" of the form is investigated.


15 Markan priority is presupposed in this thesis. A reconsideration of the entire Synoptic problem is beyond its scope, even though the problem is again wide open. The theory of oral tradition presented here would be useful, were it adopted, in considering the Synoptic problem. Brief mention of this will be made later.

16 "Literary criticism" in New Testament parlance
tive, the evangelist is neither any longer a mere collector nor an editor or "redactor", but an author. The Gospel is taken as a unified narrative: plot, characterization, and a consistent point of view are all to be found in Mark's Gospel. One literary critic of Mark, David Rhoads, states:

The author has not simply collected traditions, organized them, made connections between them, and added summaries; the author has told a story, a dramatic story, with characters whose lives we follow to the various places they travel and through the various events in which they are caught up.17

Literary criticism of Mark is a promising approach, but the gap between it and the previous two methods of study ought not to be overlooked. Redaction criticism had raised questions about form criticism, but there was at least continuity in their orientation toward the fragmentary nature of oral tradition and the composite nature of the Gospels. Literary criticism comes from an entirely different perspective. This in itself would not necessar-

frequently means source criticism. Here the term, as in its more usual sense, refers to comparative study of literature.

17David Rhoads, "Narrative Criticism and the Gospel of Mark", JAAR 50 (1982), 413. See also, e.g., David Rhoads and Donald Michie, Mark as Story (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982); and Norman Petersen, "'Point of View' in Mark", Semeia 12 (1978), 97-121. The most overtly literary-critical treatment of Mark to date is that of Frank Kermode, The Genesis of Secrecy, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979). It should be noted, however, that he is concerned more to treat problems of interpretation by way of Mark, than he is to interpret the Gospel itself: see the preface to Secrecy, p. ix.
ily create a difficulty. In fact attempts to create a synthesis have been made.18

But the foundational assumption of the literary-critical approach to Mark is that it is an integrated narrative, the unified product of a single author. Norman Petersen states, for example, "Mark has produced an integral system, and for this reason it is necessary to read his Gospel as a narrative and not as a redaction": interest in a "redactor and his sources" actually hinders understanding the Gospel's unitary "narrative world".19

The form-critical goal of studying the history of the traditions used by Mark, already rendered problematical by redaction criticism, now recedes to the horizon. If the Gospel is no longer a "collection", or even a "redaction", but a unified literary whole, how can one recover the Evangelist's sources, in particular, the text of his sources?

Of course form and redaction criticism have definite grounds for their approach to the Gospel. Schmidt would certainly appear to have shown that Mark's narrative is at best loosely connected and has many signs of being a

18See, e.g., Norman Perrin, "The Evangelist as Author", Biblical Research 17 (1972), 5-18; and Norman Petersen, "Introduction" to Semeia 16 (1979), 1-5. Petersen looks more for a "detente" than a synthesis.

composite work. Repetition, awkwardness, and narrative inconsistency are frequent: Mark is hardly a tightly integrated story. The ground for most redaction-critical exegesis of Mark lies in the obvious "seams" between his pericopes. Moreover the rearrangement of various Markan pericopes by Matthew and Luke argues that they too treated Mark as a composite work, and furthermore they appear to have had other traditional sources similar to those posited for Mark. Not only this, but Matthew and Luke are clearly "redactors" in their treatment of Mark, which leads one to infer that Mark could have worked in much the same way.

Form criticism and redaction criticism are related methods by virtue of their tradition-oriented approach to the Gospels. Even so, they raise certain problems for one another. Literary criticism, which is not related to either, raises more fundamental problems for the entire tradition-oriented approach. The reverse is also true: the latter gives pause to full acceptance of the literary-critical approach.

---

20 This is the cumulative impression gained from Schmidt's analysis in *Rahmen*: see his conclusions: pp. 208ff., 317.


22 So Marxsen, *Mark*, pp. 28f., 43f.

23 Schmidt's classification of the Gospels as Kleinliteratur, "Die Stellung", pp. 84-90, has not been overturned. The Gospels are not to be considered on a par with
There is then the threat of polarization in Gospel criticism between the tradition-oriented approaches, which view the Gospel and its composition in terms of the oral tradition from which Mark's material is drawn, and what may be called the "narrative-oriented" approach, which takes the Gospel as is and views it in categories applied to a whole range of narrative literature.24 Both positions have their value and their "results", but the composite picture of Mark's Gospel is impossible. Mark is at once "not sufficiently master of his material to be able to venture on a systematic construction",25 the theological creator of a wholly new literary Gattung,26 and a skillful, dramatic narrator.27 It is difficult to see how all these could be true at the same time.

The argument of this thesis is that a way forward, without completely discarding the insights of any of these methods, lies in the description of oral tradition and of

---

either ancient or modern Hochlitteratur. The problem of Schmidt's understanding of the nature of Kleinlitteratur is discussed below in chapter 3, under "K. L. Schmidt". There are both continuities and differences to be reckoned with, as will be seen.

24Petersen, "Introduction", pp. 3ff., clearly recognizes the polarity.


27Cf. Rhoads, "Narrative Criticism", p. 413, quoted above; Rhoads and Michie, Mark as Story; and Petersen, "'Point of View'".
oral traditional literature established by the "oral-formulaic theory" of Milman Parry and Albert B. Lord.\textsuperscript{28} The theory is based on actual fieldwork by Parry and Lord, carried out in a living oral tradition.

An article by Lord on the relationships among the Synoptic Gospels as characteristic of parallel oral narratives, provided first inklings of a different relationship between the evangelist and the oral tradition than was dictated by standard form criticism: he might have been neither a "collector" nor a "redactor", but a traditional narrator or storyteller who habitually used traditional material in composing coherent, literary narratives. Such "oral compositions" would be a typical feature of the tradition itself.\textsuperscript{29} Were this the case, then at least elements of both the tradition-oriented and the narrative-oriented approaches to Mark may become compatible, and their apparently conflicting findings capable of explanation in terms of a theory embracing both oral tradition and literature.

To the end of reconsidering the composition of

\textsuperscript{28}Further bibliography will be given below. The basic expression of the theory is in Albert Lord, The Singer of Tales.

Mark's Gospel and its relation to the oral Synoptic tradition in the light of the oral-formulaic theory, the thesis will fall into two parts. The first part, consisting of three chapters, will present and discuss the oral-formulaic theory and the tradition-oriented approach to Mark's Gospel. Chapter 1 will present the oral-formulaic theory in its entirety as it is expressed by Lord in *The Singer of Tales*. Chapter 2 will discuss and broaden the theory by reference to scholarly discussion of the theory, particularly from the field of folklore studies. Chapter 3 will review and analyze the concept of oral tradition found in standard form-critical and redaction-critical thinking, and propose a fresh, "oral-formulaic" assessment of the composition of Mark's Gospel.

The second part will be an attempt to carry out an oral-formulaic analysis of Mark's Gospel, to test the hypothesis that the text of the Gospel could be a direct product of oral traditional composition. The motivating principle of the oral-formulaic theory was an attempt to understand the composition of the Homeric epics (and,

---

30 The oral-formulaic theory, and Singer in particular, are referred to several times in recent New Testament literature, but it does not yet appear that consideration has been given to the full implications of the theory. See, e.g., Guttgemanns, Candid Questions, pp. 204-11; Graham N. Stanton, "Form Criticism Revisited", *What about the New Testament?*, eds. Morna Hooker and Colin Hickling (London: SCM Press, 1975), pp. 18-20; and Kelber, "Mark and Oral Tradition", pp. 8, 20ff. Guttgemanns and Kelber are discussed briefly in chapter 3. Kelber's article is discussed at length in appendix 1.
latterly, other ancient compositions) as the product of an oral traditional process. Two primary means of testing such a claim were developed, "formulaic" analysis and "thematic" analysis, which deal respectively with the repetitive phraseology and with the repeated use of typical scenes, that were found by the fieldwork of Parry and Lord to be characteristic of oral traditional compositions. Chapter 4, therefore, will be a formulaic analysis of Mark, and chapter 5, a thematic analysis.  

It is hoped that the second part of the thesis will help to validate the modifications of the standard form-critical view of the Synoptic tradition which are suggested in chapter three, and at the same time to focus literary-critical attention on the relationship between Mark and the tradition, so that criticism will have a more firm idea of the compositional medium that may have produced the first Gospel.
PART I

ORAL LITERATURE, THE ORAL-FORMULAIC THEORY, AND THE TRADITION-ORIENTED APPROACH TO MARK'S GOSPEL
CHAPTER 1

THE ORAL-FORMULAIC THEORY OF
ORAL NARRATIVE LITERATURE

The student of the Gospels who would undertake comparative study of the Synoptic tradition on the basis of research in oral literature and folklore encounters a broad, many-faceted field. The decision to begin from the oral-formulaic theory of Milman Parry and Albert Lord is a product of three factors.

First, the oral-formulaic theory was originally proposed to clarify the relationship of the Homeric epics to their oral traditional background, which immediately leads into questions of the literary capacities of oral composition, for the Iliad and the Odyssey are of unquestioned literary quality. This means that the oral-formulaic theory deals with issues similar to those that have been outlined in the introduction with relation to Mark's Gospel.

Second, the oral-formulaic theory has included a proposal to test for oral composition in texts of indefinite origin. Although the testing process is by no means simple or final, it does at last offer the prospect of the controlled evaluation of a hypothesis, and is based upon field study of actual oral tradition. Such a test would
self-evidently be useful, if it can be applied to Mark's Gospel.

Third, as was indicated in the introduction, Lord has already published an article, applying aspects of the oral-formulaic theory to the Synoptic problem. His willingness to do so encourages the belief that his theory may indeed prove useful in the analysis of Mark's Gospel.

If the oral-formulaic theory takes pride of place in this study, nevertheless it cannot stand alone for the purposes of understanding Mark's Gospel. The differences between the poetic, epic traditions with which the oral-formulaic theory is immediately concerned and the Synoptic tradition are not to be denied. It will be necessary to set the oral-formulaic theory in the broader context of oral and folklore studies. This will be the purpose of the second chapter.

It is proposed now to summarize the oral-formulaic theory as it is presented by Lord in The Singer of Tales.\(^1\) It is important to grasp the theory as a whole: frequently various aspects of it have been taken out of this context and elevated into independent principles which have no real basis in the theory as a whole.\(^2\) The full

\(^1\)Albert B. Lord, The Singer of Tales (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960). References to Singer in this chapter will generally be inserted into the text as page numbers within parentheses.

\(^2\)This has happened particularly with regard to the "formula", and to the difference between oral and written composition. The first of these will be discussed below in chapter 2, under "the formula". The second, which has found its way into New Testament circles, will be consi-
statement of the theory here will provide bearings to be followed both in the second chapter and in the reconsideration of the tradition-oriented approach to Mark's Gospel to follow.

The Context of Homeric Studies

At the beginning of Singer (7-12), Lord provides a sketch of the modern history of Homeric criticism, in order to set a framework within which to understand the significance of the oral-formulaic theory. (It may be useful to keep in mind the state of modern Gospel criticism for the sake of comparison.)

One influential view of the composition of the Homeric epics is that the Homeric poems were "written literary productions by a single author". This is still held by the "unitarians", or the "loyalists" as Lord calls them, who have held to and defended the standard view throughout the modern period.

Over the years several problems about this received view have arisen. First of all, it was not believed that the Greeks could write as early as the ninth century B.C., when "Homer's" works appear to have originated. It
dered briefly in chapter 3, under "Erhardt Gättemanns" and "Werner Kelber", and somewhat more extensively in appendix 1, a critique of Kelber's article, "Mark and Oral Tradition", Semeia 16 (1979), 7-55.

3This was first claimed by Josephus in Contra Apionem I:2. It was brought forward again later in the eighteenth century, most cogently, according to Lord, by Friedrich August Wolf, Prolegomena ad Homerum (1795). Wolf in turn probably influenced J. G. Herder's thinking.
has since been discovered that the Greeks did indeed have the ability to write, but no texts are extant that would give any indication that it was used for literary texts of the length and quality of the Iliad and the Odyssey.

Other critics have pointed out errors and inconsistencies in the poems. With the development of linguistic studies, the presence of various dialects in the poems, and also of archaisms from different periods has been uncovered. These all militate against unified authorship. The typical resolution of these difficulties is to affirm some sort of multiple authorship, with "Homer" at one or the other end of a series of poets. Homer becomes either the originator of the poems, or the great final redactor, "who reworked oral tradition into a 'literary' poem".

Those who placed Homer at the beginning of the process often undertook "dissection", as Lord calls it (or redaction criticism?), in an attempt to recover the "archetypal poems" at the foundation of the tradition. One such scholar detected four strata of expansion and interpolation atop an original "core" of poems. Lord does not intend simply to dismiss the findings of all these studies. Many of their observations about the "peculiarities of language and structure" in the Homeric corpus are indeed typical of "oral poetry" as he understands it.

Oral transmission of the Homeric poems in various forms and over various periods has been posited by most non-unitarian theorists. But according to both Parry and Lord, it appeared that the understanding of how oral tradition functioned, how its carriers composed traditional material when they recited, and how the traditional material itself took its forms was misconceived.

The basis of this misconception lay in the idea that the successive carriers of oral traditional poems were dealing with "fixed" texts, retained in "the 'fantastic memories' so 'well attested' of illiterate people", and subject to change therefore only through (rare) lapse of memory or through intentional alteration. Although such an assumption seemed self-evident to literate Western scholars, Parry observed in his work among the Balkan poets that their oral transmission operated on a different principle than the verbatim repetition of fixed texts. The description of how an oral narrative tradition functions is the distinctive contribution of the oral-formulaic theory to the literary evaluation of traditional texts.

The "Singer of Tales"

Lord's book, The Singer of Tales, is comprised of two parts. The first, theoretical part has as its aim a full definition of "oral epic song", and the second has the practical purpose of applying the principles of the oral-formulaic theory to Homer and other epic poetry (4).
There are insights to be gleaned from the second half of Singer, which will be put to use later with regard to the interpretation of Mark, but attention will be focussed for the present upon its first part. Returning then to "oral epic song", Lord defines this briefly as:

Narrative poetry composed in a manner evolved over many generations by singers of tales who did not know how to write; it consists of the building of metrical lines and half-lines by means of formulas and formulaic expressions and of the building of songs by the use of themes (4).

"Formula" and "formulaic expression" here refer to verbal and metrical combinations of which individual lines of verse are constructed. "Themes" are defined as "repeated incidents and descriptive passages". A theme, therefore, is roughly comparable to the "form" of New Testament form criticism.

Lord describes oral epic as a "living organism" (4)

---

4 Three objections against the use of the oral-formulaic theory within the framework of Gospel studies arise in this preliminary definition: (1) that it has specific reference to poetry and not to a prose tradition such as the Synoptic; (2) the short time available between Jesus' lifetime and the composition of the Synoptic Gospels, compared to Lord's "generations"; and (3) the condition of illiteracy prescribed by Lord. The first and the third objection are taken up in the second chapter. The second applies to practically any tradition-oriented approach to the Gospels: what may be said, and what Lord does say in "Gospels as Oral Traditional Literature", Relationships among the Gospels, ed. William Walker (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1978), pp. 36, 38ff., 91, is that the events of Jesus life were taken up into already established narrative forms. This is not uncommon in oral tradition, as will be seen. Cf. also Linda Degh, "Folk Narrative", Folklore and Folklife, ed. Richard M. Dorson (London: University of Chicago Press, 1972), pp. 78ff.
and the oral-formulaic theory presents an organic conception of oral tradition. As such it is difficult to know where to begin describing it. Probably the best way is to return to the idea that oral tradition does not consist in the handing on of verbally-fixed texts.

**Composition in Performance**

The poems of oral poets are not composed prior to, but in performance (13). The singer-poet, then, does not "know" the material of his tradition, rather he himself is the tradition at the moment of recital. He is an organic part of the oral tradition. The traditional material only takes on a quantifiable form as it is orally presented or performed. Performances are not mechanical repetitions, but neither are they free creations of the poet.

The rapidity of composition before an audience makes the use of formulas and themes necessary for the oral poet. These formulas and themes are, in turn, provided to him through his experience of the tradition. Each performance ("performance", is a technical term among folklorists for the process of public recitation; it is not limited to "entertainment" in the usual sense) of a particular "song" is unique, but it is also closely related to other performances of the song, whether by the same poet or by his peers, through the medium of the traditional formulas and themes (4). The tradition depends upon the poet and the poet depends upon the tradition.
Oral tradition is not an "anonymous" process. Every performance is really a separate song which bears the "signature of its poet singer", and his audience knows who he is because they are present at the time of composition. The stories of oral tradition are composed and re-composed each time they are performed, and this continuous re-composition of the poems upon the basis of traditional elements accounts for the existence of both the continuity and discontinuity in the texts of songs which Parry and Lord recorded in the Balkan epic tradition.

A particular recording or transcription of a traditional poem does not give one the "poem": there is no ideal or model form of it (4f.). Indeed the question of an "original" poem has very little meaning (100ff.)—certainly not what a text-critic would mean by an original or autograph manuscript. If this is so, then ancient texts based upon oral tradition present but a cross-section, as it were, of the traditional process in which they were set.

Lord, in his article on the "Gospels as Oral Traditional Literature", has tentatively considered the Synoptic Gospels on this model as three distinct "performances" of the Synoptic tradition. He felt that the pattern of their agreements and disagreements would be characteristic of what one could expect from oral traditional compositions. Even if that approach is unlikely to cut through

---

the Gordian knot which is the Synoptic problem, the fact that Lord found it conceivable may help to clarify his conception of the nature of oral tradition.

In summary then, "oral" does not mean recital of a fixed text, but "composition during oral performance", which is neither rote memorization, being unique, nor "free improvisation", being traditional. "Oral learning, oral composition and oral transmission seem to be different facets of the same process" (5). Lord develops his theory by concentrating on three components of the tradition: the training and performance of the singer, the formula, and the theme. He concludes his presentation by considering the relationship between "songs and the song", and more generally, that between writing and oral tradition.

The Singer

The term "singer" is used descriptively of the Balkan oral poets who habitually sing their poetic narratives to the accompaniment of a one-stringed "gusle", and the term serves by extension to encompass all the oral traditional composers whose epics Lord considers. Lord has in mind a somewhat deeper role for the singer as well: he has a "mantic and sacred function" (155), even as his epics have a fundamentally "religious" nature (67).

The singer occupies the center of the oral theory, for he is "not a mere carrier of the tradition but a creative artist making the tradition" (13). It is this
idea which must be clarified. With written texts, Lord states, one must consider the "moment of composition" in order to understand the author's motives, and not later performances or readings of the text. The same holds true for oral poetry, except that the "moment of composition" is the performance (13). Each performance is also "live", as would be said today: the singer must simultaneously compose and satisfy an audience.

This relationship of composer and audience is an essential part of the traditional process. The typical Southslavic singer observed by Parry and Lord performed on a variety of occasions, mostly informal; village inns and homes were common settings. During the month-long Islamic festival of Ramadan, when men would fast all day and gather each evening for talk and song, a good singer would often perform nightly, perhaps having the opportunity to sing one song for an entire night, and to go through a repertoire of thirty songs over the course of the festival (24).

The informality of the performance meant that a singer would have to deal with an audience of constantly changing size and mood. In such conditions, considerable "dramatic ability and narrative skill" were needed to maintain the listeners' attention. A singer would have to gauge the mood of his audience in order to know how long he could afford to make his song. Singers of greater talent could usually sing for a longer period than others. (Not surprisingly, it was observed that a song sung by the
same man several times would vary most in its ending, because it was sung less often than the rest.) The setting of the composition of the songs demands both speed and flexibility, and the techniques of oral composition provide the key to the singer's ability to satisfy these demands (16f.).

The process of becoming an oral poet is also informal. Singers are not a guild, although it is common for a son to follow his father, nor do they come from any particular social class. There is no formal training. Lord isolated three stages in the learning of oral composition: listening and absorbing, application, and beginning to sing before a critical audience (21-26).

The first stage often begins in boyhood through listening to singers with an interest born of a personal desire to sing. Through listening, a would-be singer begins to learn the traditional stories, the names and characters of heroes and far-away places, and about the habits of the distant past. The various themes which go into the songs become familiar. The rhythm of the music and the words do, too, and these are the foundation of the formulas by which the lines of verse are composed. The ear of the listener becomes more and more acute as more songs and discussions about songs are heard.

This process is best called absorption, for it is an informal process and there are no definite sets of themes or lists of formulas to learn and memorize. Because the "same" song is a little different each time it
is heard, he never gets the idea of memorizing one performance of it, even if that were possible. It is more like learning to speak one's native language than formal training in a second language. Even mature singers are not really conscious of the formulas they employ as "formulas", any more than the average person would be aware of the "rules" of grammar of his own language, if he had not been taught them.

The second stage begins when the would-be singer first attempts to sing. During this time he gradually learns to express himself within the confines of rhythm and melody by the formulas and phrases which may have collected in the tradition, perhaps for generations. The formulas in turn influence the kinds of ideas which the singer will express, because the most familiar formulas will be related to the "ideas most common to the poetry". (For example, as horses loom large in the heroic actions of the Balkan epics, the formula related to, say, mounting a horse occurs frequently, and is readily adapted to differently colored horses, as well as to various numbers of horsemen.) Formulas finally become "part of his poetic thought", through repeated use and satisfaction.

Much is learned by imitation in this stage: music, formulas and themes of songs are emulated, often from one mature singer who acts as a teacher and model. Because the themes and formulas are common to the entire tradition, the learning of a particular song facilitates the ability to compose others as well. This stage comes to an
end when a singer can perform one entire song for the satisfaction of a critical audience.

The singer will know parts of other songs and his ability to perform the one will not yet be mature. The singer is at this point the closest to his models that he ever will be, in themes and words, but he will also be familiar with the fluidity of the tradition. As time passes his songs develop with the increase of repertoire and competence.

The third stage of learning includes this increase, and ends when the singer can perform for several nights running or when he can move freely through the tradition. By this Lord means that he has sufficient command of formulas and themes to be able to sing any song he hears, and to expand and "ornament" a song when the occasion permits. Not all reach this level. During this time, too, the audience plays a role by demanding more and more skilful performances. The singer never ceases the process of accumulating and recombing his formulas and themes. He is constantly refining his ability and learning new songs.

In view of the training and consciousness of a singer, it is possible to conceive oral tradition as a conservative institution, the traditions of which are carefully preserved, and at the same time as a creative, ever-changing process. If asked, the singer will see himself as a "defender of the historic truth of what is being sung" and will not recognize a difference in his own
telling of a story from that which he first heard. He has sung it "exactly" as he heard it. On the other hand, he will recognize that no two other singers will sing a song alike: changing and adding do occur, and this may not be a good thing. But this is about the art of singing itself, and not about (his) "preservation" of the tradition. The singer will see no contradiction here for it is the essence of the story which must be and is preserved. The tradition is preserved in its constant recreation by singers who have themselves been taught by the tradition (28f.). Lord does note that a well-known and particularly skillful singer will make a proportionately greater impression on the tradition than his fellows (20).

Of course, "singer" is a peculiar term in the context of Gospel criticism. The term here for this person will be, more prosaically, "narrator" which should indicate much the same as Lord's term, and will also avoid the connotations inherent in other terms such as "author" or "story-teller". In view of the "religious" function Lord ascribed to the singer, perhaps "evangelist" would be a better term for the narrator in the Gospel tradition, but that is to presuppose a number of matters yet to be considered.
The Formula

The poems of Homer abound with what have been variously called "repetitions", "stock epithets", "epic tags", and "stereotyped phrases". The "formula", as understood by oral-formulaic theory, embraces all these, and goes on yet further to include about ninety per cent of the 27,000 lines in the Iliad and the Odyssey (144).

"Formula" is defined as "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea" (30). As such it is a combination of "thought and sung-verse", as the latter imposes certain restrictions upon the expression of the former. In the course of the tradition, the rhythm and the thought become one whole—at a level beneath the immediate awareness of the poet. The most stable formulas are those for the most common ideas of the poetry: names of actors and of places, and the time and description of actions (31-33).

Lord employs the analogy of grammar to illustrate how formulas work. The formulas can be assembled into tables of paradigms, or "systems". But their actual use is no more mechanical than is the normal speech of the native speaker from which grammatical rules and paradigms are derived. "Formulas are the phrases and clauses and sentences of this specialized poetic grammar." Pleonasm is characteristic of formulaic expression in order to fill out lines and half-lines left partially vacant by particular expressions. As in grammar, there are rules, but also
exceptions and abnormalities (34-36).

Because they provide plastic and greatly adaptable patterns, the actual number of formulas employed by a poet may be much less than one would expect. The adjustment of formulaic expressions, and even the creation of new ones by analogy from others, becomes a habit in performance and does not entail any sort of mechanical juxtaposition (36f.). It is true that certain formulas are more "set" than others in the singer's usage and he will often have relatively stable sequences of formulas used to express common thoughts in his themes.6

Nevertheless, the formulas themselves are less important than the fact that they make possible a "formulaic style of expression", for more often than not the singer must form a phrase rather than rely upon one that is ready made. This ability makes the oral recomposition of a song possible without recourse to a computer-like memory (44f.). Not every line is identical with another, but many are related to a common pattern or phrase.

The oral poem, then, is constructed of sequences of lines. Because each line is a compositional unit, it generally expresses a complete thought. Fully eighty-five per cent of the lines of Yugoslav oral poetry are either complete sentences or clauses which in themselves make

---

6Some "language" is most often associated with particular themes: see the discussion in chapter 5, under "structure of themes". Other formulas are not so restricted.
sense. This results in what Parry called an "adding style" which allows for either a rapid story pace by binding a series of actions together, or for richly detailed description in breaks between the actions (54f.). Paratactic connection is quite common in oral style because of this feature (65).

Passages are constructed with syntactic, rhythmic, and acoustic (alliteration, assonance, etc.) patterns. The outcome of this is a comparative stability of expression for the singer and to a lesser extent, in the tradition itself. The larger clusters of formulas or lines, characteristically employed by singers, also work toward this effect (57f.). On the other hand, individual styles of verse-making are distinguishable, given a sufficient sample of poetry. This provides a possibility of testing the unity of longer textual pieces, such as the Iliad and the Odyssey (63ff.).

Because the tradition tends to carry formulaic expressions along, it can become a repository for archaic and dialect forms of expression. This helps to explain the presence of peculiarities in the language of Homer's poetry, as noted earlier. In addition, formulas retain "connotative depths" which elicit "traditionally intuitive meaning". Phrases in Homer like "ox-eyed Hera" or

---

7The technical term for a sentence which requires more than one line of verse to complete its sense is "enjambement". The absence of "necessary enjambement" is an obvious characteristic of oral poetry, although not exclusively so: Lord, Singer, p. 54.
"bright-eyed Athena" are more than mere line-filler: they recall epiphanies of these goddesses in Greek religion. Formulas themselves often carry ritual and religious overtones. This feature of oral composition also will have implications for the Gospel tradition, for example in underlining the power of Old Testament allusions or the use of apocalyptic imagery in the expression of the tradition.

Formulas in oral traditional poetry are more obviously conditional upon the metrical requirements of poetry than are other aspects of the tradition. Although the Evangelists have not employed poetic formulas in their compositions, Mark's style particularly tends to "characteristic" terms and constructions, to paratactic and pleonastic expression, and to shorter sentences than are common in "literary" Greek. This may well indicate some affinity to the oral style of expression described by Lord, which also displays these characteristics.

---

The Theme

Whereas formulas are the means for telling a story in song and verse, there are many basic incidents and descriptions that recur in oral epic. These complexes of ideas are called themes (68). The calling and conduct of a council, and the assembly of an army are two common examples from Lord's literature; the miracle story and the calling of a disciple are two from the Gospels which come readily to mind.

Themes are structured groups of ideas. The structures are absorbed by the singer from the earliest stage of his development and form the constant factor in the expression of the theme. The words of a particular theme can often be rather constant as well, but the various ideas are of the essence. Some themes can involve lesser themes in their structure, or in their actual expression. That of a council, for instance, will generally involve the introduction of a speaker or speakers and the speeches themselves, which are "minor" themes (68ff.).

When a singer builds a large theme, he has a plan which goes beyond the bare necessities of the narrative. There are elements of balance, order, and progression within the theme. This sense of the ordered totality of the theme allows a good singer to slow down the action and to elaborate any element of the theme without losing his sense of the whole (92). Singers also exercise a technique of "framing" one theme within another to express concurrent actions (104).
The quality of oral epic tradition depends largely upon a singer's skill at describing heroes, houses, arms and castles, to the marvel of his hearers. Such "ornamentation", as the singers call it, is often thematic as well. Lord observes that the ornamentation also has a "strongly ritualistic flavor" and that it does not occur indiscriminately. Elaborated themes are often reserved for the protagonist who prepares for a special mission, and this may well be a survival from rites of initiation or dedication (86-89). Ornamentation thus calls particular attention to the action or person described.

If at first a singer is greatly influenced by his primary teacher in the variety and construction of his repertoire of themes, he will add elements as he matures (1) from other performances by other singers, (2) by performing the same theme in other songs, and perhaps (3) by his own artistic creativity. The potential of the themes grows and develops with the singer's art. An experienced singer is an active listener who combines listening and learning into one process by adapting a new song to his own stock of themes, for the song is essentially a given pattern of major themes with particular heroes and settings supplied (78f.).

Themes are multiform. Both major and minor themes can take several forms in a singer's repertoire, depending upon their importance and context in a given song. The full form of the letter-writing theme of the Balkan tradition, for example, includes the gathering of writing mate-
rituals, dictation of the letter, writing of the letter, and the expectation of a response which may not arrive until later. The process of dictating and writing can be expanded to a great length, or the entire theme can be expressed in one formula-line (80-85). 9

As with formulas, Lord associates both stability and change with themes. A particular poet's use of themes will be distinguishable from that of another. And although a singer's themes are subject to change as he matures in his ability and learns the tradition, after a time the general outlines of a theme will become quite constant.

In a singer's use of themes, two forces are at work which can result in narrative inconsistency, which is not untypical of oral poetry ("Homer's nod"). The first is the pattern of themes which comprises the story: one theme leads naturally to another in the narrative. At the same time, however, each theme has its own "semi-independent life". Thus there is a pull in two directions, toward the song being sung, and toward the previous uses of the same theme by the singer and in the tradition at large. A theme, or an episode, has its own consistency and its own habitual associations. One major theme will often lead to another by demands for further action created in its telling, but this second action may not be

9Note, incidentally, that a familiarity with the possibility and practice of writing and reading is not incompatible with oral tradition.
necessary or even consistent with the song in which the first theme occurs (93ff.).

In the tradition at large, major complexes of themes are held together by the logic of narrative or by repeated association. In Southslavic epic, the complex of themes involving the return of a hero from captivity almost invariably requires a disguise or a deceptive story on the hero's part, which logically leads to recognition of the hero by certain parties at certain times (compare, for example, the return of Odysseus to Ithaca).

Some force, a "tension of essences" as Lord terms it, holds these themes together. Some of the themes belong to other such complexes as well, which can give rise to long and involved stories.10 Both singers and audiences can feel this tension, as a result of the tradition, and at some point in a story, at least vestiges of these themes must appear in order to resolve it. Association of this kind is at the heart of epic and is vital to its stability and continuity. When one analyzes a composition thematically the "hidden tension of essences" must be taken into account. It will often be found to stem from the religious or "mythical" loading of the tradition (96ff., cf. 164).

With Lord's discussion of "themes", the material of oral traditions is encountered, more familiar to New Testament students as the various "forms" of form criticism.

10 In Lord's analysis, the Odyssey is a prime example of this: see Singer, pp. 158-85.
What is important to observe here is not only the existence and development of individual themes, which has indeed been the focus of much attention since the classical form-critical works of Rudolf Bultmann and Martin Dibelius. It is rather the use of the themes which has new implications for the interpreter of the Gospels: themes do not exist solely for themselves, but in relation to larger wholes. The "tension of essences" operates between the smaller units within the traditional process.

**Songs and the Song**

Lord sums up his discussion of themes under the new heading of "Songs and the Song". "The singer thinks of his song in terms of a flexible plan of themes" (99). Some of these themes are essential to the song and some are not. The essential themes comprise the "stable skeleton of narrative", which is the "Song" itself. Every performance will differ somewhat in the expression and elaboration of the narrative, but these do not affect the stability of the story. As long as the "Song" contains its essential themes, its story—its history—is true.

All this is, of course, the analytical construction of the literate scholar: the "Song" itself does not have an existence separate from its re-creation in the performances of a singer who has himself received it through prior re-creations. The "Song" is, like its themes, multiform; its text is fluid (99ff.).

The variations among performances of the same song
by different performers fall into six categories (123, cf. 105): (1) saying the same thing in different ways according to personal style; (2) expansion or ornamentation by adding details to descriptions, usually for events of significance; (3) changes in the sequence of themes, determined by an individual's sense of balance or by chiastic reversal of themes; (4) addition of material common to a locality; (5) omission of material; and (6) substitution of one theme for another, in a story configuration held together by inner tensions.

In the second of these categories, one can include the fact that the community's way of life will inevitably affect the tradition. Similarly such things as the moral values or the artistic sense of characterization of an individual singer and the social pressures he feels will affect his performances (106, 110, 118, 136).

At a deeper level, the tradition is a powerfully conservative force for the "preservation of an essential idea as expressed either in a single theme or in a group of themes". The very multiformity of the tradition works conservatively, contrary to what might first appear, because the variations occurring in the songs are themselves related largely to forces within the tradition. In fact the same story will sometimes be sung with different heroes, indicating that the particular story is more important than the person to whom it is attached, or more correctly that the "type of hero is more important than the specific hero".
Songs with unorthodox characteristics in a particular singer's performances will tend to move back toward the mainstream under the corrective influence of hearing the song from other singers (118, 120). The performances of a given song in the tradition are distinct, but are simultaneously inseparable from one another.

The signal element of Lord's discussion of the relationship between themes and the longer narratives of which they are the constituent parts is that there may be larger unities—narrative unities—operative in at least some oral traditions. This fact is not commonly recognized in Gospel tradition-criticism, and suggests that the contrast between tradition- and narrative-oriented approaches to Mark's Gospel may in fact be reconcilable.

Writing and Oral Tradition

In his discussion of writing and oral tradition, Lord has two distinct things to say. The first is that the transcription of a song is just one more performance—albeit one with special circumstances—for the singer. The second is that the mind-set of the fully literate person is not compatible with the process of oral traditional composition.11 Lord also describes a set of crite-

11 It is necessary to distinguish clearly between these two factors because of an apparent misunderstanding of Lord by Erhardt Güttgemanns, Candid Questions Concerning Gospel Form Criticism, trans. William G. Doty (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1979), pp. 204-11; and repeated in Werner H. Kelber, "Mark and Oral Tradition", Semeia 16 (1979), 20. The fact that a Gospel or even several
ria for determining the "orality" of a text.

When a singer dictates his poem for a scribe, as he must have done before the invention of modern sound recording systems, he faces a slow and difficult task. Without his music and his customary tempo, a singer finds it hard to compose, often resulting in irregular or poorly formed lines and even in an admixture of prose. But while dictation will generally lower the quality of verse-making, some poets adjust more easily to this and find that dictation makes for the "finest and longest of songs". Dictation grants the poet a "command" performance. Given an indefinite amount of time, the exceptional singer is allowed to "apply every resource to adorn and enrich his song".

It must be remembered, of course, that the dictated narrative is unique just like every other performance. The singer and the tradition carry on; the scribe has captured only a "single moment" in the tradition. From the viewpoint of the literate world, a "fixed text" has been established, perhaps inevitably to become the model

Gospels are written down does not mean that the composer or composers had themselves crossed over the literary divide which Lord places between the oral composer and the writer. Cf. Graham N. Stanton, "Form Criticism Revisited", What about the New Testament?, eds. Morna Hooker and Colin Hickling (London; SCM Press, 1975), pp. 18-20, who has also pointed this out. One must disagree with Stanton, however, when he affirms, in opposition to Göttemanns, that Mark is "not quite other than the sum of its parts". The issue is complex, but an oral traditional composition (like a written one) is certainly more than a mere collection of isolated tales. This is certainly true in the case of Homer's epics.
or "original" to which other performances heard or read will be compared. But this is a historical development within the literate world only (124ff.).

Lord maintains that oral narrative song is a highly developed, indeed a "perfected" art, complete within itself with no artistic "need" for writing (124). He reiterates this often in the Singer to counteract the prevalent idea that written literature represents an evolutionary advance over oral literature. This now involves the second idea mentioned above, that oral composition and written composition are two distinct processes. Dictation did not afford the singer anything essentially new: it did not represent in and of itself a "transition" from oral to literary composition, being only another oral composition, however "special" (128).

More broadly, Lord argues against the very idea of "transitional texts", written by one who is at the same time an oral and a literary poet. He offers three lines of argument for his view. The first is that a "superior written style" is the product of generations. If oral poets start as functionally illiterate, simply learning to read and write would not equip them with the skills to write good poetry. One poet in his experience who had learned to write would only do so at a collector's request, and then composed poorly (129, 134f.).

The second argument, and the most telling, is that the techniques of composition differ. Writing focusses attention on words and lines, matters which have practi-
cally no meaning to the oral poet, as has been seen. When the words and lines of verse are seen as fixed, this inevitably causes the oral singer to begin to memorize, thus blunting his ability to compose orally.

The writer is not dependent upon traditional formulas and formula patterns to compose metrical lines. Neither is the writer dependent upon themes. The oral poet is not bound by themes, but the written poet can exercise immeasurably greater freedom to develop new themes and to move toward non-recurring episodes in his stories. In fact he must do so to please his audience. Therefore the lines and the themes of written poetry both become consciously unique. Lord describes this uniqueness as "stark" by comparison with the uniqueness of each oral song as a "multiform of a large complex" (129-32).

He also reports in this connection that the greater dissemination of reading in contemporary Yugoslavia has affected the younger generation and that very few young are developing the ability to compose orally. Instead, the dispersion of songbooks—some of nearly "canonical" status—is leading to the memorization not only of these texts but of the oral songs of the elders as well. The oral tradition is slowly dying out (137f.).

Lord's third argument is that in European countries whose history shows "traces of a change from an oral to a literary tradition", this development has occurred through the influence of a foreign literary tradition and not spontaneously (133, 138). The transition to writing in
periods since the introduction of writing has more to do with socio-cultural levels than with the passage of time.

Although written poetry can imitate the characteristics of oral poetry, it will not reproduce them. Nor is there such a composition which can be considered "transitional" as an evolutionary or "progressive" step from oral to written composition.

The three criteria for "orality" are, briefly:

(1) formula analysis of a text, yielding a predominance of formulas and formulaic expression, when a sufficient sample to work from is given (130f.);

(2) analysis of the level of "enjambement" in the style of a text—although this form of analysis is not conclusive by itself as certain writing styles also encourage composition line by line (131); and

(3) analysis of thematic structure, yielding well-established themes which are used recurrently in the construction of the narrative (131f.).

The oral-formulaic theory suggests that two widespread notions about oral narrative traditions need to be changed. First, transmission of oral traditional material does not take place through the recitation of fixed texts by anonymous individuals. Instead, transmission occurs by the composition of narratives in "performance", a process involving distinct, artistic individuals who use traditionally provided phraseology ("formulas") and narrative

12The first and third criteria are put to use in chapters 4 and 5, respectively. Fuller discussion of these is offered there. The second is practically meaningless in the context of a prose tradition. Fortunately Lord indicates that its value is less than that of the other two criteria. See the general discussion of "Oral 'Style'", below in chapter 2.
units ("themes"). Secondly, it suggests that by this means significant "literary" compositions may be achieved—of a quality to be compared with that of the Homeric epics. The use of the traditional elements is necessary for the oral composer, however, and so "oral literature" will retain distinct textual characteristics which distinguish it from written literature. The chief characteristics are "formulaic" phraseology and a narrative composed of recurring "themes".

These two factors alone appear to promise much to the student of Mark's Gospel who faces the paradoxical image of the Gospel produced by the current critical approaches. Before returning to Mark, however, it will be necessary to look somewhat more deeply into the broader context of oral and folklore studies.
CHAPTER 2

THE ORAL-FORMULAIC THEORY AND FOLKLORE

In the Singer of Tales, the oral-formulaic theory is set in the context of Classical scholarship, but it must also be viewed in the context of oral and folklore studies.¹ The field-work and theorizing of Parry and Lord may be seen as typical, even exemplary, of the work of folklorists who study oral tradition in many different social and cultural settings.² The detailed summation of

¹Ostensibly the form-critical interpretation of the Gospels itself arises from a folkloristic approach to the Synoptic Gospels and their "tradition". It is not altogether clear whether in fact this was the case, or if so, whether NT form-critics actually drew upon folkloristic resources to any great extent. See E. P. Sanders, Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition (Cambridge: University Press, 1969), pp. 8f., 12-21, who, in regard to so-called "laws of the tradition", argues that this was not the case. It is fair to say that there has been little ongoing dialogue of NT critics with folklorists. Derek Brewer, "The Gospels and the Laws of Folklore", Folklore 90 (1979), 37-52, expresses at the outset his "surprise" that Biblical scholarship has made so little use of folklore scholarship. One attempt at this has been that of Thorlief Boman, Die Jesusüberlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), which will come under scrutiny later. See also C. H. Lohr, "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew", CBQ 23 (1961), 403-35.

Singer in chapter 1 was offered because (1) the oral-formulaic theory is expressed there in full, and (2) Lord's work is consistently concerned with detecting oral composition in ancient texts—"literary archaeology" as one folklorist has called it. This aim is not found or so clearly developed, generally, in folklore studies. Even so, a survey of the literature on folklore and some related fields, will help to fill out the description of oral composition and its literary characteristics, particularly by bringing prose composition into view. This will better enable an approach to the text of Mark's Gospel.

The oral-formulaic theory, with its concern to show how epics such as Homer's could have been created orally, essentially addresses two matters. The first is that transmission of oral narrative is not by recitation of a fixed, memorized text, but by recomposition during oral performance. The second is how oral literature came to be written down, and what the effects of this would be upon the recorded performance and upon the tradition itself.

These two are complex matters as the previous dis-

---


4 A similar task has been undertaken by Robert C. Culley, Structure of Hebrew Narrative (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), pp. 1-31, in regard to OT narratives. Occasional reference to his work will be made, but a different course is taken.
cussion has shown. Within the first are included the
creative role of the narrator as he addresses his audience
and composes his story, the compositional elements and
techniques provided by his tradition, and the resultant
characteristics of orally composed narrative texts found
by analytical study.

The second takes in discussion of the difference
between written literary style and oral, and Lord's obser-
vations of transcription of oral epics, which demonstrate
that the process need not alter the character of the oral
text. Out of all these things, Lord was able to put
forward his criteria for "orality" in older literary
texts. This chapter will consider how these matters have
been described and discussed in oral and folklore studies.

The Folk-Narrator

The role of the narrator has come in for much
attention in recent folklore studies. Both "fixed phrase"
and "free phrase" oral transmission are known, but the
second is far more common. This means that the partic-
ular narrator is immediately responsible for the wording
and content of his composition, although the degree of
variation from other tellings may sometimes be greater or
lesser.

Studies have further shown that the term "folk" has

5Alan Dundes, ed., The Study of Folklore (Englewood
See also Culley, Hebrew Narrative, pp. 25f.
in the past been invested with a Romantic connotation that had little justification in reality. Folk traditions are not simply the creation and common property of peasant communities, borne anonymously from generation to generation. Rather, "active" tradition-bearers are only a small number out of the community: less than one per cent by one calculation. These bearers are generally creative, aiming to tell their story in the "best possible form" for reasons of communication and artistry. Anna B. Booth expressed the often repeated view that "storytelling" is a highly important "narrative art" in areas where literacy is not the norm.

One must take cognizance of the different roles, often implicit, which a narrator can play. One cross-cultural study, in which various groups of people were

---


9Anna Birgitta Booth, The Importance of Storytelling (Uppsala: University of Uppsala, 1976), pp. 11f.
shown a film without dialogue, revealed that American university students, when asked to recount the film, carried out a "memory task", whereas students in Greece "tended to interpret the events in the film, making better stories". One should recall here the ambiguity Lord discovered about accuracy and creativity, among the Slavic singers. The average, educated Anglo-Saxon may well have difficulty in appreciating that strict accuracy of description is not at all a universal value.

Just as Lord observed the narrator's need for flexibility due to the exigencies of informal oral performances, a distinct school of folklorists also emphasizes the importance of the performance-context in understanding the implications of what is said and the selection of traditional material.


11See above, pp. 27f. Cf. Seán Ó Coileáin, "Oral or Literary?", Studia Hibernica 17,18 (1977-78), 11-21, who observes the tendency of some older folklore studies to view transmission as verbally fixed, and to accept, uncritically, exaggerated claims by informants regarding their memory.


Compositional Elements and Techniques

Turning to the compositional elements described by Lord, one finds that the "theme" is a commonly observed factor in almost all oral narration. The "formula" on the other hand is not so widely attested: this is in part because "formulaic" is the particular contribution of Parry and Lord to folklore studies, whose origin lies in the literary and comparative concerns first expressed by Parry.

Linda Dégh has described the composition of the folktale as "fashioned from stable formulas commonly known to the tellers who adjust them to a basic outline kept together by a frame", where both the formulas and the outline are traditional.14 Dégh's use of the term "formula" is broader than Lord's, and includes (1) folktale types and motifs,15 (2) framework indicators for the introduction and conclusion, as well as "formulaic interjections" which bridge the setting of the performance and the narrative setting, (3) "patterned figures of speech" describing characters, scenes, and key points in the story, (4) recurring monologues and dialogues, and

14 Linda Dégh, "Folk Narrative", Folklore and Folklife, ed. Dorson, pp. 60ff.
15 These are technical terms in folklore studies. "Motif" designates particular narrative units (types of person, scene or event) which are widespread in folk traditions. They have been extensively catalogued and classified: the most well-known such catalogue is that of Stith Thompson, Motif-Index of Folk Literature, 6 vols. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955-58).
(5) repetition of passages or events which serve as compositional devices and to give structure to a narrative. One might wish that Dégh had described the nature and function of these types of "formula" in more detail, but it is fair to affirm that her list of formulas embraces both the "formulas" and "themes" of the oral-formulaic theory.

The Formula

The conception of the formula put forward by the oral-formulaic approach has been controversial. Some reactions have been based on a misunderstanding of what Lord had intended, as will be seen, but others have come to terms with the phenomenon, and have entered into critical dialogue with the theory on two levels. These are (1) basic description and definition of the formula, and (2) the linguistic nature of formulaic expression.

Description and definition. Bennison Gray, writing on "repetition in oral literature", begins with the affirmation that repetition is a "fundamental characteristic" of oral literature, and has been recognized as such by

---

16 One should note that Dégh is describing the "folktale" form, and not the legend, which she describes here as "formless". This is largely a problem of terminology and genre description. "Legend" can be highly structured like a folktale, as she indicates later in "Folk Narrative", pp. 72ff., and also in her article "Legend and Belief", p. 93. See also Dorson, Folklore and Fakelore (London: Harvard University Press, 1976), pp. 130ff.; and Dégh and Vázsonyi, "The Memorate and Proto-Memorate", JAF 87 (1974), 225-39.
folklorists since the 1930's. He maintains, further, that such repetition is a function of the orality of the literature and not due to the "primitiveness" or lack of creativity which non-specialists often predicate of "the folk". But a clear line of distinction must be drawn between repetition within an oral literary composition and that which occurs within an oral literary tradition. (This distinction is applied to "themes" as well as to "verbal repetition"). Verbal repetition of the first sort is properly designated "formula", but the second is "convention". Gray agrees with Lord that the formula, so defined, is an indicator of "oralness" but this is not so for the convention.

Both formula and convention can only include "linguistic" constructions that are restricted to and characteristic of the literature, and not simply expressions which are characteristic of the language itself. So with Homer: the noun-epithet combinations used for gods and heroes are formulas, says Gray, but a phrase for "so he said" is not. This already touches upon the linguistic nature of formulaic expression which will be dealt with shortly. Gray's central point is that one must retain the


18 Gray, "Repetition", pp. 290f.

19 "Conventions" are no indicator of a specifically oral tradition. They are part of what defines any literary "tradition", oral or written: Ibid., pp. 296f.

20 Ibid., p. 292.
ability to distinguish between repetition that is properly a function of oral narrative and repetition that is inevitable in any "extended sample of language on a coherent topic".\(^{21}\)

About the occurrence of formulas in oral literature, Gray asserts:

*Formulaic repetition occurs constantly in folk-tales--entirely independent of meter. Most obviously it occurs in sequences of repeated incidents, particularly those involving verbal encounters.*\(^{22}\)

Alongside the general confirmation of formulaic expression as characteristic of oral narratives, the insistence that formulas are present in oral narrative prose, no less than in poetry, is particularly noteworthy. It helps to surmount one of the possible objections which had been foreseen earlier, namely that Mark's Gospel is a prose composition in contrast to the poetry of Lord's singers.

Indeed, one of Gray's criticisms of the oral-formulaic theory is that the metrical element in the definition of formula needlessly "complicates" the idea.\(^{23}\) The metrical line is itself a "structure of

\(^{21}\)Ibid., p. 295.  \(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 294.  
\(^{23}\)Ibid., p. 293. Gray finds it "puzzling" that the oral-formulaic theory was not aware of the frequency of formulas in oral prose, and points out (pp. 301f.) that one particular oral-formulaic study of American folk sermons went astray here in trying to force the material into non-existent metrical lines. It is perhaps not so surprising in the case of Parry and Lord, who were initially concerned with problems of Homeric poetry, and were probably not generally acquainted with folklore studies at the time. Similar affirmations of "formulaic" expression in
repetition" which aids memory and fluency, rather than obstructing it as Parry and Lord appear to believe.

Since Gray's article, Lord himself has affirmed that "formulaic diction" is to be found in all forms of oral narrative. He insists only that the formulas of oral poetry are more "visible" than those of oral prose, because a metrical medium limits the performer's choices more (or, as one should perhaps say, because it encourages a greater stability), and that formulas are therefore more readily quantified in oral poetry.

Yet another distinction must be made in regard to the definition of the formula, between its literary and its compositional value. Parry had emphasized that stanzaic repetition in the epics of Virgil and Milton, for example, was a (written) literary device, based upon the observed formulaic character of Homer's epics. The difference is that Homer's formulas go beyond occasional use, primarily for effect, to constitute the characteristic mode of his composition in general.

---

prose may be found in James Ross, "Formulaic Composition in Gaelic Oral Literature", *Modern Philology* 57 (1959-60), 1-12; and Kevin O Nolan, "Homer and the Irish Hero Tale", *Studia Hibernica* 8 (1968), 7-20, esp. pp. 15f.


It is not uncommon for this distinction between truly formulaic expression and literary manipulation of formulas to be overlooked. When this happens, one can immediately affirm that formulaic repetition is characteristic of all forms of literature, oral and written. To use Gray's terms, repetition is itself a literary "convention", which may indeed have its origin in oral composition, as appears to have been the case for the classical epic tradition but which is no longer by any means confined to the oral. But it is claimed by the oral-formulaic theory that formulaic diction characterizes oral narrative. The case for this is best considered within a study of the linguistic nature of the formula, which will now be undertaken.

---

27 As in Ilhan Bağdöz, *Formula in Prose Narrative—Hikaye*, Folklore Preprint Series vol. 6, no. 1 (1978). Bağdöz has observed and discussed literary formulaic repetition, but apparently has not analyzed the diction of Hikaye-narrations for formulaic composition. He understands "essential idea", in Lord's definition of formula, to mean "central and important" rather than as "basic and necessary." The same mistake is found in Susan Wittig, "Formulaic Style and the Problem of Redundancy", *Centrum 1* (1973), 123-36, esp. pp. 125, 126, 131f., despite the overall quality of her article.

28 This is the problem in C. H. Lohr, "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew", who uses the oral devices discussed by James A. Notopoulos, "Continuity and Interconnexion in Homeric Oral Composition", *TAPA 82* (1951), 81-101: the techniques are found in and are necessary for oral literature, but are by no means limited to it. They may (now) be simply "literary" techniques, oral and written.

29 Paul Kiparsky, "Oral Poetry: Some Linguistic and Typological Considerations", *Oral Literature and the Formula*, p. 83, e.g., concurs with this, although he himself is critical of the ambiguity of the definition of formula.
Linguistic nature of the formula. Jan Vansina gives attention to the structure and form of oral "testimonies" in his book, Oral Tradition. For his purposes structure and form are first of all factors to be considered in the historian's comprehension and evaluation of oral traditions. He begins, "a testimony is always composed according to certain rules which restrict the informant's choice as to the way in which he expresses its content". These rules give the testimony its "structure", which Vansina divides into "outward formal structure" and "internal structure". The internal structure is related to the theme and will be mentioned again later, but the discussion of the outward formal structure should lead into a profitable analysis of the linguistic nature of the formula.

The outward formal structure of an oral testimony is identified by linguistic "categories", and not by literary ones. Vansina makes two pairs of distinctions here: formal and non-formal texts, and fixed and non-fixed (or "free") texts. Of the first pair, he states:

---


31Ibid., p. 54.
In the latter [i.e., non-formal texts], only the ordinary rules of grammar have to be obeyed, but in the former, certain linguistic regularities—phonological, morphological, or syntactical—have to be observed. It would be possible to classify testimonies according to the particular laws to which they have to conform—laws of quantity or scansion, of rhyme, of tone, of morphology, or of syntax.\(^\text{32}\)

These then are factors affecting the linguistic texture of the testimony itself, in contrast to the other pair of categories, fixed or free, which affect transmission of text.\(^\text{33}\) Some of these factors will affect the particular text of a testimony, rhyme and syntax, for example; others, like tone, must be heard by the analyst. For the Homeric texts and Mark's Gospel, only those affecting the texture of the testimony as recorded can be evaluated, of course.

Vansina rejects the thesis of M. Jousse,\(^\text{34}\) that

\(^{32}\text{Ibid., p. 55.}\)

\(^{33}\text{Ibid., p. 56. Vansina states here that all "formal" texts are "fixed" but he does not defend this assertion. If the Southslavic epics are any guide, this is not correct. ("Formulaic expression" must be a "formality" of some sort.) Presumably there are degrees of formality and degrees of "fixity", and there may be no constant correlation between them. Vansina himself states that there are non-formal, fixed texts. The "formal factors" operative in extended narratives, prose or poetry, must differ from those of shorter testimonies--ballads, lists, creeds, or whatever. Note that for Vansina "formal" and "non-formal" correspond roughly to poetry and prose, respectively.}\)

\(^{34}\text{M. Jousse, Le Style oral rhythmique et mnemotechnique chez les verbamoteurs (Paris, 1924), cited by Vansina, p. 55. Consideration of Jousse's work will be omitted in favor of more recent linguistic developments in this discussion, despite its significance and relevance for the development of Parry's early thinking.}\)
all oral literature is subject to formal, mostly syntactic rules that are "clearly distinguishable from written literature", accepting only that the frequency of repetition marks off oral literature. But what are the "linguistic regularities" which Vansina himself mentions, if not repetition of certain characteristics (or "rules") of a language with an unusual degree of frequency? If by regularities, he had meant unusual or archaic forms—phonological, morphological or syntactical—he might have said so. (The contrast of formal with non-formal, where "only the normal rules of grammar have to be obeyed", might appear to indicate this, but what are "normal rules of grammar"?)

One suspects that Vansina had, in fact, other forms of "regularity" in mind. It should be clear, at any rate, that "morphological" and "syntactical" regularities are relevant to the issue of formulaic expression, and Vansina's introduction of these linguistic categories appears promising. More specificity about linguistic "rules", "laws" and "regularities" than Vansina himself provides is, however, needed. After some more discussion his statement will be considered again, in order to attempt to clarify these matters.

Michael N. Nagler\(^35\) and Paul Kiparsky\(^36\) have both


\(^36\)Kiparsky, "Oral Poetry".
approached the formula from a linguistic point of view. As Nagler indicates there is precedent in Lord's own work\(^{37}\) for this approach. However the absence of technical jargon in Lord's treatment has perhaps resulted in ambiguity on the point and has allowed many to overlook this crucial dimension of the formula.\(^{38}\)

Kiparsky begins by asserting the "grammatical nature" of the (Homeric) formal, comparable to the phenomena of "bound expressions" and "set expressions" in everyday language.\(^{39}\) Such expressions can be phrases (or compound words) of various degrees of fixity and complexity. From there, Kiparsky moves to account for both formulas and "formulaic systems" on the basis of a "generative" grammar, which "refers the formula to the abstract system

\(^{37}\)Singer, pp. 22ff., 35f. This is reflected in the presentation of the oral theory, in chapter 1, pp. 29f. See Nagler, "Generative View", pp. 281, 285f.

\(^{38}\)E.g., Abrahams, Licence to Repeat, p. 3, who states that the "Parry-Lord hypothesis" relies on a "concept of the unconsciousness and a theory of memory and invention that is both naive and misleading". He does not explain the remark, but it appears to have some relation to the "storage" of formulas. This hardly seems a fair criticism of Lord's conception who has made formulaic speech a learned language, like a dialect, rather than a store of particular phrases. Another example of overlooking the linguistic nature of the formula can be seen in the scholastic-like arguments between the "hard Parryists" and two types of "soft Parryist", described by Nagler, "Generative View", pp. 270f. In all probability, some adjustment of the original definition of "formula" by Parry, retained by Lord, is necessary.

\(^{39}\)Kiparsky, "Oral Poetry", pp. 73-81. He also provides helpful examples of the various types discussed.
of the poetic language".\textsuperscript{40} This is the aim of Nagler's article, as well:

With the conceptual framework in question, a group . . . [of assorted, but formulaically-related] phrases would be considered not a closed 'system' but an open-ended 'family' and each phrase in the group would be considered an allomorph [i.e., an alternative form], not of any other existing phrase, but of some central Gestalt--for want of a better term--which is the real mental template underlying the production of all such phrases. The Gestalt itself in our case, would seem to exist on a preverbal level of the poet's mind. . . .\textsuperscript{41}

A given "system" of formulas is to be accounted for by a single, abstract form (Gestalt). The Gestalt, that is, "generates" all the formulas as allomorphs of the system or family.

It might be helpful before proceeding further to provide a brief description of what is meant by generative grammar. Noam Chomsky first proposed a "transformational-generative grammar" (usually shortened to "generative grammar"), in an attempt to formulate grammar as "a device which generates all and only the grammatical sentences of a language".\textsuperscript{42} "Taxonomic" grammars, which only compared and classified surface syntactical phenomena, were seen to be inadequate to account for a speaker's intuitive sense

\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., pp. 81-88. See the introduction to modern treatments of syntax and generative grammar in David Crystal, Linguistics (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), pp. 199-231, esp. pp. 217-231.

\textsuperscript{41}Nagler, "Generative View", p. 281 (his emphasis). Kiparsky, "Oral Poetry", p. 85, briefly refers to the similarity of his approach to Nagler's.

\textsuperscript{42}Crystal, Linguistics, p. 221.
of what was "grammatical" in his native language, and of what expressions "made sense" in it.\(^\text{43}\) Moreover, the possible sentences of any language are (probably) infinite, but the linguistic capacity of any speaker or set of speakers can only be finite.\(^\text{44}\) Therefore, a complete "taxonomy" of any language is not possible and one must attempt to account for linguistic and grammatical phenomena on a "deeper", more abstract plane. In other words, linguistic analysis must proceed from the analysis of concrete "surface structures" to the "deep structures" of language, that is, to the more limited means employed by humans to create and to interpret the infinite variety of expression possible in a language.\(^\text{45}\)

Generative grammar is useful in understanding formulaic expression. Lord himself had referred to formulaic expression as a "poetic grammar", learned, organized and used much as is any language system, as has been seen.\(^\text{46}\) Nagler suggests that it also improves the understanding of the formula for study of Homer, where many had advocated a rather rigid, "taxonomic" approach to the phenomena.\(^\text{47}\) Kiparsky goes even farther to maintain that the generative approach improves upon the concept of

\(^{43}\)Ibid., pp. 103f., 217f., 221f.  
\(^{44}\)Ibid., p. 223.  
\(^{45}\)Ibid., pp. 104f., 218.  
\(^{46}\)See above, pp. 29f.  
\(^{47}\)See fn. 38, above.
formulaic expression in four ways. 48

(1) The members of a formulaic expression (or "flexible formula") are grammatically related, as parts of a single phrase-structure (a noun phrase or verb phrase, for example). This specifies the "single idea" of Parry's definition of the formula. It also highlights the usefulness and flexibility of formulaic expression in composing sentences, whose basic constituents are the simpler phrase structures, according to generative grammar.

(2) Because formulaic expression is a matter of phrase-structure, it is open to the operation of transformational rules. The transformational rules do not affect the structural identity of the phrase (or its lexical identity, as this is primarily a function of the deep structure), but they can affect the inflection and the location of the words 49 which constitute the phrase-structure. This means that formulas are basically "flexible". Insistence upon the absolute, phonological or morphological identity of the (original) formula, which can only be adapted by deliberate "analogy" on the part of the speaker to other surface forms is misplaced in giving priority to surface structures over deep structures.

(3) Phrase structures are open to further specification or "expansion" in accordance with the syntactical rules of a generative grammar. The addition of an extra lexical element (such as an extra adjective to a noun phrase, or an adverb to a verb phrase) which modifies the structure is one form of this. Another is the "embedding", by transformational rules, of one phrase within another, 50 where one or both may be formulaic. Variety in formulaic expression is thus to be expected, as Lord has maintained. As will be seen later, however, oral composition limits the degree of complexity, and therefore of variety, which is possible

48 Kiparsky, "Oral Poetry", pp. 83ff., 88. (He speaks of the "flexible formula" here, as distinct from the "fixed-formula", which is a "surface structure", pp. 82f.)

49 "Transformational rules" describe linguistic processes that "operate" upon a phrase-structure to produce, for example, passive or interrogative forms of basic, active phrases.

50 Kiparsky's term is "nesting" ("Oral Poetry", p. 86), but the technical term, "embedding", has been used here.
in formulaic expression. This limitation is the basis for the identifiability of oral composition over against written composition.

(4) Finally, Kiparsky observes that the generative understanding of formulaic expression does not involve "metrical considerations", in contrast to the original definition by Parry. This allows for the observed metrical variation found in some Homeric formulas. He also points out the "more general corollary . . . that formulas should occur equally in oral poetry that uses relatively free metrical schemata, and in oral prose", and not only in the tighter meter of Homeric poetry. Kiparsky takes this as given for folktales, "the most obvious example of formulaic language in oral prose". The tight meter of Homeric poetry led to the "complete- ness and economy of [its] formulaic repertoire", but "this is, however, a special utilization of formulaic language, not its cause".

If Kiparsky is correct that formulas are related to the "bound phrases of ordinary language" and are subject to analysis along the lines of generative grammar, it follows that:

The language of oral literature does not differ qualitatively from ordinary language. It does differ quantitatively in the extent and frequency of its use of bound phraseology, especially, but not exclusively, when the meter is strict.

This may allow some clarification of the ambiguities found in Vansina's earlier statement. The "linguis-

51Ibid., p. 87 (my emphasis).
52Ibid., p. 88. This provides a significant confirmation of the opinions of Gray and Lord (above, pp. 53f.) that formulaic expression is typical of both oral poetry and oral prose, with meter leading only to a more "visible" concentration of formulas.
53Ibid., p. 88. Note that Abrahams, Licence to Repeat, p. 2, only refers to the first statement quoted here, and does not mention the other, in his criticism of the "Parry-Lord hypothesis". The analysis of formulaic language by generative grammar would appear to counter both of Abraham's objections noted above, fn. 38.
tic regularities" of formal texts need not involve anything other than the application of the "ordinary rules of grammar" (they can involve more of course, particularly in poetic texts). When one discovers frequent recursion of particular rules, or the employment of a certain identifiable set of rules, this could identify the text as having "formal" characteristics. The degree of formality could, perhaps, be measured in various ways, but this is not of importance for present purposes. It would not do to force a generative grammar upon Vansina's statements, but the grammar may offer a clearer understanding of the phenomena (that is, the "linguistic regularities") which Vansina has mentioned.

In general, then, the generative approach, as outlined, can provide a very useful explanation of formulaic expression. This is so for several reasons. (1) It clarifies Lord's own description of formulaic expression as a "poetic grammar".54 (2) By establishing the linguistic nature of the formula, it frees the formula from the metrical conditions imposed by Parry's early definition. This allows for the occurrence of formulaic language in oral prose, such as folktales, which Gray and Lord had already accepted, and yet accounts for the quantitative

---

54 See also Lord's statement on this in "Perspectives on Recent Work", p. 202: language is "organized in substitution systems in repeated syntactic patterns", a fact which is also true of "formulaic diction." This description appears to approach a generative-linguistical perspective.
differences between prose and poetry. (3) Finally, it promises a better explanation of why one may take formulaic expression as a criterion for orality. The first two reasons should be clear already, but the third can only be worked out after the general discussion of the relationship of oral and written literature, which is to come later.55

In the light of the above affirmations that formulaic expression is characteristic of oral prose, as well as of metrical oral poetry, "formula analysis" may be retained as a criterion for oral composition. Nevertheless, one will not be able to ascribe the value to it for analysis of Mark's prose that Lord and others have for epic poetry. As the formulaic expression of epic poets is affected by the "metrical conditions" of their poetry, one cannot expect the same degree of stereotyped expression in oral prose.56 Formula percentages57 will therefore be of little use, and "thrifty" systems of formulaic expression will be less obvious, if not nonexistent, where a metrical standard is absent. Even so, formulaic, repet-

55See below, "Oral and Written Literature".

56Lord, "Perspectives on Recent Work", p. 202, states that formulas are more numerous and "visible" in oral poetry than in oral prose. Unfortunately there does not appear to be any research into oral prose at all comparable to the empirical work of Parry and Lord.

itive expressions in Mark's narrative would help to indicate oral composition. The testing procedure will be discussed further in chapter 4.

The Theme.

If the "formula" is controversial, the theme by contrast appears to be universally recognized in folklore. It is variously described and termed, the most common name being "motif". Themes are notable both for their use in diverse tales in diverse places, and for their repetition and patterning within single narrations. Axel Olrik, in his classic essay "Epic Laws of Folk Narrative", set out several "laws" which relate to their use in narrative, including the following:

(1) the Law of repetition, which is the folk-narrator's means of emphasis and fullness;

(2) the Law of three, being the characteristic

---


59 Axel Olrik, "Epic Laws of Folk Narrative", SF, pp. 231-41. Olrik's use of "law" is behind the use of similar terms in the early form-critical studies of the Gospels. See Dibelius, FTG, p. 4, e.g.: "the laws of Form-construction". Dundes makes clear in his introduction to Olrik's essay that such "superorganic laws" as an explanation of folklore characteristics are widely challenged now by many folklorists who hold that the individual narrator's role is more important than Olrik (and Dibelius) allowed; Dundes, SF, 138. Note however, that the frequency of the phenomena described by Olrik is not questioned. See also, Dorson, Folklore and Fakelore, pp. 40, 83, 137; and Juha Pentikäinen, Oral Repertoire and World View, FF Communications 219 (1978), pp. 17f.
number of such repetitions, and of significant groups of people and places;\(^60\)

(3) the Law of two to a scene in a given theme;\(^61\)

(4) a general principle of concreteness—"each attribute of a person and thing must be expressed in action, otherwise it is nothing"; and

(5) patterning, according to which similar people and situations are described as similarly as possible.\(^62\)

Olrik's "laws" go further in some respects than Lord's analysis of themes, but there is congruity in their views of the nature and function of themes in oral narration, as "repetition" and "patterning" are central in the epic material studied by Lord.

Bennison Gray, in his article noted previously, proposed the distinction between "repeated themes" and themes of repetition, analogous to his distinction between a convention and a formula.\(^63\) Repeated themes, to be

\(^{60}\) See also, Dégh, "Folk Narrative", pp. 61f., on threefold repetition, which can be used simply to embellish or to emphasize the art and intent of a story.

\(^{61}\) Olrik describes this as a "strict" law. A third party can only be a "mute" observer. The active involvement of a third party is only possible in written narration. Dorson, Folklore and Fakelore, p. 137, notes the continued use of this law on the principle that the oral narrator "cannot readily present" a more complex dialogue in a single setting.

\(^{62}\) Olrik finds this contrary to written expression, which will describe two similar things as differently as possible. Oral narration suppresses the superfluous in order to emphasize the essential.

compared with folklore "motifs", are traditional in a
general sense--occurring in various narrations in various
times and places: they are "conventional". Themes of
repetition occur within an oral narration, often providing
it a "pattern of organization".

It is with the latter type of theme that Olrik's
laws have to do, of course, and Gray emphasizes that, as
with formulas, only repetition within a narrative is
related to the "oralness of oral literature".\(^6^4\) The
theme of repetition includes both the repetition of iden-
tical incidents within a narrative (as in prediction of an
event and its fulfillment or the recapitulation of an
event previously described), and the description of
similar but distinct events in similar ways.\(^6^5\)

Some folklorists have been seeking to come to terms
with the independence of "repeated themes", or motifs. The
fact that individual folklore motifs are found in various
traditions across Eurasia, and even in the Americas, has
led to an implicit "de-contextualization" of the motif,
which is reinforced by folklorists' cataloguing, giving it
an apparent existence of its own.\(^6^6\) But motifs exist
concretely only in larger tales and narratives, and the
particular incidents they relate are "symbiotic" with the

\(^{6^4}\)Gray, pp. 296f. \(^{6^5}\)Ibid., p. 296.

\(^{6^6}\)Dan Ben-Amos, "The Concept of Motif in Folklore",
Folklore Studies, ed. Newall, pp. 27f.
tale, as Dégh puts it; the motif as told only makes sense only in its larger context as part of a story.

Motifs, understood as various "minimal narrative units" of significance for a plot and capable of transference from one story to another in oral transmission, are often catalogued in more general terms than they would ever be expressed in within a particular narration. They are not tales in themselves, as a rule; more often a "motif-complex" (that is, a grouping of motifs, some of which are essential and some expendable) serves as the true "unit of oral composition". However, "tale-types", characteristically combining a given set of motifs, are also catalogued. This recalls Lord's discussion of complexes of themes and the epic song itself as a "flexible plan of themes", some of which are essential and some not.

There appears therefore to be an inner connection between Olrik's "law of repetition" and his "principle of

---

67 Dégh, "Folk Narrative", p. 62.

68 Ben-Amos, "Concept", pp. 27f.

69 For example, "Animal who steals fire scorched; cause of his color", and "Remarkably strong man"; drawn from "Index" of Dorson, Folklore and Fakelore, p. 387. (Titles are from Thompson's Motif Index.)

70 Ben-Amos, "Concept", pp. 27f. See Scholes and Kellogg, Nature of Narrative, pp. 27f. Also Daniel J. Crowley, I Could Talk Old-Story Good. Folklore Studies 17 (1966), pp. 2f., who observed that a Bahamian folk-narrator's skill in combining and elaborating various "stock-incidents" in different plot sequences was a factor observed and appreciated by a Bahamian audience. This observation calls to mind Lord's description of the Balkan singers and their audiences, Singer, pp. 15ff., 25f., e.g.
concreteness" (one and four in the list above). The motif in isolation is simply the description of a type of event. It is often patient of any number of meanings or "morals", which can be associated with it. Not only does its role in a larger story-context help specify this meaning, but repetition of the motif is "essential" to the expression of an idea in narrative form.71

Scholes and Kellogg support this connection by their term "topos", which combines the elements of motif (narrative or "representational" function) and "theme" (here, ideational function). The topos is, generally, the folk-traditional form of expression (as in myth or saga) which breaks down, in written expression, into its components. The representational component continues as "empirical narrative", historical or fictional, and the ideational as "allegory" or "discursive philosophical writing". In both cases their prior union in the traditional "image" or topos is lost, and becomes difficult for later, literate readers to discern in traditional texts.72


72Scholes and Kellogg, Nature of Narrative, pp. 26-28. This view is closely related to the thesis of Eric A. Havelock, Preface to Plato (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1963), that Plato's criticism of "poetry" in his Republic, had to do primarily with oral "epistemology".
Regardless of whether a narrative is in poetry or prose, thematic structure is a widespread phenomenon in oral literature. Thematic structure in a narrative is not only an indicator of its relation to oral composition, it is also a key to the interpretation of the narrative as a whole. Jan Vansina, for instance, speaks of the internal structure of an oral "testimony". It is not simply random, but is plotted as a sequence of episodes (which episodes he calls the "functional unit of the narrative"). Both fixed and free texts are found to be structured in this way. Vansina goes on to propose a means of analysing oral compositions by making a "graph of the internal structure... according to the degree of tension conveyed by each episode". He reasons:

The chief artistic requirement of all tales is that they should be able to hold the interest of the listener and keep him waiting with bated breath for the denouement. Hence the construction of a tale pivots on the attempt to attain this end. Now the ability to hold the listener's attention can be gauged for each episode, for it depends mainly on the extent to which the listener can foresee what is going to happen next.

Therefore, episodes having only one possible outcome, and those having an indefinite number of possibilities elicit very little tension from the hearer. The

---


74 Vansina, Oral Tradition, pp. 60ff.
degree of tension of an episode may be said to increase proportionately from the indefinite number of possible outcomes, down to episodes having only two. Repetition of episodes is an artistic means to heighten tension, as well. Vansina stipulates that such a measurement is only relative and not precise, and that analysis of internal structure is particularly useful in evaluating "free" texts.

As Vansina's work deals with oral texts which are often ostensibly "historical", his recognition of "artistic" elements in their telling goes a long way toward bringing together "factual" and "fictional" narratives. Distinctions of "genre" in terms of their perceived credibility are not necessarily relevant to their textual or structural characteristics.

Thematic structure is related to the demands of oral composition and performance upon the narrator, and arises from repeated expression of the stories and ideas which comprise the tradition. One of its effects upon oral narrative, observed by Lord, is the common occurrence of narrative inconsistencies. R. M. Dorson confirms

---

75 I.e., as fiction or non-fiction: "fairytales", for example, are generally recognized by "folk" as fictional, in contrast to, say, legends.


77 Dorson, "Oral Literature, Oral History and the Folklorist", Folklore and Fakelore, p. 137.
that such inconsistencies are indeed "commonplace in oral storytelling" and are related to thematic structure, as well. From all this, it appears that application of the criterion of thematic structure and density\textsuperscript{78} to Mark's Gospel is a well-justified procedure.

Oral "Style"

The third criterion for orality put forward by Lord was that of the level of "enjambement" in a text. Enjambement is specifically related to a metrical text, in which the length of a line is pre-determined. In prose, this becomes practically meaningless. Instead, it may be useful to indicate other features of the "style" of oral narrative expression which might be useful in the analysis of a text for oral composition.

The use of the term "style" is peculiar in this context. It could be argued, on the one hand, that formulas and even themes are "stylistic" features of oral texts. From the perspective of oral traditional composition, however, these are best viewed as compositional devices of the tradition. The features here included under "style" have more to do with the conditions of spoken communication in general, and therefore manifest themselves in oral narrative as well.

On the other hand, "style" often connotes the

\textsuperscript{78}See Lord's comment in "Perspectives on Recent Work", pp. 206f., that a thematic "density" analogous to formulaic density is to be expected in oral compositions.
characteristics of an individual's expression. The term is used here, however, to include features which arise more from the situation of a speaker, than from his own choice or habit. G. W. Turner states:

Explanation in stylistics depends on examining the circumstances of language, the situations in which it is used. Variations in style are measured against variations in setting, and where the two appear to be interdependent, style is to that extent explained. In this view style is not a matter of free, unfettered choice, but it is at least partly controlled by setting.

Absolute differences between speech and writing are ... comparatively trivial, and the important linguistic differences ensuing when writing is added to a spoken language are those which, while theoretically able to occur in both speech and writing, arise especially from the detachment of writing from the immediate environment of its production.79

Differences are likely in principle, but folklorists, working with known, oral sources, do not often go into the stylistic characteristics of their sources at the syntactical level. The comparison of written and oral "styles" has not concerned them so much as have larger issues, such as the sources, range, genre, and literary quality of folklore, and its cultural significance. In this respect, the Singer of Tales breaks new ground, spurred on by its concern for "literary archaeology".80


80 Notopoulos, "Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry", American Journal of Philology 83 (1962), 343f., has done some field-work among Greek-speaking folk-narrators. He, like Lord and Parry, is primarily a classicist and not a professional folklorist. See, too, Bruce Rosenberg, Art of the American Folk-Preacher (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970).
A practicing folklorist, fluent in several traditions and in several languages, could perhaps speak with a degree of authority on this, either positively or negatively. As it is, few folklorists have made any generalizations on this level. More interest has been focussed upon the general relation of oral literature to written,\(^8\) as the next section makes clear. Nevertheless, there are a few comments to be gleaned, and there is also one significant, cross-cultural study, on psycholinguistic principles, to which reference may be made.

As Lord himself counselled with regard to "enjamblment", caution in the use of stylistic criteria is necessary. There are no exclusively-oral stylistic features; ones, that is, which could not be, or have not been, employed by writers as well. Furthermore, the current state of comparative studies in written and oral literature, as just seen, will allow no more than a tentative affirmation of other oral features than parataxis. Nevertheless it may be of use to approach features of Mark's much studied style from the perspective of oral composition in order to introduce an analysis of the Gospel primarily on the bases of formulaic expression and of theme.\(^9\)

---

\(^8\)A major, general work on this subject is that of Scholes and Kellogg, *Nature of Narrative*.

\(^9\)Derek Brewer, "The Gospels and the Laws of Folklore", *Folklore* 90 (1979), pp. 38f., claims that Mark's "colloquial style" is evidence of oral tradition and that one is "justified" in approaching Mark and the other
Parataxis. Confirmation for Lord's view that parataxis is a constant feature in oral narrative, but only optional for the writer, comes from those who have studied the effects of literacy upon spoken language. Jack Goody, for instance, observed that writing and reading promotes the "backward scanning" which encourages the greater syntactical complexity found in written language. The oral, paratactic, "adding style" is replaced by more closely integrated, hypotactic expression, which, in Goody's words, "creates a different cognitive potentiality for human beings than communication by word of mouth".83

A cross-cultural study of oral discourse is reported in W. L. Chafe, ed., The Pear Stories.84 A specially produced film, without any speaking by the actors, was shown to people in various European, Asian, and American cultural groups, who were then asked to recount the "story" of the film orally.85 Although the study deals

Gospels from the perspective of "oral narration", although he finally holds that the Gospels deliberately emulate OT phraseology and thus have a written element in their present states.

83 Jack Goody, The Domestication of the Savage Mind (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1977), pp. 127f. Turner, Stylistics, pp. 199f., indicates that hypotaxis is possible orally, but that it is "more typical" of written expression.

84 Subtitled, Cognitive, Cultural and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production.

85 Chafe, "Preface", Pear Stories, pp. xii-xv, describes the procedure in more detail.
with oral, "spontaneous language", as Chafe puts it,\textsuperscript{86} and not traditional diction as such, some of the findings, and also Chafe's interpretation of them, are of significance. Some will be treated more fully in the next section, but the findings relative to parataxis need to be presented at this point.

"Spontaneous speech . . . is produced, not in a flowing stream, but in a series of brief spurts", which Chafe calls "idea units".\textsuperscript{87} These idea units were identified in the tape-recorded narrations by criteria of intonation, pause-hesitation, and syntax, of which syntax was the least significant factor. Idea units were found to have a mean length of about six words or about two seconds.\textsuperscript{88} Furthermore, of the three possible "strategies" for constructing connected discourse—"adjoining", "coordinating", and "subordinating" (equal to asyndeton, parataxis, and hypotaxis, respectively)—the coordinating, or paratactic, strategy is "characteristic" of the

\textsuperscript{86}Chafe, "Deployment of Consciousness in the Production of Narrative", \textit{Pear Stories}, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{87}Ibid., pp. 13f.

\textsuperscript{88}Ibid., pp. 14, 38. The standard deviation for the number of words was 3.27 words. That is to say, just over 68 per cent of the idea units fit into a range of 2.7—9.3 words. See, e.g., Abraham N. Frazblau, \textit{A Primer of Statistics for Non-Statisticians} (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 43—53, for a brief discussion of the significance of standard deviation. (No standard deviation for the duration in time of idea units was given by Chafe.)
collected narrations.\textsuperscript{89}

The third course, that is the subordinating strategy, required a greater and more lasting focussing of consciousness on the "verbalizing process itself" than speakers could easily afford.\textsuperscript{90} Hypotaxis, although it offers the most "integrated" expression of the three strategies, is the most difficult for a speaker to carry out consistently. Complex, hypotactic speech requires a "gamble" on being able to finish in mid-sentence, although some "syntactical crutches" which are independent of "lexical content" can reduce this gamble: the English expression, "there is a . . . who/which . . .", for example.\textsuperscript{91} So a greater degree of integration than that provided by parataxis and simpler forms of hypotaxis, such as simple relative clauses or elision, is "relatively rare in spontaneous speech, being more often found in written language".\textsuperscript{92}

These findings confirm that one can expect parataxis to be characteristic of oral style, although--again--it cannot be excluded from written style. It is

\textsuperscript{89}Chafe, "Deployment", pp. 30ff. The description of the "strategies" is drawn from F. Syder and A. Pawley, English Conversational Structures ("in preparation" when Pear Stories was published). Chafe also quotes this work as finding "strong statistical preference . . . for a coordinating or chaining style of syntax, over a subordinating or integrating style." (One assumes this is primarily in reference to English language speakers, of course.)

\textsuperscript{90}Ibid., p. 32. \textsuperscript{91}Ibid., pp. 30f.

\textsuperscript{92}Ibid., p. 32.
also significant that the cause of paratactic style comes directly from the orality of a text, and not from poetic conventions of metrical lines. Chafe's findings would appear to be useful in understanding the basis for formulaic expression itself, but that goes well beyond the scope of this thesis.

Other stylistic features. R. M. Dorson, writing of the significance of the performance context of oral literature states, "audiences are much less bothered by false starts, repetition, interjections, and obscure pronouns than are readers", because the physical presence of the performer contributes to their comprehension. From this one may reasonably infer that the four characteristics listed are typical of oral texts. One of these, repetition, has been dealt with under other headings. Interjections are also noted as characteristic by Dégh, by Vansina, and by Chafe, who lists several sorts of ways in which a narrative series can be "perturbed". (One of these is the "false start", listed by Dorson.)

In addition to these, Gray noted that "the shift to present tense at key moments and the use of the rhetorical

---

93 Dorson, "Oral Literature, Oral History and the Folklorist", Folklore and Fakelore, p. 137. The article itself is a good introduction to some of the issues of this discussion, from a folklorist's point of view.

94 Dégh, "Folk Narrative", pp. 60f.

95 Vansina, Oral Tradition, pp. 44f.

96 Chafe, "Deployment", p. 33.
question" are oral features, relatively rare in written narrative.97

Most of these features can be taken as no more than suggestive, except perhaps for interjections. There is little offered in demonstration of these characteristics, and they are probably all debatable. Nevertheless, the suggestions are made by students of oral literature, as general observations. They are not making the claims to demonstrate the oral, or written, provenance of any particular text, and thus have claim to a certain degree of disinterestedness. On the other hand, when these "oral" features are given, even a shallow survey of Markan stylistic features will reveal striking correspondences.

The features of oral style suggested above by various students, in addition to parataxis, are: (1) interjection (the most strongly supported); (2) false starts; (3) obscure pronouns; (4) shift to present tense at key moments; and (5) rhetorical questions.

Oral and Written Literature

Before turning back to the New Testament, it is necessary to consider what folklorists would have to add to the second part of the oral-formulaic theory, that is, how oral tradition has come to be written down, how this affects it, and how oral and written literature are to be compared. The relationship of written literature to oral, on the one hand, and the presence of originally oral

97Gray, "Repetition", p. 300.
material in written texts on the other are different but related matters. Here, Lord's perspective on the first appears quite similar to that of many folklorists, but his specific case for oral-dictated texts should not be seen as normal for the recording of folklore, especially in recent times.

The relationship of written literature to oral is open to endless discussion. One resounding note in most discussions of the subject is opposition to the older, generally nineteenth-century view that oral literature is less "literary" and more "primitive" than written. The straight-line evolutionary or "progressive" view of this is largely without foundation. The modern ascendancy of literate cultures over non-literate, and of literate societies within mainly non-literate cultures, may have helped to create such an illusion, but it is based on ethno-centric perspective and prejudice. In medieval and modern times, the ballad and the (short) folktale or fairytale have been considered the primary oral genres, but this is largely because the high literary ground has been taken by written literature, often backed by (literate) religious institutions or dominant foreign influences.98 When scholars have argued from the ballad and

98 Scholes and Kellogg, Nature of Narrative pp. 17-20, 56. See also H. Munro, and N. Kershaw Chadwick, The Growth of Literature, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932-40), 3:xx, who found that folktales received a "disproportionate" amount of attention in comparison to major oral literature.
folk tale against the oral composition of such "major" pieces as Beowulf, the Icelandic Eddas, the Iliad, and the Odyssey,\textsuperscript{99} they have often not taken into account the difference between cultural conditions which prevailed at the time of their composition and those prevailing in later periods. Scholes and Kellogg provide an illuminating discussion of the contribution of oral narrative to the general history of Western narrative art.\textsuperscript{100}

Olrik's "laws" of epic narrative were meant to provide distinctive characteristics of extended oral narratives over against written.\textsuperscript{101} More generally, Archer Taylor stresses that the chief difference is the undisguised conventionality of oral traditional literature over against the uniqueness and individuality of written composition. The conventions of oral literature are manifested in "repetition with variation" on the levels of style of expression and of narrative-structure. The writer either avoids repetition or "charges" it with new rhetorical or symbolic content.\textsuperscript{102} This is just what happened to

\textsuperscript{99}Some still do of course: the oral composition of these is not universally accepted.

\textsuperscript{100}Scholes and Kellogg, \textit{Nature of Narrative}, pp. 1-56.

\textsuperscript{101}See above, pp. 66f.; also Gray, "Repetition", p. 289.

Homeric formulas in later written epics.

Gray attempts to move beyond the basic recognition of repetition as characteristic of oral literature to an explanation of the phenomenon.\textsuperscript{103} He dispels the notion that repetition occurs because of the "primitiveness" of folk society and that repetition reflects a "static" society. Repetition is an \textit{oral} phenomenon and not a social or cultural one. It can serve both permanence and change, both "aural memory" and "oral improvisation". Repetition allows for better understanding and better retention of what is said; this is less necessary in written literature, where one can always refer back to what was written earlier.\textsuperscript{104}

More significantly, repetition aids literarily in extended compositions for structure, emphasis, and length. "The chief compositional principle of oral literature is duplication of incident; the chief compositional principle of written literature is description of incident."\textsuperscript{105} The oral narrator \textit{can}, of course, engage in description, Gray acknowledges (Lord himself has pointed this out); however, duplication, or repetition, is more taxing for the

\textsuperscript{103}Gray, "Repetition", pp. 289ff., 297-300.

\textsuperscript{104}Cf. the "back and forth" nature of reading and of written composition described by Goody, \textit{Domestication}, pp. 127ff.; and Stahl, \textit{Style in Oral and Written Narrative}, pp. 7f.

\textsuperscript{105}Gray, "Repetition", p. 300.
writer than for the speaker, and less rewarding.

Folklorists become rather elusive, however, on the question of distinguishing oral composition from written, in manuscripts. Taylor, for example, avers that a high level of "philosophical criticism" is necessary for the task,\textsuperscript{106} without being more specific. Rigorous students would insist that only field-collected texts be employed in descriptive studies of folklore,\textsuperscript{107} but that is not the same as heuristic application of such descriptive studies to other, potentially oral literature. It is Gray who speaks most boldly about the possibility of distinguishing clearly between oral and written literature:

The kind of repetition that does regularly occur inverifiably oral literature and is just as conspicuously absent from verifiably written literature is repetition within works.\textsuperscript{108}

Nevertheless, it must be said that, on the whole, folklorists are less positive than Lord on the prospects of positively identifying certain manuscripts as oral compositions. It is possible that Lord has oversimplified the nature of oral composition and its relation to written

\textsuperscript{106}Taylor, "Folklore and the Student of Literature", p. 40.

\textsuperscript{107}Francis Lee Utley, "Folk Literature: an Operational Definition", SF, pp. 13-17. For this reason, the use of Chadwick, Growth, must be curtailed here. Most of their source material is from older manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{108}Gray, "Repetition", p. 297. (As has been seen, he includes "repetition" on both the formulaic and the thematic planes in this criterion.)
composition, to some degree. This will to some extent depend upon the nature of the text being considered. For example, the three Pentateuchal narratives of a Hebrew patriarch deceiving a foreign king considered by Culley, are set in a demonstrably conflated source (Genesis). This prevents one from even considering the three narratives as "repetitions within a literary work", to use Gray's phrase. On the other hand Homer's epics and Mark can be discussed as potentially unitary compositions, with close, if not immediate, connections to an oral tradition.

Over against the apparent reticence of folklorists to take up Lord's cause at this point, it must be recalled that the oral-formulaic movement has only gained its wide acclaim relatively recently. In addition, the cross-disciplinary requirements of such study in relation to older manuscripts is more likely to appeal to students of ancient and medieval literatures, such as Parry, seeking new avenues of approach to their literature, than it would to folklorists who are still active in collecting their

---

109 Ruth Finnegan, "What Is Oral Literature Anyway?", Oral Literature and the Formula, pp. 127-66, challenges Lord on both these points. Note Lord's (partial) response in the same volume, pp. 175f. The composition of (brief) folksongs or "panegyrics" prior to performance, which Finnegan adduces against Lord's theory, may well be called "oral composition" (pp. 133, 146ff.), but the difference in the requirements of an extended oral narrative would seem to preclude such memorization. Finnegan's discussion of Parry and Lord's work is by no means totally negative, see pp. 127-35.

110 Culley, Structure, pp. 33-41.
own. The need, then, is for more applications of the oral-formulaic theory to textual sources, in order to test its viability further.

If folklorists are not uniformly positive on the possibility of distinguishing between oral and written composition, they do appear willing to allow for the possibility that oral transcriptions, or texts approximating this could occur in fact.

Richard Dorson, in an article on the use of printed sources in folklore studies, has set out four possible types of relationship between text and oral tradition:

1. "Close replicas of oral texts", without embellishment or alteration, often a paraphrase of the oral source;

2. "Elaborations and revisions of oral texts, "with a recognizable" core of oral material, plus non-traditional episodes;

3. "Literary invention based on oral folklore", which crosses the line from tradition-dominated to literary creativity, still retaining folk topics and style; and

4. "Literary invention based on literary folklore", where the "source" is another printed work, and the end result is polished and sophisticated.\[11\]

---

\[11\] Dorson, "The Use of Printed Sources", Folklore and Folklife, pp. 465-77. Bruce Rosenberg gives a similar fourfold list or "taxonomy" in "Folklore and Medieval Literature", Journal of the Folklore Institute 13 (1976), p. 317. He speaks of (1) narratives which "bear the impress of 'oral shaping'" in conjunction with "orally derived structures", and (2) narratives, like the Song of Roland, developed from oral heroic legend, drawing in folktale motifs. These correspond roughly to the first two of Dorson's types. N. R. Grobman, A Theory for the Sources and Uses of Folklore in Literature, Folklore Pre-print Series vol. 4, no. 1 (1976), goes yet further to classify both uses and users of folk literature into
These types are somewhat arbitrary descriptions, although Dorson provides examples for each. Any number of modern writers, such as Walter Scott or Nathaniel Hawthorne, have made use of folk material in their writings, falling into the third category. Early "collectors" of folklore often polished and edited their material for publication, resulting in material approximating the second type.

Lord, of course, contended that Homer's epics are of the first type, and has devoted several articles to this end, beyond the material in Singer. The very size of the Homeric corpus makes such an analysis more possible; the case for the oral composition of the extant version of Beowulf by contrast is vitiated by the smaller amount of Anglo-Saxon poetry. Other literatures are yet worse off. Other text sources which may be variously classified in types one or two are chapbooks of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and several publications about an eighteenth century Russian criminal, Van'ha Kain, whose deeds are known to have become a matter of folklore,

twelve categories, one of which is "authentic transcrip-
tive reproduction" (p. 9). He finds such material to be rare in "artistic literature", by which he means modern literary works; he does not consider ancient or medieval texts as such.


perhaps even during his own lifetime.114

Where on this scale would the Gospels best fit? Lord's analysis of the Synoptics would place them into the first two of Dorson's types. Even if Matthew and Luke have employed Mark's Gospel as their "literary" source, the nature of Mark's narrative is still an open question. This much can be said: the mere fact that Mark's Gospel is an extended narrative text does not immediately tell one anything about its relation to the oral Jesus-tradition. There are means of testing this relationship upon the basis of textual considerations, without requiring prior recourse to historical reconstructions or inviolable "laws" of development in traditions.

It must only be supposed with the form critics that the early Christian oral tradition about Jesus was in fact a popular or folk tradition,115 analogous to other folk traditions and therefore eligible for comparative study.


115 See the definition of "folk" of Alan Dundes, SF, p. 2: any group of people who share at least one common factor--job, language, religion--with its own traditions, the "common core" of which helps the group have a sense of identity. In this sense, "folk" does not necessarily entail lower class, peasant culture, or other broad sociological judgments about the group or tradition under consideration. Also, F. L. Utley, "Folk Literature; an Operational Definition", SF, pp. 13f.
This does not mean that the Synoptic tradition is to be reduced to fit another mold. It is a unique tradition—as are all traditions to some extent. Such uniqueness can hardly be absolute, however.

It is now possible to review the basis of the tradition-oriented approach to the Gospels in the light of a considerable body of current research or oral narrative traditions. Beyond that, it still appears possible to use two of Lord's criteria for testing the hypothesis that Mark's Gospel is indeed an oral narrative composition.
CHAPTER 3

TRADITION-ORIENTED CRITICISM AND THE COMPOSITION OF MARK'S GOSPEL

In the introduction, the problem of the paradoxical image of Mark's Gospel in current criticism was raised. The Gospel is portrayed by form criticism and, to a lesser extent, by redaction criticism, as a loose, frequently inconsistent compilation of semi-independent stories. On the other hand, literary criticism and, to a lesser extent again, redaction criticism, view it as a unified and purposeful literary narrative created by a skillful author.

It was suggested that the understanding of oral tradition and of oral traditional literature found in oral-formulaic theory offered a way to resolve the paradox, accounting for both aspects of the image of Mark's Gospel under the characteristics of oral literature. Both the tradition-oriented and the narrative-oriented approaches to Mark could then be retained and harmonized, although with modifications to both.

The oral-formulaic theory was described in chapter 1, and a supplementary discussion of oral and folklore studies was presented in chapter 2 in order to set the oral-formulaic theory in a broader context and to enable
its adaptation to a prose narrative such as Mark's. In this chapter a review of the concept of oral tradition which is operative in standard form criticism will help to show its differences from that offered by oral-formulaic theory and other current studies of oral tradition.

As form criticism is ostensibly a comparative and folkloristic method,¹ it should benefit from input of recent, more empirically-based study. Attention will be focussed upon the "father" of form criticism, Hermann Gunkel, and upon the ground-breaking form-critical analysis of Mark's Gospel by K. L. Schmidt. It will be seen that their concept of tradition, under the influence of thinking then current about "primitive" and "folk" cultures, created a false alternative between oral, "folk" tradition and "literature".

If Gunkel and the other standard form critics cannot be faulted for being men of their times, those who have continued to use form-critical method in New Testament studies since their time may be accused of a certain insularity insofar as they merely extend and adapt standard form-critical method without continuing methodologi-

¹But see E. P. Sanders, Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition, NTS Monographs, no. 9 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 8f., 12-21, who argues that this is not actually so. There is a degree of truth to his claim, but it appears that the classical form critics were not so far out of touch with the state of the discipline at the end of the nineteenth century: see Gene M. Tucker, Form Criticism of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 4ff.; and John H. Hayes, Introduction to Old Testament Study (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979), pp. 131ff.
cal awareness of studies of oral tradition outside Biblical circles. The insularity is now in the process of being bridged, and the work of three scholars engaged in the exercise will be reviewed before the proposal for part two of this thesis is discussed. Each of these three attempts fails in some way to grasp the implication of comparative studies of oral literature, and in particular the oral-formulaic theory.

Oral-formulaic theory and folklore studies appear to promise much to the interpreter of the Gospels, and in many areas. The sociological interests of form criticism,


would receive enlightenment from work by anthropologi-
cally-oriented folklorists. Historical investigation of
the Synoptic tradition might begin with Jan Vansina, Oral
Tradition, whose concern is "historical methodology". And
it should be self-evident how the model of "multiform"
oral compositions will add another dimension to study of
the Synoptic problem—even if, as has been observed, it
will probably not solve it single-handedly.4

But from the start the concern of this thesis has
been understanding the composition of Mark, based on
the assumptions that it was indeed the first of the Synop-
tics to be written, and that it was closely related in its
origin to early Christian oral tradition about Jesus.
This chapter therefore will conclude with a proposal to
undertake an oral-formulaic analysis of Mark's Gospel,
with a view towards testing the hypothesis that the Gospel
was an oral traditional composition.

Oral-Formulaic Theory and Form Criticism

Hermann Gunkel

In his essay, "Fundamental Problems of Hebrew
Literary History", Gunkel offers a clear summation of the
assumptions and principles of Formgeschichte, the analysis
of "form history". Four principles for standard form

4See, already, Albert Lord, "Gospels as Oral Tradi-
tional Literature", Relationships among the Gospels, ed.
William Walker (San Antonio: Trinity University Press,
1978), pp. 33-91; and C. H. Talbert's response in the
same volume, "Oral and Independent or Literary and
Interdependent?", pp. 93-102.
criticism are enunciated.

(1) In antiquity, individual creativity played a considerably more restricted role than in modern societies, and the "power of custom" was far greater.5

(2) Social forces, therefore, and not "individual effort" governed literary expression, and socially determined "laws of literary form" produced various literary "types" or "forms", each of which "originally belonged to a quite definite side" of the life of the society in which they arose.6

(3) Ancient compositions were extremely brief by comparison with modern written ones because the "receptive power" of the ancient and primitive listener was "very limited". Length and "collection" came with gradual growth of civilization and of writing.7

(4) "The oldest types, in the form in which they were current among the people, are always pure and unmixed; but in later periods, when men and conditions of life were more complex, when professional writers adopted the type, there occur deviations and mixtures of styles."8

---


6 Ibid., pp. 59ff.

7 Ibid., pp. 62f. This clearly reflects Gunkel's meaning. However, a statement on p. 62 seems to conflict with this: "It is a familiar fact that a hearer is able to grasp much longer literary units than a reader, who can, of course, suspend and resume his reading at will" (my emphasis). This seems to be an accurate translation of the German original, "Grundprobleme der Israelitischen Literaturgeschichte", in Gunkel's collected Reden und Aufsätze (1913), pp. 33f.: "Nun ist es eine bekannte Erfahrung, dass der Hörer viel grossere literarische Einheiten aufzufassen vermag als der Leser, der ja beliebig aufhören und wieder anfangen kann; "...". It may be observed, however, that the final clause quoted seems to indicate the reader's advantage over the listener, and the next clause of the sentence makes this more certain: "... zumal der antike Hörer dessen Aufnahmefähigkeit sehr beschränkt ist". Gunkel wishes to emphasize the listener's limitations. Perhaps for "grossere" in the former quotation, one should read "kleinere".

8 Ibid., pp. 63ff. (Gunkel's emphasis).
In light of the previous discussion of more recent studies of oral expression, certain modifications or corrections of these principles are required. The relationship between social forces and individual activity in folk culture is much more balanced than Gunkel allows. The oral narrator uses his tradition creatively, and a good narrator may exercise considerable influence upon the tradition.\(^9\) It remains true that he does not exercise the freedom over "custom", that is apparent in literate expression (although it could well be questioned whether this "freedom" has not itself been exaggerated). The folklorist, C. W. von Sydow, states that the notion that folk tradition was somehow a product of a people in its entirety is a product of Romanticism, to be discarded.\(^10\)

From this it becomes clear that the "laws of form" mentioned in the second principle are not necessarily


immutable or "superorganic", as Alan Dundes calls Axel Olrik's conception of his laws. They are subject to change and manipulation by individual members of society. This is not to deny the impact of social forces upon traditional verbal expression. Gunkel emphasizes consideration of the "performance" context of tradition as clearly as a contemporary folklorist might:

To understand the literary type we must in each case have the whole situation clearly before us and ask ourselves, Who is speaking? Who are the listeners? What is the mise en scène at the time? What effect is being aimed at?

Nevertheless, the social determinism apparent in Gunkel's conception is not acceptable as it stands: the significance of individual creativity needs fuller recognition. The same is true for his restriction of a type to a "definite side" of the social system, limited to

---

11Alan Dundes, editor's note to "Epic Laws of Folk Narrative" by Axel Olrik, in Study of Folklore, p. 130. Incidentally, Olrik and Gunkel were contemporaries, but Olrik's article (1909) was apparently only a late influence on Gunkel. According to Hayes, Introduction, pp. 131ff., the third edition of Gunkel's Legends of Genesis (1910), made frequent reference to Olrik, but previous editions show that Gunkel already held to many of the same views even before Olrik's article. Olrik would have simply confirmed Gunkel's thinking regarding "laws". (But see Boman, Jesusüberlieferung, pp. 17f., who declares that Olrik himself thought of his "laws" as "rules".)

a "special class of speaker". This is too "schematic": "active bearers" may command a wide range of genres of tradition. Gunkel's notion of the restriction of types is related to his social determinism and neglect of the individual.

Of course Gunkel's basic concept of clearly marked literary types being characteristic products of a traditional process is valid. The alteration lies in the understanding of how these types come to be. Social forces are but one factor in this. John Hayes cites an article by Gunkel which states that each traditional genre is characterized by (1) a store of thoughts and moods, (2) a traditional linguistic form of phrases, sentence structures, and images, and (3) a definite Sitz im Leben. To the first of these one can compare the folktale "motif", and to the second, the common "language"

---

13Ibid., p. 62. The end-product of this view is the currently widespread notion of narrow, theologically-biased streams of tradition. This notion lies behind much of James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, Trajectories in Early Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971). See especially Koester's chapters "Gnomai Diaphorai", and "One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels".

14The term is from Hayes, Introduction, p. 153.

15For example, the fishermen-informants of James H. Delargy, "The Gaelic Story-Teller", Proceedings of the British Academy 31 (1945), 183ff., possessed a broad repertoire of traditions including folktales (Märchen), hero-tales, myths, and even songs. Cf. Bornan, Jesus-Überlieferung, p. 21, who directs attention to this.

of some oral-formulaic themes. But the genre and its characteristics derive from, and serve personal, "artistic" concerns, as well as "social" ones.

The third principle of form criticism enunciated by Gunkel, concerning the brevity of ancient narratives, and presumably of "popular" ones, must be rejected. The notion that an ancient hearer had a "short attention span" is groundless. Certainly observable folk traditions, the only basis upon which to describe "ancient" folk societies, commonly bear narratives of great length: Lord's Southslavic tradition is only typical in this regard. In fact it has been repeatedly suggested that "shorter" narratives of ancient manuscripts are more likely to be abbreviations or summaries of much longer oral originals.

Gunkel suggested that "ballads" would consist of only one or two long lines; wisdom-proverbs, prophetic utterances, and Torah statutes would be recited as single

\[\text{\footnotesize 17 See below, chap. 5, under "Structure of Themes".}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 18 Hayes, Introduction, p. 153, referring to Gunkel's statement about the limited "receptive power" of the ancient hearer; cited above, fn. 7.}\]


\[\text{\footnotesize 20 Chadwick, Growth, 3:xxi; Delargy, "Gaelic Story-Teller", p. 206; and Jay A. Wilcoxen, "Narrative", OT Form Criticism, ed. Hayes, pp. 65f.}\]
epigrams; and saga narratives would be no longer than two or three modern Bible verses. As Jay Wilcoxen observed, these "narrations" would last less than a minute! The ancient or "primitive" man is portrayed as a child. Even Axel Olrik, Gunkel's contemporary, wrote his article on "Epic Laws" with the purpose of raising the common (low) estimate of the artistic value of folk composition.

The fourth principle of Gunkel's form criticism, that the original types were "pure and unmixed", is also groundless. Martin J. Buss called it "one of the more questionable elements" of his system, and wondered how he had arrived at it, for "virtually all studies of primitive literature, including works Gunkel knew, stated or implied at least partially otherwise". It would appear that Gunkel inferred the purity from the close tie he perceived between form and a given social Sitz, but once again this proves to be too "schematic".

It is evident that Gunkel's principles are no longer acceptable in their original form. Gunkel himself can not be blamed for the failure of subsequent Biblical critics to realize this. Gunkel performed a

---


22Olrik, "Epic Laws", pp. 139ff.


24The pervasiveness of these principles in Bultmann, HST, p. 36, and Dibelius, FTG, pp. 1-8, e.g., hardly needs to be indicated: they are still to be seen at work
great feat of methodological synthesis, but it is only
lately that his heirs have noted its erosion—and this has
taken place primarily in the context of Old Testament
scholarship, as the notes to the present discussion re-
veal. A number of influences guided Gunkel's thinking.
Prominent among these must be listed Romanticism, from
which Gunkel derives the enduring notion of comparing
forms of expression, but which also saddles him with ideas
of community creation, and of the "simplicity" of primiti-
tive and folk cultures. Any human society, no matter
how "primitive", is already more complex culturally than
Gunkel seems to have realized.

The evolutionary model of Literaturgeschichte then
will just not work. The supposition of the "pure-and-
simple-original", on which it rests, cannot be accepted.
Gunkel's anthropology has created a false alternative
between folk culture and "literary" expression; and form

in the more recent form-critical works of Heinz-Wolfgang
Kuhn, Altere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium (Göttingen:
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971); and Eta Linnemann, Studien
zur Passionsgeschichte (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &
Ruprecht, 1970), which are discussed below in chap. 5,
under "Patterning in Mark".

25 According to Hayes, Introduction, pp. 123ff.,
Gunkel himself acknowledged neo-Romanticism as an influ-
ence. Cf. Klaus Koch, Growth of the Biblical Tradition,
3rd ed., trans. S. M. Cupitt (London: A and C Black,

26 Buss, "Study of Forms", pp. 35f., observes that
the "simplicity" of "primitive" peoples was a popular
notion in turn of the century anthropology. Cf. Koch,
Growth, p. 25; and Widengren, "Oral Tradition", p. 205.
criticism as a "scientific" discipline must continue to work as inductively as Gunkel himself did, in seeking to understand the oral traditional process, which now appears to involve individual and oral society, "art" and Sitz im Leben, in a mutual, symbiotic relationship.

K. L. Schmidt

In light of the operating assumptions bequeathed by Gunkel to the standard Gospel form critics,\(^{27}\) the nature of the achievement of K. L. Schmidt needs to be reevaluated. The overall exegetical achievement of his Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu is not faulted. The stories in Mark are loosely connected, both in terms of time, place, and subject matter.\(^{28}\) There is no master chronological plan evident, nor a developing biography.\(^{29}\) Furthermore Matthew and Luke freely reverse and alter Mark's ordering of the stories "ohne Skrupel".\(^{30}\) All these confirm that the present order of the events narrated in Mark is arbitrary, to a great extent. In terms of absolute historical chronology it is fair to say that Mark's individual pericopes appear fragmentary and that Mark's "framework" is loosely superimposed on them.

But what does this really imply for the state of

---

\(^{27}\)See Schmidt's acknowledgement of Gunkel's influence, "Die Stellung", p. 88.

\(^{28}\)See, e.g., Schmidt, Rahmen, pp. 43, 67f., 208f., 303.

\(^{29}\)Ibid., p. 317. \(^{30}\)Ibid., pp. 52f.
the tradition before Mark? Schmidt, to be sure, believed it implied that the pericopes themselves were transmitted as a "profusion" of independent and fragmentary units. Could it not equally be said simply that they were transmitted by means of a series of loosely-structured narratives?

In fact, Schmidt already had a notion of how oral or folk traditions originate and are passed on. He envisions the tradition as taking place in a gathering of Christians who alternately recount to one another what they recall of the words and deeds of the Lord. In these informal exchanges, one would take up where another left off, saying, "and it happened that . . . ." Such a form became standard in collections of stories and is ultimately retained by Mark. Schmidt is candid enough to admit that his description is hypothetical:

Wir wissen über diese Dinge nichts Bestimmtes. Wir können uns aber solches Reden und Erzählen über die Geschichte Jesu innerhalb eines Erzählerkreises, innerhalb der Kultgemeinde nicht lebendig genug vorstellen.32

Nevertheless this notion of oral tradition is already present in Schmidt's thinking and cannot be said to

---

31 Ibid., p. 317: "eine Fülle von Einzelgeschichten". See also pp. v-vi, 208f., 303. To be fair, Schmidt's concern was with those who understood Mark's Gospel to be a truly coherent, chronologically reliable book. That Mark's framework is "arbitrary" or "secondary" in this regard is not denied.

32 Ibid., p. 19. Schmidt makes the point that some such hypothesis is necessary. This is true. The oral-formulaic theory provides another alternative, and one with a better empirical claim, too.
be a product of his exegetical results. Form critics have recognized that the oral independence of the traditions is an "assumption", but Schmidt is sometimes considered to have demonstrated or "justified" the assumption. This is not so. The hypothesis and the "evidence" do appear to match, but the evidence may also fit other hypotheses.

Schmidt's analysis leads him in his later article, "Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte", to class the Gospels, particularly Mark's, as Kleinliteratur and not Hochliteratur. Hochliteratur is literature that is the immediate product of an individual author's work, with what may properly be called "literary" characteristics. Kleinliteratur, by contrast, is a product of the "people", and with unstable literary connections. But the contrast is more than one of manner of composition or of literary characteristics. The genres of the two types of literature are simply not to be compared:

Das Evangelium ist von Haus aus nicht Hochliteratur, sondern Kleinliteratur, nicht individuelle Schriftstellerleistung, sondern Volksbuch, nicht Biographie, sondern Kultlegende.


34 Schmidt, "Die Stellung", pp. 51, 82. On p. 82 Schmidt speaks of "das Ich des Schriftstellers".

35 Ibid., pp. 84ff.

36 Ibid., p. 76; cf. pp. 59ff. Schmidt's use of the term "Kultlegende" points to the tacit assumption by standard form criticism of the "myth-ritual" theory. Cf.
This discontinuity in the respective genres stems from the form-critical conviction, first expressed by Gunkel, that Kleinliteratur is the product of social forces not under the control of conscious, individual thought. "Die ursprüngliche Einheit der mündlichen Überlieferung ist der kurze Einzelbericht." The eventual compilation of a Volksbuch comes only at the end of an "Entwicklungsprozess" of these original, short, individual reports. In this, according to Schmidt, the composition of the Gospels is analogous to many other folk literatures, including the formation of the Homeric poems.

Schmidt's assignment of the Gospels to Kleinliteratur, his insight that they share many "literary" characteristics with (other) folk literatures, and that their composition was analogous to that of folk literatures are fully accepted here. But since Schmidt's time,

---

Talbert, What is a Gospel? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), p. 3. The theory is that folk narratives arise as a means to explain or justify already existing rituals in the society. This implies that such narratives have no, or at best a very limited, historical value. This theory now has little credibility in folkloristic circles, although (1) it still influences, anachronistically, everyday thought about "folklore" and "old wives' tales", and (2) folklorists have not swung back to a naive credulity regarding traditions. See William Bascom, "The Myth-Ritual Theory", JAF 70 (1957), 103-14, who refers to the positive statement of the theory by Lord Raglan, in JAF 68 (1955).

37 Schmidt, "Die Stellung", p. 84.
38 Cf. Ibid., pp. 60f., 69-75.
39 Ibid., pp. 84-90.
the study of these folk literatures has not ceased, and different understandings of their nature and composition have been offered, of which the oral-formulaic theory is one.

Nor does it follow that there is a distinct gulf between the genres of **Kleinliteratur** and **Hochliteratur**. Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, for example, have traced the development of Western "literary" genres out of primitive and oral origins.40 C. H. Talbert observed that current studies of Classical literature, while retaining the **Hochliteratur** and **Kleinliteratur** distinction, understand literary genres as embracing both.41 There is, as Lord said, a "continuum" in man's verbal expression,42 and the differences are more quantitative than qualitative.

Schmidt's argument that the Gospels are to be understood by analogy to (other) folk literatures establishes a fundamental justification for a tradition-oriented approach to the Gospels.43 His exegetical treatment of the "framework" of their "history of Jesus" provides strong support for treating the Gospels in this way.


42Lord, *Singer*, p. 130. This continuity is directly contrary to what Gåttgemanns and Kelber argue about the difference between oral and written literary capabilities; see the discussions of their work, below.

For all that, however, Schmidt's understanding of the nature of folk literature, like Gunkel's, needs considerable revision.

One significant revision is the estimate of the framework: it may indeed be "chronologisch und psychologisch nicht ergiebig", but the notion that it is therefore "secondary" does not necessarily follow. A framework is equally likely to be as much a part of tradition as the "units" which are used to enflesh it. The framework of the epic songs in the Southslavic tradition is as basic as the themes, and Lord suggests that the framework of an "oral life story" was integral to the Gospel tradition, as it was to other ancient traditions and literatures.

One additional observation about form-critical assumptions needs to be made. It is tacitly assumed, by Schmidt at least, that the tradition passes on verbally-fixed texts. This is evident at several points in Rahmen, as Schmidt describes where Mark did and did not alter the traditions as they came to him. The assumption is even more visible in Johannes Sundwall's analysis, which even

44 Schmidt, "Die Stellung", pp. 84f.

45 Cf. Boman, Jesusüberlieferung, pp. 30f.

46 See below, under "Albert Lord on the Gospels"; and Lord, "Gospels", pp. 36-41.

prints the supposed texts of the tradition used by Mark. As Lord stated in Singer, such an assumption is only natural for literate scholars, but it is by no means accurate.

Redaction Criticism

Where redaction criticism of Mark follows the principles of standard form criticism, there it too must reconsider its methods and results. It is unwise to assume that the "redactor" imposed order where none had existed before. Even more is it dangerous to affirm that Mark "created" the Gospel genre and then attempt to draw theological implications from this. Such views are founded upon the assumption of fragmentary oral transmission which should now be considered doubtful. Similarly, attempts to distinguish between "tradition" and

---


51 This is already evident in Marxsen, Mark, pp. 208f. It has recently been taken much farther: see, e.g., John Dominic Crossan, "A Form for Absence: the Markan Creation of Gospel", Semeia 12 (1978), 41-55, who argues that Mark "created" the Gospel to historicize Jesus, in opposition to a theology of "presence". Cf. Kelber, "Mark and Oral Tradition", pp. 40-44.
"redaction" may fail to take into account the possibility of oral "composition" which embraces both. The tradition was probably not a fragmentary collection of fixed texts, needing only to be sewn together.

On the other hand, it has been suggested that redaction criticism in effect alters certain principles of standard form criticism. These alterations bring it closer to an appropriate exegetical method for interpreting oral compositions. For example, the recognition of the individual creativity of the evangelist is dangerous to form criticism, but fits nicely into oral-formulaic understandings. Similarly, consideration of the selection, arrangement, and characteristic treatment of materials by the evangelists is entirely appropriate to notions of oral composition.

52 Marxsen, Mark, p. 28.


Hypothesis for the Origin of Mark's Gospel:

Oral Traditional Composition

It was stated in the first chapter that the oral-formulaic theory presented an "organic" conception of oral tradition. Standard form criticism may also be said to have presented an organic theory. Redaction criticism as it is presently constituted upon certain form-critical principles cannot help being somewhat "mechanical", because of the intervention of the literary redactor. Perhaps, of course, the composition of Mark's Gospel was a "mechanical" redaction: given Mark's priority, one can certainly trace the mechanics of the redaction of Mark by Matthew and Luke. But it does not necessarily follow that one can move straight back from Matthew and Luke to Mark.

If Mark is the "first" manuscript to be produced on the basis of an oral tradition, then the immediate relationship of Mark to that tradition ought to be explored on its own terms so far as possible. Perhaps Mark stands in an "organic" relationship to the tradition, requiring nothing beyond the tradition itself for its present form, except the presence of a scribe. This is what Parry and Lord have argued for Homer. What happens if the first Gospel is approached as a Volksbuch, but with an improved understanding of the ability of the Volkserzähler?

Lord has developed a method to test for oral composition in manuscript texts, on the basis of observed characteristics of oral compositions. It has been seen
that such features might in principle be expected of oral prose compositions as they were for the oral poetry actually studied by Parry and Lord themselves. In the second part of this thesis, it is proposed to carry out an oral-formulaic analysis of Mark to test the hypothesis that Mark's Gospel was an oral composition, perhaps typical of the form in which the tradition was transmitted.

**Suggested Revisions of Form Criticism**

Before discussing the proposal itself, it is necessary to review three recent studies which have sought, in differing degrees, to bring the resources of oral literary and folklore studies to bear upon the Gospel tradition. These three are Thorlief Boman, *Die Jesusüberlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde*; Erhardt Gütgemanns, *Candid Questions Concerning Gospel Form Criticism*; and Werner H. Kelber, "Mark and Oral Tradition." One should also mention Gerd Theissen, *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten* in this context as a particularly promising form-critical study, in touch with recent trends in oral literary and folklore studies. Theissen rightly rejects the notion of fixed-text transmission, although he wishes to retain its "heuristic" value. But he continues to hold to fragmentary transmission of pericopes.

---


56 Ibid., p. 211. Curiously, Theissen emphasizes the continuity of the Gospel-formation process with the tradition, but still simply assumes the oral independence of the pericopes. Theissen's work is considered in more detail in chap. 5, under "Type B, miracle scenes."
Thorlief Boman. First to be considered is Boman's study, which is an explicit attempt to apply folkloristic points of view to the Synoptic tradition. At the start Boman indicates that a fundamental change has taken place in the folkloristic understanding of the origin and transmission of oral tradition.57 The old "Romantic" notions of collective creation and transmission by the "folk" have come to be seen as an "absurdity",58 and their continued influence in theological circles is anachronistic. This is a conclusion to which the first two chapters of this thesis have led also.

Another point of contact lies in Boman's rejection of the idea of a fragmentary transmission of the tradition.59 But this is complicated by the fact that Boman understands the tradition to have been transmitted by repetition of a verbally fixed text,60 and that the fixed verbal text was nothing less than the Gospel of Mark itself.61 There are several points to sort out here.

(1) Boman, too, accepts the arbitrary nature of the Gospel framework, but rejects Schmidt's conclusion that it was secondary.62 He asserts that a "picture" of the

57Boman, Jesusüberlieferung, p. 9f. A problem is that the change goes even farther than he realizes. See the comments of the folklorist, Wolfgang Brückner, "Narrativistik; Versuch einer Kenntnisnahme theologischer Erzählforschung", Fabula 20 (1979), 27f.
59Ibid., pp. 21, 30f.
60Ibid., pp. 11f, 32, 95.
61Ibid., pp. 35, 40-50.
62Ibid., pp. 30f., 91f.
tradition's hero would provide immanent coherence for the tradition.\textsuperscript{63} Although he does not cite much folkloristic support at this point, Lord's description of the singer's "absorption" of such matters would be relevant. A character like Odysseus is certainly well-defined in oral literature.

(2) The notion of fixed-text transmission is precarious. At least two of the folklorists cited by Boman are made to say a little more than they perhaps meant.\textsuperscript{64} One needs to recall here the singer who told Lord that he repeated his songs "exactly" as he heard them: the singer had no real concept of verbal identity however.\textsuperscript{65} At least one folklorist has suggested that such a misunderstanding may happen frequently between collectors and informants.\textsuperscript{66}

\textsuperscript{63}Ibid., p. 21.

\textsuperscript{64}Boman, Ibid., pp. 10f., refers to C. W. von Sydow's distinction between the roles of "active" and "passive" tradition bearers, to prove that the "passive" bearers acted as a "check" on the narrator to ensure "dass der Erzähler 'richtig' erzählt (er darf nichts ändern)". As stated, this seems to refer to an absolute identity. But Sydow, "On the Spread of Tradition", Selected Papers on Folklore, ed. L. Bødker (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1948), p. 14, states: "If some deviation should be made, they can easily correct it, and they do so, which is of great importance for the unchanging survival of the tradition." By "deviation", Sydow could mean "any change of wording", but this is by no means clear: he certainly does not say that nothing may be altered. In his article, "Folktale Studies and Philology", SP, pp. 232, 237, Sydow indicates that one must balance between the "conservation" and the "new formations" of a tradition; the active bearer is a creative person. Delargy, "Gaelic Story-Teller", is also cited as supporting verbal fixity (Jesus-Überlieferung, pp. 11f.). But Delargy is ambivalent: on pp. 194, 209, he specifically excludes verbal identity; and on pp. 201, 208, he allows for it.

\textsuperscript{65}See Lord, Singer, p. 28.

\textsuperscript{66}Seán Ó Coileáin, "Oral or Literary?", Studia Hibernica, 17,18 (1977-78), 11-21, refers to Delargy (see fn. 64, above) as accepting his informant's claims to exact memorization uncritically. The idea of the "immutable" oral text is an anachronism still found even in certain areas of folklore, according to Ó Coileáin. This misunderstanding could be at work, too, in the acceptance at face value by Gerhardsson and Riesenfeld of claims for "exact" memorization in early rabbinic tradition.
(3) Boman offers, without any folkloristic support, an unlikely account of how John Mark was actually commissioned by Peter and the other apostles to compose, orally, his Gospel. This gospel became the "official" (amtlich) version, to be memorized by other subordinate members of the early Christian hierarchy. Needless to say, this account of Mark's composition is not "oral" composition at all in the oral-formulaic sense of the term, and is highly improbable.

Boman's attempt to reconsider the oral Synoptic tradition makes some useful points, but ultimately fails. His attraction to fixed-text transmission is unwarranted, and his peculiar, and unsupported, notion of how the Gospel form was started fails to persuade.

Erhardt Güttgemanns. The second study to be mentioned is Güttgemanns' Candid Questions. Only areas of mutual agreement and divergence may be indicated here. On the one hand, Güttgemanns quite clearly sees the implications of redaction criticism for the standard form-critical enterprise. In fact, he appears ready to give up the quest of a tradition-oriented approach altogether,

---


68Boman, Jesusüberlieferung, pp. 91-95, cites a number of "oral" characteristics in Mark, but calls them "mnemonic" techniques, in line with his predisposition toward memorization. As with Schmidt earlier: same data, different interpretation. From an oral-formulaic perspective, these are "compositional" techniques.

apart from the basic acknowledgment of a no longer attainable traditional substratum. The Gospels must be taken as "autosemantic" entities, that is, they are not to be explained in terms of anything else.\textsuperscript{70}

This may be correct, but Güttgemanns' uncritical retention of the fragmentary-tradition model prevents him from appreciating the potential of oral narrative literature.\textsuperscript{71} This occurs even though he has read extensively in studies of oral literature, including the work of Lord himself.

In fact, one of the most important aspects of Güttgemanns' study for this thesis is his repeated mention of Lord's findings. What develops however is a fascination with one aspect of the oral-formulaic theory, namely, the difference between oral and written composition.\textsuperscript{72} The difference is extended from a matter of the use or non-use of traditional language and compositional techniques, to a "sociological" and conceptual divide. This, plus his retention of the fragmentary tradition model causes, Güttgemanns to plug his concept of what "oral" is

\textsuperscript{70}Güttgemanns, Candid Questions, pp. 9-12, 408ff.

\textsuperscript{71}Güttgemanns notes the overlap of oral and written genres, Ibid., pp. 195, 210 (esp. fn. 236), but makes nothing of it.

into Lord's description of the "difference" between oral and written.

To create this divide is to misunderstand Lord. "Literarily", he saw no absolute difference between oral and written literature. On the contrary, he affirms **generic** continuity, as has been noted. Moreover he is particularly concerned with discerning oral literature as it may be preserved in ancient manuscripts. So, simply because a text is now preserved in written form does not mean it was a written composition.

Yet Gütgemanns fails to inquire seriously into this possibility for Mark. Instead, he holds that Mark "created" the Gospel form, and thereby made some sort of breach with oral, "pre-literary" tradition from which he derived much of his material. This could be possible: many authors have "borrowed" from folklore and transformed it, but in view of the heavy "oral" characteristics (which even Gütgemanns acknowledges in Mark) it is strange that the alternative—that Mark is an incidental transcription of an essentially oral performance, and therefore **typical** of the tradition—is hardly considered.


74 Cf. above, pp. 86f.

75 See Gütgemanns, *Candid Questions*, pp. 137ff. He does raise the possibility of the Gospels as "oral auto-
This oversight arises from the fact that Glit
gemanns retains the notion of fragmentary oral trans-
mission. Again, he does not seem to have caught on to
what Lord intended in his description of thematic composi-
tion. He has not allowed the oral-formulaic theory itself
to function "autosemantically". It is true that Glitt-
gemanns' aim is to raise "candid questions" and not yet to
provide answers, but he has too hastily moved to
structural linguistics and literary criticism as the
likely source of answers, and has not sufficiently ex-
plored the possibilities of oral traditional literature.

Werner Kelber. The same fascination with what Lord
has to say about the difference between oral and written,
and the same exaggeration of what Lord actually said, which
were found in Candid Questions, are also detectable in
Kelber's article, "Mark and Oral Tradition." Kelber

graphs", Ibid., p. 211, but rejects it as "approaching
Thorlief Boman's conception". Clearly, Glittgemanns does
not recognize the difference between oral-formulaic
composition and what Boman suggested.

76 Glittgemanns, Ibid., p. 210, fn. 236, states that
Lord's "epic analogies" are in "lack of a composition from
'small units' comparable to that of the Gospels"!

77 Ibid., pp. 9ff. Glittgemanns' rejection of the
"Romantic" notions of collective creation and transmission
(pp. 184-93) is quite similar to that given above in the
discussion of standard form criticism, but somehow he
fails to see that this requires a modification of the
overriding "sociological" interests of form criticism;
cf. pp. 259-267. Glittgemanns is right to wish to preserve
the sociological aspect of form criticism; but takes this
as an end of exclusive importance without seriously asking
about other factors to be considered: see pp. 56ff., 68f.
begins from some of the same sources as this thesis, yet
comes to a diametrically opposite hypothesis, namely that
Mark's Gospel must have been written, and stands in stark
opposition to what was possible in the oral Synoptic
tradition. He states, for example:

By and large, the pre-Markan oral traditions
diverge into a multiplicity of forms and directions. The
laws which govern the transmission of oral
traditions do not allow for a consistent process of
accretion toward the single goal of gospel compo-
sition. . . . [Therefore] while the gospel is linked
with oral life by a network of connections the past
states of synoptic orality cannot account for the
present state of gospel textuality. 78

An extended critique of Kelber's article and of his
use of his sources, primarily Lord, Singer, and Eric
Havelock, Preface to Plato, is offered in an appendix. 79
Somehow, for example, Kelber comes up with the notion that
coherent plot structures are the property only of written
literature, but it surely is impossible to get that idea
from Lord. Not only does he embrace the fragmentary-
tradition model, but he does so aggressively, allowing
only for collections of like traditions.

It is suggested in the appendix that Kelber's mis-
reading of Lord and Havelock, and his subsequent deniga-
tion of the potential of oral composition are motivated by

---

78 Kelber, "Mark and Oral Tradition", pp. 39f. Cf. Marxsen's description, Mark, pp. 16ff. Has Kelber pro-
gressed very far after all?

79 See below, appendix 1, "A Critique of Werner H. Kelber, 'Mark and Oral Tradition'".
his already-established historical and theological hypothesis that Mark's Gospel was redactionally "created" to combat tendencies in the oral tradition, sponsored by "prophets" in the early church. This position is served by sharpening the difference between "orality" and "textuality", and on this account he appears to have taken what Lord and Havelock have said to an extreme.

One objection raised by Kelber to the hypothesis of oral composition of Mark should be noted. Lord in "Gospels", had stated that it is "rare" for oral traditional narratives about an individual to include the entire course of his life, from birth to death; more commonly they relate "separate elements or incidents in the life of the hero". Kelber implies that this rules out an oral Gospel. The fact that it was "rare" would surely not make it impossible. More important than this, Mark does not record the whole of Jesus' life: only Matthew and Luke do so, if their infancy narratives may be regarded as completing it. In fact, Mark only really covers two "elements" of the six which Lord listed as comprising the

---


81 Lord's "Gospels", pp. 39f. C. H. Talbert's response to Lord, "Oral and Independent or Literary and Interdependent?", Relationships, p. 101, also noted this statement of Lord's, and suggested: "This fact would seem to point to the inappropriateness of oral traditional literature as a model for understanding the Gospels, which encompass the whole life story of Jesus." Looking at all the Gospels, Talbert is correct; when one looks at Mark alone, however, one does not see a "whole life story".
"traditional pattern of the life of the hero": these are the last two, "deeds" and "death."\textsuperscript{32}

Kelber's article suffers from a poor, and probably biased reading of his sources, and does not really offer a fresh approach to the whole issue of a tradition-oriented understanding of the Gospel. Lord offered criteria by which one may distinguish oral and written composition. Kelber has not taken these up in deciding that Mark is "textual". The way still lies open to do so, and that is what is now proposed.

Mark as an Oral Traditional Narrative

The idea that Mark was an oral narrative is as old as J. G. Herder and has recently been revived by Boman, as has been seen. Lord himself however must be credited with suggesting in his article, "Gospels as Oral Traditional Literature", that the Gospels be understood not as oral fixed texts, but as products of oral composition in performance.

The article was read at a conference on the relationships among the Gospels, and Lord was primarily concerned with elucidating the Synoptic problem. His remarks were therefore directed toward the possibility that oral composition of the Gospels could account for the various types of similarity and difference between them. One must agree with his respondent, C. H. Talbert, that Lord's

\textsuperscript{32}Lord, "Gospels", p. 39.
solution—a tentative one by his own account—was hardly conclusive. Even so, many of his observations have a bearing upon the predecessors of the extant Gospels, and even perhaps upon the composition of an individual Gospel such as Mark's. This would be especially so, if Mark is indeed the Synoptic Grundschrift.

The hypothesis proposed then is that Mark's Gospel was a transcription from an early Christian traditional narrator who composed his narrative in the manner described by oral-formulaic theory. As a preliminary to such an inquiry, a review of Lord's observations in the article just named will be useful. In addition, mention will be made of some circumstantial indications of the use of such a mode of composition in early Christian writings, and of general characteristics of Mark's Gospel itself which are frequently described as "oral". These may provide some context in which to proceed with the main inquiry of the second part of this thesis.

Albert Lord on the Gospels. Lord begins his article by making a distinction between "oral history" and "oral traditional literature". Oral history is defined as orally communicated transmission of information about people, events, and places. Oral literature can be either poetry or prose, and a prose tradition consists of narratives, ranging from anecdote to legend to saga. These

---

83 Talbert, "Oral and Independent or Literary and Interdependent?", Relationships, pp. 93-102.
narratives can attain highly developed oral forms, in contrast to oral history which is not set in definite literary forms. It should be noted that these two are not mutually exclusive: oral history can be incorporated into oral traditional literature, and Lord expresses the opinion that this has in fact happened in the Synoptic tradition.84

He next proceeds to sketch the rudiments of the oral-formulaic theory as it could relate to the Gospels. In the sketch he emphasizes two aspects of oral traditional literature. The first of these is the nature of transmission and the second is the manner of composition. These have already been dealt with at length in chapter 1, but some of his adaptations of the theory to the Gospel tradition are of interest.

First of all, Lord describes the role of the "narrator", relative to his tradition, in the same way as that of the "singer". The narrator is capable of adapting his narrative to a situation through expansion or contraction.

Secondly, Lord indicates that traditional, formulaic diction would be found, even in a prose tradition such as the Synoptic tradition:

In oral traditional literature, 'transmission' is in reality composition of the same story by someone else in the tradition, i.e., by another traditional narrator. Each such narrator, using the phrases and

84Lord, "Gospels", pp. 33f., 36ff.
devices picked up from others, develops his or her own usage of lines and half-lines, clusters and passages, but always within the parameters of the tradition.  

The tradition itself may be considered to "consist of stories or various kinds of non-narrative elements that are in suspension, potential actions (performances) to be realized". In practice, he continues, "each teller has some elements, narrative and non-narrative, more or less pre-formed in his mind". This much is already familiar. Lord expands this, however, affirming that narrators "think in terms of blocks and series of blocks of traditions", and that this is a characteristic structural device in oral composition.

There come to mind immediately the hypothetical pre-formed collections of narratives that some have claimed to discover in Mark. Rather than being pre-Markan written sources, these could just as well be oral units formed by Mark or by his predecessors in the tradition. In such a case, it would appear less likely that they were theologically-loaded "aretalogies", as has often been claimed, than that they were simply traditional

---

85Ibid., p. 37 (my emphasis).  86Ibid.

87Ibid., p. 58. Lord mentioned this to deal with "parallel sequences" shared by the Synoptics.


89By Weeden, Mark--Traditions in Conflict; and Paul J. Achtemeier, "The Origin and Function Of the Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae", JBL 91 (1972), 198-221.
devices to aid the narrator.

Lord also holds that the genre of the Gospels, if oral traditional, would be that of oral life story or "biography". Now by this he does not open the possibility of a return to the biographical interpretations of the original "Quest of the Historical Jesus". In the oral life story, the narrative elements are "bound" to a framework which consists of "transitional points" of the subject's life: birth, childhood, initiation to manhood, mature deeds, and death. This framework is as much logical and universal as it is "historical", of course, because it potentially describes all humans. It would not be common for a given oral narration to span the entire life of a person, although the instance of a transcription could provide such an exceptional situation, as Lord had observed in Singer. One could compare what Lord calls

---


91 Surveying the material of the Gospels, Lord, "Gospels", pp. 44f., declared the full pattern to be: birth, precocious childhood, investiture (repeated at several points), death of a substitute (John the Baptist), mature deeds, death and resurrection. He also noted that Jesus' mature deeds do not wholly participate in a (customary) "mythic" pattern, as they are based in the "actions and words of the miracle-worker and teacher".

92 Lord, Singer, pp. 124, 127f.
the "repeated patterns" of Old Testament life-stories to
this framework—both as to structure and as to their
religious or "cultic" purpose.\textsuperscript{93}

The second aspect of oral traditional literature
emphasized is just this religious dimension or function.
This was noted in passing in the prior description of the
oral-formulaic theory, but it is of greater significance
in this article. Lord holds, with many others, that a
"significant body of epic tales is of mythic origin
and . . . was associated with ritual". The "myth"\textsuperscript{94} of
the dying and rising God is the one most important to the
New Testament, he adds. Now it is "normally" the case
that a "traditional" story is the product of several
generations, but a recent person's story could become
traditional if the "essential story pattern" has been used
for a long time. He concludes that, given the existence
and nature of the Gospel tradition, "the events in Jesus'
life, his works and teaching, evoked ties with 'sacred'
oral traditional narratives that were current in the Near
East and in the eastern Mediterranean in the first century
A.D."\textsuperscript{95} The "biographical" pattern itself served reli-
gious or cultic ends, therefore, just as Gunkel and
Schmidt held that the short "forms" did.

\textsuperscript{93}Lord, "Gospels", p. 38f.

\textsuperscript{94}Lord defines myth as "sacred narrative in
the full truth and efficaciousness of which people
believe": "Gospels", p. 38.

\textsuperscript{95}Ibid., p. 91; Cf. pp. 36f., 39ff.
The hypothesis. In light of what Lord has written here and of the overall discussion of oral literary composition in the first two chapters, it may be proposed that Mark's Gospel was orally composed by an early Christian narrator and was transcribed into manuscript form. As such, the present text of the Gospel is not to be identified as the precise verbal form of traditional narration as Boman proposed. Rather, compositions like Mark in form, that is loosely connected (biographical) accounts of various actions and words of Jesus, were typical of the traditional narration. Mark is just a particular instance, a cross-section, of the tradition. The traditional narrations would have been readily adaptable to various needs and situations. The "needs and situations" will have been both religious or cultic, and therefore typical, but also related to particular "performance" events. Mark's Gospel is a unique text, composed in a unique performance, but it is at the same time a "multi-form" of the oral narrations which characterized the tradition.

96The reason for the transcription could only be the subject of speculation at this time. It may be sufficient to note (1) that such an event was probably inevitable in the light of widespread literate culture in the Hellenistic world; and (2) that a likely cause has to do with the spread of Christian influence into particular social strata for whom the use of written literature was a "norm".

97Lord, Singer, pp. 120, 126ff.
The pericopes "used" by Mark were, on this hypothesis, analogous to the "themes" discussed by Lord, an analogy already suggested by form-critical analysis of the Gospels. They were not themselves fixed texts, although they may have remained relatively so, in actual narration. Nor were the pericopes transmitted in a fragmentary fashion, but were told in the context of an overarching, "biographical" story pattern. This is not to say that they themselves were told in a fixed succession: as themes they may have been narrated as part of a intermediate block or pattern, but their selection and arrangement, and placing relative to one another, could easily vary between individual narrators and even between particular narrations.

As seen in chapter 1, Lord has suggested means of testing such a hypothesis. These tests for oral composition will be applied to Mark's Gospel in the second part of this thesis. In Singer, three tests were used: "formulaic" analysis, "thematic" analysis, and analysis of "enjambement". This last form of analysis can only be performed with metrical texts and cannot be employed for Mark's prose. Fortunately, as Lord indicated, this analysis is not of the same significance as the other two. Even with these, it is not expected that a truly quantitative result will be obtained. Nevertheless, given the

---

98 Lord, "Gospels", pp. 37f.
99 Lord, Singer, p. 131.
empirically observed phenomena of oral composition and their coherent explanation by the oral-formulaic theory, it is reasonable to look for the more specific characteristics of oral literature in Mark. The definition of the analysis, the criteria established for the analysis, and the means of carrying it out are all open to scrutiny. More discussion of the method for the formulaic and thematic analyses will be offered at the start of each of chapters 4 and 5, respectively.

Before proceeding with the specific analyses, it may be helpful to consider (1) circumstantial indications in early Christian writings that narrative composition in performance characterized the Synoptic tradition, and (2) generally accepted characteristics of Mark which already suggest its proximity to oral narration.

C. H. Dodd's framework theory. Mention of a traditional narrative framework or structure in the Synoptic tradition, and in Mark's Gospel particularly, may already have brought to mind the well-known article of C. H. Dodd, "Framework of the Gospel Narratives". It should be obvious that there is no real connection between the framework spoken of here and Dodd's. Nevertheless,

it may be of value to look at this for the sake of clarification, and because the first trace of circumstantial evidence for narrative composition in performance in early Christian community arises out of Dodd's article and the equally well-known response to his argument by D. E. Nineham.

Dodd had proposed that a skeletal outline of the course of Jesus' ministry prior to the crucifixion was extant in both the Synoptic tradition and in the apostolic preaching. He drew evidence for this from three sources: (1) Mark's travel summaries (the Sammelberichte in 1:35-39, 3:7-12, and 3:13), (2) Luke's summaries of apostolic sermons (especially, Acts 10:37-41 and 13:23-31), and (3) Pauline traditions (1 Corinthians 15:3-7 and 11:23-25). Nineham's arguments against Dodd's interpretation of these passages is convincing.

By reference to these passages, Dodd had opposed K. L. Schmidt's "strict theory of wholly independent units" of tradition. Now the present hypothesis also opposes Schmidt at this point, but not on the same grounds. Rather, according to the oral-formulaic theory, oral tradition simply need not "circulate" in isolated pericopes as Schmidt supposed, and the best evidence for this is the Gospel form itself.101 From an oral literary perspective, this makes Nineham's otherwise effective attack on Dodd's

101 See Keck, "The Seminar", p. 104: "all we know is what a Gospel came to be". 
Dodd had claimed that the framework was historically significant. That is not the point of the traditional framework suggested by Lord. Instead, the framework was a "formal" compositional element commonly found in traditional religions. This, in turn, challenges Nineham's statement that there was no conceivable Sitz im Leben for such a narrative framework in early Christianity. Its setting is within the religious interests of the tradition itself. As such it was hardly the explicit affair spoken of by Dodd, however. Furthermore, one must come to a historical evaluation of the framework in the Gospels on different grounds than are directly provided by an oral literary approach.

The discussion of the sermons in Acts, by Dodd and Nineham, raises a somewhat different point, one that may be of significance for the present hypothesis. Nineham was certainly correct over against Dodd that these hardly provide much of an outline of Jesus' ministry, and that whatever framework they might provide was probably already based on Mark's Gospel, which Luke has incorporated in his "former treatise". But Nineham himself refers to the "Thucydidean model" of historiography, whereby Luke would have reconstructed what the disciples

---

102Nineham, "Order", pp. 230f. Nineham's argument here is based on the exclusively "social" notion of Sitz im Leben typical of standard form criticism.
were "likely" to have said in a given circumstance.\textsuperscript{103}
If this is the case, one may infer that Luke considered an appropriate or typical "sermon" to be one which referred to the following: (a) John the Baptist (Acts 10:37b, 13:24f.), (b) Jesus' pre-crucifixion works (10:36-38, 13:26), (c) his crucifixion and resurrection (10:39-41, 13:27-30), and (d) the fulfillment of prophecy by all this (10:43; 13:23b, 27b, 32).

Moreover, these references have the rudiments of a narrative form. Could all this suggest that a "gospel" like Mark's (for Mark plainly has all these elements) was itself "preached", that is, that Mark is in the "form" of an early Christian sermon? If so, it could determine the "ritual" function (Lord) or the Sitz im Leben of "gospel", as an extended oral traditional narrative about Jesus used not merely "in preaching", as Dibelius had suggested,\textsuperscript{104} but as preaching. The Acts sermons also suggest not a fixed narrative form, but one adaptable to various situations. This finding now invites a brief look at the use of the term "gospel" in the New Testament.

\textsuperscript{103}Ibid., p. 229. Note that it is not being claimed that the "sermons" were actually preached in an oral narrative form, but that Luke apparently assumed that they would have taken that form. The tradition would have taken more time to develop than this. See the discussion of the term "evangelist", below, under "The meaning of 'Gospel'".

\textsuperscript{104}Dibelius, FTG, e.g., pp. 14f. The present hypothesis, however, runs counter to what Dibelius considered likely, as described in the pages cited.
The meaning of "gospel". A cursory glance at a Greek concordance will reveal that both the noun, "gospel", εὐαγγέλιον, and the verb based on it, "to preach (gospel)", εὐαγγελίζειν, are sometimes used absolutely and sometimes used so as to specify their content. For Paul this content is, as Gerhard Friedrich put it, simply Jesus the Christ. One should add, Jesus the Christ as preached, for it does not seem that the term ever became simply a coin for "Christian doctrine", except again as it is proclaimed. "Gospel" can be used to indicate the Christian cause generally as in 1 Corinthians 9:12,18b,23, but even in this context the cause is perceived as a missionary cause (see 1 Cor. 9:14,16,18a), which is carried out, of course, by "preaching" (1 Cor. 9:16).

Luke prefers the verb form and uses it almost exclusively in both his Gospel and in Acts. The verb is consistently used to describe missionary preaching in Acts. When it is not used intransitively there, its object will usually be "Jesus Christ". When Paul uses the verb transitively, the noun "gospel" is often the object. The great majority of uses of the noun and

105Gerhard Friedrich, "εὐαγγέλιον", TDNT, 2:731.
107See, 1 Cor. 9:18, 15:1, 2 Cor. 11:7, and Gal. 1:11.
verb, "gospel", in the New Testament are found in these two writers, and it appears consistently to refer to "Jesus Christ who is preached". In itself, this does not prove anything specific about the form of that preaching, but it does locate the term as to its meaning and reference in early Christian parlance: missionary preaching about Jesus. And this is significant for understanding the term's use in Mark's Gospel.

Turning to Mark 1:1, one finds the Pauline-looking phrase, "(The beginning of) the gospel of Jesus Christ", as the introduction to the whole. Five of the remaining six occurrences are absolute in form (1:15, 8:35, 10:29, 13:10, 14:9). The sixth occurrence, Mark 1:14, has as its referent, "kingdom of God", and 1:15, which is closely tied to 1:14, should be assumed to share its reference.

Two other instances, 13:10 and 14:9, appear to be used in a manner quite similar to that of Paul and Acts. Willi Marxsen devotes considerable discussion to Mark's use of "gospel", beginning with the assertion that Mark has adopted the term from Christian missionary terminology (see 13:10, in particular). The phrase in 8:35 and 10:29, "for my sake and the gospel's", which is shortened to "for my sake" in the parallels of Matthew and Luke, tends to identify Jesus and the gospel, according to Marxsen. Concerning this phrase he finds that:

108 Marxsen, Mark, pp. 127, 129.
For Mark the gospel is the (or a) form in which Jesus is made present. For this reason, Mark inserts the term wherever Jesus is mentioned [i.e., in 8:35 and 10:29]. On the other hand, the (proclaimed) gospel is Jesus' representative. It thus reflects a feature which all but eliminates historical distance, but by emphasizing and retaining the historical reference. Not only in Jesus' lifetime could a person undertake something for his sake. He can do so today as well, and in fact when he undertakes it for the gospel's sake.109

Therefore, when the gospel is proclaimed, its content (the Lord) is contemporaneous with the hearer.110 Returning to the first verse of Mark with this understanding, Marxsen holds that the term gospel here is intended as a summation to the whole: his book is to be read as a "proclamation", a "sermon".111

Although the conception of Mark's composition suggested here is radically different from that of Marxsen,112 this does not invalidate his exegesis here. One could differ with him on minor points, but there is considerable merit in his interpretation of Mark's understanding of "gospel". However the difference between

109 Ibid., pp. 128f.


111 Marxsen, Mark, pp. 131ff., 138.

112 Described, Ibid., pp. 15-29, as counter to the "natural" tendency of the tradition to fragment continually.
the conceptions of Mark's composition leads to a different understanding of the significance of this interpretation: Mark is not necessarily, as Marxsen has it, a unique development contrary to the tendency of the tradition; quite the opposite, Mark's composition would be typical of the tradition—an oral narrative, repeatedly composed both by Mark and other early Christian "preachers".113

Could this practice be reflected in the title, "evangelist" (also derived from "gospel"), which occurs three times in later New Testament writings? In Ephesians 4:12, it is third in the list of office-charismata after apostles and prophets; in 2 Timothy 4:5, it is mentioned in the context of an exhortation to preach and to preach soundly—avoiding fables or "myths" (which is a narrative form); and in Acts 21:8—late in Luke's history—Paul and his party are said to arrive at the house of "Philip the evangelist" in Caesarea.

This Philip was one of the seven "Hellenist" leaders of the early Jerusalem community and was singled out with Stephen as a missionary preacher. Why does Luke use this term? Can Luke have used the term "evangelist" without it meaning "preacher of the gospel of Jesus

113 This would cohere with the thesis of Graham N. Stanton, Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974). But this connection cannot be pursued here, until the basic hypothesis that Mark was an oral traditional narrative is tested and finds some degree of acceptance.
Christ", in light of his general preference for the verb form? It is not likely. The title must surely be of some particular meaning, for Luke knew of many preachers but only uses this title here. It could be that Philip was known to have become a "Gospel" narrator after arriving in Caesarea. And why does the title become attached to Philip only now? Perhaps the term could only have meaning after a significant lapse of time from the inception of the church, during which an oral narrative tradition might have had time to develop. The location is also right: a Greek, oral Jesus-tradition would most likely take root in a region with a fairly dense Christian population, probably among people who had witnessed or had first-hand access to stories about Jesus' ministry.

Philip, the "Hellenist" leader, formerly of Jerusalem and now resident in Caesarea, is located by Luke in just the right area where conditions would be conducive to the rise of such a tradition, and he is just the right kind of person to be in on it at its inception. This is conjecture, of course, but it does seem reasonable to believe that the proper conditions for an oral Jesus-tradition to have arisen were present in a Greek-speaking, Jewish-Christian community found in a place like Caesarea.

Peter in the Papias testimony. Finally, it may be worthwhile to consider the testimony of Papias recorded by
The identity of the individual who composed what is called Mark's Gospel is of no immediate concern for the present hypothesis—particularly after Boman's scenario. What is interesting is Papias' description of Peter's teaching: "... Peter, who adapted his teachings to the needs (of the hearers), but not as if he were drawing up a connected account of the Lord's oracles." Many things are unclear about what is meant here and why it was said, not to mention doubts about the historical trustworthiness of the record. But the description of Peter's activity, "adapting his teaching", is similar to the technique of the oral narrator who may exercise considerable flexibility in addressing his audience. If by "connected account" (σύνταξις) is meant a formal and complete account of the "Lord's oracles", such as Luke claims to provide (Luke 1:1-4), then the contrast is between Petrine compositions of the character of Kleinliteratur and expectations of something approaching Hochliteratur. Luke certainly seems to aspire to the latter, in contrast perhaps to the predecessors he mentions.

---


116 Martin, Mark, p. 82, suggests another possible interpretation of the passage.
Oral characteristics of Mark. The circumstantial "evidence" offered may be intriguing, but can be no more than this. The question must finally be settled in terms of Mark's text, itself, as it is presumably the text closest to the tradition itself. At the end of the second chapter, a brief list of general oral characteristics was drawn up: interjections, false starts, obscure pronouns, shifting to present tense at key moments, and rhetorical questions, in addition to a general paratactic style. These characteristics are present in Mark, and provide presumptive evidence to justify a full oral-formulaic analysis of the Gospel.

Mark's fondness for interjection is well attested. C. H. Turner provides a list of some twenty examples of "parenthetical clauses" in Mark.\footnote{C. H. Turner, "Marcan Usage", JTS 26 (1925), 145-155. He lists: 1:2-3; 2:10f.,15f.,26b; 3:22-30; 6:14f.; 7:2,3f.,18f.,25-26a; 8:14-17; 9:36-42; 13:9-11,14; 16:3f.,7. Others could be added. See the discussion of "explanatory" formulas in chap. 4. Others to mention the phenomenon include Nigel Turner, in James Hope Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, 4 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906-76), vol. 4: Style (1976), pp. 26ff. (cited hereafter as N. Turner, Style); and Max Zerwick, Untersuchungen zur Markus-Stil (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1937), pp. 130-38.} False starts are not obvious in Mark: two possibilities would be 10:46, where Jesus' entering and leaving Jericho is reported in one sentence; and 11:11, where Jesus enters the Temple, but simply departs until his dramatic action of the next day. Frequent and inconsistent use of impersonal plural by Mark
forces one to infer the subjects of various statements: forces one to infer the subjects of various statements: this corresponds to the characteristic of "obscure pronouns" in oral expression. Sometimes Mark's referent is tacit; other times the impersonal plural is even followed by a singular subject. Mark's frequent shift of tense and fondness for the historic present are also well attested. Rhetorical questions occur frequently. Finally, the paratactic style of Mark has also been long observed, and frequent comments about his vernacular, "spoken" Greek are found. Some of these characteristics are frequently taken for Semitisms, but all are equally likely to be

---


123 Lagrange, Saint Marc, pp. lxx, lxxii, lxxxii; Taylor, Mark, p. 52; and Haenchen, Weg Jesu, p. 29.

124 See esp., Taylor, Mark, pp. 56-66; and N. Turner, Style, pp. 19-27.
simply "oral" usage. So, it appears that numerous characteristics of Mark's Gospel are typical of "oral" expression—even Kelber acknowledges this.125

Two factors already suggest a close relation of Mark's Gospel to oral tradition. These are: the "oral" characteristics of Mark's expression which have just been discussed; and Schmidt's analysis of Mark and his early identification of the Gospels with Kleinliteratur. These, combined with Lord's opinion that all three Synoptic Gospels could be treated as parallel traditional narrative, give quite adequate cause to subject Mark to an oral-formulaic analysis, in order to see if Mark's relation to oral tradition may be specified further by this means.

---

125 Kelber, "Mark and Oral Tradition", pp. 34, 39f., lists (1) frequency of simple καὶ parataxis, (2) habitual use of εὐθὺς, (3) preference for direct speech, (4) predominance of historical present tense, (5) "the lack of an artistically reflected prose", (6) an "incomplete characterization of Jesus", (7) the "gospel's exposition as a series of events", and (8) "little enthusiasm for the abstract". Cf., more recently, Kelber, Oral and Written Gospel, pp. 64-68.
PART II

AN ORAL-FORMULAIC ANALYSIS OF MARK'S GOSPEL
CHAPTER 4

FORMULAIC ANALYSIS OF MARK

The hypothesis that Mark's Gospel is an oral traditional composition is both an old and a new suggestion. As has been noted, Johann Gottfried Herder theorized that Mark was based directly on an early Christian "oral Gospel" back in the eighteenth century. This view has been advocated recently by Thorlief Boman.¹ The present hypothesis differs from these in that its concept of oral tradition is not one of transmission of a verbally fixed text, but of successive (re-)compositions of a "Gospel" narrative by oral narrators. These narrators exercise traditional "improvisation" in their compositions by using the means provided by the tradition—"formulaic" phraseology, "thematic" episodes, and larger "biographical" patterns. Their improvisation is not totally free, because of their dependence upon the traditional means, but they use these means to meet and satisfy the conditions of each separate "performance" by adaptation of their narrative.²

Form criticism in its way had also understood Mark to be a traditional "composition". The Gospel was no more

¹See above, pp. 1f., 111ff.
than an element of the traditional process: a stage in the evolutionary development of the tradition from a mass of short, primitive *Einzelpreichte* up through levels of increasing length and complexity, and even into "unliterary" written form.\(^3\) The present hypothesis differs again: initially under the impact of the recognition that there are in fact "literary" qualities in Mark's Gospel; and subsequently on account of the discovery that oral traditional composition could indeed be a "literary" process itself. The form-critical model of evolutionary development of the tradition, under the influence of exclusively "social" forces is therefore neither adequate to account for the nature of Mark's Gospel, nor accurate in its description of the traditional process.\(^4\)

The oral-formulaic theory, which was described and discussed in the first two chapters, provides the theoretical framework for the present hypothesis that Mark is an oral traditional composition. In his statement of the theory, Albert Lord suggested means for testing such a hypothesis, by looking for evidence of the use of formulaic phraseology and of themes in the text of the composition under consideration.


\(^4\)See above, pp. 93-103.
The second part of this thesis is therefore an "experiment". First of all it is a test of the hypothesis of the oral traditional composition of Mark's Gospel. Secondly, the very attempt to apply Lord's criteria for orality to Mark is experimental: it is necessary to work with the particular nature of Mark's Gospel, and to do so in the context of a considerable body of prior research. Accordingly, this chapter will attempt a "formulaic analysis" of Mark's narrative and chapter 5 will conduct a thematic analysis. Each chapter will include a discussion of method before the analysis proper.

**Method for Formulaic Analysis**

The formula as originally defined by Parry and Lord and as presented in chapter 1 was conditioned by the presence of poetic meter in both Homeric epics and the Southslavic epic tradition. Subsequent discussion of the formula as related in chapter 2 appears to lead to the recognition that formulaic expression is in fact common in all oral narration whether poetry or prose, and that the meter of the epic poetry has served to give epic formulas a greater "visibility" by creating a relatively high degree of stability in wording and phraseology.

---

5See above, pp. 29f., 32.

Two consequences follow. First, a formulaic analysis of a prose text like Mark's is a theoretically valid procedure. Second, the formulaic analysis of prose will not have the clarity and "objectivity" that it could have with a poetic text, in which the meter provided a "control" on lines and parts of lines, and also produced a greater stability of the formulas themselves. In Mark, the mere identification of a "line" is a more hazardous affair, although two scholars have endeavored to set the text into colometric form. And, as will be seen, the repetitive phraseology that is to be found in Mark is by no means woodenly reiterated. This is not surprising, but at the same time it makes "formulaic" claims based upon the imprecise repetitions more difficult.

Perhaps a more sophisticated approach than the one to be employed here could yield more quantifiable results. It may be for instance that one could develop the "generative" description of the formula and psycholinguistic analysis of oral speech processes into a more acute analytic method for identifying formulaic expression,
suitable for poetry and prose equally. The work involved in such a methodological synthesis would have led too far afield to be attempted within this thesis. Perhaps the thesis will help to motivate an attempt along these lines; it would undoubtedly be useful for many prose literatures. Sufficient oral prose narratives have presumably been collected to form a base of evidence analogous to the oral epic collection of Parry and Lord. Unfortunately there has been no comparable analysis of these to establish the presence, nature, and extent of formulaic expression in oral prose.10

"Formulas" in Prose

The method which is followed in this chapter simply adapts the oral-formulaic definition of the formula and of the "formulaic expression" to prose by elimination of the metrical requirement. This adaptation is probably imperfect, because of the derivation of that definition from poetic texts. Even so, Lord himself appears ready to extend his understanding of the formula into prose expression, and therefore to allow for the adaptation.

In a recent article, Lord provided a "recapitula-

tion" of the nature of formulaic expression.\textsuperscript{11} He made three points which provide a basis from which to proceed.

(1) Formulaic style is not peculiar language, but a function of the repetitive matter of traditional stories. Language itself is already "organized in substitution systems in repeated syntactic patterns". The storyteller, who frequently repeats his ideas "in the same or very similar words", simply uses a limited amount of the language available to him.\textsuperscript{12}

(2) For the story told in verse "the requirements of the medium limit the possible choices of phrases more than does prose, and the repeated phrases become more noticeable, more 'visible'. The formulas and the network of phrases like them are more numerous in traditional sung verse than in prose."

(3) A "weave" of formulas and formulaic expressions is characteristic of oral-formulaic style. A literary imitator is likely to employ the repeated phrases, which are more obvious, but would find the weave "more difficult, perhaps impossible to imitate".

The third point is already found in Parry, who observed that Homeric formulas were emulated by composers of written epics as a stylistic feature of the epic genre, even though the overall expression of the written epics was not "formulaic".\textsuperscript{13} This use of "obvious" formulas for effect by literary writers corresponds to the general pattern of differences between oral and written literature regarding repetition: oral literature works by "repetition with varitation", and written literature either avoids repetition or selectively uses it for special


\textsuperscript{13}See above, p. 54; and also Lord, "Homer as Oral Poet", HSCP 72 (1967), 21, 29, on "oral imitative" texts.
effect.\textsuperscript{14}

Given that formulaic speech is the product of oral traditional narration and composition, and that the difference between prose and poetry in this regard is a matter of degree, it is justifiable to look for evidence of formulaic expression in Mark's Gospel as the product of the oral Synoptic tradition. It is not expected that fully-blown formulaic systems will appear—both the prose and the relatively short text of Mark would appear to prohibit this. The term "formulaic phraseology" is used here in order to express the relationship of this analysis with the oral-formulaic approach to oral tradition. Yet one must allow for the difference between Mark's prose and epic poetry, and recognize that the procedure followed here is tentative and undoubtedly open to improvement.

The formula is defined by Lord as "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea."\textsuperscript{15} Study of the debate about the nature of the formula has suggested that "metrical conditions" are not essential, and that formulas

\textsuperscript{14} See the comments of Archer Taylor, "Folklore and the Student of Literature", Study of Folklore, ed. Alan Dundes (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp. 39f.; cited above, p. 82. See also, Gyula Ortutay, Hungarian Folklore (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1972), p. 136: "Unchanged repetition and multiplication of the authentic and unique form are the predominant tendency of literature. . . . Oral tradition is dominated by the revival and reshaping of the transmitted material."

\textsuperscript{15} Lord, Singer, p. 30.
are simply at the most stable end of a spectrum of formulaic diction. So, a phrase in Mark will be called a formula when it consists of at least two significant and identical terms. Allowances will be made for inflection and conjugation of terms within the phrases, and for alteration in the definite article, as these are the result of normal syntactical processing of the formulaic phraseology.  

Lord defines a formulaic expression as "a group of words having the same basic pattern of rhythm and syntax, with at least one word in the same position in common with other lines or half-lines in the text". Lord specifies that the words in the same position in different expressions need not be identical, but must have the same grammatical (and rhythmical) function. As with the formula, the rhythm or meter is not essential, even though its absence will result in greater diversity and therefore less precision in analysis. For this reason, two classes of formulaic expression will be indicated in this analysis: those having at least one particular term in com-

---

16 So Kiparsky, "Oral Poetry", Oral Literature and the Formula, eds. Benjamin Stolz and Richard Shannon (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1976), pp. 83-88; see above, p. 62. Lord specifically allows this, too: "Homer as Oral Poet", p. 25. In poetry with a tight meter, the "processing" might result in a phrase that would not "fit", calling for an alternative phrase to be used. In prose this need not happen (although it might in the case of a cadenced oral prose performance) and more variation becomes likely.

17 Lord, Singer, p. 42.
mon, and those having only a common syntactical pattern. The second class is, of course, more ambiguous and vague in a prose composition such as Mark's Gospel.

Selection of Text

In the Singer of Tales, Lord selected the first fifteen lines of the Iliad for the formulaic analysis.\textsuperscript{18} In a more recent article, Lord reports that for seminar work on texts, twenty-five to one hundred line samplings from more than one part of a text are subjected to analysis.\textsuperscript{19} This expanded analysis would appear a better procedure but is more readily carried out by a group.

It is not practical for an individual to attempt an analysis of an entire text of Mark's length, and only a selected portion of Mark's text is dealt with here. That portion is the first chapter of Mark, which provides a substantial sample of Mark's language, and also a mixture of what is considered "redactional" and "traditional" material.\textsuperscript{20} Ideally, more portions of text could be analyzed, especially from the Passion narrative and other sections of Mark commonly considered to be "textual"

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{18}Ibid., pp. 142f.
\item \textsuperscript{19}Lord, "Homer as Oral Poet", pp. 20-29.
\item \textsuperscript{20}The "redactional text" of E. J. Pryke, Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 151ff., e.g., lists about two-thirds of chapter 1 as "redactional" and the remainder as "source".
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
sources for the evangelist. For the present, especially
given the likely scope for improvement of the analytical
method to be used, the analysis of a more limited portion
of text will have to do. The present analysis will be
successful even if it does no more than encourage a
refinement of the method and an extension of the passages
considered.

Arrangement of Text

The text of the passage from the Iliad selected by
Lord was readily laid out into lines of metric verse.
From there it was a relatively straightforward process to
search for related lines and parts of lines in the rest of
the Iliad, through the use of a concordance.

As has been indicated, two colometric arrangements
of Mark's text are available. The analysis follows that
of Frans Neirynck, with minor alterations of his text.
For the most part these alterations result from (1)
adjustment of Neirynck's text to bring it into verbal
agreement with the twenty-sixth edition of the Nestle-
Aland Novum Testamentum Graece, and (2) comparison with

21 Some consideration will be given to the distribu-
tion of formulaic "analogy" from Mark 1 over the remain-
der of the Gospel; see below, figure 4.3.

22 Neirynck, Duality, pp. 139-91.

23 Novum Testamentum Graece, 26th ed., eds. Kurt
Aland and others (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung,
1979; abbr.: NA26). Neirynck's text was NA25; the NA26
is used for the sake of convenience and as a standard for
the analysis.
the colometric text of James A. Kleist.24

Lord set his findings into the form of a chart, printing the lines of text with two levels of underlining, one for the entire line of text and a second for parts of the line. Formulas were indicated by a solid line beneath the appropriate text and formulaic expressions by a broken line. The underlining, in turn, was keyed to a set of notes which provided the location and text of the analogous phrases elsewhere in the poetry.25

A similar procedure is followed here. A colometric text of Mark 1 is printed in figure 4.1. Two levels of underlining are used, the upper for the entire line, and the lower for parts of the line. Three types of underlining are used to indicate the three levels of "formulaic phraseology": a double underline will indicate "formulas", a single underline will indicate "formulaic phrases", and a broken underline will indicate a "syntactical patterning".

Each line of text in figure 4.1 will be keyed to the notes for the analysis, which are located in appendix 2, "Notes to the Formulaic Analysis of Mark 1:1-45." Every line of a verse is assigned a small letter (for example, the four lines of 1:13 are 13a, 13b, 13c, and 13d, respectively). In the notes, and also in references

24 See fn. 7, above. There are no major differences between the two arrangements.

to individual lines in this chapter, the verse number plus a letter will refer to a particular line of text as arranged in figure 4.1. Consecutive lines will be indicated to by use of the appropriate letters (as in, 13cd).

Discussion of the analysis will proceed in the following manner. First the overall results, as displayed in figure 4.1, will be stated and their implications considered. Second, some characteristics of Mark's phraseology and material which affected the analysis will be outlined. Third, consideration will be given to the distribution of formulaic phraseology, both within Mark's first chapter and over the remainder of the Gospel. Finally, conclusions regarding the results, or effects, of the analysis will be drawn.
FIGURE 4.1
FORMULAIC ANALYSIS OF MARK 1:1-45

1 ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἵσσου χριστοῦ [υἱοῦ θεοῦ]
2 καθὼς γεγραπται εν τῷ Ἑβραίῳ τῷ προφήτῃ
   ἰδοὺ αποστέλλω τοῖς ἀγγέλον μου πρὸς προσωποῦ σου
   ὑμῶν κατεσκευάσει τὴν οὐδὲν σου
3 θνηθεὶς δομηθεὶς εἰς τῇ ἐρημῷ
   ετοιμάζετε τὴν οὐδὲν κυρίου
   εὐθείας τοῖς ταῖς πρώτας του αἵματι του
4 ἐγένετο ἰωάννης [ὁ] βαπτιστής εἰς τῇ ἐρημῷ
   καὶ κηρύσσων βαπτισμά μετανοια εἰς αφεσὶς αμαρτιῶν
5 καὶ ἐκείποντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πασα ἡ οὐδέτερα χώρα
   καὶ οἱ ἰεροσολυμίται πάντες
   καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ εἰς τῷ ἱεράν ὄποιαν
   ἐξομολογούμενοι ταῖς αμαρτιαῖς αὐτῶν
6 καὶ ἡ ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμπλοῦ
   καὶ ἐπηνεκράνετο περὶ τὴν οὐδέτεραν αὐτοῦ
   καὶ ἔστιν ἀκραίδας καὶ μῆλον ἀγρίου
7 καὶ εκηρύσσεσεν λεγὼν
   ἐρχέται ὁ ἑκατοτέρος μου ὁπισώ μου
   οὗ ὡρίζεται ἡ θνατικὴ μου θνατικὴ μου ἐν ἡμῖν
   τῶν ὑποθέματων αὐτοῦ
8 εἰς ἐβαπτίσα σὺμος υδατί
   αὐτοῦ δὲ βαπτίσει υμᾶς εἰς πνεῦμα αγίῳ
9 καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς ἐκεῖνο εἰς ἡμέρας
   ήλθεν ὁ υἱὸς απὸ τὸν θανάτον
   καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο εἰς τὸν ἤλευσθεν υπὸ ἰωάννου
10 καὶ εὐθύς αναβαίνων εἰς τὸν υδατός
   εἰδὲν σχισμένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς
11 καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα κατὰ πρώτην καταβαίνων εἰς αὐτοῦ
12 καὶ θυσίᾳ ἐγένετο εἰς τῶν οὐρανῶν
   εἰς τοῖς καταβαίνον ὧν ὡρίζεται
   εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν ἐρημών

NOTE: Double underline indicates a formula. Single underline indicates a formulaic expression. Broken underline indicates syntactic patterning only.
FIGURE 4.1—Continued

13 καὶ ἡν εν τῷ ἐρήμῳ τεσσεράκοντα ημέρας
tειραγμένον υπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ
cαὶ ἡν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων
καὶ οἱ αγγέλοι διηκονοῦν αὐτῷ

14 μετὰ δὲ τοῦ παραδοθήναι τον ἰωάννην
ηλθεν ὁ ἵσσους εἰς τὴν γαλιλαίαν
κηρύσσων το εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ

15 καὶ λεγὼν στὶ
πεπληρωματο οἱ καιροι
καὶ ἡγικεν η βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
μετανοεῖτε
καὶ πιστευετε εν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ

16 καὶ παραγνυν παρὰ τὴν θαλάσσαν τῆς γαλιλαίας
eἰδέν σιμών καὶ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ αἰελφόν σιμώνος
ἀμέβαλλοντας εἰς τῇ θαλάσσῃ

17 καὶ εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ὁ ἵσσους
ἐδείκτει ὁ ποταμὸς μου
καὶ ποιημόν ὡς γενεσθαι αἰλιείς αὐτῶν

18 καὶ εὐθύς ἄφνετε τὰ δίκτυα

19 καὶ πρώβασε ολίγουν

20 καὶ εὐθύς οκαλέσαν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἄφνετε τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν θεμεδαίον εἰς τῷ πλοῖῳ

21 καὶ εἰσκατεύοντο εἰς καθαρρακω
καὶ εὐθύς τοῖς σαββάσιν εἰσέλθων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν

22 καὶ εἰσελπορούντω εἰς τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ αὐτοῦ

23 καὶ εὐθύς ἦν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν

24 καὶ ἀνεκράζεν λέγων

τῷ ημῖν καὶ σοι ἢσου ναζαρηνε

ηλθεν απολέσαι ημᾶς
οἶδα σε τίς εἶ ὁ ἁγιος τοῦ θεοῦ
FIGURE 4.1—Continued

25 καὶ επετιμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἱησοῦς λεγὼν
     φιμωθῆτι
    καὶ εξελθε έξ αὐτοῦ
26 καὶ σαραζαν αὐτον το πνεύμα το ακαθαρτον
     καὶ φωνασαν φωνη μεγαλη
     εξελθεν έξ αὐτοῦ
27 καὶ εθαμβησαν απαντησ
     ωστε συζητειν προσ εαυτου λεγοντας
     τί εστιν τοντο
     διδαξα καινη κατ’ εξουσιαν
     και τοις πνευμασι τοις ακαθαρτοις επιτασσει
     και υπακουουσιν αυτῷ
28 καὶ εξηλθεν η ακοὴ αὐτου ευθυς πανταχου εις ολην
     την περιχωρον την γαλαλαιασ
29 καὶ ευθυς εκ της συναγης εξελθοντεσ
     ηλθον εις την οικιαν σιμωνος και ανδρου
     μετα ιακωβου και ιωαννου
30 η δε πενθερα σιμωνος κατεκετα πυρεσοουσα
     και ευθυς λεγουσιν αυτω περι αυτησ
31 καὶ προσελθων ηγειρεν αυτην
     κρατησας την χειροσ
     και αφηκεν αυτην ο πυρετος
     και διηκονει αυτοισ
32 οφιας δε γενομενησ
     οτε εδυ ο πλιοσ
     εφερον προς αυτον παντας τως κακως εχοντας
     και τους δαιμονιζομενουσ
33 και ην ολη η πολις επισυνημενη προς την θωραν
34 και εβεραπευσεν πολλους κακως εχοντας ποικιλαις νοσοισ
     και δαιμονια πολλα εξεβαλεν
     και ουκ ηφιεν λαειν τα δαιμονια
     οτι ηθειαν αυτον
35 και τρω ηνυχα λιαν αναστας εξηλθεν
     και απηλθεν εις ερημον τοπον
     κακει προσηφυσετο
36 και κατεδιωξεν αυτον οιμων και οι μετ’ αυτου
37 και ευρον αυτον
     και λεγουσιν αυτῳ στι
     παντας επητουσιν σε
38 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς
αγιωτεκνὴν ἀλλαχὺν εἰς ταύτα ἐχομενας κωμοπόλεις
ινα καὶ εκεί κηρύζω
εἰς τοῦτο γαρ εξήλθον
39 καὶ ἠλθὲν κηρύσσων εἰς ταύτα συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην

eczayxev 4
καὶ τὰ δοιμονία εκβάλλων
40 καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρον
παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν
[καὶ γονυπετῶν]
καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι
εὰν θέλῃ ἰδίως καὶ λαμβάνει με καθαρίσαι
41 καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς εκτείνας τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἤπατο
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ
θέλω καθαρισθῆναι
42 καὶ εὐθὺς απῆλθεν αὐτῷ εἰς αὐτὸν ἥ λεπρα
καὶ εκαθαρίσθη
43 καὶ εὐθὺς εἰσεβάλεν αὐτῷ
cαὶ λέγει αὐτῷ
εὐθὺς εἰσεβάλεν αὐτῷ
44 ὁ δὲ εξελθὼν πρῶτον κηρύσσειν πολλὰ
cαὶ διαφημίζειν τοῦ λόγου
ωστε μηκετὶ αὐτῷ δυναθαι φανερωσ εἰς τολίν εἰσελθειν
45 ἄλλῳ εἰς τόπους ἐκείνοις ποιεῖσθαι τὸν λόγον
καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν παράτηθεν
Overall Result

Of the 136 lines of Mark 1:1-45 in figure 4.1, twenty-one lines were formulas (plus twelve part-lines), twenty-six were formulaic, and eight were syntactical patternings. Only thirty-one lines were entirely without any formulaic analogies, or about 23 per cent. Seventy-seven per cent therefore qualify as "formulaic" phraseology.

Such a percentage may be misleading in appearing definite and precise. In fact the situation is complex. Often one line contained more than one phraseological analogy to other lines in Mark's text, making for a still higher concentration; on the other hand some lines appear "formulaic" only on the basis of a word or phrase carried over from a previous line.

---

26 Whole line formulas: 1:11a, 17a, 22a, 24b, 25c, 26c, 27f, 30b, 31(a)b, 31d, 32a, 34a, 34b, 37b, 38a, 39b, 40b, 41b, 43a, 44a, 44f. Part-lines: 1:1, 9a, 11b, 22b, 23, 26a, 27b, 27e, 32c, 34a, 35b, 45d.

27 Formulaic lines: 1:1, 2a, 4a, 4b, 5a, 5b, 7a, 9a, 9b, 9c, 10a, 10b, 11b, 12, 13a, 13c, 13d, 14a, 14b, 14c, 15a, 16abc, 16d, 17b, 18a, 18b, 19abc, 20a, 20b, 20c, 21bc, 22b(c?), 23, 24a, 24d, 25ab, 26a, 26b, 27a, 27b, 27c, 27d, 27e, 28, 29ab, 31a, 32b, 32c, 35a, 35b, 35c, 37c, 39a, 40a, 40cd, 40ef, 41a, 41cd, 42b, 43b, 44b, 44c, 45a, 45b, 45c, 45e. (Eight formulaic expressions cover more than one line of figure 4.1.)

28 Syntactical patternings: 1:6ac, 21a, 31c, 33, 38d, 42a, 45d.

29 No formulaic elements: 1:2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, 3c, 5c, 6b, 7b, 7c, 8a, 8b, 10c, 11c, 13b, 15bcde, 17c, 22c, 24c, 30a, 34cd, 36, 37a, 38bc, 41a, 44de.
Despite these problematic factors, the formulaic percentage leans toward the 80 per cent minimum benchmark which Lord set for oral formulaic poetry.\textsuperscript{30} That this occurs in a prose composition is at first glance remarkable and strongly suggests the oral composition of this chapter. As was indicated earlier, any percentage of formulaic phrases must be taken cautiously, due to the difficulty in defining lines of text and to the fact that the identity of a "formula" and of a "formulaic expression"—so clearly defined in epic poetry with the aid of a recognized metrical system—is more vague for prose.

**Characteristics**

Repeated phrases which contain at least two significant terms, and which appear to be reasonably self-contained, have been designated as formulas. Thus in 1:1 υίοῦ ἑκοῦ is a formula, but 1:2α καθὸς γέγραπται is not, because the preposition which is part of this phrase here and in 9:13 and 14:21 is never the same. It may be remembered that there are over half as many formulaic part-lines as there are whole lines.

Formulaic phrases consist in phrases with a common syntactical structure and at least one significant term in common. One exception to the rule for identifying formulaic phrases is the decision to count epexegetical καὶ ὡς phrases (1.13ac) as formulaic. These are so common in

\textsuperscript{30}Lord, "Homer as Oral Poet", pp. 33f.
Mark, and so characteristic, that the description appears justified. Neither the copula nor the conjunction alone could be called significant terms, but their characteristic use together in Mark as adding further description is clearly formulaic. Some periphrastic phrases (for example, 1:22b, 33, 1:6ac?) and "γάρ explanatory" phrases (1:16d, 22b) are also treated as formulaic types of the ἐν epexegetical.

Where the ἐν epexegetical phrase has no other words in common with other phrases in Mark, it is marked as a "syntactical" formulaic phrase, to distinguish it from those phrases which are identifiable upon the basis of both common words and syntax.

The lack of meter means, among other things, that particles could be freely included or omitted in formulas and formulaic expressions, depending upon the habit, or the whim, of the narrator. The inclusion of τὸ ὅσις, say, in the καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς convention in Mark 1:30b did not prevent its classification as a formula. One cannot

---

31 The border between periphrasis as a true predicate compound and as copula plus adjectival participle is often vague: e.g., 1:13ab. Cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 163. Where a periphrastic is used epexegetically, it is often taken in the latter sense.

32 C. H. Bird, "Some γάρ Clauses in St. Mark's Gospel", JTS n.s. 4 (1953), 171-87, describes Mark's use of these clauses as having an "assertive-allusive" function for the evangelist. They extend "an invitation to understand the context in the light of something outside the data explicitly presented to us" (p. 173). Matthew and Luke habitually omit these interjections.
entirely explain Mark's use of εὐθὺς but it could be used as a "hesitation" word, for emphasis, for balance in oral expression, or for narrative effect. Any of these would make its occurrence in the text unpredictable.

Another particle whose presence or absence was not deemed of much significance is the definite article. A. T. Robertson notes that its use is, in Koine, "convenient" and not a necessity: context may often suffice to fulfill its function. Its presence or absence may be due again to the whim or habit of the speaker when speaking in a given context. Examples of formulas with "optional" definite articles include 1:1, 3:11, 15:39: (ὁ) ὑιός (τοῦ) θεοῦ, and 1:32c, 34a: (τοῦ) κακῶς ἔχοντας. Lord has already noted that in the formulas of oral poetry declension and order of words may vary. Such variation is even more to be expected in prose.

It may be observed in the notes to the formulaic analysis that several formulas are complemented by a cluster of related "formulaic" phrases. This phenomenon is found in the oral poetry analyzed by Lord as well, and

---

33 Rosenberg, Art of the American Folk Preacher, pp. 66ff., has documented the occurrence of such a practice in the oral prose sermons of folk preachers.


35 Lord, "Homer as Oral Poet", p. 25.

36 1:1, 11b, 17a, 25c, 31ab, 31d, 34a, 35b.
illustrates the nature of formulaic expression as a linguistic convenience for the oral performer. Often such a cluster pattern extends over more than one line (for example, 1:16abc, 19abc; 2:14). As will be seen in chapter 5, certain "themes" are characterized by a common "language" as well.

Other formulas are repeated within a pericope, for example, 1:25c and 26c. This particular formula also occurs elsewhere in Mark. But there are several sets of formulaic phrases which are not found outside the rather narrow context of a pericope. Although these do meet the usual criteria for formulaic phraseology, nevertheless it could be objected that their existence only here cannot demonstrate an oral "style" of expression, because the first use immediately suggests the next.

There would be no conclusive response to this. One could only appeal to the relative shortness of Mark's text as providing a limited sample of the form of expression of its composer. It could also be observed, more positively, that such a repetition is itself characteristic of an oral narrator for whom a varied phraseology was not of interest as it would normally be for a literate author: Olrik's law of similarity may be seen to be operative here.

The formulaic pairs within a pericope provide an

---

37 E.g., 1:17b/20c, 22b/27d, 38cd/39a, 40ef/41de/42b.

38 Lord, Singer, p. 133. See the partial list of Olrik's "laws" above, pp. 66f.
opportunity to glance at contrasts in the phraseology of the three Synoptics. Within Mark 1:16-20, 17c and 20c are formulaically related phrases:

(17c) δεῦτε δπίσω μου; and
(20c) ἀπῆλθον δπίσω αὐτοῦ.

In Matthew's parallel, 4:18-22, the first phrase is retained in 4:19. The second is changed in 4:22 to the more technical ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ, which Matthew also employs at 4:20 (=Mark 1:18b). Luke's account of the call 5:1-11 is substantially different, providing no place for either of Mark's phrases. It ends, however, like Matthew's with the technical formula, ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

Matthew uses ἄφεντες ... ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ twice (4:20,22) in the passage, whereas Mark uses it only the first time (1:18b), switching to ἄφεντες ... ἀπῆλθον δπίσω αὐτοῦ (1:20c) the second. This is strange, if Mark is formulaic, why the "switch"? Is Matthew also formulaic, perhaps even more formulaic? If there was a metrical pattern here, it could easily be determined whether Mark's formula-switch was related to the immediate requirements of expression or not. If it was not, and the switch was for the sake of literary novelty, then one would have concrete evidence against the oral origin of Mark. As there is no metrical structure to serve as a guide, two things may be said.

(1) Mark indeed knows the ἄφεντες ... ἡκολούθησαν formula (see appendix 2 on 1:18a), but also knows another formulaic expression of motion verb plus δπίσω,
perhaps related to the dominical logion found in Mark 8:34.39

(2) Matthew's action is typical of his style. He tends to describe some things with identical wordings:

4:20 οἱ δὲ εὐθέως ἄφεντες (τὰ δίκτυα)

4:22 οἱ δὲ εὐθέως ἄφεντες (τὸ πλοῖον . . .)

Matthew is even more "formulaic", in his use of fixed phrases, than Mark. He exercises the alternative to the more usual literary tendency to variation—that is, exact repetition.40 His expression approaches the literary manipulation of formulas which also characterized the literary epic poets as they followed and imitated Homer. It fits in with what Lord had predicted of the literary imitator of oral-formulaic narration, that is, the imitation of the repeated phrases.41 This might be credited to "Jewish" or "rabbinical" or "school" influence on Matthew's Gospel, but in any case appears to be a somewhat

39See also 8:33: ὑπαγε ὁ πίσω μου, σατανᾶ (1), and John 12:19, Τὸς δὲ κόσμος διήκονεν αὐτῷ ἀπῆλθεν. Perhaps also Mark 1:7 par.? Kendrick Grobel, "He that Cometh after Me", JBL 60 (1941), 397-41, has discussed the relationship among these phrases and argues that the preposition ἄνω also carries connotations of discipleship derived from an Aramaic expression. In any event, ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ does not appear to be the exclusive technical term for "follow as a disciple" in Mark.

40See fn. 14, above.

41Note in connection with Matthew's penchant for unchanged repetition that he takes the formula of Mark 1:22a almost word for word as the conclusion for the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. 7:28f. A full comparison of the expression of the three Synoptics with "formulaic" questions in mind would be a worthwhile endeavor, and might be of use in addressing the Synoptic problem.
different form of expression than is being claimed for Mark.

Matthew's language emphasizes discipleship by the appropriate terminology. Mark's gives coherence (and a rounded end) to the pericope: the second paired phrase (1:20c) describes the response of James and John and recalls the phrasing of Jesus' initial call in 1.17c. It is Mark's pericope that conveys the concept of discipleship. Other formula pairs within pericopes may be said to function in a similar manner.42

It must be reiterated that no "unusual" language is being claimed for Mark, nor is it to be expected that his "formulas" be grammatically remarkable in some way. The claim is that the repetitiveness of his expression suggests oral traditional composition by a narrator who has often heard and told his story, acquiring in the process the economical form of expression reflected in his formulaic phraseology.

Distribution

The formulaic expression in Mark 1 is distributed across both the chapter and, through the formulaic "analo-

42The same is true of Mark 1:22d/27d, 38cd/39a, and 40ef/41de/42b. Two different ideas are held together within one complex pericope by 1:22d/27d. 1:38cd/39a function transitionally (observe Luke's alteration of these phrases, 4:43f.); 1:40ef, 41de, 42b again provide coherence—but the redundant 42b is resolved (in different ways) by both Matt. 8:3 and Luke 5:13, even though they otherwise parallel Mark closely.
gies", across the rest of the Gospel. These may be looked at in turn.

Of the thirty-one lines without formulaic elements, five occur in an Old Testament quotation (1:2f.) and eight in sayings material (1:7f., 15). The remaining lines are scattered throughout the chapter.43

The Old Testament quotation at the beginning of Mark is credited to Isaiah, but, as is well known, actually includes not only words from LXX Isaiah 40:3 (significantly, these are the last three lines of the quotation), but also a collation of LXX Exodus 23:20 and (Hebrew?) Malachi 3:1.44 Both the misattribution and the collation rule out Mark's first-hand use of a written Old Testament text here.

The collation (Mark 1:2) and especially its mixed character, part LXX and part non-LXX, is likely to be an oral product. It appears to belong to Q as well, as both Matthew (11:10) and Luke (7:27) use it—in a different context.45 Given its nature as a quotation, not too different from a traditional saying, the lack of formulaic phraseology is not surprising.

43 1:5c, 6b, 10c, 11c, 13b, 17c, 22c, 24c, 30a, 34cd, 36, 37a, 38bc, 44de.


45 See Ernst Haenchen, Der Weg Jesu, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968), p. 40, fn. 4. He suggests that the whole compilation may come from a testimonia book or from oral tradition. The whole issue calls up the question of the nature of the Q "source", and of Mark's relationship to it—a more complicated issue than is often thought.
The same holds true for the proper sayings material. Two interests of the Synoptic tradition are in tension here: interest in actual sayings of Jesus—this is as true of Mark as it is of Matthew or Luke, even if to a lesser degree—and interest in composing narratives. The form-critical apophthegm or paradigm, enshrining a saying within a narrative context, is itself a paradigm of this tension. So "free" sayings like 1:15 and paradigm-sayings like 1:17c occur which are not formulaic, but are specific expressions of Jesus, arguably authentic.

Other speech credited to Jesus is not really "sayings" material at all but formulaically recreated dialogue appropriate for individual narratives, as in 1:25bc and 44bce. The boundary here will not always be clear, perhaps. Nevertheless some sayings are specific and unique, whereas other speech is generic and more

---

46It may be suggested that Mark was more selective in his use of sayings than were Matthew (especially) and Luke, who appear to have been more interested in including all available material. This is most striking in Matthew's use of Mark's discourse sections (chaps. 4, 10, 13), as he piles up related material. (To speak of "actual" sayings is not to prejudge the authenticity of the sayings, but to indicate that the Synoptic sayings tradition remains distinct from the narrative context provided by the Gospels.)

47The issue of formulaic and poetic elements within the sayings tradition itself is yet another matter, related but distinct. Mark 1:8ab are a "formulaic" pair—but primarily a poetic couplet, and this is a somewhat different phenomenon from the formulaic expression under discussion. The "formula" here is likely to be mnemonic and aesthetic more than it is compositional—to preserve rather than to create. Even these are probably related; see Havelock, Preface to Plato (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), pp. 61-86, on this relation. The "poetic" element
likely to be formulaic. This element of the tradition will affect the distribution of formulaic phraseology, as there will be proportionately less of it where there is more sayings material.

The most important observation about the distribution of formulas and formulaic phraseology is that they occur (and do not occur) equally in "redactional" and "traditional" material. This suggests, contrary to analytical redaction-critical views, that all the material is "traditional" in an oral literary sense. On the terms of redaction criticism, one would expect two things. First, at best some phraseology common to the traditional material might exist, especially within pre-Markan Sammlungen, but the diverse origins of much of the material would preclude the presence of very much. Secondly, one would expect to find Markan phraseology in redactional passages—although not perhaps too much "formulaic" phraseology from the literary editor. In fact the distribution

in the Synoptic sayings tradition is well-established. There are oral literatures which combine prose narratives and poetic speech elements: see Chadwick, Growth, 1:48, 58f., on the Irish hero tales; and Wolfram Eberhard, Minstrel Tales from Southeastern Turkey, Folklore Studies 5 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1955) on a Turkish tradition of extended oral narratives combining prose and poetry.

48 Such an expectation presupposes that the pre-Markan oral traditions were verbally fixed, which is not all that likely for the narrative traditions on the analogy of most other folk traditions. If these were not verbally fixed prior to Mark, then the whole analytic enterprise of "separating tradition from redaction" becomes a haphazard affair. See above, pp. 5f., 107f.
of formulaic phraseology indicates that the composer of Mark is responsible for all the wording of his Gospel; the existence of the formulaic phraseology suggests that this composer worked orally.

This distribution may be illustrated by reference to the ambitious redaction-critical analysis of Mark in E. J. Pryke, Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel. He begins with a list of "redactional verses" culled from various commentators,\(^\text{49}\) and after extensive discussion of "redactional" style and terminology prints a "redactional text" of Mark, omitting "source" text, at the end.\(^\text{50}\) Of the 136 lines of Mark 1 in figure 4.1, ninety-one, or two-thirds, were assigned to the "redactional text" (R) by Pryke, and forty-five to "source" (S).\(^\text{51}\)

As may be determined from figure 4.2, there is no significant correlation between this breakdown into redaction and source, and the distribution of formulaic and non-formulaic lines in Mark 1.\(^\text{52}\) Only the ratio of formulas in R and S deviates any noteworthy amount (16 to 5.5)

\(^{49}\)Pryke, Redactional Style, pp. 10-23; see also pp. 139-48.

\(^{50}\)Ibid., pp. 149-76.

\(^{51}\)The proportion levels off to about half, over the whole of Mark, still a striking amount (see above, p. 5). This is not surprising, for the present hypothesis of oral composition would make the entire text "redactional", so to speak.

\(^{52}\)Of 31 non-formulaic lines, 20 belong to R and 11.5 to S. Of 105 formulaic lines, 71 belong to R and 33.5 to S. Both are close to 2:1 ratio of R to S in the whole chapter, established by Pryke.
**FIGURE 4.2**

**DISTRIBUTION OF ANALYZED LINES FROM MARK 1:1-45 OVER E. J. PRYKE'S "REDACTIONAL TEXT OF MARK"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>PRYKE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>PRYKE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
<td>1:15a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1:15b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15d</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15e</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1:16a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:4a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>16b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>16d</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1:17a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>17c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:6a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>1:18a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>18b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>1:19a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:7a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>19b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1:20a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:8a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:9a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
<td>1:21a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>21b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>21c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1:22a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>22b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>22c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:11a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1:23</td>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>II/I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
<td>1:24a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>24b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>24c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:13a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>24d</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1:25a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>25b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13d</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>25c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1:26a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>26c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
1. Lines of verse are keyed to the text of Mark 1 as arranged in figure 4.1.
3. I=Formula, II=Formulaic expression, III=Syntactical pattern, and N=Non-formulaic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>PRYKE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>PRYKE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:27a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1:38a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
<td>38b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>38c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27d</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>38d</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27e</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
<td>1:39a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27f</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>39b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:28</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (II)</td>
<td>1:40a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:29a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>40b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29b</td>
<td>R/S</td>
<td>II/N</td>
<td>40c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40d</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I (II)</td>
<td>40f</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:31a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>41f</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>41a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>41b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31d</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>41c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:32a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>41d</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>41e</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:33</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>III (II)</td>
<td>1:42a</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
<td>42b</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:34a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I (I)</td>
<td>1:43a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>43b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1:44a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34d</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>44b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>44c</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II (I)</td>
<td>44d</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>44e</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:36</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>44f</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:37a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1:45a</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>45b</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>45c</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45d</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>III (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45e</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from the 2:1 ratio that is a random distribution. As frequency of terms is a "redactional" cue used by many critics, including Pryke, it is remarkable is that so many formulas, which are sets of repeated terms, have not been ascribed to R.

The fact that so-called "source" material appears to participate equally in the formulaic phraseology of the first chapter indicates that the attempt to isolate the redactor's words from the rest is a fruitless first step. There is more unity in Mark's style than Pryke allows for.  

Another factor of distribution to be considered is how the formulaic analogies to lines in Mark 1 are distributed through the rest of the Gospel. This is shown in figure 4.3. The chart goes by chapters, even though these are of uneven length. The number of words in each chapter is given to help even this out; the figures come from Robert Morgenthaler's Statistik. The chart was compiled simply by tallying analogies listed in the notes to the

---

53 This was frequently observed by older commentators but has been overshadowed by the form-critical dissection of the Gospels into smaller units. Form criticism was right in principle to describe the Gospels as composed of smaller units, but went wrong in assuming that these could be lifted verbally out of context as the true stuff of the tradition. Pryke, Redactional Style, pp. 8, 30, himself holds that Mark has borrowed many of his "techniques" and expressions from his sources.

54 Robert Morgenthaler, Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes (Frankfurt-am-Main: Gotthelf Verlag, 1958). The numbers of words per chapter were determined from the chart folded inside the back cover of the book.
formulaic analysis in appendix 2. The chart is approximate. Its only purpose is to show that formulaic phraseology discovered in Mark 1 is in fact distributed across the whole of Mark. The formulaic composition of any particular chapter can only be established by direct analysis.

FIGURE 4.3

DISTRIBUTION OF FORMULAIC PHRASEOLOGY OVER MARK 2-16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogies</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogies</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Were the formulaic analogies to be concentrated in one chapter or one section of Mark, or to be absent from significant sections, then the unity of formulaic style would be broken, and some form of literary redaction would become evident. As figure 4.3 indicates this was apparently not the case, for formulaic analogies are found in every chapter. The distribution is not entirely even, however. Chapter 15 has relatively few analogies for a chapter consisting so largely of narrative, and would
repay further study; chapters 12 and 13 also have relatively few, but as these consist largely in sayings material this is not unexpected.

The two classes of distribution of formulaic phraseology, across "redactional" lines and over the whole of the Gospel, together reinforce the notion of the unity of Mark's style. If Mark had textual sources, it must be held that they have been extensively recast into his own words and style.55

Conclusions

Mark does have sources in oral tradition. But what was Mark's relationship to the tradition? Nothing can be known directly about this. A spectrum of possible uses of folklore in literary works has been described by Richard Dorson and Neil Grobman.56 The unity of style would suggest that Mark is not somewhere in the middle of this range: a collector who performs limited editing. He is either a literary composer taking up oral material into his literary composition, with a debatable amount of skill, or he is a traditional composer whose "work" at least resembles an actual oral performance.

55The shorter sayings embedded in Mark are excepted of course. For these the case is that they are not his words. They would be relatively fixed in oral tradition, with the degree of fixity depending upon the length and genre of a given saying, and upon the socio-cultural dynamics of the tradition.

56See above, pp. 86f.
The formulaic phraseology suggests that the latter is the case; under the circumstances it cannot really do more than suggest. But if Mark's Gospel has been pushed toward one end of the spectrum or the other, perhaps it will now be easier to decide which end is more correct. The formulaic phraseology was one test; thematic composition is the other. More definite results from a formulaic analysis require (1) clarification of a method for formulaic analysis of prose; (2) further analysis of Mark; and (3) a more thorough comparison of Mark's expression with that of Matthew (especially) and of Luke.

From an oral-formulaic perspective, many of the right questions have not yet been asked of the language of the texts. M.-J. Lagrange, for example, described the unity of Mark's style and its stereotyped character, but attributed the latter to "l'indigence de son imagination". More recently, Nigel Turner commented:

Mark is manipulating none too skilfully but with a curious overall effectiveness, a stereotyped variety of Greek, rather inflexible and schematized, adhering to simple and rigid rules.

Turner has unintentionally described just what one might expect of an oral-formulaic diction. He correctly saw that the language must be the Evangelist's and cannot


be simply attributed to (fixed) traditional sources (against Vincent Taylor\textsuperscript{59}). However, Turner believed that Mark intended by this language to evoke "a numinous sense to point the reader upwards by the unclassical barbarism of the style".\textsuperscript{60} This interpretation seems impressionistic and is inherently unprovable.

It does not appear, then, that the formulaic analysis of Mark 1 has actually discovered anything dramatically new about Mark's diction. What is perhaps most significant is the provision of a theory to account for its characteristics. As with Schmidt's analysis of Mark's "framework",\textsuperscript{61} the oral-formulaic theory offers an explanation of characteristics of the Gospel for which previous suggestions have been or have become unsatisfactory.

\textsuperscript{59}Turner cites Taylor, Mark, p. 53. Taylor at this point also mentions Mark's lack of "creativity".

\textsuperscript{60}Turner, Style, p. 27. He infers intention from the fact that the Evangelist's Greek usage is generally "correct", and from his overall compositional achievement.

\textsuperscript{61}See above, pp. 101ff.
CHAPTER 5

THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF MARK

Milman Parry, in his second article on the "Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making", observed that the epic formula was by no means the only traditional element to be considered in the composition of oral poetry. The poet also "uses whole passages which he has heard". In fact, "his whole art" consists in re-telling the same poems he has heard before, in making the "best use" of his tradition:

The good singer will keep what is striking, and even add, on the pattern of other poems, lines which he knows will please, and new incidents, or give a fuller tale with many such borrowings. He may even have heard the same tale told by a singer living at a distance who inherited from a different tradition; then he will fuse the poems using the best in each. Thus the highest sort of oral verse-making achieves the new by the best and most varied and perhaps the fullest use of the old.  

The "passages" and "incidents" of which Parry speaks were designated "themes" by Lord. He defines the

---


3Lord apparently derives the term from C. M. Bowra. See Lord, "Composition by Theme in Homer and Southslavic Epos", TAPA 82 (1951), 71; referring to Bowra, "The Comparative Study of Homer", American Journal of Archaeology 54 (1950), 186. The phenomenon had previously been
theme as "a recurrent element of narration or description in traditional oral poetry", and as "groups of ideas regularly used in telling a tale".

**Method for Thematic Analysis**

The theme provides the basis of the second test proposed by Lord for the oral composition of a manuscript narrative, namely "the investigation of thematic structure". Regarding this test he states:

The first step in thematic analysis must be to prove the existence of themes in the poem under consideration. In other words we must find, either in the poem under scrutiny or in other poems by the same singer or otherwise belonging to the same tradition, the same situations repeated at least once. The method is the same used for formulaic analysis; but the units are larger and exact word-for-word correspondence is not necessary. In fact, exact word-for-word correspondence, as we have seen, is not to be expected.

Over the next few pages of Singer, where Lord applies this analysis to the Iliad, one looks in vain for a "second step" or for a more explicit methodological statement. The quotation above indicates that a search for repetition, not of words but of types of events, is the first procedure. Lord carries this out. He isolates seven instances of the "theme of assembly" in the first

---

4Lord, "Composition by Theme", p. 73.
5Lord, Singer, p. 68.
6Ibid., p. 145. 7Ibid.
two books of the Iliad. This may be called forming a "typology" of themes in a narrative. Next the themes are compared and classified into two general categories, with further sub-types emerging as well. This is a second procedure, which pays attention to the internal structure and content of the themes. Yet a third, and perhaps a fourth, become visible later: these have to do with the use of themes in building the larger narrative. These procedures may be divided into two major "steps", respectively concerned with the typology and internal structure of themes, and with external relations between themes or thematic composition.

Lord's discussion of thematic analysis itself is perhaps somewhat cursory, but it may be expanded by reference to other parts of Singer and to his earlier article, "Composition by Theme". The first step, which finds not only repetition of similar situations, but also a structural or formal relationship among the repetitions, is grounded in the chapter on the "Theme" in Singer.9

8Ibid., p. 147.

9Lord shows his interest in both steps in the concluding paragraph of his use of the test in Singer, p. 147:

"Thus in the first two books of the Iliad we find some seven examples of the theme of assembly. The second example in Book I provides a good model. The rest seem to be variations in different tonalities on this theme [the first step]. We have already become aware in this analysis of the interweaving and overlapping of major themes; we have begun to glimpse the complexity of thematic structure in the Iliad" [the second step].

10Singer, pp. 68-98.
Themes are described there as "groups of ideas", whose identity lies in a common "pattern" or "structure" and not in any "fixed set of words". Later, Lord states that the oral performer has a "plan" of the theme in his mind as he performs, and that the theme has "elements of order and balance". Furthermore, he believes it to be likely that formal considerations would make it possible to distinguish the themes of one singer from another.

The second step is carried out more thoroughly in the second part of Singer where Lord examines the overall structure of both Homeric epics in terms of the use of thematic material and patterns. Lord speaks of this also in his article mentioned earlier. Themes are necessary for learning and creating songs, which are, as has been seen, "plans" of certain essential themes. Themes allow for the development of a "complex structure" and the exercise of "artistic imagination" in the oral composition of a narrative.

In this chapter, a thematic analysis of Mark's Gospel will be attempted, employing both steps which have been indicated above. Some more discussion of methodology is in order to fill out what has been said, and to take

---

11 Ibid., pp. 68f., 198.  12 Ibid., pp. 92f.
13 Ibid., pp. 93f., 198.
14 Lord, "Composition by Theme", pp. 73f. Cf. above, p. 37.
15 Ibid., p. 80.
account of other significant contributions to thematic analysis. The analysis will deal both with the text of Mark itself, and with selected contributions from New Testament scholarship of significance for the analysis.

**Typology and Structure of Themes**

The twofold first stage of the thematic analysis points directly to the oral nature of the narrative under consideration. That thematic composition is characteristic of oral narration, both poetry and prose, is, as has been shown, the most well-established tenet of the oral-formulaic theory. In the hands of writers, the repeated use of themes tends to break down, as originality and variation are sought.\(^{16}\)

**Typology.** The most basic procedure of thematic analysis is establishing the existence of "recurrent" elements or situations in the narrative under consideration.\(^{17}\) That is achieved by the creation of a "typology" of the themes present in the narrative. An apparently comprehensive typology of themes from South Slavic epics lies behind Lord's discussion in Singer, and at least the


\(^{17}\)Lord, as quoted above, p. 176, allows for the search within an entire tradition for related thematic material as well. But Bennison Gray, "Repetition in Oral Literature", JAF 84 (1971), 295ff., has stated that only repetition within an individual narrative can properly be called "theme". Gray's more strict rule will be followed here.
beginnings of one for Homer exists as well. The typology not only serves to identify the themes but to allow one to determine what proportion of the narrative consists of thematic material. Lord has recently stated that just as a high proportion of the language of an oral composition will be formulaic, so a high proportion of the narrative will be thematic. Existing form-critical analysis of Mark will provide much of the material needed to establish the typology.

Thematic structure. Beyond the typology, the "structures" of themes within both compositions and traditions have been analyzed. Here, the individuality of the narrator is revealed. David Gunn has followed Lord's suggestion on this: he established distinctions between individuals in their use of the same theme within the Southslavie epic tradition, and then argued the common authorship of the Iliad and the Odyssey on the basis of

---

18 This is inferred from Singer, esp. chapters 8 and 9, pp. 158-85 and 186-97, respectively. The motif-indexing of the international folktale is easily the most thorough practice of such a typology.


common "elements" and "structure" within themes shared by those epics.\(^1\) The homogeneity of a narrative could also be determined on this basis.

If analysis of the structure of themes allows one to assess the compositional unity or homogeneity of a narrative, then it should prove useful in studying manuscript materials whose primary relationship to oral tradition is unclear, and which are held to have been subject to editorial or scribal alterations, additions, and interpolations. It will therefore be particularly useful in studying Mark, because of the standard form-critical view that Mark had scattered sources in prior oral tradition which were not significantly altered when incorporated into the Gospel.\(^2\)

Gunn's article is most useful for its terminology, and Arend's study for its graphic presentation of the evidence. Gunn denotes each particular theme as an "instance" of the general category to which it belongs, reserving "theme" for the abstract form. "Elements" are "narrative or descriptive segments which constitute a

\(^{1}\)Gunn, "Thematic Composition", esp. pp. 1ff. for method and terminology. See Singer, pp. 93ff., for the view that an individual's use of themes will be distinctive.

theme"; "structure" is the "particular arrangement or order of the elements, and more especially the most important of these"; and "language" is the "actual verbal expression, the wording of the elements".  

Arend comes to consider Homer's "typical scenes" after a general discussion of repetition in Homer and "primitive poetry", in which he concludes that repetitions are generally misunderstood by literary critics, frequently being excised from the so-called original. From repetition on the small scale of phrases, lines, and groups of lines, he expands the scope to the study of scenes having the same construction (Aufbau) and, often, similar wording (Ausdruck). These scenes may exhibit significant surface variations, but they will retain the same "feste Form".  

Arend compares several sets of scenes describing similar actions and draws up graphic schemata, to demonstrate that these display "fixed parts, recurring in fixed succession". These parts in turn often share character-

---

23 Gunn, "Thematic Composition", p. 3. Cf. Hermann Gunkel's view (above, p. 97) that traditional types are characterized by a traditional linguistic form.

24 Arend, Scenen, pp. 23f. Parry, reviewing Scenen in Classical Philology 31 (1936), 358, comments that Arend's description of the phenomena and his ascription of them to the "original" poet are correct, but that Arend "fails . . . to understand the reason for it". He appears to attribute Homer's fixed structures to a Greek mindset.

25 Arend, Scenen, pp. 8, 27.

26 Ibid., p. 28: "feste Teile, in fester Reihenfolge wiederkehrend".
istic expressions. The schemata are set in columns, with the first column denoting the parts common to the set; the remainder either quote the corresponding lines of, or give appropriate references and key words for, the particular passages. This method should be of help in a treatment of Mark's component narratives.

In addition, Lord has indicated that there are two sorts of themes: one is characterized by a rather high degree of common terminology, and is called "composition theme"; the second, called "type-scene", contains "a given set of repeated elements or details, not all of which are always present, nor always in the same order, but enough of which are present to make the scene a recognizable one".27 This distinction is a useful one, particularly as it allows for more individuality in the expression of a particular theme. Both sorts are found in Mark.

This completes the discussion of the two procedures that make up the first step in thematic analysis, that is, construction of a typology of thematic material in the composition, and demonstration of a common form or structure for related themes. The first procedure can determine whether the material of the composition is oral, and the second confirms this and may also help to determine whether the material was all composed by the same narrator.

Thematic Composition of the Narrative

Themes are not strung together artlessly in oral narration. They "interweave and overlap" to form a coherent and even a complex narrative. The second step of thematic analysis involves a demonstration of this use of themes in forming the narrative as a whole. That is, here one studies thematic composition, in contrast to the structure of the themes themselves which was the object of the first step.

As the first step in thematic analysis was twofold, so is the second step. One examines first of all the techniques used to put the themes together in the composition. Secondly, with the nature of (oral) composition by theme in mind, it should be possible to attain new literary appreciation of the narrative as a whole. Once again Lord's work provides grounds for these two procedures. The second is carried out to a considerable extent in his chapters on the Iliad and the Odyssey in Singer.

This second step in thematic analysis does not serve directly to demonstrate oral composition. It provides inferential support. The first step can show that the content of the narrative is oral traditional. The second shows that the use of themes is a positive literary technique available to the oral narrator. Often the "interweaving" and "overlapping" in manuscript narratives

28Lord, Singer, p. 147. See also Lord, "Composition by Theme", p. 80.
are taken as evidence of redactional or scribal activity, or, flatly, as written composition. This has been true in Homeric scholarship as well as in the study of the Gospels, as will be seen. But the existence of themes and the literary use of themes to form extended narratives together characterize oral literary composition. Merely cataloguing or collecting themes is an entirely different process. 29

Of course, redactional and scribal activity cannot be ruled out. The Pentateuch would appear to be a classical example of this, built over and above presumed oral traditional sources. 30 Moreover, oral literary techniques have passed over into written literature. 31 The move into

---

29 Consider, e.g., Walter Ong's example of medieval "commonplaces", catalogues which may have been "oral in outlook and performance", but were not themselves a genre of oral narrative literature, in Presence of the Word (London: Yale University Press, 1967), pp. 84f.


31 For example, Martin Dibelius, James, rev. Heinrich Greeven, trans. Michael A. Williams (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), pp. 6f., observes that linking sayings or stories by catchwords was originally an oral device, but has been employed by writers as well. The presence of catchword-linking alone then does not directly allow one to determine the origin of a composition. Presumably there are many other oral devices, oral literary devices, which have made the transition as well. Paradoxically (given the scholarly disposition to deny "literary" qualities to oral tradition) the presence of these literary devices in a manuscript has often been taken as proof of its written origin. See also Notopoulos, "Continuity and Interconnexion in Homeric Oral Composition", TAPA 82 (1951), 81, 90f., 98, who mentions at least two oral epic devices which made the transition.
"literary" matters leads into area where the distinction between oral and written literature may become ambiguous. For these reasons, the second step cannot do more than support results gained in the first step by showing how composition of the text was possible orally, and by allowing the hypothesis of oral composition to prove its value in interpretation.

The aim of this step of the analysis will be to show that several literary devices present in Mark in fact characterize oral composition fully as much as written, and that their presence in no way impedes the hypothesis of an oral origin for Mark's narrative. This is the first procedure of the analysis. The second procedure will be limited to a brief discussion of appropriate and inappropriate literary-critical approaches to Mark's narrative, when it is understood as a thematic composition.

Techniques of thematic composition. Lord speaks of the "adaptation" of themes to the story being performed, and indicates some of the ways this is done. James A. Notopoulos has added further discussion of several means by which an oral composer may fashion a unified, extended narrative out of these shorter units. The three areas

---

32 Singer, p. 94.

of "adaptation" mentioned by Lord—(1) expansion, (2) overlapping, and (3) patterning—will now be reviewed, with special reference to the contribution of Notopoulos. Consideration must also be given to one significant byproduct of these, (4) "narrative inconsistency".

(1) Expansion. A theme is a grouping of ideas: the expression of these ideas can be expanded in performance to where an individual idea becomes a "minor theme" unto itself. Conversely, their expression may be contracted to a single line.34 This technique of expansion straddles the fence between the analysis of the structure of themes and of thematic composition.

(2) Overlapping. The overlapping or "framing" of themes and patterns of themes is another means of achieving literary effect, and can create a complex literary structure.35 Notopoulos described the framing technique under the heading of "ringcomposition". The technique allows the storyteller to make two events concurrent, to round off a digression and resume the main story line, and to provide a frame for a largely self-contained passage. The ring may be single or complex, that is, with one or more rings enclosed by another.36

34This principle is frequently discussed in Singer, see pp. 69, 71, 81-85, 92, 100, 103-15, 147. Cf. Arend, Scenen, p. 8.

35Singer, pp. 104, 120, 147, 173.

36Notopoulos, "Continuity", pp. 97f.
On the specifics of the technique, Notopoulos states:

Ringcomposition usually takes the form of repetitions which frame the beginning and the end of a digression; it often repeats the same or similar verb; repetitions extend from words to ideas.\(^{37}\)

This provides a clear example of one means of literary achievement through the repetitive character of oral composition.

Related to the overlapping of themes are two more techniques discussed by Notopoulos: foreshadowing and retrospection. Both of these are forms of repetition which help the narrator, and his audience, face the "problem of relating the discrete parts" of the composition to the whole.\(^{38}\) Foreshadowing anticipates events to come, and retrospection brings to mind past events: they are conversely related.\(^{39}\)

Foreshadowing can take various forms according to Notopoulos. The prologue of a narrative foreshadows what is to come, not always explicitly, but by providing a set


\(^{38}\)Notopoulos, "Continuity", p. 83. The "problem of unity" is raised by (1) the physical demands of extended oral performance, (2) the possibility of breaks in a performance, and (3) the inherent paratactic "looseness" of oral narration: see pp. 81-88.

\(^{39}\)Ibid., p. 91.
of "pregnant associations which find expression later in the story ... offering a thread of unity". In the body of the story, foreshadowing can reiterate its leading ideas, illustrate them by concrete description of actions, relate them to lesser motifs, and relate the story world with its ideas to the larger tradition to which it belongs.  

Forms of retrospection include flash back, summaries or recapitulations, and "associative characterization". Ringcomposition may also be considered as a form of this technique.  

(3) Patterning. Combinations of themes are used habitually in narration, and are even repeated within a composition. The story line itself is a pattern of themes, of course. But a lesser pattern--perhaps a story in itself, or a chiastic series of themes--may also occur within the building of an extended narrative. The patterns may themselves be traditional or may simply derive from "habitual association" in a singer's experience. Lord found these patterns in Southslavic epic and in Homer; the Odyssey in particular shows several repeated

40Ibid., p. 90.  
41Ibid., pp. 91, 93f. Notopoulos is at pains to show that all these are products of the repetition which characterizes oral composition. His description of these techniques as forms of repetition, brings to mind Bennison Gray's description of "Repetition in Oral Literature": see above, p. 83.  
42Lord, Singer, pp. 97, 120ff.
patterns.\textsuperscript{43} It is important to note (a) that these patterns need not always be expressed in linear fashion, but may be submerged for a while in the narrative;\textsuperscript{44} and (b) that the use, repetition, and combining of patterns can achieve major literary effects.\textsuperscript{45}

(4) Narrative inconsistency. Lord and Notopoulos both stress that oral literature does not operate on an Aristotelian principle of "close knit unity" (Lord). Meaning and unity are derived from the oral tradition as a whole;\textsuperscript{46} they do not depend solely upon the intrinsic elements of a particular narrative. Here is manifested yet another difference between oral literature and written. (Aristotle stood on the written side of the divide, of course.)\textsuperscript{47} This difference lies on the more profound

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., pp. 158-65. \textsuperscript{44}Ibid., pp. 97f.

\textsuperscript{45}This is strongly argued by Lord in his chapters on the Iliad and the Odyssey in Singer.

\textsuperscript{46}Ibid., pp. 147f.; see also pp. 97, 123. See Notopoulos, "Continuity", p. 99; also his article, "Parataxis in Homer", \textit{TAPA} 80 (1949), 1-23. This idea is reinforced by Axel Olrik, "Epic Laws of Oral Narrative", \textit{Study of Folklore}, ed., Dundes, pp. 138f., who states that the folk narrative is loosely organized, and that a good deal of the narrative's unity is implicit for the listeners. This factor would differ from Erhardt G"{u}tgemanns' claim that the Gospel narrative is "autosemantic", as this is a property of written literature. At the same time, his view that the form-critical separation of "tradition" and "framework" in the Gospels is questionable, hermeneutically, receives support from what has been said of oral literature. See G"{u}tgemanns, \textit{Candid Questions Concerning Gospel Form Criticism}, trans. William G. Doty (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1979), pp. 121-25, 297, 410.

plane of epistemology.48

One side-effect of this lack of a strict sense of "unity" is the phenomenon of "narrative inconsistency" in oral literature. Inconsistency does not mean "anything goes": if it is sufficiently "gross" to be observed by the singer's audience, then it counts against his ability.49 Even so, the strict unity of written literature and the sharper analysis possible of written texts by literate scholars make visible (lesser) inconsistencies that would probably not be evident to the oral performer and his audience.

Inconsistency can occur between individual themes and between thematic patterns. The individual theme is a traditional entity, as much as is the story, and it has a "semi-independent life" of its own. There is no "pure form" of a theme but even so the performer faces "a pull in two directions: one ... toward the song being sung and the other ... toward previous uses of the same

48 See esp., Havelock, Preface to Plato (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), whose entire book is about this; and Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, Nature of Narrative, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 51-55. Also see Walter Ong, The Presence of the Word, although Ong's book is given to hazardous generalizations which have resulted in the exaggeration of this difference in, e.g., Werner H. Kelber, "Mark and Oral Tradition", Semeia 16 (1979), 7-55. See the extended critique of Kelber's article in appendix 1.

49 Lord, Singer, pp. 94f., esp. fn. 16: "The traditional artist is not illogical and there is a limit of ingenuous ignorance that we can assign to him."
theme". So, matter extraneous, ill-suited, and perhaps even contradictory to the overarching story line may appear in the expression of a particular theme which is not fully adapted to the larger whole. Such material may not even be evident in an oral performance situation. It would, self-evidently, be difficult to prevent in the fluid setting of extended oral improvisation. The writer could avoid it or correct it, and his reader has ample opportunity to detect it. Inconsistency may nevertheless occur in written texts, but then it is the product of carelessness or incompetence, defects which are likely to manifest themselves in other ways. In oral compositions, the most brilliant narrator is subject to "Homer's nod", and the inconsistency may be silhouetted against the overall quality of the narrative.

50 Ibid., pp. 94, 97, 119f. See also Lord, "Homer and Huso II: Narrative Inconsistencies in Homer and Oral Poetry", TAPA 69 (1938), 439-45.


53 With regard to Mark, how does one move from, e.g., Bultmann's evaluation of Mark (above, fn. 22) to, e.g., the Kafkaesque perspectives on Mark offered by the literary critic Frank Kermode in his The Genesis of Secrecy (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979)? This is, of course, part of the paradox of current interpretation of Mark's Gospel which was pointed out in the introduction to the thesis.
The "pull in two directions" can also lead to inconsistency on the plane of thematic patterns. Two patterns may share a common theme. When one pattern is being employed, the shared theme may evoke the second pattern. This can result in duplication of material and the "vestigial" or partial expression of one of the patterns, as well as in sheer inconsistency.

The repetition of patterns as a literary technique for emphasis or for length also may lead beyond "redundancy" (a literate evaluation) to inconsistency. In the Odyssey, for example, there are three recognition patterns by which Penelope discovers Odysseus' identity. Logically one is enough, but the repetition underscores and heightens the effect. Simply to point out the logical inconsistency is to miss the greater effect. Dismembering the narrative to smoothe the inconsistency out—reasonable by literate standards—imposes an inappropriate aesthetic upon oral narrative literature.

If narrative inconsistency can be shown to be produced by techniques of thematic composition, then the

54 See Lord's discussion, Singer, pp. 174-77.

55 The matter of a distinctive aesthetic for oral literature is a controversial, but important issue. Some basic elements of one have appeared here. Notopoulos, "Parataxis in Homer: a New Approach to Homeric Literary Criticism", TAPA 80 (1949), 1-23, has made some suggestions. Also see the works of Olson (above, fn. 47), Havelock, Scholes and Kellogg, and Ong (above, fn. 48), and Goody (above, fn. 51). A coherent discussion of this subject would lead beyond the scope of this thesis, which is to see if Mark can be classed as oral literature in the first place.
inconsistency ought first to be attributed to oral composition. The practice in (literate) scholarly circles is rather to attribute such inconsistency to "conservative" or incompetent redaction, or to scribal activity. These possibilities remain of course: the New Testament manuscript tradition, at least, shows this clearly. But thematic analysis provides an alternative explanation which may be simpler and more satisfying in certain situations.

**Literary implications.** Literary expression, like any art form, must be judged to some extent by the nature of its medium. On the one hand, oral and written literature are, as Lord has put it, part of a continuum of verbal expression. Nevertheless, the media are significantly different. In the previous section it was stated that repetition of various kinds and narrative inconsistency are characteristics of the oral literary medium. This of course is in contrast to the written medium, in which repetition and inconsistency are considered as defects.

Brief mention has been made of "the aesthetics of oral literature". There is no definitive description of such an aesthetic. Among other things, "oral literature",

---

56 See, e.g., Lord, "Homer and Huso II", TAPA 69 (1938), 444, quoting G. Murray *Rise of Greek Epic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1924), pp. 242ff.: "Both passages lay before the compiler of the Iliad. They were not consistent but each was too good to lose." Similar thinking is to be found in Gospel studies as well; see below, under "Patterning in Mark".
per se, is a broad, all-encompassing category about which generalizations are dangerous. The oral-formulaic theory has dealt with one genre of oral literature, epic poetry. Its findings appear to be significant for other sorts of extended, oral narrative composition, both poetry and prose. This is fundamental to the present thesis.

Components of an aesthetic for oral narrative include a positive view of the role of repetition, and an understanding of the different sort of literary unity possessed by an oral composition. Beyond these generalities, Lord, having studied the Southslavic oral epic tradition, was able to see story patterns in the Homeric epic literature in a clearer light than they had perhaps been seen before. Some degree of continuity in the epic genre had persisted across the centuries. There is no similar, clear-cut genre in which to class the Gospels, unless the "oral life story" suggested by Lord or the "hero pattern" first outlined by Lord Raglan can serve. It is unlikely that there is a live oral tradition comparable to the Southslavic available to the Gospel critic.

---


58 Consider, e.g., the pattern, return of the hero in disguise, which is basic to the Odyssey: Singer, pp. 164, 177.

59 On Albert Lord's suggestion, see above, pp. 123f.; Lord Raglan's position is found in his classic study, The Hero (London: Watts, 1949).
The comparative study of Hellenistic materials, Jewish and Greco-Roman, is of course helpful in this context.60

The recent interest in exercising contemporary literary-critical analysis upon Mark's Gospel also provides useful results. If the hypothesis is correct that Mark's Gospel is an oral traditional narrative, then this interest is well-founded—and can be more easily reconciled with the "standard" form-critical approach to the Synoptic tradition. Both approaches must be qualified by the realization of both the similarities and the differences between the transmission, composition, and literary qualities of oral and written narratives. It is proposed therefore to indicate literary-critical studies of Mark, which appear to be consistent with oral traditional composition, as understood by the oral-formulaic theory.

Analysis

Typology of Mark's Themes

The form-critical analysis of Mark provides a ready starting place for construction of a typology of the themes in Mark's Gospel. Bultmann's History of the Synoptic Tradition, in particular, is well-suited for this purpose as it comprehensively types Mark's pericopes.

Various other form-critical works are also used, but a comprehensive review of form-critical exegesis is not possible in this context.

It will be necessary to go beyond the form-critical typology. The oral-formulaic "theme" is related to the form-critical "form", but it is defined differently. The form is conceived on the notion that it is solely determined by its function within the social framework of its community, the Sitz im Leben, and that consequently each particular unit originates and circulates independently.

The theme, on the other hand, is conceived as a compositional unit of larger narratives, whose formal properties serve to enable oral composition in performance situations. As this definition fits in well with the way many redaction critics understand Mark's Gospel to have been composed, it is reasonable to enquire if it should not


63 See, e.g., Norman Perrin, "The Interpretation of the Gospel of Mark", Interpretation 30 (1976), 122, who is speaking for the more literary-oriented redaction criticism.
have an equal share in how the units of the Gospel narrative are understood.

The theme does have a "semi-independent life" of its own in the tradition, as has been seen. Form-critical interest in the Sitz im Leben of the individual form is not to be ruled out. But the idea of the isolation of traditional units must be abandoned if Mark's pericopes are in fact themes. (Even if they are not themes, the assumption of isolation must be called into question on general folkloristic grounds.) These alterations of the form-critical principles must have an effect on the entire analysis, however.

Because of the differences between a "form" and a "theme", the proposed thematic typology will differ from the form-critical one. It will alter the form-critical categories themselves, alter the distribution of material, .

---


65 Similarly the usually implicit notion of fixed-text transmission must also be abandoned, but this is not at issue here. Theissen maintains that the fixed-text idea, with its derivative model of "archaeological layers" of material in a given tradition, retains heuristic value: Wundergeschichten, p. 29. Perhaps so, but this seems dubious; if Theissen's structural model of "fields" available to the narrator is accurate (see Wundergeschichten, pp. 13-18, and below, under "Type B, miracle stories"), then these fields are where the "strata" of the tradition will be uncovered.
and even introduce new types of theme, not previously recognized as forms.

It should also be added that the "theme" is a narrative unit and does not extend to cover types of sayings traditions. However, the sayings material in Mark is itself framed within the narrative of the Gospel, and this framework is subject to thematic analysis. The speech or "speech complex" (Marxsen) is a thematic type, and will be treated as a theme or part of a theme regardless of how many distinct sayings elements it contains.

As Lord put it, the Synoptic tradition is a tradition about the "words and acts" of Jesus, so both elements are present, but the immediate concern is with the presentation of these elements in a larger, narrative framework.

66 Except, of course, for the apophthegm (or paradigm or pronouncement story), which is really a narrative unit, even though it is classed by Bullmann with the sayings, on account of its focal saying. So too, Arland J. Hultgren, Jesus and His Adversaries (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1979), pp. 50-53. See above, pp. 165ff.

67 The number of pericopes may be reduced by this factor. See figures 5.1 and 5.2, below. Schmidt counted 68 in Mark 1-13; Taylor figures 90, and 106 for the whole Gospel. The number in figure 5.1--75 (and 93, respectively)--is closer to Schmidt's because he, too, was interested in the narrative framework. Divisions of Mark in this thesis are generally based upon indicators of new narrative interest: changes of place, time, or personnel.

68 The Gospel of Thomas (also Q), whatever its origin and relation to the Synoptic tradition, is a different, non-narrative genre, despite its designation, "Gospel".
Form-critical typology. The form-critical typology consists of four major classifications, with some subcategories: these four are pronouncement stories, sayings, miracle stories, and legends. Sayings will be disregarded for the reasons just mentioned. The legends are not a well-defined group, being an assortment of material not otherwise classified. The remaining two classes, pronouncement stories, and miracle stories, are reasonably well-defined and recognized, and break down into lesser types.

In figure 5.1, the first thirteen chapters of Mark contain seventy-five pericopes. Bultmann describes forty-one as belonging to the two classes of pronouncements and miracles. Although this is a significant proportion, just over half of Mark's material would not constitute a sufficient "density" of thematic content to establish oral composition. The omission of the Passion narrative from this figure of course lowers the proportion of units contained.

69The terminology is mixed here: "pronouncement story" is Taylor's term, Formation, pp. 23ff. "Miracle story" is used by both Bultmann (Wundergeschichte) and Taylor; Dibelius' term for these is "legend".

70See, e.g., Bultmann's analysis of apophthegms, or pronouncement stories, HST, pp. 12-38; and of miracle stories, pp. 209-218. The actual breakdown of miracle stories in figure 5.2 is closer to Theissen's (see Wundergeschichten, pp. 94-120), particularly for the inclusion of "epiphany" stories.

71Compare Taylor's calculation, Formation, pp. 142f., that apart from the Passion narrative only eighteen "stories" do not fit into these two categories. (Taylor's figure excludes Sammelberichte and sayings material, presumably.)
### TABLE OF PERICOPES IN MARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peric.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Peric.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Peric.</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1-3</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>6:14-16</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>11:1-10</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>17-29</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Non (E?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>E (C)</td>
<td>12-14/</td>
<td>20-25 A (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>A (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>45-52</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>A (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18</td>
<td>F (A)</td>
<td>53-56</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>27-33</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-28</td>
<td>B (C,G)</td>
<td>7:1-13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12:1-12</td>
<td>C (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-34</td>
<td>E (B)</td>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>18-27</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>A (B)</td>
<td>28-34</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>31-37</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-44</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1-12</td>
<td>B (A)</td>
<td>8:1-10</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E (C)</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13:1-2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13-21</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3-37</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>22-26</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>27-30</td>
<td>G (D)</td>
<td>14:1-2</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-28</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31-33</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1-6</td>
<td>A (B,H)</td>
<td>8:34-9:1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9:2-10</td>
<td>B (D)</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>Non (I)</td>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17-25</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21/</td>
<td>14-29</td>
<td>B (A,D)</td>
<td>26-31</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30-32</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>32-42</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>A (C)</td>
<td>33-50</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>43-52</td>
<td>A (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1-34</td>
<td>C (D)</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>E (C)</td>
<td>53-65</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-41</td>
<td>B (G)</td>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>66-72</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1-34</td>
<td>C (D)</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>E (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-41</td>
<td>B (G)</td>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>15:1-5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1-20</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6-15</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24a/</td>
<td>17-22</td>
<td>A (F)</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>Non</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-43</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23-31</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>21-32</td>
<td>Non (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24b-34</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32-34</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>33-39</td>
<td>Non (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:1-34</td>
<td>C (D)</td>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>E (C)</td>
<td>40-41</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1-6</td>
<td>A (B,G)</td>
<td>46-52</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>42-47</td>
<td>Non (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The table was independently compiled. Cf. the pericope divisions of Schmidt, Rahmen (in his table of contents); Taylor, Mark, pp. 107-11; and David F. Noble, "Structure of St. Mark’s Gospel", p. 544.

A key to the types is in figure 5.2. The types are included here to give an idea of their distribution over the whole of the narrative. Brackets indicate that (elements of) the enclosed type of theme is also present.
still further. Only one of the seventeen pericopes there falls into a form-critical category: Mark 14:3-9 is classed with the pronouncement stories. The remainder of the Passion narrative pericopes are legends, form-critically. The legends, however, are an assortment of pericopes which have not been analyzed thematically. It is from among these that more themes will emerge.

**Thematic typology of Mark.** It is apparent from figures 5.1 and 5.2 that a great deal more of the material in Mark fits into the typology of themes. Notable additions include a substantial number of pericopes from the Passion narrative, and the Sammelberichte. Some discussion of the themes is in order now, but substantial justification should emerge from the discussion of the structure of the themes which follows.

Most of the alterations from the form-critical picture result from the narrative perspective by which themes are defined. The form-critical pronouncement story must have Jesus as the crucial speaker, in order to satisfy the Sitz im Leben criterion. The young man of Mark 16:1-8, however, is in a similar situation to that of Jesus in 10:17-22; and Pilate succumbing to the crowd in 15:6-15 recalls Jesus before the Syro-Phoenician woman (7:24-30). The thematic pronouncement story (type A) is more inclusive, therefore, than the form-critical one.

---

72See Bultmann, HST, pp. 41, 61, 66.
FIGURE 5.2
THEMATIC TYPOLOGY OF MARK

Type A. Pronouncement and Dialogue Scenes

1. Pronouncement scenes
   3:22-30

2. Dialogue scenes
   (2:6-10) 7:1-13 11:12-14/ 14:3-9
   2:15-17 7:24-30 20-25 14:53-65
   2:18-22 8:11-12 11:27-33 14:66-72
   31-35 10:17-22 12:28-34

Type B. Miracle Stories

1. Epiphanies
   1:9-13 9:2-10 (16:1-8)

2. Exorcisms

3. Healings
   1:29-31 2:1-12 5:21-24a/ 7:31-37
   (1:32-34) (3:1-6) 35-43 8:22-26
   1:40-45 5:24b-34 (6:1-6) 10:46-52

4. Nature miracles
   4:35-41 6:45-52 8:1-10 (11:12-14/
   6:35-44 20-25)

Type C. Public Speech Scenes

1:7-8 (2:13) (6:34) (10:1)
(1:21-22) 4:1-34 8:34-9:1 12:35-40

NOTE: Brackets indicate that elements of the enclosed type are also present, or "embedded", in the pericope. These may be called "minor themes".
FIGURE 5.2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type D. Private Speech Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4:10-20, 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6:7-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:17-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:13-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:(27)31-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:(2)11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:33-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:23-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:32-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10:41-45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:3-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:17-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:32-42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type E. Sammelberichte (Generalizing Summaries)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:32-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:53-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11:11?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type F. Calling Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10:21-22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type G. Reaction Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1:21-28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4:41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6:1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:27-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15:397)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type H. Opponents' Plot Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3:6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11:18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12:12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14:42-47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type I. Sending Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3:13-15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:7-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:12-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type J. The Observing Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:40-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15:47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16:1-8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Thematic Scenes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:12-13?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:13-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:17-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:16-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:21-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:33-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:42-47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The public teaching scene (type C) is most frequently used to introduce sayings material. This occurs in 1:7f., 1:14f., 4:1-34, 7:14f., 8:34-9:1, 12:1-12, and 12:35-44. Three of four other passages which indicate that public teaching occurs, but which do not carry specific sayings (2:13, 6:34, 10:1) are components of Sammelberichte, and constitute minor themes. (It is interesting to note in this regard that 12:1 introduces "parables" even though only one is spoken.) A fourth, minor theme of public teaching (1:21f., 27) is part of Jesus' initial miracle in the Capernaum synagogue. This compounding has led to dissension among the form critics who see the lack of "purity" as either secondary or an indication of pre-traditional material. From an oral literary perspective, this "interweaving" of two (traditional) themes becomes more readily understandable.

Public teaching scenes may both include and also conclude with other thematic material: private teaching episodes (type D) and dialogues (type A), in particular. This happens in 4:1ff. (notably), 10:1, 12:1ff. By their nature, they are open to this kind of combination. The composition of teaching themes is to be envisioned as taking place in a manner similar to Bultmann's description. Only a "compositional" understanding must be

---

73 Bultmann, HST, p. 209; Diblelius, FTG, p. 43.
74 Taylor, Mark, p. 171.
75 Bultmann, HST, pp. 329-333.
substituted for his "editorial" one, and the speech compositions must not be understood as fixed combinations.

Private speech scenes (type D) are clearly marked, and have been acknowledged as a typical phenomenon since Wrede. David Daube has pointed to where Synoptic private teaching scenes intersect with a traditional narrative combination in Rabbinic tradition, which he calls "public retort and private explanation."76 This combines a dialogue scene (type A) with the private teaching scene, a combination found in Mark 7:1-13 and 17-23, and in 10:2-12. He has also indicated that Synoptic scenes go beyond the Rabbinic model.77

It may be questioned whether Synoptic narratives are specifically modelled upon the rabbinic ones, if that implies some sort of genetic relationship. The private speech form was probably common wherever "discipleship"—which necessarily implies inner and outer circles—would have existed. The extension of the private teaching scene to independent thematic status in the Synoptic tradition marks a clear differentiation from what Daube says of the rabbinic tradition. The difference between dialogue scenes and private teaching scenes is not always so clear, as Bultmann observes.78 He also indicates the close relationship between public and private teaching scenes.79

76 Daube, *NT and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 141-49.
77 Ibid., p. 149. 78 Bultmann, *HST*, pp. 331f.
79 Ibid., p. 330.
The Sammelberichte (type E), as has been pointed out by Egger, relate similar types of events as well: the gathering of a great crowd to hear and see Jesus (and John). As will be seen, these "reports" have clearly marked formal characteristics as well. They were not considered to be "traditional" by form critics because (1) it was difficult to see them fulfilling a social Sitz im Leben, and therefore to have circulated independently, and (2) Schmidt considered them to be künstlich, serving the art of the connected Gospel narrative and therefore the product of an individual author.

Schmidt's evaluation is correct in many ways, but artistic concerns and individuality in composition are no longer to be excluded from oral tradition on an a priori basis. In fact, as will be seen, the Sammelberichte fit Gunkel's form-critical criteria well.

---

80 Egger, Frohbotschaft, p. 27.
81 Schmidt, Rahmen, pp. 33f., 160. See also Egger, Frohbotschaft, p. 11.
82 See below, "Type E, Sammelberichte". In a sense, the identification of the Sammelbericht as a traditional entity supports C. H. Dodd's similar claim in "Framework of the Gospel Narrative", New Testament Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), pp. 1-12. (Discussed above, pp. 127ff.) The difference is that Dodd saw them as a series of fixed units, preserving a traditional and "historical" outline of Jesus' ministry. As oral-formulaic themes, no more can be said than that they are flexible, compositional units at the narrator's disposal, and which could well serve in the "framework" of his narrative. Evaluation of the historical veracity of their content or sequence is an open question, to be answered on another plane.
Two calling themes (type F) were classed by Bultmann as an apophthegm (1:16-20). Taylor rightly recognized that there are two narratives here, to be classed with the third calling episode in 2:14. He took the "picturesque detail" of 1:16-20 as pre-traditional, yet observed that their "schematic character" is a product of extensive use in oral tradition. The activity of traditional "ornamentation" of a theme may help to resolve this tension.

The reaction theme (type G) is probably best taken as a minor theme or motif. It is definitely minor in four narratives (1:21-28, 4:35-41, 6:1-6, 15:39); and of the two pericopes governed by it (6:14-16, 8:27-30), the second could easily be understood as primarily a theme of private teaching. In both these cases it is closely tied to material that follows. One can identify an element of plot among these themes, as the last two instances of the theme provide definite answers to the questions posed by earlier ones.

The theme of the plotting of the opponents (type H) is also to be considered minor. It shows an even stronger element of plot-like progression. The major occurrences, 14:1-2 and 10-11, clearly mark the solution to the previously recurrent dilemma of "how" (ὡς: 3:6, 11:18, 14:1) to do away with Jesus. The climax comes in the

---

83Bultmann, HST, p. 28.
84Taylor, Mark, pp. 167f.
betrayal and arrest episode, 14:43-47, where Jesus is at last "seized" and the opponents' plot can be realized.

A theme of sending (type I) is basic to the appointment of the Twelve (3:13ff.) and to the description of their preaching mission (6:7-13), as well as to more mundane missions with which Jesus entrusts them (11:1-7, 14:12-16). Bultmann observed the relationship between this latter pair, but described the second simply as a variant.85 (Such a judgment opens many questions regarding, especially, the formation of the Passion narrative—a subject which Bultmann indeed regarded as complex and unclear.86) Taylor also saw the connection, and constructed a comparative chart which suggested to him composition of each by Mark "on the basis of tradition"87—which is exactly the point being made here. Although the three major instances of sending differ because of the nature of the mission, they do retain similar characteristics, as will be seen. Mark 6:7-13 is specified by a description of the mission which employs the theme of private teaching.

85Bultmann, HST, pp. 263f. In addition, Bultmann's discussion of the "presupposition" of 14:12-16 (a subsequent Passover meal), and its lack of "independence" is marred by notions of the independence and fixity of forms which are fundamental to his analysis. The independence of themes is a relative thing; and the thematic story will have a definite, but uneven, degree of continuity and connection between its themes.

86Ibid., pp. 275-84, esp. p. 279.

87Taylor, Mark, pp. 535f.
The theme of the observing women (type J: 15:40-41, 15:47) is a curious one. They "observe" Jesus' death and his burial (15:40, 47). That the tradition had interest in the role of women is not to be denied. Mark himself comments that these women, whose names he repeatedly lists, had "followed and served" Jesus in Galilee, and Luke recounts the fact that three (also named) women "served" (or supported) Jesus and the twelve in their wandering preaching activity (Luke 8:1-3). It is significant in Mark that the same--named yet again--women "observe" that the stone has been removed from Jesus' tomb, and are the recipients of the resurrection proclamation in 16:1-8. The reason for the form of this element or for the tradition's evident interest is not immediately clear.  

There are seven, possibly eight, pericopes which do not seem to fit the typology. The first of these is in the opening prophecy quotation (1:1-3) which serves to introduce the narrative. The second (possible) exception, Mark 1:12f., has usually been considered as a temptation "episode" and taken as an independent pericope. If so, there is no other similar scene in Mark. But this understanding is unduly influenced by the "redaction" of

---

88 Note in this connection what H. Munro, and N. Kershaw Chadwick had to say about oral literature and the role of women tradition bearers, Growth of Literature, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932-1940), 3:894f.
this passage in Matthew and Luke. In Mark, it appears to be an "immediate" consequence of the baptism-epiphany, involving an anti-epiphany of Satan. The whole passage (1:9-13) serves to characterize the newly-introduced Jesus, just as 1:4-6 had introduced John with a Sammelbericht and a symbolic description of his appearance. The positive but contrasting relationship between Jesus and John is deepened by this episode.89

The catalogue of the names of the twelve (3:16-19) is not theme by standards used here as there are no other clear instances of a comparable catalogue in Mark. Other passages in Mark that approach catalogue status are the list of the elements in the interpretation of the parable of the sower (4:15-20), the list of vices (7:21f.), the rewards of discipleship (10:29f.), and the list of names of the observing women (15:40,47, 16:1). These might be catalogues, but it is not clear. Catalogues are however popular themes in all oral traditions.90 In Matthew and Luke (Q?), the genealogies (Matt. 1:2-17, Luke 3:23-38) and the list of miracles recited to John's disciples (Matt. 11:2-6, Luke 7:18-23) provide other Synoptic examples. Homer's catalogues are well-known and definitely thematic. Mark's catalogue cannot be called thematic, but it can


90 Chadwick, Growth, 3:747.
hardly be said to militate against the oral composition of the Gospel.

The account of John's death at the hands of Herod (6:17-29) is perhaps the most singular narrative in the Gospel. Its presence may best be explained in terms of the aforementioned relationship between John and Jesus. As a contrasting pair, it is only natural that what happens to one happens to the other. Mark of course wishes to emphasize Jesus' activity and passion, but the need to fill out the relationship has probably had its effect here. As is commonly noted, Mark has located the story—aesthetically—between the sending out and the return of the twelve (6:7-13,30); a more immediate cause is likely to be an association of Herod and his "reaction" (6:14-16) with the circumstances of John's death. Taylor sees no reason to think Mark is dependent upon a foreign, fixed source here: the story has the "colourful character" of other Markan stories, shows Mark's style, and the "presence of many unusual words is accounted for by the subject-matter".92

Jesus' first "entry" into Jerusalem and the temple (11:11) is strangely uneventful. It is also hard to type. It could be considered as the—anticlimactic93—conclusion

91 Lord discussed the pairing: see fn. 89, above. Axel Olrik's "law of twins" probably applies here: "Epic Laws", pp. 135f.

92 Taylor, Mark, pp. 310f.

93 Matthew "corrects" this by bringing about the Temple-cleansing right after the Triumphal entry (Matt.
to the triumphal-entry episode. But it should probably be seen in connection with the following material (11:12-25), in which case an abab structure of Jerusalem/temple scenes and fig tree symbolism appears. The first verse of this (11:11), then becomes a preparatory key to the symbolism. It could also be a "false start" on the temple-cleansing narrative which Mark was not yet wanting to narrate. In its present form, the narrative bears a faint resemblance to the Sammelbericht theme, but this is not a very likely classification.

A significant amount of material from the Passion narrative has been included in the typology. Three episodes did not fit. The first of these, 15:16-20, deals with the abuse of Jesus by Roman soldiers after his sentencing by Pilate. This may actually be thematic: embellished and expanded here, but related to 14:65, where similar (ironic) abuse follows Jesus' condemnation by the

21:1-17). Luke does, too, but inserts the sympathetic note of Jesus' tears over Jerusalem (Luke 19:41-44), which creates a bit of distance between the two main events comparable (but not identical) to that in Mark's account. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Genre and Function of the Markan Passion Narrative", HTR 73 (1980), 177ff., offers the simpler explanation that Mark wanted to round off the day, as the first of a three-day sequence.

94 The complex has been thoroughly studied recently by W. R. Telford, Barren Temple and the Withered Tree (JSNT Supplement Series, 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980).

95 See the discussion of the "Type E, Sammelbericht" structure, below. Taylor, Formation, pp. 85ff., regards it as one; cf. his Mark, p. 85. Egger, Frohbotschaft, p. 2, does not include it in his list.
Sanhedrin. It is also foreshadowed in the last and most explicit of the three Passion predictions, 10:34. The theme would at best be a minor one, attached to a story about arrest or trial. But it is left unclassified in the absence of a more definite counterpart.

The account of Jesus' death, 15:33-39, is paralleled only at a great distance by the account of John's death (6:17-29). It should not be surprising that the death scene in an "oral life story" is not repeated, but nevertheless it does not fall into any obvious type within Mark. These remarks may also be applied to the account of Jesus' burial, 15:42-47, which is not a "repeatable" event, either. It too is paralleled by mention of John's burial (6:29). Both of these accounts are, however, invested with minor themes: the observing women (15:40ff., and 47) and the "reaction" of the centurion (15:39).

In summary, none of the non-classified pericopes by themselves constitute a clear threat to the hypothesis of the Gospel's oral composition. They are all consonant with materials or patterns which may be expected in oral literature of the "biographical" genre. On the other hand, the great proportion of pericopes in the entire Gospel are found to be thematic. This proportion argues that oral composition is immediately behind the Gospel narrative. The analysis of the structure of these themes will reinforce this impression.
Structure of Mark's Themes

Standard form criticism has been generally less interested in literary "form" of tradition than in the social setting which produced the individual genres or Gattungen. This somewhat paradoxical approach resulted in only a minimal discussion of form itself, sufficient to establish the relationship among the particular traditions which comprise a Gattung.96 Oral-formulaic theory suggests that form is a more important function of traditional material than merely an indicator of Gattung. It is the key to how instances of a Gattung may be used in the process of the oral composition of larger narratives.

Nevertheless, the form-critical analysis of pronouncement and dialogue stories and of miracle stories provides a useful starting point. The real shortcoming of form criticism's lack of interest in form itself is evident in the failure to recognize formal relationships in other narrative material beside these two types. Bultmann, for example, repeatedly (and correctly) observed the "schematic" nature of many other elements in Mark's narrative, but attributed this to "editorial", that is, secondary, written, and non-traditional, activity.97 The


97 See Bultmann, HST, pp. 330ff., on the "editorial" activity involved in the "insertion of the speech material into the narratives"; and p. 343, on connecting links and Sammelberichte.
present analysis of the structural relationships between instances of various themes will help to confirm the typological analysis, which dealt solely with surface similarities among scenes.

"Structure" here refers primarily to a series of "elements" used to compose thematic units, in Gunn's terminology. Elements are "ideas", forming part of that "group of ideas" which is an oral-formulaic theme, and may be characterized by a typical terminology or "language". There is a limit, then, to the degree of abstraction which can be ascribed to the elements of the structure in thematic analysis. This limit may not necessarily be easy to prescribe, but it is related to the nature of elements as "ideas", and not as simply logical parts of an outline or of some universal narrative framework. Oral-formulaic analysis must be more specific if it is to achieve its aim of distinguishing oral from written composition.

Having this in mind, it will be useful as a preliminary to review the work of David F. Noble on the structure of Mark's narratives. Noble has discerned a seven-part structure of narrative "sections" which lay behind every narrative pericope in Mark. This structure is evidenced in six standard variations: these omit certain

---

98 This distinguishes the present approach from, e.g., the Structuralist, "actantial" model of Jean Calloud, whose "actants" are intended to be universal roles for any narrative composition; see Daniel Patte, *What Is Structural Exegesis?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), pp. 41-52.
sections of the "full pattern", but the overall sequence of the sections remains "quite fixed" throughout the Gospel. The full pattern of the structure is: (1) setting, (2) situation, (3) reply to the situation, (4) problem, (5) reply to the problem, (6) result, and (7) consequence.99

In view of the generality of these sections, it is not surprising that Noble finds that he cannot distinguish between, say, pronouncement stories and miracle stories on the basis of this pattern. He deduces from this that the form-critical forms are not structurally distinct.100 But Noble's pattern is too abstract for thematic analysis. The "content" of a structural element is significant for the thematic type of a narrative.101 The "situation" which arises when confronted by a demoniac or an illness is bound to require a different "reply" or to raise a different "problem" than when confronted with a disciple or a Pharisee. Thematic analysis concerns itself with "groups of ideas", and the ideas are no less important than the fact of their being part of a structured "group."

99 Noble, "Structure", pp. 19, 134. Noble incidentally provides a list of 86 pericopes (p. 544); his analysis and the number of pericopes is similar to that of figure 5.1, which described 93 pericopes.

100 Ibid., pp. 119-31, esp.

101 Noble, Ibid., pp. 10f., 13, is careful not to distinguish absolutely between structure and content. Yet it appears that he does divide them too sharply in this regard. Theissen's discussion of "fields" is helpful here: see below, under "Type B, miracle stories".
Noble's study is useful in that it provides an argument for the unified composition of Mark's Gospel on the basis of a series of smaller units which share formal properties. To this extent at least it supports what one would expect of oral composition by theme. He also finds that the "pattern" itself is to some extent traditional. Oral-formulaic theory would put these findings in a different light, and one perhaps not too inconsistent with his result.

It is also noteworthy that Noble finds that stories in Matthew which have no parallel in Mark diverge from this pattern, and that these "irregularities" are still more frequent in Luke, in both special and parallel material. This shows, again, the individuality of the composition of Mark, and also the move toward variation in the other Gospels, especially Luke's, which is, on theory, to be expected from literate authors. Noble's findings therefore considerably lighten the burden which this stage of the present analysis must bear.

One reason for Noble's criticism of the form-critical typology was that some of the narrative "sections" of Mark's pericopes could be classed into different

\[102\] Ibid., pp. 17f., 517f. Noble thinks that the pattern may go back through Jesus himself to Old Testament narratives, but cautiously does not press the issue: pp. 518f. Cf. Lord's comment on the likelihood of a Jewish background for the early development of "themes" in the Christian oral tradition: "Gospels", pp. 36ff.

\[103\] Noble, "Structure", pp. 17, 517f.
types, but that these types did not correlate with form-critical units. For example, there were several types of consequence statements in Mark, but each type was distributed over various forms. This lack of correlation was taken to demonstrate the lack of distinctiveness for form-critical types.\textsuperscript{104}

However, one of the differences between a "form" and a "theme" is that the latter is conceived from the start as a smaller unit of a larger whole, subject to variation, and even to compounding with other themes, according to the need and the skill of the oral narrator. The concept of the "pure" and "simple" original form is excluded, therefore, at the beginning. The basic theme is part of a larger narrative and belongs to a compositional matrix, which also includes formulaic phraseology. It is not surprising therefore that many, if not all, elements and language characteristic of a given theme may be found at times in other themes. The themes, to quote Lord, "interweave and overlap".

This factor, in turn, complicates things for analysis of the structure of themes. Structure is not a wooden absolute, nor solely the product of impersonal social forces. Rather it serves as a preliminary framework around which a narrative is built by one who may be a "creative artist".\textsuperscript{105} The fleshing out of this skeleton

\textsuperscript{104}Ibid., pp. 119f., 131.

\textsuperscript{105}Lord, \textit{Singer}, p. 13.
may take varied forms, but this constitutes a use of the structure and not a violation. It is necessary to take this usage into account when speaking of "structure".

How then does one isolate the structure of a theme? Structure is first of all sequential: this is common to Gunn, Arend, Noble, and Theissen. It is a sequence of elements, not all of which are used in every instance. The order and the presence of "key elements" are the constant factors; and correlation between an element and certain language is not unusual. These indicate what is to be expected of the structure of a theme. A particular instance of a theme is formed upon this structure by the use or non-use of various elements, by expansion ("ornamentation") of certain elements, and--to borrow terms from generative grammar--by "recursion" of elements, in which part of the sequence is repeated within the bounds of a single instance, and by the "embedding" of elements from a second theme within the structure of the first.

---

106 For Theissen, see Wundergeschichten, pp. 18, 21, 82.

107 As noted earlier, the "type scene", will have less of this correlation between elements and language than will the "compositional" theme. See above, p. 184.

108 See, e.g., John Lyons, Chomsky, 2nd. ed. (Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1977), pp. 49-51, 76. The three means of variation in the composition of the individual instances of the themes, expansion, recursion, and embedding, are well-established as oral devices. The expansion of individual elements is a form of "ornamentation" much discussed by Lord (Singer, pp. 78f., 86-91,
Graphic presentations of the structures of the themes will help to make this formation clear, as well as to demonstrate the shared structure of Mark's themes. The graphic presentation and discussion of the various types of theme will proceed in series to analyze the types as they have been identified by the typology. (See figure 5.2, above.) These are, once again: type A, pronunciation and dialogue scenes; type B, miracle stories; type C, public speech scenes; type D, private speech scenes; type E, Sammelberichte; type F, calling scenes; type G, reaction scenes; type H, opponents' plot scenes; type I, sending scenes; and type J, observing-women scenes.

**Type A, pronunciation scenes.** The two form-critical categories brought over into the thematic typology, pronunciation scenes and miracle stories, constitute the largest and most diverse theme types. They have also been the subjects of practically innumerable studies, only a selected few of which have been consulted here. The point of the present discussion is to demonstrate that the textual evidence accords with the expectations of oral-formulaic theory regarding "themes".

103). The recursion of the elements of a theme is evidenced, for example, in the Southslavic letter-writing and the dialogue themes, which can be extended indefinitely (Ibid., pp. 82-85 and 92f., respectively). The embedding of elements of a secondary or minor theme within another theme as a form of expansion is frequent (Ibid., pp. 71, 95, 119f., 147; see also "Composition by Theme", p. 76).
The pronouncement scenes have fallen into two subtypes. First are pronouncement scenes proper (A.1), in which the emphasis falls on a significant oral statement, usually in response to a given (controversial) situation. The statement generally has a wider significance than that required by the situation described and could frequently stand alone as a form-critical "saying".\(^{109}\) In dialogue scenes (A.2), the statement comes in response to a more direct leading question or address. The setting may still contribute to the final utterance, as in 2:15-17, for example, but the address means it is no longer so necessary.\(^{110}\) Accordingly, the final statement of the dialogue no longer has the overriding significance which it did in the pronouncement. Rather the address element in a dialogue may share some of the significance. Form-critically independent "sayings" are less frequent in dialogues.\(^{111}\)

(1) Type A.1, pronouncement scenes. Figure 5.3 presents an illustration of the structure of type A.1,

---

\(^{109}\) Cf. Bultmann, HST, pp. 56f., 61ff.; Dibelius, FTG, pp. 56-58, 63, defines paradigm in a similar, but somewhat more inclusive fashion.

\(^{110}\) Bultmann, in the Ergänzungsheft, to HST, p. 390 (note to p. 41), defends his classification of these types into one form, apophthegm, against criticism by Dibelius; Bultmann feels that the emphasis in both sub-types is on the final saying and the particular situation may be equally well established by setting or by the leading question. Both are correct in their own light: Bultmann, on overall purpose, and Dibelius (cf. FTG, pp. 67f.) on the form.

\(^{111}\) Bultmann, HST, p. 41, e.g., notes the use of such forms of response in dialogues as metaphors, counter-questions, and Scripture quotations.
pronouncement scenes. Only three significant elements appear to make up the structure. These elements do not appear to share common language, so formal characteristics are limited to more general ones which serve to project the content of the pronouncement element. The two required elements are the "situation" and the "pronouncement". The "outcome" element is omitted in 12:41-44.

The "situations" vary. In five of the eight instances the situation is one of (at least implicit) conflict between Jesus and his opponents in authority. This is true even in the final instance, 15:29-32, where it is the opponents who have the upper hand and who make the mocking, but ironic, pronouncements. In the three remaining instances it is disciples who receive the pronouncement; this holds in 16:1-8, for the women named there are certainly disciples, even if not "the" disciples (see 15:41).

The "pronouncements", too, vary in form and in length. Several could well have circulated independently of their immediate context, as well as of the larger context of Mark. Several of the rest are significant

---

112 Cf. the two-part structure of apophthegms described by Bultmann, HST, pp. 39ff.: "starting point" and "reply".


114 These include 3:28-29, 10:14b-15, 11:17, and possibly, 3:4 and 3:22-26. The saying in 16:7b appears as a prophecy in 14:28, but its range as an independent saying would have to be quite limited.
## FIGURE 5.3

**STRUCTURE OF TYPE A.1, PRONOUNCEMENT SCENES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Pronouncement</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:1-6</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-6 (H=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:22-30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23-29 (C=23)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:13-16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-19</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>17 (C)</td>
<td>18-19 (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:41-44</td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td>43-44 (D=43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:43-52</td>
<td>43-47 (H)</td>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>50(-52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15:29-32)</td>
<td>29a</td>
<td>29b-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31a</td>
<td>31b-32</td>
<td>32b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:1-8</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Theme types shown in brackets, e.g., (B), mark the presence of embedded elements from that type within the major sequence or in the indicated verses. Rec indicates recursion of a part of the sequence of elements within the theme. These conventions will be used for all illustrations of thematic structures in this chapter.
for the unfolding course of the narrative: 3:4 (as the "outcome" in 3:6 makes clear), 14:48f., and 16:6f. (the last more retrospectively, perhaps). Still others are significant for the broader scope of the narrative's ideology: 10:14f., 12:43f., 15:29b-30, 31b-32.

The "pronouncement" in 3:23-29 is long and complex, and indeed within it are embedded elements of the type C, public speech scene: the "assembly" of the audience and an indication of the form of "speech" (cf. figure 5.8, below). The pronouncement in 10:14-15 is also a compound of more than one individual saying. These may be considered an expansion of the pronouncement element, which may or may not have been fairly constant in the performance of the narrator(s). Expansion is probably more than simple accretion and its presence may be asking the listener, and the critic, to pay closer attention to what is occurring in the narrative.

The "outcome" element does not appear to be of the same significance as the other two. Its main function seems to be one of confirming the significance of the pronouncement. This is so for 3:6 and 11:18, which portray the reaction of Jesus' opponents in terms of the embedded theme of the "opponents' plot" (type H, figure 5.13); and also for 10:16, where Jesus enacts his pronouncement by "receiving" the children. The outcome of the empty tomb pronouncement is notoriously difficult, even though its "language" is not infrequent in the final elements of other pericopes. It is, perhaps, more under
the influence of the miracle theme embedded there, but it is still a difficulty.

Both embedding and recursion of the structure occur. In addition to those instances of embedding already noted, a "distinction" element of the type D, private speech scene may be embedded in 12:43a; and embedded in the situation element of 16:1-8 are elements of two themes, the miracle story (type B.1, epiphany; see figure 5.5) and the observing women (type J; see figure 5.15).

A healing miracle (type B.3) is embedded in 3:1-6, providing key elements of its situation and the outcome. In fact, the elements alternate: v. 1 contains the initial "setting" and "illness" elements of a miracle story and v. 2 the "situation" of the pronouncement; vv. 3 and 5 contain the central healing miracle elements of "approach" and "cure", and v. 4 the "pronouncement." Each theme is present in its essential elements.

This instance of embedding is more integrated than is usual. The closest analogy, Mark 2:1-12, has elements of the dialogue theme incorporated as a block in vv. (5b?)6-10—a much simpler affair. The present example in 3:1-6 reflects a greater degree of compositional activity, and would perhaps require a more fixed usage than the other. Certainly the picture created by v. 3 (the "approach" element of the healing structure), of the man standing before Jesus, while he confronts his "watchers" in vv. 4-5 is effective and suspenseful. This is achieved through manipulation of the embedded structures, as one
might expect of thematic composition. The question is whether the effort expended in this particular pericope to alternate elements of the respective structures—producing a "hypotactic" narrative of sorts—is compatible with a claim for oral traditional improvisation of the whole. The isolated instance of 3:1-6 is probably not that weighty, but too many narratives with this degree of "integration" would militate against such a claim.

Recursion of the structural sequence occurs only once. Part of the crucifixion narrative 15:21-32, which is as a whole non-thematic, consists of a pair of mocking, yet ironic pronouncements aimed at the dying Jesus (vv. 29b-30, 31b-32). Each pronouncement is set up by a preceding "situation" marker identifying the two taunting parties. The whole passage is concluded by an "outcome" indicating that yet a third group—Jesus' fellow sufferers, of all people—joined in the affair.

The sequence of distinguishing elements of the type A.1, pronouncement story is relatively simple. Being simple, it is also pliable. This pliability is well-suited to the purpose of providing a brief context for the central pronouncement, which is by no means of standardized content. Inevitably, then, there is little verbal

\textsuperscript{115}The interrelationship and allusions (cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 591) of these two pronouncements would repay closer study. Can it be accidental that the two descriptions of Jesus—"who would destroy the temple and build it in three days" and "the Christ the King of Israel"—repeat in the same order the issues raised against Jesus in his trial before the Sanhedrin (14.57-63)?
correspondence among the pronunciation scenes and they are to be considered as "type-scenes" within the framework of the larger narrative. The extension of the type into the Passion narrative is particularly significant for the compositional unity of Mark.116

(2) Type A.2, dialogue scenes. The structure of the dialogue scenes possesses the additional element of an "address" to the leading character. This alters the character of the entire scene to some extent, broadening the focus of the narrative from one speaker's "pronouncement" to an exchange between two speakers. The alteration is reflected in the change in figure 5.4 from "pronouncement" to "response" as the title for what remains the major element of the theme. Not all the dialogue scenes have been included in figure 5.4, but the selection allows for a fair evaluation of the structure, its pliability, and—again—the presence of the type in the Passion narrative.

The situation elements are a mixed lot, as in the pronunciation scenes. There are very few involving Jesus in dialogue with his disciples; such dialogues are generally classed as type D, private speech scenes. It would appear from this that there is no hard and fast division between these two themes: type D may be considered a

116The reason for this is the common view that the Passion narrative (i.e., Mark. 14-15) was a connected and written source for Mark and not his own redaction or composition. This view has been challenged recently on other grounds as well; see below, under "Patterning in Mark".
### FIGURE 5.4

**STRUCTURE OF TYPE A.2, DIALOGUE SCENES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:35-39</td>
<td>35-37a</td>
<td>37b</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15-17</td>
<td>15-16a</td>
<td>16b</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:18-22</td>
<td>18a</td>
<td>18b</td>
<td>19-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1-6</td>
<td>1-2a</td>
<td>2b-3 (G)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-6 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1-13</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6-13</td>
<td>(7:14ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:24-30</td>
<td>24-26a</td>
<td>26b</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:2-9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>(10:10ff.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12-14/</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:13-17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15-16a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:53-65</td>
<td>53-59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61a(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63-65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:66-72</td>
<td>66-67a</td>
<td>67b</td>
<td>68a</td>
<td>(68b) Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69a</td>
<td>69b</td>
<td>70a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70b</td>
<td>70c</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:1-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5a(1)</td>
<td>5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:6-15</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14b</td>
<td>15a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hybrid of type A.2 and of type C.\textsuperscript{117} One dialogue scene which features the disciples, 1:35-39, does not have a significant "teaching" content.\textsuperscript{118} Rather, its effect is compositional: to establish the itinerant ministry of Jesus.

Miscellaneous situations place Jesus in front of a home-town audience (6:1-2a), in dialogue with a Gentile woman (7:24-26a), and in (symbolic) confrontation with the barren fig tree (11:12); others show Peter in confrontation with members of the high priests' household (14:66-67a, 69a, 70b), and Pilate before a crowd (15:6-7).

In the majority of instances, the "situation" sets up a confrontation between two parties, usually between Jesus and a set of opponents. Some progression may be noted in the confrontations between Jesus and his opponents. Early confrontations are portrayed as relatively unpremeditated responses to the activity of Jesus and his disciples. Several are introduced by the neutral participle ἑξῆς: 2:15-16a, 2:23, 7:1-4; to this group may be added 2:18a, in which the interlocutors are unnamed and not necessarily "opponents" as such. Later confrontations

\textsuperscript{117}Bultmann, writing on the editing and insertion of speech material, HST, pp. 330-333, claimed that the "old" apophthegm, and its characteristics were employed in the editorial work of Mark and his predecessors. He is correct on the existence of the formal relationship, but a different explanation is offered here.

\textsuperscript{118}Others, not included in figure 5.4 are 10:35-45, 13:1-2, and, presumably, 14:3-9. A recursion in 11:12-14/20-25 places the disciples in the second situation element (11:20).
occur by design, as Jesus' opponents test him in various ways: 8:11, 10:2, 11:27, and 12:13. Confrontations in the Passion narrative proper have the opponents with the upper hand, "accusing" Jesus: 14:53-59 and 15:1-3. The friendly dialogue with a scribe about the greatest commandment (12:28-34) is thrown into sharp relief by this progression, and vice-versa.

One term which makes its appearance several times in the situation element is a form of the coordinate participle, "seeing" (ἰδὼν), as a means to motivate the "address" element. It may represent a compositional "strategy" for the narrator, although not too much should be made of it, perhaps. In any case it is at least a first glimmer of "language" that correlates with an element of a theme structure.

In some instances the address element functions as an extension of the situation, and the pericope is little different from a pronouncement scene. In others the "address" and the "response" approach a coordinate status, and become a true dialogue in which the "response" clearly loses the overriding importance possessed by the "pro-

119 The statement of the scribes from Jerusalem in 3:22, does not fit this progression well, but they do not actively initiate the confrontation. Jesus does.

120 In 2:15-16a, 7:1-4, 11:12,20, 12:22, 14:66,69. In addition, three instances of the address element, 2:24, 3:32, 13:1, are prefaced by ἴστε, referring back to the "situation" which motivates the address. Yet two more situation elements involve a similar use of the participle, "hearing".
nouncement". In two of these the leading character actually comes out second-best in the exchange: the addressing Syro-Phoenician woman wins her way with Jesus in 7:24-30, just as the crowd prevails over Pilate in 15:6-15. The more properly dialogical scenes dominate the second half of the Gospel, and in the first half there are more pronouncement-like scenes.121

The "address" is usually in direct speech, but indirect is not infrequent. There does not appear to be any special language attached to this element, although naturally terms for "to ask" and "to say" are frequent.

Apart from the tendency for some of the "response" elements to be coordinate with the "address", previous observations regarding "pronouncements" also apply to the response element. Complex "responses" of more than one saying are found in 2:17,19b-22, 2:25-28 (esp. vv. 27-28), 3:34-35, 8:12(?), 10:5-9, 11:22-25 (the longest), 14:6-9, and 14:62. It should be noted that a "response" of silence on Jesus' part is found in 14:61a and 15:5a—in both cases to "false" accusations: it appears to be an effective and even an elegant response.

121 The "address" is an extension of "situation" element in: 2:16b, 2:18b, 6:2b-3, 7:5, 7:26b, 11:21, 14:61b. The address is coordinate with "response" in: 1:37b; 7:28; 10:2; 10:4; 10:17,22; 10:35,37,39; 11:3; 11:28,31-33a; 12:14,16b; 12:19-23; 12:28,32; 14:60; 14:67b,69b, 70c; 15:2a,4; 15:8,11,13,14b. The following address elements are doubtful or contain material that might go either way: 2:24, 8:11, 14:4-5; in addition, 3:33 and 13:1 are too evenly balanced to decide.
The "outcome" of dialogue scenes, when it is present, is also similar to the outcome of pronouncement scenes, tending to confirm the effect of the dialogue.\textsuperscript{122} In three of these instances, 6:6, 12:17, and 15:5, a typical outcome expression of "amazement" is found: this is "language" that is also found in the "outcome" elements of the miracle theme types (5:20, 6:51; also 15:44). The "field" of material for this element transcends boundaries of theme-types: the narrator is drawing upon his "formulaic" repertoire.

In four other pericopes, the outcome appears to fill out the picture, offering detail not otherwise to be had: 6:5-6, 10:22, 14:63-65, and 14:72. The last of these tells that Peter "remembered" what Jesus had spoken in an earlier pericope, 14:17-31 (v. 30, in particular). This is the second time in the dialogues it is said that Peter "remembered"; the first is in 11:20. This is a means for creating narrative unity among the pericopes. In 11:20, it binds the fig-tree narrative together around the temple-cleansing episode; and in 14:72, it recalls an earlier statement. In both cases, the technique works within the structure of the themes: in the first it helps to reestablish the "situation", and in the second it serves as the "outcome".


In three of these (7:1ff., 10:2ff., 14:3ff.) the pericope following appears to function as "outcome".
Expansion, recursion, and embedding are all represented here. Expansion of the situation element occurs, for example, in 7:1-4, 7:24-26, and 14:53-59. The "addresses" in 6:2b-3 (embedded), 12:19-23, and 12:32-33, and the outcome element of 14:63-65 are also expanded. The previously noted complex "responses" of more than one saying may be considered expansions as well. Recursion is frequent in the dialogues, as might be expected. Sometimes there is a shift in the "personnel" involved, as in 11:12-14/20-25 and 14:66-72, but this is never too involved.\(^{123}\) Embedded themes occur in the address of 6:1-6, where the reaction theme (type G) is evident; and elements of the miracle theme (type B) are present in 6:5f., 7:24-30, and 11:12-14/20-25.

The basic structure of the pronouncement and dialogue scenes is simple but quite adaptable. It proves a good vehicle especially for narrating the didactic aspects of Jesus' ministry, but is by no means limited to this. It is primarily a narrative form whose content is by and large influenced by the interests of the tradition in the words of Jesus on a variety of subjects. The simple sequence is consistently followed, and is used as a basis

\(^{123}\) Olrik's "law" of two to a scene ("Epic Laws", pp. 134f.), could easily be broken in the dialogue form, but the pairing of "addresser" and respondent helps to maintain it. At no point must the respondent fight a battle on two fronts or switch back and forth among opponents or partners. Taylor, Formation, pp. 166f., saw this as true of all three Synoptic Gospels.
for expansion, recursion, and embedding of various elements. Only minimal "language" is seen to characterize the theme or its elements. This is probably due to the variety of subjects covered by the speech material of the central element. The one instance found occurs, significantly, in the situation element which prepares for the speeches.

Type B, miracle stories. In considering the structure of the miracle stories, it will be necessary to review Gerd Theissen's contribution which has been influential in the classifications and analysis presented here.

Within the broad sphere of miracle stories, Theissen has established six sub-types, which he calls Themen. These draw upon a common repertoire, or "field", of Motive. Certain "themes" more characteristically draw upon certain motifs, and motifs in turn are occasionally "signalled" by grammatical characteristics. The Gattung of miracle story consists of this repertoire of "themes" and "motifs" (and "persons"), which are structured in both compositional sequences and paradigmatic fields.124 The "themes" have a structural similarity and a restricted range of narrative possibilities: the Gattung itself

dictates no single, all-encompassing structure.\textsuperscript{125} Theissen's "themes" correspond at several points to the oral-formulaic "theme". His "theme" classification is influential for the division of the miracles into four sub-groups by the present analysis. This division is further borne out by the analysis represented in figure 5.5. The entire miracle \textit{Gattung} might be called a theme. But the sub-types are properly the oral-formulaic "themes", and the \textit{Gattung} is considered as a unity in this thesis only for the sake of simplicity.

Theissen lists six themes, but figure 5.5 lists only four. Theissen names exorcisms, healings, epiphanies, deliverance miracles (\textit{Rettungswunder}), feeding miracles, and \textit{Normenwunder} (miracles related to accepted standards or rules).\textsuperscript{126} The last category, Theissen states, are frequently classed as apophthegms.\textsuperscript{127} It is true that several miraculous events are related to stories also dealing with issues other than the \textit{Wunder} itself. The practice of embedding elements of one theme in another, already observed, would seem a better and simpler explanation of these mixed forms than an attempt to stretch the

\textsuperscript{125}Theissen, \textit{Wundergeschichten}, p. 13.
\textsuperscript{126}Ibid., pp. 94-114.
**FIGURE 5.5**

**STRUCTURE OF TYPE B, MIRACLE STORIES**

### B.1: Epiphanies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Manifest. Voice</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:9-13</td>
<td>9a</td>
<td>9b</td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2-10</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2c-3</td>
<td>4(5-6)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16:1-8)</td>
<td>1-2a</td>
<td>2b-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B.2: Exorcisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Demonic</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Exorcism</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:21-28</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27-28 (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C,G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3:11-12)</td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>11b</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1-20</td>
<td>1-2a</td>
<td>2b-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8-9a</td>
<td>13a</td>
<td>13b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9b-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7:24-30)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(29b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:14-29</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>(A=16-19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(A=21-24)</td>
<td>25b</td>
<td></td>
<td>26-27</td>
<td>28-29 (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pericope</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Touch</td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:29-31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30a</td>
<td>30b</td>
<td></td>
<td>31a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40-45</td>
<td>(39)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41a</td>
<td>41b</td>
<td>41c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1-12</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A=5-10)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3:1-6)</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td></td>
<td>(A=2-5a)</td>
<td>(5b)</td>
<td>5c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21-24/35-43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23b</td>
<td>22-23a</td>
<td>24a/35-40</td>
<td>41a</td>
<td>41b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:24b-34</td>
<td>24b</td>
<td>25-26</td>
<td>27a</td>
<td></td>
<td>27b-28 (28?)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27b-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:31-37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32a</td>
<td>32b</td>
<td>33a</td>
<td>33b</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22-26</td>
<td>22a</td>
<td>22b</td>
<td>22c</td>
<td></td>
<td>23a</td>
<td>23b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:46-52</td>
<td>46a</td>
<td>46b</td>
<td>47-52a</td>
<td></td>
<td>52b</td>
<td>52c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FIGURE 5.5—Continued

#### B.4: Nature Miracles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Jesus'</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Command</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:35-41</td>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38a</td>
<td>38b</td>
<td>39a</td>
<td>39b</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41 (G)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45-52</td>
<td>45-47</td>
<td>48a</td>
<td>48b</td>
<td>49-50a(b)</td>
<td>51a</td>
<td>51b</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:35-44</td>
<td>(34)35a</td>
<td>35b-36</td>
<td>37a</td>
<td>37b</td>
<td>38-39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:1-10</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1b-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-6a</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
miracle genre to include them. For this reason there is no Rettungswunder classification in figure 5.5, and the elements of the miracle story found in such scenes (e.g. 3:1-6 and 7:24-30) are analyzed under the more directly appropriate sub-type.

Moreover, the deliverance miracles and the feeding miracles are considered under the single, standard heading of "nature miracles" (B.4). Some structural similarity among these is discerned, but in deference to Theissen's differentiation and to the obvious differences between the sea episodes and the feedings the listing of these in figure 5.5 is adjusted to place the respective pairs of narratives (4:35-41, 6:45-52, and 6:35-44, 8:1-10) next to one another.

Despite what was just said about a lack of overall structure for the Gattung, Theissen does offer a sequential list of thirty-three motifs drawn from all the miracle stories, upon which he has superimposed a general, four-part structure: introduction, exposition, middle (the miracle itself), and conclusion. In any given narration, Theissen claims, the traditional narrator will (unconsciously) choose among these motifs, but always in this

---

128Cf. Bultmann, HST, pp. 215ff.; and Dibelius, FTG, p. 90. It must be said that Bultmann appears simply to lump these together, and that Dibelius does not really press any formal distinctions among the "tales" in FTG, pp. 70-103.
order. His choice is also limited to some extent by the sub-type he has chosen.

The four-part structure is altogether too broad and would fall prey to Noble's criticism of form-critical "structure", but Theissen is not really claiming any distinctiveness for it. The distinctiveness lies, properly, in the motif series. However, Theissen's discussion of the structure and characteristics of the sub-types, his "themes", is too sketchy, and the following analysis supplements it by providing a somewhat more detailed structure of from six to eight significant elements for each sub-type.

The relationship of Theissen's analysis and that offered here is positive, but the difference, as with standard form-critical analysis, is that the perceived formal elements are taken as a means to enable oral composition of extended, multiple-episode narratives. Theissen, on the other hand, despite his significant research in oral and folklore studies, still holds to the original, independence of the oral traditional episodes. The difference will generally have more effect

129 Theissen, Wundergeschichten, pp. 82f. The (acknowledged) similarity of his approach to that of Propp's "Morphology" is most marked here.

130 Theissen, Wundergeschichten, p. 211. Cf. the criticism of Boers, "Sisyphus", pp. 38-42, that Theissen does not give sufficient weight to the larger Gattung, the Gospel form, in which the miracle stories are located. It must be emphasized, however, that Theissen, contrary to the apparent trend of late, did wish to reduce the discontinuity perceived between the tradition and its "redaction", as far as was possible (see pp. 29, 31, 197).
upon the explanation of the textual phenomena than upon the perception of the phenomena.

(1) Type B.1, epiphanies. "Epiphanies" are not numerous, but occur in what must be considered strategic places in the narrative. If there are elements of the epiphany in the empty tomb narrative (16:1-8), as figure 5.5 illustrates, then the epiphanies become extremely significant, framing the entire narrative of Jesus' activities. Six elements common to the stories have been isolated.

The first two, "time" and "arrival", are probably not of great significance nor are they especially distinctive. Nevertheless it is worth noting that all three epiphanies have a time marker, and that this element is especially precise in 9:2a and 16:1-2a. Theissen has observed that temporal connection in Mark is infrequent between 2:1 and 14:1,131 which leads one to conclude that the "after six days" of 9:2a would draw particular attention to the location of the pericope in the narrative and its significance. If the time marker of 1:9a is not so precise, this can hardly be surprising, as it is the first action of Jesus. The phrase "in those days" adequately puts Jesus' baptism into the context of the Baptist's activity. The "arrival" element corresponds to the first

---

131Ibid., pp. 198f.
motif listed by Theissen\textsuperscript{132} as part of the whole field of elements.

The epiphany proper involves three elements, a striking "initial" action, a "manifestation" of some figure representing divinity, and a "voice" or pronouncement (perhaps authenticated by the two preceding elements). The initial actions are all different, and the figures manifested also differ. Included in the manifestation elements, 9:4-6 and 16:5, are indications of the reaction of the human observers; this is expanded in 9:4-6, perhaps by association with the embedded private speech scene (type D).\textsuperscript{133} It is also worth noting that the initial action of 9:2c-3 and the manifestation of 16:5 draw attention to the whiteness of the clothing of Jesus and the "young man," respectively.\textsuperscript{134} The "voice" in 1:11 and 9:7 expresses a similar message, the version in 9:7 being pointed directly at the small circle of disciples. In these elements there appears a minor network of similar language, although the similarities only go so far.

\textsuperscript{132}Ibid., p. 82: "coming of the wonder-worker".

\textsuperscript{133}It is not clear whether one should presuppose observers in 1:9-13. None is mentioned.

\textsuperscript{134}Something else is also at work in the description of the "young man": the garment of the "young man" in 14:51-52 is also significant. On this, see Robin Scroggs and Kent I. Groff, "Baptism in Mark: Dying and Rising with Christ", JBL 92 (1973), 531-48; Harry Fledermann, "Flight of the Naked Young Man", CBQ 41 (1979), 412-18; and, most recently, Ernst L. Schnellbächer, "Das Rätsel des νεανίσκος bei Markus", ZNW 73 (1982), 127-35.
The final element, "outcome", varies in each instance. Those in 1:12-13 and 9:8-10(12?) are significantly expanded. The former sets the "larger" context of Jesus' ministry; and the latter points toward the resurrection (and presumably the "epiphany" in 16:1-8) through an embedded private speech scene. The outcome element in 16:8 would not be too surprising, were it not (apparently) the last verse of the Gospel. The language is not unusual for an "outcome" or "reaction" element. In fact a phrase quite similar to that of 16:8 may be found in the reaction to the "manifestation" in 9:6:

16:8 ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ
9:6 ἐκφοβοῖ γὰρ ἐγένοντο

The sequence of elements here is longer and more complex than the type A themes, although the three middle

---


136 Cf. 4:41, 5:15, 33 (with "trembling" associated, as in 16:8), 9:32, 10:32(?), and 12:12.

137 The abrupt ending of Mark is difficult to explain on the hypothesis of oral composition, as it apparently violates Olrik's "law of closing", i.e., that oral saga should not end abruptly, but calmly: "Epic Laws", pp. 131f. One possible explanation would be an aborted dictation session. Another suggestion is a non-narrative (?) form of resolution of the story in the performance situation. Cf. Thorlief Boman, Die Jesusüberlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), pp. 97f. Consider in this regard the narrative "sermons" in Acts (2:22-24 plus 25-36, and 3:13-15a plus 15b-26—but not 10:35-43) which end in personal or kerygmatic witness to the resurrection (see 2:32 and 3:15b, respectively). This in turn could be related to the puzzling figure of the "young man" in Mark. 14:51f. and 16:5. (See fn. 134 above.)
elements which constitute the epiphany itself could be considered as one compound element. There are substantial differences between the three scenes, yet at the same time a stronger web of relationships, in language and "motif", does appear in these than was found in the type A themes.

Theissen had described epiphanies as events in which the "divinity" of the wonder-worker is revealed in his person and not through his acts. He also claimed that they shared no characteristic motifs.\textsuperscript{138} It would seem better to say that these are scenes of direct divine "attestation" of the wonder-worker, for the emphasis in the two major epiphanies seems clearly to lie with the "voice" and not with the manifestation; this could also be argued for 16:1-8, although it is chiefly a pronouncement story: even in the physical absence of the wonder-worker, his "promise" (16:7, repeated from 14:28) receives attestation.

There are no instances of recursion in the epiphanies. Expansion of the outcome occurs in both 1:12-13 and 9:8-10(12); it may occur also in the "manifestation" in 9:4-6, where the disciples are frightened and Peter speaks. Both expanded elements in 9:2-10 make use of embedded elements of the private speech scene, type D. The elements of the epiphany present in 16:1-8 are themselves embedded in a pronouncement scene.

\textsuperscript{138}Theissen, Wundergeschichten, pp. 102f.
Type B.2, exorcism narratives. The exorcism narratives also display a six-element sequence. The first two set the situation with the "arrival" of Jesus on the scene, followed by the "appearance" and description of the demoniac. There follows a confrontation between the demon and Jesus which the demon initiates ("address") and which Jesus, effortlessly resolves by the act of "exorcism". The outcome of the narrative may clearly be divided into two more elements, the "result" of the exorcism for the demoniac, and the "reaction" of the witnesses. The structure is fairly straightforward.

Theissen indicated that exorcisms possess four characteristic motifs: (a) the characterization of need, (b) the struggle between the demon and the exorcist, (c) the coming out of the demon, and (d) the destructive action of the demon in nature. It is difficult to see the fourth in 9:14-29, if by "nature" is meant the world apart from the possessed person; and it is difficult to see it at all in 1:21-28, where neither the demoniac nor "nature" appear to suffer greatly. Theissen is not too clear about this one.

The first and third characteristics named by Theissen correspond respectively to the second and fifth elements (that is, description of the "demoniac" and "result" of the exorcism) in the sequence in figure 5.5. The struggle, Theissen pointed out, is the element without 

\[139\] Ibid., pp. 94f.
analogy in the healings, and corresponds to the two central elements, address and exorcism, in the analysis. The confrontation, then, is the peculiar feature of the exorcism narratives. Significantly, the exorcisms mentioned in Sammelberichte, 1:34b and 3:11-12, both indicate the confrontation specifically.

Perhaps because the exorcisms are a more restricted type of action, the presence of characteristic "language" in the elements is greater than in previously discussed theme types. This is illustrated in figure 5.6. Repeated terms are underlined and those marked by a dotted line correspond to another, similar term.

The "appearance" of the demoniac is a good example. A decided relationship in expression may be seen in the following: the consistent use of "unclean spirit", even though Mark also uses the term "demons" in other contexts; the clear distinction between the possessed and the demon; and the indication that the demoniac was prostrated before Jesus. The same consistency is also

140 In speech material generally: 3:15,22; 6:13; 7:29,30; 9:38, and in summary statements: 1:34,39. The phrase is usually the all-embracing, formulaic τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξβάλλειν. The Sammelberichte 3:7-12 also uses both the exorcism sequence of elements and language. The mixed usage in 7:24-30 is related to the fact that the exorcism is embedded in a dialogue scene: the "appearance" element of the exorcism proper uses appropriate terminology; cf. figure 5.6.

141 This is the weakest similarity, and may well have more to do with the relationship of the exorcism-type to the healings—this is especially so for 7:25.
I. Appearance Elements

1:23 εὐθὺς ἦν ... ἀνέρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ

3:11 καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα ἐστίν αὐτῶν ἐξελθόντας προσέπιπτον

5:2b-6 εὐθὺς ... ἀνέρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ ... καὶ ἰδὼν ... προσεκύνησεν

(9:20b) καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα ... πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν

7:25 ἐἴχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ... (γυνὴ ... ) προσέπιπτον

9:17b τὸν υἱὸν μου ... ἔχοντα πνεῦμα ἁλαλοῦν

II. Address Elements

1:23b-24 καὶ ἀνέκραζεν λέγων τί ἦμιν καὶ σοι ἰησοῦ ναζαρηνέ ... ὁδὸν σε τίς εἶ ὅ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ

3:11 καὶ ἐκραζον λέγοντες οτι αὕτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

5:7 καὶ κράζας ... λέγει τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοι ἰησοῦ \[πρὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ του \]

III. Exorcism Elements

1:25f. ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ... φιμωθῆτε καὶ ἐξελθεῖ εἷς αὐτοῦ

5:8-9a ἐλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκαθάρτου ἐξελθεῖ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνέρωπου

9:25b ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκάθαρτῳ τῷ ἁλαλοῦν καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα ἐγὼ ἐπιτάσσωμαι σοι ἐξελθεῖ εἷς αὐτοῦ

IV. Result Elements

1:26 καὶ σπαράξας αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκαθάρτου καὶ φωνῆσαι ψωφῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν εἷς αὐτοῦ

5:13b καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα (v. 7: καὶ κράζας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγει)

9:26 καὶ κράζας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξας ἐξῆλθεν
evident in the "address",142 the "exorcism",143 and the "result".144

Expansion, recursion, and embedding allow for a significant amount of variation and distinctness among the exorcisms, despite the amount of shared language. The central sequence of the first exorcism, 1:23-26, is simple and straightforward, but the arrival of Jesus is expanded by embedded elements of public speech scene (type C), and both the arrival and the reaction elements are further amplified by use of the reaction theme (type G). The sequences of 5:1-20 and 9:14-29 have been ornamented even more. Two recursions in 5:1-20, and expansion of three elements, the appearance of the demoniac (2b-6),145 the second address of the demon (9b-12), and the final reaction (15b-17), make this pericope one of Mark's most lengthy, and draw particular attention to this act of Jesus among the Gentiles.

1421:23b-24, 3:11, and 5:7 all share a form of the term κοίμησιν and a confessional declaration of Jesus' (filial) relation to God. In addition, 1:24 and 5:7 share a form of the Semitic phrase τί ἐσοφι καὶ σοφι.

143With somewhat more variation and expansion than the others: terms for "command" are in 1.25f. and 9.25b, and a formal address to the demon, and the words "come out of (him)" are in all three.

144All three instances, 1:26, 5:13b, 9:26, share the same verb, "to come out"; the idea of a cry and convolution are expressed in the first and third. Cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 280, who also pointed out these features.

145The contrast between the demoniac's wild appearance in 5:2b-6, and the simple, peaceful, "result" picture of him in 5:15 is particularly effective.
The final exorcism (9:14-29) is still more complex, structurally.\textsuperscript{146} In place of the elements, appearance of the demoniac and the address of the demon, there is an embedded dialogue (type A, vv. 16-19) between Jesus and the father of the possessed boy. Recursion then leads back to the actual appearance of the demoniac himself. At this point, true to form, the demon reacts to Jesus' presence. But instead of a verbal "address" by the demon, who is after all "deaf and dumb", there comes yet another embedded dialogue scene (vv. 21-24) with the boy's father. The final reaction element is also expanded by the embedding of a private speech scene (type D, vv. 28-29) involving the disciples.

The main sequence of the exorcism approximates a "composition theme", yet by recognized forms of expansion, each of the three main instances has been given its own distinct features. It may be presumed that these expansions have tailored the passages to the context of the narrative in which they occur.

(3) Type B.3, healing stories. The healing stories have an eight-part structure, although only four to five appear to be essential (see figure 5.5). The "setting", the "illness", the "cure", and the "outcome" are constant elements. (The "approach" element is frequently not

\textsuperscript{146}Theissen, Wundergeschichten, pp. 53, comments that only in this passage in Mark do all seven "person" roles appear, and that both Matthew and Luke tone the passage down in this respect.
distinguished from the description of the "illness".) Either the "touch" or the "speech" element (sometimes both) is found in every story.

The setting element describes the appearance of Jesus upon the scene and other relevant details such as location and the presence or absence of a crowd. The description of the illness and the approach depict the nature of the plight and how Jesus and the person to be healed are brought together. The reaction element describes Jesus' response to the illness or to the approach; this is perhaps the most pliable of the elements. The elements of touch and speech are preliminaries to and means of the "cure", which is usually stated quite simply. The outcomes vary, but are usually conceived in terms of the setting.

There is some common "language" shared by certain elements, less than in the exorcisms, but more than in theme-type A. The language is most visible among three elements: illness, approach, and touch. The common terms and phraseology are indicated in figure 5.7.

In addition to these, two speech elements contain a formula commending the healed person's faith plus a command to "go" (5:34, 10:52b, cf. 2:11). Two others contain Aramaic commands, each translated in a phrase introduced

---

147Theissen, Ibid., p. 99ff., states that the motif of the touch is perhaps the most characteristic motif of the healing theme. The idea of touching is frequent in the stories even outside this element.
FIGURE 5.7
"LANGUAGE" COMMON TO TYPE B.3, HEALINGS

I. Illness Elements

1:40 καὶ ἔρχεται πρός αὐτὸν λέγων
2:3-4 καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρός αὐτὸν παραλυτικῶν
7:32a καὶ φέροντες αὐτῷ κηφᾶς καὶ μογιλῶν
8:22b φέροντες αὐτῷ τυφλῶν

II. Approach Elements

1:40 παρακαλῶν αὐτῶν ... καὶ λέγων ... ἔληγ
5:23 καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτῶν πόλλα λέγων ... ἵνα
7:32b καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτῶν ἵνα ...
8:22c παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτῶν ἵνα ...

5:22 καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτῶν τίττει πρὸς τούς πόλεις
5:27a ἀκουόσας περὶ ἑσοῦ ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῇ ὁχλῇ
10:47,50 ἀκουόσας ὧτι ἑσοῦ ... (Hdratok krάζειν) ...
Τὸν πρός τὸν ἑσοῦν

III. Touch Elements

1:31a ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρᾶς
1:41b ἐκτείνας τῆς χειρᾶς ἠψάτο
(3:5b) ἐκτείνων τῆς χειρᾶς
5:27b-28 ἠψάτο τοῦ ἰματίου
5:41a κρατήσας τῆς χειρᾶς τοῦ παιδίου
6:5 ἐπιθεῖσα τῶς χειρὰς
7:33b ... καὶ πτύσας ἠψάτο τῆς γλῶσσῆς
8:23b(25b) πτύσας ... ἐπιθεῖσα τῶς χειρὰς
by a formulaic ὑ ἐπιν (5:41b, 7:34). Taylor constructs a
comparison of two healings in Mark (7:32-37, 8:22-26)
whose shared language is so "striking" as to suggest they
form a healing "composition theme." 148

Expansion of the elements, other than by embedding,
is limited. Only one description of an illness is dwelt
upon, 5:25-26, for reasons not immediately obvious. The
outcomes of 1:43-45 and 7:36-37 are expanded to detail how
the individual cures led to the spread of Jesus' fame in
Galilee and Decapolis, respectively. The former also
appears to pave the way for the coming confrontations
between Jesus and the religious hierarchy by the command
in 1:44.

Recursion takes place in 5:21-24a/35-43 around the
intercalated healing story 5:24b-34; it also occurs with-
in 5:24b-34 itself and in 8:22-26. 149 The very first
instance involves recursion of practically the entire
sequence, as new word on the illness is received. The
second involves a dialogue occurring after the cure itself
has taken place, and third relates a cure in two stages.
The recursions display considerable variety and freedom in
the manipulation of the sequence.

148 Taylor, Mark, pp. 368f.

149 Taylor, Mark, p. 289, claims that "the inter-
calation of narratives is not a feature of Mark's method".
This is difficult to sustain; Mark's intercalations are
discussed below, under "Overlapping in Mark" as "ringcom-
position". It is worth noting that Matt. 9:18-26, paral-
lel to Mark 5:21-43, maintains the intercalation, but
simplifies each story by eliminating the recursion found
in their Markan forms.
Embedding, by contrast, repeatedly occurs in one location in the sequence, and only one thematic type is used: the type A, pronouncement/dialogue theme. It occurs in the element of Jesus' reaction, or embraces both the "approach" and the reaction elements, in 2:5-10 and 3:2-5a. These two instances, taking place at either end of Mark's controversy section, involve a confrontation with opponents in which Jesus authenticates his authority by the miracle.

As in the exorcism theme, the long structural sequence and the shared "language" of its central elements are no barrier to creative composition in the healing theme. It may just as easily be claimed that they could provide the skilled narrator with a secure foundation upon which to build both his stories and his story.

(4) Type B.4, nature miracles. The nature miracles are the most diverse group of all the miracle stories. They share general features of the structural

---

150 3:1-6 has been classified primarily as a type A, pronouncement scene, but it could easily be classed the other way. It was noted above that this pericope possesses a high degree of integration for an oral narrative.

151 As noted earlier, Theissen makes two classes of these, miracles of rescue (Rettungswunder) and of feeding. Neither set of the suggested characteristics for these is impressive, in Mark's context at least. He listed three characteristic motifs for the rescue, Wundergeschichten, pp. 107ff.: (1) a cry for help (absent from 6:45-52), and a definition of need (found in healings and exorcisms, too), (2) a saving "epiphany", and (3) recognition of the divine nature of the rescuer (absent from 6:45-52, and at best rhetorically implied in 4:35-41). Only (2) appears to be truly characteristic of the sea miracles as found in
sequence of the exorcisms and healings, that is elements of situation, description of the problem,152 "command" to deal with problem,153 and (of course) the "result", an accomplishment of the miracle. The paired feeding stories, 6:35-44 and 8:1-10, share extensive similarities in content and language, but few other similarities are evident within the group.

Nevertheless, there does appear to be an element, and perhaps two, which may be considered as characteristic of all four nature miracles (see figure 5.5). All have a "point" to them. This point is expressed after the accomplishment of the miracle, and in the case of the feedings it is brought out after an intervening pericope.154 Another possible shared element comes prior to the miracle,

Mark. For the feedings, Theissen, p. 111, lists as characteristics: (1) the spontaneous initiative of the wonder-worker (not so in 6:35-44, where the disciples present the need), (2) the lack of obvious means for the miracle (true, the description of distribution is brief, and emphasis lies on the "blessing" and "breaking"—if that is what Theissen meant), and (3) stronger than usual emphasis upon the demonstration of the miracle (presumably referring to the leftovers, but these are more important for the "point"—see below—in 8:14-21).

152 Cf. "appearance of the demoniac" (and "address by demon") in the exorcisms, and description of the "illness" in the healings.

153 Cf. the act of "exorcism" in the exorcisms and, "touch", "speech", and "cure" in the healings.

154 The "point" of 6:35-44 is made (incongruously) in 6:52 after the second sea miracle, and the "point" of 8:1-10 is made in the private teaching scene, 8:13-21 (with retrospection to 6:35-44, also), again after an interval (8:11-12). The content of 8:13-21 (esp. vv. 17-18) is reminiscent of 4:12-13.
when Jesus' attitude or approach to the problem is peculiar, and prompts a questioning reaction from the disciples. In the two sea miracles and the first feeding, Jesus' attitude is one of apparent unconcern about the problem;\(^\text{155}\) and in the second feeding, Jesus poses the problem without offering a solution. Even in the fig-tree episode, an embedded nature miracle (11:12-14,20) a yap explanatory phrase indicates that figs were not in season, although no reaction from the disciples is given on this.

So some distinctive structural features of the nature miracles can be made out. The point element might be said to result from an attitude in the tradition against taking such miracles as "wonders" in their own right, but this cannot be pressed here. As has been indicated, common language in these is restricted to elements of the feeding miracles: the "command" and "result". This agreement has been adequately treated by Taylor;\(^\text{156}\) but it may be added that the agreement in language follows right on through the recursion of these elements in both episodes.

\(^{155}\)In 4:38a, Jesus is sleeping through the storm; in 6:48b, one is told that Jesus "meant to pass them by"; and in 6:37a, he simply tells the disciples to provide food for the crowd.

\(^{156}\)Taylor, Mark, pp. 358ff. He also points out the differences of the second which "suggest independent compilation", p. 360. These differences are reflected in Pryke's "redactional text", Redactional Style, pp. 159f., 162: practically all of 6:35-44 is "Markan", and practically all of 8:1-10 is not.
There are no other instances of recursion beside the two just noted. Expansion is also limited to the early descriptions of the "setting" (4:35-36, 6:45-47) or of the "problem" (8:1b-3), and to the "point" elements (8:14-21, for both feedings; and 11:21-25, which is the heart of that pericope).

In summary, the type B, miracle scenes as a whole fall into four more or less distinct groups, with the epiphanies being the most different from the rest. Common language is more frequent, within these groups, than it was in the type A, pronouncement scenes. The structure and the language, again, fit what might be expected of oral themes, and the (literary) means of elaborating these pericopes fall within the bounds of how an oral narrator composes themes as he tells his larger story.

Type C, public speech scenes. Some discussion of the type C, public speech scenes, and type D, private speech scenes has already been offered in the typology, which presented them as a framework within which the narrator could introduce sayings material into his narrative. Bultmann has already provided a reasonably extensive analysis of the "insertion" of the speech material into the narratives. He understands this procedure as an extension and adaptation of the apophthegm form, more or less equivalent with theme-type A.157

157Bultmann, HST, pp. 329ff.
Indeed there is much to be said for his view. It is a fact that several type A narratives have pronunciation or response elements "expanded" by the addition of apparently discrete sayings material. Moreover the difference between type A material and type C is not always crystalline. The distinguishing mark is the degree to which the narrative is an outgrowth of a particular situation given at the start of the pericope: the teaching in type C usually appears unmotivated—Jesus simply calls an audience together and begins.

Type D is slightly different again: its chief difference from type A themes is the clearly-marked seclusion in which the teaching (or dialogue) takes place. Type D is otherwise even more close to type A, and in fact, as has been noted, is frequently paired with type A themes as a private explanation of the public pronunciation which precedes.

Both type C and type D have their own structural identity, and this confirms their classification. The structure of type C is a fairly simple four-element sequence, occasionally extended by a concluding element indicating the "reaction" of the audience. A "setting", giving indications of place or time, is followed by the "assembly" of a crowd to listen. The "sayings" material proper is often introduced by a "speech" element, indicating the form of the address (see figure 5.8).
The "speech" and the "sayings" elements are essential to the theme; the setting and assembly elements are frequent but may be omitted, especially in contexts where these details are already given or implicit. There are a few embedded instances where all the other elements are present, but no actual "sayings" are given (1:21-22, 2:13, 6:34, 10:1).

Bultmann illustrated how the "language" of the introductory elements is related to that of the apoph-
theqms, and, further, listed phrases from the "fixed terminology" characteristic of what he called this "editorial activity". The structure and the language, however, may equally be characteristics of oral compositional activity—indeed more than equally, if it is correct that a literate editor would be more likely to seek variety.

Of the "language" listed by Bultmann, the phrases beginning with προσκαλεσόμενον are characteristic of the assembly element of type C themes: this "calling together" occurs in 7:14a and 8:34a (of the "crowd"), and in 3:23a. In other instances of the assembly element one finds the formulaic phrase, ὑμεῖς ἐρχεσθε πρὸς αὐτόν (2:13b, 4:1b, 10:1, cf. also 1:5): this phrase is not listed by Bultmann. A network of related phrases characterizes the "speech" element: the simple "he said" occurs (7:14b, 34b), but more frequently the speech is called "preaching" (1:7a, 1:14b) or "teaching" (1:21b, 2:13c, 4:12a, 6:34, 10:1c, 12:35a, 38a). In addition, when appropriate, Mark indicates that the teaching is "in parables" (4:2, 12:1a; also 3:23b).

Only the "sayings" element is subject to expansion. This expansion occurs through the compilation of various sayings, by type (as in parables: 3:23-29, 4:3-8, 21-32) or by subject matter and catchword (8:34-9:1). None of the examples in Mark shows embedding, although several

158Ibid., pp. 331f.
type C themes are themselves embedded elsewhere. The only instance of recursion is in 12:35-44, where a repetition of the speech-form element in v. 38a is used to append a saying against the scribes (12:38-40) to a (scribal) scripture argument (12:35-37).

The type C, public speech scene is a simple theme, whose narrative components show definite signs of structure and a common language. This is especially clear in those instances which do not introduce actual sayings material. Type C therefore approaches being a "composition theme".

**Type D, private speech scenes.** Private speech scenes have a somewhat more complicated structure (see figure 5.9). These scenes all involve Jesus and a varying number of his disciples in dialogue or teaching activity which is clearly not open to the public. The second element in the structure, "seclusion", will generally make this clear, although occasionally the fact of privacy is already given. The first element may be the familiar "setting", or it may be omitted when the private speech scene comes immediately behind a type A, type C, or another type D scene, as an explanation or expansion of what has already been said. As was noted in the typology, the combination of types A and D is well-attested in Rabbinic tradition.

Bultmann's comments, just referred to in relation to type C themes, are also applicable here. The type D
# FIGURE 5.9

## STRUCTURE OF TYPE D, PRIVATE SPEECH SCENES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Prior type A,C</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Seclusion</th>
<th>Question/Reaction</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>Reproof</th>
<th>Saying (Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:10-20</td>
<td>C=1-9</td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>11-12(34)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6:7-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:17-23</td>
<td>A,C=1-16</td>
<td>17a</td>
<td>17b</td>
<td>18a</td>
<td>18a</td>
<td>18b-23</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:13-21</td>
<td></td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:(27)</td>
<td>(D)=27-30</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>32b</td>
<td>33a</td>
<td>33b</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-32a Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:(2)</td>
<td>(D)=2-10</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-32</td>
<td></td>
<td>30a</td>
<td>30b</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:33-50</td>
<td>(D=30-32)</td>
<td>33a</td>
<td>33b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33c Rec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 35a 35b(7) 35b-37 Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 39-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pericope</td>
<td>Prior A,C</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Seclusion</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>Reproof</td>
<td>Saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10-12</td>
<td>(A=2-9)</td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>23a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:23-31</td>
<td>(A=17-22)</td>
<td>(17a)</td>
<td>23a</td>
<td>24a</td>
<td>24b-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27b</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:32-34</td>
<td>(D=23-31)</td>
<td>32a</td>
<td>32b</td>
<td>32c-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:3-37</td>
<td>(A=1-2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:17-25</td>
<td>(14-16)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:26-31</td>
<td>(D=17-25)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27-28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:32-42</td>
<td>(D=17-31)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34-36</td>
<td>37-38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
theme is even more closely related to the apophthegm (type A) form than is type C, and could even be considered a special sub-type of it. Other characteristic elements, beside "seclusion", are those of "distinction" and "reproof". These stem from the relationship between Jesus and his disciples and serve, when present, to reinforce the impression of privacy.

"Distinction" indicates actions or words of Jesus which (1) narrow down the circle of listeners even further than the fact of "seclusion" indicates (8:33a, 9:35a, 10:32b, 14:33), or (2) express a contrast between those privately addressed and those "outside" (4:11-12, 7:18). The "reproof" is directed towards actions or ideas of the disciples which Jesus criticizes. Neither of these elements is found in every instance, but they are frequent.

The elements in the private teaching scene closest to the apophthegm are the concluding "saying" element, and the "question" or "reaction" of the disciples which leads up to it. The "question" element is not essential, as Jesus may take the initiative for a pronouncement or "saying" upon himself. The essential elements in the theme are the saying, plus some indication of seclusion or distinction.

Common language in the elements is largely restricted to the note of seclusion. The frequently noted vague place-markers, "in the house" and "on the road",

159"House": 7:17, 9:33, 10:10; and "road": 8:27, 10:17, 10:32.
as well as phrases meaning "privately" (κατ' ἰδίαν, 9:2, 13:3; and κατὰ μόνας, 4:10a) are used for the seclusion element, although other phraseology is found. In addition, three reproof elements consist of rhetorical questions enquiring after the disciples' failure to understand (4:13, 7:18a, 8:17-18, 21).

As with the type C themes, expansion of the elements is restricted to the sayings element at the end. The most extended of these are 6:8-11, 9:39-50, and 13:5-37. Less ambitious, but similarly-compounded "sayings" groups include 7:18b-23, 9:12-13, 10:29-31, 14:20-25, 14:27-28, 14:41-42. Embedding is rare: the only instance is the possible embedding of a Type A, pronouncement scene in the saying element of 9:36-37.

Recursion proliferates in the type D themes, just as it did in type A.2 dialogue scenes. Most instances of recursion reflect a development of the central idea under discussion (e.g., 8:13-21, 8:31-33, 9:33-50, 10:23-31, and 14:26-31). Twice the recursion allows alternation between two ideas: 14:17-25 and 14:32-42. Recursion always takes place following a saying element.

One noteworthy feature of recursion in this type is that at least three times, the final recursion of the sequence does not end in a "saying" element, but in a "reproof" (8:21, 8:22b) or in a "question" (14:31). It is not impossible that the sequence of elements may be altered for emphasis, just as the sequence of grammatical elements in a phrase may be altered. This anomaly, then,
underscores the freedom and variety of composition which takes place in the use of this particular theme, whose importance for Mark's narrative cannot be underestimated. The extension of the theme into the Passion narrative provides another important thread of thematic continuity with the Gospel's narrative as a whole.

**Type E, Sammelberichte.** It has been pointed out that type E, Sammelberichte report "similar types of events" just as much as do other pericopes. More than this, Sammelberichte display a common structural sequence, and individual elements share common "language" characteristics, exactly as would be expected of an oral-formulaic theme and even as Gunkel would have expected.  

Wilhelm Egger's treatment of these matters in his *Frohbotschaft und Lehre* is helpful.  

He finds the structure to be a simple, three-element sequence: (1) an indication of Jesus' arrival at a precisely established "place" (and often at a definite time); (2) a description of the gathering of a "crowd" around Jesus; and (3) an account of Jesus' "activity." The first element, he says,

---

160 Gunkel, as cited by John Hayes, *Introduction to Old Testament Study* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979), pp. 127ff., prescribed three criteria: (1) a store of thoughts and moods, (2) a traditional linguistic form, and (3) a definite Sitz im Leben. Sammelberichte appear to meet the first two; only an overriding "social" definition of the Sitz prevents its classification as traditional. Egger tried to supply such a Sitz.

161 Egger, *Frohbotschaft*, pp. 27-38. See especially his charts on the "structure", p. 28; and on the parallels in Matthew and Luke, p. 36.
is not unlike that of most pericopes, but the second is distinguished by the fact that the crowd "gathers" together. The third of course is the most important.162

Despite the simplicity of the structure, itself a contrast to some forms (he cites Theissen's list of thirty-three motifs for miracles), Egger maintains that the Sammelberichte have many vivid touches to them.163 Of course, this use of "structure" to create particular narratives has so far been found to be typical of all themetypes.

Two reservations need to be lodged against Egger's analysis. First, the "place" is not always precisely determined, as he had claimed. This may be a matter of semantics and interpretation, but Egger's insistence on this is exaggerated: "beside the sea" (2:13), "to the sea" (3:7), and "a lonely place" (6:31,32) are quite general markers. Secondly, the focus upon Jesus leads Egger to omit Mark 1:4-5 which places the crowd around John the Baptist in a pericope having all the other marks of a Sammelbericht.

The form-critical, rather than oral compositional, nature of Egger's approach dictates this overlooking of a clear literary relationship. Schmidt, who apparently coined the term, "Sammelbericht", also overlooked this

162 Ibid., pp. 27ff.
163 Ibid., pp. 29f.
instance,\textsuperscript{164} as did Taylor:\textsuperscript{165} both apparently for the same reason. This example shows most clearly the negative effect of the form-critical neglect of "formal" characteristics.\textsuperscript{166}

Another difference from Egger's analysis is reflected in figure 5.10, which lists fewer Sammelberichte than Egger does.\textsuperscript{167} In some cases Egger appears to go too far toward letting "content", something approximating a generalized report of Jesus' activity, take precedence over structure in identifying instances of the type. For example, 1:14f. and 1:21f. omit any mention of the coming or gathering of a "crowd", although the audience's presence is certainly implicit in the latter. They are better classified with public speech scenes--especially 1:14f., which introduces a formally discrete saying (no matter how programmatic it appears, and is). Other instances, 1:39, 5:21, 6:6b(?), and 6:12b(1), are perhaps Sammelbericht


\textsuperscript{165}Taylor, Mark, p. 85, did not include it in his list, nor did he appear to recognize any similarity in his comments on the passage, pp. 154f.

\textsuperscript{166}Typically, Bultmann, HST, pp. 341ff., acknowledged the "schematic" nature of Sammelberichte, and similar passages, but still considered them to be "editorial"--precisely because they were schematic. Of course Bultmann recognized little difference in principle between oral and written processes.

\textsuperscript{167}Egger, Frohbotschaft, pp. 2, 28, listed the following, which are not included in figure 5.10: 1:14f., 1:21f., 1:39, 5:21, 6:6b, 6:12f.
elements embedded in their respective contexts. They are certain not full Sammelberichte.

---

**FIGURE 5.10**

**STRUCTURE OF TYPE E, SAMMELBERICHTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Crowd</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:4-5</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>5a</td>
<td>4b,5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:32-34</td>
<td>(29),33</td>
<td>32b-33</td>
<td>34 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:13</td>
<td>13a</td>
<td>13b</td>
<td>13c (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:7-12</td>
<td>7a</td>
<td>7b-8</td>
<td>9-12 (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30a</td>
<td>30b Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31b</td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34 (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:53-56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54-56a</td>
<td>56b (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:1</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>1c (C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this last judgment, it is clear that for the thematic analysis all three elements are essential for the theme to be discrete entity. Characteristic language attaches itself to all three elements, although to a varying degree. Two, one-verse instances of the theme, 2:13 and 10:1, are composition themes with quite similar language.\(^{168}\)

---

\(^{168}\)For all these elements, see Egger's chart, Frohbotschaft, p. 28.
2:13 (Place) καὶ ἔξηγῆσαι πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν
(Crowd) καὶ τῶν ὁχλος ἤφεξε τοὺς αὐτῶν
(Act) καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοῦς

10:1 (Place) καὶ ... ἤφεξε τὰ ὅρια ...
(Crowd) καὶ συμπροεξεταὶ πάλιν ὁχλοι πρὸς αὐτῶν
(Act) καὶ ὅσα εἶ须ει πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοῦς

Similar "place" elements occur in 1:4a, 3:7a, 6:(31)32, and 6:53. Similar "crowd" elements, occur in 1:5a and 3:7b-8; less similar are 1:32b-33, 6:33, and 6:54-55a. All are characterized by common συν-compounded words,169 by frequent use of terms for "all", "many", and "great",170 as well as the term "crowd", and by formulaic phrases consisting of motion verb plus πρὸς αὐτῶν. Lists of those who gather are found here, too: 1:5a and 3:7b-8 (cf. 1:32b-33 and 6:54).

The "activity" elements fall into two main classes, healing (1:34, 3:9-12, and 6:56b) and teaching (2:13c, 6:34, 10:1; cf. also 1:46, 2:2, 4:2). The healing elements display more variety, sharing only a twice-repeated formula, πολλοὶ ἔθεράπευσεν, and liberal use of terms for quantity. The teaching elements are more similar, with formulaic variations on ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοῦς, and the same terms for quantity yet again.

169 ἐπισυνηγμένη, 1:32b-33; συνάγονται, 6:30a; συνέδραμον, 6:33; συμπροεξεταὶ, 10:1. Cf. also, 2:2, and 4:1.

170 τῶν: 1:5a (twice), 1:32b-33, 2:13, 6:33, and (4:17); ὁλος: 1:32b-33, 6:54; πολὺ πλήθος: 3:7b-8 (twice); and πολλοὶ: 6:31b (also 2:2).
The "crowd" and "activity" elements are freely expanded. This led Schmidt to hold that the Sammelberichte violated Olrik's "law" of "simple" (schlicht) narration of individual events. But expansion here consists in multiplying the general statements about crowds or the activities of Jesus. The narratives may be jumbled and full, but they retain the paratactic, "adding" style of oral composition. Expanded crowd elements include 1:5, 1:32b-33, 3:7b-8, and 6:54-56a. Activity elements in 3:9-12 and 6:34 are expanded.

Recursion of the elements only occurs in 6:30-34, where it is used to effect a transition between the return of the disciples and the gathering of the crowd for the first feeding miracle. It was observed earlier that the effect and message of the feeding miracles were directed at the disciples; and this transition was likely intended to draw the idea of the disciples' mission into relationship with the feedings.

It is likely that the exorcism (type B.2) and the

---

171 Schmidt, Rahmen, pp. 33f. Has Mark really violated Olrik's law of "concreteness" here? Olrik, "Epic Laws", p. 137, stated that concreteness is "a general principle that each attribute of a person or thing must be expressed in actions—otherwise it is nothing". Surely the Sammelberichte only detail collective sets of actions, which have individually illustrated elsewhere in the Gospel.

172 Egger himself noted the paratactic style, Frohbotschaft, pp. 33f. He points out, with reference to Schmidt's evaluation of the "style", that it is the description and not the grammar which is complicated.
healing (type B.3) themes are embedded in 3:11-12 and 6:55-56, respectively, as the sequence of these themetypes is followed in the description of Jesus' exorcistic and healing activities.

The compositional significance of the Sammelberichte for Mark's narrative is widely recognized. Their identity as oral themes does not take away from this significance, but this significance should not be exaggerated by the impression that these are free creations of the Gospel's redactor, in contrast to the received form of his other traditions. Undoubtedly their narration was somewhat more general and therefore more plastic than many other themes in Mark, but all are structured and are products of a traditional improvisation which is neither totally free nor totally pre-determined.

Type F, calling scenes. Three calling scenes were described in the typology, and yet another pericope, 10:17-22, appears to share elements of the theme. The sequence of elements has four members, all of which are found in the three primary instances (see figure 5.11). These are: a setting element, indicating both the movement and the location of Jesus at the time of the event; an indication of the person "seen" by Jesus (establishing Jesus' initiative in the calling and giving a degree of

173 See, e.g., Egger's summary, Frohbotschaft, pp. 20f. He declared that every essential theological idea of Mark is reflected in them. See also Leander Keck, "Mark 3:7-12 and Mark's Christology", JBL 84 (1965), 341-58.
individuality to those called); the specific "call" to follow; and finally, the "response" to the call.

FIGURE 5.11
STRUCTURE OF TYPE F, CALLING SCENES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Person seen</th>
<th>Call</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:16-18</td>
<td>16a</td>
<td>16b</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:19-20</td>
<td>19a</td>
<td>19b</td>
<td>20a</td>
<td>20b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:14</td>
<td>14a</td>
<td>14b</td>
<td>14c</td>
<td>14d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10:17-22)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>21a</td>
<td>21b</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some common language is found for every element in the sequence. Both setting elements 1:16a and 2:14a begin with καί παράγων, and the following phrase, "along the sea", in 1:16a occurs in the verse immediately preceding 2:14. In all three major instances the second element consists of εἶδον, plus the names of those called, plus a participial phrase describing their activities or profession at that time. The corresponding element in the minor theme, 10:21a, states that Jesus "looking (ἐπετίθη) at him, loved him": this is not the same wording but might be considered to have the same effect of focusing on the individuality of the one about to be called.

The "call" and "response" elements show a similarity of terms which is best illustrated:
The only expanded element in the three major instances is the "call" in 1:17. This expansion takes place through the only example of embedding as well: a type A, pronouncement is present. There is no recursion in any of the scenes.

The calling theme is clearly marked by common structure and common language. In fact, it approaches the "composition theme" in its verbal stability more closely than any theme studied so far. Bultmann and Taylor both cite the call of Elisha (1 Kings 19:19ff.) as a forerunner of the present narrative form. One would not be surprised if other examples of a similar theme could be found in other non-Synoptic traditions.

**Type G, reaction scenes.** The reaction theme only governs two pericopes, but a related form or related language is distributed across several other passages as

---

174Bultmann, *HST*, p. 28; Taylor, *Mark*, p. 167. Somewhat surprisingly Bultmann did not call 2:14 a "doublet" but considered all three instances to be "variants of the same motif". When he then attempted to find the origin of the episodes in the metaphor about "fishers of men", he complicated matters needlessly, for that means the call of Levi, 2:14, must be a doublet after all. It is far easier to see the metaphor as an additional element.
well. The theme proper is found in 6.14-16 and 8:27-30 (see figure 5.12). The first of three elements is the standard "setting" element: one distinctive feature of the element in this theme is that it provides the motivation for the options provided in the "response". The "response" lists a series of opinions on the "true" identity of Jesus. This list is the same in both cases (6:14b-15, 8:28), with only minor variations in phrasing. The third element, the "reaction", is an individual decision or opinion as to Jesus' identity. No significant expansion, embedding, or recursion is present.

FIGURE 5.12
STRUCTURE OF TYPE G, REACTION SCENES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1:21-28)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22,27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4:41)</td>
<td>(4:37-4)</td>
<td>41a</td>
<td>41b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6:1-6)</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2c-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14-16</td>
<td>14a</td>
<td>14b-15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:27-30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15:39)</td>
<td>39a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>39b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reaction elements embedded in other pericopes consist of a "response"—generally of surprise or fear (1:22,27a, 4:41a, 6:2b)—to an action in the setting, followed by questions as to "who", or "what", is "this one" who is responsible for "this" (1:27b, 4:41b, 6:2c-3).
The last instance, 15:39, proposes an answer (finally) to who "this" is, much like the individual "reactions" of the major themes.

The differences between the major themes and the minor embedded themes are real, but the similarities in purpose, and to some extent in language (ἦνωμεν in 6:2 and 6:14; "this one" in 6:14; "who" in 8:27,29) appear to bind them together as a related form.

Type H, opponents' plot scenes. The opponents' plot scenes also form more of a minor theme than a major one. But structurally it is more homogeneous than the reaction theme. It governs two pericopes, 14:1-2 and 14:10-11, which form a ring around the anointing of Jesus in 14:3-9, and is also present as an embedded theme (1) in the situation element of the type A theme of Jesus' arrest, 14:43-52, and (2) in the outcome elements, 3:6, 11:18, and 12:12.

The sequence contains three essential elements, a description of the group which makes up the "opponents", a description of their "meeting", and the content of the "plot". A fourth element may conclude the sequence by indicating the opponent's "motive" for plotting or for the nature of the plot itself (see figure 5.13).

The language of the essential elements shows considerable similarity. Apart from the very first instance, the opponents are regularly the "chief priests and the
scribes". The aim of meeting is indicated by the term "seek" (ἐξήτουν, 11:18, 12:12, 14:1, 14:11). And the plot consistently is to seek "how to" destroy, seize, or betray him:

3:6 ἐπον αὐτὸν ἀπολέομαι
11:18 τῷ αὐτὸν ἀπολέομαι
12:12 . . . αὐτὸν κρατήσαι
14:1 τῷ αὐτὸν . . . κρατήσαντες ἀποκτεῖνωσιν
14:10 τῷ αὐτὸν . . . παραδοθῆναι
(14:46 καὶ εκράτησαν αὐτὸν)

In addition, "fear" is twice named as a motive for the plot: 11:18 and 12:12.

---

FIGURE 5.13

STRUCTURE OF TYPE H, OPPONENTS' PLOT SCENES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Motives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3:6)</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>6b</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11:18)</td>
<td>18a</td>
<td>18b</td>
<td>18c</td>
<td>18d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12:12)</td>
<td>(11:27)</td>
<td>12a</td>
<td>12b</td>
<td>12c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:1-2</td>
<td>(1b)</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>1c</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10-11</td>
<td>10a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11a</td>
<td>11b</td>
<td>11c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14:43-47)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45-46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A simple recursion of the elements occurs in 14:10-11, when Judas goes to the (other) opponents with his own

---

175 These two only in 11:18 and 14:1 (cf. 10.31); the "elders" are added to the pair in 12:12 and 14:43 (cf. 8:31). Judas appears in concert with the regular opponents in 14:10 ("chief priests" only) and 14:43.
"plot", and at the subsequent meeting it is agreed to carry this out.

The opponents' plot scene has sufficient similarity of wording among the instances to qualify as a "composition theme".

**Type I, sending scenes.** The sending scenes display a five-element structure (see figure 5.14). The "setting", "commission", "preparation", and possibly the "mission" elements may be considered essential. The "choice" element is present in 3:13b-14 and 6:7a, where it is necessary to distinguish the "twelve" who are then commissioned from other followers of Jesus. The choice is not found in 11:1-7 and 14:12-16, but may be implicit in the fact that "two" are commissioned. The "commission" simply indicates that Jesus has chosen to delegate a responsibility.

The "preparation" and the "mission" are the most significant elements of the sequence. These describe, respectively, the purpose and instructions for the commission, and how it turns out. The preparation and the mission in 11:2-7 are described in very similar terms, and the mission in 14:16 is summarized as occurring "just as" Jesus had said it would in the preparation (14:13b-15).

---

176 The "mission" element is missing from 3:13-15, which is embedded in an otherwise non-thematic pericope. Motifs of the "preparation" described here—namely, preaching and exorcising demons—are, however, found in the "mission" of 6:12-13.
The significant term common to all four commission elements is ἀποστέλλειν, and the "sending" is habitually in "twos" (6:7, 11:1, 14:13). The verbal similarities between the preparation elements in 11:2-3 and 14:13b-15 may be clearly seen in Taylor's comparison, and do not need to be repeated here. These similarities in fact extend from the "commission" through to the beginning of the "mission" and suggest that the theme-type as represented by these two examples be considered a "composition theme".

The "preparation" element is "expanded" in all the instances, as might have been expected. In 6:7-11, it is expanded through an embedded private teaching scene; in

---

177 The "choice" element of 3:13-14 and 6:7 also reflects a common phraseology:

3:13-14, καὶ προσκαλεῖται ... καὶ ἔτοίησεν ἀδήμοος
and 6:7, καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοῦ δόξας ἀδήμοος.

178 Taylor, Mark, p. 536.
form, 11:2-3 and 14:13b-15 could also be taken for private teaching, but the context and content argue otherwise. There are no other instances of embedding in the pericopes, nor is there any recursion of the elements.

Type J, the observing women. The final theme, the observing women, consists of only two elements which are identified strictly on the basis of their common "language" (see figure 5.15). It is not really proper to speak of a "structure" here at all, as the elements do not form a sequence. The elements are a "list" of the names of the women and an indication that they "observed" Jesus' death, his burial, and the uncovered entrance to his tomb. Mark, characteristically, adds an explanatory remark to the first instance of the list (15:41), and this may be taken as an expansion of the element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pericope</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:40-41</td>
<td>40a</td>
<td>40b-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15:47)</td>
<td>47b</td>
<td>47a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16:1-8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The key term in the "observation" element is the term, ῥησαίνω. Its use in these elements makes up three of the seven times the verb occurs in Mark. The statements in 15:40, 15:47, and 16:4 are all simple and
straightforward assertions in themselves, but the repeated use of the term stands out as more than coincidental. Similarly, the list of names itself is only mildly surprising, as Mark does drop names here and there, but when an almost identical list ("Salome" drops out in 15:47) is repeated three times in close succession, mere coincidence becomes unlikely. Sundwall also noted the common elements and language, speculating that Mark worked different narratives into the respective passages. This again points at the lack of "redactional" thoroughness in Mark, if the Gospel is viewed from that perspective.

Incidentally, this theme (or motif?) probably qualifies the passages with which they are associated for the designation "memorate", in folkloristic terms; this is in contrast to most other traditions in Mark which ought probably to be termed "legends". The difference lies

179E.g., not counting the major disciples, "Levi", 2:14; "Jairus", 5:22; "Bartimaeus", 10:46; "Barabbas", 15:7; and "Simon of Cyrene", "Alexander", and "Rufus", 15:21. The inference that some of those named (apart from Barabbas, i.e. I) were members of the Christian community is probably correct for all. Cf., e.g., Taylor, Mark, pp. 448, 588.

180Bultmann, HST, p. 276, simply takes this as evidence of the original individuality of the stories and of Mark's poor editing.


182"Legends" are traditional stories which in contrast to, say, folktales, make a truth claim, whatever one
in two things: (1) the source of a legend is unknown, whereas the memorate may still be traced back to an informant; and (2) the legend becomes "stereotyped in... style, content, structure, and form". Significantly, 15:33-39 and 15:42-47, to which the two most obvious type J themes are attached, have been found to be non-thematic.

Summary. The typology had established that the great proportion of Mark consisted of various "types of events", which were provisionally designated as themes. The present analysis has confirmed the existence of an extended network of structured themes, which are composed and combined to form the varied narrative units which make up the bulk of Mark's Gospel. The variations do not violate structures, but use them for literary ends. This finding is as predicted by oral-formulaic theory of thematic oral composition. Only a wooden view of oral "form", based upon the "pure-and-simple-original form" idea, would hold that this flexible composition of the pericopes in Mark must necessarily be the product of written redaction.


The phenomena of common sequences of "elements", which are frequently characterized by similar "language", appear to meet the expectations of the oral-formulaic theme, as described by Lord. Moreover this finding also answers to Gunn's description of a unitary thematic composition by an individual (oral) narrator. The structures of the themes were manipulated by expansion of individual elements, recursion of the sequence of elements, and through the embedding of "minor" themes within the sequence of the major themes. As a rule, the difference between major and minor themes was clear.

Some of the themes showed considerable variety in verbal expression. Others showed a relatively high degree of similarity. These alternate tendencies are present in the distinction between "type-scenes", having common elements and details, but little verbal correspondence, and "composition themes" which have a "seasonably high degree of verbal correspondence". The most varied were type A, pronouncement and dialogue scenes. Only slightly more common "language" was found in type B.1, epiphanies; type B.4, nature miracles; and type D, private teaching scenes. Toward the other end of the spectrum were type B.2, exorcisms, which had the most verbal similarity, followed by type B.3, healings; type C, public teaching scenes; type E, Sammelberichte; type F, calling scenes; type H, opponent's plot scenes; and type I, sending scenes. Types G, reaction scenes, and J, observing-women scenes, fell somewhere in between these poles.
The various theme-types retain their characteristic language even within unified traditional compositions by one narrator. The variations of language between different theme-types, then, does not in the first place give evidence of different, fixed "sources" used by the narrator. The use of verbal differences to distinguish supposed sources is found, for example, in an attempt by Morton Smith to delineate a written "aretalogy" used by Mark which was about a third the length of the Gospel and contained most of the miracle stories. Of course, the use of verbal differences to separate (written) sources is not to be entirely rejected as a critical method, but it requires careful qualification and the acknowledgement of other factors, such as thematic relationships, which may contribute to the same effect.

The first half of the thematic analysis has now been completed. The Gospel of Mark has been found to consist largely of a network of types of events. To each type, or its constituent sub-types, there is a structural identity, which provides a sequence of lesser narrative "elements". These characteristics of the Gospel and of its narrative units appear to qualify the Gospel as an oral traditional composition, in terms of the oral-formulaic theory.

Thematic Composition in Mark

The theme is not an end in itself, but a building block to be used in constructing a larger narrative. Given that Mark's narrative units are themes, a discussion of the use of these themes for thematic composition is in order. Earlier, three means of adaptation of themes to a larger narrative were mentioned: expansion, overlapping, and patterning; a by-product of these, narrative inconsistency, was also described. The discussion of thematic composition in Mark will take up each of these. The most extensive part of this discussion will deal with patterning, which is saved for last.

Because of the extensive study of Mark's Gospel at this level in recent years, it is not anticipated that new exegetical ground will be broken in this discussion. Instead, various exegetical studies which deal with groups and patterns of narrative units in Mark will be reviewed from the perspective of oral composition by theme. Particular attention will be given to claims for written sources supposedly used by Mark, as these are almost entirely incompatible with the hypothesis of oral composition.185 But the fact of literary formation, as seen in,

---

185 Oral traditional performers are in fact capable of taking up material initially received from written sources. See Lord, Singer, p. 137; and Finnegan, Oral Poetry, pp. 161f., 168. Indeed, the Old Testament is an undeniable, written "source" for Mark. Public readings of the Old Testament, for example, in synagogue worship, could account for the presence of the quotations and
say, narrative patterns and groups, is no longer necessary evidence of "later" or "secondary" (and therefore probably written) activity superimposed upon originally simple and independent, "primitive" units. Rather, such literary formation is likely from the beginning. The aim of this section is to show that literary formation found in Mark was possible orally.

Expansion of themes in Mark. Already in the study of thematic structure a considerable number of instances were pointed out where expansion has taken place. As was noted in the previous discussion of methodology, this "technique" has to do with both structure and composition. Oral composition builds upon the structure: expansion of individual elements within the structure and recursion of elements in its sequence are means to this end. (Expansion by embedding is related to "overlapping").

Substantial alteration or obliteration of the structure would be evidence of written composition. The analysis however found little evidence of this. Instead expansion took place within the bounds of the thematic structures. Lord has stated that the "balance and order" provided by the themes' structure enable the epic singer to stop and elaborate a point without losing a sense of

allusions in the tradition, and also for shared narrative types. A different explanation is needed for Matthew's two distinct classes of Old Testament quotations: he, or a predecessor, used the Old Testament text as a reference.
This is exactly the impression gained from the constancy of structure beneath Markan episodes of varying length, content, detail, and importance.\textsuperscript{187}

Overlapping of themes in Mark. The techniques by which the pericopes in Mark are brought together have been frequently discussed in recent literature,\textsuperscript{188} although Bultmann himself had a fairly extensive discussion of it already in his History of the Synoptic Tradition, and Johannes Sundwall published a pericope-by-pericope study of Mark's "Zusammensetzung" in 1934. Schmidt, in Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, does this too, but concentrates on showing the lack of good connection.

The issue here does not really have to do with the fact that certain "techniques" were used: the generally acknowledged literary relationships found in the text argue the use of the techniques. The question, rather, is, can these techniques be claimed as oral techniques exercised in the oral composition of Mark's Gospel? The fragmentary, simple-original, fixed-text concept of oral "forms" of course would argue against this. But a list of

\textsuperscript{186}Lord, Singer, p. 92.

\textsuperscript{187}David Noble's findings in "Structure" (cf. pp. 17f., 19) are to the same effect.

oral literary techniques has already been presented, and what is needed now is to compare these with the techniques found to have been exercised in the composition of the Gospel. The previous list of characteristic techniques of putting oral themes together to form a narrative included framing or ringcomposition, foreshadowing, and retrospection.

Ringcomposition, or "intercalation" as it has frequently been called, has long been acknowledged as a narrative technique in Mark. Ernst von Dobschütz found examples in Mark 6:12-30 (13-29 inserted), 14:1-11 (3-9), and 5:23-43 (25-34). Sundwall claimed 2:1-12 (5-10), 3:20-35 (22-30), 5:22-43 (25-34), 6:1-16 (7-13), and 11:13-25 (15-18), and also that 14:32-42 was inserted into a longer Petrusbericht. R. H. Stein, Werner Kümml, Howard Clark Kee, and Joanna Dewey all provide similar lists with slight variations.

Kee offers the most extensive discussion of the method and its significance, and observes that four of his examples are found in the small section of text that follows.

---


190 Sundwall, Zusammensetzung, pp. 13f., 20ff., 29, 35, 36f., 71, 81. Interestingly, Sundwall, p. 78, does not take 14:3-9 as an intercalation. He generally felt that link words motivated the intercalations, and found none there.

eight instances (2:1-12, 3:1-6, 3:20-35, 6:6-30) show the repetition of a phrase or of similar verbs on either side of the interpolated unit. This is typical of ringcomposition as it has already been described by Notopoulos.\textsuperscript{192} Kee's claim that "literary means are employed to serve dogmatic and pragmatic ends" is not disputed here,\textsuperscript{193} even if one might wish to debate some of his interpretations. It is simply to be observed that the "technique" is probably oral in its genesis, a product of oral composition by thematic units. The presence of the technique therefore does not argue a differentiation between Mark and oral tradition.

A second form of "overlapping" mentioned by Notopoulos is "foreshadowing", which may serve various functions. The prologue of a composition for example will foreshadow what is to come by creating "pregnant associations" for what follows. That this has occurred in Mark's prologue is affirmed by several interpreters:\textsuperscript{194} the role of John, of Old Testament prophecy, of the Holy Spirit, of Satan, of "the Kingdom of God", and of Jesus' identity as

\textsuperscript{192}See Kee's table in \textit{Community}, p. 54. On Notopoulos, see above, pp. 188f.

\textsuperscript{193}Ibid., p. 56.

"Son (of God)", to name several, are all established but not fully defined in Mark 1:1-15, first, and bear influence at later points in the Gospel.

Other instances of "foreshadowing" are the recurrent opponents' plot scenes (3:6, 11:18, 12:12, 14:1f., 10f.) and prophecies by Jesus. Chief among the latter are the "Passion predictions" (8:31, 9:31, 10:33f.), the last of which could almost serve as an outline for the coming Passion narrative. The prophetic apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13, which reaches out beyond the boundaries of Mark's story, is also a type of foreshadowing: it too is listed by Notopoulos.

The final form of overlapping to be considered is retrospection, the converse of foreshadowing. The chief instances of this in the Gospel are the Sammelberichte, which provide generalized descriptions of typical activity and help to achieve unity out of the individual accounts of various types of activity. Notopoulos had specifically included summaries or recapitulations in his description of retrospection. Retrospection also occurs in the reaction scenes (6:14f. and 8:27-30) and frequently in the


196 See above, p. 190. On Mark 13, cf., e.g., Norman Petersen, "'Point of View' in Mark", Semeia 12 (1978), 112f.

197 See above, p. 190.
private teaching scenes (esp., 4:10-20, 8:14-21, and 10:23-31).

All these forms of overlapping are equally possible in oral and written composition, as means of providing narrative unity. It is only if the creation of narrative unity is already denied to oral tradition that the presence of these techniques becomes "evidence" of written literature. The oral theme itself is a coherent narrative unit, and themes are in turn ordered by a coherent framework, but the consistent details of the unit are not always consistently carried out between the units. In this way narrative inconsistency becomes a typical characteristic of oral composition, even within a "unified" narrative.

Narrative inconsistency in Mark. Four examples of narrative inconsistency in Mark may be mentioned. In Mark 4:1, Jesus is pictured on a boat, addressing a crowd gathered along the sea-shore. This setting is reiterated in 4:36, and is implicit in 4:33f., where "them" can only mean the people or the crowd, in contrast to the disciples. Yet in 4:10, Jesus explains the parable of the

198 Lord, Singer, p. 95: an episode has its own "consistency".

199 Cf. John A. Meagher, "Die Form- und Redaktionsungeschickliche [sic] Methoden: The Principle of Clumsiness in the Gospel of Mark", JAAR 43 (1975), 459-72, who correctly recognizes inconsistency or "clumsiness" as a normal phenomenon in oral narration. His use of the analogy of joke-telling, which is a genuine form of oral tradition, is a questionable one for the Gospels on most other grounds, but not so in this instance.
sower "when he was alone" with the disciples. When does this happen? Mark gives no indication, and furthermore gives no explicit indication of when Jesus again begins speaking to the crowd (4:21 or 26?).

Observing this situation, Norman Petersen claimed that "the editing is flawed".200 This is of course a possibility, although one wonders why Mark, who according to Petersen himself often shows considerable skill in his composition (or redaction), should overlook such a simple factor. It is at least equally possible to envision the "inconsistency" in terms of oral narration. The parable of the sower calls to mind its interpretation, which is given as an aside in a private speech scene: the return to the main theme of public, parabolic teaching could be indicated by tone of voice just as easily as by verbal reiteration of the public setting. The private setting of the explanation (4:10) belongs to the theme of private speech and need not materially affect the broader context of the passage for either the speaker or his hearers.

The second example of inconsistency is the conflict between the indicated destination of the voyage of Jesus and the disciples in 6:45, Bethsaida, and the actual landing at Genessaret recorded in 6:53.201 It will be

---


201 Observed, e.g., by Schmidt, Rahmen, p. 182; and Achtemeier, "Isolation", pp. 282ff. Mark gives no indication that the change was caused by the storm of 6:48 (cf.
argued later that the extent of Markan "redactional" activity seen in this context in fact works against the supposition that Mark-the-redactor would have carelessly failed to smoothe out the inconsistency. The "redactional" characteristics and the inconsistency are more compatible from the perspective of oral composition.

A minor inconsistency is found in 12:1-12, where Mark indicates that Jesus spoke with "parables", yet relates only one example. Schmidt suggested that Mark was borrowing just one parable from a prior collection.202 It has been seen that the formulaic, "he spoke (taught) in parables", is commonly associated with such public teaching scenes. The statement is therefore related to the narrative theme being presented and says nothing of Mark's "sources". Of course, Mark may well have had more sayings at his disposal, which for some reason he did not put to use.

The final inconsistency occurs between 14:64, where "all" the Sanhedrin condemn Jesus, and 15:43-46 where a "respected member" of the same Sanhedrin, Joseph of Arimethea, sympathetically takes it upon himself to bury Jesus.203 The "condemnation" of 14:64 is a "reaction"

Taylor, Mark, p. 332): as it stands there is an inconsistency and one seeks explanation for it in terms of how one perceives Mark's Gospel to have been composed.

202 Schmidt, Rahmen, pp. 287f.

203 Werner Kelber, Passion in Mark, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), p. 175, points out this "incongruity".
statement and has a generalizing nature. The fact that this would appear to exclude sympathetic action by a single member of the group is a classic example of an oral narrative inconsistency. One of the types of inconsistency classified by William Hansen is the failure to prepare in advance for a detail introduced later in the narrative.²⁰⁴ In this instance, the detail is not Joseph's intervention itself, but the fact of his membership in the condemning body (15:43).

Just as various techniques used in Mark to join narrative units into a coherent whole are seen to be possible and even more likely in an oral composition, so the failure to achieve a consistent, detailed coherence is characteristically oral. Mark the writer, who employed the former techniques with reasonable effectiveness upon fragmented sources, would not be expected to overlook these inconsistencies (although of course he might do so anyway), but there is far less tension, if any, between the presence of both in an oral composition.

Patterning in Mark. The presence in Mark of groupings of similar types of material, such as the parables in the fourth chapter, and of smaller narrative unities, such as the Passion narrative, has long been noted. It is frequently inferred that these unities were created before

²⁰⁴Hansen, Conference Sequence, pp. 2f.
the composition of the Gospel as a whole. This inference is based on such things as the presence of "doublets" in the narrative, and on narrative inconsistency. In general, the "literary" shortcomings of the Gospel as a whole are believed to force one to conclude that Mark's compositional effort was impeded by the prior existence of these complexes which provided so much of his material. If he had been their creator, then he would have been better able to integrate them into the whole.

Recent literary appreciation of what Mark has accomplished tends, however, to lead the other direction,

---

205 Taylor, Mark, pp. 67-77, for example, reviewed various theories for "the Markan sources". Later, pp. 90-104, he reviewed some eighteen "small complexes" of material within the Gospel, some "arranged topically" and some "with a narrative interest". He concluded, pp. 102ff., that Mark himself formed some of these prior to composing the gospel itself; that he received others as direct "personal testimony"; and that the rest were pre-formed in his tradition and so were used as source material.

206 Ibid., p. 67.

207 Ibid., pp. 92f., e.g., on 2:1-3:6 being "too early in the Markan plan", and 3:19b-25 making the "death plot" of 3:6 an "anticlimax". Even C. H. Dodd, "Framework of the Gospel Narrative", pp. 7, 9, 10f., used awkwardness and inconsistency for evidence of the (verbally fixed) pre-existing traditional outline of Jesus' ministry which, he believed, consisted of several consecutive Sammelberichte.

208 Taylor, Mark, p. 105: "the Gospel is not a carefully planned literary composition, but a popular writing conditioned by the state of existing tradition... [with] limitations... imposed by the earlier groupings of Gospel material". This view is not being contested here (except for the "writing"): Mark is Kleinliteratur, after all.
in evaluation of both the collections and the smaller narrative unities. That is, Mark, through, with, or despite the smaller complexes, did achieve more literarily than has sometimes been held. Once again the familiar paradox appears: Mark seems to have been a skillful composer (and theologian), and yet a clumsy redactor.

As a general principle it may be said that all of these matters—the presence of "doublets", the use of pre-formed traditional complexes of material, narrative inconsistencies, a lack of thorough narrative integration, and (despite these) the achievement of significant literary effect—are held to be characteristic of oral narrative literature. The oral-literary hypothesis therefore offers a simpler, all-embracing explanation for these conflicting characteristics of Mark. The following review of a few significant contributions to the study of "patterns" in Mark is intended to illustrate this point, and to examine claims that these pre-Markan complexes had a written form.

The first study to be reviewed is Paul Achtemeier's

---

209See, e.g., Joanna Dewey, Markan Public Debate, who argues for Markan composition of 2:1-3:6. (Note that Taylor, Mark, p. 92, holds that Mark the evangelist was the "compiler" of 2:1-3:6 prior to composition of his Gospel.) Cf. also Norman Petersen, "The Composition of Mark 4:1-8:6", HTR 73 (1980), 185-217, who argues that Mark interacted creatively with pre-existing miracle cycles (whose existence he accepts as given).

210See, e.g., Werner H. Kelber, ed., Passion in Mark: especially John R. Donahue, "Introduction", pp. 8-20, who reviews recent work challenging the unity of the Passion narrative, and offers a literary, "redaction-critical" perspective on its composition.
influential attempt to demonstrate the existence of two parallel "miracle catenae". The fundamental argument for the existence of the pre-Markan catenae is that there is a parallel sequence of miracle stories in Mark 4:35-6:44 and 6:45-8:26, when intervening non-miracle material is filtered out. Achtemeier goes further to establish the independent identity of the miracle cycles (1) by showing the presence of Markan "editorial activity" in the non-miracle material and its (relative) absence in the miracle stories, and (2) by highlighting the awkwardness and inconsistencies in the present narrative, while arguing that a more coherent narrative can be discerned in the plain series of miracle stories (with Mark 8:22-26 moved "back" to fall between 6:45-52 and 7:24-31).

As has just been stated, the fundamental notion that two parallel sequences of material would be "pre-Markan" is perfectly understandable from an oral literary perspective: such "patterns" are simply to be expected as part of the "repertoire". But they would serve Mark's ends, primarily, and not just constitute an obstacle. The presence of awkwardness and inconsistency in Mark's narrative conforms to oral literary expectations and does not

---


212 Achtemeier, "Isolation", pp. 265f. See Petersen, "Composition", for a study of what is accomplished with this intervening material.
necessarily indicate a (poor) use of fixed sources.

One is not then surprised to find that the critic can (re-)construct a more coherent narrative than Mark presents: the perils of this aspect of Achtemeier's careful and detailed analysis are obvious. This is particularly evident when he rearranges Mark's order to make the pericopes fit the order of his hypothetical sequences by moving Mark 8:22-26 back to follow 6:45-52. It may be observed in passing that parallel "cycles" are still present if one leaves 8:22-26 in place and counts the intercalated healings of 5:21-43 as one: sea miracle (4:35-43, 6:45-52), healing of females (5:21-43, 7:24-30), healing

213 See Kümmel, Int, p. 85.

214 Achtemeier, "Isolation", pp. 285f. An inconsistency occurs after 6:45-52, in which Jesus sets the disciples on their way across the Sea of Galilee to Bethsaida (v. 45): after the sea miracle, they arrive in Genessaret (v. 53). This problem has been evident for some time, of course: see, e.g., Schmidt, Rahmen, pp. 182-85. Achtemeier makes the acute observation, that 8:22-26, which takes place in Bethsaida, fits nicely here between 6:52 and 53. And this would also help to explain the apparent inconsistency discerned by Schmidt at 8:13-22 (Rahmen, pp. 182ff.). But is one really to accept that Mark (1) takes a fixed, coherent narrative, as the catena presumably was, (2) extensively redacts 6:45-52 (elements of vv. 45, 46, 50, 51, and 52 are redactional, according to Achtemeier himself, "Isolation", pp. 283f.), (3) cuts out the next element to paste in later, and (4) in replacing it with his "own" construction, 6:53-56, makes such a glaring mistake so few words later? And all this time Mark has the clear-cut critical and theological aims regarding this material ascribed to him by Achtemeier in "Origin", pp. 198, 218ff. Can Mark really be such a purposeful theologian and such a "slipshod" writer, simultaneously? The narrative inconsistency itself does not appear consistent with this explanation of Mark's activity. ("Slipshod" is Morton Smith's term: see his "Comments on Taylor's Commentary on Mark", HTR 48 (1955), p. 38, fn. 23.)
of a male Gentile (5:1-20, 7:31-37, both with κηρύσσειν), and feeding miracle (6:35-44, 8:1-10).

A crucial part of Achtemeier's argument is the claim that the extent of Markan language is limited within the text of the miracles themselves. Achtemeier certainly perceives the catenae as having fixed texts, although he leaves open the issue of oral-versus-written in the end.215 The problem here is that the acknowledged range of Markan phraseology is narrow.216 Achtemeier states, for example, regarding 5:1-20: "The very lack of Markan style in the story argues for Mark having gotten it in written form and having reproduced it substantially as he received it."217 Yet Pryke's "redactional text" lists 5:1-2a, 8-9a, 11, 15, 17-20, about half of the pericope, as "undisputed" redactional composition.218

The intercalated stories of Jairus and the woman with a hemorrhage, 5:21-43, are said to have been origi-


216 Achtemeier only acknowledges three "Markan phrases" as such: καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ (and variations) and καὶ συνάγονται: Ibid., pp. 266-74, 275; and also ἦρξατο διαδόκειν (6:34), p. 280: but not ἦρξατο κηρύσσειν (5:20) because in "Markan editorial use" the combination "is restricted to references to Jesus": p. 276, fn. 44.

217 Ibid., p. 276: the "pleonasm" in v. 4, normally a characteristic of Mark, can equally be a "pre-written" carry-over. Note, too, the phrase omitted from 5:20 in the above footnote.

218 Pryke, Redactional Style, pp. 157f. (See p. 151, for "undisputed").
ally independent because they have different "styles" of composition. In the catena, the woman came first and Mark has inserted her story into the Jairus narrative.\textsuperscript{219} Now why Mark should combine these is not really explained; neither is it explained why the compiler of the catena--more coherent than Mark--did not himself impose a unified style upon the two stories. Additionally, the "different styles" could have been a direct product of the intercalation itself: the first of the "frequent" participles pointed out by Achtemeier in the woman's story comes right at the beginning of the pericope as the first of an exceptional series of participles in 5:25-27.\textsuperscript{220} After this, the style levels off again. According to Pryke, incidentally, about half the text of this complex (5:21, 23a, 24-26, 28, 30-31, 33, 35a, 41b-43a) is "Markan" too.\textsuperscript{221}

Finally, Achtemeier thinks that the extensive verbal parallels between the two feeding stories, 6:34-44 and 8:1-10, shows that they are "doublets", and "may even imply that they appeared in written form in the pre-Markan tradition".\textsuperscript{222} Of course, oral-formulaic theory would take the doubling as evidence of an oral formation.

Achtemeier observes the closeness of the language of these to the institution of the Lord's supper (14:22-25), which

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{219} Achtemeier, "Isolation", pp. 277ff.
\item \textsuperscript{220} Cf. Taylor, Mark, p. 289.
\item \textsuperscript{221} Pryke, Redactional Style, p. 158.
\item \textsuperscript{222} Achtemeier, "Isolation", p. 290.
\end{itemize}
he takes as a pre-Markan phenomenon; had Mark created the relationship, "he would, presumably, have brought the phrases into closer parallel with his account of the Lord's supper".223

Achtemeier claims in his second article that Mark has introduced the "fish" into these stories (at 6:38, 41, 43 and 8:7—awkwardly, of course) in order to distance the accounts from a eucharistic association, which had been forged by the compilers of the catenae. These had created the catenae for use in celebrating an "epiphanic Eucharist based on bread broken with the ἁπλή ἑαυτή", to which Mark was theologically opposed.224 So, despite the facts that the feedings are similarly worded doublets, and that they are at the crux of the theological Tendenz he wished to combat, Mark included both because he, for some inexplicable reason, also wished to preserve the material of the two catenae intact.225

The paradox of the entire analysis is evident: Mark is at once a critical theologian and a second-rate redactor. Achtemeier has not proven that a non-Markan style exists in these passages; in fact, Pryke's study consistently argued the opposite.226 There are then no

223Ibid., p. 279. Why now is it expected that Mark would be more thorough than his predecessors?


225Ibid.

226This is true for the feeding miracles, too. Pryke, Redactional Style, pp. 157f., found that in 6:34-
literary phenomena here which are not compatible with an oral-formulaic view of Mark's composition.

Another influential study of pre-Markan formations is that of Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn.\textsuperscript{227} He proposes a somewhat different approach to the delineation of pre-Markan collections. Regarding the normal literary-critical analyses as indecisive and insufficiently informed by form and tradition criticism, he takes the demonstration of a common \textit{Sitz im Leben} for the collected stories as the decisive criterion, with literary-critical and redaction-critical analysis as "controls" upon the exegesis.\textsuperscript{228} On

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1.37a] only vv. 35b-40 were "non-Markan"; however, vv. 2-9a of 8:1-10 appear as "non-Markan" in his analysis, p. 162. Both sets of "source" verses, by the way, include the "fish", contrary to Achtemeier's analysis!

\textsuperscript{227}Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, \textit{Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium}. Kuhn distinguished between the \textit{Sammlung} proper and an \textit{Überlieferungszusammenhang}, a collection and a "connection" of traditions, pp. 14-16. (He lists 1:16-39a as an example of an \textit{Überlieferungszusammenhang}.) Both may incorporate several traditional units with a common \textit{Sitz}, but only the \textit{Sammlung} is a "literary" unity. Kuhn is not too specific on all this, but the contrast is odd. If nothing else, \textit{Zusammenhang} would seem to imply more "unity" than does \textit{Sammlung}. Certainly a distinguishing feature of 1:16-39 is that it is a more unified passage than are most in Mark: see Schmidt, \textit{Rahmen}, p. 67; and Taylor, \textit{Mark}, pp. 90f. Perhaps the collections or patterns expected by oral-formulaic theory are better described by the \textit{Überlieferungszusammenhang}.

\textsuperscript{228}Kuhn, \textit{Sammlungen}, pp. 5, 45-51. In the intervening pages, Kuhn reviews arguments for the existence of several supposed pre-Markan collections and found all but one, 4:1-34, to be inconclusive; cf. Kümmei, \textit{Int}, pp. 84f. It should be recalled that Achtemeier, "Origin", pp. 210-220, made a similar attempt, apparently independently, to establish the \textit{Sitz} of his catenae.
this basis, Kuhn proceeds to study four possible collections: 2:1-3:6, 4:1-34, 10:1-45, and 4:35-6:52.

Some general methodological comments from an oral-formulaic perspective can be made at this point. Of course, the use of patterns by Mark is not doubted, and a modified acceptance of Sitz im Leben for traditions makes Kuhn's approach feasible. On the other hand, Kuhn wishes consistently to follow a form-critical method, that has definite limitations: the "sociological" Sitz im Leben is one-sided; the "collections" idea is based upon the original independence of the pericopes; and he still operates with a notion of fixed-text transmission, several "archaeological strata" of which are supposedly identifiable in Mark's text.

Still, the critical problem raised by Kuhn for oral composition of Mark is the description of the patterns as factors which Mark must overcome in his own composition (and which he fails to do), rather than as the very means by which his lengthy story is told. Crucial to the suc-


230 See, Ibid., pp. 12, 47f., 52.

231 This is evident in Kuhn's extensive (dare one say, literary-critical?) analyses of the history of the individual traditions prior to collection, of their adaptation to the collection, and then of Mark's own redaction of them; see, e.g., Ibid., pp. 53ff., on 2:1-12; pp. 61-71, on 2:18-22; and pp. 72-77, on 2:23-28.
cess of Kuhn's claim to have identified fixed pre-Markan complexes is the "redaction-critical" argument that he is able to find a distinct difference between the orientation of the collection and Mark's own purposes in the larger narrative.\textsuperscript{232}

For example, the \textit{Sammlung} in 2:1-28 is found to have been set in a controversy between Hellenistic and Jewish Christians, broadly speaking, over elements of Jewish piety now all but discarded by the former group.\textsuperscript{233} Kuhn offers four reasons why the \textit{Sammlung} is not Mark's.\textsuperscript{234}

1. The redactor's insertion of 2:13, 14f. has destroyed the ("original") connections here: 2:1-12 and 15-17 had been joined by \textit{stichwort}: \textit{δυσφατία} (four times in 2:1-12) and \textit{δυσφατωλίς} (three times in 2:15-17).

2. 2:28 appears redundant with the response of v. 27, but in fact formed the original conclusion to the whole collection: Mark himself would not have added v. 28, as he is not interested in the "Son of Man" until Peter's confession.

3. The redactional statement of 3:6 forms a second, historicizing conclusion to the whole section for Mark, reinterpreting the complex in terms of the conflict between the church and Judaism.

4. Finally, as has long been argued, Jesus' reference to his death in 2:20 and the use of "Son of Man" in 2:10 and 28 "conflict with Mark's redaction" (seiner Redaktion widerstreiten), because redactional interest in these only comes out later.

\textsuperscript{232}This difference must be "distinct", too: a certain degree of inconsistency is not unlikely.

\textsuperscript{233}Kuhn, \textit{Sammlungen}, p. 84. One could, no doubt, argue about this conclusion and about the methods used to attain it. Note that 3:1-6 is not included.

\textsuperscript{234}Ibid., pp. 86f.
It is difficult to argue with Kuhn without extensive exegetical discussion. Some response may be made to these four points, however.

(1) The "insertion" of 2:13,14f. may equally be said to expand the stichwort connection, simply introducing ἔκλωτοι into the mix. Perhaps this is only a matter of semantics, but it is significant that Mark should keep to the same method of connection. In addition the call of Levi increases the offense described in 2:16: Jesus not only eats with such people, but he calls them as disciples.

(2) Doubling of expressions is a general characteristic of Mark's composition.\(^{235}\) 2:28 also serves as a nice transition to 3:1-6 in which, as in 2:1-12, Jesus demonstrates the authority of the "Son of Man" by an exercise of miraculous power before his enemies.

(3) The concluding "historicizing" comment in 3:6 is only remarkable if it is presupposed that there was no "life-story" structure in the tradition. Besides this all the controversy apophthegms are, on the surface, about the conflict of Jesus (and implicitly, the church) with Judaistic norms. Kuhn's one-sided concept of Sitz im Leben causes him to overlook that Mark could in fact be carrying on a war on two fronts, the overt narrative and the implicit "ideational"—and this is no different from the practice he attributes to the Sammlung itself!

(4) If Mark was not yet interested in Jesus' death, despite 2:20, then why does he add 3:6, as Kuhn himself claims? And "Son of man", to Mark himself, may be little more than Jesus' own epithetic way of referring to himself.\(^{236}\) More broadly, is there any real way of

\(^{235}\) Cf. This is the burden of Frans Neirynck, Duality in Mark. (Louvain: Louvain University Press, 1972).

\(^{236}\) Morna Hooker, Son of Man in Mark, (London: SPCK, 1967), pp. 175, 179f., thought of the epithet as connected in Mark's mind with Jesus' "authority", and therefore as fully consonant with the rejection in 3:6 as well. She also observed that the three "groups" of Son of Man sayings are not integrated in Mark: this makes statements about a distinct meaning of the epithet for Mark himself speculative—too speculative to serve as a norm for his redaction.
saying that Mark has a coherent, conscious redactional intention if he habitually ignores material in conflict with it?

Beyond all this, 2:1-3:6 are shot through with Markan phraseology and techniques (the two intercalations in 2:1-12, 3:1-6, for example). Moreover, the entire section from 1:16 through to 4:34 creates a panorama of all the significant groups and ideas of the Gospel: disciples, opponents, family, and crowds. 2:1-3:6 is one "act" of this, establishing the confrontation between Jesus and his disciples on one side, and the religious hierarchy on the other. The confrontation is already implicit in 1:21f. and 27, and perhaps in 1:44. Mark does indeed have definite ("redactional") interests here.

In short, Kuhn's attempt to find tension between Mark's material and his compositional aims is founded (1) upon an unrealistically precise notion of what that material was, and (2) upon limited and dubious notions of what that aim was. The remainder of the Sammlungen work out much the same way. The stylistic differences are at best inconclusive, and the material differences

---


239 For example, three versions of "and he said (to them)" are found in 4:1-34. Kuhn, Sammlungen, pp. 130f., holds that one is Markan; another is rare in Mark and therefore non-Markan (even though Kuhn cites M. Zerwick, Zur Markus-Stil, citing other instances); and the third is pre-Markan. The distinction seems rather fine. Pryke, Redactional Style, p. 156, agrees: all three are part of his "redactional text".
between the perceived Sitze of the collections and the possible thrust of Mark's narrative are not really very great. In fact, in the concluding part of his study, Kuhn acknowledges that the collections are important structural units in Mark's composition: between 3:13-25 and 6:1-31, where two Sammlungen occur, and also between 1:32-45 and 3:7-12, where the first is located. He even notes "eine gewisse Parallelität" between the function of the collections for themselves and for Mark's narrative.

So, Kuhn's study, as Achtemeier's, ends up providing a certain amount of evidence for the positive use of (traditionally identifiable) groupings of material in the composition of Mark's Gospel. But he can neither prove that these groupings were fixed sources nor that they bore a distinct, self-contained meaning over against Mark's intentions.

Turning to the Passion narrative, a somewhat different situation is faced. Here is a literarily coherent and traditionally complex unit which has long been declared to be pre-Markan. Schmidt and Dibelius in particular advocated this view. Part of the reason for this position is the more thorough chronological structure

---

of the narrative, in contrast to what is the norm in
Mark's Gospel. Schmidt states:

The Passion narrative requires a different literary
evaluation. It is the only section of the Gospels
which provides precise details of place and time—even
to days and hours. It is clear without further ado
that here from the start lay a continuous narrative by
design.243

Bultmann however discerned a rather less coherent
narrative, formed of shorter units much like the rest of
the Gospel, and with a complex tradition history.244 The
core was a short "report" of the arrest, condemnation, and
execution of Jesus. It is significant that this Bericht
bears a close similarity to the schematic foreshadowing of
events provided in Mark's three passion predictions, 8:31,
9:31, and 10:33f. Bultmann in fact derives his descrip-
tion of the original report from these "kerygmatic"
sayings.245 This report has been expanded in various ways
and stages; Mark has contributed his share, but the
narrative was substantially complete before him.

More recently Eta Linnemann subjected the Passion
narrative to a fresh form-critical treatment, and con-
cluded: "it has been composed from beginning to end out

243 Schmidt, Rahmen, p. 303: "Die Leidensgeschichte
erfordert eine andere literarische Wertung. Sie ist die
einzige Abschnitt der Evv., der genau örtliche und zeit-
liche Dinge, ja Tag und Stunde angibt. Es ist ohne
weiteres deutlich, dass hier von vornherein eine fort-
laufende Erzählung in der Absicht lag."

244 Bultmann, HST, pp. 275-84.

245 Ibid., p. 275.
of independent units of tradition". Furthermore, she declared that Mark was its composer.

Linnemann's book studies six pericopes in the Passion narrative: 14:32-42, 14:43-52, 14:27-31 and 14:54,66-72 together, 14:55-64, and 15:21-39. Each of these is subjected to Dekomposition, and then a three-layer tradition-history of original form (or forms), traditional expansion, and redactional adaptation is described. The keys to this process are found in the familiar literary phenomena of repetition (Dubletten), awkwardness, and inconsistency.

Despite the methodological dubiousness of this use of these phenomena, Linnemann arrives at conclusions about these pericopes akin to, but not the same as, the thematic analysis of the same pericopes. The Gethsemane story, 14:32-42, is described as a threefold exchange with the disciples, with most of the actual dialogue and the note of exclusion as "secondary". This corresponds to the previous classification of this pericope as a Type D,

246 Eta Linnemann, Studien zur Passionsgeschichte, pp. 54, 171: "Sie ist von Anfang bis Ende aus selbständigen Überlieferungsstücken komponiert."

247 Linnemann, Studien, pp. 54, 68f., 173. Her conclusions have been reinforced and occasionally taken to somewhat extreme lengths in a series of essays edited by Werner Kelber, The Passion in Mark.


249 Ibid., pp. 27-32.
private teaching scene with several recursions (see above, figures 5.2, and 5.9).

The arrest story, 14:43-52, is said to combine a "biographical apophthegm", with an independent narrative about Judas' betrayal and a fragmentary account of a more active defense of Jesus by the disciples. Apart from the third, this corresponds precisely to the thematic typology: a pronouncement story with embedded opponents' plot scene (see above, figures 5.2 and 5.3).

The prophecy of Peter's denial, 14:27-31, is found to be formally related in structure to the prophecy of Judas' betrayal, 14:18-21: both of these were typed as private speech scenes (see above, figures 5.2 and 5.9).

Finally, the story of Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin, 14:55-64, is seen to be composed of two exchanges: one, Jesus' response to the high priest, 14:55,61-64; and the other, Jesus' silence in response to the false accusations, 14:55,57-60, which is also a doublet of the account of Jesus' silence before Pilate in 15:1,3-5. All these were classed as dialogues, and the Sanhedrin trial was seen to involve a recursion (see above, figures 5.2 and 5.4).

The substantial differences which do exist between the two analyses result of course from different concep-

---

250 Ibid., pp. 44-52. 251 Ibid., p. 83.

252 Ibid., pp. 127-30, 35.
tions of oral tradition and its capacities, but the agreements should not be overlooked.

The key to Linnemann's conclusions about the Passion narrative as a whole comes in the second study, on Jesus' arrest. In the middle of this she reviews the arguments for a pre-Markan Passion narrative of Bultmann, Dibelius, Schmidt, and others, and finds them all wanting.253

With regard to Schmidt's statement quoted above, that the "precise details of place and time" show it to be literarily distinct from the rest, Linnemann demonstrates that with one or two exceptions these details are no more precise or frequent than are time and place markers in chapters 11-13.254 Later, she comments that the more coherent feel of the narrative in chapters 14-15 is a product of the fact that all of these traditions were closely connected to the Passion event, and therefore required a more interrelated narration than had previously been the case.255 It may be added that the time markers are not any more specific here than anywhere in the Gospel, and that much earlier, in 1:21-39, Mark offered a

253 Ibid., pp. 54-68.

254 Ibid., pp. 62f. The main exception is the time marker in 14:1, which is related to a definite event in the Jewish calendar, the Passover. Another is 14:12, also related to the Passover, but this marker has less to do with the larger course of events than with the immediate pericope of preparation for the paschal meal.

coherent time structure, as well as in scattered other locations, such as 5:35 and 6:30-52.256

Given then that the Passion narrative is not necessarily the unified "source" for Mark that has been claimed, is there any pattern which may help to account for the coherence that does exist? Linnemann herself asked such a question about whether a Gattung for the narrative as a whole could be found.257 A recent article by George W. E. Nickelsburg provides a good suggestion for this.258 He identified a genre of "stories of persecution and vindication" in Jewish literature running from the Joseph narratives of Genesis 37ff., through the stories of Esther and Daniel, and Maccabean literature. In the fashion of Propp's "morphology", he catalogued twenty-one "components", some essential and some "variable", in a firm but not rigidly fixed sequence.259

The sequence is of course related to the motif of the "suffering righteous one," but proposes a definite

---

256 Theissen, Wundergeschichten, pp. 198f., observed that "time" is the predominant connecting element in Mark 1-2:1 and 14-16, and that "place" predominates in between them. Chaps. 14-16 are not therefore so remarkable: compositional reasons for more attention to temporal arrangement at the start and finish of a story seem a priori to be likely.


259 Ibid., pp. 155-63. See esp. the chart on pp. 158f.
"literary shape" for it. The motif has frequently been associated with Mark's Passion narrative, but Nickelsburg finds that most "formal components of the genre" are present there as well. Nickelsburg defines it as a "conventional medium," so it could well be considered as having been available to an oral narrator.  

The main plot of the genre is the description of the vindication of the protagonist "vis-a-vis the specific provocation or accusation, and in terms of the ordeal when it is present". Nickelsburg found that Mark's conformity to the genre began in 11:15-18, the "provocation" which evokes the "conspiracy" of 11:18 and 14:1. Another "provocation" element is 14:3-9, leading to the second "conspiracy" in 14:10f. It becomes evident from these alone, as Nickelsburg observed, that the components are "doubled".

Nickelsburg went on to infer that this doubling argues the existence of two pre-existing Passion narratives, or the thorough redaction of one by Mark. Again, the use and combining of such patterns in oral composition may offer a simpler explanation of the origin of such a complex narrative structure.

---

260 Ibid., p. 163. 261 Ibid., p. 162. 262 Ibid., pp. 164ff. 263 Ibid., pp. 179-83. 264 It should be observed that neither of the two "sequences" or story lines which Nickelsburg found, Ibid., p. 167, have a complete sequence within themselves, as "certain key elements" are lacking from each. When both
Nickelsburg's article supplies a key to the coherence of the Passion narrative, and more. The immediately preceeding chapters 11-13 are found to be integral to the pattern as well. Nickelsburg also pointed out the clear place-and-time framework of 11-13: day one, 11:1-11; day two, 11:12-19; and day three, 11:20-13:37. Each of these begins with entry to Jerusalem, describes action in the Temple, and concludes with Jesus' exit to Bethany.265

It may be suggested, in addition, that the three passion predictions, 8:31, 9:31, and 10:33f., clearly contain key elements of this narrative pattern—"opposition", "accusation" (10:32), "ordeal", and "vindication"—and qualify literally as authentic instances of "foreshadowing". More than this, the "provocation" element goes far back in the narrative to 2:1-3:6 (possibly to 1:21f. and 40-45?), together with the very first "conspiracy" element in 3:6. This gives 3:6 (and perhaps all of 2:1-3:6) a foreshadowing function in the narrative. To some extent, then, the first thirteen chapters of Mark's Gospel are indeed an "extended introduction" to the Passion narrative, to echo Martin Kähler's famous description.

Of course they are much more than that as well: the fact that the story all comes together at the end does not make the first part unimportant. Robert Tannehill has are considered together all key elements are present: this would appear to argue against the prior, independent existence of either one as a "source" for Mark.

265Ibid., pp. 179f.
pointed out, for example, how the narrative "matrix" of characters and actions in the Gospel serve to define who Jesus is, that is, they too serve to express Mark's Christology.266

To summarize the discussion of "patterning" in Mark, it is possible to account for a good deal of Mark's narrative in terms of groups of traditional material, each complex of which would be patient of expansion or contraction267 to suit the aims and the skill of the narrator. Included among these are collections such as 2:1-3:6, 3:23-30, 4:1-34, 4:35-8:10 (at least), 11:27-12:41, and 13:3-37.

In addition to these, and even within these, may be seen narrative patterns: (1) the construction of a day or series of days, as in 1:21-39, 4:35-51, 6:32-52, and, as has just been shown, 11:1 to the end of the Gospel; (2) "triadic" patterns such as those suggested recently by Norman Petersen in 4:1-8:26,268 and the well-known one in...
8:27-10:45 described by Eduard Schweizer;\textsuperscript{269} (3) the motif of the "journey" in 9:30(?), 10:1 and 32, and culminating in 11:1-11;\textsuperscript{270} and of course (4) the just-discussed vindication sequence governing the passion narrative. This is not to mention the life-story (or "hero") pattern possibly governing the entire narrative tradition from which Mark originated.

**Literary Interpretation of Mark.** It is not possible to go into a detailed discussion of an appropriate "aesthetic" for the interpretation of Mark, and the other Synoptics, in light of oral-formulaic insights into oral traditional composition. It should be obvious that much of the form-critical and redaction-critical enterprise, to the extent that it is based on notions of independent transmission of fixed, "original" forms expanding by verbal accretion, must be ruled methodologically dubious. This is the same result as reached by Lord regarding


\textsuperscript{270}Lord, Singer, p. 109, speaks of the "journey" as an "archetype", having a ceremonial nature and marked along the way by significant encounters. Cf. treatments of the "way" in the redaction-critical study by Ernest Best, *Following Jesus* (JSNT Supplement Series, no. 4; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981); and in the literary-critical study by David Rhoads and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).
analytical Homeric criticism: one cannot simply dismiss the intense efforts and research of the standard critical school, but it appears likely that their method of "dissection" of the texts has frequently asked the wrong questions.\(^{271}\)

Similarly, literary-critical studies which suppose that Mark has freely created his narrative in a manner comparable to a modern, literate author, may mistake the nature of the improvisation which Mark has exercised. He is not necessarily to be held accountable for the introduction of every detail into his story. Some of these may have simply been carried over from previous performances in which they did have meaning; oral narratives are not tightly integrated.

Frank Kermode, for example, compares the "young man" of Mark 14:51f. and 16:5 with the use by James Joyce in his *Ulysses* of "the man in the macintosh".\(^{272}\) To the extent that both are teasingly inexplicable and contribute to the "enigmatic" nature of their respective narratives, the comparison is apt. Before one moves to compare Mark's intent or creativity with that of Joyce, however, the

\(^{271}\)Lord, Singer pp. 7-12 (see above, pp. 18f.). For modified form-critical research with comparable goals to those of standard form criticism, the way forward lies through a more controlled "folkloristic" approach to the traditions. Theissen, *Wundergeschichten*, represents a significant step in this direction.

difference between oral and written literary creativity must be taken into account. As Kermode himself observes, Joyce "liked jokes and riddles", and seems consciously to have been addressing his readers (and manipulating them) on several levels. But if Mark is a traditional storyteller, then this amount of "distance" between Mark, and his narrative, and his audience is unlikely, according to Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg. The (literate) expectation of "coherence" (which Joyce manipulated) is not applicable to the same extent in oral traditional literature. Orally, narrative unity is a more "loose" matter, and derives not least from its traditional context, in which the narrator and his audience share a more immediate relationship than is so in written literature.

Another example of the questionable application of literate standards to Mark's traditional narrative is found in Norman Petersen's treatment of "point of view" in Mark. There are many valuable insights in the article.

---

273 Ibid., pp. 51ff.

274 Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, Nature of Narrative (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 51ff. In written narrative the potential grows for "ironic disparity between the knowledge and values of the author and those of his narrator."

275 Kermode, Secrecy, p. 53.

276 See above, pp. 191-96; and also Scholes and Kellogg, Nature of Narrative, pp. 51f.

277 Norman Petersen, "'Point of View' in Mark's Narrative", *Semeia* 12 (1978), 97-121.
Petersen establishes that there is a third-person, "omniscient", and "intrusive" point of view within Mark's narrative, and that this shows the Gospel to be an authentic, unified narrative and not simply a "redaction". Later Petersen concludes that this particular, omniscient point of view cannot possibly have been a historical attribute of the author, and that therefore "Mark's rhetoric is a rhetoric of fiction". This is true in a sense, of course, but the use of the term "fiction" implies a generic distinction that is simply not applicable for oral traditional narrative. As Scholes and Kellogg, again, point out, "oral narrative invariably employs an authoritative and reliable narrator"; they too describe his point of view as "omniscient". The distinction between the "empirical" and the "fictional" narrative occurs in written literature.

Apart from these general matters of the point of view of the traditional narrator and his relationship with his audience, comparative literary criticism must give special attention to the "rhetoric" of the narrative. Robert Tannehill, for example, appears to be moving in a promising direction in his article on Mark's "narrative Christology", in which he has suggested the following perspective:

\[278\text{Ibid., pp. 104ff.} \quad 279\text{Ibid., pp. 114f.} \quad 280\text{Scholes and Kellogg, Nature of Narrative, pp. 51f.} \quad 281\text{Ibid, pp. 12ff., 28.}\]
Jesus is the central figure in the Gospel of Mark, and the author is centrally concerned to present (or re-present) Jesus to his readers so that his significance for their lives becomes clear. He does this in the form of a story. . . . What aspects of the Gospel's narrative composition significantly shape its presentation of Jesus?\textsuperscript{282}

The events of the Gospel fit into "story lines", he continues, providing for "realization or frustration of goals or tasks which are suggested early in the story". Tannehill observes that Mark provides "little description of the inner states of the story characters"; rather, "characterization takes place through the narration of action. We learn who Jesus is through what he says and does in the context of the actions of others." Christological titles therefore become more coincidental: they must be seen to derive their function from the narrative itself.\textsuperscript{283} Here Olrik's oral "law of concreteness" may be seen to be at work in Mark's narrative. Mark combines the "ideational" and the "representational", a feature which Scholes and Kellogg found to be typical of traditional narrative literature.\textsuperscript{284}

Tannehill continues:

We must also study features of composition which control the 'rhetorical' dimension of the story. These features show that the story has been shaped in order to influence the readers in particular ways. . . . Literary composition provides clues to the nature of

\textsuperscript{282}Tannehill, "Narrative Christology", pp. 57f.

\textsuperscript{283}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{284}Olrik, "Epic Laws", p. 137; and Scholes and Kellogg, Nature of Narrative, pp. 26ff. Cf. the discussion of the theme above, pp. 68ff.
the act of communication which the words are to make possible. It may provide clues to the speaker's purpose, the conception of the hearers and their needs, and the anticipations of response held by the speaker. It provides clues to the type of influence which the speaker wishes to exercise with regard to the hearer.285

This suggests that a suitable approach to the literary interpretation of Mark may already be found in studies employing a "rhetorical-critical" method of interpretation, related to or derived from the approach of that name proposed by the Old Testament critic James Muilenberg.286

Joanna Dewey287 and Thomas Boomershine288 have already applied "rhetorical criticism" to the composition of specific sections of the Gospel. For Dewey, rhetorical criticism focusses upon the relation of the parts to the whole of the text. She undertakes a study of the controversies in Mark 2:1-3:6 and finds there an "extended concentric" pattern, which in turn helps to reveal Mark's

285 Tannehill, "Narrative Christology", p. 59. In this connection it may be observed that the previous suggestion that the oral traditional Gospels were "sermons" (as Dibelius put it), like some of the narrative "speeches" in Acts, could be tested in this way. This would help to establish a Sitz im Leben in the life of the community for compositions such as Mark's.


theological interests in the passage and in the Gospel as a whole.289

Boomershine's study of the Passion narrative emphasizes (1) the search in the smaller "literary units" for "climactic or balance lines", which "bear the burden of the entire unit", (2) the recognition of instances of inclusio or "ringcomposition", and (3) the search not for "seams" dividing material, but for "junctures" in the final form as clues to its meaning.290 In a statement remarkably similar to what Tannehill had to say, Boomershine suggests:

Mark's purpose was to re-present the events of Jesus' passion, death, and resurrection in a manner that would call forth the same ambiguous responses which the original events themselves called forth in Jesus' followers.291

The "rhetorical" approach studies the organization of smaller units within a larger narrative unity, the implications of this activity for the author's ideas, values, and ends, and the likely effect of this construction upon the audience. It may therefore be considered compatible with the oral-formulaic idea of composition of narratives by thematic units, in a "performance" context


290 Boomershine, Mark, pp. 19ff., 34ff. Boomershine also emphasizes that "listeners" and not "silent readers" are the appropriate audience for Mark, Ibid., pp. 331f.

of close interrelation between "author" or narrator and his audience.

Conclusions of the Thematic Analysis

The first step of the thematic analysis has indicated that Mark's Gospel as a whole ought first to be considered as an oral traditional composition. The typology of themes showed the existence of a network of similar types of events that comprise the greatest part of the Gospel narrative. Subsequent analysis of the structure of these themes showed the consistent use of various sequences of "elements" to compose the themes. These elements in turn were frequently accompanied by characteristic "language", as expected of oral themes. Also, "literary" use is made of the structure of the themes, both through expansion in various forms, and through intermixing or "embedding" of themes. The typology and the structure of themes in Mark, therefore, appear to have satisfied the criteria of the thematic analysis prescribed by oral-formulaic theory in order to substantiate the claim that oral composition was the creative medium in which Mark's Gospel originated.

The second step of the thematic analysis argued that the means of relating themes (or pericopes) in Mark, especially the apparent use of larger groups and patterns of them in constructing the narrative, are consistent with recognized means of oral composition by theme, and that "source" or "redactional" hypotheses are not needed to
account for them. In addition recent studies of Mark following "rhetorical-critical" approaches were mentioned as being consistent with the literary characteristics of orally composed literature described by oral-formulaic theorists. This rhetorical-critical method itself may benefit from the realization that oral and not necessarily written composition can be responsible for the text and achievement of Mark's Gospel, although it should already be open to the importance of oral tradition through Muilenberg's influence.

Further study of Mark's themes is necessary. The comprehensiveness of the present thematic analysis meant that it was rarely possible to go into much depth on particular matters. This was so exegetically, in relation to numerous texts, types, and patterns, and also in terms of the volume of critical literature which exists, only a sample of which has been consulted. "Confirmation" of the thematic analysis, if that is a reasonable hope, will require more work in these areas. Nevertheless, the present analysis provides a positive first step toward that aim.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the introduction to the thesis, the paradoxical image of Mark's Gospel in contemporary criticism was described. The paradox is partly a function of Mark's Gospel itself and partly a product of the three major critical methods used in Synoptic scholarship, namely form, redaction, and literary criticism. These three methods each appear to account for certain characteristics of Mark, but are not able to treat others adequately.

In addition, the principles of the three methods appear to be mutually contradictory. This was especially so between, on the one hand, form and redaction criticism, and, on the other, literary criticism. The first pair follow a "tradition-oriented" approach, emphasizing that a significant amount of Mark's material was provided by oral tradition, and that this use of traditional material is clearly reflected in certain characteristics of the Gospel, such as its loosely constructed narrative. Literary criticism follows a "narrative-oriented" approach, emphasizing the Evangelist's creativity and the unity of his composition. The tension between these approaches has been felt by some scholars, but no thoroughgoing attempt to harmonize them has been made.

It was suggested that such a harmonization could be attempted through consideration of the "oral-formulaic
theory" of oral narrative literature. This theory provides a tradition-oriented approach to a text, but one which takes full account of the personal creativity of traditional narrators and their ability to compose unified, extended narratives.

The oral-formulaic theory, as described by Albert B. Lord in The Singer of Tales, was presented in the first chapter. The two essential elements of the theory are that transmission of oral narrative tradition does not take place by recitation of fixed texts and that significant "literary" compositions are quite possible within an oral tradition, although the literary characteristics of an oral composition will differ from written compositions in several ways.

The oral-formulaic theory, initially based upon field research among Southslavic epic "singers", states that oral transmission takes place through the composition of narratives in "performance" by individuals who employ two sets of traditional elements, a "formulaic" phraseology and a repertoire of smaller narrative units, called "themes". This method of transmission produces "multiform" versions of a given composition: the composition is not to be identified with any particular "text" of words, but with a pattern or sequence of themes. When such oral compositions are viewed as texts and compared with written compositions, the formulaic phraseology and thematic structure of the oral compositions produce textual characteristics which stand out as distinct from written compo-
sitions. Upon this basis, the oral-formulaic theory claims that it is possible to distinguish between oral and written composition in ancient manuscripts, such as, in particular, the Homeric epics.

Two principles of the oral-formulaic theory, (thematic) composition in performance and the "literary" creativity of traditional narrators, appeared to promise a resolution of the Markan paradox—a loosely connected narrative comprised of traditionally shaped units which at the same time displays definite literary qualities. In addition, the possibility of testing for oral composition in manuscript texts offered a means to justify a tradition-oriented approach to the Gospel.

Because the oral-formulaic theory was originally conceived in terms of metrical oral poetry, and because it is in fact to be seen within the broader context of contemporary studies of oral expression and folklore, the second chapter considered the salient features of the oral-formulaic theory as they are described and discussed in these circles. Opinions and evaluations were found to differ, but it appeared that most elements of the oral formulaic theory were in line with the findings and perspectives of a broad range of folklorists and scholars in related fields. In particular, it was found that formulas are in principle to be expected of oral prose, although no studies of this phenomenon comparable to that of Parry and Lord on oral poetry were found.

The interest of oral-formulaic theory in compara-
tive study of ancient, possibly oral literatures is not widely shared among folklorists. The confirmation that the characteristics described by the oral-formulaic theory are typical of many oral narrative literatures, however, encouraged the belief that the criteria for "orality", formulaic phraseology and thematic composition, are valid in examining genres other than epic poetry. Additionally, folklore studies offer a wealth of critical and comparative studies which may benefit the student of the Gospels in a variety of ways.

The interest of the thesis in the current state of Markan studies dictated application of oral-formulaic theory and related discussion to the "literary" problems of the Gospel. For this reason, the third chapter focussed attention on the application of what was learned of the nature, characteristics, and potential of oral traditional literature to the tradition-oriented approach to Mark, which has dominated Synoptic studies for a considerable period. Discussion of the work of two key proponents of "standard" form-critical method, Hermann Gunkel and Karl Ludwig Schmidt, revealed that their conception of oral tradition stood in need of drastic revision, particularly with regard to the literary creativity which individuals may exercise within the traditional process. Standard form criticism as originally expressed by Gunkel emphasizes the dominance of "social" forces to the exclusion of individuality in the production and transmission of traditional material. In addition, form
criticism presumes that the earliest oral traditional units were brief, independent, and generically pure, and that only an evolutionary process of verbal accretion and collection produces larger complexes of traditional material. All these notions were found to be outmoded.

Schmidt's analysis of Mark's narrative in Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu points out the composition of Mark from smaller units and its loose organization. Presupposing the model of fragmentary oral tradition, Schmidt concludes that Mark was little more than a collection of previously disparate material. While it was agreed that the Gospel is loosely composed from smaller units, Schmidt's understanding of the implications of this fact is not necessarily to be accepted. Oral-formulaic composition provides an alternative, improved framework within which to understand Mark's composition and its relationship to the oral Synoptic tradition.

Redaction criticism, the second major tradition-oriented approach to the composition of Mark follows the form-critical model of fragmentary oral tradition, but lays more emphasis upon the individual role of the Evangelist in his utilization of the isolated traditions. The Evangelist comes to be seen as operating on a different level from that of the tradition, perhaps even opposed in principle to its influence. This realization stems from the recognition of "literary" purpose and creativity in the Gospel, for which the form-critical, evolutionary view could not account. But literary purpose and creativity
are indeed found in oral tradition. Therefore, it is not necessarily the case—although it may be—that a literate individual has taken over traditional sources in the composition of Mark's Gospel. Traditional literary processes alone may be able to account for its composition.

In the second half of the third chapter, the hypothesis that Mark was orally composed in the manner described by the oral-formulaic theory was proposed. This was to provide an alternative to the standard tradition-oriented approaches which were shown to be based upon an unsatisfactory understanding of oral tradition.

As a preliminary to pursuing the hypothesis, three previous suggestions for revision of the standard tradition-oriented approach to the composition of the Gospel were discussed. Thorlief Boman, Die Jesusüberlieferung im Lichte der neueren Volkskunde, suggests that the historical individual John Mark first composed a lengthy, oral "Gospel" account. This was commissioned by the apostles and was memorized by numerous early Christians. Eventually, it provided the basis for the canonical Synoptic Gospels. It was argued that Boman's view depends upon an extreme and poorly grounded notion of fixed-text transmission in oral tradition. This model of fixed-text transmission is based on misunderstanding and confusion about the nature of oral tradition, and has little value for understanding the oral transmission of extended narratives.

Erhardt Göttermanns, Candid Questions Concerning
Gospel Form Criticism, and Werner H. Kelber, "Mark and Oral Tradition" both attempt to sharpen the difference between the Gospels and their traditional sources. It was found that these scholars each retain the fragmentary-tradition model, despite their familiarity with the oral-formulaic theory and other folkloristic research. This in turn leads them to claim that recognition of the existence of oral tradition prior to Mark offers little help in understanding the composition of the Gospels, which took place on an entirely separate literary and cultural plane. None of these revisions of form criticism appeared to take into account the nature and capacity of oral traditional composition, or its possibilities for understanding the composition of Mark's Gospel.

The description of the hypothesis itself began with a review of an article by Albert Lord on the Synoptic problem. In the article, he indicates that oral traditional composition as understood by the oral-formulaic theory may indeed be of use to the student of the Synoptics, and provides some indications of how it could be applied. Two particular statements were of special significance for the hypothesis. The first was that the tradition was probably governed by a biographical pattern, the "oral life story", which provided a framework for narration of the traditional material. The second was that the fairly rapid attainment of traditional literary forms by the early Christian tradition was possible by assumption of long standing forms current in the first
century world.

Lord's willingness to apply oral-formulaic theory to the composition of the Synoptics, combined with the existence of circumstantial indications of oral narrative improvisation in early Christian circles and the general ascription of "oral" characteristics to Mark by numerous commentators, provided sufficient justification for attempting an oral-formulaic analysis of Mark's Gospel in order to see if the hypothesis of oral composition could be verified by this means. This analysis constituted the task of the second part of the thesis.

The fourth chapter began the analysis with a formulaic analysis of Mark's phraseology. Although formulaic diction should in theory be characteristic of orally composed prose, there has been no work done on oral prose texts comparable to the research of Parry and Lord for oral poetry. This means that the analysis in chapter 4 lacks the solid empirical "control" which was available for the formulaic analysis of the Homeric epics. The formulaic analysis of prose and its results can therefore only be provisional until such time as a more well established analytical method may be put forward. In the meanwhile, it is probably true that the effort to refine such a method for prose will wait upon some indications that this is a needed and worthwhile endeavor.

The fourth chapter did establish at least initial indications that Mark's diction is indeed formulaic. The analysis took the standard oral-formulaic definitions of
the poetic "formula" and "formulaic expression", and adapted them to prose simply by eliminating the metrical requirement. Analysis was limited to the first chapter of Mark's Gospel because of the previously mentioned methodological uncertainties and the effort required by analysis of extensive sections of text. Between seventy-five and eighty per cent of the lines of Mark's first chapter were found to have analogous expressions elsewhere in the Gospel which qualified them as "formulaic". This percentage must of course be taken cautiously; nevertheless it does satisfy oral-formulaic expectations of the formulaic "density" to be expected of oral compositions, and at least suggests that oral composition is reflected in Mark's expression.

The analysis found that the "formulaic expression" in Mark 1:1-45 was evenly distributed across what have been described as "redactional" and "source" (or traditional) passages in the first chapter of the Gospel. It was also pointed out that the phrases analogous to those in the first chapter were distributed across the whole of the rest of the Gospel. These findings reinforce the perception of the unity of Mark's style. They also imply that "separation" of tradition and redaction in Mark cannot be carried out by simple dissection of the text. Mark is a stylistically unified composition: the presence of a repetitive, formulaic style suggests that the medium of this composition was oral.

The fifth chapter undertook a thematic analysis of
Mark's Gospel. As the use of smaller narrative units to compose oral narratives is well established for both prose and poetic compositions, a more comprehensive treatment of Mark was offered in this analysis. In a lengthy discussion of method, two steps for the analysis were described. The first focussed on the themes themselves, their types and their forms or "structures". The second dealt with the use of themes in composing the larger narrative.

In the first step, a ten-member typology of similar scenes was found to account for the largest proportion of Mark's pericopes, suggesting that Mark's Gospel was composed by the use of a network of formally related "thematic" units. This suggestion was strongly supported by the analysis of the structures of these ten types of scene, which showed that the respective types were characterized by a common sequence or sequences of lesser "elements", and, frequently, by related terminology.

These structural features were not a barrier to creativity, but were the foundation for literary variation. Expansion of individual elements, repetition or "recursion" of the sequence of elements, and "embedding" of one theme within another were frequent phenomena, indicating that the Evangelist employed these as compositional techniques. This use of traditional themes is consistent with the expectations of the oral-formualic theory.

The second step of the thematic analysis, dealing with the relationships between the themes in the narrative, discussed the "overlapping" of themes, narrative
inconsistency, and the "patterning" of themes in Mark. Overlapping of themes is a means of achieving narrative unity among the episodes. Three techniques for this, described by James A. Notopoulos as characteristic of oral narrative poetry, were found in Mark: ringcomposition or intercalation, foreshadowing, and retrospection. These are "literary" techniques commonly assumed to be "redactional" in Markan studies. They are, however, first of all oral literary techniques, and their presence in Mark does not argue written composition or redaction—even though they cannot be held to prove oral composition, either. Narrative inconsistency is not infrequent in Mark. Four examples were discussed in order to demonstrate that the presence of these inconsistencies, too, is characteristic of oral traditional literature and need not be ascribed to "flawed" editing.

The most extensive discussion in this step, on "patterning", dealt primarily with previous suggestions regarding pre-formed collections of material that the Evangelist may have used as sources for his composition. Oral-formulaic theory indicates that both the tradition at large and the individual performer will create intermediate collections and patterns of themes in order to facilitate the oral composition of longer, whole narratives. The previously suggested complexes in Mark were examined for evidence of a written nature or of some non-traditional characteristics that would necessitate a "redactional" rather than an oral compositional understanding
of how the Evangelist operated. No definite evidence of either was found. At the very least, then, there are no obstacles to thinking that the techniques and patterns of material used by the Evangelist were used as oral devices. More positively, it may be said that the Evangelist appears to have composed his narrative in a manner entirely consistent with the expectations of oral-formulaic theory regarding "composition by theme".

Although the fifth chapter was quite lengthy, it was not possible at any point to go into much depth in the discussion of types, structures, or composition. The comprehensiveness of the thematic analysis, dealing with the entire Gospel, precluded this. Because of the preliminary nature of the entire oral-formulaic analysis, as a first test of the hypothesis of the oral traditional composition of Mark, it was believed that the need was for the thematic analysis to deal with the entire range of material used to compose the Gospel. Subsequent work must deal more closely with specific instances. Confirmation of the positive result of the present thematic analysis will require this.

Both parts of the oral-formulaic analysis of Mark must therefore be taken as preliminary efforts; further work is needed. It is also warranted. The hypothesis of the oral-formulaic composition of Mark may not be "proven" in a final sense. Nevertheless, its consistency with various sets of phenomena of the text of Mark suggests that it provides a viable alternative to theories of mere
compilation, mechanical redaction, or outright literary creation. Oral traditional composition by theme, as described by the oral-formulaic theory and other studies of oral literature, allows a critical synthesis of the tradition-oriented and narrative-oriented approaches to the composition of Mark. The paradox of Mark's Gospel, its literary qualities and "defects", can be resolved by the hypothesis of oral composition which predicts the presence of both features together in a single narrative.

Finally, a few suggestions for future research may be offered. It has already been indicated that further improvement to the method for formulaic analysis of prose is needed. In addition, more parts of Mark's Gospel should be subjected to the analysis; and, if one does not wish to presuppose Mark's priority, comparative formulaic analysis of Matthew and Luke should be performed as well. Formulaic analysis of such extensive range is probably best undertaken collectively.

The thematic analysis, similarly, may be carried further. First, more focussed attention on particular types and methods is undoubtedly necessary. Second, the relationship of thematic analysis to previous form-critical and redaction-critical study needs further thought. There are continuities as well as alterations here. It is not to be expected that oral-formulaic theory will simply render previous work obsolete, nor that it will resolve all difficulties or enlighten every obscurity. On the contrary, oral-formulaic theory may indicate
that some questions are probably not answerable at all. For example, if Mark had employed verbally fixed sources and one could determine just what alterations he had made to them, then there would exist clear grounds for inquiry into his thinking and purposes. As it is, oral-formulaic theory suggests that it is difficult to distinguish in a manuscript between the narrator and his tradition. This has been the case in Homeric criticism. If, however, it is not possible to distinguish between them clearly, then it is best not to seek more precision of the evidence than it may reasonably be expected to provide. This would be a methodological gain, even if it did mean less "result".

The problem which motivated this thesis, that is, the paradoxical image of Mark's Gospel in current criticism and the polarity in the critical approaches to the Gospel, prescribed a specific concern with the mode of its composition. However, as has been indicated, the oral-formulaic theory and oral studies in general have implications for a broad range of issues in Synoptic criticism. Discussion of such issues as the historical evaluation of traditions and of their Sitz im Leben may be conducted in a more comparative mode, methodologically, than has been the case previously. The bibliography of oral studies provided in this thesis gives a good selection of available literature.

One specific area which merits further consideration is the Synoptic problem. In the course of the thesis, frequent mention was made of the fact that oral-
formulaic theory does not necessarily lead to new discoveries regarding Mark's Gospel. Instead it offers an improved framework within which to understand the Gospel's characteristics, or a better set of questions to ask concerning these characteristics. This would be true, too, for discussion of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, and of the Synoptic problem in general.

Markan priority was assumed for the purposes of this thesis. It need not be so in the future. Quite possibly, oral-formulaic analysis may provide another avenue of approach to the Synoptic problem. C. H. Talbert has suggested that the Synoptic Gospels are "interdependent". This is difficult to envision without assuming multiple recensions of one or more of the Gospels. If, however, numerous Mark-like, and non-Mark-like, narratives were habitually composed and recomposed by early Christian narrators, then this interdependence is more easily explained. The literary relationships between the Gospels may be based not only upon use of the text of one by another but also upon a common use of traditional material and of traditional formulaic expressions.

In addition, the model of non-fixed performances of the tradition suggests that variation between the Evangelist's versions of certain stories may be explained—'Lord's article on the Gospels—simply as literary variation typical of the tradition. There need not necessarily be deep, "theological" differences motivating the change. This is not at all to deny that the respective Evangelists
impressed their Gospels with their own characteristic concerns and ideas. "Rhetorical" and literary interests do, however, need to be weighed more equally with ideological ones in considering the formation of the Gospels.

Synoptic scholarship has approached the Gospels with a poor concept of how oral tradition works and what it can achieve. When asking literary questions, on the other hand, scholarship has perhaps failed to appreciate the nature of oral literary composition and its differences from written composition. Recognition of the nature and characteristics of oral traditional literature may prove to have considerable value for Synoptic criticism, by offering a middle road between (1) the denial of literary characteristics to products of oral tradition, or works of *Kleinliteratur*, and (2) the inappropriate comparison of these same works with *Hochliteratur*. The latter were written by non-traditional authors whose compositional methods are different and whose non-traditional audience entertains different expectations. It remains to be seen how far this middle road may lead.
APPENDIX 1

A CRITIQUE OF WERNER H. KELBER,
"MARK AND ORAL TRADITION"

Werner H. Kelber's article, "Mark and Oral Tradition," Semeia 16 (1979), 7-55, has a marked similarity of purpose with this thesis. He seeks to bring studies of oral tradition and oral culture to bear on the standard form-critical approach to the Gospels, and in particular on the origins of Mark's Gospel. Kelber begins with a critical review of the "model" of the transmission and development of the Synoptic tradition found in Rudolf Bultmann's History of the Synoptic Tradition, one of steady evolutionary growth ultimately producing the Synoptic Gospels themselves. Kelber next seeks to establish the critical difference between "orality" and "textuality", referring to Albert Lord and others.¹ Finally, with this difference in hand, Kelber proceeds to reevaluate the relationship between the oral Synoptic tradition and Mark's Gospel.

Formally then, Kelber's project closely resembles this thesis: a fresh look at the composition of Mark's Gospel, in light of recent study of oral tradition. Materially, however, there are only a few points of agreement and several significant disagreements—even contradictions. The points of agreement will be considered first and then the crucial differences. An attempt will be made to demonstrate that these differences result primarily from Kelber's misreading of his authorities.

Points of Agreement

Implicit in the related purposes of Kelber and this thesis is a general agreement about the relevance and utility of the study of oral literature and oral culture for Synoptic criticism. Another implicit agreement, equally general, is that there is a methodological gap between a current trend in redaction criticism toward literary criticism, and the standard form-critical view of the Gospels. Kelber is a participant in this literary-critical movement: it takes the Gospels first as liter-

2Norman Perrin was perhaps the leading scholar in this movement. See his article, "The Evangelist as Author", Biblical Research 17 (1952), 5-18. For a brief account of the development of Perrin's thinking and of the movement itself, see John R. Donahue, "Introduction: From Passion Traditions to Passion Narrative", Passion in Mark, ed. Kelber (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), pp. 16-20; cf. also Kelber, "Mark and Oral Tradition", pp. 15ff. The movement differs from standard redaction-critical method in its estimation of the degree to which traditional and "redactional" material in the Synoptics are integrated, and therefore also in its estimate of the degree of creativity exercised by the evangelists, especially Mark. In this respect it goes beyond understanding
ary unities, in contrast to the received form-critical view, which understood them as collections of disparate units of tradition. Some statement of the relationship between these two views is needed, for the standard form-critical analysis of the Synoptic tradition has not been renounced. Kelber provides such a statement of relationship—not a synthesis—in his article; this thesis, if correct, could serve as a basis for a synthesis of the two, although much work would remain. Unfortunately, Kelber's statement and the position taken in this thesis are mutually exclusive.

A major and specific agreement can be found in Kelber's rejection of the idea of a fixed "original form" for a given oral tradition. On the basis of the concept of "pure" and "simple" original forms, Bultmann and the other form critics had portrayed the Synoptic tradition as steadily evolving toward complexity. Kelber aptly summarizes this portrayal. The whole idea of original form is also rejected, as has been seen, by Lord and others. Oral narrative tradition rarely operates with such fixed tradi-

the evangelists' role as "redactors", i.e., as editors: Ernst Haenchen's term, Kompositionsgeschichte, is perhaps more suitable; see Der Weg Jesu, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968), p. 24.

3The need is recognized by Norman Petersen, "Introduction [to 'Perspectives on Mark's Gospel']", Semeia 16 (1979), pp. 1, 3f.

4Kelber, "Mark", pp. 9, 11, 22f., 33.

5Ibid., pp. 10-13.
tions; the accompanying ideas of purity and simplicity are Romantic notions imposed upon the "folk" and folk culture. Although the "complexity" of Mark's Gospel is accounted for differently, the present thesis agrees with Kelber that this is not to be seen simply as a (late) stage in the tradition's "growth" away from its basic, original forms.

Central to Kelber's article is the distinction between "orality" and "textuality". Kelber takes Bultmann (and E. P. Sanders) to task for failing to recognize the distinction. He holds, rightly, that form criticism cannot simply infer backwards from the relationships among the written Synoptic Gospels to the oral traditional process. Kelber derives the distinction from his three main authorities, Albert Lord, Eric Havelock, and Walter Ong, and also from Erhardt Guttgemanns. It is upon the basis of such a distinction that Lord is able to put forward his analytical criteria for identifying oral composition. Of

6 Ibid., p. 7, e.g.


8 Kelber, "Mark", pp. 13ff. On p. 15, Kelber makes a curious comment on Bultmann's "aversion to appreciate the integrity of oral culture versus written culture". It is not clear how Bultmann could have experienced "aversion" to a theoretical position fully worked out only after the completion of HST, and even after its Ergänzungsheft of 1957.

9 See esp., Guttgemanns, Candid Questions, pp. 204-11.
course, the distinction is familiar and is accepted in this thesis as well, for it is fundamental to the proposed use of Lord's criteria to test the hypothesis of the oral composition of Mark's Gospel. In principle then, there is agreement with Kelber on the existence of this distinction. The agreement goes no further, however, as will be seen.

So there is agreement upon three points. First is the need to apply recent study in oral "communication" to New Testament form-critical thinking, especially in light of the methodological fragmentation in current Synoptic studies. Secondly, it is agreed to reject the concept of an "original form" for each traditional element, and the related concept of an evolutionary growth toward the complexity of the Gospels. Essential to both positions, thirdly, is the formal principle that one must distinguish between the oral and the written, although the nature and description of that distinction is not agreed upon. This material disagreement is of utmost importance and is at the heart of most of the points of disagreement to be discussed.

Points of Disagreement

The term "oral literature" is etymologically contradictory because "literature" derives from an old Latin word for written learning. But the term has come in

10See, e.g., Harry Levin, "Preface" to Singer of Tales, by Albert Lord (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univer-
normal usage to describe artistic verbal expression. On the basis of this usage it has been applied to a body of artistic verbal expression which is composed and transmitted primarily by word of mouth.

Terminology in this field is frequently awkward (should one speak of "written literature"?) and ambiguous. For example, what Lord and Havelock mean by "oral" is not the same at all. Havelock describes the entire period from the recording of the Homeric epics and Hesiod (Havelock estimates ca. 700 B.C.) down to Plato's day (the Republic, ca. 375 B.C.), as one of oral culture. During this period the Homeric epics were fixed texts recited orally, as was true for the Greek drama of the same period. But Lord is quite specific that he does not view this recitation as "oral", because it is not a product of oral improvisation. Milman Parry had much earlier claimed that the "formulas" of Greek drama were demonstrably a product of written expression, because they were used for specific dramatic effect. Of course, Havelock is not describing oral composition as such, but the development of a literate "technology" of communication and learning, superseding an oral one. This he held was a gradual

sity Press, 1960), p. xiii; and Ong, Presence, pp. 19-22. Ong dislikes the term, preferring "oral performance". The disadvantage of Ong's term is that it loses the implicit claim of parity between the two forms of "literature".

process, already begun by Hesiod and culminating with Plato’s Republic.\textsuperscript{12} Therefore, what Parry and Lord mean by "oral" is distinct from Havelock's sense of the term, just as their respective interests differ. One must be clear about which sense of the term is meant.

Kelber prefers to use the word pair, "orality" and "textuality", but this is similarly ambiguous. Already, Lord has spoken of an "oral fixed text" as being essentially non-oral, in his sense of the term\textsuperscript{13}. The contrast between the terms is clear, and there would be no objection to their use, were they clearly defined and used. This does not appear to be the case, however.

In the abstract prefixed to his article, Kelber distinguishes between "pre-Markan orality and Markan textuality".\textsuperscript{14} When a few lines later, Kelber speaks of the "writing performance of Mark", it appears that he has precluded the possibility of oral composition of Mark's narrative. (In fact, the term "oral composition", so important to Lord and the oral-formulaic theory, never occurs in Kelber's article.) Now it could well be the case that Mark's Gospel was not an oral composition. Has Kelber already applied Lord's criteria, perhaps? He has

\textsuperscript{12}Havelock, Plato, pp. 97, 304f.
\textsuperscript{13}Ruth Finnegan, Oral Poetry (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 16f., e.g., emphasizes that Lord's sense of the term "oral" is not the only proper one.
\textsuperscript{14}Kelber, "Mark", p. 7.
not done so explicitly, although he does mention possible
grounds to substantiate a view of the Gospel's written
origin, namely the presence of "causality" in the narra-
tive.\textsuperscript{15} One hopes that textuality does not mean merely
"found in manuscript form": even the Homeric epics are
then undeniably "textual". Kelber never does define the
terms clearly.

\textbf{Composition or Cognition?}

To establish what Kelber understands by the dis-
tinction between "orality" and "textuality", and to come
to the heart of the disagreement, it will be necessary
first to indicate his dominant interest in the cognitive--
as distinct from the compositional, the literary, or the
formal--implications of the distinction. Indeed, Kelber
reveals a cognitive bias in his approach to the distinc-
tion, displaying little interest in what his authorities
have to say about the literary aspect.

The cognitive implications of "formulaic" expres-
sion have attracted considerable attention.\textsuperscript{16} In some
cases this has led to the eclipse of the compositional
nature and purpose of the formula as described by Parry
and Lord. The compositional and cognitive aspects of the
formula, and of oral traditional literature as a whole,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{15}Ibid., pp. 29f., 36f. "Causality" will be
discussed briefly, below.
\item \textsuperscript{16}This is emphatically true for Havelock, see
\end{itemize}
are not mutually exclusive or even antagonistic,\textsuperscript{17} although they may be so construed. They should be seen as complementary: thought and the expression of thought are intimately connected and mutually affect one another.\textsuperscript{18} One could hardly ask which comes first. It is arguable however that expression of thought is the concrete evidence of the cognitive process; one must then acknowledge and understand the (literary) form of that expression, before proceeding to analyze its implications for the cognitive processes of the speaker.

In any case, Kelber leaps directly to the cognitive side of "orality". This cognitive bias leads him to distort what his authorities have to say in several ways. For example, he attributes to Lord the idea that oral and literate culture are "contradictory and mutually exclusive".\textsuperscript{19} But Lord was not speaking about culture in general when he penned these words; rather he was referring to oral and written "techniques" for literary composition of narrative poetry. This distortion of what Lord

\textsuperscript{17}Havelock insists upon the centrality of the cognitive, particularly for the Homeric tradition, but does not deny the compositional component; see, e.g., Ibid., pp. 82, 93f., 115-33.

\textsuperscript{18}For a representative of the oral-formulaic school on this complementary relationship, see James Notopoulos, "Generic and Oral Composition in Homer", TAPA 81 (1950), 28. Also see Havelock, Plato, p. 142: "Control over the style of a people's speech . . . means control also over their thought."

\textsuperscript{19}Kelber, "Mark", p. 20; quoting Lord, Singer, p. 129.
wrote then helps to substantiate the position in his article's abstract that "oral poetics" reflects a "semantic world" entirely distinct from "generative poetics". Moreover, the bias leads him to over-emphasize the cognitive. He speaks of Lord and Havelock as students of "oral communication", a description which is fair for Havelock but strange applied to Lord. The "formulaic mode of communication", acknowledged to be typical of all oral tradition, is seen as a by-product of social forces at work upon oral communication, and serves as a means of "storing and transmitting knowledge". These statements are not necessarily erroneous: for example, formulaic expression in Lord's theory exists to enable "oral composition in performance", and this in turn is, among other things, a social expectation. Havelock certainly supports the claim that formulaic expression conveys knowledge. The problem is that Kelber pays scant attention to Lord's description of a particular form of oral tradition (that is, lengthy epic narrative-songs), before turning to the conceptual differences between oral and written cultures. In doing so, he overlooks the formal, literary continui-

---

20 Kelber, "Mark", p. 7. The implied contrast between "oral" and "generative" is curious. One doubts that Noam Chomsky, who brought the latter term into prominence, would recognize such a distinction, linguistically. Since Saussure, oral speech has been the modern linguist's fundamental interest.

21 Ibid., p. 8.

22 Ibid., pp. 27, 29 (my emphasis).
ties that do exist between them—even (and especially) such basics as plot and narrative.23

The consequences of this soon appear. Kelber appeals to Lord, together with Havelock and Ong, to establish "the oral habit of analogical or associative thinking" which produces the oral "clustering technique [that] constitutes the oral equivalent of plot".24 This is to help explain the origin of the (supposed) pre-Markan collections, clusters of similar types of forms which many form and redaction critics believe were employed by Mark in the composition of his Gospel. That clustering is an oral phenomenon is not denied, but it is important to see that Kelber believes the clustering exists not alongside but instead of plot.

In arriving at this point, Kelber's interest in oral thinking and his consequent failure to consider oral literary expression cause him to lift out of context Lord's words about "a body of related thematic material" below.

23These will be discussed below. See Robert Scholes and Robert Kellogg, Nature of Narrative (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 12-56, on literary continuity and change across the boundary of literacy. See, too, Lord, Singer, p. 130, who speaks of "a continuum of man's artistic expression in words" in which characteristics of oral and written composition do overlap to an extent.

24Kelber, "Mark", pp. 29f. (my emphasis); referring to Lord, p. 159. Havelock and Ong will be considered below.

25"Theme" is of course Lord's term for a narrative element of a song, not to be confused with the common use of "theme" for a topic or notion.
and "the analogical thinking or associative thinking of oral poets". That context was a discussion of "return songs", an epic plot type of which Homer's Odyssey is the best known. In his discussion Lord relates that other return songs existed in the Greek heroic tradition, as is evidenced at the beginning of the Odyssey where Zeus is pictured "meditating on the story of the return of Agamemnon". The "analogical thinking" of the oral poets is illustrated by this cross-reference which invites comparison of the two songs. The poet's associative thinking does not cause him merely to collect similar themes or forms or pericopes, but to bring together similar songs, that is, similar plot structures.²⁶ What Lord has to say has nothing to do with the form critic's Sammlungen. Lord is speaking about plots, oral plots; despite this Kelber arrives at an oral "equivalent" to plot, that is, at something other than, and less than, plot. In turn, plot, or coherent narrative structure, ceases to be oral.

This confusion leads to yet another. Kelber states that Mark has taken over "oral forms", but has transcended "oral drives" by lifting the forms "onto a new conceptual level" (in itself not an impossibility). This "conceptual level" is provided by the Gospel's narrative.²⁷ When

²⁶Lord, Singer, p. 99: a song is "a flexible plan of themes" or "a stable skeleton of narrative". The return song, for example, "entails disguise, deceptive story, and recognition" (Singer, p. 97); these three themes are not generically similar to each other, but are drawn into relation by a type of plot.

²⁷Kelber, "Mark", p. 35.
Kelber then describes this narrative as a literary formation imposed from without upon the oral forms, one can see clearly that he assumes the extended narrative form of Mark to be beyond "orality". How could one read Singer of Tales and miss the fact that the entire book is about the oral production of extended narratives? In his eagerness to discuss cognitive matters, a derivative aspect of the oral-formulaic theory, Kelber has missed its central point.

A conception of oral cognitive "processes" which does not accept that these processes are able to construct narrative plots cannot claim Lord as an ally. Lord's description of an oral song as a "stable skeleton of narrative" flatly contradicts Kelber's claim that only "textuality" can provide "oral drives" with a "stable interior organization". Therefore, this aspect of Kelber's distinction between "orality" and "textuality" does not and cannot stand upon the oral-formulaic theory. As formulated by Lord, the distinction between oral and written composition does not have to do with the basic ability to compose narratives, but with how narratives are in fact composed. The form of Mark as a narrative is possible orally; the relation, literary or conceptual, between Mark and the oral Synoptic tradition cannot be resolved simply on the basis of the presence of narrative form. Kelber's cognitive bias, however, leads him first

---

28 Ibid., p. 39 (my emphasis).
to overlook what Lord has to say about oral narrative. Then, when he returns to the literary implications of (his view of) oral thinking, oral narrative is no longer possible at all.

Kelber's interest in the cognitive side of "orality" and "textuality" is probably influenced by his prior redaction-critical position on the theology and purpose of Mark's Gospel. The author of Mark was opposed to bearers of oral tradition who consistently employed traditions of a single form-critical genre, such as logoi, producing a characteristic—and to Mark, inadequate—religious sense of Jesus' presence. To combat this, Mark's only recourse was to escape from the confines of oral discourse and thinking to the written.29

Kelber's reconstruction of the oral situation is based in general upon the same form-critical model of fragmentary oral tradition30 which, it has been argued, is challenged by the work of Lord (and Havelock too, for that matter). In this respect, Kelber has retained the old form-critical wineskin and at the same time attempted

29Ibid., pp. 41-44. See also his, The Kingdom in Mark (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), significantly subtitled, "A New Place and a New Time".

30Kelber follows Helmut Koester's position in "Gnomai Diaphorai", Trajectories through Early Christianity, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), pp. 114-57. It is worth asking why Mark should go to all the bother of creating a whole new genre to combat these tendencies, when Paul had (already) used the established epistolary genre to the same effect, according to Koester in "One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels", Trajectories, p. 186.
to pour in the new wine of Lord and Havelock. He is not sufficiently radical.

"Orality"

It is now possible to turn more directly to Kelber's view of "orality", especially in relation to his review of form criticism. He writes: "there is no mistaking the fact that the view redaction criticism has developed of the gospel is not a natural consequence of form criticism".31 Now given the general correctness of the particular redaction-critical view held by Kelber, that is, that a Gospel is "an autosemantic entity...
[whose] interpretation depended on perceiving the interplay of all its parts",32 it does indeed follow that form criticism, as exemplified by Bultmann, has misunderstood the nature of the Gospels. They are certainly not haphazard collections of traditions in any case. But what is the source of this error? Is it, as Kelber holds, that something other than the "oral drives" dealt with by form criticism was at work in the Gospel's formation; or could it be that "oral drives" are somewhat more powerful, literally, than Bultmann and Kelber allow?

31 Kelber, "Mark", pp. 16f.

32 Ibid., p. 16. The description is obviously borrowed from Ghattgemanns, Candid Questions, pp. 297, 410. One could wish that Kelber would not view "redaction criticism" so monolithically--many might disagree with his description.
In his own revision of form criticism, Kelber explicitly claims to work with the "current perception of orality" that he has derived from Lord, Havelock, and Ong. He wishes to revise three aspects of Bultmann's study: "his model of oral transmission, of the transition toward written literature, and of gospel textuality".

What Kelber does not think needs revision is, however, illuminating:

[Bultmann's] perception of the formal attributes of oral tradition was astoundingly close to the point of current perception of orality, more in need of elaboration today than of correction. In his view, the pre-literary material grew out of and remained bound to the anonymous and mysterious matrix of community, the 'folk'. Moreover it was conditioned by the same stylized forms of expression and concurrent modes of experience which are characteristic of collective consciousness. By and large, the synoptic material was therefore the carrier of the typical experiences of common opinion, while lacking poetic imagination and the versatility of individual authorship. Anonymity, collectivity and a nonliterary character were the formal attributes of the synoptic tradition, and together they epitomize Bultmann's concept of Kleinliteratur.

This extensive quotation is offered because of the strength of Kelber's affirmation, and to illustrate the deficiency of Kelber's own concept of the "current perception of orality". The first thing to notice is his description of the "folk" as "anonymous", "mysterious", and "collective." "Current" folklorists would flatly reject such a depiction as groundless. Even Kelber's own author-

33 Kelber, "Mark", p. 9. 34 Ibid., p. 15.
ities would reject this. Singer is all about locally well-known "individual authors"; and Lord dispels "mystery" by a clear description of how the singer develops and practices his art. Tradition is handed on through generations, to be sure, but the individual is not subsumed by the "collective" mass. Havelock concurs in all this. The oral material was known to all, but those who mastered it were inevitably leaders in their community. Havelock traces clearly, perhaps too clearly, the historical development of the Homeric tradition and its psychological effects. The anonymity and the mysteriousness of the "folk" are, as Harry Levin puts it, "quasi-mystical" ideas left over from Romanticism. These notions are not supported by Kelber's authorities: he has uncritically retained them from form-critical thinking.

When Kelber states that the Synoptic material "lacked poetic imagination", he may of course be correct. But this would not necessarily follow from its oral nature. Lord, at least, is at pains to underscore the poetic ability of his Balkan oral poets. The same holds true to a lesser extent for "individual authorship" and its "versatility": these features are not to be absolutely denied to oral performance, either. It must be kept

36 Havelock, Plato, pp. 108-11, 166ff.
37 Ibid., pp. 115-33, 145-64, 167.
38 Levin, "Preface" to Singer, p. xiii.
39 See Lord, Singer, pp. 4f. Lord speaks quite clearly to both these points. What is meant by "indivi-
in mind that Lord and Havelock both refer extensively to the Homeric epics as products of an oral traditional process. In no way could one claim that these are of a "non-literary character" or lack "poetic imagination"!

The problem does not necessarily lie in something in the Gospel that "orality" cannot account for. It lies in a concept of "orality," or of Kleinliteratur, that is far too restrictive and ignorant of the possibilities of oral literature. Bulmann's view as described above is not "close to current perception" at all, but is in need of thorough revision. The only thing that is "astounding" is how Kelber could have missed this in both Lord's and Havelock's works. The Gospel cannot be a "natural consequence" of oral tradition as understood by form criticism because form criticism is operating under now outmoded views of the nature and limitations of oral tradition. This is not yet to say that the oral synoptic tradition did in fact produce Mark's Gospel, but only to neutralize the pre-emptive claim that it could not have done so.

The misconception of "orality" inherited by Kelber from form criticism is visible at several points in his article, and also affects his understanding of Havelock dual authorship" needs to be carefully defined. Oral narrators are clearly individuals, but are not the first "author" of their compositions. At the same time, they do re-compose their works, and exercise definite artistic perogatives.

40 Again, see Levin, "Preface" to Singer, p. xiii, for a brief discussion of the misconception.
and Lord. This is most clear in Kelber's repeated assertions that the creativity and complexity of Mark's Gospel text can only be accounted for at the level of "textuality", that is, by origin in writing. According to Bultmann's "model" this complexity was the product of an impersonal evolutionary process. This model of the tradition does indeed need revision here, as Kelber says, but not as he thinks. Literary complexity does not evolve, as Bultmann had claimed, but neither need it have been imposed from outside the tradition as Kelber claims.\textsuperscript{41} It could well have existed right from the start. Even non-literate societies are already anthropologically complex—why should not their literature reflect that?

Kelber's restrictive view of folk culture and "orality" is most damaging in his discussion of the "cluster formations" which are, he claims, the oral counterpart to "plot" in "textuality". Kelber writes:

Traditions of like kind tend to enter into cluster formations... This clustering technique results from the oral habit of analogical or associative thinking. Strung together by thematic associations, the stories from a succession of single impressions or 'pluralized instances' (Havelock). In the absence of a sense of continuous causality, the clustering constitutes the oral equivalent of plot. This oral logic for like to attract like is ill-equipped to form the gospel sequence. A perceptual chasm separates the oral, associative thinking from Mark's causal thinking as it is expressed in his gospel's sequential pattern.\textsuperscript{42}

The "cluster formation" derives from "oral thinking", reflecting the "perceptual chasm" between "orality"

\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., p. 19. \textsuperscript{42}Ibid., pp. 29f.
and "textuality". It is, however, only a product of the artificially limited abilities of oral culture to express its thinking. Kelber's perception that creativity and complexity are absent from oral culture produces this model of simple collections of like-colored stones; design, mosaic, or "sequence" are beyond the ability of the child-like "folk". Yet Havelock himself is using Homer as his exemplar of "oral techniques of storing and transmitting knowledge". Where did Homer's sequential epics originate, if not in "orality"? To be sure, there are those who would dispute just this point. But Havelock, following Lord, does not.43

Kelber refers to Havelock five times in the paragraph from which the previous quotation was taken. Just as Lord has been misinterpreted, it now appears that the restrictive view of "orality" inherited by Kelber from the standard form-critical position has caused him to misunderstand Havelock as well. A closer look will be taken at a particular section of Havelock's Preface to Plato to which Kelber refers twice here.

The section is found in a chapter entitled, "The Content and Quality of the Poetised Statement".44 In this chapter Havelock turns to consider "the epistemological

43 Havelock explicitly accepts the oral origin of the Homeric epics, Plato, p. 115. On "sequence", see pp. 87-96.

44 Ibid., pp. 165-93. Kelber refers to Plato, pp. 180, 185, and then to pp. 183-85.
laws" of oral poetic expression which he believes Plato has attacked in his dialogue, the Republic.45 Havelock has already established that Greek "poetry" served not merely as aesthetic literature, but that it functioned as the "encyclopedia" of Greek culture, the repository of its laws and customs and general knowledge.46 This "encyclopedia" consisted of all Greek poetic literature up to Plato's time, including Homer (the fountainhead), Hesiod, and also the Greek tragedians, whose "orality" at the compositional level was in fact disputed by Parry. Havelock does not deny the "literary" nature of all these, but finds that Plato's fierce attack on "poetry" can only be explained by recognizing that the subsequent, Aristotelian concept of "aesthetics" misapprehended the cultural and cognitive role of poetic literature in the predominantly "oral" Greek culture prior to Plato.

Kelber's mistake is to move from Havelock's chapter on epistemology to make inferences for the "literary" limitations of oral composition. He refers to Havelock47 to support the first statement quoted above, that like traditions tend to enter "cluster formations". But Havelock in fact says (of "navigation procedures" mentioned in the Iliad):


47Ibid., pp. 180, 185.
These are not gathered together and grouped and topicalised as navigation procedures. On the contrary they occur in four disjunct passages each of them prompted by its specific narrative context [1], and it is only the reflective mind of the sophisticated reader, who rereads and reviews the text, that can group them together and unify them under a single heading.48

Earlier,49 Havelock described the "cataloguing" activity of Hesiod and others, by whom elements were "separated out from narrative contexts". According to Havelock, narrative is primary in oral composition, and the formation of clusters is a secondary activity which moves toward—but does not yet attain—the literate, abstracting epistemology advocated by Plato. Kelber's "cognitive bias" has misdirected him again. Rather than looking first to the literary form (the given) of the sources in early Greek literature used by Havelock, Kelber turns to Havelock's discussion of epistemology (the inferred) and to what he takes to be Lord's comments on the subject, and from these draws what oral literary form may be like.

In chapter 2 of this thesis, it was indicated that folklore "motifs" may be patient of various "meanings", to be shaped through context and use. Such a concept of the motif is complementary to what Havelock has to say about oral preservation of data.50

48Ibid., pp. 185f. (my emphasis).
49Ibid., pp. 179f.
50Ibid., p. 180. All three of the following statements seem to describe characteristics of Mark's Gospel as a whole. See also p. 167, on the contrast between ideas expressed as "doings" or as "concepts".
(1) Information is always presented as events in time, "that is, concretely and specifically".

(2) These events are remembered as "separate disjunct episodes each complete and satisfying in itself", joined to other statement-episodes paratactically. (Havelock suggests the basic phrase 'and next' as a typical link.)

(3) These episodes "retain a high content of visual suggestion . . . as persons or as personified things acting out vividly before the mind's eye".

The idea is a component of the narrative unit according to both Havelock and folklorists. To take an example from Mark's Gospel, the series of conflict stories in Mark 2:1-3:6 serves to indicate the fact and the nature of official opposition to Jesus and therefore to show how Christianity is distinct from Judaism. The literate equivalent to this may be seen in John 5:18: "This was why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath but also called God his Father, making himself equal with God." The cause of the opposition here is based upon a conceptual understanding of Jesus' activity rather than being left implicit in specific narratives.

Kelber cannot draw support for the existence of his cluster formations from Havelock. What about the "associative thinking" which Kelber claims produces these clusters? Havelock does indeed speak of associative thinking and connection.51 Again he is not speaking of actual clusters of "like" traditions, but of the epistemological

---

51 Ibid., pp. 183-85.
relationships between traditions. That is to say, the ideas are not integrated in terms of cause and effect, or subordinated in terms of importance. Rather each item is "self-subsistent" and taken together all make up "a plurality of typical instances" rather than a unified "system". The whole tradition, that is the entire social encyclopedia, "consists of a vast plurality of acts and events, not integrated into chained groups of cause and effect, but rather linked associatively in endless series".\(^2\) Rather than being characteristic only of sections of Mark, as Kelber holds, this last statement calls to mind K. L. Schmidt's judgement of the entire "Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu" in Mark: it is not a connected "biography" but a loose narrative of various actions and words of Jesus joined topically. In fact, Kelber's disparaging image of the form critic who limits Mark's "redaction" to a rearrangement of furniture\(^5\) is remarkably like Havelock's image of the epic poet making his narrative way among the furniture which is the encyclopedia.\(^6\) This is related to Lord's description of thematic composition of narratives.

Finally, Kelber uses Havelock's phrase "pluralized instances" as if it were Havelock's description of these

---

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 183. See pp. 166ff., for a more full description by Havelock.

\(^5\)Kelber, "Mark", p. 15.

\(^6\)Havelock, \textit{Plato}, pp. 87-96.
clusters. In fact, Havelock is speaking of the removal of similar traditions (navigation rules again) from various narrative contexts in the Iliad to form topical catalogues. In order to integrate them, says Havelock, "they have to be torn out of context, correlated, systematised, unified and harmonised". Only when this is done do they appear as a series of pluralized instances. Havelock nowhere claims that clusters of like forms are characteristic of oral composition itself or that they "constitute the oral equivalent of plot", and that therefore "oral logic ... is ill-equipped to form the gospel sequence". Sequence, plot, and narrative are everywhere presupposed, and in fact are part of the epistemological problem that Havelock considers Plato to have been struggling against.

It is not that oral composers will not produce clusters of similar events now and then; they clearly do,

---

55 Ibid., p. 218 (my emphasis). Note the use of "plurality", in the quotation from p. 183, above.

56 The phrase turns out to be Ong's, Presence, pp. 84f. Even he is referring to narrative "patterns", and not to clusters as such. These were lists of stereotyped resources ("commonplaces") used by (literate) medieval hagiographers. In fact, Ong affirms that oral "plot" exists, calling it "episodic": see his Interfaces of the Word (London: Cornell University Press, 1977), pp. 253f.

57 See e.g., Havelock, Plato, p. 179: "The information cannot exist independently; it rises up in recollection only as it is suggested by the great story of which it is a part. The catalogues of epic ... the Hesiodic element, are often discussed though they formed the most ancient layer of tradition in the poems. This can mislead us, for in oral tradition they never could have existed as sheer catalogues."
for example, in the Iliad itself. The point is that they are capable of much more than this, as may be seen equally clearly in the same Iliad. Kelber has presented a far too limited "model of oral processes" and he has not derived this from his authorities. He has retained it from formal criticism, and read it into Lord and Havelock. "Generative poetics" should cover both oral and written composition, with the difference in medium being one of the "generating" factors: this would be more true to the positions of Lord and Havelock than is Kelber's formula, "oral poetics versus generative poetics".

"Textuality"

Having discussed Kelber's concept of "orality", and its problems, it may also be profitable to examine his concept of "textuality". It has been shown how "orality"

---


59 The same can be said, too, for Kelber's statement that oral tradition is governed by a "law of social identification", Ibid., pp. 24-28. At no point does Kelber refer to his major authorities on "oral communication" for this law, nor could he. His only reference is to an article by Gerd Theissen, who expresses this law in his "Wanderradikalismus", ZTK 70 (1973), 246f. Theissen, in turn, bases his view on C. W. von Sydow, "On the Spread of Tradition", Selected Papers (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1946), 11-43 and, primarily, upon P. G. Bogatyrev and R. Jakobson, "Die Folklore als eine besondere Form des Schaffens", Donum Natalicium Schrijnen (Nijmegen/Utrecht: N. V. Dekker and Van de Vegt, 1929), pp. 900-13. More recent work on folklore "performance" would undoubtedly help to clarify this notion. As it is, one wonders whether it is not true that all forms of human expression are influenced to a greater or lesser degree by social pressure. The "law" needs further work.

60 Kelber, "Mark", p. 7.
in fact encroaches upon abilities that Kelber reserves for textuality. However, it is necessary to retain such a distinction for the purposes of this thesis as well. A brief consideration of Kelber's description will help to express the distinction more clearly.

The term "textuality" itself is ambiguous, as has been seen. Any verbal expression can be a "text", whether it is oral or written. The fact that most oral tradition does not operate by passing on "text" should not obscure the fact that each oral performance can be recorded and become a written text. By textuality, Kelber of course wishes to indicate something like "written composition and thinking", but it must be clear that this cannot simply be inferred from the existence of a document as such. This inference might be reasonably safe in modern, Western culture, but it becomes much more hazardous in ancient cultures or in contemporary traditional cultures, in which effective literacy would be largely confined to certain social strata.61 It could be, however, that this very inference is at work implicitly in Kelber's article, because the phrase "Markan textuality" appears to need no justification in his eyes. It is certain that Kelber never entertains even the possibility of Mark's origin in oral performance.

It has been shown that "textuality" is not to be distinguished from "orality" simply by the presence of

---

61Ibid., pp. 21f.
narrative "sequence" or plot. It appears, however, that Kelber has inferred Mark's textuality from this characteristic. He expressed this most clearly in writing:

"Mark's vast assemblage of literary forms, dramatic characters, and human experiences [is] unprecedented— as far as is known— among pre-Markan synoptic traditions." Of course one cannot know directly about Mark's (oral) predecessors, but there is nothing in the "assemblage" as such which could not, in principle, have been achieved orally. One can ask, then, whether the characteristics of Mark's assemblage reflect those of oral or written composition. If oral, then it may be inferred that Mark's narrative is not unprecedented. If written, then the question of Mark's predecessors may remain open. In either case, the mere fact of the "assemblage", no matter how "vast", is not in itself an indicator of textuality.

Kelber does consider one characteristic of textuality that might function to distinguish oral from written compositions, namely "causality". This term, too, has its ambiguity as well as a usable content. The view that oral logic cannot deal well with cause-effect relationships, whereas literate thinking can, is expressed by

\[62\text{Ibid., e.g., pp. 16, 18f., 29f.}\]

\[63\text{Ibid., p. 35. Consider the effect of substituting "Homer" for "Mark" in the quotation. The description is even more appropriate for Homer than for Mark, of course, yet Lord (especially) and Havelock hold such an "assemblage" to be quite possible orally.}\]
Havelock. But what is meant by "causality"? Havelock takes it as a form of abstract, conceptual thinking which can form general, "timeless" and "universal" statements and principles. This thinking is different in turn from oral thinking, which is always expressed in "time-conditioned" and particular "happenings". Literate thinking "presupposes that the effect is more important than the cause and in thought is therefore to be selected first before you seek for its explanation. This reverses what we may call the temporal-dynamic order, or the natural order", which is followed by oral thinking. "Causality" does not refer simply to recognition that one thing precedes another—a basic requisite for narration—but to reflection upon a series of events in order to "integrate" them into an order of significance, that is into a "system". Oral thinking can do little of this according to Havelock.

Kelber, on the other hand, appears to make "causality" mean no more than recognizing the connection or "sequence" between events:

In the absence of a sense of continuous causality, the clustering constitutes the oral equivalent of plot. This oral logic for like to attract like is ill-

64 Havelock, Plato, pp. 168ff., 181-85, e.g.


66 Havelock, Plato, p. 185. 67 Ibid., p. 170.
equipped to form the gospel sequence. A perceptual chasm separates the oral, associative thinking from Mark's causal thinking as it is expressed in his gospel's sequential pattern.68

This passage was quoted earlier to illustrate the error of limiting "orality" to an "associative thinking" not capable of narrating a series of events. "Causality" is nowhere defined by Kelber with Havelock's clarity. But the adjectives attached to it, "continuous" (as here) and "linear",69 seem to run contrary to Havelock's description. He had described causality as doing away with "natural" order or sequence, which suggests discontinuity, or at least a different form of continuity.70 Havelock had also described causality as involving a "vertical" or hierarchical ordering of events rather than a sequential or linear one, analogous to the difference between hypothetic and paratactic syntax.71

Kelber has, then, raised a characteristic which does in fact distinguish written from oral thinking, and which will be reflected in composition. His description of it is, however, once again not recognizable as a valid interpretation of his authority.

68 Kelber, "Mark", pp. 29f. (my emphasis).
69 Ibid., pp. 20, 36.
70 See the rephrasing of the opening lines of the Iliad by Havelock, Plato, p. 183.
71 Ibid., p. 183, esp.
The Prospects: Mark and Oral Tradition

Kelber's "modest purpose" was "to present a general model of synoptic oral processes and contrast it with Mark's chirographical performance". He cannot be said to have succeeded. The "model of synoptic oral processes" can only be formed by analogy with other oral processes. Kelber does not appear to have a correct understanding of oral processes as described by either Lord or Havelock, and therefore one questions the validity of his description of the Synoptic tradition. Furthermore, the misunderstanding of "oral processes" means that he is not able effectively to put Mark's "performance" into "contrast" with them. The possibility remains open that Mark's composition was not "chirographical" (Ong's term) at all, but oral. This is, moreover, what the recent studies of "oral processes" seem to suggest is quite conceivable.

The concern with the origin of Mark's gospel, which this thesis shares with Kelber, suggests, finally, a look at what Kelber has to say specifically of Mark itself. First, Kelber's own well developed notion of Mark's purpose, historical origin, and theology must be recalled. The fact that Kelber has a distinctive interpretation of Mark's Gospel already may have colored his thinking on the whole question of the relationship between "orality" and

---

"textuality". It must be said that the distinction, as he describes it, certainly fits well with his own previous position. This leads to at least one contradiction within the article.

Kelber has discerned the historical circumstances of Mark's Gospel behind its thirteenth chapter. If, however, the Gospel is really an "autosemantic entity" and its interpretation depends "on perceiving the interplay of its parts", why should Mark's historical context be so significant to understanding the whole? Why when Mark speaks negatively of the "disciples" is he taken as referring negatively to actual disciples of Jesus and their activity in Mark's own day? The "redaction criticism" of which Kelber speaks, and is in fact a representative, is a combination of historical-critical, tradition-critical, and literary-critical activities, without any coherent methodological statement. While it is only natural for Kelber to prefer his own interpretations, it is good to recall just how tenuous many of his conclusions are—no matter how tantalizing and acute. It would be better to

74 Ibid., pp. 40f.
75 Kelber mentions the influence of "New Criticism" upon recent "literary" redaction criticism, Ibid., p. 16. According to Ong, Interfaces, pp. 213-29, the New Criticism treated a poetic composition as a "closed field", without external reference or "meaning". Interpretations of Mark such as Kelber's which define the historical circumstances of the Gospel are therefore not consistent with New Criticism.
suspend redaction-critical method and results while one investigates "oral processes", than to define methodological considerations after the fact.

A consequence of starting from well advanced ideas about Mark's Gospel is illustrated by Kelber's statement about "Mark's choice of textual medium". When Lord made his strong statement on the "contradictory and mutually exclusive" nature of oral and written composition, the very thing he intended to rule out was that one individual could exercise such a "choice". An oral poet would never write poetry well. A literate poet could never immerse himself in the tradition (and its "logic") sufficiently to become a good oral performer. Even if Lord's statement is conceded to be somewhat bald, Kelber again has missed the point. If the Evangelist was literate enough to "create" and compose the Gospel, he would not have been capable of "choosing" instead to be another link in the oral tradition, as it had come down to him. He could only become a reciter of fixed texts, and this is not truly "oral" in Lord's sense.

He would be more likely to write the traditions down simply because that was his preferred method of recollection and expression, than on account of some "crisis" in the early Christian sub-culture. In short, the

76 Kelber, "Mark", p. 44.

origin of a written Gospel is more likely to have occurred inevitably as early Christianity spread and began to take root in higher, functionally literate social strata. This is more true to the social relationship of oral and written communication envisioned by Lord (at least). The specific historical circumstances of the Gospel's origin are likely to have been no more than a contributing factor; the necessary and sufficient cause lay in the contact of early Christian oral tradition with functionally literate social strata.

Finally, the amount of oral material and oral characteristics which Kelber himself recognizes in Mark is remarkable. To be sure, the "clusters" found in Mark, chapters 2, 4, 4-6, 10 and 13, are "oral" firstly in Kelber's limited sense of the term, but they do appear to be oral. The widespread assumption that these "collections" must have been written is thus no more than an assumption in Kelber's eyes. He also points out several stylistic traits of Mark's composition which are characteristically oral—a list which alone suggests a close relationship between the Gospel and oral composition. In this light, it may be stated that had it not been for Kelber's limitation of the possibilities of oral composition, the logical question to have asked first would have been whether Mark's whole composition could have arisen

---

78 Kelber, "Mark", pp. 34f.
orally, rather than by "redaction" of isolated oral units. This is still the chief alteration in the standard form-critical and redaction-critical views of Gospel origins that recent studies of oral communication suggest, and which this thesis pursues.
### APPENDIX 2

NOTES TO FIGURE 4.1, FORMULAIC

ANALYSIS OF MARK 1:1-45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refs.</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>αρχή του ευαγγελιου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>αρχή ωδινων ταυτα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>[υιου θεου]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:11</td>
<td></td>
<td>(συ ει) ο υιος του θεου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:7</td>
<td></td>
<td>υιε του θεου του ωψιστου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:39</td>
<td></td>
<td>υιιος θεου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:24d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(οιδα σε τις ει) ο αγιος του θεου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14:69)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(συ ει ει χριστος) ο υιιος του ευλογητου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2a</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>καθωσ γεγραμαι εν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:13</td>
<td></td>
<td>καθωσ γεγραμαι επι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:21</td>
<td></td>
<td>καθωσ γεγραμαι περι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ωσ γεγραμαι [οτι]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:12</td>
<td></td>
<td>και πως γεγραμαι επι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:17</td>
<td></td>
<td>ου γεγραμαι οτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:27</td>
<td></td>
<td>οτι γεγραμαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:4a</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>εγενετο ιωαννης [ο] βαπτισιν εν τη ερημω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:7</td>
<td></td>
<td>και εγενετο νεφελη επικειαζοντα αυτοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9:7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>και εγενετο θωνη εκ της νεφελη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15</td>
<td></td>
<td>και γινεται κατακειεσθαι αυτον εν τη οικια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:23</td>
<td></td>
<td>και εγενετο αυτον • • • παρατορευεσθαι χριστου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:4</td>
<td></td>
<td>δια των στοριμων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>και εγενετο εν τω σπειρειν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. also 1:11, 2:21, 4:37, 39, 15:33, e.g. Of particular interest is 4:4, which as the introduction of Jesus' parable itself has a narrative-within-the-narrative function.

---

**NOTES**

Class I: Formula, repeated phrases of two or more significant words.

Class II: Formulaic, phrases having the same basic syntactical pattern, and at least one significant term in common.

Class III: Common syntactical pattern only.
1:4b II καὶ κηρυσσον βαπτίσμα μετανοιας
1:14c . . . κηρυσσων το ευαλλελιον του θεου
6:12 (και εξελθοντες) εκηρυξαν εινα μετανοιαιν
13:10 . . . κηρυχθηλι ει το ευαλλελιον
14:9 (οπου εαν) κηρυχθη το ευαλλελιον

1:5a II και εξεπορευετο προς αυτον
πασα τη ιουδαια χωρα και
οι ερεσιολυμιται παντεσ

1:32c εφερον προς αυτον
παντας τους κακως εχοντας

1:45e και προχοντο προς αυτον
παντοθεν

2:13 και πας ο οχλος προχετο προς αυτον

Cf. also 3:3, 4:1, 11:27, and 12:18, where sizeable groups also come or gather προς αυτον.

1:5b II και εβαπτισσετο υπ’ αυτου εν τω ιορδανω
και εβαπτισθ εις τον ιορδανω υπο ιωαννου

1:6a,c III και ην ο ιωαννης ενδεδυμενος
(II?) τριχαις καμπλου . . .
και εσθιων . . .

Periphrastic syntax is a notable feature of Mark's style; see the list in Taylor, Mark, p. 45 (e.g., 1:22,33). Cf., too, the "ην- explanatory" phrases of 1:13a, etc.

The following might be considered as related formulaic phrases:

15:17 και ενδεδυμενων αυτου παρηφυραν
εξεθυσαν αυτον την παρηφυραν και
ενεθυσαν αυτον τα ιματα αυτου

J. H. Moulton, Grammar, 2:305, suggested that ενδεδυμενοφ of 15:17 is an "alternative present stem" for ενθυω.

1:7a II και εκπροσευν λεγων
1:14b κηρυσσων . . . και λεγων
1:24a και ανεκραζεν λεγων (also 3:11)
5:12 και παρεκαλεσαν αυτου λεγοντες


1:8a,b II The saying is a self-contained formulaic pair (βαπτιζειν), in "poetic" paralelelse.
Taylor, Mark, p. 159, notes the "Semitic flavour" of 1:9, καὶ εγένετο ... ηλθέν, but finds the construction (i.e., καὶ εγένετο plus a finite verb) to be "rare in Mark". The whole line is related to the formulaic expression first encountered in 1:4a and is common in Mark.

Cf. 5:1, 38; 6:1, 53; 7:31; 8:10, 22; 9:33; 10:1, 46; 11:15, 27; 14:16, 32; 16:2.
The ἡ- explanatory phrase is normally class III, but the καὶ ἡ combination is taken as class II (see above, pp. 158f.). Taylor, Mark, p. 163, notes that 1:13ab, ἡν ... πειρασµένον, could be a periphrastic, but that the parallel phrases in 1:13a and c suggest otherwise, and that the participle "is used independently".

Cf. also, 5:42, 16:4.

Cf. also, 9:11, 10:49, 14:57. C. H. Turner
lists 38 occurrences of the "οτι recitative" in Mark. Almost all are dropped by Matthew and Luke, which prefer indirect speech; see "Marcan Usage", *JTS* 28 (1927), 9-15.

1:16abc II See above, 1:10b.

1:16d II See above, 1:13ac

1:17a I καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
2:19 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
9:23 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ
9:39 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν
14:72 ὁς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς

Cf. also (a) 10:52; 12:32; 13:2—same as 1:17a; (b) 10:5,18,38,39; 11:29; 12:17—same as 9:23; (c) 14:6—same as 9:39.

1:17b II δεῦτε ὅπισώ μου
1:20c απηλθὸν ὅπισώ αὐτοῦ

1:18ab II καὶ εὐθὺς ἀφεντες τὰ δικτυὰ ἡκολουθησαν αὐτῷ

See above, 1:10a; and also:

1:20bc καὶ ἀφεντες τὸν πατέρα . . . απηλθὸν
2:14 καὶ ἀναστὰς ἡκολουθησαν αὐτῷ
10:28 ἵδου ημεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἡκολουθηκαμεν σοὶ

1:18d II ἡκολουθησαν αὐτῷ
2:15 καὶ ἡκολουθησαν αὐτῷ
5:24 καὶ ἡκολουθεῖ αὐτῷ ὁχλὸς πολὺς
6:1 καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ

Cf. also 8:34, 10:52, 14:13, 15:41. This phrase might be considered class I.

1:19abc II See above, 1:10b; cf. esp. 1:16abc, and 2:14.

1:20a II See above, 1:12

1:20bc II καὶ ἀφεντες τὸν πατέρα . . . απηλθὸν πρὸς αὐτοῦ

12:12 See above, 1:18a; and also:
καὶ ἀφεντες αὐτοῦ απηλθὸν

1:20c II See above, 1:17b
1:21a III καὶ εἰσπορευομένοι εἰς καθαρναομὴν

See above, 1:9a; and also a general class of "motion" phrases, e.g.:

2:13 καὶ εξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θαλασσάν
3:1 καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν
3:13 καὶ αναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὀρὸς

1:21bc II καὶ εὐθὺς τοῦτο σαββατεῖν εἰσηλθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν

1:29ab καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς εξελθοντες ἠλθον . . .
2:1 καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς καθαρναομὴν διὶ ημερῶν ηκουσθη . . .
5:39 καὶ εἰσελθὼν λέγει αὐτοῖς


1:22a I καὶ εξεπλήσσοντο εἰς τῇ δίδαξιν αὐτοῦ
11:18 . . . εξεπλήσσοντο εἰς τῇ δίδαξιν αὐτοῦ

1:22b II τὴν γὰρ διδασκάνων αὐτοῦς ὡς εξουσιαν εχων

See above, 1:16c; and also:

10:22 τὴν γὰρ εχόν κτήματα πολλὰ
14:40 ηπαν γὰρ αὐτων οἱ οἶνοι ὑπαρχομένοι
κατὰβαρυνομένοι


1:22b I (διδασκάνων ως) εξουσιαν εχων
2:10 (οτι) εξουσιαν εχει . . . αφεναι
3:15 καὶ εχειν εξουσιαν εκβάλλειν
(1:27d) διδαξὴν καὶνη κατ ἐξουσιαν

1:23 II See above, 1:12

1:23 I ἀνθρώπου εν πνευματι ἀκαθαρτῳ
5:2 ἀνθρώπου εν πνευματι ἀκαθαρτῳ

1:24a II καὶ ἀνεκραζέων λεγον
3:11 καὶ ἐκραζέων λεγοντες οτι
5:7 καὶ κραζασ φωνῃ μεγαλῆ λεγει

1:24b I τί ημιν καὶ σοι ἵνα παρηγηνε
5:7 τί εμοι καὶ σοι ἵνα πάρω καὶ σοι ἵνα του θεου . . .

1:24d II See above, 1:11b
1:25ab II καὶ επετιμήσεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἴησος λεγὼν
φιμώθητι

4:39 επετιμήσεν τῷ ανέμῳ... σιώπα πεφιμωσο
8:30 καὶ επετιμήσεν αὐτοῖς ὃν μὴδεν ἐλημεν

καὶ επετιμήσειν περὶ αὐτοῦ

Cf. also 3:12, 8:33, 9:25, 10:48.

1:25c I καὶ εξελθε εξ αὐτοῦ
1:26c εξηλθεν εξ αὐτοῦ
5:8 εξηλθε τὸ πνεῦμα... εκ τοῦ ανθρώπου
9:25 εξελθε εξ αὐτοῦ

1:26a II καὶ σπαραξαν αὐτον τὸ πνεῦμα...
9:20... τὸ πνεῦμα εὐθὺς συνεσπαραξαν αὐτον

1:26a I τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ακαθαρτὸν
1:27e (καὶ) τοὺς πνευμας τοῖς ακαθαρτοῖς
3:11 (καὶ) τα πνευματα τα ακαθαρτα
3:30 οτι ελεγκν πνευμα ακαθαρτον εχει

Cf. also 1:23; 5:2,8,13; 6:7; 7:25; 9:25.

1:26b II καὶ φωνήσαν φωνῇ μεγαλῇ
5:7 καὶ κραζας φωνῇ μεγαλῇ λέγει
15:34 εβοησεν ὁ ἴησος φωνῇ μεγαλῇ
15:37 ο δὲ ἴησος αφεις φωνήν μεγαλν

1:26c I See above, 1:25c.

1:27a II καὶ εθαμβήθησαν απαντες
5:20 καὶ παντες εθαμαρχουν
9:15 καὶ εὐθὺς πασ ὁ οχλος... εξεθαμβηθησαν

1:27b II, I υστε υσητειν προς αὐτούς λεγοντας
9:10 (καὶ τον λογον εκρατησαν)
9:14 προς εαυτος συσητουντας προς αὐτος
9:16 τι συσητετε προς αὐτος

Taylor, Mark, p. 394, says of 9:10 that "it is better" to read προς εαυτος with συσητουντας than with the preceding εκρατησαν.

1:27c II τί εστιν τουτο
2:7 τίς αὐτος ουτως λαλει
4:41 τίς απα ουτος εστιν
6:2 ποθεν τοτε ταυτα και
τίς η σοφια η δοξεισα τουτω

1:27d II See above, 1:22b.
1:27e II, I kai tois pneumasi tois akathartoi epitasaei

See above, 1:26a; and also:

9:25 epetimhsein tw pneumat tw akathartw to alalou kai kwdon pneuma
9:25 eym epitasou soi

1:27f I kai upakououvin autw
4:41 (kai o anemos kai h thalassa)
upakouei autw

1:28 II kai ezelhven h akou autou euvous pantaxou
2:13 kai ezelhven palin para thn thalassan
4:3 idou ezelhven o steirwn steirai
6:1 kai ezelhven ekheihen

Cf. also 8:11, 27; 11:11; 14:16, 26, 68.

1:28 II ... pantaxou eis olhn thn periwhan
1:39a eis olhn thn xalilaias
14:9 eis olon thn xalilaiav
6:55 (periadramon) olhn thn xurain ekheihn
15:33 (egeveto) ef' olhn thn yhn

1:29ab II kai euvous ek ths suneagwghs ezelhontes
hellon ...

See above, 1:21bc (and 1:28); and also:

3:6 kai ezelhontes oi pharisaioi euvous ... sumboulion edidoun
5:2 kai ezelhontes autou ek tou ploutou euvous
uphtsesein ...
7:31 kai palin ezelhun ek thn orion turon
hlaevn

Cf. also 1:45a; 3:6; 5:2, 13; 6:12, 24(?), 34, 54; 7:31; 9:30; 16:8.

1:30b I, II kai euvous leougoun autw peri autwn

See above, 1:12; and also:

1:37b kai leougoun autw
1:38a kai legi ei autois
1:41b kai leugi autw
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1:31a II καὶ προσελθὼν ἡγείρεν αὐτὴν
6:35 . . . προσελθὼντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ εἶπον
10:2 καὶ προσελθὼντες φαρίσαιοι επηρτῶν αὐτὸν
12:28 καὶ προσελθὼν οἱ τῶν γραμματέων . . . επηρτήσεν
14:45 . . . προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει

1:31ab I . . . ἡγείρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τὴν χειρὸς καὶ κρατήσας τὴν χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου . . . εγείρε
5:41 . . . κρατήσας τὴν χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἡγείρεν αὐτοῦ
9:27 . . . κρατήσας τὴν χειρὸς αὐτοῦ

1:31c III καὶ αφῆκεν αὐτὴν ο Πυρέτος
1:42a (καὶ διηκονεῖ αὐτοῖς)
καὶ εὐθὺς απῆλθεν αὐτῷ η λεπρα (καὶ εκαθαρίσθη)
3:15 καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη η χειρ αὐτοῦ
4:39 καὶ εκοπάσεν ο ἀνεμός (καὶ εγενέτο γαλνη μεγαλη)

Cf. also 5:29,42; 6:42(?),51; 7:30(?); 8:25; 10:52; 11:20(?).

1:31d I See above, 1:13d.

1:32a I οὐίας δὲ γενομένης
4:35 (ἐν εκείνῃ τῇ ημέρᾳ) οὕλας γενομένης
6:47 καὶ οὕλας γενομένης
14:17 καὶ οὕλας γενομένης
15:42 καὶ ἡ πάν οὕλας γενομένης

1:32b II οτε εὕρεσαν ο ηλιος
4:16 οτε ανετειλην ο ηλιος
16:2 ανατειλαντος ο ηλιος

1:32c II εφερον προς αὐτον παντας τους κακως εχοντας

See above, 1:5a; and also:
2:3 (καὶ ερχονται) θεροντες προς αυτον ταραλυτικον
7:32 καὶ θεροποιαν αυτω κωφων και μωγιλαλων
8:22 καὶ θεροποιαν αυτω τυφλων

Cf. also 9:19,20; 11:7(?); 15:22.

1:32c I τους κακως εχοντας
1:34a πολλους κακως εχοντας (ποικιλαις νοσοις)
2:17 αλλ' οι κακως εχοντες
6:55 . . . τους κακως εχοντας

Taylor, Mark, p. 180 calls οι κακως εχοντας "idiomatic", and on p. 288 draws attention to its relation to εσχατως εχει in 5:23.
1:33 III,II καὶ ἡ πολίς ἐπισυνηγημένη πρὸς τὴν θυραν

See above, 1:6a. Taylor, Mark, p. 193, points out the similarity of 1:33 to 2:2:

2:2 καὶ συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ . . . πρὸς τὴν θυραν

(11:4) καὶ εὐρον τελον δεδεμενον πρὸς θυραν

1:34a I καὶ εὐθραπευσεν πολλοὺς πολλοὺς ἀρρυτοῦ . . . εὐθραπευσεν

3:10 καὶ πλείθον ελαῖον πολλοὺς ἀρρυτοῦ καὶ εὐθραπευσεν

6:5 See above, 1:34a

1:34b I καὶ δαίμονια τολλα ἐξεβαλεν

1:39b καὶ τα δαίμονια ἐκβαλλον

6:13 καὶ δαίμονια τολλα ἐξεβαλλον

3:15 (καὶ εχειν εξουσαν) ἐκβαλλειν τα δαίμονια

Cf. also 3:22, 7:26, 9:38.

1:35a II καὶ πρων εὐνυχα λιαν ανασασ εξηλθεν . . . καὶ λιαν πρων τη μια των σαββατων ερχονται

16:2

1:35b II ανασασ εξηλθεν και απηλθεν εις ερμον τοπον

7:24 εκειθεν δε ανασα εξηλθεν εις τα ορια τυρου

10:1 και εκειθεν ανασα ερχεται εις το ορια της ουδαίασ

1:35b I εις ερμον τοπον

1:45d εξω επι ερμοις τοποις

6:31 εις ερμον τοπον

6:32 εις ερμον τοπον

6:35 οτι ερμον εστιν ο τοπος

1:35bc II απηλθεν εις ερμον τοπον κακει προσημηχετο . . . απηλθεν εις το οροο προσευξασθαι (και παλιν) απεληθων προσημηχατο . . .

1:37b I See above, 1:30b.

1:37c II παντεσ ητουσιν σε

(η μηπηρ σου . . .) εξω ητουσιν σε

3:32

1:38a I See above, 1:30b.
1:38d  III See above, 1:22b.
1:39a  II See above, 1:9b, 14b, and 28.
1:39b  I See above, 1:34b.
1:40a  II καὶ ερχεται προς αὐτον λεπρός
See above, 1:5a; and also:
2:3  καὶ ερχονται φεροντεσ προς αυτον
9:20  καὶ ηνεγκαν αυτον προς αυτον
1:40bd  I παρακαλων αυτον . . . και λεγων
5:12  και παρεκαλεσαν αυτον λεγοντες
5:23  και παρακαλει αυτον τολλα λεγων
1:40cd  II (παρακαλων αυτον) [και γονυπετων]
10:17  και λεγων αυτω
See above, 1:9b, 14b, and 28.
1:40e  II και ερχεται προς αυτον λεπρος
See above, 1:5a; and also:
1:41a  II εαν θελης δυνασαι με καθαρισαι
1:41c  θελω καθαρισθητι
1:42b  και καθαρισθη
1:41b  I See above, 1:30b.
1:41cd  II See above, 1:40ef.
1:42a  III See above, 1:31c.
1:42b  II See above, 1:40ef.
1:43a  I και εμβριωσαμενος αυτω
14:5  και εμβριωντο αυτη
1:43b  II ευθυς εξεβαλεν αυτον
See above, 1:12; and also:
5:40  αυτως δε εκβαλων παντας
11:15  . . . ηρξατο εκβαλλειν τους πωλουντας
See above, 1:12; and also:
1:44a  I See above, 1:30b.
1:44b II ορα μηδενι μηδεν ειπης και διεστειλατο αυτοις  
7:36 και επετιμησεν αυτοις ινα μηδενι λεγωσιν 
8:30 και ουδενι ουδεν ειπαν 
16:8 

Cf. also, possibly, 5:43, 6:8, 9:9.

1:44c II αλλα υπαγε σεαυτον δειξον τω ιερει 
6:38 υπαγε ιδετε 
10:21 υπαγε οσα εχεις πωλοσον και δος [τοις] πωλοις 
16:7 αλλα υπαγετε ειπατε τοις μαθηταις αυτου 
2:11 και υπαγετε εις τον οικον σου 
5:19 υπαγε εις τον οικον σου 

Cf. also 5:34, 7:29, 11:2, 14:13.

1:44f I (προσενεγκε ... ) εις μαρτυριον αυτοις 
6:11 (εκτιναζατε ... ) εις μαρτυριον αυτοις 
13:9 (σταθησεθε ... ) εις μαρτυριον αυτοις 

1:45a II ο δε εξελθων ηρξατο κηρυσσειν πολλα 
4:1 και παλιν ηρξατο διδασκειν ... 
5:20 και απηλθεν και ηρξατο κηρυσσειν 
6:34 και ηρξατο διδασκειν αυτους πολλα 

Cf. also 6:2; 8:31,32; 10:28,32,47; 12:1; 

1:45b II και διαφημιζειν τον λογον 
2:2 και ελαλει αυτοις τον λογον 
4:33 ... ελαλει αυτοις τον λογον 

1:45c II ωστε μηκετι αυτου δυνασθαι φανερωσ 
2:2 εις πολιν εισελθειν 
3:20 ωστε μηκετι χυρειν μηδε τα προσ την θυραν 
ωστε μη δυνασθαι αυτους μηδε αρτον φαγειν 

1:45d III αλλα εξω επι ερμοιος τοποις ην 

See above, 1:13ac.

1:45d I επι ερμοιος τοποις 

See above, 1:35c.

1:45e II See above, 1:5a.
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