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The dissertation presents the results of an examination of the literary structure of Mark's narratives as they now stand in his Gospel. A common assumption is that the form critics analyzed the structure of the Gospel narratives, but the Introduction of the dissertation shows that, apart from the discussion of the stylistic scheme or construction of paradigms or apophthegms and tales or miracle stories, the form critics did not give much consideration to narrative structure, if this is understood as the order of content within a story. Noting the form critics' discussion of the schemes of apophthegms and miracle stories and interpreting 'form' as structure, interpreters of form criticism in the English-speaking world gave form an emphasis that it did not have in the works of Bultmann and Dibelius and led many readers of form criticism to believe that the form critics' method was committed to a study of structure, when the form critics were interested primarily in observing the presence of typical features and motifs and comparing these with Hellenistic parallels and Rabbinic analogies. Ever since the work of the form critics, there has been a need to examine in detail the literary structure of all the Gospel narratives, especially those in Mark's Gospel, for its priority is assumed.

In the dissertation Mark's narratives are presented in colormetric form according to sense lines and thought groups and compared with the parallels of Matthew and Luke to see whether one can go beyond the broad, twofold and threefold schemes of form-critical analysis and detect a greater number of structural sections not only in apophthegms and miracle stories but in all the narratives of Mark's Gospel. The dissertation is limited to the discussion of structure with special reference to the form-critical positions of Bultmann, Dibelius, and Taylor. Before one can talk meaningfully about Mark's work as a redactor, it is necessary to have an adequate understanding of the structure of his narratives.

Part I of the dissertation illustrates seven kinds of narrative sections that are evident in Mark's stories arranged colometrically: a setting statement, situation statement, reply-to-the-situation statement, problem section, reply-to-the-problem section, result statement, and consequence statement. Types of each kind of narrative section are discernible through stylistic tendencies that appear at corresponding locations in Mark's narratives. Except for the result statement, which appears mostly in miracle stories, there is no correlation between recognizable types of the narrative sections and the form-critical categories. With this general absence of correlation, it is apparent that the narrative categories of form criticism are structurally not distinctive.

Part II presents Mark's narratives in colometric form and grouped according to narrative structure. The seven kinds of narrative sections—setting, situation, reply to the situation, problem, reply to the problem, result, consequence—for the most part appear in that order in Mark's narratives and so constitute a pattern of narration. Not all the narratives have all these sections. Instead most of the stories individually display one of five abbreviated forms of the Full Pattern. In one variation the reply-to-the-situation statement is omitted. In a second variation the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections are omitted. Sometimes the Full Pattern or either of the variations appears in a short form without result and consequence statements. Inasmuch as the order of sections is the same both in the Full Pattern and its abbreviated forms, it is evident that all the stories in Mark's Gospel have been written according to one pattern of narration and thus have essentially the same narrative structure.

The pattern in its six forms (Full Pattern Long, Full Pattern Short, Variation #1 Long, Variation #1 Short, Variation #2 Long, Variation #2 Short) is evident throughout Mark's Gospel—in long narratives as well as short ones, in stories in the Passion Narrative as well as in the rest of Mark's Gospel. Once the pattern is understood, it becomes a useful criterion for identifying stories on the basis of their narrative structure.

The pattern is very regular in Mark's narratives. In seventy-four of eighty-six identifiable stories the sections of the pattern appear in their proper order. Nineteen of the seventy-four regular stories are extended, generally through developments of the problem and replies to these developments. Five of the twelve irregular stories are extended as well as irregular. Even the irregular stories manifest the pattern. There is therefore no story in Mark's Gospel that does not show the influence of the narrative pattern.

Use other side if necessary.
The regularity of the pattern in Mark's stories becomes further apparent through comparisons with the parallels of Matthew and Luke. When Matthew's parallels have the same structure as Mark's stories, there is often much verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark; but Matthew's structure is frequently different with the presence of special Matthaean material. Sometimes Luke's parallels also have different structure with material found only in Luke, but generally his parallels display the greatest number of pattern irregularities. Time and again the pattern is most regular and clearest in Mark's stories.

The regularity and clarity of the pattern in Mark's narratives suggest that Mark himself was responsible for the composition of his stories. This estimate is supported by other recurrent signs of order, such as the step development of thought, the presentation of ideas in an orderly manner, the clustering of stories with the same form of the pattern, the restatement of an initial concern near the end of a story, and the presence of the pattern within the pattern.

The occasional appearance of the pattern within sayings of Jesus suggests that Jesus Himself might have used the pattern in His teaching. Although it is possible that Jesus did use the pattern in some way in His teaching, it is preferable to attribute to Mark the regularity and clarity of the pattern when it is present in Jesus' sayings.

Grounds for thinking that Jesus could have used the pattern, however, are found in the fact that the narrative pattern and its various forms are evident in significant stories of the Old Testament. A number of these stories are presented in colometric form in English at the end of Part II of the dissertation to show that the structure of Mark's narratives is essentially the same as that of certain stories of the Old Testament. One does not need to look to Rabbinic analogies or Hellenistic parallels to account for the structure of Mark's narratives.

In its presence in stories of the Old Testament, the pattern was a traditional pattern that would have been culturally known to both Jesus and His disciples through their familiarity with the Scriptures. Brief consideration is given to the possible influence of the pattern on Jesus, the formation of the oral tradition, and the kerygma. The possibility that the kerygma of the early Church was influenced by the traditional pattern is suggested by the presence of the pattern in certain speeches in Acts. In portraying a human dilemma that was answered by an authoritative, redemptive word or act of Jesus, the traditional pattern would have been useful as a Gospel pattern for use within the kerygma.

The many signs of regularity and order in the structure of Mark's narratives suggest that Mark, with an apparent sensitivity to order, might have been the Evangelist who best preserved the order of the tradition before him.

Part III of the dissertation presents further evidence that indicates that Mark was an orderly writer. The definition of structure as the order of content enables one to regard as thematic structure the orderly recurrence of ideas in Mark's narratives, as these have been delineated by the narrative pattern.

A study of the themes of Mark's narratives shows that they recur in the fashion of rhythmic parallelism. Instead of there being a single point to a story, most of the narratives have at least two ideas that are restated in a rhythmic fashion.

Five types of thematic structure are described and illustrated: (I) abab, (II) ab ab, (III) ab a + b, (IV) a + b ab, (V) ab ab ab. Each type has inverted forms. Every type except Type IV has extended forms. Two of the extended forms have inverted forms.

These structures, which are rhythmic, complete, and negative in tone, accentuate the chief thematic concerns of Mark's Gospel: the Messiahship of Jesus and His suffering and death. Also, the structures promote understanding of the arrangement of material in Mark's stories and provide clues for their interpretation.

Thematic structures in sayings of Jesus suggest that His teachings displayed a rhythmic order from time to time; but on account of Mark's apparent interest in order, it is difficult to determine whether rhythmic order in Jesus' sayings stems from Jesus or from Mark.

The thematic structures are most apparent in Mark's stories in comparison with the parallels of Matthew and Luke. The structures are frequently imperfect, lost, or absent altogether in the parallels of the two other Evangelists, especially Luke. The regularity of the thematic structures may be seen as another sign of Mark's methodical workmanship, and the completeness of these structures is evidence of his thoroughness and carefulness as a writer.

Mark's workmanship may also be seen in certain relationships between the thematic structures and the narrative pattern. These relationships display consistency in the written presentation of Mark's stories. Such consistency is another indication that Mark himself was somewhat responsible for the formation of his narratives.

The examination shows that the analysis of literary structure as the order of content is an important method of investigation of biblical literature for clearer understanding of Jesus and traditions of the early Church about Him.
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SUMMARY OF DISSERTATION

The dissertation presents the results of an examination of the literary structure of Mark's narratives as they now stand in his Gospel. A common assumption is that the form critics analyzed the structure of the Gospel narratives, but the Introduction of the dissertation shows that, apart from the discussion of the stylistic scheme or construction of paradigms or apophthegms and tales or miracle stories, the form critics did not give much consideration to narrative structure, if this is understood as the order of content within a story. Noting the form critics' discussion of the schemes of apophthegms and miracle stories and interpreting 'form' as structure, interpreters of form criticism in the English-speaking world gave form an emphasis that it did not have in the works of Dibelius and Bultmann and led many readers of form criticism to believe that the form critics' method was committed to a study of structure, when the form critics were interested primarily in observing the presence of typical features and motifs and comparing these with Hellenistic parallels and Rabbinic analogies. Ever since the work of the form critics, there has been a need to examine in detail the literary structure of all the Gospel narratives, especially those in Mark's Gospel, for its priority is assumed.

In the dissertation Mark's narratives are presented in colometric form according to sense lines and thought groups and compared with the parallels of Matthew and Luke to see whether one can go beyond the broad, twofold and threefold schemes of form-critical analysis and detect a greater number of structural sections not only in apophthegms and miracle stories but in all
the narratives of Mark's Gospel. The dissertation is limited to the dis-
cussion of structure with special reference to the form-critical positions of
Dibelius, Bultmann, and Taylor. Before one can talk meaningfully about Mark's
work as a redactor, it is necessary to have an adequate understanding of the
structure of his narratives.

Part I of the dissertation illustrates seven kinds of narrative sections
that are evident in Mark's stories arranged colometrically: a setting state-
ment, situation statement, reply-to-the-situation statement, problem section,
reply-to-the-problem section, result statement, and consequence statement.
Types of each kind of narrative section are discernible through stylistic
tendencies that appear at corresponding locations in Mark's narratives.
Except for the result statement, which appears mostly in miracle stories,
there is no correlation between recognizable types of the narrative sections
and the form-critical categories. With this general absence of correlation,
it is apparent that the narrative categories of form criticism are structurally
not distinctive.

Part II presents Mark's narratives in colometric form and grouped
according to narrative structure. The seven kinds of narrative sections—
setting, situation, reply to the situation, problem, reply to the problem,
result, consequence—for the most part appear in that order in Mark's narra-
tives and so constitute a pattern of narration. Not all the narratives have
all these sections. Instead most of the stories individually display one of
five abbreviated forms of the Full Pattern. In one variation the reply-to-
the-situation statement is omitted. In a second variation the problem and
reply-to-the-problem sections are omitted. Sometimes the Full Pattern or
either of the variations appears in a short form without result and consequence
statements. Inasmuch as the order of sections is the same both in the Full
Pattern and its abbreviated forms, it is evident that all the stories in Mark's Gospel have been written according to one pattern of narration and thus have essentially the same narrative structure.

The pattern in its six forms (Full Pattern Long, Full Pattern Short, Variation #1 Long, Variation #1 Short, Variation #2 Long, Variation #2 Short) is evident throughout Mark's Gospel—in long narratives as well as short ones, in stories in the Passion Narrative as well as in the rest of Mark's Gospel. Once the pattern is understood, it becomes a useful criterion for identifying stories on the basis of their narrative structure.

The pattern is very regular in Mark's narratives. In seventy-four of eighty-six identifiable stories the sections of the pattern appear in their proper order. Nineteen of the seventy-four regular stories are extended, generally through developments of the problem and replies to these developments. Five of the twelve irregular stories are extended as well as irregular. Even the irregular stories manifest the pattern. There is therefore no story in Mark's Gospel that does not show the influence of the narrative pattern.

The regularity of the pattern in Mark's stories becomes further apparent through comparisons with the parallels of Matthew and Luke. When Matthew's parallels have the same structure as Mark's stories, there is often much verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark; but Matthew's structure is frequently different with the presence of special Matthaean material. Sometimes Luke's parallels also have different structure with material found only in Luke, but generally his parallels display the greatest number of pattern irregularities. Time and again the pattern is most regular and clearest in Mark's stories.

The regularity and clarity of the pattern in Mark's narratives suggest
that Mark himself was responsible for the composition of his stories. This estimate is supported by other recurrent signs of order, such as the step development of thought, the presentation of ideas in an orderly manner, the clustering of stories with the same form of the pattern, the restatement of an initial concern near the end of a story, and the presence of the pattern within the pattern.

The occasional appearance of the pattern within sayings of Jesus suggests that Jesus Himself might have used the pattern in His teaching. Although it is possible that Jesus did use the pattern in some way in His teaching, it is preferable to attribute to Mark the regularity and clarity of the pattern when it is present in Jesus' sayings.

Grounds for thinking that Jesus could have used the pattern, however, are found in the fact that the narrative pattern and its various forms are evident in significant stories of the Old Testament. A number of these stories are presented in colometric form in English at the end of Part II of the dissertation to show that the structure of Mark's narratives is essentially the same as that of certain stories of the Old Testament. One does not need to look to Rabbinic analogies or Hellenistic parallels to account for the structure of Mark's narratives.

In its presence in stories of the Old Testament, the pattern was a traditional pattern that would have been culturally known to both Jesus and His disciples through their familiarity with the Scriptures. Brief consideration is given to the possible influence of the pattern on Jesus, the formation of the oral tradition, and the kerygma. The possibility that the kerygma of the early Church was influenced by the traditional pattern is suggested by the presence of the pattern in certain speeches in Acts. In portraying a human dilemma that was answered by an authoritative, redemptive
word or act of Jesus, the traditional pattern would have been useful as a Gospel pattern for use within the kerygma.

The many signs of regularity and order in the structure of Mark's narratives suggest that Mark, with an apparent sensitivity to order, might have been the Evangelist who best preserved the order of the tradition before him.

Part III of the dissertation presents further evidence that indicates that Mark was an orderly writer. The definition of structure as the order of content enables one to regard as thematic structure the orderly recurrence of ideas in Mark's narratives, as these have been delineated by the narrative pattern.

A study of the themes of Mark's narratives shows that they recur in the fashion of rhythmical parallelism. Instead of there being a single point to a story, most of the narratives have at least two ideas that are restated in a rhythmical fashion.

Five types of thematic structure are described and illustrated: (I) abab, (II) ab ab, (III) ab a + b, (IV) a + b ab, (V) ab ab ab. Each type has inverted forms. Every type except Type IV has extended forms. Two of the extended forms have inverted forms.

These structures, which are rhythmical, complete, and negative in tone, accentuate the chief thematic concerns of Mark's Gospel: the Messiahship of Jesus and His suffering and death. Also, the structures promote understanding of the arrangement of material in Mark's stories and provide clues for their interpretation.

Thematic structures in sayings of Jesus suggest that His teachings displayed rhythmical order from time to time; but on account of Mark's apparent interest in order, it is difficult to determine whether rhythmical order in
Jesus' sayings stems from Jesus or from Mark.

The thematic structures are most apparent in Mark's stories in comparison with the parallels of Matthew and Luke. The structures are frequently imperfect, lost, or absent altogether in the parallels of the two other Evangelists, especially Luke. The regularity of the thematic structures may be seen as another sign of Mark's methodical workmanship, and the completeness of these structures is evidence of his thoroughness and carefulness as a writer.

Mark's workmanship may also be seen in certain relationships between the thematic structures and the narrative pattern. These relationships display consistency in the written presentation of Mark's stories. Such consistency is another indication that Mark himself was somewhat responsible for the formation of his narratives.

The examination shows that the analysis of literary structure as the order of content is an important method of investigation of biblical literature for clearer understanding of Jesus and traditions of the early Church about Him.
INTRODUCTION

The present investigation began as an examination of the overall arrangement of the Gospel of Mark. In the course of analyzing Mark's topical groupings and their relation to one another within the Gospel as a whole, it became apparent, however, that more knowledge was needed about the structure of the individual narratives. Scholars frequently differed in their identification of the narratives, holding divergent views about the beginnings and endings of stories. The structure of the narratives was not regularly considered in the commentaries; and when attention was given to narrative structure, the analyses were often broad and little more than the detection of a story's beginning, middle, and end. There was also little uniformity among scholars in their conceptions of structure itself. Clarification was needed, and intensive analysis of the structure of Mark's narratives was begun. This dissertation presents the results of an examination of the literary structure of Mark's narratives as they now stand in his Gospel.

A common assumption is that the early form critics thoroughly analyzed the structure of Mark's narratives approximately half a century ago. Any examination of narrative structure would thus merely seem to retrace the steps that were first taken by K. L. Schmidt, Martin Dibelius, and Rudolph

---

1Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Berlin: Trowitzsch und Sohn, 1919). Hereafter cited as R.G.J. Schmidt was not a form critic in the strict sense of the term. His close inspection of the connective tissue between the narratives differed noticeably from the investigations of Dibelius and Bultmann, who independently classified the narratives according to literary type.

Bultmann in their studies of the Gospel narratives. An investigation of form criticism with regard to the question of narrative structure has revealed, however, that these form critics discussed narrative structure far less than is often supposed in the English-speaking world.

Inasmuch as form criticism has been in existence as a methodology for over half a century, there is no need to describe form criticism here. Many adequate descriptions have already been written, and one can assume that even the average reader of New Testament criticism will be familiar with the classifications of Dibelius and Bultmann. It is necessary, though, to comment further about the form critics' treatment of structure, for ambiguity in their conceptions of form and structure has generated certain misconceptions in the English-speaking world.

---

3Rudolph Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. from the 3d German ed. by John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row, 1963). Hereafter cited as H.S.T. See also Rudolph Bultmann, 'The Study of the Synoptic Gospels' in Form Criticism, trans. Frederick C. Grant (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962). Hereafter cited as Form Criticism. One must not overlook the contribution of Hermann Gunkel in his pioneering study of legends in the Old Testament. See Hermann Gunkel, The Legends of Genesis, trans. W. H. Carruth (New York: Schocken Books, 1966). In this book, which was first published in 1901, Gunkel anticipated the discussions of Schmidt, Dibelius, and Bultmann by giving attention to the discussion of myths (pp. 14-8), the classification of legends according to features (pp. 24-34, 36), the concept of 'mixed legends' (p. 34), the idea of 'professional story-tellers' (pp. 41, 96, 123), the notion that writers were 'collectors rather than authors' (p. 125), the detection of a single point in a story (p. 75), the search for a 'rule of style' (p. 84), the study of Greek parallels (p. 93), and the consideration of 'artificial links of connexion' (p. 82), and redactional, chronological 'framework' (p. 158).

It is not necessary to consider at this point Schmidt's analysis of the framework of Mark's Gospel. Schmidt was not really interested in the discussion of the structure of whole narratives. He wanted to show that Mark's outline is artificial, and Schmidt's investigation was generally limited to an examination of time and place notes at the edges of stories for evidence against the popular view that Mark's Gospel presents a reliable, connected, chronological account of the itinerant ministry of Jesus. Apart from the consideration of the composite character of certain stories, Schmidt did not discuss the overall structure of the individual narratives.

It is essential, however, to refer to the works of Dibelius and Bultmann—in particular, to their conceptions of 'style', 'form', and 'structure'. According to Dibelius, style is not simply a matter of 'vocabulary and construction' but of 'the whole way of speaking'. Nevertheless, one may determine the purpose of an author through consideration of 'the choice of words, the construction of sentences, the wordiness or the brevity, the nature of the description, the introduction, and the peroration'. In this respect, style is related to form. For Dibelius, to study 'Form' is to study the use of words and phrases and to determine the 'leading interests' of a story.

---

5See Schmidt's radical conclusion about Mark's outline, R.C.J., p. 281 ("... die Mk-Darstellung ist nicht eine Perlenkette von lose aneinander gereihten Perlen, zwischen denen man andere bald hier, bald da einschieben kann, sondern ein Haufe von nicht aufgereihten Perlen, wenn auch ab und zu mal einige Perlen zusammengehören"). It is surprising that this remarkable statement has not been cited more often to exemplify Schmidt's position. Cf. Taylor, F.G.T., p. 39, who refers to Schmidt's metaphor. It should be noted, however, that Schmidt's statement does not apply to the Passion Narrative.

6Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 7.

7Ibid.

8Ibid., p. 119.

9Ibid., p. 141.
Used in this sense, form has little to do with the shape or design of a story but pertains to the presence or absence of ideas, motifs, features, and interests in the story. Here form is a category of content, not design or shape. Generally, form is used in various ways in Dibelius' discussion and sometimes means little more than 'manner', 'version', or 'fashion'.

Another aspect of style is found in Dibelius' conception of a 'fixed stylistic scheme' in his discussion of 'therapeutic Tales'. Here the stylistic scheme of a story refers to its 'commencement', 'middle part', and 'conclusion'. Initial description of the illness is followed by narration about the 'operation' of the healing, and the story ends with some indication of the 'success' of the cure. Such a discussion of the stylistic scheme of a story shows interest not simply in the presence of features but also in the order in which they occur. Elsewhere, Dibelius refers to the 'plan of the usual miracle stories' in connection with 'the style of current anecdotes', and the understanding of style as scheme is evident here as well. In this respect style is a category of structure, not simply content, if one defines structure as the order in which material is presented in a story.

It is significant that Dibelius rarely refers to structure as a category. He speaks in a general way about 'inner and outer structure', but he does not comment further on this distinction.

---

10 See the varied use of 'Form' or 'form' in Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 165.
12 Ibid., p. 169.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid., p. 99.
15 Ibid., p. 10.
16 Cf. below, p. 463, n. 532.
Similar concepts appear in the work of Bultmann. There are two dimensions to the notion of 'style'. On the one hand, style is thought of in connection with the presence of 'typical characteristics', 'typical motifs', and 'typical features'. On the other hand, the style of a story is seen in the location of characteristic features. For Bultmann, to think about the style of miracle stories is to consider those features that appear in the 'exposition' and narration about 'the miracle itself' and its 'effect'—presumably in that order. In this respect style is a category of structure, if structure is understood as the order of material within a narrative. Generally, Bultmann's discussion of style in this second sense is limited to miracle stories and apophthegms. For the most part, Bultmann is content to recognize the presence of stylistic features and motifs without concern for their location in stories, especially legends.

As was true for Dibelius, Bultmann's references to 'form' are varied and often general in character. Frequently 'form' is used in the sense of 'mode', 'manner', 'version', or 'fashion'. Sometimes form is thought of as a literary 'category'. Similarly, form is seen in connection with 'literary types'. On occasion form is understood as motif or some figure of speech. In this respect form is a category of content and not structure, if structure

---

17 Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 214.
18 Ibid., pp. 215-6.
19 Ibid., pp. 220-6.
20 See, for example, Bultmann, H.S.T., pp. 36, 41, 87, and 132.
21 Ibid., p. 4. See also Bultmann, Form Criticism, p. 29.
22 Bultmann, Form Criticism, p. 36.
23 Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 70.
is understood as the organization of content within a story.\textsuperscript{24}

The concept of 'structure' appears more often in the work of Bultmann; but, like form, the notion of structure is expressed with various meanings. The term is used in reference to the whole Gospels of Matthew and Luke,\textsuperscript{25} in relation to a 'frame' for a saying,\textsuperscript{26} in connection with the absence of an introduction\textsuperscript{27} or argument,\textsuperscript{28} and with regard to the 'construction' of a story.\textsuperscript{29} When Bultmann asserts with regard to Mk. 6:34-44 that 'the construction of the story is according to form'\textsuperscript{30} and has in mind the three parts of a miracle story, there is an explicit relation between structure ('construction') and 'form', and an implicit relation between structure and style, in so far as the latter sometimes pertains to the order of features in miracle stories. In one instance, 'structure' and 'form' are used as parallel, if not synonymous, terms.\textsuperscript{31}

The discussions of both Dibelius and Bultmann conspicuously lack clear definitions of style, form, and structure and some description of the relation of these concepts with one another. With such fluid conceptions of form and structure, which were at times categories of content, and with such notions of style, which at times was a category of structure (the order of features),

\textsuperscript{24}Bultmann's notion of 'formal features', \textit{H.S.T.}, p. 196, is another indication that 'form' is sometimes a category of content.

\textsuperscript{25}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{26}Bultmann, \textit{Form Criticism}, pp. 39-40. See also \textit{H.S.T.}, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{27}Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, p. 12.

\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 17.

\textsuperscript{29}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 113.

\textsuperscript{30}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 217.

\textsuperscript{31}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 356. Cf. the use of form and structure on p. 25.
form criticism, perhaps inevitably, generated further ambiguity in the study of narrative structure.\textsuperscript{32}

For example, Vincent Taylor regarded 'the investigation of the form or structure of the tradition' as a pursuit of form criticism.\textsuperscript{33} What for Dibelius and Bultmann was a particular matter of style (e.g., the location of typical features in therapeutic tales or healing miracle stories), for Taylor was a matter of form understood as structure.\textsuperscript{34} In understanding form primarily as structure, Taylor gave 'form' an emphasis that it did not have in the works of Dibelius and Bultmann and led many English-speaking readers of form criticism to believe that the new method was committed to a study of structure, when the form critics were interested primarily in noting the presence of typical features and motifs and comparing these with Hellenistic parallels and Rabbinic analogies.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{32}In his description of form criticism, Klaus Koch, The Growth of the Biblical Tradition, trans. from 2d German ed. by S. M. Cupitt (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), p. 38, recognizes that 'form' is a term that 'is much too indefinite', but warns against limiting the term too severely. See also p. 5, n. 5, where Koch speaks of the difficulty of distinguishing between 'type' and 'form'. Cf. p. 3, n. 1, where Koch indicates a relation between form and style. With regard to the relation between form and style, see Erich Fascher, Die formgeschichtliche Methode (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1924), pp. 208-11. See below, p. 24, n. 11.

\textsuperscript{33}Taylor, F.G.T., p. 3. See also p. 85.

\textsuperscript{34}See in F.G.T. those places (pp. 31-2, 90, 97, 142) where Taylor uses the phrase 'structural form', revealing further the tendency to think of form in terms of structure. It will be recalled that Dibelius and Bultmann sometimes thought of 'form' as a category of content.

\textsuperscript{35}Before Taylor, Burton Scott Easton in The Gospel before the Gospels (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), pp. 61-4, focused on the distinction between form and content and observed that form criticism had not been a thoroughgoing investigation of form. Easton (pp. 80-1) warned that such a study would nevertheless have its limitations so far as historical criticism is concerned. Easton's interest in form in contrast with content was another emphasis not intended by the form critics. See Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 245, n. 2; and see further below, p. 21.
Taylor's interpretation of 'form' as 'structure' is understandable. (1) The two words are often used synonymously in the English language. (2) As indicated above, form and structure are concepts that are sometimes yoked in Bultmann's writing. (3) Dibelius and Bultmann did discuss the structure of paradigms or apophthegms and tales or miracle stories when consideration was given to the scheme or location of typical features within the two or three broad parts that were seen in these stories.

Generally, the paradigms or apophthegms were thought to have two-part structure. In one instance Dibelius saw 'a word of command of Jesus and its carrying out' as the 'whole apparatus' of a paradigm.\textsuperscript{36} Elsewhere, Dibelius gave little attention to the structure of paradigms, possibly because the term 'paradigm' is indicative not of structure but of the illustrative function of the story in preaching.\textsuperscript{37} Bultmann considered 'framework' and 'a saying' to be the two elements of apophthegms.\textsuperscript{38} In his discussion of the controversy dialogues, he spoke of a 'starting-point'\textsuperscript{39} and a 'reply'.\textsuperscript{40} In a similar manner he used the terms 'starting-point' and 'answer' for the scholastic dialogues.\textsuperscript{41}

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{36} Dibelius, \textit{F.T.G.}, p. 54.
\item\textsuperscript{38} See Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, p. 12, and \textit{Form Criticism}, p. 40.
\item\textsuperscript{39} Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, pp. 39-41.
\item\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 41.
\item\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 54. Cf. Martin Albertz, \textit{Die synoptischen Streitgespräche} (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1921), p. 6, who maintains that question and answer are the two main points of the controversy dialogues in Mk. 2:1-3:6, although he detects also a two-part 'exposition' in the first four of these stories and considers the answer to be the high point of each story. Taylor, \textit{F.G.T.}, pp. 65, 78, likewise thought of a twofold, question-and-answer scheme in his treatment of the pronouncement stories. All of these critics agreed that a saying of Jesus is generally the climactic point of the story.
\end{footnotes}
thought of a saying of Jesus that is occasioned by a request or a question, by conduct, or by Jesus' initiative.\textsuperscript{42}

The scheme of the miracle stories was considered in broad lines to be tripartite with an introduction, an account of the miracle itself, and a description of its effect. Dibelius referred to the three sections as 'the history of the illness', 'the technique of the therapy', and the 'proofs of the reality of the recovery'.\textsuperscript{43} Bultmann thought of the three parts as the 'exposition', which describes the patient's condition; the healing; and a third section that demonstrates the cure and tells of its impression on others.$^{44}$

No real attempt was made to describe the scheme of the legends, for they were distinguished conceptually as a class of narratives on the basis of

\textsuperscript{42}Bultmann, H.S.T., pp. 55-6.

\textsuperscript{43}Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 54. See also pp. 82-7. Sometimes Dibelius referred to the third section as a description of the 'success' of the cure (p. 87).

\textsuperscript{44}See Bultmann, H.S.T., pp. 220-6, and Form Criticism, pp. 37-9. See also Taylor, F.G.T., pp. 24, 30-1, 67, 121-7. On p. 131 Taylor speaks of 'the perfect three-fold form of the Miracle-Story' with reference to Acts 3:1-10. For a recent statement of Taylor's view that the miracle story has distinctive form, see his article, 'Second Thoughts: VI. Formgeschichte', The Expository Times, LXXV (1964), 356-8. Cf. Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, trans. Percy Scott (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965), p. 211 (hereafter cited as T.I.M.), where Held speaks of 'the inadequacy of the form-critical category of miracle stories'. Later (pp. 241-2) Held attempts to study the scheme or 'form of construction' of Matthew's miracle stories in greater detail. Held recognizes four parts to the scheme: (1) 'formal introduction', (2) 'the request in direct speech', (3) 'the reply of Jesus', and (4) 'a brief formalistic notice that the miracle has taken place' (p. 241). According to Held, 'Matthew has standardised his healing miracles as conversations and has approximated their form to that of the controversy and scholastic dialogues' (p. 242). Cf. pp. 217-8, where, in connection with the story of the haemorrhaging woman, Held maintains that the story has a beginning, a middle, and an end. Cf. also Laurence J. McGinley, Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives (Woodstock, Maryland: Woodstock College Press, 1944), pp. 88-92, who sees as the 'topic' of miracle stories the 'exposition', the 'miracle', and the 'conclusion'. 
'motives which play upon the telling of religious stories' and not because they had a distinctive scheme.45

Others besides Taylor assumed that form criticism was oriented to the investigation of narrative structure. In his assessment of form criticism, E. Basil Redlich used 'form' and 'structure' synonymously46 and judged form critics for making judgements about stories that had no form or structure.47 Here it is evident that Redlich considered the study of form (structure) to be the proper area for form-critical investigation.48 Historical judgements apart from the study of form were held to be illegitimate.49

Recently, Edgar V. McKnight in his descriptive study, What Is Form Criticism?, understands form as structure and judges form critics for making judgements about content instead of 'outward structure'.50 In a sense the criticism that the form critics sometimes made judgements about content instead of structure is without force, inasmuch as the form critics never attempted to study structure in a thorough way. From the outset their method of investigation was primarily a study of the stylistic content (features, motifs, interests, characteristics, etc.) of stories; and only when certain schemes were evident in broad lines did the form critics attempt to make pronouncements

45See Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 245. Taylor, F.G.T., pp. 31-2, agreed that legends had no definite form but sensed a failure here on the part of form criticism 'to devise an adequate terminology'. But is it simply a matter of finding the right term for the legends? Cf. Bultmann, H.S.T., pp. 244-5.

46See Redlich, p. 13. See also his reference to 'structural forms' on p. 180.

47Ibid., p. 15.

48Ibid., p. 77.

49Ibid.

50See McKnight, p. 46. See also his use of 'structural form' on p. 49.
about the structure (construction) of the stories.\footnote{51}

Ever since the work of the form critics, there has been a need to investigate in detail the literary structure of the Gospel narratives, especially those of Mark.\footnote{52} The dissertation presents the results of such an investigation. Mark's narratives are inspected individually and comparatively with the parallels of Matthew and Luke to see whether one can go beyond the broad, twofold and threefold schemes of form-critical analysis and detect a greater number of recognizable structural sections not only in apophthegms and miracle stories but in all the narratives of Mark's Gospel.

In this investigation it is helpful to cast the narratives into colometric form according to sense lines and thought groups.\footnote{53} This procedure

\footnote{51Whenever in the dissertation it is pointed out that a particular form-critical view is a judgement about content instead of structure, it should be understood that such an observation has limited value as a criticism, inasmuch as the form critics were fundamentally not interested in a thorough study of structure.}

\footnote{52Cf. Antonio Gaboury, \textit{La structure des Évangiles Synoptiques, Supplements to Novum Testamentum}, Vol. XXII (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), pp. 224-5, who assumes that Formgeschichte was interested in investigating the structure of particular narratives and proposes the use of the term 'Strukturgeschichte' for a study of the history of the evolution of structure (p. 225, n. 1). On pp. 110-4 Gaboury points out several 'stereotyped' structures in certain Markan narratives. The structural recurrence of particular narrative sections is more frequent than Gaboury envisages.}

\footnote{53This method for this study arose from the recognition that Mk. 1:12f. contained parallelism and that the structure of these two verses could be better seen when they were written in strophic form. So J. Weiss, \textit{Das älteste Evangelium} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903), p. 135 (hereafter cited as \textit{D.A.E.}) It proved worth while to cast Mk. 1:1-13 into strophes according to sense lines and thought groups, and later this method was applied to all the narratives in Mark's Gospel. In the course of this investigation it was learned through a book by a Jesuit scholar, James A. Kleist, that this method of writing resembles colometry or colon-writing, the method used by St. Jerome when he wrote his Vulgate. See James A. Kleist, \textit{The Gospel of Saint Mark} (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1936), pp. 91-3. In Kleist's book the Gospel of Mark is arranged colometrically. The narratives presented in this dissertation resemble Kleist's arrangement from time to time, but generally differ through an attempt to show more clearly—especially through indentation and the omission of punctuation—the overall form of the narratives, the shape of their sections}
facilitated considerably by Mark's paratactic style, makes it easier to recognize smaller sections in a story and subsequently to compare stories according to these sections. The Greek text that is used for this procedure is *The Greek New Testament*, edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren.\(^5\) In addition to the omission of punctuation, capitalization in this text is altered from time to time. A capital letter is placed at the beginning of each narrative. Capitals frequently appearing at the beginning of narrative sections are altered to lower case. The accents of the Greek narratives are preserved as they occur in the text.

It also proves to be both fruitful and beneficial to think of structure as *the order of content within a narrative*. This definition makes it possible to examine as structure both the order of discernible sections within a narrative and the order of recurrent themes. Structure so defined is akin to instances of parallelism, participial constructions, and other literary features such as formulae for introducing sayings. Kleist's informative book with copious notes about Mark's style deserves more attention than it has received. See also Roland Schütz, *Der parallele Bau der Satzglieder im Neuen Testament und seine Verwertung für die Textkritik und Exegese* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1920). In this brief work Schütz calls attention to parallelism in New Testament prose and approves of a suggestion by Eduard Norden that the entire New Testament be presented in a special edition 'κατά πολὺν καὶ κοματα' (p. 5). Schütz examines the rhythmical parallelism of certain sayings and parables of Jesus in Mark's Gospel (pp. 9-18) and uses symmetry as a criterion for evaluating some variant readings (pp. 18-22). Unfortunately Schütz's study is not comprehensive; except for a brief reference to Mk. 4:2 (p. 10), he does not deal with the prose material in Mark's narratives but only with sayings of Jesus. Colometric arrangement, however, is useful precisely in the study of whole narratives for recognizing narrative sections for a more detailed understanding of narrative structure. The colometric arrangements presented in this dissertation differ considerably from those of Schütz, who nevertheless saw the value of indentation for making the parallelism more apparent (p. 12). In addition, see P. Gächter, 'Strophen im Johannesevangelium', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LX (1936), 99-120, 402-423, who presents portions of John's Gospel in strophic form.

to the form-critical notion of stylistic scheme.

In the consideration of structure, the use of the word 'form' is unavoidable. To minimize confusion in the dissertation, 'form' and 'structure' are regarded as synonymous. On some occasions, however, form is thought of in the general sense of 'manner', 'version', or 'kind'; but this use of form frequently is rejected to avoid unnecessary ambiguity.

The definition of structure—or form—as the order of content helps to minimize the error of drawing a sharp distinction between form and content—an error that often creeps into discussions of literary structure. This error is a natural one since the distinction between form and content is legitimate categorically, if not always intrinsically. In the investigation structure is seen not as something apart from the content but precisely as the order in which the content appears. Although the categorical distinction between form and content cannot be avoided, a rigid dualism between the two is overcome through the conception of form as the order of content. This conception in its clarity is at the same time a safeguard against the confusion of form and content, a second possible error that arises especially from the analyses of those who in the name of form discuss 'motifs' and 'features' and not the overall shape or design of a narrative.\(^{55}\)

When structure is understood as the order of content within a narrative, it becomes appropriate to use the word 'pattern' whenever the same order of content appears in two or more stories. In this respect pattern and structure are used synonymously in the investigation.

It should be recognized that the idea of a pattern is not new. Bultmann

\(^{55}\)See, for example, Bultmann, *H.S.T.*, p. 287, with regard to the Easter stories. See also p. 304, where Bultmann thinks of the shape or form of the motif itself!
regarded Mk. 1:44 as a 'pattern' for Lk. 17:14.\textsuperscript{56} In a description of form criticism, C. H. Dodd used 'pattern' synonymously with 'form', interpreting form as a category of structure.\textsuperscript{57} Similarly, L. J. McGinley spoke of a 'narrative pattern' with reference to the 'topic' or progression of sections in healing stories.\textsuperscript{58} Regarding form criticism as the study of structure as pattern, James Stewart wrote the following significant passage:

We meet the term 'pattern' in Biblical scholarship outside the range of interpretation. Form-criticism and traditio-historical criticism assure us that the original unit of Scripture is not to be found in the book, chapter or lengthy document but in the very short story, stanza, law, prophecy, hymn, preaching or homily. They show us how these brief units have grown or been developed in accordance with recognizable laws. We are to study them in isolation and comparatively to discern their patterns and see their common design. 'Pattern' is the key-word, the accepted technical term, in this study.\textsuperscript{59}

The present dissertation shows that a 'common design' or pattern is evident in Mark's narratives in contrast with the parallels of Matthew and Luke. In addition to Stewart, A. M. Hunter, in writing about form criticism, referred to 'the patterns which the tradition assumed'.\textsuperscript{60} Xavier Léon-Dufour thought of 'patterned narratives' in connection with two miracle stories that displayed 'the same pattern'.\textsuperscript{61} Klaus Koch spoke of 'literary patterns' that were

\textsuperscript{56}Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, p. 240.


\textsuperscript{58}McGinley, p. 88.

\textsuperscript{59}James Stewart, 'Patterns in Scripture', \textit{The Congregational Quarterly}, XXVIII (1950), 137-8.


accessible to the biblical writers. With regard to the written fixation of the tradition, Willi Marxsen contrasted the notion of 'a great variety of patterns' with the 'forms' that were used. It thus can readily be seen that the idea of a pattern has already been widely considered, especially with reference to the design or structure of the miracle stories.

In the investigation, the definition of structure as the order of content is an aid to objectivity. Once the sections are delimited with reasonable certainty, there can be little quarrel about the order in which they occur, unless the order of several sections in a narrative is questioned as being inverted. The possibility of subjective error does remain, however, in the determination of the sections—as to where a section begins or ends, whether it is one kind of section rather than another, or whether it actually is a section and not some part of another section. A number of tendencies that become apparent through comparative study of the narratives help to minimize error here, but judgements cannot always be made with certainty. An obvious task of later research will be to test the validity of these uncertain judgements to eliminate as much as possible the subjective error of any one interpreter.

Another area for possible subjective error has to do with the identity

---

62 Koch, p. 13. See also the foreword by Dan O. Via, Jr., to McKnight's *What Is Form Criticism?* (p. v).


64 Cf. another use of the word 'pattern' by Otto A. Piper, 'The Origin of the Gospel Pattern', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXVIII (1959), 115-24, where pattern refers to the Gospel story as a whole that arose out of confessional interest in Jesus as the Christ with concern for stories about His life to illustrate the confession. Cf. also Heinz-Dieter Knigge, 'The Meaning of Mark', *Interpretation*, XXII (1968), p. 65, where there is reference to 'the geographic pattern of the Gospel' in connection with Marxsen's 'Galilee hypothesis'.
of the narratives themselves. It is not always clear where a story begins or ends, so one cannot always proceed with certainty in an examination and description of those sections that are found at the edges of the stories. Here, however, the results of the investigation of those narratives whose limits are generally not in question help to determine with greater confidence the identity of narratives whose limits are uncertain.

Although Mark's narratives are the main object of attention, the examination of structure includes the parallel narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. These narratives were cast into colometric form before comparisons were made. These comparisons provided further grounds for assessing the structure of Mark's stories. Some of the results of this part of the investigation are indicated in the course of discussion.

In the study of structure there is always the hazard of forcing the narrative material into a rigid mould, particularly as it becomes more and more evident that Mark's narratives have been written according to essentially one pattern of narration. Certain variations of this pattern indicate that the pattern itself was not a rigid structure but was used in narration with great flexibility. Such variations help to offset any temptation on the part of the investigator to force the material into any one mould.

With regard to the style of writing in the dissertation, a conscious effort is made to make it readable and to minimize as much as possible the use of intensives, such as 'hardly', 'scarcely', 'completely', 'wholly', 'purely', 'certainly', etc. Such words presuppose a sense of certainty that is difficult to substantiate in biblical discussion, when Jesus of Nazareth and the actual events relating to His life are beyond historical observation, and when so many views of scholars are founded upon assumptions that cannot be verified. With a limited number of intensives the presentation may seem
flat or dispassionate, even when some of the findings are exciting. A conspicuous weakness is repetition. The overuse of certain words, such as 'narrative', 'pattern', and 'structure', is perhaps unavoidable. On numerous occasions the repetition of thought is allowed for the sake of thoroughness and to impress upon the reader the number of times a particular phenomenon recurs. Possibly such repetition is also a consequence of living with Mark's Gospel over a number of years, for repetition for the sake of thoroughness appears to have been characteristic of Mark's own method of writing.

It is assumed that Mark, the person, was both the Mark who aided Peter and the Mark of Acts who knew Paul. The priority of Mark's Gospel is also assumed on the weight of (1) the many arguments that have been advanced for its priority; (2) the number of scholars who still believe that Mark wrote his Gospel before the composition of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke; and (3) the presence of structural phenomena which suggest that Mark's narratives were antecedent to those of Matthew and Luke and available to them for the composition of their own Gospels. Time and again, structures/in Mark's narratives are interrupted at those places where unique material is presented in Matthew's parallels. In these instances it seems preferable to assume that Matthew wrote later than Mark and altered a structure through the addition of material, rather than assume that Mark wrote later than Matthew and for some reason omitted a block of Matthaean material. That Luke's differences are often stylistic improvements suggests that Mark's Gospel was available to Luke.

Another assumption is that Mark was an author and not merely a compiler. Reasons for holding this assumption are indicated from time to time in the discussion of literary phenomena which give the impression that Mark composed his narratives and did not merely collect them and arrange them with links
here and there. Ultimately, one cannot presume to know the mind of Mark; and whenever reference is made to his method of writing, it should be understood that pronouncements about his workmanship are essentially inferences that are drawn from phenomena that are evident in his material. Here it should also be understood that, unless otherwise stated, these phenomena are generally considered to be unconscious. For example, when in the dissertation reference is made to Mark's use of a particular narrative pattern with specific narrative sections, it is not assumed that Mark thought in terms of these sections or even of the pattern itself. Customarily, he tended to say certain things at certain locations in his narratives, but it is unlikely that he was conscious of these tendencies when he displayed them in his writing.

To speak of Mark as an author is to lean towards redaction criticism over against form criticism.⁶⁵ This dissertation, however, is limited to a discussion of structure with special reference to the form-critical positions of Dibelius, Bultmann and Taylor. Before one can talk meaningfully about Mark's work as a redactor, it is necessary to have an adequate understanding of the structure of his narratives. Form criticism failed to provide such an understanding through its broad analyses of the structure of paradigms, apophthegms, tales, and miracle stories, and inattention to the structure of many other Gospel stories. It is hoped that the present study will prove to be useful for further work in redaction criticism and in the analysis of literary structure in the biblical narratives.

Part I

THE NARRATIVE SECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

Is the structure of the Markan narratives more complex than that indicated by the twofold and threefold divisions of form-critical analyses? To answer this question, the narratives were written colometrically according to sense lines and thought units to see whether a greater number of recognizable sections were apparent. Attention was paid especially to the location of features within stories as a criterion for identifying narrative sections.

A detailed examination of the Markan narratives has led to the detection of seven kinds of narrative sections: a setting statement, situation statement, reply to the situation, problem section, reply to the problem, result statement, and consequence statement—mostly in that order. The matter, however, is not so clear-cut as it first may appear. The term 'section' is used rather loosely. Sometimes it is a sentence or several sentences; sometimes a section is only part of a sentence: perhaps a sense line or in a few instances just a word (e.g., Mk. 11:12b: ἐμείναςεν). Furthermore, not every narrative has all seven sections; and not every section can be determined with certainty. Nevertheless, the various sections are discernible with reasonable assurance in most of the narratives, and numerous examples can be given. Space will not permit a complete catalogue of all the examples, since this would amount to a presentation of the entire Gospel of Mark; but many illustrations will be given to demonstrate the distinctive character of each kind of section.
The discovery of these narrative sections has made it possible to consider concurrently a second question: are the narrative classes of form criticism formally distinctive? If miracle stories have distinctive structure, as the form critics claim, sections of miracle stories should be distinctive over against parallel sections of other kinds of narratives. To test this assumption, types of the seven narrative sections were used as criteria for measuring the form-critical classes of narratives. Letters indicating the classifications of Dibelius, Bultmann, and Taylor were placed after each example of a type of narrative section to see whether there was any correlation between type of narrative section and kind of narrative. If a recognizable type of section were found wholly or predominantly in one kind of narrative, this finding could be regarded as evidence in support of the narrative class. If a recognizable type of narrative section were found in various kinds of narratives, this fact could be seen as an indication that the kind of narrative in question was not distinctive at that point of narration. If a number of sections failed to support a kind of narrative, the narrative class could be judged not distinctive on formal grounds.

This part of the investigation has shown that correlations between type of narrative section and kind of narrative are considerably fewer than one would expect from form-critical claims about the distinctiveness of miracle stories and pronouncement stories. For the most part a particular type of narrative section is found just as well in various kinds of narratives. Moreover, the formal resemblance of corresponding sections of a particular class of narratives is sometimes less striking than that between those sections and parallel ones of other kinds of narratives, such as stories about Jesus. Together these findings indicate that the narrative classes of form criticism are not so distinctive formally.
A basic assumption in the discussion that follows is that the investigation of structure is pertinent to an evaluation of these narrative classes. When Fascher and Easton criticized Dibelius and Bultmann for not classifying narratives clearly on the basis of form, Bultmann replied to their criticism by arguing that the aim of form criticism is not to classify narratives neatly but 'to exhibit the motives which led to their formulation'. In this manoeuvre Bultmann attempted to remove discussion from the province of literary form to that of motives. But his appeal to motives at this point was highly questionable in the context of his own discussion. He himself had just relied on formal grounds to plead that miracle stories are a distinct class of narratives but then turned away from these grounds when they were used by opponents to question legends as a category. When Bultmann declared that form criticism is really interested in motives (and presumably not arguments about form), what was offered as a clarification of his method seemed to be a convenient change in the rules to protect some of his pieces. But so long as formal arguments are advanced to establish miracle stories and pronouncement stories as narrative classes, literary structure is a valid tool for measuring the form-critical classifications. Here structure is a more reliable criterion than the discussion of motives, which is more conjectural and less capable of verification. Even when it becomes recognized that the narrative classes of form criticism are not distinctive formally but rather thematically—miracle stories tell of miracles, pronouncement stories tell of a saying of Jesus—and that these classes have some validity on these thematic grounds, the investigation of structure is still a worth-while subject of inquiry, for it yields a new

\[^{1}\text{Bultmann, }H.S.T., p. 245, n. 2. In this important footnote Bultmann calls attention to the criticisms of Fascher and Easton.}\]

\[^{2}\text{Ibid., pp. 221-6.}\]
description of the form of the Markan narratives.

When structure is taken seriously as an acceptable area of investigation, it becomes apparent that the narratives in Mark's Gospel have been formulated according to a manner of narration that is more uniform and more fundamental than the supposed narrative classes of form criticism. Some of the formal grounds for this assertion are found in the narrative sections: in the types of sections that cut across the form-critical narrative classes. The first of these sections is the introductory setting statement.

I. THE SETTING STATEMENT

An introductory statement of place or time may be seen as the first formal section of most of the Markan narratives. The isolation of such a section in itself is a clarification of form-critical descriptions of the first parts of narratives. In his discussion of the exposition of miracle stories Bultmann draws attention to the features of the exposition without commenting on its structure and limits.³ There are a few indications that the exposition is a broad term covering everything in the first part of the story from an opening statement of place to the miraculous deed,⁴ but adequate discussion is lacking. Bultmann speaks with some clarity, however, about 'editorial introductions' or 'situation-indicators' which appear at the beginnings of stories.⁵ The introduction contains geographical statements or notices of time⁶ and is often an 'editorial link' that is supplied by the

³Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 221; see also his Form Criticism, p. 37.
⁵Ibid., p. 338; cf. Taylor, F.G.T., p. 126, who uses the terms 'Introduction' and 'Exposition' synonymously. Elsewhere (pp. 121f.) Taylor uses the word 'circumstances' for the first part of the miracle story.
Evangelist. 

Sometimes the place statement is held to be more extensive; and it is evident that Bultmann's conception of the introduction includes material that belongs to a second recognizable narrative section: the situation statement. Bultmann's use of a general term for content that contains several discernible sections is apparent also in his discussion of apophthegms, where the terms 'situation', 'starting-point', and 'occasion' are closely related. Here Bultmann treats without differentiation material that can be distinguished to a considerable degree in the Markan narratives: setting statements and situation statements. The validity of such a distinction will be made clear in the discussion that follows.

In broad lines, the introductory setting statement answers the questions Where? and When? It is a brief indication of time or place (or both), which provides general orientation for the narrative in which the statement is found. Some of the statements are definite in character (e.g., Mk. 1:29: Kατ' εὐθὺς ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἐξελθόντες ἠλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἰωάννου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου); but usually they are quite indefinite, indicating only that Jesus and his disciples enter a certain city (8:22a) or district (10:1a), go up a mountain (3:13a), pass by early (11:20a), and similar notes of time and place. These introductory setting statements are to be distinguished from internal setting statements that occur within narratives often at the beginning of other narrative sections, and also from setting statements that appear from time to time in consequence sections.

---

7 Bultmann, *H.S.T.*, pp. 242, 244.
9 See below, pp. 37-54.
The most common type of setting statement consists of ἐρχεται or ἐρχονται with εἰς and some location, usually a place name:11

\[
\begin{array}{l}
3:20a \quad \text{Kat ἐρχεται εἰς οἶκον} \\
6:1a \quad \text{Kat ἔξηλθεν ἐκεῖθεν} \\
6:1a \quad \text{καὶ ἐρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ} \\
10:1a \quad \text{Kat ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστὰς} \\
10:1a \quad \text{ἐρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρα τῆς Ἰουδαίας} \\
11:15a \quad \text{Kat ἐρχονται εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα} \\
11:15a \quad \text{Kat ἐρχονται εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα} \\
11:27a \quad \text{Kat ἐρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα} \\
14:32a \quad \text{Kat ἐρχονται εἰς χωρίον ὁδὸ τὸ ὄνομα Γεωθημανί.}
\end{array}
\]

11To distinguish setting statements and other narrative sections mainly on the basis of thematic interests, vocabulary, and syntax is to think of narrative style. See Fascher, pp. 208, 210f. Cf. Taylor, G.M., pp. 52-4, who discusses style apart from vocabulary and syntax. To recognize that certain thematic interests and words occur at particular places in narratives is to observe the form or structure of narratives. Here the location of the features is important for structure, which is understood as the order of content in a narrative. Cf. Fascher, p. 210, who thinks of form primarily in terms of the features and motifs themselves: if a crowd expresses astonishment in a miracle story, that is a matter of form; if the expression of astonishment is presented as a question, that is a matter of style. While it is true that Fascher notices that the expression of astonishment occurs at the end of the miracle story, the presence of the feature itself is the decisive thing for him. When Fascher later observes that similar stylistic features in very different kinds of narratives make it difficult to distinguish narratives on stylistic grounds (p. 211), he does not see that precisely these features—especially in their location in a story—may be used to evaluate the formal distinctiveness of the narrative classes of form criticism. It should be understood that in all the illustrations of narrative sections in this part of the dissertation, the entire quotation is regarded as the section. It should also be clearly understood that where sections are grouped according to one or several—and sometimes minor—features, the existence of these sections is not determined solely by these features. What is decisive is the position of the entire section in the story.
The similarity of these introductory setting statements is both self-evident and striking. They constitute an identifiable formal section: the first 'moment' of narration. They also indicate in their similarity a style of narration: a customary way to start a story. The style of narration apparent in these notes of orientation is found across the spectrum of the narrative classes of form criticism. This fact is indicated by the letters or symbols in bold type which represent the classifications of Dibelius, Bultmann, and Taylor, respectively. An explanation of the symbols that are used throughout the discussion is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dibelius</th>
<th>Bultmann</th>
<th>Taylor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA Paradigm</td>
<td>A  Apophthegm (unspecified)</td>
<td>P  Pronouncement Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA- Paradigm (less pure)</td>
<td>AC  Apophthegm, Controversy</td>
<td>M  Miracle Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T Tale</td>
<td>AS  Apophthegm, Scholastic</td>
<td>S  Story about Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS Passion Story</td>
<td>AB  Apophthegm, Biographical</td>
<td>MC  Markan Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Legend</td>
<td>L   Legend</td>
<td>SC  Small Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY Myth</td>
<td>HM  Healing Miracle</td>
<td>SS  Summary Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU Summary</td>
<td>NM  Nature Miracle</td>
<td>SY  Sayings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF Tradition Fragment</td>
<td>SY  Sayings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Dispute</td>
<td>MS  Minatory Saying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR Incidental Remark</td>
<td>EF  Editorial Formulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP Editorial Passage</td>
<td>SA  Synoptic Apocalypse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX Exhortation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY Saying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS Apocalyptic Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The symbols generally indicate the kind of story or material in which the section is found and are not form critics' designations of the sections themselves. Where two symbols are given for a particular example, they indicate that the story in question is considered to contain either several formal elements or features of several 'forms'. In some instances the symbol indicates merely the leaning of a form critic towards a particular classification where a judgement is uncertain because of the presence of additional features of some

12 The sources for these classifications are Dibelius, F.T.G., pp. 43, 71f., et passim; Bultmann, H.S.T., passim; and Taylor, G.M., pp. 78-87, and the introductions to his discussion of each narrative.
other kind of narrative. Also it must be kept in mind that the form critics, especially Dibelius, did not attempt to make their classifications exhaustive and systematic. In a few instances the letters signify judgements that are only implicit. A dash in place of a letter means that the story is not classified by a particular form critic. Parentheses indicate some sort of variation.

These symbols are given not to show how the form critics differ in their classifications of any one story but rather to call attention to the common lack of correlation between type of narrative section and form-critical classification. In the examples of setting statements with a present form of \( \xi \rho \chi \varepsilon \sigma \omega \alpha \) there is no significant correlation between this type of statement and kind of story. Such statements appear alike in pronouncement stories, miracle

---

13The fact that the form critics do not always agree in their classifications of a particular story has now and then been advanced as an argument against form criticism. For an early expression of this argument see Easton, pp. 60f. Perhaps some allowance should be made for the fact that Dibelius and Bultmann independently pioneered the form-critical method and differences could be expected. But disagreement among form critics in their classifications is an inevitable consequence of their conception of form as kind of story categorized by motif. Where a given story has more than one kind of motif, differences in classification are bound to occur according to the importance assigned to the various motifs. G. Iber in a more recent article, 'Zur Formgeschichte der Evangelien', Theologische Rundschau, N.F., 24 (1957-58), 283-338, attempts at one point to defend the form-critical classifications of Dibelius and Bultmann. Iber realizes that the question is not simply a matter of terminology but concerns the determination of the narrative types themselves (pp. 287f.). He also realizes that the narrative types have been questioned on formal grounds, especially by E. Schick, who asserted that Dibelius' legends and myths are not types determined by form but rather are Motivgattungen (p. 288). In reply Iber merely reasserts the form-critical position that legends and myths are recognizable 'forms' on the basis of narrative interests, and accuses critics (presumably Schick in particular) of having a 'formalistic misconception of form and style' (p. 289; see also p. 298). But this charge of Iber can be met with the countercharge that the form critics, with a conception of form in terms of interests and motifs, have a stylistic misconception of literary structure. The debate hinges on the conception of form and continues apparently with neither side willing to reconsider basic assumptions. Possibly the 'stagnation of form-critical work' (H. Conzelmann's phrase, which Iber uses with acknowledgement, p. 285) may be attributed in large measure to this long-standing impasse concerning the conception of form.
stories, and stories about Jesus. This fact shows that at this first point of narration the various kinds of stories cannot be distinguished from one another.

It must be admitted, however, that setting statements are often regarded as redactional formulations; and therefore their soundness for the study of correlation may be questioned. For this reason the lack of correlation between subsequent sections of narratives and form-critical classifications will be more valuable. Nevertheless, it is instructive to show the lack of correlation between setting statements and kinds of narratives, since there is relatively little correlation throughout the narrative sections. What is true for setting statements is true for situation sections, replies to the situation, problem sections, and so on: to a remarkable degree correlation between narrative section and form-critical narrative category does not exist. This general lack of correlation across the sections, rather than the want of correlation in any one section, is the important datum for a case against a particular class of narratives.

Another type of introductory setting statement, almost as common as the one with a present form of ἐρχεσθαι, contains ἠλθέω or ἠλθοῦ with εἰς and some indication of place:

1:9 ἴν ἡμέρας ταῖς ἡμέρας ἥλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας κατὰ ἐβαπτίζοντα εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου

1:14a δὲ τὸ παραδόθηκαν τοῦ Ἰωάννου ἥλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν

7:31 καὶ πάλιν ἐξελάθω ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου ἥλθεν διὰ Σιδώνου εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως

8:10 καὶ εὕρεις ἐμβάς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἥλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθί

1:29 καὶ εὗρος ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἑξελάθων ἥλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σιμῶνος καὶ Ἄνδρέου μετὰ Ἰωάννου καὶ Ἰωάννου
5:1 ἑλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν

6:53 διαπεράζαντες ἔπει τὴν γῆν ἥλθον εἰς Γεννησαρέτ καὶ προσωρμόθησαν

9:33a ἥλθον εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ.

These introductory setting statements appear as an identifiable first section of narration—the first moment of thought in telling a story. Their close resemblance exhibits a style of narration that is essentially the same as that visible in the first group of statements. Once again this style of narration cuts across form-critical classifications, and a picture emerges that will be enlarged and clarified by examples of sections throughout the narratives of Mark's Gospel: the 'forms' of form criticism are not distinctive structurally.

14 Cf. διαπεράζαντες τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν (5:21a).

15 Bultmann is of the opinion that 7:31 is an editorial conclusion to the story of the Syro-Phoenician woman to bring Jesus back from an imaginary journey north, H.S.T., pp. 64-5. Cf. Schmidt, R.G.J., pp. 200-1. To support his opinion Bultmann argues that 7:24-31 is a variant of Mt. 8:5-13 and points to 8:22-27a, which supposedly has a place statement both at the beginning and end of the story. But Bultmann's view is questionable on formal grounds. (1) Mk. 7:31, as may be seen in the comparative study of setting statements, resembles many setting statements that appear at the beginning of narratives and is therefore better regarded as a formal introduction to 7:32-37. Additional support for this judgement is found in the fact that elsewhere πάλιν never appears in a consequence statement at the end of narratives but is a word that occurs a number of times in introductory setting statements (e.g., 2:1, 2:13a, 3:1a, 4:1a, 5:21a, 11:27a). Furthermore, 7:30 is a suitable formal ending (see 14:16; cf. 6:29). (2) The possibility that v. 31 is editorial to bring Jesus back to Galilee is in itself no argument for regarding the verse as part of 7:24-30, since v. 31, as an introduction to vv. 32-37, could just as well be an editorial attempt to establish connection. Generally editorial efforts at connection are found in introductory setting statements rather than in narrative conclusions. (3) Formally Mt. 8:5-13 stands against the theory that Mk. 7:31 is a concluding setting statement to 7:24-30, since the story of the centurion's servant begins, but does not end, with a setting statement. (4) Bultmann's appeal to 8:22-27a is problematic because v. 27a can be instead an appropriate introductory setting statement within 8:27-30 (see below, p. 197), and also because 8:26 is a suitable narrative ending (see 1:34b, 5:42b-43, 7:36f., 8:30). Cf. H.S.T., p. 227, where Bultmann in a contrary manner speaks of 7:24-30, 7:31-37, and 8:22-26.
There is a tendency for statements of the second group to occur in miracle stories and Markan passages; but instead of being evidence for the miracle story as a narrative class, this tendency supports the widely held view that Mark was partly or wholly responsible for the introductions to his narratives.\textsuperscript{16}

At times the setting statement has a compounded form of ἔλθεν or ἔλθον:

6:45-46 \textsuperscript{45}Καὶ ἔλθεν ἡμᾶς ἡμέρας τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδᾶν ἐως αὐτῶν ἀπολύσει τὸν ἡχόν
\textsuperscript{46}καὶ ἀποταξόμενος αὐτοῖς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι

7:24a Ἐκείθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Τίφου

\textsuperscript{16}In this group of setting statements 8:10 is another verse that is sometimes regarded as a narrative conclusion. Following Westcott and Hort, Taylor, G.M., p. 360, sees v. 10 as the ending to the story of the feeding of the four thousand, even though he notices that the vocabulary of v. 10 closely resembles that of 6:45, an introductory setting statement. That 8:10 so resembles both 6:45 and other introductory setting statements suggests that 8:10 should be seen as the formal introduction to the story of the demand for a sign. The fact that most of Mark's narratives begin with such statements stands in favor of this judgement. A number of scholars regard v. 10 as a narrative introduction within 8:10-13: for example, H. B. Swete, The Gospel According to St Mark (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1898), pp. 157-9; J. Weiss, Das Markus-Evangelium in Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, I (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907), 141-5; M.-J. Lagrange, The Gospel According to Saint Mark (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne Ltd, 1930), pp. 80-1; J. Schniewind, Das Evangelium nach Markus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), pp. 76-7; E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959), pp. 154-6; W. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Markus (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1959), pp. 160-2; and R. Grob, Einführung in das Markus-Evangelium (Zürihc: Zwingli Verlag, 1965), pp. 109-10. Cf. Schmidt, R.G.J. p. 203, who thinks that the story of the demand for a sign originally began with v. 11, to which v. 10 was later added. But it is likewise questionable whether v. 13 should be regarded as a narrative conclusion. Like 8:10, v. 13 can be seen as a conventional introductory setting statement. A. E. J. Rawlinson, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1925), p. 105, and P. Carrington, According to Mark (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1960), pp. 164-5, treat 8:10-12 as a narrative unit but without giving reasons for limiting the narrative to these verses. When vv. 10 and 13 are recognized as introductory setting statements, the questions of context and connection for 8:10-12 and 8:13-21 require reconsideration (see further below, pp. 247-50).
The similarity of the setting statements in this group is especially noticeable through the recurrence of παλιν, εἰς τὸ πέραν, εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, ἀναστάς, and the use of εἰς in all but two of the statements. These resemblances are

17 In 14:10a Judas goes to a group of people rather than a specified place. In this respect 14:10a could be regarded as a situation statement without a prior setting statement. The remark that Judas was one of the Twelve may be a Markan comment, but is possibly an epithet that was currently used in the early Church. See Taylor, G.M., p. 535.

18 It will be shown below (pp. 407-9) that formally 6:30f. and 6:32-34 are separate narratives, so that it is permissible to think of 6:32 as an introductory setting statement.

19 Mk. 11:11 is frequently regarded as a conclusion to the story of Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem, but the similarity of v. 11a with other introductory setting statements suggests that Mark thought of a new beginning at v. 11. The brevity of the verse, which barely qualifies as a narrative on formal grounds (see below, pp. 410-1), may be explained by the fact that it tells of an action of Jesus that never developed on account of the lateness of the hour. A decision here is most difficult on formal grounds alone, and a slight preference for the view that v. 11a marks a new beginning can be asserted only with uncertainty.
further evidence of a manner of narration that is manifest in the setting statements irrespective of the form-critical categories. There is a tendency for some of the statements to appear in stories about Jesus and Markan constructions; but correlation with stories about Jesus is of limited value formally, since this class of narratives is considered to have no distinct form of its own.20 The presence of the statements in Markan constructions supports once more the view that Mark was responsible for the style of his introductory setting statements.21

A few of Mark's setting statements contain a participial form of ἔρχεσθαι or one of its compounds:

2:1 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν ἐκ τῆς Καφαρναοῦμ δι' ἡμέρην ἥκοδθή ὥστι ἐν οἷς ἔσται. PA AC P

7:1 Καὶ συνάγονταὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων ἐλθοντες ἀπά Ἰεροσολύμων D AC SC

9:30a Κάκειθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας EP EF MC

11:12a Καὶ τῇ ἑπαύρνον ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Βηθανίας. L NM M


21Further warrant for this view is found in Matthew's and Luke's parallels to Mark's introductory setting statements with a present or an aorist form of ἔρχεσθαι or one of its compounds. Luke and especially Matthew often prefer a participial construction: Mt. 13:54, cf. Mk. 6:1; Mt. 8:14, cf. Mk. 1:29; Mt. 18:28a, cf. Mk. 5:1; Mt. 26:14 and Lk. 22:4, cf. Mk. 14:10a; Mt. 16:13, cf. Mk. 8:27a; Mt. 21:10a, cf. Mk. 11:11a; Lk. 4:42a, cf. Mk. 1:35a; Lk. 22:39, cf. Mk. 14:26. Matthew and especially Luke sometimes use a construction with ἔγενε: Mt. 13:53, cf. Mk. 6:1; Mt. 19:1, cf. Mk. 10:1a; Lk. 18:35, cf. Mk. 10:46; Lk. 20:1, cf. Mk. 11:27a; Lk. 9:18, cf. Mk. 8:27a; Lk. 6:6a, cf. Mk. 3:1a. Sometimes Matthew and Luke employ different or more sophisticated verbs: μετήρην (Mt. 13:53, cf. Mk. 6:1); ὄνεβη (Mt. 14:23, cf. Mk. 6:45f.); ἀνεχώρησεν (Mt. 15:21, cf. Mk. 7:24); παρευθείς (Mt. 26:14, cf. Mk. 14:10a); ματέπλησαν (Lk. 8:26, cf. Mk. 5:1); ὑπεκάμψαν (Lk. 9:10b, cf. Mk. 6:32); and ἐπερεῦσθη (Lk. 4:42a, cf. Mk. 1:35a). Occasionally in Matthew's and Luke's parallels there is an omission of Mark's statement (e.g., Mt. 20:29, cf. Mk. 10:46; Mt. 21:12 and Lk. 19:45, cf. Mk. 11:15; Mt. 21:23 and Lk. 20:1, cf. Mk. 11:27a). In these comparisons the style of Mark's statements is consistently simple and straightforward.
In this group 7:1, with its statement that the Pharisees and certain of the scribes came to Jesus, resembles some of the situation statements;\textsuperscript{22} but the reference to the leaders' coming from Jerusalem establishes the statement as a formal setting statement. The similarity of the statements of this group is less noticeable, but the lack of correlation with any one form-critical category is just as apparent.\textsuperscript{23}

Another type of setting statement is identified by the presence of γενομένης with either ὁφιάς or ὕφας:

\begin{verbatim}
1:32a ὃφιάς ὑφ γενομένης ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος
4:35 Καὶ λέγει ἄνυτοις ἐν ἑκείνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὁφιάς γενομένης Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν
14:17 Καὶ ὁφιάς γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν ὀδηγα
15:42 Καὶ ἡδὲ ὁφιάς γενομένης ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή ὁ ἐστιν προσάββατον\textsuperscript{24}
6:35a Καὶ ἡδὲ ὄφας πολλῆς γενομένης
15:33a Καὶ γενομένης ὄφας ἐκτις\textsuperscript{25}
\end{verbatim}

Unlike previous types, these statements give indications of time rather than place, except for 4:35 which mentions both time and place. The similarity of these statements is another sign of a narrative style that transcends any particular kind of form-critical classification. In 15:42 there is a comment

\textsuperscript{22}See below, pp. 43-6.

\textsuperscript{23}In the Synoptic parallels to this type of statement, Matthew characteristically uses more sophisticated verbs: συστρεφομένων (17:22a, cf. Mk. 9:30a) and ἐκανάγων (Mt. 21:18, cf. Mk. 11:12a); but in two instances he simplifies the participial constructions of Mark (Mt. 9:1, cf. Mk. 2:1; and Mt. 15:1a, cf. Mk. 7:1). Luke presents another of his constructions with ἔγενετο in 5:17a, his formal parallel to Mk. 2:1.

\textsuperscript{24}Cf. Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου (16:1a).

\textsuperscript{25}See also 6:21a.
that explains the meaning of ἀπαθευετα. Possibly the phrase in 1:32a about the setting of the sun is also a comment to indicate that the Sabbath was over. 26 The Markan character of all the statements of this type is apparent in a comparison with Matthew and Luke: Matthew occasionally omits ἐγενομένης (8:18, cf. Mk. 4:35; Mt. 27:45, cf. Mk. 15:33), and Luke either omits Mark's statement or uses a construction with ἐγένετο (8:22a, cf. Mk. 4:35; Lk. 22:14, cf. Mk. 14:17).

There is no need to illustrate a few brief types of setting statements that show no clear correlation with any narrative class: types which refer to 'sitting' (Mk. 2:15a, 12:41a, 13:3a) or 'teaching' (4:1a, 6:6b) and statements that refer to 'days' (8:1a, 14:1a) or a particular 'day' (14:12a). These statements are introductory setting statements that show stylistic tendencies but no correlation. Nor is it necessary to illustrate some miscellaneous statements (3:7a, 11:1a) and a number of brief temporal setting statements that do not resemble one another verbally, although they are found in stories about Jesus in the Passion Narrative (15:1a, 6a, 25a).

It is more important to illustrate some introductory setting statements that do exhibit correlation with narrative class. One type consists of a compounded form of παραθευεθαι:

1:21a Καὶ ἐσπορευόμεναι ἐὰς Καφαρναοὺμ

2:23a Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν
παραθευεθαι διὰ τῶν στορύμων

26 See Taylor, G.M., p. 180. This view is preferable to the elaborate theory of E. Hirsch, Frühgeschichte des Evangelium, I (2d ed.; Tübingen: J.C. B. Mohr, 1951), p. 6, that the statement is a doublet, where ὄψιας (ὅπερ) ἐγενομένης is the original indication by the first narrator (Mk I) and δὲ ἐδοξάσεν ὁ Πλοῖος is the contribution of a later narrator at Rome (Mk II), and where the combination of the two phrases is the work of a redactor (R). For a general criticism of Hirsch's source analysis, see Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist, pp. 27-8, n. 36.
The stylistic resemblance of this type of statement is self-evident. The style is Markan, as can be seen through the parallels of Matthew and Luke. Matthew either omits Mark's construction or changes the form of the verb to ἐπορεύεται (Mt. 12:1a, cf. Mk. 2:23a) or to ἔξελθων with ἐπορεύετο (Mt. 24:1a, cf. Mk. 13:1a). Similarly, Luke either omits Mark's construction or changes the verb (Lk. 4:31a, cf. Mk. 1:21a; Lk. 6:1a, cf. Mk. 2:23a). With regard to Mark's statements, there is some correlation with paradigms or apophthegms. There is, however, considerable variance among the form critics in their classifications. The three agree only in their classifications of 2:23-28, and such diversity of opinion undermines the correlation. This diversity does not nullify the correlation, since a particular form critic's classification may be essentially sound for a certain kind of narrative, whether or not other form critics agree with him. One would expect, however, that if the form-critical method is valid, there should be frequent correlation between narrative sections and form-critical categories for more than one form critic.

There is a brief type of statement in Mark's Gospel that shows a correlation with the classifications of two form critics who disagree in their classifications:

1:16a Καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας

2:14a Καὶ παράγων

Unless otherwise indicated, the term 'Markan' is used to denote an apparent tendency in Mark's narrative sections in comparison with Matthew and Luke and does not imply a judgement as to whether the material in question has been created by Mark or formulated by him on the basis of tradition.
The narratives in which these statements are found (1:16-18, 19f., 2:14) are so similar formally that correlation is inevitable no matter how the stories are labeled. Here the conflicting set of labels undermines confidence in the classifications, but the correlation with the two different sets of labels calls attention to the formal similarity of the stories.

A type of setting statement with a compounded form of βαίνειν shows a correlation with Markan constructions according to Taylor's classification:

3:13a Καὶ ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὃρος
10:32a Ἡσαύ δὲ ἐν τῇ ὅδῃ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα
9:9a Καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὃρους.

Such a correlation may help to confirm Markan constructions as a class of narratives; but then again, the correlation may do no more than indicate a tendency in Mark's usage. The additional support of correlations in other narrative sections will be important for confirming the narrative class.

There are several other brief types of introductory setting statements that exhibit correlation with form-critical classifications. One of these types has ἀπήγαγον as a feature:

14:53a Καὶ ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρὸς τὸν ἄρχιερεὰ
15:16a Οἶ δὲ στρατιώται ἀπήγαγον αὐτῶν ἐσω τῆς αὐλῆς ὡς ἐστιν πραγμάτων.

Another type contains a regular or a compounded form of φέρειν:

9:2a Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἐξε παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον
καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην
καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὅρος ὑφηλᾶν κατ' ὁδίαν μέσον

15:22 Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλλάδον τόπον ὡς ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον Ἑλλάδος τόπος.
A construction with ὅντος is the characteristic mark of still another type:

14:3a  Καὶ ὅντος αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ
       PA   AB   S

14:66a  Καὶ ὅντος τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ.
       T   FS   L   S

According to Bultmann and Taylor, the stories in which these statements are found are legends or stories about Jesus. Inasmuch as this kind of classification has no distinct form of its own, the correlation is of limited value. For the correlation to be significant formally, it would have to point to a group of narratives that could be identified as a separate class either on the basis of a unique structure or because of common features, depending on one's conception of form. But stories about Jesus display neither distinctive structure nor features that distinguish these stories as a separate class. At best they are described as having 'religious and edifying' character, but this criterion is so broad that it could conceivably include miracle stories and pronouncement stories.

To conclude this discussion of setting statements, it may be said in summary that an introductory setting statement is a recognizable first moment of narration in the Markan narratives. Certain types of statements are discernible on the basis of stylistic tendencies that are noticeably Markan in comparison with formal parallels in Matthew and Luke. There is little correlation between the main types of setting statements and the narrative classes of form criticism. There is some correlation, however, in less frequent types of statements; but this correlation is undermined by disagreement among form critics in their classifications and by correlation with narrative classes that do not have distinctive form. Time and again, types of statements cut across the form-critical categories, so that the question arises whether the

28Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 244. See also p. 245.
categories are as distinctive as is often assumed. To help answer this question, it is fruitful to examine the second section of Markan narratives: the situation statement.

II. THE SITUATION STATEMENT

A statement about the situation or occasion of an event is in itself a second recognizable section in almost all the Markan narratives. In the discussion of setting statements it was mentioned that Bultmann speaks of 'situation-indicators' in the broad introductions to miracle stories and uses the terms 'situation', 'starting-point', and 'occasion' to describe the introductions of apophthegms.29 Held, in his description of the form of miracle stories, refers to a 'formal introduction in which the suppliant is quite briefly introduced and an attitude of supplication is expressed'.30 But no matter what kind of story is told, a statement about the occasion of the event is the second moment of thought in the Markan narratives.

The situation statement is distinguished by the fact that it answers the questions Who? and What? Who prompted the action of the story? What was he doing, seeing, thinking, saying? Who was present? What was going on? Generally situation statements report that persons were doing something or coming to Jesus. Or the statements indicate that Jesus Himself saw something, began to do something, wished something, or said something to His disciples. Occasionally it is told that they said something to Jesus, and there are a few instances where the statements disclose that certain persons were seeking to do something against Jesus.

29See above, pp. 22-3.

The situation statement is further distinguished by the fact that it is often much longer and more detailed than the introductory setting statements. Frequently an explanatory comment appears in a situation statement, suggesting that Mark felt freer to intrude into his narratives at this point to expand them with information and remarks of his own.

Like introductory setting statements, however, situation statements sometimes contain brief notes of time and place. These 'internal setting statements' that occur within narratives are found now and then in other narrative sections as well—often at the beginning of a section. The presence of time and place notes within narratives indicates that setting statements cannot be dismissed as mere links between narratives. Also, should it be judged that internal setting statements are somewhat traditional in origin, their presence raises the question whether introductory setting statements are altogether redactional.

As was also true for introductory setting statements, there are identifiable types of situation statements which are often noticeably Markan in comparison with Matthaean and Lukan parallels. Furthermore, most of these types of statements are found just as well in various form-critical narrative classes. Such evidence blurs further the distinctiveness of these classes and deepens the impression that the categories of form criticism do not adequately mirror certain tendencies of narration that are apparent in the narrative sections.

A distinctive type of situation statement contains a periphrastic construction with ἦν and generally indicates what certain people were doing at the time of the narrated event. The occurrences of this type of statement are given below both to illustrate the type and to show the lack of correlation
between this tendency of narration and the narrative classes of form criticism.

1:21b-22 κατ' εὐθείας τοῖς σάββασιν
              [εἰσελθὼν] εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν
              ἐξόδασκεν

22 κατ' ἐξελθόντο έπι τῇ ὀλιγχυ ἀυτοῦ
          ἢν γὰρ ὀλιγχυκῶν αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐξουσιαί έχων
          κατ' οὗξ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς

1:32b-33 ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτῶν
           πάντας τοὺς καθὼς ἔχουτας
           κατ' τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους

33 κατ' ἤν ὡς ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνημένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν

2:18α κατ' ἢσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου
           κατ' οἱ φαρισαῖοι νηστείοις

Cf. 3:1b κατ' ἢν ἐκεῖ ἀνθρώπος
             ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χειρὰ

4:36-38α 36 κατ' ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον
             παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἢν ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ
             κατ' ἄλλα πλοῖα ἢν μετ' αὐτοῦ

37 κατ' γυναῖκα λατλαφ μεγάλη ἀνέμου
          κατ' τὰ κύματα ἐπεβαλλεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
          ὡστε ἡ ἴν γεμίζῃσθαι τὸ πλοῖον

38 κατ' αὐτὸς ἢν ἐν τῇ πρόμην ἐπὶ τὸ προσκήπταλον καθεδρὼν

5:2-5 2 κατ' ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου
            [εὐθείας] ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων
            ἀνθρώπως ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ
            3' ὡς τὴν κατολίκην εἴχεν ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις

κατ' οὔδε ἄλογος σε οὐκέτι οὔδες ἄλογον αὐτὸν ἔδωκα
        ἢ διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ τολάκις πέδας καὶ ἄλογος ἔδωκα
        κατ' ἀνεπιστόμα ὡς' αὐτός τὰς ἁλογεῖς
        κατ' τὰς πέδας συντετερωθαί
κατ' οὔδες ἵνα περιπετεύονται αὐτῷ δαμάσαν

5 κατ' οἷα παντὶς νυκτὸς κατ' ἡμέρας
          ἐν τοῖς μνημασίαν
          κατ' ἐν τοῖς ὁδρείσιν
          ἢν ἱεράσων
          κατ' καταχώπτων έαυτὸν λέγοντας

PA- HM M

SU EF S

PA AC P

PA AC P

T NM M

T HM M
These statements, which bear little resemblance thematically, are similar in
that they portray after an introductory setting statement the occasion of the event: what was going on at the time, what certain people were thinking and doing, what were the circumstances. Some of the statements give traces of background information: previous attempts to shackle the demoniac were unsuccessful (5:4); the chief priests and the whole Sanhedrin were seeking to kill Jesus, but without success (14:55); those jailed with Barabbas had committed murder in the uprising (15:7); Joseph was one of those looking for the Kingdom of God (15:43). The amount of information in the situation statements is conspicuously greater than that in the introductory setting statements, but interest in the orientation of events is further evident in internal indications of place in 1:21b; 1:33; 4:36, 38; 5:2, 5; 14:54.

The common feature in this type of situation statement is the periphrastic construction. To consider this construction by itself is to think merely of vocabulary and style in terms of syntax, but to recognize that this construction frequently appears in the second section of Markan narratives is to make an observation about narrative structure. The location of this stylistic feature in the story is the decisive thing, not the feature itself.

In comparison with Matthew's and Luke's parallels to the statements just given, the use of a periphrastic construction at this location is a Markan tendency. Matthew has the construction just once (Mt. 7:29, cf. Mk. 1:22), generally altering the verb in the other parallels. Luke also has this same Markan construction but changes the order of the surrounding material (Lk. 4: 31f., cf. Mk. 1:22). In another parallel Luke has a periphrastic construction but changes the participle (Lk. 23:19, cf. Mk. 15:6b-8). Many of Mark's

---

31 No setting statement precedes 2:18a; see below, pp. 353-4.
32 Cf. also Lk. 23:38 with Mk. 15:25b-27, and Lk. 23:51 with Mk. 15:43.
constructions have no parallel in Luke's Gospel, a further sign that their presence in situation statements is a Markan tendency.

This tendency is apparent in various kinds of narratives: miracle stories, stories about Jesus, a pronouncement story, and a Markan construction. The wide distribution of the tendency demonstrates that these categories are not distinctive at this point and also that Mark's manner of narration here is not governed by any particular kind of story or subject. The tendency is apparent in a number of legends or stories about Jesus, but the significance of this relationship is diminished by the formal indistinctiveness of this kind of story and also by the fact that this category was assigned to most of the stories in the Passion Narrative for conceptual rather than structural reasons.33 Wherever any type of narrative section appears in a number of stories in the Passion Narrative, there will be a correlation with stories about Jesus. In labeling stories of the Passion Narrative legends or stories about Jesus, the form critics followed the widely held assumption that these stories of the Passion Narrative were different from the rest of the Gospel narratives.34 There is no question that the Passion Narrative stories are thematically distinctive, but the fact that this first type of situation statement is present in Passion Narrative stories and other stories raises the question whether the Passion stories are distinctive formally. The presence of this type of situation statement in certain Passion stories is an indication that

33Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 245.

34See, for example, Martin Kähler's famous description of the Gospels as 'passion narratives with extended introductions', The So-called Historical Jesus and the Historic, Biblical Christ (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 80, n. 11. One must keep in mind that this judgement did not arise from a study of literary structure but from a reaction to pragmatic biographies that gave undue attention to the early stages of Jesus' ministry and the development of his consciousness. Also, Kähler's statement was influenced by his dogmatic interest in the 'work' of Jesus at the end of His life (p. 95).
structurally there is sometimes little difference between stories of the Passion Narrative and other stories in Mark's Gospel.

A second type of situation statement tells of people who come to Jesus, and has as a common feature the prepositional phrase πρὸς αὐτόν. The phrase itself is not distinctive; its location in the story is the important thing. Several times those who approach Jesus are ill and come for help:

1:40a  Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτόν λεπρὸς

2:2-4  ἑλάλει αὐτοῖς τον λόγον

Some of the statements refer to crowds that come to Jesus:

2:13b  καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξετο πρὸς αὐτὸν

3:7b-8  καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐκολούθησεν

4:1b  καὶ συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλεῖστος

10:1b  καὶ συμπεριεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν.
In one situation statement the Apostles come to Jesus, whose name is given instead of the pronoun:

6:30  Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

But in other statements Jesus is approached by antagonists, including some of his relatives (cf. 7:1):

3:31  Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες
ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν
καλοῦντες αὐτὸν

11:27b  καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁρπῇ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ
ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἁρχιερεῖς
καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς
καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι

12:13  Καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν πρὸς αὐτὸν τινὰς τῶν βαρβαρῶν
καὶ τῶν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ
ἐνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ

12:18a  Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτὸν
οἴτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἰναι.

There is one situation statement in which Jesus comes to His disciples:

6:47-48  Ἰδὼν αὐτὸς γενομένης
 ἵνα πλεοῦν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης
 καὶ αὐτός μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

There are also several statements that refer to sick persons whom Jesus approaches: Peter's mother-in-law (1:30a) and Bartimaeus (10:46b). Some of these statements will be shown in forthcoming illustrations of whole narratives.

35Not illustrated are situation statements without πρὸς αὐτῶν that nevertheless tell of various people who come to Jesus: crowds (3:20b, 5:21b, 8:1), a hemorrhaging woman (5:24b-28), a woman with a jar of ointment (14:3b); cf. tax-collectors and sinners who recline with Jesus (2:15b). Three other statements use a regular or compounded form of φέρειν with αὐτῷ (7:32a, 8:22b, 10:13a).
The distinctive character of this second type of situation statement is further evident in the stylistic tendency of Mark to use some form of ἐρχόμενοι or verbs compounded with σῖν (4:1b, 6:30). Once again, however, there are internal setting statements that express interest in the orientation of the events (in 3:31, 4:1b, 6:47f., 11:27b), and also brief explanatory comments (in 6:47f., 12:13, 12:18a). It is not always clear (as in 12:13) whether the comments stem from the tradition or from Mark himself. But perhaps this distinction between tradition and redaction should not be drawn too sharply even when Markan responsibility is clearer (as in 12:18a), since an editorial remark may pass on valid information.

Mark's tendency to present this type of situation statement should be seen in comparison with Matthew, who has προς αὐτόν just once in a parallel section (Mt. 13:2, cf. Mk. 4:1b), preferring to use different verbs with αὐτῷ in other parallels (cf. Mt. 14:25 with Mk. 6:48 concerning the use of προς αὐτῷς). Luke has the construction twice (Lk. 8:4, cf. Mk. 4:1b; Lk. 8:19, cf. Mk. 3:31), omitting it in most of his parallels.

This type of statement is found in a variety of stories, demonstrating again a manner of narration that pervades different form-critical classes and renders them indistinctive at this point. There is, however, a correlation between this type of statement and some apophthegms that tell of antagonists who come to Jesus. Three of these statements (3:31, 12:13, 12:18a) are not

---

36 See also 2:15b (συνερχομένοι), 3:20 (συνέρχεσθαι), 5:21b (συνήχθη), 5:24b-28 (συνέδαλβον in v. 24b); cf. 10:1b (συμπορεύοντα) and 14:53b-56 (p. 40 above). In view of this stylistic tendency in situation statements, the use of σών αὐτῷ in 15:27 (also p. 40 above) becomes meaningful. Jesus, who was surrounded in life by people who had come to hear his teaching and to be healed, is now accompanied by common criminals in death. The contrast heightens the humiliation of His rejection and death.

37 See Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 65, n. 3, concerning 'historical reminiscence' in editorial place notes.
preceded by a setting statement, but the same is true for 1:40 in a miracle story. Whether apophthegms are distinctive as a class depends on the extent of correlation in subsequent sections.

Several types of statements tell of an initiating act of Jesus. Sometimes He saw something and that is the occasion of the event:

1:10 καὶ εὗθες ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ᾑδατός εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς ὀὐρανοὺς κατ' τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαίνον εἰς αὐτόν ἩΥ, Λ, ΣC

1:16b εἶδεν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τῶν ἀδελφῶν Σίμωνος ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ ἀλασίᾳ ἦσαν γὰρ ἀλλεὶς Λ, ΑB, Σ

1:19b εἶδεν Ἰακώβου τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφόν αὐτοῦ κατ' αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δέκτημα Λ, ΑB, Σ

2:14b εἶδεν λευκὴν τὸν τοῦ Ἁλφαίου καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον ΡΑ- ΑB, Σ

12:41b-42 ἐθεώρησεν πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον κατ' πολλοὺς πλούσιοι ἔβαλλον πολλά

42καὶ ἔλθοισα μία χῆρα πτωχῆ ἔβαλεν λεπτὰ δύο ᾃ ἐστὶν κοινοῦντης. ΕΧ ΕΠ, ΑB, Π

In other statements the verb is plural, and Jesus is sometimes not among the observers:

6:33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἔπεν γνωσοντος πολλοὺς καὶ πεζῷ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνεδραμον ἐκεῖ κατ' ἐποίησον αὐτοὺς ΕΠ, ΕF, ΜC

9:14-15 14Καὶ ἔλθοντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτοὺς κατ' γραμματεῖς συζητούντας πρὸς αὐτοὺς

15καὶ εὗθες πῶς ὁ ὄχλος ἔλθοντες αὐτοῦ ἔξεθαμβήθησαν κατ' προστρέχοντες ἡσπάζοντο αὐτόν ὃ Τ, ΗM, Μ

11:20b ξειδον τὴν συχῆν ἐξηραιμένην ἐξ ἀριθμών Λ, ΑB, ΣY, Μ
The use of ἔδεν in the former group of statements is not peculiar to Mark. Matthew has the verb in his parallels to the call stories; Luke uses ἔδεν in 21:1, when Mark has ἔδεω (Mk. 2:41b). But the presence of ἔδον or ἔδνεσς in the latter group is found only in Mark's passages; neither verb appears in a parallel section. There is a correlation between the first group and apophthegms but no correlation in the second, distinctively Markan.

38The content of the situation statement actually begins with v. 1, where Pharisees and scribes come to Jesus. The use of συνάγονται πρὸς ἀυτὸν is characteristic of certain situation statements and supports that judgement. The indication, however, that the antagonists are coming from Jerusalem is a formal setting statement appearing in the first thought-unit of 7:1-23. (Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 334; but Mark's setting statements are not always links or clear indications of when or where an event took place.) In that first unit Mark has fused setting and situation, giving priority to the latter by starting the unit with information about the situation. This subordination of the setting to the situation occurs in several other passages (6:45f. in the previous narrative and 12:35a), and probably should be seen as a minor deviation by Mark from his customary course of starting narratives with a distinct setting statement. Mark's deviation in 7:1 and the syntax in 7:1f. may have been occasioned by his anticipation of a need to explain at length to Gentile readers certain practices of the Pharisees. There are numerous indications that Mark composed portions of his narratives in anticipation of subsequent material. This feature of his method of writing is discussed in Part III on the thematic structure of Mark's narratives. See below, pp. 482, 495.

39See also the use of ἔδον in 9:9b and its absence in Mt. 17:9.
group. Apart from the call stories, there is no correlation in the two groups combined; and the question arises whether the correlation in the first group is to be attributed more to the formal similarity of these particular stories themselves than to the validity of the apophthegm as a class of narratives. Even with the call stories, the two groups combined exhibit a manner of narration that is independent of any particular class of narratives, especially in the classifications of Dibelius and Taylor. Here Taylor is customarily more in agreement with Bultmann, whose classifications reflect the type of statement with greater consistency than those of Dibelius—a trend that appears often in other types of statements and draws more attention to the analyses of Bultmann.

Another type of situation statement displaying the initiative of Jesus contains a construction with ἔφησον. Jesus said or did something, and that is the occasion of the event:

6:1b–2a καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ

2καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου ἔφησον διδάσκειν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ

6:7–9 ἐπερηγηγείλειν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν ἀρσεῖν εἰς ὅδον εἰ μὴ ῥάβδου μόνον μὴ ἀρτον μὴ πῆραν μὴ εἰς τὴν ἔζων χαλκὸν ἀλλὰ υποδεχεμένους σανδάλια καὶ μὴ ἐνδύοσθαι δύο χιτώνας

8:31–32a ἔφησον διδάσκειν αὐτοῦς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκαταστῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστηκῖαι

32καὶ παρεσῆλθεν τὸν λόγον ἐλάλησεν
11:15b-16 καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοραζοῦντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ
καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν καὶ τὰς καθόρας τῶν πωλοῦντων τὰς περιστερὰς κατέστρεψεν

16καὶ οὖν ἤφειν ᾿Ιησοῦς διὰ τῆς διενέγησις σκέψεως διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ PA- AB S

14:32b-34 καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Καθίσατε ὑμεῖς προσευχόμεθα
καὶ παραλαμβάνει τὸν Πέτρον καὶ [τὸν] Ἰάκωβον καὶ [τὸν] Ἰωάννην μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀπεμονεῖν
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Περιλαμβάνεσθαι εἶστιν ἡ φυσῆ μου ἐως θεατῶν μεծνατε ὑμεῖς καὶ γηγορεῖτε. PS L S

To be compared with these situation statements are others with ἤρξαντο, where those who did something are persons other than Jesus:

2:23b καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὑμῖν ποιεῖν τῆλοντες τοὺς στάχυας PA AC P

6:54-55 54καὶ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ἐπιγυνότατε αὐτῶν
καὶ ἤρξαντο ἐπὶ τοὺς κραδάτους τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας περιφέρειν ὁποῦ ἤκουσον ὅτι ἔστιν SU EF MC

8:11 καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἤρξαντο συνητεῖν αὐτῶν ἐπεουντεῖν παρ’ αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑφρασοῦ περιράζοντες αὐτῶν. SY EF S

40See also Mk. 15:8, p. 40 above, where ἤρξατο (concerning a crowd) appears in a situation statement with a periphrastic construction. Sometimes a situation statement will have more than one kind of feature characteristic of a type of situation statement. The presence of several features in a particular statement supports the view that the situation statement is a narrative section that is recognizable through stylistic tendencies found at a particular location in a narrative. It does not matter here whether ἤρξατο or ἤρξαντο means 'began' or is only a redundant auxiliary verb. See Taylor, G.M., pp. 48, 63-4.
These statements with ἄρας and ἀρξας are rather Markan inasmuch as Matthew has ἄρας in a parallel section only twice (Mt. 16:21, cf. Mk. 8:31f.; Mt. 26:37, cf. Mk. 14:32b-34) and ἀρξας once (Mt. 12:1, cf. Mk. 2:23b). Luke has only ἄρας just once (Lk. 19:45, cf. Mk. 11:15b-16). There is a tendency for this type of statement to appear in Taylor's stories about Jesus, but it is present also in Markan constructions and a pronouncement story. No distinctive relationship exists in the classifications of Dibelius and Bultmann. The style of narration apparent in this type of situation statement is evident in various kinds of narratives, so that one cannot speak of 'the style of a paradigm' or some other kind of story at this point.

There are a few situation statements with ἐθέλειν that tell of Jesus' will or intention:

3:13b καὶ προσκαλεῖται ὁδὸς ἐθέλειν αὐτὸς
καὶ ἄκελθον πρὸς αὐτὸν

7:24b-25 καὶ ἐισελθὼν εἰς οἶκον
οὐδένα ἐθέλειν γυνώναι
καὶ οὐκ ἠσυχήθη λαθεῖν

25 ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἀκούσας γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ
τὸ ἐλέημα τὸ ἀκαθάρτων ἀνθρώπων
ἐλθούσα
προσέπεσεν πρὸς τὸν τὸς πόδας αὐτοῦ

9:30b καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλειν ἵνα τίς γνοί.\(^{41}\)

The absence of ἐθέλειν in Matthaean and Lukan parallels attests to the Markan character of these statements. Their Markan character is apparent also in the form-critical classifications, where two of the three statements are from

---

\(^{41}\)See also 6:47f., p. 44 above. Cf. the use of οὐκ ἐθέλειν in 11:16, p. 49 above; cf. also the situation statement 9:9b:

διεστελλόντα αὐτοῖς
ἵνα μηδενὶ ἢ εἰδὼν διηγήσωταί
εἰ μὴ σταυρὸς τοῦ ἁναράξου ἐξ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ.
narratives labeled Markan constructions. The value of this correlation for supporting Markan constructions as a class of narratives, however, becomes lessened by the presence of ἔαλεν in 6:47f., which is the situation statement of a miracle story.

In two situation statements Jesus takes the initiative by asking His disciples a question:

8:27b καὶ ἐν τῇ ὑδίῳ ἐπηρῶτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ
λέγων αὐτοῖς
Τίνα μὲ λέγουσιν οἱ ἀνωτέροι εἶναι

9:33b-34 καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος
ἐπηρῶτα αὐτοῦς
Τί ἐν τῇ ὑδίῳ διελεύσεσθε

34οί δὲ εἰσιῶτων
πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ διελέξθησαν ἐν τῇ ὑδίῳ
τίς μελέτων.42

These two statements resemble each other with a similar internal setting statement, the use of ἐπηρῶτα, and questions that begin with τί or τίνα. The statements are Markan, as is seen by the omission of ἐν τῇ ὑδίῳ in the parallels

42Certain passages where Jesus takes the initiative to introduce a saying (9:33; 9:36; 7:14; 10:23; 8:27; 12:35; 8:31; 9:9, 30; 10:32) are considered to be secondary formulations by Bultmann, H.S.T., pp. 66, 257-8, 333. If Bultmann is correct, the question arises whether all the situation statements that speak of the initiative of Jesus are also secondary formulations. There are formal grounds, however, for a negative answer to this question. First of all, it is formally inappropriate to think of the initiative of Jesus in some of the passages that Bultmann mentions (9:36, 7:14, 10:23). Jesus' acts of taking a child, calling the people, and looking at His disciples are presented as part of His reply to some situation or problem. This fact does not shield these passages from the charge of being secondary formulations, since the introductions to reply sections can conceivably be editorial; but the reply character of these passages does suggest that the initiative of Jesus is not the issue in every case. Secondly, there is some question whether instances where Jesus does take the initiative are secondary. Here it is important to look at those types of situation statements with ἐλευθερωθείτω or ὑπήρχεισθε, ἔκτασις or ἔκτασθε. Formally, no distinction can be pressed between passages where Jesus is the subject and those where the initiative lies with other persons. It is doubtful that all of the latter instances are secondary formulations, and it is likewise questionable whether those statements concerning Jesus' initiative are uniquely secondary. The portrayal of Jesus' initiative is no sure sign of editorial formulation.
to 8:27, the absence of a parallel section to 9:33b-34, and the Markan comment in 9:34. These similar statements are found in different kinds of stories according to the form critics. Again stylistic tendencies of Mark betray the formal indistinctiveness of form-critical narrative classes in this second section of certain narratives.

There is no need to illustrate some situation statements where Jesus says something to His disciples (11:1b-3, 14:27f.) or some miscellaneous statements that tell of some activity of Jesus (1:14b, 1:35b, 11:11b, 11:12b, 12:38a, 14:18a, 14:22a). A few of these statements are just a word or two (ἐπείλανεν, 11:12b; καὶ ἐπρώκετο, 1:35b) but nevertheless serve as formal situation statements.

It is more important to show a fourth main type of situation statement in which disciples or persons sympathetic to Jesus ask Him a question or say something to Him:

6:35b-36 ἀπελθόντες [αὐτῷ] οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι
"Ἐρώτησέ ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἡ ὥρα πολλή"

36 ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοὺς ἕνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλους ἄγιους καὶ κώμας ἁγιάσασιν ἐαυτοῖς τὸ φάγωσιν

10:17b προσδραμὼν εἰς
καὶ γονυπήθης αὐτῶν ἐπηράτα αὐτῶν
Διόδοσις ἀγαθή
tὸ ποιήσω
ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω

12:28 καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς τῶν γραμματέων ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων ἰδιῶν ὅτι καλῶς ἀπερωῒθη αὐτοῖς ἐπηράτησεν αὐτῶν
Πολλα ἐστὶν ἐντολή πρῶτη πάντων

13:1b λέγει αὐτῷ εἰς [ἐν] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ
Διόδοσις
Ἡ ποταποὶ λέξοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαὶ
These statements resemble one another through verbs compounded with πρός (6:35b-36, 10:17b, 12:28) and through the recurrence of ἵνα (6:35b-36, 10:17b, 14:12b), διάδοχαν (10:17b, 13:1b), τί (6:35b-36, 10:17b, 13:3b-4), ἀπελθοῦντες (6:35b-36, 14:12b), and some form of ἐσθήσεν (6:35b-36, 14:12b). The stylistic similarity of 6:35b-36 with 14:12b is striking, especially since the former is labeled a miracle story and the latter a story about Jesus. The two kinds of narratives clearly are not distinctive at this point. There is also no correlation between type of statement and narrative class concerning the other statements in this group. The style of narration evident in these statements cuts across the three main classes of narratives: the miracle story, pronouncement story, and story about Jesus.

Space will not be taken to illustrate several brief types of situation statements that depict hostility to Jesus (14:1b, 10b, 43; 15:1b, 16b-17) or contain ἐγένετο as a common feature (1:4f., 6:14a, 9:2b-3, 15:33b). These statements are not distinctively Markan and tend to appear in stories about Jesus—the narrative class that has no distinctive form of its own.

In summary, numerous examples have been given to show that the situation

43Cf. 16:1b-3, where the speakers address themselves.
44See also 8:11, p. 49 above.
statement is a recognizable second section in the Markan narratives. Types of situation statements are discernible through certain stylistic tendencies that are often distinctively Markan in the sense that they tend to appear in this second moment of narration in Mark's stories. These types of statements generally are found in various kinds of narratives, so that it is difficult to distinguish between the form-critical classes in this second narrative section. But does the picture change as one gets further into the narratives? A look at the next narrative section helps to provide an answer.

III. THE REPLY TO THE SITUATION

A reply to the situation may be seen as the third formal section in a majority of the Markan narratives. Most of the reply-to-the-situation statements contain sayings of Jesus that are germane to the situation: direct and indirect sayings, questions, and commands. On occasion the section merely

45 The fact that a particular type of situation statement appears both in apophthegms and various other kinds of stories raises doubts about Bultmann's opinion that situation remarks in apophthegms are 'imaginary scenes' for the sake of an idea; see H.S.T., pp. 39-40. As has been shown, often no distinction can be drawn between the situation statements of certain apophthegms and those of other narrative classes. To uphold Bultmann's contention, one would have to explain how the situation statements of apophthegms can be both imaginary and stylistically indistinguishable from such statements in other kinds of stories. Here it is improbable that most of the situation statements are imaginary, so some other kind of explanation should be sought. One could argue that Mark, or some narrator before him, invented for a saying of Jesus a situation according to a basic style of storytelling; but such an assumption about a fundamental manner of narration is at odds with the form-critical view that the traditions were transmitted or invented according to different forms that arose from various needs of the Christian communities. As will be shown in the forthcoming discussion of the structure of whole narratives, a basic pattern of narration evident in Mark's narratives reveals that the forms of form criticism are structurally often indistinguishable from one another. Ultimately, the question is not whether the situation of an apophthegm is imaginary but whether the apophthegm itself can be maintained as a distinct class of narratives.

46 The abbreviation of certain narratives through the omission of the reply to the situation is discussed below, pp. 134-5, 270-1.
indicates that a reply is given, without actually presenting the reply. It is
natural that a number of the reply-to-the-situation sections refer to teaching
as an activity of Jesus. Several sections tell of nonverbal responses,
especially when the situation statement describes some act or command of Jesus
that calls for responsive action.

A number of reply-to-the-situation statements present direct sayings of
Jesus:

8:1c-3  προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς
λέγει αὐτοῖς
2Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν δόξων
ὅτι ἡ ὁπι ημεραὶ τρεῖς προσμένουσαν μοι
καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τὰ φῶταν
3καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστεις εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν
ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ
καὶ τίνες αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακράθεν ἤκασιν

9:35-37 35καὶ καθίσας
ἐφώνησεν τοὺς δάδεκα
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς
Ἐὰν τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι
ἐσται πάντων ἐσχάτος
καὶ πάντων διάκονος
36καὶ λαβὼν παιδίων
ἐστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν
καὶ ἐναγκαλίσαμεν αὐτὸν
ἐξείπεν αὐτοῖς
37··Ος ἀν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις παιδίων δέχηται
ἐπὶ τῷ όνόματι μου
ἐμὲ δέχεται
καὶ οὗτος ἐμὲ δέχεται
ολοκληρώσω τὸν ἀποστελλόντα με

11:17  καὶ ἔδεδασθεν
καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς
Ὡς γέγραπται ὡσι
Ὁ οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται
πάσιν τοῖς ἐθνεῖς
ὑμεῖς δὲ κατακτήσατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον λῃστῶν

T NM M

EX SY
EP AS MC

PA AB S
12:35-37a 35Kat ἁποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
ἐλεγεν
οὗδαμιν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ
Πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς
ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς υἱὸς Δαυὶδ ἐστιν

36αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἄγγε
Εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου
Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου
ἔως ἄν ὃς τοὺς ἐξήρουσιν σου
ὑποκάτω τῶν τοδῶν σου

37αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον
καὶ πόθεν αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν υἱὸς

14:18b  ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν
Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν
ὅτι εἰς ἐπὶ ύμῶν παραδόθησα με
ὁ ἐσθίων μετ’ ἐμοῦ

14:35-36 35καὶ προσέλθων μικρῶν
ἐκπέτευ τῆς γῆς
καὶ προσήχθησέν
ἐνα εἰ δυνατὸν ἐστὶν
παρέλθῃ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ η ὥρα

36καὶ ἐλεγεν
Αββα
ὁ παῖς
πάντα δυνάμει σοι
παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον τούτῳ ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ

ἀλλ’ οὐ τις ἐγὼ θέλω
ἀλλὰ τι σοῦ.47

Several reply-to-the-situation statements contain indirect sayings of Jesus:

9:31 ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς
ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
παραδόθηκε εἰς χείρας ἄνθρώπων
καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτὸν
καὶ ἀποκτάνθεται
μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται

47See also 12:43f.
With regard to both groups of sayings—direct and indirect—some statements mention the disciples (8:1c-3, 9:31) or the Twelve (9:35-37, 10:32d-34) and refer to the teaching of Jesus (11:17, 12:35-37a, 9:31). A feature in all the direct sayings is the use of first person pronouns. A number of statements show interest in the identity of Jesus and His Sonship (12:35-37a, 14:35-36, 9:31, 10:32d-34), and several allude to His suffering and death (14:18b, 14:35-36, 9:31, 10:32d-34). No one feature or motif is important in itself. What is important is the tendency to present a saying of Jesus—direct or indirect—at this point in certain of Mark's narratives. This tendency may be seen as a structural tendency, and the fact that it is apparent in various kinds of form-critical narrative categories is further evidence that these categories are formally not distinctive.

Some reply-to-the-situation statements present a question of Jesus:

5:30  κατ' ἐνδόθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς

εἶπεν γινώσκει εὖ ἐαυτῷ τὴν ἐκ τούτων δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαι

ἐπιστραφείς ἐν τῷ ὅχλῳ

ἔλεγεν

Τῆς μου ἱστοῦ τῶν ἑταίρων

T  HM  M

48See also 1:15, 12:29-31. Cf. 6:14b-16 and 8:28, which present sayings about Jesus by others.
These reply-to-the-situation statements with questions have several recurrent features: indications of Jesus' inner perceptions or feelings (5:30, 8:12), the use of ζητεῖν or συζητεῖν (8:12, 9:16, 9:10), and allusions to God (10:18f., 15:34). But more important is the placement of these statements in narration. They all occur as the third moment of interest in Mark's narratives, and this fact is a datum of structure. In this third narrative section Jesus addresses the situation, responding to human need, unbelief, and

49 Cf. 9:10, where the questioning is done by disciples:
καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συζητοῦντες τὸ ἐστὶν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστηναι.
personal suffering.  

It is significant that these reply-to-the-situation statements with questions are found just as well in the major categories of form-critical analysis. One cannot speak here of the style of the miracle story or paradigm. The categories clearly are not distinctive at this point in these narratives, and misgivings about the validity of these categories become greater.

There are some reply-to-the-situation statements that present commands of Jesus. In the following examples some of the statements have been grouped to make stylistic tendencies more apparent:

1:17 καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
  Δεῦτε ὑπέρ μου
  καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἄλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων
L AB S

6:31 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς
  Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἱδονεν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον
  καὶ ἀναπάτασθε ὀλίγον

ησαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι κατ' οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοὶ
  καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαλύπτουν
EP EF MC

2:14c καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ
  Ἀπολοῦθει μοι
PA- AB S

3:3 καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν ἐξήρανεν ξένην ἐξοντι
  ἢγείρει εἰς τὸ μέσον
PA AC P

4:2-9 καὶ ἔδειξακεν αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλὰ
  καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ δίδαξι αὐτοῦ
3 Αποκαλεῖ
  ἱδον ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων σπείραι

50 Structurally, Jesus' quotation from Ps. 22:1 in Mk. 15:34 is a formal reply to the situation, which is darkness according to the formal situation statement (15:33b). This structural relationship supports the view that for Mark Jesus' cry is an expression of trauma rather than trust. Cf. F. W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus (New York: Abingdon Press, 1964), pp. 238-9. The cry echoes the agony of Jesus in Gethsemane and the conflict between His will and that of the Father. Although the structural location of the quotation provides a clue to Mark's redactional understanding of the saying, it is impossible to know the intention of Jesus—whether the cry is an outburst of torment or filial faith.
κατ' ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπειρέων

καὶ ἠλών τὰ πετελνά
καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτὸ

καὶ ἄλλο ἔκεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρώδες

καὶ κατὰ ἐκεῖνῇ τοῦ ἐλευθέρων

dιὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς

καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ρύζαν

καὶ ἀνέβησαν αὐτοὶ ἀκανθαὶ
καὶ συνέπυξαν αὐτὸ
καὶ καρπὸν ὁὐκ ἔδωκεν

καὶ ἄλλα ἔκεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν
καὶ ἔδωσεν καρπὸν ἀναβάζοντα
καὶ ἀὐξανόμενα
καὶ ἔφερεν ἐν τριάκοντα
καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα
καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν

καὶ ἠλέγει

10καὶ ἠλέγειν αὐτοῖς

καὶ αὐτοῖς ὁποὺ ἐὰν εἰσέλθητε εἰς οἰκίαν

καὶ μένετε

καὶ ἐως ἂν ἔχειν ἐκεῖθεν

11καὶ ὅσ' ἂν τότες μὴ ἐξέπηται υμάς

μηδὲ ἁκοδοσίων υμῶν

ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν

ἐκτίναξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν υμῶν

καὶ μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς

οἱ δὲ ἄκορησεῖς

ἐπεκαὶ αὐτοῖς

καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς

λέγων

ἐπεκαὶ αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φάγετε

καὶ ὀρᾶτε

βλέπετε ἀπό τῆς ζῴης τῶν φαρισαίων
καὶ τῆς ζῴης Ἰησοῦν

καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταις συναγωγαῖς
καὶ πρωτοκλίσιας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις

40οἱ κατεσθάνοντες τὰς οίκιὰς τῶν χρῶν
καὶ προφέρει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι
οὗτοι λήψωνται περισσότερον κρέμα

13:5-37 5ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἠρέστα λέγειν αὐτοῖς
Βλέπετε κτλ. 51

14:13-15 13καὶ ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς
'Υπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν
καὶ ἀπαντήσει υἱὸν ἀνθρωπος
κεράμιον θέατος βαστάζων
ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ

14καὶ ὅπου ἐδώ εἰσέλθη
εἴπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ
ὅτι ὁ διεδώκατος λέγει
Ποῦ ἔστιν τὸ κατάλυμα μου
ὅπου τὸ τάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω

15καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνάγαυον μέγα
ἐστρωμένον ἐτοιμοῦ
καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν. 52

There are recurrent features in these statements such as Δεῦτε, Βλέπετε, and references to teaching (4:2, 14:14), hearing (4:3, 9; 6:11), eating (6:31, 6:37a, 14:14), and following (2:14a, 14:13-15; cf. 1:17); but the significant fact is that a command of Jesus occurs in each statement, no matter whether the statement comes from a biographical apophthegm, Markan construction, controversy apophthegm, sayings complex, miracle story, Synoptic apocalypse, or legend from the Passion Narrative. This stylistic tendency to present a command at this location is found in all the major form-critical classes, and their indistinctive-

51Formally the whole of 13:5-37 is a reply-to-the-situation statement; see below, pp. 413-4.

52See also 14:22b-25, which contains the command Δεῦτε; cf. 2:5 and 13:2, which are similar reply-to-the-situation statements that, however, do not contain a command.
ness here is quite apparent.

There are some reply-to-the-situation statements that do not attempt to
give Jesus' reply but merely indicate that He said something. The reference to
His speaking—often teaching—constitutes in itself the reply to the situation
statement:

1:20a καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκάλεσεν αὐτοῦς

2:13c καὶ ἔδεισακεν αὐτοῦς

3:9-10 καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
ἐνα πλοιάριον προσκατερή αὐτῷ
dιὰ τὸν ὀχλον
ἐνα μὴ θλίψασιν αὐτῶν

6:34 καὶ ἔξελθαν
eἶδον πολὺν ὀχλον
καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτῶς
dιὶ ἡσαν ὡς πρόβατα
μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα
καὶ ἠρέατο διδάσκαλεν αὐτοῦς πολλά

10:1c καὶ ὥς εἰλαθεὶ πάλιν ἔδεισακεν αὐτοῦς

10:16 καὶ ἑναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ
kατευλύγει
τιθέεις τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτὰ.

---

53 This verse, which has the hint of a setting statement (ἔξελθαν) and
features of situation statements (ἐλὲον, ὀχλον, ἡσαν, ἠρέατο) in addition to
the material of a reply-to-the-situation statement (the references to Jesus' emotion and teaching) at this point in the narrative, is a good example of a narrative section that contains in itself Mark's pattern of narration in miniature. Further illustrations of this phenomenon will be given in Part II. The amount of situation material in 6:34 may be explained by the view that 6:32-34, which is structurally a separate narrative, describes the situation for 6:35-44. See Taylor, G.M., p. 318, who sees 6:30-34 as a 'prelude' to the feeding story. A judgement about a passage such as 6:34 should not be based
on motifs alone but on the location of these motifs in the passage, the position of the passage in its narrative, and the relation of the narrative
to its context.

54 See also 3:14-19, where the naming of disciples is Jesus' reply to the
situation. Cf. 9:4, in which Elijah and Moses talk with Jesus. Cf. also
14:11a, where the speakers are the chief priests.
Other statements present replies by persons other than Jesus. Most of
these passages are from the Passion Narrative:

1:6-8  καὶ ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου
καὶ ἔδωκε δερματίζην περὶ τὴν ὁσφυν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐστιν ἄριστος καὶ μέλι ἄγριον

1:11 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν
σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός
ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα

14:2 ἔλεγον γὰρ
Μὴ ἐν τῇ έορτῇ
μὴποτε ἔσται θρησκείας τοῦ λαοῦ

14:44 δεδώκει δὲ ὁ παραδότος αὐτῶν σύσσωμον αὐτοῖς
λέγων

15:9-10 ὁ δὲ Πιλᾶτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς
λέγων

15:18-19 καὶ ἔτυπτον αὐτὸν τὴν κεφαλὴν καλὰ μή
καὶ ἐνέπτυσαν αὐτῷ
καὶ τιθέντες τὰ γόνατα
προσκύνησον αὐτῷ.

In the previous group of statements there was no correlation between type of
statement and form-critical class; but in the group of statements just illus-
trated there is an obvious correlation with legends. This correlation may
help to confirm the legend as a category; but in a decision here one should
remember that legends were not thought to have distinctive structure and that the form critics generally applied this nonstructural label to most stories in the Passion Narrative for conceptual reasons.

A few reply-to-the-situation statements tell of a nonverbal response to a particular occasion. Instead of saying something, the person does something in response to the circumstances:

11:4 καὶ ἀπῆλθον
καὶ εὗρον πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου
καὶ λῦσαν αὐτόν

11:13a καὶ ἴδων συχῆν ἀπὸ μαχράθεν
ἐχούσαν φύλλα
HELL' έλαθεν εἰ ἄρα τι εὑρήσει ἐν αὐτῇ 55

15:23b ὅς δὲ οὐκ ἐλαβεν

15:44a ὁ δὲ Πιλατὸς ἐδαιμόσεν
εἰ ἡ ὅπη τεθνηκεν.

Of interest is the statement in 15:23b, where the lack of a response is indicated in the formal reply-to-the-situation statement. Mk. 11:4 is another example of a narrative section that contains the pattern of narration in miniature: καὶ ἀπῆλθον is the hint of a setting statement; the reference to the colt is a brief situation statement; and the untying of the colt is the disciples' response to the situation. Together, however, the departure, discovery, and possession of the colt constitute the disciples' response to Jesus' instructions in 11:1b-3—the formal situation statement. Three of the four sections above are found in legends, two of which are from the Passion Narrative. But the presence of this type of statement in a miracle story as well suggests that the correlation, instead of supporting the validity of legend as a category, is merely an indication that certain stories labeled legends

55Cf. 11:11c: ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Ἑθαυλίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.
manifest a style of narration that is not to be identified with any one form-critical class. Clear recognition of this manner of narration is of the utmost importance for understanding the structure of Mark's narratives, as will be shown in the study of whole narratives in Part II.

In summary, the reply to the situation is the third recognizable, formal section in Mark's narration. In most of the statements Jesus is the subject, who acknowledges through word or deed the situation of the event. Some of the statements have recurrent features that are noticeably Markan in character, so that it is possible to think of Markan responsibility in connection with these statements. Here the issue is not merely style—Mark's choice of words—but also structure: the use of these features in this third moment of narration in Mark's stories. Among the statements of this third section there is little support for the form-critical categories, since the various types of statements appear in different narrative classes. Their indistinctiveness becomes clearer in the light of the structural tendencies of the reply-to-the-situation statements. Where there is some correlation with legends, the value of this relationship is questionable on account of the wholesale use of the nonstructural legend category for stories of the Passion Narrative.

Most of the material presented so far as setting, situation, and reply-to-the-situation statements has not supported the form-critical categories. Is the matter, however, different with subsequent material in Mark's stories? If the various categories are valid, they should be distinguishable in the larger internal sections of the narratives. An investigation of the next narrative section uncovers additional structural tendencies that cut across the different categories and so reveal even further their formal indistinctiveness.
IV. THE PROBLEM SECTION

A fourth section in the Markan narratives may be termed the problem section.\(^{56}\) Often this section tells of a negative reaction, such as an accusation against Jesus concerning His teaching or a complaint about His disciples' behaviour. Some of the problem sections present 'difficult' questions about lawful conduct or the afterlife. A large number of the sections refer to troublesome limitations of the disciples: their fear, unbelief, inability to heal, exclusiveness, need for private explanation, and petty jealousy. There are sections that present confessions or questions concerning Jesus' Messianic identity. Several sections describe hostile acts. Some of the sections, however, tell of requests for healing through Jesus' touch. These various features in themselves are not so important for structure as the fact that they occur in this fourth narrative section.

One type of problem section portrays negative reactions against words of Jesus and actions of His followers. The use of τίνες at the beginning of the section is a characteristic feature:

2:6-7 Εξαπατούσιν ἐν τοῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν
καὶ διαλογίζομενοι ἐν τοῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν
Τῇ οὖτος οὗτως λαλεῖ
βλασφημεῖ
Τῆς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἀμαρτίας
eἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεὸς

11:5 καὶ τίνες τῶν ἐκείνων ἐστηκότων
ἐλέγον αὐτοῖς
Τῇ πολεμίᾳ
λύοντες τὸν πᾶλον

\(^{56}\) The problem section is the fourth section in approximately one third of the narratives but occurs as the third section in another third of the narratives. In these stories the reply-to-the-situation statement has been omitted. The problem section does not appear in the remaining third of the narratives. These tendencies will be discussed at length in Part II.
The passages are similar in more ways than one. Besides τίνες there are other recurrent features: τι (2:7, 11:5, 14:4, 14:60), references to hearing (14:58, 15:35), and some form of δόνασθαι (2:7, 14:5). There is also some similarity in shape between 14:57-60 and 15:35f.: each section begins with words of the unspecified participants and ends with a saying of an individual. The

57The use of τίνες here is Markan with the word occurring in just two of Matthew's parallels to these passages (Mt. 9:3, cf. Mk. 2:6f.; Mt. 26:60f., cf. Mk. 14:57-60) and in none of Luke's parallels. The other recurrent features are not clearly Markan.

58Cf. a similar section in 3:21f., pp. 69-70 below, where the end of the section presents the accusations of a group of scribes from Jerusalem.
stylistic and structural similarities of the passages support the view that they are a recognizable type of narrative section.\(^59\)

Just as important is the fact that the stories in which the sections are found are quite diverse: the anointing at Bethany, the forgiveness and healing of a paralytic, the acquisition of a colt for Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, His trial before the high priest, and the Crucifixion. That the same type of section should occur in such different stories is evidence of a manner of narration that cannot be identified with just one form-critical category. No structural distinction can be made at this point between the pronouncement story, 2:1-12, and the story about Jesus, 11:1-10. Nor can such a distinction be pressed between the problem sections of these two stories and those of the three stories from the Passion Narrative. With regard to these sections the three stories are structurally no different from the two stories that appear earlier in Mark's Gospel.

All but one of the sections with τίνες appear in stories about Jesus according to Taylor's classifications. When these sections, of which four have τί, are seen in connection with the following problem sections with τί, the tendency seems less significant:

2:18b \(\text{kat\ 'erxontai kat\ legousin aut\'i}\)
\(\Delta\ i\ ti\ o\ i\ me\beta\eta\tau\alpha\ 'Iw\alpha\nu\o\nu\)
\(\text{kat\ o\ i\ me\beta\eta\tau\alpha\ t\'n\ f\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\a\iota\nu\ v\eta\sigma\tau\e\d\iota\ou\s\iou\}
\(\text{o\ i\ d\e\ so\ i\ me\β\eta\τ\au\ o\ u\ v\eta\sigma\τ\e\d\io\s\iou\}

\(\text{PA AC P}\)

2:24 \(\text{kat\ o\ i\ f\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\ai\oi\ \e\l\e\γ\o\u\ a\u\t\i}\)
\("I\de\ ti\ p\o\l\o\υ\si\n\ t\o\i\z\ s\a\β\b\a\si\n\' o\ u\k\ \e\xe\st\i\n\)

\(\text{PA AC P}\)

\(^{59}\)That the offering of vinegar to Jesus appears in a formal problem section is a structural indication that Mark considered the act to be hostile. Such an indication, however, does not shed light on the problems of whether the vinegar was posa and whether the person who offered it to Jesus was a Jew. See D. E. Nineham, The Gospel of St Mark (London: Cox and Wyman Ltd, 1963), p. 429 (hereafter cited as Saint Mark).
Two of these problem sections (2:24, 7:5) present complaints of Pharisees about the conduct of Jesus' disciples. All the passages are related in some way to the question of eating and appear in pronouncement stories. Whether these passages support the pronouncement story as a category depends on one's estimate of the distinctiveness of the passages. The use of τι in both this group and the previous one is an indication that a sharp distinction cannot be made between the two types of problem sections. If the indefinite word τινες were used in the second set of sections, there would be little difference between the two groups. In both groups there are negative reactions against the conduct of Jesus' followers and a construction with ἵνα (15:35, 2:24). If the two types of statements are considered to be essentially the same, the correlations with the form-critical categories dissolve. What remains is the undeniable presence of a problem section at a similar location in the various stories, no matter how they are labeled by the form critics.

In a similar brief type of problem section ἔλεγον with τι is a common stylistic feature:

2:16 καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν φαρισαίων ἱδόντες ἵνα ἐσθίετε μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ "Ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει λαβὼν κατήσαι αὐτῶν

3:21-22 ἐξῆλθον κρατήσαι αὐτῶν

---

60 Καὶ is placed before ἱδόντες in Ν Δ Λ 33, where γραμματεῖς τῶν φαρισαίων is variously coupled with καὶ ἐξολοθρεύουν αὐτῷ of 2:15b; but καὶ is omitted before ἱδόντες here with Α C K Θ Π f1 f13. See Taylor, G.M., p. 206. Elsewhere in Mark's Gospel the following of Jesus is an activity that is appropriate for disciples (e.g., 1:18, 2:14, 6:1, 8:34) or interested seekers (e.g., the crowd in 5:24) but not antagonists. Cf. 14:13, where Jesus' command to follow a man is somewhat neutral in character.
The indirect form of the sayings is Markan, as is seen through the absence of ὅτι in the Synoptic parallels and by its presence in the Markan comment in 3:21. Both passages set forth scribal accusations against Jesus and are further examples of problem sections that occur at a conventional location in Mark's narratives. Both sections appear in pronouncement stories according to Taylor's classifications. The significance of this correlation depends on the extent to which this brief type of problem section is judged to be essentially different from the preceding two types.

Another similar brief type of problem section has a construction with ἐλ as a common feature:

3:2 καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτοῦν ἐλ τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύει αὐτοῦν ἵνα κατηγορήσωσίν αὐτοῦν PA AC P

10:2 καὶ [προσελθόντες Φαρισαίοι] ἐπηρώτων αὐτοῦν ἐλ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναικα ἀπολύσαι πειράζοντες αὐτοῦν D AC P

14:29 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ Ἐλ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθοῦνται ἀλλ' οὖν ἐγώ PS L MC

15:44b καὶ προσκαλεσμένος τοῦ κεντυρίωνα ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοῦν ἐλ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν.61 PS L S

The use of ἐλ is not important in itself. What is important is the expression of hostility at this point in the story. Hostility towards Jesus is self-evident in the first two problem sections, is implicit in the anticipated out-

61See also 15:35f., p. 67 above.
come of the third section, and has left its mark in the fourth in the reference to Jesus' death. Formally there is little difference between 10:2 and 15:44b, but they appear in stories that have been labeled differently by form critics on account of differences in content.

There is a conspicuous tendency for problem sections to contain Διδάσκαλε as an address for Jesus. Four of these sections pertain to strangers who make a problematical statement or ask a 'difficult' question:

10:20
ο δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ
Διδάσκαλε
tauta panta ephulaezomen ek nestetos mou

12:14
καὶ ἐλάθνεις
λέγουσιν αὐτῷ
Διδάσκαλε
οὕδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθῆς εἶ
cαι οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός
οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς προσώπον ἀνδρῶν

12:18b-23
καὶ ἐκηρύτων αὐτῶν
λέγοντες

Mwthēs ergafoi hmin
ὅτι ἐὰν τινος ἄδελφος ἄποθανη
καὶ καταλήπῃ γυναίκα
καὶ μὴ ἀφῇ τέκνον
ἐνα λάβῃ ὁ ἄδελφος αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναίκα
καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἄδελφῳ αὐτοῦ

20ἐπὶ ἄδελφοι ἤσαν
καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἔλαβεν γυναίκα
καὶ ἀποθάνεις
οὐχ ἀφίκᾳ σπέρμα

...

23ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει
[ὅταν ἀναστάσειν]
tinon aitow enstai gynai
οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναίκα

PA- AC P
There is little hostility in two of the statements (10:20, 12:32f.). In 10:20 the remark of the rich man evokes Jesus' respect but nevertheless is deficient and precipitates a reply by Jesus in 10:21. The passage, 12:32f., is formally a problem section that describes a rare occasion where the questioner shows a favourable reaction to Jesus' reply to the situation in 12:29-31. The respect shown towards Jesus in 12:14 is ironical, as is apparent in the intention of the Pharisees and Herodians to trap Jesus verbally (12:13). All four passages are found in some kind of apophthegm according to Bultmann's classification.

Other sections with Διδάσκαλε present negative reactions of the disciples, whose fear and unbelief are problematical for Jesus. Included here are problem sections in which the disciples address Jesus as 'Rαββί':

4:38b  καὶ ἔγερσον αὐτὸν
καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ
Διδάσκαλε
οὐ μέλει σοι
ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα

9:5-6  καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος
λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦν
'Rαββί'
καὶ λέγει: οὗτοι ἦμᾶς ἵνα μὴν ἐξηκονισῇς
καὶ τις τρεῖς εἰς μίαν
καὶ ἡμῖν μίαν
καὶ Ἡμῖν μίαν
The negative character of these sections is apparent in the disciples' fear, inability to heal, unbelief, and treachery. Three of the four instances of the

62 If 9:4 is judged to be part of the situation statement and not a reply to the situation (cf. above, p. 62, n. 54), vv. 5f. could then be seen as a reply to the situation. But the comment in 9:6 suggests that Mark probably considered Peter's exclamation in v. 5 to be a problematical statement that is answered by the divine voice from the cloud. The use of ἀποκριθής in v. 5 is not conclusive evidence that the verse is a reply-to-the-situation statement, since problem sections, which often present reactions, sometimes begin with a reply or response (see, for example, the adjacent illustration, 9:17f.).

63 Possibly 14:47 belongs here as well; see below, p. 177. See also 9:38, p. 74 below; and 10:35 (part of an extended narrative), p. 253 below.

64 Peter's surprise in 11:21 is followed by sayings about faith in 11:22-24, and it is likely that Mark viewed Peter's reaction as an expression of unbelief. Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 466, who considers the saying in 11:22 about faith in God to be 'inappropriate in this context'.
use of 'Pctg$t in Mark's Gospel occur in these passages. The fourth instance is 10:51b, where Bartimaeus addresses Jesus with this title. This act occurs in the development of the problem section. See below, pp. 315-6.
passages about forbidding are found in the same position in a Markan construction, story about Jesus, pronouncement story, and miracle story, is important both for understanding narrative structure and for seeing the frequent indistinctiveness of narratives that have different form-critical labels.

In three of the illustrations John's exclusiveness (9:38), Peter's interference (8:32b), and the disciples' barring of the children (10:13) are problematical for Jesus. The disciples are often the subjects of problem sections in the Markan narratives, as can be seen in the following brief groups. Included in some of the groups are similar passages in which persons other than disciples are the subjects. In the first group disciples react with unbelief to apparent absurdities, and other persons manifest unbelief in their inquiries about the power, identity, and authority of Jesus:

5:31 καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ ὦ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ

8:4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ ὦ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ

6:2b-3 καὶ πολλοὶ ἄκουσαντες

11:28 καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ
6:37b καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ Ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν δηναρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους καὶ δώσωμεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν

8:16 καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἅλλους διὰ ἄρτους οὓς ἔχομεν.

Common features are the use of τῶς (5:31, 8:4, 6:2b, 11:28), πάντες (8:4, 6:2b), ταῦτα (6:2b, 11:28), ἐνα (6:2b, 11:28), some form of δίδωμι (6:2b, 11:28), and the question of bread (8:4, 6:37b, 8:16). The presence of several of these features in 6:2b-3 and 11:28 contributes to the similarity of these two sections. There is no correlation between the six sections and the form-critical categories, although three of the passages are from different kinds of miracle stories. More important is the fact that the six sections are additional evidence of a structural tendency to present a negative reaction at a customary location in a narrative.

In several problem sections the disciples ask Jesus a question:

4:10 καὶ διὰ ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας ἡρώτων αὐτῶν οἱ περὶ αὐτῶν σὺν τοῖς ὀδόκεια τὰς παραβολὰς

9:11 καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτῶν λέγοντες ὁτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς διὰ ἦλθαν δεῖ τελεῖν πρῶτον.

Two different kinds of negative reactions by the disciples are given in two other problem sections:

10:41 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δεκα ἤρεσαντο ἀγανακτεῖν περὶ Ἰακὼβου καὶ Ἰωάννου

14:19 ἤρεσαντο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ ἐλευθερίας κατὰ ἐλευθερίας Μὴν ἔγνω.

Three of the four passages are from narratives that are classified by Taylor as Markan constructions, and the fourth (4:10) is closely related to 4:11f., which is generally held to be a Markan addition to the discourse on parables in 4:1-34.
The two correlations with Markan constructions attest to Mark's practice of presenting problem sections in many of his narratives, but verification of the category, 'Markan construction', depends on the extent of additional correlations with this category in other narrative sections and on the presence of correlations in a number of narratives considered Markan constructions.

Two important problem sections tell of a strange sight and an emotional reaction by followers of Jesus:

6:49-50a οι δὲ άδονες αυτόν ἡγετεὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστὶν καὶ ἀνέκραζαν
50πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδον καὶ ἔμαθαν οὐδὲν τὸ ΝΜ

16:5 καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοίς περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκήν καὶ ἔρεμωσαν. Λ Λ S

The stylistic similarity of these sections is striking, especially since they come from narratives that have been classified differently by the form critics. Both sections contain εἶδον and an aorist passive verb denoting anxiety or amazement. Found in corresponding sections in their respective narratives (6:45-52, 16:1-8), these features are at the same time structural tendencies that reveal the formal indistinctiveness of a miracle story and story about Jesus at this location in these two narratives. In view of the fact that 16:5 is Markan in content, the similarity of the passages suggests that Mark was partly responsible for the formation of both narratives.66 Also the resemblance of the sections is of interest concerning the question whether 6:45-52 is a post-Resurrection appearance story that has been placed earlier in the

---

66Taylor, G.M., pp. 602-3, asserts that 16:1-8 is the work of Mark, but favors the view that 6:45-52 is a pre-Markan story that was already connected with the preceding feeding story (pp. 326-7). Taylor nevertheless sees v. 50a as a Markan addition (p. 330). Cf. Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 177, who thinks that Mark was the one who combined the two stories artificially.
been placed earlier in the Gospel.\(^\text{67}\)

Another type of problem section consists of confessions and questions concerning Jesus' identity:

1:23-24 \(^{23}\)καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἀνθρώπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ

καὶ ἀνέκραξεν

\(^{24}\)λέγων

Τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σοί

'Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ

κλέες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς

\(^{67}\)The similarity of 6:49-50a and 16:5 suggests that 6:45-52 might have been influenced by reflection about the Resurrection (see Taylor, G.M., p. 326, who believes also that the story is based on 'actual events'); but the resemblance does not support the view that the narrative is a post-Resurrection appearance story, insofar as 16:1-8 is not an appearance story. According to C. H. Dodd, 'The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels', More New Testament Studies (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968), p. 121, 6:45-52 is either a transplant of an original appearance story or an original Galilean Ministry story that has been formally influenced by post-Resurrection narratives. Dodd seems to favor the latter view, pointing out that the story in Mark and John is 'firmly welded into its context'. In his essay Dodd sets forth 'a standard pattern of resurrection-pericope' (p. 106) that consists of five parts: A. The situation, where Jesus' followers are without their Lord; B. The appearance of the Lord; C. The Greeting; D. The Recognition; and E. The Word of Command (p. 104). But there are difficulties with this hypothesis. (1) Dodd's pattern is not fully present in one of the three 'concise' narratives (Mt. 28:8-10, 28:16-20, Jn. 20:19-21) that are cited to illustrate the pattern (p. 105). In Dodd's scheme for Mt. 28:16-20 the entry 'Jesus approached' for Part B is misleading inasmuch as there is no reference to His appearance at this point in the narrative. (2) If the narrative sections illustrated in this chapter are used as criteria for recognizing narrative structure, the pattern proposed by Dodd is not always commensurate with the narrative sections themselves. For example, with regard to the three narratives mentioned above, Part A in Mt. 28:16-20 (v. 16) is a formal setting statement; but Part A in Mt. 28:8-10 (v. 8), if it is not a formal consequence statement to 28:1-7, is both a setting statement and a situation statement. Part A in Jn. 20:19-21 (v. 19a) is likewise both a setting statement and a situation statement. (3) Furthermore, if the narrative sections are used as criteria for measuring structure, there is little or no structural difference between the appearance stories and many other stories not only in Mark's Gospel but in the other Gospels as well. This fact will be amply discussed in Part II. The fundamental question is not whether Mk. 6:45-52 is like an appearance story formally but whether 6:45-52, 16:1-8, and the appearance stories have been formed according to a common pattern of narration that is comprised of the narrative sections illustrated in this chapter. In this respect there is much validity to Dodd's recognition of 'the broad, basic similarity of the gospel narratives among themselves' (p. 118).
Jesus is associated with Nazareth in 1:24 and also in 14:67, where Peter is questioned about his own identity. In three of the passages unclean spirits confess Jesus to be specially related to God. For Mark Jesus’ spiritual antagonists are some of his best credentials. There are Messianic overtones in 15:2a, 8:29a, and possibly in 1:24 in the reference to Jesus as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.68 It is significant that this group of passages is not simply the juxtaposition of similar statements but rather the presentation of statements that are found in corresponding locations in the respective narratives. This

68 Cf. 15:29f., which is not concerned with the identity of Jesus but portrays an encounter in which one of the participants is addressed in the second person. See also 3:11, p. 226 below.

type of statement appears in an assortment of form-critical narrative classes. Thus another apparent structural tendency in storytelling betrays the formal indistinctiveness of these classes and so perpetuates doubt about their validity.

There is a brief type of problem section in which the activities of seeking and finding are the characteristic features:

1:36-37  
καὶ κατεδώξεν αὐτὸν Ἐλμων
καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ
καὶ εἴρεν αὐτὸν
καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ
ὅτι πάντες ζητοῦσίν σε

3:32
καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν δύχος
καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ
'Ἰδοὺ ἢ μὴν σοῦ
καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ σοῦ
ἐξώ ζητοῦσίν σε

11:13b  
καὶ ἐλήων ἐπ' αὐτήν
οὕδεν εἴρεν
εἰ μὴ φύλα
ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σῶκων

14:37a  
καὶ ἔρχεται
καὶ εὐφράσκει αὐτὸς καθεύδοντας.

There is clearly no correlation between this type of problem section and the form-critical categories.

Not illustrated are several miscellaneous problem sections that refer to some kind of hostile act (6:17, 6:24f., 15:11, 15:24a). It is more important to draw attention to one more type of problem section that, instead of a negative reaction, describes a request for healing through Jesus' touch. Most, but not all, of these sections are found in miracle stories:

---

70The fact that πάντες ζητοῦσίν σε appears in a formal problem section is structural evidence that supports the observation of R. H. Lightfoot, The Gospel Message of St. Mark (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1958), pp. 23-4, n. †, that the verb 'to seek' is used in 'an unfavourable sense'.
Common features are the use of παρακαλεῖν, ένα, and references to Jesus' touch. But more important is the consistent placement of these requests for healing at that point in narratives where a negative reaction or problem is generally related. This structural tendency concerning requests for healing shows that healing stories, while unique topically, are structurally little different from many other narratives in Mark's Gospel. The presence of 6:56a and 7:26 in this type of statement is an indication of this fact.

71See also 10:47f., p. 74 above.
A wealth of material has been presented to demonstrate that a problem section is a recognizable section in the Markan narratives. This section differs from the situation statement and the reply-to-the-situation statement by reporting at a subsequent location a negative reaction, difficult question, problematical action of disciples, hostile act, or request for healing. In the various types of problem sections there is some correlation with form-critical categories but little correlation in most of the types. Some of the correlation that does exist dissolves to the extent that certain groups of narrative sections are considered essentially the same. The fact that certain types of statements frequently cut across various form-critical classes is additional evidence that the categories are not distinctive in terms of narrative structure.

The four narrative sections described so far—setting statement, situation statement, reply-to-the-situation statement, and problem section—fall under the form critics' general term 'introduction'.72 There should now be little doubt that 'introduction' is much too broad a term in view of these structural sections that are discernible in Mark's narratives.

Is there, however, considerable correlation in the next narrative section—the reply to the problem—which is often the longest section and generally contains 'the miracle' of miracle stories or 'the point of the story' of pronouncement stories? The following discussion of this section shows that here as well there is relatively little correlation between type of section and form-critical class.

V. THE REPLY TO THE PROBLEM

Most often the reply to the problem gives Jesus' answer either to the

72Cf. Held, T.I.M., p. 241, where the 'formal introduction' corresponds to the situation statement.
negative reaction or request for help of the problem section. In almost half of these reply sections Jesus issues a command: to heal, to put an end to fear, and to welcome those who have been forbidden to come to Him. There is a noticeable tendency for Jesus to allude to scriptural precedent in His reply to the problem. Like the reply to the situation, a few reply-to-the-problem sections refer to an answer of Jesus without giving the answer. Some of the sections present replies by persons other than Jesus. Several sections tell of nonverbal replies. The sayings of Jesus, however, are predominant in this, the largest of the narrative sections. This characteristic shows that Mark was interested in Jesus' sayings, but only as they were presented in narratives. The narrative was normative for Mark. It was the medium for transmitting the commanding words of Jesus. The primacy of the narrative is a chief literary characteristic of Mark's Gospel.73

What is striking about the reply-to-the-problem sections is their thematic homogeneity. There are many recurrent theological themes that express simple dichotomies between God and man, God and Satan, Scripture and tradition, spirit and flesh, holiness and sin, eternity and this generation, heaven and hell. There is also recurrent interest in the Sonship of Jesus, His Christhood, and the Kingdom of God. Very few Markan comments appear in the reply-to-the-problem sections, and this trait shows Mark's great reluctance to intrude editorially into sayings material. Possibly a clearer understanding of Jesus' theological emphasis may be gained through close study of the content of these reply-to-the-problem sections.

A command of Jesus is the most distinctive feature of the reply-to-the-

---

73Cf. Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 11. Bultmann's remark that it is 'a secondary matter whether one begins with sayings or stories' and his beginning with sayings do not reflect Mark's fundamental interest in narration. It is likely that Mark made no distinction between sayings and stories. All was told in narratives.
problem section. The examples below have been grouped to make similarities more apparent. Two reply sections from exorcism stories have commands with ἐξελθεῖν:

1:25 καὶ ἐπετύμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων
   φιλμάθητι
   καὶ ἐξελθεῖ ἐξ αὐτοῦ

5:8-9a ἐξελευν γὰρ αὐτῷ
   Ἐξελθεῖ τοῦ πνεύμα τοῦ ἀκάθαρτου ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

καὶ ἐπηράτα αὐτόν
   Τῇ δύναι σοι. 74

Two sections from miracle stories have commands with some form of ἀφετεῖν:

6:50b-51a  ό δὲ εὐθύς ἐλάλησεν μετ' αὐτῶν
   καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς
   ἀφετεῖ τί ἐγὼ εἰμί
   μὴ φοβεῖσθε

καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον 75

10:49 καὶ στὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν
   Ψυχήσατε αὐτὸν
   καὶ ψυχοῦσιν τὸν τυφλὸν
   λέγοντες αὐτῷ
   Θάρσει
   ἔγειρε
   ψυκῆσθε σε. 76

Three sections from stories variously labeled by form critics contain some form of ἀφιέναι for the command:

7:27 καὶ ἐλευν ἀὐτῷ
   Ἄφες πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὸ τέκνα
   οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων
   καὶ τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν

74 In 5:8-9a the command is referred to within an explanatory comment. See also 9:25, a reply to the problem development, p. 210 below.

75 Here the reply to the problem consists of both a saying and an action.

76 In this reply-to-the-problem section the command with ἀφετεῖν is spoken by bystanders in response to Jesus' command to summon Bartimaeus. From time to time reply-to-the-problem sections contain responses to commands.
10:14-15  ἐκ τῆς Ἰσσοῦς ἡγανάκτησαν
cat ἐπεν αὐτοῖς
"Ἀφετε τὰ παιδία ἐρχεσθαί πρὸς με
μὴ καλύτετε αὐτά
tῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
15 ἀλήθεια ὑμῖν
ὅσα ἂν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ
ὡς παιδίαν
οὺ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν

14:6-9 ὑ ὑ Ἰσσοῦς ἐπεν
"Ἀφετε αὐτήν
tὸ αὐτὴ κόπους παρέχετε
καλῶν ἐργον ἡργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ
7πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν
καὶ ὅταν θέλητε δόνασθε αὐτοῖς εἰς τοῦτοι
ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε
8ο ἐσχέν
ἐποίησαν
προσέλαβεν μωρᾶς τὸ σῶμά μου
εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμὸν
9ἀλήθεια ὑμῖν
ὅπου ἂν κηρυχῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
eἰς δόνον τὸν κόσμον
καὶ ὃ ἐποίησαν αὐτὴ λαλήθησται
eἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς.

Two sections are similar through the use of φέρετε followed by ἤνεγκαν in a response statement:

9:19-20a ἐκ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς
λέγει
7Ὡ γενεὰ ἀπίστους
ἐξ ὧς τότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι
ἐξ ὧς τότε ἀνέζωμαι υμῶν
φέρετε αὐτὸν πρὸς με
Resp. ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν

12:15-17a ὑ ὑ ἐδείχνας αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν
ἐπεν αὐτοῖς
Τὸ μὲ πειράζετε
φέρετε μοι ἐνναύων
τὸν τὸ
Resp. ἤνεγκαν
A command of Jesus is evident in each of these reply-to-the-problem sections. There is no necessary correlation between type of command and form-critical classification. Some features such as ἔξελθε and θεός ἐστιν appear in miracle stories, but other features such as ἀφίέναι and φέρετε occur in various kinds of stories. What is important is that a command constitutes Jesus' reply to the problem at a uniform location in each narrative, no matter whether the story is labeled a miracle story, pronouncement story, or story about Jesus. The presence of a command at a customary location in any kind of story is further evidence of a manner of narration that cuts across the different form-critical categories.

Also evident in several of these reply-to-the-problem sections is a

77 In 12:15-17a the reply to the problem is extended through dialogue—a feature which appears in a number of reply-to-the-problem sections. Here Resp.' stands for the response that is made to the reply, and 'RepP. cont.' indicates a continuation of the reply.

78 The Markan character of the reply sections given so far is evident in a comparison with Matthew and Luke. Matthew has no parallels to Mark's use of ἔξελθε in 1:25 and 5:8-9a. Luke employs ἔξελθε in Lk. 4:35 but differs from Mark slightly by choosing the infinitive form of the verb in Lk. 8:29. Like Mark, Matthew has φέρετε in Mt. 14:27 in a story where there is frequent similarity between Matthew and Mark; but there are no other parallels to Mark's selection of this verb in the reply sections under discussion. All three Evangelists have ἀφίέναι for the saying of Mk. 10:14, but there is no parallel to Mark's use of the verb in the other two reply sections. Matthew, like Mark, has φέρετε in Mt. 17:17; but Matthew and Luke choose other verbs for their parallels to Mk. 12:15. In each type of the reply-to-the-problem sections given above, the language of the command is Markan. Such a feature at a customary location is not simply a matter of style but is above all an indication of Mark's method of shaping a story.
tendency that appears in other reply sections: polarized thematic interests. Some polarizations are explicit: God in contrast with Caesar (12:15-17a); and 'children' distinguished from 'dogs' (7:27). Other polarizations are implicit: Jesus over against unclean spirits (1:25, 5:8-9a), a faithless generation (9:19-20a), and unbelieving disciples (6:50b-51a). The presence of this tendency in a number of the reply-to-the-problem sections is additional evidence for recognizing the reply to the problem as an identifiable section in Mark's narratives.

The next group of reply-to-the-problem sections contains ὑπαγε or ὑπάγετε as one of several commands. In all but one of the sections (16:6f.) given below, Jesus issues the commands:

2:8-11  ὥς καὶ εὐθές ἐπιγνον ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ
       δι' οὗ τις διαλογίζεται ἐν ἑαυτῷ
       λέγει αὐτοῖς

       Ἡ ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθαι ἐν ταῖς καιροῖς ὑμῶν
       ἔστιν εὐκοπότερον
       εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτίκῳ
       Ἀφενταὶ σου αἱ ἀμαρτίαι
       ἦ ἐιπεῖν
       Ἄγειρε
       καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου
       καὶ περιπάτει

       10 ὥσιν δὲ εἴδητε
       δι' ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
       ἀφεῖναι ἀμαρτίας ἑπτὰ τῆς γῆς
       λέγει τῷ παραλυτίκῳ

       11 σοι λέγω
       Ἄγειρε
       ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου
       καὶ ὑπαγε ἐν τοῖς αἰῶναῖς σου

6:38-41  ὃ ὦ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς
       Πιστεύεις ἃ δεῖται ἐχεῖτε
       ὑπάγετε ὑδετε

Resp.  καὶ γυναῖκες
       λέγουσιν
       Πέντε

---

79 Cf. 8:17-19a where Jesus' reply begins in a similar fashion with Ἡ διαλογίζεσθαι κτλ. Cf. also 5:34.
καὶ ὁδὸ ἰχθύας

RepP. 39καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλέναι πάντας
cont. συμπόσια συμπόσια
ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ

Resp. 40καὶ ἀνέπεσαν προσκιά προσκιά
κατὰ ἑκατὸν
κατὰ πεντήκοντα

RepP. 41καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους
cont. καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας
ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
εὐλόγησεν
καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους
καὶ ἐόδους τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ]
καὶ παρατιθέσθων αὐτοῖς
καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν τάσιν

T NM M

8:33-9:1 33ο ὅ καὶ ἐκπραγμένος καὶ ἠδοὺ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ
ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ
καὶ λέγει

"Ὑπαγε ὅπως μου ζατανά
ἄτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ
ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων"

34καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὀχλον
σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
ἐξεκά τοῖς
Εἷς τὸν θέλει ὅπως μου ἐλθθεῖν
ἀπαρνηθάσθων έαυτοῦ
καὶ ἀράτω τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτιν μοι

35δ' γὰρ ἐὰν θέλη τὴν φυχήν αὐτοῦ σάσαι
ἀπολέξει αὐτὴν

δ' ὅ ἐὰν ἀπολέξει τὴν φυχήν αὐτοῦ
ἐνεκεν [ἐμοί καὶ] τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

35τ' γὰρ ὑφελεῖ ἀνθρωπον
κερδήσαι τὸν κόσμον δλον
καὶ εἰμιῳδῇν τὴν φυχήν αὐτοῦ

37τ' γὰρ δοῖ ἀνθρώπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς φυχῆς αὐτοῦ

38δ' γὰρ ἐὰν ἐπαισκυνηθῇ με
καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους
ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἀμαρτωμῇ

80In this extended section with responses the reply of Jesus consists not only of the direct command with ὑπάγετε in v. 38a but also of the reported command to sit in companies (v. 39), plus the blessing and distribution of the loaves and fishes (v. 41).
καὶ ὁ οἶδας τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαυσχυνθῆται αὐτὸν
ὅταν ἔληθ ἐν τῇ δοξῇ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ
μετὰ τῶν ἁγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων

9:1 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς
'Αμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν
ὅτι εἰσὶν τινες δόε τῶν ἐστηκότων
οὗτοι οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου
ἐὼς ἐν ζωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ
ἐλημυσθὰν ἐν οὐναμεῖ. 81

10:21 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ
ἡγάπησεν αὐτὸν
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ
'Εν σε ύστερεῖ
ὑπαγε
δόσῃ ἔρευς τάλανσον
καὶ ὅς [τοῖς] πτωχοῖς
καὶ ἔξελες ἱσσαρόν ἐν οὐρανῷ
καὶ ἀθρόο ἀκολούθει μοι

16:6-7 ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς
Μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖτε
'Ἰησοῦν ἔπειτε τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐσταυρωμένων
ἥγησθι
οὐκ ἔστιν ζῶε
ἐὰν ὁ τόπος διὸν ἔσηκαν αὐτόν

7 ἄλλα ὑπάγετε
eἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ
ὅτι προάγει ύμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν

ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὅψεσθε
καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν. 82

A command with some form of ὑπάγειν appears in each of these narrative segments as part of a reply to a problem. This recurrent feature at a corresponding point in various narratives is further evidence for considering such a reply to be a recognizable narrative section. Other characteristic features support this judgement. Sometimes the commands are multiple in character, especially in 2:9, 11; 8:34; and 10:21. Polarized thematic interests—

81 Not to be overlooked in this section are other imperatives of Jesus in 8:34.

82 See also 10:52, a reply to a problem development.
phenomena that are apparent in other reply-to-the-problem sections—are manifest in these sections with ὑπάγειν: man over against God (8:33); the world in contrast with one's life (8:36); and a present, adulterous generation that is considered with a view to a future coming of the Son of Man (8:38). Together these features help to establish the reply to the problem as an identifiable moment of narration within the Markan stories. The fact that a similar command with ὑπαγε or ὑπάγετε appears in different kinds of stories indicates that the form-critical narrative categories are not so distinctive at this location in the stories under discussion.

Several reply-to-the-problem sections contain commands of Jesus with some form of ἀκοῦειν along with related commands about seeing or understanding. The first of these sections (4:11-32) is too long to be presented in its entirety, and only the portion that contains the commands (vv. 21-25) is set forth below:

4:21-25 21καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς
(within Ἄκατ ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος
4:11-32) ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθη
ἡ ὑπὸ τὴν κλῖνην
οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθη

22οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν κρυπτὸν
ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ
οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπάρκουσιν
ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν

23εἰ τις ἔχει ὁτα ἀκοῦειν
ἀκούέτω

24καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς
Βλέπετε τὸ ἀκούετε
ἐν ὧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε
μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν
καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν

25δς γὰρ ἔχει
δοθήσεται αὐτῷ
καὶ δς οὐκ ἔχει
καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.  

One should keep in mind that the entire reply-to-the-problem section here con-
sists of vv. 11-32. This larger section is formally a reply-to-the-problem section, containing features that are found in other reply-to-the-problem sections, such as ἀνέρ, and references to the Kingdom of God, heaven(s), and Satan. The presence of these features in various reply sections is an indication of their homogeneity and supports the reply to the problem as a section, while betraying the formal indistinctiveness of the form-critical narrative categories.

The second reply-to-the-problem section that has a command of Jesus to hear is Mk. 7:6-15:

7:6-15 ὅ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
Καλέω ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἰσαὰκ περὶ υμῶν τῶν ὅσκριτῶν
ἀς γέραται
ὅτι ὦτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσιν με τιμῇ
ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πέρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ

8 ἀφίνετε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ
κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων

9 καὶ εἶλεγεν αὐτοῖς
Καλέω ἀδετείτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ
ἐνα τὴν παράδοσιν υμῶν στήσατε

10 Ἡμών ὁ γὰρ εἶπεν
Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου
καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου

καὶ ὁ κακολογών πατέρα ἢ μητέρα
θανάτῳ τελευτᾷ

11 ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε

---


84Mk. 4:29, 31f. See 8:33-9:1 (8:38), 11:22-25 (v. 25), 12:24-27 (v. 25), and 14:6-9 (v. 7).


87Mk. 4:15. See 3:23-30 (vv. 23, 26) and 8:33-9:1 (8:33).
There are other commands in this reply section: σώνετε in conjunction with ἀκοῦσατε (v. 14); and the imperatives in the quotations of Moses (v. 10), which, as commands, rather naturally appear in a reply-to-the-problem section. Jesus' allusion to scriptural tradition both in vv. 6f. and v. 10 is another feature of certain reply-to-the-problem sections.89

The third reply-to-the-problem section with a command to hear is found in the Transfiguration story:

9:7 καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς
καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφελῆς
Οὕτως ἐστίν ὁ υἱὸς μου
ὁ ἀγαπητὸς
ἀκοῦστε αὐτοῦ.

---

88If v. 16 is read here following Taylor, G.M., p. 344, then a second command to hear (ἀκουέτω) is present in this reply section. In v. 17 the problem is developed in the disciples' private questioning about the parable, and vv. 18-23 constitute a reply to the problem development. Thematically the content of this reply is homogeneous with some reply-to-the-problem sections through interest in man and the human heart. See, for example, 2:8-11, 3:4-5a, 10:3-9, and 11:22-25. Cf. 8:17-19a, a reply section where there is no command to hear but similar interest in hearing, seeing, and understanding.

89See below, pp. 97-100.
In this section the command is about Jesus in connection with His Sonship. The question of His Messianic status and Sonship—especially His role as the Son of Man—is of interest in a number of reply-to-the-problem sections.\textsuperscript{90} Evident in this section is a style of narration that places commands at a customary location in a story, regardless of what that story is about. The fact that a command to hear is present in the three examples above draws attention to this narrative convention and at the same time blurs the distinctiveness of those form-critical labels that are given to the respective narratives.

The tendency to tell of a command in the reply-to-the-problem section is apparent in the following narrative segments, where commands are present but do not resemble one another:

1:38 \textit{kai légei autōs}
\begin{quote}
"Agwmen allagou eis tâs exoménavas koumôleis

- EF S
\end{quote}

1:41 \textit{kai splanchnisaseis}
\begin{quote}
EKTEINAS THN XEIRA AUTOU

- T HM M
\end{quote}

3:4-5a \textit{kai légei autōs}
\begin{quote}
"Eexestin tois saúbasin

- PA AC P
\end{quote}

4:39a κατ' ὀικερότερες ἐπετέλεισεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ
καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσσῃ
Συμπαθεῖ,
περιμνυσθεῖ.

7:33-34 καὶ ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου καὶ τ' ἵλλαν ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὅτα αὐτοῦ
καὶ πτούσας ἡγατον τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν ἔστεναεν καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Εφφαθα ὁ ἐστίν Διανοοίχητι.

9:39-50 Ἡ Ἰσσοῦς εἶπεν
Μη κωλύσε τοῖς αὐτοῖς
οὐδετερός γὰρ ἔστιν ὑπὸ ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄντῳ μου καὶ δυσμάτει ταχὺ ἐκαλολογηθῆσαι με

40 'ὅτι γὰρ ὑμῖν ἔστιν καὶ ἱμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔστιν

41 'ὅτι ἤν ποτός ὑμᾶς ποτήριον δότας ἕν ὄντῳ ἢτι ἡμᾶς ἐστε ἄμην λέγω ὑμῖν σαρκικώς· ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ

42 καὶ ἤν σκανδάλιζεν ἐνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστεύοντων [εἰς ἐμὲ]
καὶ ἀπετίθη αὐτῷ μᾶλλον εἰ περίκειται μύλος ὄνυχας περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

43 καὶ ἔδω σκανδάλιζεν σε ἡ χεῖρ σου ἀπόκοφον αὐτὴν καὶ ἔδω σε κυλλόν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γην ἥ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχουσα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γένναν εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἀδιέσβετον

45 καὶ ἔδω ὁ τοῦς σου σκανδάλιζει σε ἀπόκοφον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔδω σε εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γην χωλόν ἥ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχουσα βληθηναι εἰς τὴν γένναν

47 καὶ ἔδω ὁ ὀρθαλμὸς σου σκανδάλιζει σε ἑκβάλει αὐτοῦ καὶ σε ἐστίν μονοθελόμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ δύο ὀρθαλμῶν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γένναν ἄφησεν ὁ σκάλης αὐτῶν ὁ τελευταῖος καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.
49πᾶς γὰρ τωρὶ ἄλισθῆσεται

50καὶ λέγει ἐκείνης Ἰησοῦς

11:22-25 22καὶ ἀποκρίθεις ὁ Ἰησοῦς

11:29-30 29οὶ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς

14:37b-38 καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ

38γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε ξαναμηνοῦν τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρὸς καὶ ὀδρὶ ἀσθενῆς
In these reply-to-the-problem sections are commands to go elsewhere (1:38); to be cleansed (1:41); to extend one's hand (3:5a); to stop the wind and quiet the sea (4:39a); to open ears (7:34); to stop restricting a stranger's activity of exorcism (9:39); to remove a problematical hand (9:43), foot (9:45), or eye (9:50); to believe that prayer will be answered (11:24); to forgive (11:25); to answer Jesus (11:30); to watch and pray (14:38); and to come down from the cross (15:32a). Except for the last command, all are different commands of Jesus that are presented in their respective narratives at a corresponding location: in a reply to the problem. Clearly evident here is a distinct tendency of narration; and the fact that this tendency appears just as well in stories about Jesus, miracle stories, apophthegms, and sayings complexes illustrates further the formal indistinctiveness of the narrative categories of form criticism.  

---

91 Cf. 11:14a, a reply-to-the-problem section where the cursing of the fig tree is expressed in the optative mood. The first example, 1:38, has only the air of a command. Cf. the reply section, 8:5-7, where a command of Jesus is referred to, but not given, in v. 6a. Cf. also 6:39, p. 88 above.

92 The presence of a command in the reply-to-the-problem sections of various kinds of stories is useful for evaluating Dodd's theory of a 'common pattern' of 'concise' Resurrection stories, where each story ends with a 'Word of Command'. See Dodd, 'The Appearances of the Risen Christ', p. 104. The presentation of a command at a customary location in many kinds of narratives raises some doubt about regarding a command as a distinctive feature of certain Resurrection stories. The fundamental question is whether these Resurrection stories have a distinctive pattern of their own, and the widespread presence of a command at a similar location in other kinds of stories is an indication that the Resurrection stories in question are structurally not so unique as Dodd maintains.
Some of the reply sections with miscellaneous commands of Jesus have polarized thematic interests, a feature that has appeared from time to time in other reply-to-the-problem sections. Life and the Kingdom of God are placed in antithesis to Gehenna (9:43, 45, 47); heaven is seen in contrast with men (11:30); and spirit is distinguished from flesh (14:37b-38). These dichotomies may be mostly a reflection of antithetic parallelism in Jesus' teaching but also aid in the identification of reply-to-the-problem sections, inasmuch as thematic polarization tends to be present at this location in the narratives.

Thus far a command—especially of Jesus—has been the distinctive feature of the reply-to-the-problem section. In the following sections an appeal by Jesus to scriptural tradition is the characteristic feature:

9:12-13

12 δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς Ἡλλας μὲν ἔλεσθιν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα
καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου Ἰνα πολλὰ πάρῃ καὶ ἐξουδενθῆ

13 ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν
ὅτι καὶ Ἰησοῦς ἔληλυθεν
καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ δόσα ἥξελον
καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτοῦ

10:3-9 ἐγέρατο αὐτών
Τὸ υἱὸν ἑνετεύλατο Μωυσῆς

Resp. ὅτι ἐγέρατο
Ἐπέτρεψεν Μωυσῆς βιβλίον ἀποστασίου γράφαι
καὶ ἀπολύσαι

Resp. ὅτι ἐγέρατο
Ὑπεκμένες εἰς τὸν θεὸν
πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν
ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἑντολὴν ταύτην

12:24-27 ὅτι ἑκατέρον ἐπὶ ἑκατέρον
ὅτι δὲ τὰ τούτου πλανάθηκεν
μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς
μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ

14:20-21 ἐγέρατο αὐτῶν
Εἴς ἑκατέρον τὸν δώδεκα
ὁ ἐμπατήμιος μετ' ἐμοὶ εἰς τὸ τρύμβων

21 ὅτι ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει
καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ
There are several recurrent features in some of these reply sections: the use of ὡς (2:26, 9:12, and 12:26) and ἀνέγνωτε (2:25 and 12:26). Apparent also are various dichotomies—a characteristic that has been observed in other reply-to-the-problem sections. The dichotomies here express a radical distinction between the divine and the human: the Sabbath as a divine institution is contrasted with man (2:27); the commandment of God is set against the traditions of men (7:8f.); God Himself is distinguished from man (10:9); and the Son of Man will both suffer presumably at the hands of men (9:12) and be betrayed by a man (14:20f.). It is significant that these kindred reply sections are found in narratives that have been given different form-critical labels. The sections tend to appear in pronouncement stories, but some occur in Markan constructions and a story about Jesus. There is no exclusive correlation between these sections and any one form-critical category. Here as well narrative sections with similar features make it possible to see that certain 'forms' of form criticism are not distinctive at a particular

---

94In addition see 7:6-15, pp. 91-2 above. Reference to scriptural tradition is made also in 12:1-11 (v. 11), which is a continuation of a reply to the problem.

95See also 3:23 in the reply-to-the-problem section, 3:23-30; in addition, see 4:13, 30, in 4:11-32.

96See also 12:11 in 12:1-11.
location in some narratives.

There are a number of sections that contain neither commands nor allusions to Scripture but nevertheless tell of some reply to a problem. Many of these sections present sayings of Jesus:

2:17 καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς [ὁτι]
Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἱσχύοντες ἵπτρού
ἀλλ’ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες
οὐκ ἔλθον καλέσαι δίκαιος
ἀλλὰ ἀμαρτωλοὺς

2:19-22 19καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
Μὴ δύνανται οἱ νῦν τὸν νυμφῶνος
ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ’ αὐτῶν ἔστιν
υποτείνειν
δὸςον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τῶν νυμφιῶν μετ’ αὐτῶν
οὐ δύνανται νποτείνειν
20ἐξελέφασον τῷ ἡμέρᾳ
διὰ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος
καὶ τότε ὑποτείνουσιν ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

21οὐδεὶς ἐπίθλημα ὅλους ἁγίασθαι
ἐπὶ ἑαυτὸν παλαιόν
εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀρέστη τῷ πλήρωμα ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ
tὸ καίναν τοῦ παλαιοῦ
καὶ χείδον σχίσμα γίνεται
22καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁςκόδας παλαιοὺς
eἰ δὲ μὴ βάλει ὁ οἶνος τοὺς ἁςκόδας
καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἀναλυται
καὶ οἱ ἁςκοὶ
ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁςκόδας καὶ νόμος

3:33-35 33καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς
λέγει
Τίς ἔστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου
καὶ οἱ ἁδελφοί [μου]

34καὶ περιβεβλημένος τοὺς περὶ αὐτῶν κύκλῳ καθημένους
λέγει
"Ιδε ἡ μήτηρ μου
καὶ οἱ ἁδελφοί μου
35δ’ [γάρ] ἄν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ
οὗτος ἀδελφός μου
καὶ ἁδερφὴ
cαὶ μήτηρ ἔστίν

6:4 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἅτιμος
εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ
Some of the sections, however, contain sayings of persons other than Jesus:

14:68a  ος δ' ἤρνησατο
        λέγων
        οὕτε οἶδα
        οὕτε ἐπίσταται
        σὺ τὶ λέγεις

15:12  ος δ' Πιλάτος πάλιν ἀποκρίθη τὸν Βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

A few of the sections merely refer to a reply without giving the reply itself:

3:12  καὶ πώλλα ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς
        ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν φανερὸν ποιήσωσιν

11:6a  οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς

97 It should be noted that 10:36 is part of an extended narrative. See below, pp. 253-5.
Finally, in several sections the reply is an action instead of a saying:

1:31a κατ' προσελεύων
ηγειρέων αὐτήν
κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς

5:24a κατ' ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αὐτοῦ

5:32 κατ' ἑρεθσέπτε οὐδείν τῆν τούτο ποιήσαςαν.

All these sections without commands or allusions to Scripture illustrate further the presence of a reply to a problem at a customary location in a story.

These sections are somewhat varied, and only one recurrent feature stands out: the use of some form of πολεμοῦ in 3:35, 10:36, 15:12, 3:12, and 5:32. Characteristically, some of these sections contain dichotomies in Jesus' sayings. The strong are contrasted with the sick, and the righteous with sinners (2:17).

The new is distinguished from the old (2:21f.). All these sections are found in stories with different form-critical labels. Apparent here is additional evidence of a narrative tendency that cuts across the form-critical classifications and diminishes their distinctiveness at this point in the stories.

This lengthy survey of the reply-to-the-problem sections has shown that at

98The period is misleading here, since the sentence ends with ἔξεχνεσεν, which follows μεγάλην. Verse 37a is a brief reply to the problem, where Jesus' cry is presented after the problem section in 15:35f., in which the vinegar-filled sponge is withheld from Jesus in mocking expectation of Elijah. The reference to Jesus' cry appears at that location in this narrative where in other narratives Jesus gives His replies to various problems. His cry prior to death stands structurally in interesting contrast to the life-giving commands of His ministry. The greatness of His cry, however, echoes the authoritative character of many of His replies to problems. In connection with the group of reply sections illustrated above, cf. 14:61a, a formal reply-to-the-problem section where Jesus' reply is 'no reply'—just silence:

99It should be noted that 5:24a is found in an extended narrative (5:21-24a +35-43) where there are verbal replies to problem developments. See below, pp. 307-11.
this location in Mark's narratives there is little significant correlation between similar sections and narrative categories of form criticism. While some features, such as dichotomies, help to substantiate the reply to the problem as an identifiable kind of narrative section, other features, especially commands of Jesus, appear just as well in different kinds of narratives and make evident the formal indistinctiveness of the form-critical categories.

In view of the survey it is rather apparent that Mark customarily told of a reply to a problem at a particular location in his stories regardless of what that story was about. Recognition of this tendency in narration is useful not only for demonstrating the structural indistinctiveness of the form-critical narrative classes but also for understanding the overall structure of Mark's stories. To pursue further both aspects of this investigation, it is necessary to examine the next moment of narration in certain stories: the result.\textsuperscript{100}

\section*{VI. THE RESULT STATEMENT}

In their analyses of miracle stories the form critics thought of the third and last part of miracle stories as the conclusion, which was described in various ways. Dibelius saw that it contained some proof of the miracle and its effect on others.\textsuperscript{101} Bultmann in greater detail listed as features of the conclusion the accomplishment of the miracle, the demonstration of the cure, the

\textsuperscript{100}In some of Mark's narratives both the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections are developed often through dialogue. This phenomenon is treated below, pp. 138-9, as an extension of the pattern of narration in Mark's stories. Generally, the developed problem and reply-to-the-problem sections manifest many features noted in regular problem and reply-to-the-problem sections. Problematical remarks and actions are evident in the developed problem sections, and commands and dichotomies characteristically appear in developed reply-to-the-problem sections. Accordingly, it is fitting to regard these sections as section developments, rather than new kinds of sections that require illustration at this point.

\textsuperscript{101}Dibelius, \textit{F.T.G.}, pp. 80-1.
disturbance wrought by the departing demon, and the impression or effect on the crowd.\textsuperscript{102} Taylor discussed these features as part of the 'description of the result',\textsuperscript{103} using the term 'result' for the whole third part of the miracle story. McGinley, in his criticism of form criticism and examination of healing narratives, mentioned as various features a result portraying the success of healing or the departure of a devil, a prescribed action of Jesus, a reaction of the crowd, a patient's obligations, and consequences for the healer.\textsuperscript{104} By pointing to these features that are frequently found in miracle story endings, these writers attempted to show that miracle stories have distinct form.

But are miracle stories really so distinctive in their endings? In answer to this question it is helpful to see a distinction between result statements and consequence statements. The result statement presents the direct result of the command or saying in the reply-to-the-problem section. Consisting sometimes only of καί and a verb, the result statement is generally the shortest narrative section.\textsuperscript{105} It is also the least frequent section, occurring in just twenty-three

\textsuperscript{102}Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, pp. 224-6. Cf. his \textit{Form Criticism}, p. 39, where Bultmann speaks of the exclamations of wonder and the demonstration of the fact as two characteristics of the third section of miracle stories. It is indicative of Bultmann's lack of interest in the order of these characteristics that he discusses them here in the reverse order in which they normally appear in the Markan narratives.

\textsuperscript{103}Taylor, \textit{F.G.T.}, p. 127.

\textsuperscript{104}McGinley, \textit{Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives}, p. 149.

\textsuperscript{105}The brevity of the result statements in miracle stories suggests that these stories were not told for the miracle itself but for other interests such as the authoritative commands in the lengthy reply-to-the-problem sections or the confessional reactions in the concluding consequence statements. Cf. Dibelius, \textit{F.T.G.}, p. 80, where it is held that the miracle is 'an end in itself which stands in the centre of the picture and dominates everything'. Mark's relative lack of interest in the miracle itself is evident not only in the conspicuous brevity of the result statements but also in the scarcity of Markan comments in these statements. There is just one instance where Mark, if not the tradition before him, supplied parenthetical information about the miracle: in the comment that Jairus' daughter was twelve years old (5:42a).
narratives. The result statement occurs mostly in miracle stories, but not exclusively. In contrast the consequence statement is distinguishable by the fact that it tells of the actions and reactions that issue from or follow the reply to the problem or sometimes its immediate result, when one is narrated.\textsuperscript{106}

This distinction between result and consequence statements makes it possible to see the indistinctiveness of miracle story endings, for features mentioned as characteristic of miracle story conclusions are found especially in consequence statements of various kinds of narratives.\textsuperscript{107} Both the indistinctiveness of miracle story endings and the distinction between result and consequence statements become apparent when these two kinds of statements are illustrated.

Approximately one third of the result statements have an aorist indicative passive verb as a characteristic feature:

\begin{verbatim}
1:42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ Ἡ λέπρα καὶ ἐκαθαρισθη  
  T  HM  M
2:12 καὶ ἡγέρθη  
  HM  PA  AC  P
3:5b καὶ ἔξετελεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἤ χέιρ αὐτοῦ  
  PA  AC  P
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{106}In certain brief narratives, where there are no problem and reply-to-the-problem sections, the consequence statements follow the reply-to-the-situation statements. This variation of narrative structure is discussed at length below, pp. 378-99.

\textsuperscript{107}It is interesting that the form critics did not give serious attention to the features of conclusions to stories about Jesus, especially since some of these features, such as reactions of amazement, were seen in the conclusions of miracle stories. See, for example, the absence of any discussion of the endings of stories about Jesus by Taylor in \textit{F.G.T.}, pp. 142-167. Generally it was assumed that stories about Jesus had 'no common structural form' (p. 142), and such an assumption presumably discouraged comparative examination of the conclusions of stories about Jesus. When a study is made of the endings of all the stories in Mark's Gospel, it becomes apparent that miracle stories are not unique in their conclusions. Both stories about miracles and stories about other kinds of episodes have been written according to a style of narration that renders many endings similar and so cuts across the narrative categories of form criticism.
All of these statements refer to a miracle even though several statements (2:12a, 3:5b) occur in stories that are considered to be pronouncement stories.¹⁰⁸ With one exception the statement tells briefly of the immediate result of Jesus' reply to the problem.¹⁰⁹

Some of the result statements may be grouped in pairs to illustrate similarities:

1:26 καὶ σταράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον καὶ φωνῆσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν εἰς αὐτὸν

5:13b καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους¹¹⁰

1:31b καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός

11:6b καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτοὺς

4:39b καὶ ἐκδότασεν ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη

6:51b καὶ ἐκδότασεν ὁ ἄνεμος


¹⁰⁹The result statement in 5:29 irregularly appears after the situation statement. See further below, pp. 206-7.

¹¹⁰Cf. 9:26a, a result statement that is followed by a problem development in 9:26b and a subsequent reply to the problem development in 9:27a.
All but one of these statements (11:6b) refer to a miraculous result in a miracle story. The statement that the bystanders granted the disciples permission to take the colt after they had mentioned the words of Jesus occurs in a story about Jesus and illustrates the fact that result statements do not appear only in miracle stories.\(^{111}\)

The remaining result statements are not found in miracle stories.\(^{112}\)

111Some critics see a miraculous element in Jesus’ instructions to the disciples, where there is prevision of what is to happen. See, for example, Dibelius, F.T.C., p. 121. When 11:6b is seen in comparison with 1:31b and the other result statements, the question arises whether the result in 11:6b was considered by Mark to be somewhat miraculous in character—the remarkable outcome of the reiteration of Jesus’ authoritative words. If Mark did understand the event in this way, the question of miracle here is more than that of prevision.

112Parentheses are put around Taylor’s classification of 6:17-29 merely to indicate that it is a story about Herod rather than a story about Jesus.
Herod. The reference to Jesus' inability to perform a mighty work is a formal result statement which indicates that 'no result' took place with the exception of a few healings. The last expiration of Jesus appears at that position where in certain other narratives a result statement is given. Here Jesus' expiration follows immediately His last reply to the problem—His loud cry in 15:37a. The result of Jesus' last reply—His last expiration and death—stands in poignant, structural contrast with the other result statements. The narrative section that was used time and again to tell of the effectiveness of Jesus' commands is now used to signify the moment of His death. There is some question about the last result statement in 15:45b, for it is preceded not by a distinct reply to the problem but rather by a statement that implies such a reply. The knowledge that Pilate gains from the centurion is indicative of a reply that normally precedes a result statement. That 15:45b is a result statement can be asserted only with some uncertainty.

Whether 15:45b is a result statement or not, the other examples of result statements are rather apparent, especially those that tell of a miracle as the immediate result of a reply. The prevalence of these result statements in miracle stories may lead some to think that these statements actually help to establish the miracle story as a distinct kind of story, but the fact that several of the statements occur in stories other than miracle stories indicates that they are not unique at this structural location. That several other kinds of stories have result statements is another indication that Mark had a particular way of telling a story no matter what that story was about.

The structural indistinctiveness of the endings of miracle stories is considerably more apparent in an examination of the consequence statements that appear at the end of many of Mark's narratives. It is useful to illustrate now these consequence statements.
VII. THE CONSEQUENCE STATEMENT

The consequence statement is the last narrative section in many of Mark's stories. As indicated earlier in a distinction between result and consequence statements, the consequence statement tells of the actions and reactions that issue from or follow the reply-to-the-problem section—in certain brief narratives the reply-to-the-situation statement—or the result, when one is presented. Consequence statements are generally much longer than result statements, and often several consequence statements appear at the end of a narrative. Editorial comments contribute to the length of some of the consequence statements, which suggests that Mark felt freer to intrude editorially into this last section of his stories. This judgement is supported by a comparatively greater amount of distinctively Markan material in the consequence statements.

Many of the consequence statements are similar, and a number of recognizable tendencies provide criteria for evaluating the distinctiveness of form-critical narrative categories. Once again, types of statements are found in various kinds of narratives; and this fact indicates that narrative 'forms' of form criticism are not so distinctive in this last narrative section.  

A clear tendency is the presentation of a confessional statement in the consequence section of the narrative:

1:27-28 27καὶ ἔθαμβησαν ἄγαντες ἢστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας τί ἐστιν τούτο διδαχὴ καὶ ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ ὑπακούοις ἀντὶ

113 There may be some objection to the use of editorial consequence statements as criteria for evaluating form-critical narrative categories, but it must be kept in mind that the form critics appealed to such narrative conclusions in an attempt to delineate a three-part structure of miracle stories.
28 καὶ ἔξηλθεν ἡ ἄκοι ᾧτου εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ
ἐις ὅλην τὴν περὶκχον τῆς Γαλιλαίας

PA- HM M

2:12b καὶ εὐθὺς ἀρας τὸν κράβαττον
ἔξηλθεν ἐμπροσθεν πάντων
ὡς τε ἐξιστασθαι πάντας
καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν Θεὸν
λέγοντας
ὅτι Οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἴδομεν

HM

PA AC P

4:41 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβου μέγαν
καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους
Τῆς ἁρα αὐτός ἔστιν
ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος
καὶ ἡ θάλασσα
ύπακουεί αὐτῷ

T

NM M

5:13c-20 καὶ ἦρμησαν ἡ ἄγελη κατὰ τοῦ κρήσμου εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν
ὡς διοχέλιον
καὶ ἐπηύγοντο ποιῇ θαλάσσῃ

14 καὶ οἱ βοσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἔφυγον
καὶ ἀπῆγγελλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν
καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄγρους
καὶ ἠλθον λειτεὶν τῇ ἐστίν τὸ γεγονός

15 καὶ ἔχονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν
καὶ θεωροῦν τὸν δαίμονιζόμενον
καθηκόντων ἰματισμένοιν
καὶ σωφρονοῦντα
τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγώνη
καὶ ἐφοβηθήσαν

16 καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ ἱέδυστες
πῶς ἐσώρυτο τῷ δαίμονιζομένῳ
καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων

17 καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτόν
ἀπελθεῖν ἄπο τῶν ὀρὼν αὐτῶν

18 καὶ ἐμβασάνοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον
παρεκάλει αὐτόν ὁ δαίμονιζόμενος

ἔνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ἦ

19 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν
ἀλλὰ λέγει αὐτῷ

"Ἁγιασθε σὺς τὸν ἐξήκον σου πρὸς τοὺς σους
καὶ ἀπάγγελλον αὐτοῖς ὅσα ὁ κύριός σου ἐποίησεν
καὶ ἠλέπον σὲ

20 καὶ ἔγραμεν
καὶ ἤρξαντο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπλέοισιν
ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
καὶ κάνετε ἑθαύματον

T

HM M
A number of recurrent features are apparent in these confessional consequence statements: references to Jesus' authority (1:27, 4:41), deeds (5:13c-20, 7:36f.), and association with Deity (2:12b, 11:7-10, 15:38-41); and reactions of amazement and fear (1:27, 2:12b, 4:41, 5:13c-20, 7:36f.). A majority of these state-
ments are found in miracle stories; but the correlation is not clear, since one
narrative is considered a pronouncement story and two others are labeled stories
about Jesus. The tendency to present a confessional consequence statement is
evident in various kinds of stories and further reveals the structural indistin-
ctiveness of form-critical categories.114

An expression of amazement or fear is the feature of some statements:

6:6a καὶ ἐθαύμαζεν διὰ τὴν ἀπίστιαν αὐτῶν  PA- AB S
6:51c-52 καὶ λέγων [ἐκ περισσοῦ] ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἔξεσταντο
52οὐ γὰρ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις ἀλλὰ ἤν αὐτῶν ἢ καρόλα πεπωρμένη T NM M
12:17b καὶ ἐξεθαύμαζον ἐπὶ αὐτῷ PA AC P
15:5b ὄστε θαυμάζειν τὸν Πιλάτουν PS L S
9:32 οἱ δὲ ἡγοῦντο τὸ ῥῆμα καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτῶν ἐπερωτήσαι 115 EP EF MC
12:34b καὶ οúdeες οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτῶν ἐπερωτήσαι EX EP AS P
16:8 καὶ ἐξελθόσαη
ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου
εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις
καὶ οὔδενι οὐδὲν εἶπαν
ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ. 116 L L L S

The narrative tendency to tell of amazement and fear as a consequence is present
in stories about Jesus, pronouncement stories, a miracle story, and a Markan
construction. Expressions of amazement, which Bultmann considered a character¬
istic of the third part of miracle stories,117 appear just as well in other

114It should be noted that there is no confessional statement as such in
5:13c-20; v. 20 merely refers to subsequent confessional preaching by the healed
demoniac.

115Cf. 14:72, a consequence statement that also contains τὸ ῥῆμα.

116See also 4:41, 5:13c-20, 11:18f., and 12:12, which present in addition

kinds of stories. Evident here is a manner of narration that cuts across the main narrative categories, which in themselves do not adequately account for the tendencies of narration that are apparent in Mark's stories.

Another group of consequence statements have injunctions to silence and secrecy as the common feature:

1:34b καὶ οὐκ ἦσεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια ὅτι ἦσθε αὐτῶν

1:43-45 ⁴³καὶ ἐμβοηθοῦσαν διήγοντο εὐθὺς ἔξεβαλεν αὐτοῦν

⁴⁴καὶ λέγει αὐτῷν

"Ὅρα μηδένι μηδένι εἴπης

ἂλλα ὅπαγε σεαυτὸν δέξον τῷ Ιησοῦν καὶ προσένεγκε τοῦ καθαρίσου σου

ἀνάστησαι Μωϋσῆς

εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς"

⁴⁵δὲ ἔστησαν καὶ ἔστησαν τὸν ἀνθρώπον μεγάλη

5:42b-43 καὶ ἔστησαν εὐθὺς ἐκστάσει μεγάλη

⁴³καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἵνα μηδένις γνοὺς τούτο

καὶ εἶπεν δοθήναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν

8:26 καὶ ἔπεσεν αὐτῶν εἰς οἶκον αὐτοῦν λέγων

Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς

8:30 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδένι λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦν. ¹¹⁸

In some respects the statements are different. One command (1:34b) is presumably an attempt to prevent human beings from learning of Jesus' special relation to God. In two statements (1:43-45, 7:36f.) the commands are disobeyed, and the disobedience becomes an occasion for much publicity about the effectiveness of

¹¹⁸See also 7:36f., p. 111 above. Cf. 3:12, p. 101 above.
Jesus' healing. The remaining consequence statements (5:42b, 8:26, 8:30) merely tell of Jesus' strong desire for secrecy. In spite of these differences the statements are similar by virtue of the command for secrecy in each statement. The fact that this type of consequence statement appears at the end of an editorial formulation, several miracle stories, and a story about Jesus, shows further the structural indistinctiveness of these form-critical categories. Apparent here is a manner of narration that prevails without regard for any particular kind of story as conceived by the form critics. These consequence statements resemble others through features seen elsewhere: the proclamation of Jesus' deeds (1:43-45, 7:36f.; cf. 1:39, 5:14-20, 6:12f.); fame (1:43-45, cf. 1:27); and ecstasy (5:42b; cf. 2:12b, 6:51c-52, 16:8). This additional fact helps to establish the consequence statement as a recognizable concluding section in many of Mark's narratives.

Plotting against Jesus is a feature in other consequence statements:

3:6 καὶ ἔξελθόντες οἱ Ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Γραμματεῖς μετὰ τῶν Ἰησοῦν συμβούλιον ἔδωκαν κατ' αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῖς ἀπελέξωσιν

11:18-19 18καὶ ἡμοῦσαν οἱ Ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Γραμματεῖς καὶ ἔξησαν πάς αὐτῶν ἀπελέξωσιν ἐφοβόντο γὰρ αὐτόν πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος ἔξεπλησσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διάδαξῃ αὐτοῦ

19καὶ ἦσαν ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐξεπορεύοντο ἐξω τῆς πόλεως

12:12 καὶ ἔξησαν αὐτὸν κρατήσας καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον ἐγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ἐξευθείαν καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον

14:11b καὶ ἔτηει πᾶς αὐτῶν ἐυκαλύψως παραδόσας.119

The use of some form of ἀπολλύσαι (3:6, 11:18f.), ἔπεισαν (11:18f., 12:12, 14:11b),

119Cf. the consequence statement in 14:31a, where Peter with illusions pledges loyalty to Jesus.
and φοβεῖται (11:18f., 12:12) are characteristics of this type of consequence statement. There is a tendency for this type to appear in apophthegms according to Bultmann’s classification, but the trend is less noticeable in Taylor’s. The presence of this type of statement in a story judged to be a legend or Markan construction weakens any correlation between this type and apophthegms. Evident again is a narrative tendency that is found in different form-critical categories. Once again attention is drawn to a style of narration that transcends these categories.¹²⁰

There are some consequence statements that have in common some form of ἀκοῦειν:

11:14b καὶ ἡκούον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
12:37b καὶ [ὁ] πολὺς ὄχλος ἡκούειν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως
14:63-65 ὃς ὁ θεῖος ἐκεῖνος ἠκούειν μαρτύρων
       λέγει ὅτι ἔτειν χρείαν ἔχουσιν μαρτύρων
       ἡκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας
       τι ὑπὲρ φαντασιά
       οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἐνοχον ἐναὶ θανάτου

⁶³καὶ ἠρξάντο τινες ἐμπτυεῖν αὐτῶ
       καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτὸν τὸ πρόσωπον
       καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτῶν
       καὶ λέγειν αὐτῶ
       Ἴπροφήτευσον

καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ραπίσμασιν αὐτῶν ἐλαβον.¹²¹

Two of the statements (11:18f., 14:63-65) are negative in tone in depicting hostile reactions to Jesus. The other two statements (11:14b, 12:37b) are somewhat positive in tone, and their evident similarity shows that here a

¹²⁰Not illustrated are a few consequence statements (15:20f., 15:24, and 15:32b) that tell of hostilities connected with the Crucifixion. The stories in which these statements are found have been labeled stories about Jesus mainly on account of their inclusion in the Passion Narrative.

¹²¹See also 11:18f., p. 114 above; 6:20; and 6:29. Cf. 6:28f., pp. 220-1 below.
miracle story and a pronouncement story are structurally not unique in ending essentially the same way.

A similar type of consequence statement indicates that certain persons were eyewitnesses to events connected with Jesus:

9:8 καὶ ἔξειπνα περιβλεψάμενοι
ουκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον
ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ᾽ εἷμαι

15:46-47 46 καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδόνα
καθελὼν αὐτὸν
ἐνείλησεν τῇ σινδόνι
καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ
ὅ ὦ λελατομμένον ἐκ πέτρας
καὶ προσεκύλισεν λέβον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν του μνημείου

47 ἥ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή
cαὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωάννης
ἐθεάσθην ποιεῖν τεθείται.122

A recurrent feature is the use of some form of ἰδεωτεν, which appears here in 15:46-47 and in the two other consequence statements that refer to eyewitnesses (5:13c-20, 15:38-41). Three of the four statements (9:8, 15:38-41, 15:46f.) are found in stories about Jesus—the category that has no structural identity of its own. The remaining statement (5:13c-20) is from a miracle story. Here is another instance where a narrative tendency is evident in several form-critical categories, rendering them less distinctive.

Last to be illustrated are various groups of consequence statements that are mostly positive in tone. One group has as a common feature some statement about the following of Jesus:

1:18 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα
ηκολουθήσαν αὐτῷ

1:20b καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαίου
ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ μετὰ τῶν μυσθῶν
ἀπῆλθον ὅπλων αὐτοῦ

122See also 5:13c-20, p. 110 above; and 15:38-41, p. 111 above.
Other consequence statements are similar in reporting that certain persons came and found various things:

6:29  

29οι μαθηταί αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἠλθον καὶ ἔδηκαν αὐτῷ ἕν μνημεῖον

7:30  

καὶ ἀπελθοῦσα εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς εὑρεν τὸ παιδίου βεβλημένου ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξελπιθός

14:16  

καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ μαθηταί καὶ ἤλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἔδραν καθὼς εἴπεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἠτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

A few consequence statements tell of preaching, exorcising, or effective healing:

1:39  

καὶ ἠλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς δὴν τὴν Γαλατιαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων

6:12-13  

12καὶ ἐξελποῦσας ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοῶσιν καὶ δαιμόνια πολλά ἐκβάλλον καὶ ἠλείφαν ἐλαζό ς τολμοὺς ἀρρωστοὺς καὶ ἔθεράπευον

6:56b  

καὶ ὃς ἡμῖν ὑπάντησεν αὐτοῦ ἐσφόντο.

123See also 11:7-10 and 15:38-41, p. 111 above. Cf. 12:12, p. 114 above.
Two consequence statements end with the idea of serving Jesus, who is presumably among those who are served in 1:31c:

1:12-13 12 καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἐρημον
13 καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρημῷ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας
καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν ἡμερῶν
καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ

1:31c καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς. 124

Finally, there are two consequence statements that contain numerical figures:

6:43-44 43 καὶ ἠραν κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα
καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱχθῶν
44 καὶ ἠραν οἱ φαγόντες [τοὺς ἄρτους] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες T NM M

8:8b-9 καὶ ἠραν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων
ἐπὶ σπορίδας
9 ἦσαν δὲ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι
καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοὺς. 125 T NM M

Here the similarity is obviously due to narration about the same kind of event, if not the same event.

Some correlation is evident in several of the small groups that are positive in tone. The statements that tell of persons who came and found certain things appear in stories about Jesus (or Herod) according to Taylor's classification. The statements that refer to preaching and effective healing are found in editorial formulations in Bultmann's analysis. The consequence statements with numerical figures occur in miracle stories. This last group is the only one here where the form critics agree in their classifications. The general lack of agreement among these critics throws some doubt on the corre-

124 See also 15:38-41 (v. 41), p. 111 above.

125 See also 5:13c-20 (v. 13c), p. 110 above.
lation that exists in the other groups, but correlation in the analysis of any one critic is enough to raise the question of the validity of a form-critical, narrative category with regard to these story endings.

That question is answered somewhat by the general lack of correlation between the various types of consequence statements and different form-critical categories. The entire study of the consequence statements has shown that statements about concluding actions and reactions appear at the end of many stories in Mark's Gospel. Recurrent features make it possible to identify particular types of consequence statements. Time and again a type of statement is evident in different kinds of stories and so manifests the structural indistinctiveness of the form-critical categories. The general lack of clear correlation between types of consequence statements and form-critical classes shows that the categories are not distinctive in the story endings, and further doubts about the validity of these categories are raised on structural grounds.

SUMMARY AND APPLICATION

Doubts about the validity of the form-critical categories have arisen all along in the examination of the various narrative sections. The lengthy study in this chapter has shown that seven kinds of narrative sections are discernible in the Markan narratives: a setting statement, situation statement, reply to the situation, problem section, reply to the problem, result statement, and consequence statement. An abundance of illustrations of these sections has been presented to demonstrate that one can readily go beyond the twofold and threefold structures of form-critical analysis, which are much too broad.

Types of each kind of narrative section are identifiable through certain features or stylistic tendencies that appear at corresponding locations in Mark's narratives. This last fact makes it possible to think of these features
as structural tendencies. In the various types of each kind of section there is for the most part a lack of correlation between characteristic tendencies of these sections and the narrative categories of form criticism. Except for the result statement, which appears mostly in miracle stories, there is no correlation time after time between recognizable types of the narrative sections and the form-critical categories. This general absence of correlation throughout the study of the narrative sections is a clear indication that these categories are structurally not distinctive.

The structural indistinctiveness of miracle stories may be readily seen if the sections of any particular miracle story as a whole are compared with corresponding sections of other kinds of stories in Mark's Gospel. If miracle stories have distinctive structure, as the form critics have claimed, it is reasonable to assume that sections of miracle stories will for the most part resemble corresponding sections of other miracle stories. What is true, however, is that sections of miracle stories generally resemble corresponding sections of various kinds of stories—sometimes including other miracle stories, sometimes not.

With regard to the nature miracle stories (4:35-41, 6:35-44, 6:45-52, 8:1-9, and 11:12-14), their structural similarity with other kinds of stories is easily seen if one refers to the various types of narrative sections illustrated in this chapter. The story about the stilling of the storm begins with a type of setting statement that is found just as well in stories about Jesus and a Markan construction.\textsuperscript{126} The situation statement is stylistically similar to situation statements found in various kinds of stories: miracle stories, pronouncement stories, a Markan construction, and a number of stories about

\textsuperscript{126}See p. 32 above.
Jesus. The problem section has features that are found in the problem sections of other miracle stories and stories about Jesus. Present in the reply to the problem is a command, a feature that is commonly found at this location in many kinds of stories. Only the brief result statement has a feature (ἐξομολογεῖν) that is found just in some other miracle story. The confessional consequence statement is a type that is found both in miracle stories and stories about Jesus. The story about the stilling of the storm therefore has only one section that is similar only to a corresponding section in some other miracle story. The other sections resemble corresponding sections in various kinds of stories. In two sections—the setting statement and the situation statement—the resemblance is closest to sections in stories about Jesus and a Markan construction. The structure of this miracle story is hardly distinctive in view of the stylistic similarities between its sections and corresponding ones of other kinds of stories.

The story about Jesus' walking on the water has a number of sections that resemble others found only in other kinds of stories. The setting statement is a type that is present in stories about Jesus, Markan constructions, a pronouncement story, and a summary statement, but not in another miracle story. The situation statement, which tells of Jesus' coming to His disciples, is

127 See pp. 39-40 above.
128 See pp. 72-3 above.
129 See pp. 93-6 above and most of the reply-to-the-problem sections.
130 See p. 106 above.
132 Cf. 4:35 with 1:32a, 15:42, and 14:17; cf. 4:36-38a with 1:32b-33.
133 See pp. 29-30 above.
unique and affords little basis for comparison.\textsuperscript{134} The problem section is very similar stylistically to a corresponding problem section in a story about Jesus.\textsuperscript{135} Both the reply-to-the-problem section and the result statement, however, closely resemble corresponding sections found only in other miracle stories.\textsuperscript{136} In a contrary manner, the consequence statement resembles a number of other such statements that appear only in other kinds of stories.\textsuperscript{137} Thus a majority of the narrative sections in the story of Jesus' walking on the water are like corresponding sections in stories other than miracle stories, and it is evident that the structure of this miracle story is not distinctive.

If one looks at the two feeding stories, the matter is scarcely different. In the story about the feeding of the five thousand, the setting statement is a type that occurs in another miracle story, a Markan construction, and several stories about Jesus, resembling most of all a statement (15:33a) in a story about Jesus.\textsuperscript{138} The situation statement, reply to the situation, and reply to the problem are three sections that are similar to corresponding sections in stories other than miracle stories.\textsuperscript{139} Two sections—the problem section and the result statement—are types that appear elsewhere in various kinds of stories including miracle stories.\textsuperscript{140} Only the consequence statement is like others in miracle stories only.\textsuperscript{141} With three sections resembling counterparts

\textsuperscript{134}See p. 44 above.
\textsuperscript{135}See p. 77 above.
\textsuperscript{136}See pp. 84 and 106 above.
\textsuperscript{137}See p. 112 above.
\textsuperscript{138}See p. 32 above.
\textsuperscript{139}See above, pp. 52-3, 59-61, and 87-9, respectively.
\textsuperscript{140}See above, pp. 75-6 and 105-6, respectively.
\textsuperscript{141}See p. 118 above.
in other kinds of stories, and with three other sections having similarities with analogous sections in various kinds of stories including miracle stories, one can hardly maintain that the structure of this narrative is distinctively that of a miracle story—or even think here about the 'style of a miracle story'. Stylistically, the story is diffuse, sharing features with many other kinds of stories. Structurally, the story resembles many other kinds of stories by having these features at corresponding locations in the story. Such a narrative as the feeding of the five thousand is further evidence that miracle stories do not have a unique structure of their own.

In the story about the feeding of the four thousand, the setting statement is the only section that is similar to corresponding statements in stories other than miracle stories. Four sections—the situation statement, reply to the situation, problem, and result statement—resemble parallel sections in various kinds of stories including miracle stories. Only two sections—the reply to the problem and the consequence statement—have affinities with corresponding sections in miracle stories only. Once again, a miracle story lacks distinctiveness in most of its sections.

The story about the cursing of the fig tree is regarded as a miracle story by Bultmann and Taylor; Dibelius considers it a legend. It is the nature miracle story that least resembles other miracle stories. Five of its six sections—the setting statement, situation statement, reply to the situation, problem, and consequence statement—are like corresponding sections in other

---

142See p. 33 above.
143See above, pp. 44 n., 55-6, 75-6, and 105-6, respectively.
144See above, p. 96, n. 91, and p. 118, respectively.
145Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 106.
kinds of stories only, especially stories about Jesus and pronunciation stories.¹⁴⁶ The reply-to-the-problem section resembles various commands in a variety of stories including miracle stories. In almost every section this story resembles other kinds of stories exclusively, and so illustrates afresh the significant finding that miracle stories do not have unique structure of their own.

The five nature miracle stories taken together do not have distinctive structure. In four of the stories there are from one to five sections that resemble stylistically corresponding sections in stories other than miracle stories. The narrative sections that display this kind of resemblance are the setting statement, situation statement, reply to the situation, problem, and consequence statement. Also in four stories are one or two sections that resemble corresponding sections only in other miracle stories. The narrative sections involved here are the reply to the problem, the result statement, and the consequence statement. There is therefore a tendency for the first four sections to be like counterparts in other kinds of stories, and for the reply to the problem and the result statement to have material that is peculiar only to other miracle stories. The consequence statement, appearing in both groups, shows no clear tendency either way in these five stories. The evidence indicates that a characteristic feature of a miracle story is the material that is sometimes presented in the reply-to-the-problem section and especially the result statement, which is the narrative section that is found mostly—but not exclusively—in miracle stories. What makes a miracle story distinctive is a brief indication that a miracle has taken place as the immediate effect of a reply to a problem. A miracle story is distinctive topically in its reference

¹⁴⁶See above, pp. 31, 52, 64, 80, and 115, respectively.
to a miraculous result of a command or action, but formally a miracle story has no unique structure of its own, inasmuch as reply-to-the-problem sections and result statements are found in other kinds of stories.

That sections of miracle stories generally resemble corresponding sections of various kinds of stories is just as true for the healing miracle stories (1:21-28, 1:29-31, 1:40-45, 5:1-20, 5:21-24a + 35-43, 5:24b-34, 7:31-37, 8:22-26, 9:14-29, 10:46-52). Here, however, there are fewer instances where narrative sections resemble counterparts only in stories other than miracle stories,147 and more occasions where sections are like corresponding sections in various kinds of stories including other miracle stories.148 The tendency that was apparent in nature miracle stories is evident also here: the reply-to-the-

---

147Four healing narratives have such sections: in 1:29-31 the result statement and consequence section (see pp. 106 and 118 above); in 1:40-45 the situation statement (see pp. 43-4 above); in 8:22-26 the reply to the problem (see pp. 100-1 above); and in 10:46-52 the consequence statement (see pp. 116-7 above).

148An average of four out of six sections in healing miracle stories are like this, as opposed to three out of six sections for nature miracle stories. There is therefore a slight tendency for healing miracle stories to be more like other miracle stories, but here it must be kept in mind that the sections in question resemble corresponding sections in both miracle stories and other kinds of stories, so that one can hardly think of the distinctiveness of miracle stories. The sections that resemble corresponding sections in various kinds of stories are as follows (the page numbers in parentheses indicate where the types of sections are illustrated earlier in this chapter): in 1:21-28 the set. (pp. 33-4), sit. (pp. 39-40), prob. (pp. 78-9), and cons. (pp. 109-11); in 1:29-31 the set. (pp. 27-8), prob. (pp. 80-1); in 1:40-45 the prob. (pp. 80-1), rep. to prob. (pp. 93-6), res. (pp. 105-6), cons. (p. 113); in 5:1-20 the set. (pp. 27-8), sit. (pp. 39-40), prob. (pp. 78-9), cons. (p. 118); in 5:21-24a + 35-43 the set. (pp. 27-8), sit. (p. 44 n.), prob. (pp. 80-1), rep. to prob. (p. 102), cons. (p. 113); in 5:24b-34 the sit. (p. 44 n.), rep. to sit. (pp. 57-8), prob. (pp. 75-6), res. (pp. 105-6); in 7:31-37 the set. (pp. 27-8), sit. (p. 44 n.), prob. (pp. 80-1), rep. to prob. (pp. 93-6), res. (pp. 105-6), cons. (pp. 109-11); in 8:22-26 the set. (p. 24), sit. (p. 44 n.), prob. (pp. 80-1), cons. (p. 113); in 9:14-29 the sit. (pp. 46-7), rep. to sit. (pp. 57-8), prob. (pp. 72-3), rep. to prob. (pp. 84, n. 74; 85-6; 103, n. 100), cons. (p. 112 n.); and in 10:46-52 the set. (p. 24), prob. (p. 74), rep. to prob. (p. 84). That so many narrative sections of the healing miracle stories resemble stylistically corresponding sections of various kinds of stories is evidence against the structural distinctiveness of these miracle stories.
problem sections and especially the result statements tend to resemble corresponding sections of miracle stories only.\textsuperscript{149} It seems once again that the distinctive element in a miracle story is a reference to a miraculous command or act and its effect in the reply-to-the-problem section and result statement, respectively. But inasmuch as a few result statements and many reply-to-the-problem sections with commands are found in other kinds of stories, one can hardly maintain that these miracle stories are unique structurally.\textsuperscript{150}

Miracle stories differ in having different content in several conventional narrative sections, not in having different sections. Like other kinds of narratives, miracle stories have reply-to-the-problem sections with commands;

\textsuperscript{149}The reply-to-the-problem sections that show this tendency are in the following narratives: 1:21-28 (see. p. 84 above), 1:29-31 (p. 102), 5:1-20 (p. 84), and 5:24b-34 (p. 102). The result statements that manifest this tendency are in a greater number of narratives: 1:21-28 (see p. 106 above), 5:1-20 (p. 106), 5:21-24a + 35-43 (p. 107), 8:22-26 (p. 107), 9:14-29 (pp. 95, n. 110; 107), and 10:46-52 (p. 107). Two situation statements—one in 1:29-31 and the other in 10:46-52 (see p. 44 n.)—are like corresponding sections in miracle stories only; but the tendency is not clear inasmuch as the situation statements in the other healing miracle stories mostly appear in various kinds of stories.

\textsuperscript{150}One could argue that the result statement is the very section that makes miracle stories distinctive structurally. This position could be supported by the fact that three fourths of the result statements appear in miracle stories, and that most of the remaining result statements are about miracles even though the stories in which these statements are found have been classified as other kinds of stories. Result statements would then be seen as normative to the telling of miracles and irregular in a few other kinds of stories. But it is preferable to think of the result statement as part of a fundamental manner of narration and not as an essential property of miracle stories only. According to this view, the telling of an immediate effect of a command or act is an option for any kind of story that tells of a command or act in the reply-to-the-problem section and not the exclusive feature of stories that tell about miraculous commands or acts. It is clear that this option was freely exercised in the telling of miracles, and was not used much elsewhere; nevertheless, as has already been noted, several different kinds of stories have result statements, and a few of these statements are not about miracles. Whether result statements make miracle stories structurally distinctive or not, the three-part structure seen by the form critics in miracle stories remains inadequate. Any attempt to establish the structural distinctiveness of miracle stories in terms of the result statement will only call attention to a more elaborate narrative pattern that is recognizable in the Markan narratives, rather than confirm the form-critical conception of three-part structure.
but in miracle stories these commands are miraculous in character. Like some other narratives, miracle stories have result statements; but in miracle stories these statements are about the immediate effect of the miraculous reply. The difference is essentially topical, not structural.

That miracle stories do not have unique structure may be seen another way through the narrative sections themselves. Ten of the miracle stories (1:21-28, 1:29-31, 1:40-45, 4:35-41, 5:1-20, 5:21-24a + 35-43, 6:45-52, 7:31-37, 8:22-26, and 10:46-52) contain a setting statement, situation statement, problem section, reply to the problem, [result statement], and consequence statement. This combination of sections—minus in most instances the result statement, which appears only in approximately one fourth of the Markan narratives—is a narrative structure that is found in seven stories about Jesus, two pronouncement stories, and a Markan construction. Such a narrative structure is not at all characteristic only of miracle stories. The other five miracle stories (5:24b-34, 6:35-44, 8:1-9, 9:14-29, and 11:12-14) have a setting statement, situation statement, reply to the situation, problem section, reply to the problem, [result statement], and a consequence statement. This combination of narrative sections minus the result statement is by no means characteristic

---

151 The story of the leper (1:40-45), however, lacks a setting statement.

152 An instance where a result statement does appear is in 6:1-6a, one of the seven stories about Jesus.

153 See further below, pp. 347-8. These figures are based on Taylor's classification.

154 Both 5:24b-34 and 9:14-29, however, lack a setting statement.

155 The story of the cursing of the fig tree in 11:12-14 lacks a result statement, probably in conscious anticipation of the sequel in 11:20-25.

156 Six narratives (2:1-12, 3:1-6, 6:14-29, 11:1-10, 15:33-41, and 15:42-47), which are not considered miracle stories, do have result statements, however.
only of miracle stories but appears in three pronouncement stories, a story about Herod, and ten stories about Jesus.\footnote{157}{See below, p. 223. Again the figures are based on Taylor's classification.}

The general lack of correlation between types of narrative sections and miracle stories, the frequent resemblance between sections of miracle stories and corresponding sections of other kinds of stories, and the presence in miracle stories of an overall structure that is just as apparent in many other kinds of stories, together make it evident that miracle stories do not have a characteristic structure of their own. When one penetrates below the broad threefold structure of form-critical analysis and recognizes that Mark's narratives are regularly composed of combinations of certain conventional narrative sections, one can no longer endorse the concept of the 'perfect three-fold form of the Miracle-Story'\.footnote{158}{Taylor, F.G.T., p. 131.}

What can be maintained is that a miracle story tells about a miracle—especially in the brief result statement. But so far as literary structure—the order of sections—is concerned, a miracle story is for the most part no different from many other stories that have other subjects for topics.

The matter is scarcely different with pronouncement stories. When one goes beyond the broad, question-and-answer form envisaged by the form critics and recognizes the greater number of conventional, narrative sections that are evident in these stories, the structural indistinctiveness of the pronouncement story as a category becomes readily apparent. This fact can be seen in an examination of the eight stories (2:15-17, 2:18-22, 2:23-28, 3:1-6, 3:31-35, 10:13-16, 12:13-17, 12:18-27) where Dibelius, Bultmann, and Taylor show some agreement in labeling these stories paradigms, apophthegms, and pronouncement stories,
respectively.\textsuperscript{159}

As was true for miracle stories, many sections of these eight pronouncement stories resemble corresponding sections in various kinds of stories. A few sections are like corresponding sections in other kinds of stories.\textsuperscript{160} In a contrary manner, three situation statements and a problem section are types that are found only in other pronouncement stories.\textsuperscript{161} But most of the sections in the eight stories are types that occur in various kinds of stories including pronouncement stories.\textsuperscript{162} It is therefore evident that the eight pronouncement stories are not distinctive in most of their narrative sections, and it becomes difficult to subscribe to the notion that pronouncement stories have a characteristic structure of their own.

As was also true for miracle stories, the structural indistinctiveness of

\textsuperscript{159}See the charts, pp. 376, 223, 269, and 347 below.

\textsuperscript{160}The sections are the setting statement in 3:1-6 (see pp. 29-30 above), the reply to the situation in that story (see pp. 59-61 above), the problem section in 3:31-35 (see p. 80 above), and the reply to the problem in 12:13-17 (see pp. 85-6 above). Taylor's classification is also used here for the purpose of illustration. If one follows Bultmann's classification on pp. 29-30 and 59-61 above, the sections in 3:1-6 are to be seen as resembling corresponding sections in various kinds of stories including other apophthegms. No matter which classification is followed, the sections in question are evidence against the structural distinctiveness of pronouncement stories or apophthegms.

\textsuperscript{161}The three situation statements are those in 3:31-35, 12:13-17, and 12:18-27 (see p. 44 above). The problem section is found in 2:15-17 (see pp. 69-70 above).

\textsuperscript{162}These sections and the pages (in parentheses) on which these sections have been presented above are as follows: in 2:15-17 the set. (p. 33), sit. (p. 44 n.), and rep. to prob. (pp. 100-1); in 2:18-22 the sit. (pp. 39-40), prob. (pp. 68-9, cf. pp. 66-7), and rep. to prob. (pp. 100-1); in 2:23-28 the sit. (p. 49, cf. pp. 48-9), prob. (pp. 68-9, cf. pp. 66-7), and rep. to prob. (pp. 97-9); in 3:1-6 the sit. (pp. 39-40), prob. (p. 70), rep. to prob. (pp. 93-6), res. (pp. 105-6), and cons. (p. 114); in 3:31-35 the rep. to prob. (pp. 100-1); in 10:13-16 the sit. (p. 44 n.), rep. to sit. (p. 62), prob. (p. 74), and rep. to prob. (pp. 84-5); in 12:13-17 the prob. (pp. 71-2, cf. pp. 72-3), and cons. (p. 112); and in 12:18-27 the prob. (pp. 71-2, cf. pp. 72-3), and rep. to prob. (pp. 97-9).
the eight pronouncement stories is further apparent if one looks at their overall structure. Instead of having broad, two-part structure, these stories have overall shapes that are diverse with four different combinations of narrative sections; furthermore, these combinations are present in various kinds of stories. One story (3:1-6) has a combination of sections (setting, situation, reply to the situation,\textsuperscript{163} problem, reply to the problem, result, consequence) that is found in five miracle stories, ten stories about Jesus, a story about Herod, and only two other pronouncement stories.\textsuperscript{164} Another story (10:13-16) has a combination (situation, reply to the situation, problem, reply to the problem)\textsuperscript{165} that is apparent in two stories about Jesus, four Markan constructions, a sayings complex, a summary statement, and just one other pronouncement story.\textsuperscript{166} A third story (12:13-17) has a combination (situation, problem, reply to the problem, consequence)\textsuperscript{167} that occurs in ten miracle stories, seven stories about Jesus, two Markan constructions, and just one other pronouncement story.\textsuperscript{168} The remaining five stories (2:15-17, 2:18-22, 2:23-28, 3:31-35, and 12:18-27) have a combination (setting, situation, problem, result, consequence)\textsuperscript{169} that is found in three miracle stories, two stories about Jesus, two Markan constructions, and just one other pronouncement story.\textsuperscript{170}

\textsuperscript{163}In 3:1-6 the reply to the situation appears after the problem section. See further below, pp. 191-3.

\textsuperscript{164}See the chart below, p. 223, with regard to the Full Pattern Long narratives. In this comparative description of the overall structure of the eight pronouncement stories, Taylor's classification is followed throughout for the sake of simple illustration at this point. Critical assessment of Taylor's classification will be given from time to time in the next chapter as the overall structure of each narrative is examined in detail.

\textsuperscript{165}In 10:13-16 the reply to the situation is presented after the reply to the problem. See further below, pp. 259-61.

\textsuperscript{166}See p. 269 below concerning the Full Pattern Short narratives.

\textsuperscript{167}In 12:13-17 the reply to the problem is extended through dialogue with responses. See further below, pp. 329-31.

\textsuperscript{168}See p. 347 below with regard to the Variation #1 Long narratives.
reply to the problem)\textsuperscript{169} that is present in two stories about Jesus, a miracle story with sayings, and two other pronouncement stories.\textsuperscript{170} Both the structural differences of the eight pronouncement stories and their structural similarity with various other kinds of stories indicate that the eight stories do not have distinctive structure as pronouncement stories. It therefore becomes increasingly difficult to think of the pronouncement story as a valid category so far as literary structure is concerned.

In the study of both miracle stories and pronouncement stories it has been useful to observe the combinations of narrative sections in Markan narratives for a more adequate understanding of overall narrative structure. A striking fact is that with few exceptions the order in which the narrative sections appear is fixed, no matter which sort of combination is present. Variety in narrative structure is achieved for the most part not through an alteration in the order of sections but through the omission of certain sections. The order in which the narrative sections are generally presented constitutes a pattern of narration that is found to a high degree of regularity throughout Mark's narratives. Combinations of sections that omit certain sections constitute not different structures but rather abbreviated versions of essentially one basic pattern of narration. The illustration of the narrative pattern and its several variations is the burden of the next chapter.

The picture that emerges is that, contrary to the belief of form critics that different types of stories have distinctive structures of their own, the narratives in Mark's Gospel have essentially the same narrative structure. That structure or narrative pattern is a 'higher law' of narration in comparison with

\textsuperscript{169}Three of these stories (2:18-22, 3:31-35, and 12:18-27) do not have a setting statement.

\textsuperscript{170}See the list of Variation #1 Short narratives below, p. 376.
the 'laws of style' conceived by the form critics concerning various 'forms' of the tradition.\textsuperscript{171}

\textsuperscript{171}The term 'higher law' is used here loosely concerning a pattern of narration that is both fixed and flexible: fixed in the order in which recognizable narrative sections are presented; and flexible in the abbreviation of the pattern through the omission of certain sections. It should be noted, however, that the order of the sections is sometimes altered, but never to the extent that the pattern is obscured beyond recognition. It is also true that certain tendencies are evident in the omission of narrative sections, so that one can identify six regular forms of the narrative pattern. Bultmann also used the term 'laws' loosely, considering as 'elastic' both 'laws of style' concerning particular narrative forms and laws pertaining to the further development of the tradition. See Form Criticism, pp. 29, 36; H.S.T., p. 51, n. 4. See also Taylor, F.G.T., p. 26; cf. Dibelius, F.T.G., pp. 4, 7, 11. E. P. Sanders, \textit{The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition}, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, No. 9 (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1969), p. 16, makes clear Bultmann's distinction between laws that influence the form of the stories and those that affect the transmission of the tradition. Sanders, pp. 19-26, criticizes Bultmann's treatment of the latter, but praises the form critics for their 'excellent work' in describing the laws pertaining to the characteristics of narrative forms (p. 22). Here Sanders presumes that the form critics have adequately described the Gospel narratives as forms and sees his own work as a corrective to the failure of form critics to study systematically laws or 'tendencies' of transmission beyond canonical tradition (pp. 25-6). The present chapter of this dissertation has shown, however, that form-critical analysis of narrative structure was limited to miracle stories and pronouncement stories, and that the conception of structure was much too broad. The chief concern of the next chapter is to present a more adequate description of the literary structure of Mark's narratives by calling attention to a more detailed pattern of narration that is evident in a limited number of forms in all the stories in Mark's Gospel.
Part II

THE NARRATIVE PATTERN

INTRODUCTION

Seven kinds of narrative sections detected in the Markan narratives were illustrated in Part I: the setting, situation, reply to the situation, problem, reply to the problem, result, and consequence. The order in which these sections were illustrated is the order in which they appear with surprising regularity in the Markan narratives. Combinations of these sections make up the stories in Mark's Gospel. Sometimes one or more of the sections are omitted in a particular story, but the order in which the sections that are present do occur is quite fixed. This order may be seen as constituting the narrative structure of any one story. In this respect the form of a narrative is understood more as the shape of a story than as the presence of any particular motif. Indeed, when motif is dethroned as the chief criterion of determining narrative form, and when literary structure is no longer dismissed as a matter of aesthetics but is taken seriously through detailed examination of the order of content within narratives, there comes into focus a pattern of narration that is evident in a limited number of forms in all the stories of Mark's Gospel. The form critics saw broad patterns in miracle stories and pronouncement stories, but failed to see this detailed pattern which is common to all the stories. This narrative pattern is perhaps the most important narrative tendency in the Gospel tradition, especially in Mark's Gospel. The description of this narrative pattern is the first concern of this part of the dissertation.
I. THE DESCRIPTION OF THE NARRATIVE PATTERN AND ITS VARIATIONS

An examination of the order of content in the Markan narratives has led to the discovery that they have been written according to one conventional pattern of narration that is abbreviated in three distinct ways. The pattern and its abbreviations are illustrated below.

THE PATTERN AND ITS VARIATIONS

Full Pattern = \[
\begin{align*}
\text{Setting} \\
\text{Situation} \\
\text{Reply to the Situation} \\
\text{Problem} \\
\text{Reply to the Problem} \\
\text{Result} \\
\text{Consequence}
\end{align*}
\]

\(\text{Omit} = \text{Variation} \#1\)
\(\text{Omit} = \text{Variation} \#2\)
\(\text{Omit} = \text{Short form of Full Pattern or of either variation}\)

The Full Pattern consists of the narrative sections that are listed. In some stories the Full Pattern is abbreviated through the omission of a reply-to-the-situation statement. This form of the pattern is designated Variation \#1. In other stories the Full Pattern is abbreviated through the omission of the problem section and the reply to the problem. This form of the narrative pattern is called Variation \#2. Sometimes stories that contain either the Full Pattern or any one of the two variations appear in short form without result and consequence statements.

The Full Pattern and its two variations in long and short form are illustrated in the chart below, which shows the various combinations of sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FULL PATTERN</th>
<th>VARIATION #1</th>
<th>VARIATION #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Set.</td>
<td>Long Set.</td>
<td>Long Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Set.</td>
<td>Short Set.</td>
<td>Short Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Sit.</td>
<td>Long Sit.</td>
<td>Long Sit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Sit.</td>
<td>Short Sit.</td>
<td>Short Sit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long RepS.</td>
<td>Long RepS.</td>
<td>Long RepS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short RepS.</td>
<td>Short RepS.</td>
<td>Short RepS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long RepP.</td>
<td>Long RepP.</td>
<td>Long RepP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short RepP.</td>
<td>Short RepP.</td>
<td>Short RepP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Res.</td>
<td>Short Res.</td>
<td>Short Res.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Cons.</td>
<td>Short Cons.</td>
<td>Short Cons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The short form of the Full Pattern (FPS) differs from the long form (FPL) only through the omission of the result and consequence statements, and ends with the reply to the problem. In Variation #1 stories the narrator proceeds from the situation directly to the problem section. The short form of Variation #1 (VIS) differs from the long form (V1L) through the lack of result and consequence statements. It so happens that no Variation #2 story in long form (V2L) has a result statement, so in this variation of the narrative pattern the narrator proceeds from the reply to the situation directly to the consequence statement. Variation #2 stories in short form (V2S) have no consequence statements and end with the reply to the situation.

It is helpful to list briefly the abbreviations for the Full Pattern and its two variations in long and short form:

FPL = Full Pattern Long Form
FPS = Full Pattern Short Form
V1L = Variation #1 Long Form
VIS = Variation #1 Short Form
V2L = Variation #2 Long Form
V2S = Variation #2 Short Form.

These abbreviations will be used freely throughout the remainder of the dissertation.

A number of observations may be made at this point about the six forms of the pattern. It is important to note that the six forms are not six different structures but rather six versions of one conventional pattern of narration. The order of the sections is important for this judgement. If the narrative sections appeared regularly in a different order in one or more of the six forms, it would be permissible to think of more than one pattern of narration; but inasmuch as the order of the sections is the same for each of the six forms, it is justifiable to think of one pattern that is presented in six regular ways.
The narrative pattern in its six forms is descriptive of the structure of stories about Jesus and larger complexes as well as miracle stories and pronouncement stories. All the stories in Mark's Gospel have been written according to one basic pattern of narration. The belief of Taylor that stories about Jesus 'have no common structural form'¹ is true in so far as stories about Jesus do not have a distinctive structure of their own, but is untrue in the sense that they have a common structure that is shared with the other Markan narratives.

The conception of one narrative pattern in six forms eliminates the need for a theory of Mischformen.² Such a theory arises when 'form' is determined by motif, when it is assumed that there are at least two essentially different types of narratives, and when a particular story has several motifs that are associated with more than one narrative type. But when literary structure is understood as the order of content; when it is seen that the order of content is the same in each story, and that, regardless of theme, each narrative has therefore the same backbone, even though parts of it are missing from time to time, the need for a theory of Mischformen vanishes.

The six forms show that the pattern is flexible. It is not a rigid mould that produces stereotypes, but is a manner of storytelling that allows for considerable diversity through the omission of one or more conventional

¹Taylor, F.G.T., p. 42. See also p. 32. Ample illustration of the narrative pattern in stories about Jesus will be given in the next section of this part of the dissertation.

²See McGinley, Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives, p. 13, for a brief discussion of Mischformen. McGinley criticizes these 'intermediate' forms on a priori grounds. The narrative pattern, however, provides an objective criterion for questioning not only the theory of Mischformen but also the healing narrative as a distinct category.
sections. Sometimes stories that are told according to the pattern hardly resemble one another. Even stories that share the same combination of narrative sections, and therefore have essentially the same literary structure, will contain widely different content and seem quite unlike one another. These conditions point up the need for a thorough investigation of the literary structure of the Markan narratives. The conception of one narrative pattern in six forms is an important result of such an investigation and shows that literary investigation can be profitable.

The delineation of six forms of one narrative pattern is, in effect, a description of the narrative as a literary type (Gattung) in Mark's Gospel. Klaus Koch has argued that the definition of 'component types' (Gliedgattungen) is an important aspect of exegesis.\(^3\) The next section is an attempt to define more precisely the narrative as a component type in Mark's Gospel.

II. THE ILLUSTRATION OF THE NARRATIVE PATTERN IN ITS SIX VARIATIONS

The task of illustrating the narrative pattern is obviously an immense undertaking. Representative examples do not adequately illustrate all the stories. Therefore, almost all of the stories are presented in colometric form to make clear each form of the narrative pattern. It seems preferable to have too many illustrations rather than too few. Consequently, this section of the dissertation is quite long. With each illustration there is a great temptation to consider at length questions of interpretation of individual passages, comparisons with Matthew and Luke, theological issues, and questions relating to the new quest of the historical Jesus. Systematic consideration of these interesting and important concerns for each narrative that is

\(^3\)Koch, p. 24.
illustrated is, of course, beyond the province of this dissertation. Some attempt, however, is made to touch on these points when the narrative pattern seems to shed light on a related problem. The illustration of the narrative pattern remains the primary concern, and the long form of the Full Pattern is the first form to be illustrated.

A. Full Pattern Long Narratives

Nineteen of eighty-six discernible narratives in Mark's Gospel manifest the long form of the Full Pattern. Although these nineteen FPL narratives do not comprise the largest group of stories having the same form of the narrative pattern (there are twenty-one V1L narratives), the long form of the Full Pattern is the normative structure of which the remaining five forms are abbreviations.

While it is true that all nineteen FPL narratives contain the Full Pattern in long form, it is also true that there are recognizable differences in this form of the pattern. These slight differences are reflected in the following structural classification of the FPL narratives:

1. Regular Form.
2. Regular Form Extended.
3. Irregular Form.
4. Irregular Form Extended.

In narratives with regular form the order of sections is simply that of the narrative pattern. In narratives with extended regular form the form is regular, but the narratives are expanded through developments in the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections. In narratives with irregular form the order of sections is essentially the same as that in narratives with regular form, but some irregularity is evident, such as the premature appearance of a particular narrative section. There are four instances where a story's form is both irregular and extended. Some narratives of the first three
categories sometimes lack result statements, and this absence is another structural difference. In no instance, however, does any formal difference seriously obscure the narrative pattern in its long form. This fact is everywhere apparent in the forthcoming illustrations of FPL narratives, and the first to be presented are those with regular form.

**Regular form.** Four FPL narratives have regular form complete with result statements. One of these stories is the controversial account of the healing of the paralytic (2:1-12):

Set. {1] Καὶ εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ δι' ἡμέραν
          ἡκούσθεν δὴ τι ἐν οἷς ἔστιν

          [2] καὶ συνῆθησαν τολλοὶ
              ὡστε μηκετὶ χωρεῖν
              μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν

              καὶ ἔλαλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον

Sit. [3] καὶ ἔρχονται
          φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν
          αἱρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων

          [4] καὶ ἴδος ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν
              λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ
          Τέκνον
              ἀφίενται σου αἱ ἀμαρτίαι

Reps. [5] ὅσαν δὲ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων ἐκέεν καθῆμενοι
         καὶ διάλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν
         ἦταν οὐτός οὕτως λαλεῖ
         βλασφημεῖ
         τίς δύναται ἀφίεναι ἀμαρτίας
         εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός

          ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἐαυτοῖς
          λέγει αὐτοῖς
              τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν
              ἢ τί ἐστιν εὐχοπώτερον
              εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ
This story about the paralytic provides a clear example of the long form of the Full Pattern. The indication in v. 1 that Jesus was again at home in Capernaum after some days is the setting statement. Verses 2-4 describe the situation: the crowd, Jesus' preaching, the arrival of the paralytic with his bearers, and their efforts to get close to Jesus. Jesus' pronouncement of forgiveness in v. 5 is His reply to the situation. The questioning of the scribes in vv. 6f. constitutes the problem section. Verses 8-11 present Jesus' reply to the scribes' problematical thoughts. The rising of the paralytic in v. 12a is the direct result of Jesus' reply, and the rest of the verse, telling of the subsequent actions of the healed man and the confession of the witnesses, is a consequence statement.

It is interesting that the narrative pattern in its longest form is clearest in a story whose unity has been seriously questioned. Wrede appears to have been the first to suggest that the passage about the right to forgive sin is a later addition to a primitive story about the healing of the lame
man. Wrede found Jesus' pronouncement of forgiveness disturbing as an unexpected element in a miracle story, and thought of the scribes' questioning as an interruption. Supposedly, dogmatic interest in the Messiahship of Jesus has disturbed a primitive miracle story, and the saying about the forgiveness of sins is to be considered an introduction to the secondary passage about the right to forgive sins.

The narrative pattern serves as a useful criterion for evaluating these views of Wrede. (1) The clarity of the narrative pattern in 2:1-12 stands against a theory of accretion. One would expect a combination of traditions to be reflected in the structure of a composite narrative, but in the story of the paralytic there is no sign of structural disturbance of the pattern. If a combination of traditions has taken place, it has occurred in strict conformity with the narrative pattern. (2) Structurally, the questioning of the scribes does not appear as an interruption but rather as a conventional problem section. Indeed, one familiar with the narrative pattern expects a problematical action at this point in the story. (3) The appeal to dogmatic interest in Jesus' Messiahship in the passage about the right to forgive sins as an argument for the secondary character of that passage loses some force when it is realized that theological interest in Jesus' Messianic status is

---

4W. Wrede, 'Zur Heilung des Gelähnten (Mc 2, 1ff.)', Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, V (1904), 358. See Richard T. Mead, 'The Healing of the Paralytic—A Unit?', Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXX (1961), 348-354, who calls attention to this article by Wrede. See also Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 15, n. 1, and p. 382 for brief references to various views about Mk. 2:5b-10 as a secondary addition.

5Wrede, p. 354.

6Ibid., p. 355.

7Ibid., pp. 355-7.

8Ibid., p. 358.
implicit in the other narrative sections as well. Mark's high estimate of Jesus lies behind the remark in the setting statement that it was heard that He was at home. Jesus' kerygmatic activity and attraction of the crowd and the paralytic in the situation statement further manifest theological understanding of Jesus' unique status. Both the rising of the paralytic in the result statement and the confession of witnesses in the consequence statement betray interest in Jesus' special power and relation to God. Dogmatic concern for Jesus' Messiahship is a questionable argument for the secondary character of the passage on the right to forgive sins, when theological interest in Jesus' unique status pervades the whole narrative. (4) The suggestion of Wrede that Jesus' pronouncement of forgiveness in v. 5 is a saying presented to prepare the way for the secondary passage—presumably as an argument for the secondary character of that saying—also loses force when it is realized that each narrative section contains material that prepares the way for the following section. The remark in the setting statement about the rumor that Jesus was at home prepares the way for the coming of the crowd and the paralytic in the situation statement. The efforts of the paralytic's friends to get close to Jesus occasion His remark about their faith in the reply-to-the-situation statement. His pronouncement of forgiveness prompts the scribes' hostile thoughts in the problem section. Their inner questionings evoke Jesus' reply in the reply-to-the-problem section. His words to the paralytic bring about the rising of the lame man in the result statement. That act of rising precipitates the confession of the witnesses. The progression of the story is tightly knit from section to section, as each section prepares the way for the next. There is therefore some question about the importance of the preparatory character of the saying about the forgiveness of sins in v. 5.
The narrative pattern is especially useful in assessing Bultmann's theory that 2:5b-10 is an insertion within 2:1-12. It is noteworthy that Bultmann's dominant arguments for considering 2:5b-10 an interpolation are thematic rather than structural in character. His first argument is that the theme of faith that is present in vv. 3f. does not appear in vv. 5b-10. The assumption is that the theme of faith would be present in vv. 5b-10 if the story were a unity. Characteristics of the narrative pattern betray the weakness of this argument in that v. 5b is part of Jesus' reply to the situation—further expression of the bearers' faith is not to be expected here, and vv. 6-10 occur within the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections. It is in keeping with Mark's use of the narrative pattern that expressions of faith do not customarily appear in the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections.

Bultmann's second argument, likewise thematic in character, is that 2:11f. is a miracle story conclusion with its reference to the carrying of the bed and the impression made on the observers. The assumption here is that vv. 11f. are a suitable ending to a miracle story but not to the content in vv. 5b-10. The ending in vv. 11f. would have to be a suitable conclusion to the material in vv. 5b-10 for the story to be a unified whole. In terms of the narrative pattern, however, vv. 11f. present a result statement and a consequence statement, and such an ending is not found only in miracle stories. It is evident in a number of the narratives that contain the long

---


10Ibid., p. 15.

11Cf. Mk. 12:32f., a problem section in which a scribe makes a statement that is positive in character.

form of either the Full Pattern or Variation #1. Bultmann's third argument—again thematic in character—is that 'there is no real congruence between vv. 11f. and vv. 5b-10. After vv. 5b-10 one wants to ask: "What is the impression on the opponents? Are they to be counted among the δοξαζοντες in v. 12?" It is much more likely that they kept silence, as in 3, 4, etc.' The idea is that vv. 11f. would be a suitable ending to vv. 5b-10 and the story would be a unity if the scribes were among those who glorified God. It is possible that Bultmann is being facetious in his remark about the silence of the scribes in vv. 3f.; and the reader is to assume that their silence means their absence altogether in vv. 3f. and 11f., and that vv. 5b-10, which do refer to the scribes, is an interpolation. The intention of Bultmann is unclear at this point. If his position is to be taken literally, it suggests that he considers the scribes present at the end but silent. Such a conception seems to work against Bultmann's purpose. To speak of the scribes' silent presence in both vv. 3f. and vv. 5b-10 implies that one event instead of two is being portrayed, and this implication stands against the view that 2:5b-10 is an insertion.

Bultmann's three arguments lack force because they arise from considerations of theme without due attention to narrative structure. The usefulness of the narrative pattern as a criterion for testing the theory of vv. 5b-10 being an insertion becomes especially apparent in an evaluation of Taylor's views on this matter.

---

13 See, for example, Mk. 6:1-6a (V1L) and 11:1-10 (FPL), pp. 284-6, 150-2.

14 Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 15.

15 It would have been helpful if Bultmann had discussed his arguments at greater length. See Ludwig Koehler's judgement here concerning Bultmann's approach ('Mehr Dekret als Demonstration?'), Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Neuen Testaments (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927), p. 18.
Taylor presents essentially four reasons for considering 2:5b-10 an insertion:

1. Verses 5b-10a\(^{16}\) lack the vividness of vv. 3-5a and 11f. 'In 5b-10a names of persons, statements about time and place, and vivid details in the course of events, have disappeared.'\(^{17}\) In 3-5a and 11f., however, there is mention of the roof, the crowds, and the house.

2. 'The phrases "he saith to the paralytic" in 5a and 10b have the appearance of editorial links.'\(^{18}\)

3. '11f. takes account only of the act of healing, and in the intention of the Evangelist "all" refers to the crowd, whereas, as the narrative stands, it is open to the erroneous interpretation that even the scribes are included.'\(^{19}\)

4. 'Although lacking an introduction, 5b-10a has a strong resemblance in form and construction to the Pronouncement-stories in 16f., 18-20, 23-6, iii. 1-6.'\(^{20}\)

With regard to Taylor's first argument, precisely the absence of vivid details suggests that vv. 5b-10a are an internal portion of a larger narrative as a whole, rather than a separate narrative that has been inserted. Mark customarily gives such details in setting and situation statements, but not in problem and reply-to-the-problem sections.\(^{21}\) If vivid details were in vv. 5b-10a, there would be good evidence for thinking of these verses as a separate narrative.

---

\(^{16}\)Taylor's use of 10a instead of 10, G.M., pp. 191-2, is in keeping with his view that 10b is an editorial link that did not belong originally to the interpolated material.

\(^{17}\)Ibid., p. 192.

\(^{18}\)Ibid.

\(^{19}\)Ibid.

\(^{20}\)Ibid.

\(^{21}\)It is interesting that Taylor, Ibid., p. 193, regards 2:1f. as a summary statement, even though it refers to a door, which is a detail no less vivid than the roof, the crowds, and the house.
Taylor's second argument concerning the phrases in vv. 5a and 10b is also questionable. Do they really have the appearance of editorial links? In v. 5a the phrase λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ is a normal statement introducing Jesus' words to the paralytic, such as λέγει αὐτοῖς in v. 8. If the similar phrase did not occur again in v. 10b, there would be little question about its use in v. 5a. In v. 10b the phrase is necessary to indicate a change in the object of Jesus' speech from the scribes to the paralytic. Both Matthew (Mt. 9:6b) and Luke (Lk. 5:24b) recognize the necessity of this stage direction and incorporate it in their own paraphrasing of Mark's account. A similar kind of stage direction is found at a corresponding location in Mk. 3:1-6 (v. 5), which suggests that the presence of such a phrase in 2:10b is not necessarily the sign of an interpolation.22

Taylor's third argument is essentially Bultmann's third argument, only Taylor avoids Bultmann's awkward reference to the silence of the scribes in vv. 3f. Taylor, like Bultmann, assumes that 'all' refers only to the crowd and not to the scribes. Though Taylor claims to know the mind of Mark at this point, the view that 'all' refers only to the crowd is merely an assumption, and as such is a weak prop for supporting the main assumption that vv. 5b-10a are an insertion. Bultmann especially seems to shrink away from the idea that the scribes were among those who glorified God, but there is some reason for thinking that they participated in the astonishment of the crowd. Astonishment in consequence statements is often negative in character in Markan narratives. Amazement, related at times with fear, is an indication

---

22See a similar shift in Jesus' attention at a corresponding location in Mt. 8:5-13 (v. 13). See also C. H. Turner, Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical, on the Second Gospel, The Journal of Theological Studies, XXVI (1924-25), p. 146. Turner regards the phrase in 2:10 as an obvious parenthetical remark that is consistent with Mark's unskilled style.
of basic unbelief, not reverent awe. If the disciples had believed and understood that Jesus was the Messiah, they would not have been so astonished at the things that He said and did. In the same vein, amazement does not imply necessarily a change from unbelief to belief. The scribes disbelieved in their hardheartedness in vv. 5b-10a, and could just as well have disbelieved in astonishment in 2:11f. It is the very nature of hardheartedness to be amazed—even to glorify God—and to persist in disbelief.

The fourth argument of Taylor is an attempt to establish the theory of insertion on formal rather than mere thematic grounds, but Taylor's basic understanding of form in terms of content undermines the strength of this argument. Actually, formal resemblance can be used as an argument to demonstrate precisely the unity of 2:1-12 rather than the separate identity of vv. 5b-10a. An assumption in Taylor's fourth argument is that vv. 5b-10a as such have the identity of a pronouncement story, but in terms of the narrative pattern these verses have only the formal characteristics of a fragment of a reply-to-the-situation statement (v. 5b), a problem section, and a reply-to-the-problem section. It is difficult to think that these verses in themselves had separate existence in the tradition.

When 2:5b-10a is compared to 2:16f., it becomes apparent that vv. 16f. are not a story as such, but are formally analogous problem and reply-to-the-problem sections. It is more profitable to compare 2:1-12 as a whole with 2:15-17 as a whole.\(^{23}\) Structurally 2:1 resembles 2:15a as setting statements; 2:2 corresponds to 2:15b as material of situation statements. Verses 6f. are parallel to 2:16 as problem sections, and vv. 8-10a and 2:17 are structural counterparts as reply-to-the-problem sections. Such a comparison suggests

\(^{23}\)See below, pp. 351-2.
more the relation of 2:5b-10a to 2:1f. than the separate existence of 2:5b-10a.

Does 2:5b-10a resemble any better 2:18-20? Verses 18-20 resemble more 2:1-12 as a whole formally than just vv. 5b-10a, since v. 18a is structurally a situation statement that corresponds with the lengthy situation statement in vv. 2-4.24 It is possible that Taylor has been influenced by the similarity of content between 2:6 and 2:18a (the use of ἴσοι and the references to opponents), but formally 2:6 is the beginning of a problem section, whereas 2:18a is a situation statement. This particular comparison shows that similar content can appear in different narrative sections and that it is not enough merely to compare the content of narratives. The structural location of the content within the narrative pattern is the decisive thing.

A comparison between 2:5b-10a and 2:23-26 provides even less support for Taylor's fourth argument. Verse 23a presents a setting statement, and v. 25b is a situation statement.25 Structurally these two parts of v. 23 correspond with 2:1-4—material beyond the bounds of vv. 5b-10a. Here again, 2:23-26 more resembles 2:1-12 as a whole than just vv. 5b-10a.

The unity of 2:1-12 is especially suggested by the comparison of vv. 5b-10a with 3:1-6.26 Verse 3:2 is formally parallel with 2:6f., and 3:4-5a is parallel with 2:8-10; but there are many other parallels between 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 as whole narratives, which suggests that 2:1-12 should be seen as a whole narrative instead of a combination of two different sources. Verses 2:1 and 3:1a are formally parallel as setting statements. Verses 2:3f. are

24See below, p. 353.
25See below, p. 355.
26See below, p. 192.
parallel with 3:1b, where both present material of situation statements. Verse 2:5 formally corresponds with 3:3 in that both are reply-to-the-situation statements. It was indicated earlier that 2:6f. is parallel with 3:2, which as a problem section happens to precede the reply-to-the-situation statement in 3:1-6. Verses 8-11 are parallel with 3:4-5a; both are reply-to-the-problem sections. Verse 2:12a corresponds with 3:5b as result statements, and 2:12b with 3:6 as consequence statements. The structural resemblance between 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 can be used to plead for the unity of 2:1-12 rather than for the separate identity of 2:5b-10a. Contrary to Taylor's assertion in his fourth argument, vv. 5b-10a are that portion of 2:1-12 which least resembles the form of the corresponding part in 3:1-6 (because of the inverted problem section); but since there are some formal parallels between vv. 5b-10a and 3:1-6 as indicated above, this fact cannot be used as a new argument for the separate identity of vv. 5b-10a.

The views of two other scholars may be referred to at this point. Grundmann's view that 2:2-5a (plus possibly v. 5b) and vv. 11f. form a complete healing story\(^\text{27}\) is also questionable, since such a story is without problem and reply-to-the-problem sections. The form of 2:1-12 minus vv. 5b-10 would be V2L, and there is no other healing story in Mark's Gospel that has this form. Grundmann's suggestion helps to call attention to the fact that the assumed healing story is an unlikely one in terms of the narrative pattern. Beare's view that 'the controversy-portion of the pericope, accordingly, is an interpolation, which disturbs the structure of the basic miracle-story. . .'\(^\text{28}\) is to be rejected for the same reason. The assumed

\(^{27}\) Grundmann, p. 54.

\(^{28}\) Beare, p. 77.
interpolation contains precisely that material which renders the miracle story structurally credible. Without that material the miracle story does not stand on its own, so far as it concerns Mark's use of the narrative pattern.

Considerable space has been taken to demonstrate that the narrative pattern as a criterion reveals the tenuous character of arguments that have been advanced for the hypothesis that 2:5b-10 is an insertion within 2:1-12. The clarity of the narrative pattern in this story invites reconsideration of this hypothesis, which has been so widely accepted, and suggests that more attention may justifiably be given to thought about the unity of the story. In light of the pattern's clearness, one can assume with little hesitation that the story was a unity for Mark. If a combination of traditions has taken place, it has occurred early enough in the course of tradition so that subsequent narration and composition of the story has removed any structural sign of amalgamation.

A second FPL narrative is the story of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (11:1-10), one of the most carefully constructed narratives in Mark's Gospel. Mark makes a point to have each direction of Jesus faithfully carried out, presumably in respect for the authoritative command of Jesus and in keeping with Mark's concern for an orderly presentation of the material. The point-by-point relationship between Jesus' directions and their fulfilment may be

29With regard to the question of Mark's contribution to the structure of 2:1-12, a formal comparison of 2:1-12 with 3:1-6 as whole narratives with a view to Synoptic agreements may show something about Mark's personal contribution to the form and content of these stories. The fact that Markan vocabulary appears at the beginning of a number of the narrative sections, coupled with the fact that these places are where 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 most agree formally, suggests that Mark had a role in shaping the stories as well as in providing such words as κας, πάλιν, λέγει, and εὐθύς. Cf. Schmidt, R.G.J., pp. 78-9, who sees Mark's redactional work only in the supplying of time and place notes in 2:1 to fill a gap between 1:45 and 2:1.
seen in the following arrangement of the whole narrative:

Set. \{ 1Kat ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα
    εἰς Βηθφαγή κατ Βηθανίαν
    πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαίων

    ἀποστέλλει δόμῳ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ

    2Kat λέγει αὐτοῖς,

Set. \{ 'Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντί ὑμᾶν

Sit. \{ καὶ οὐδὲς εἰςπορευόμενοι εἰς αὐτὴν
    εὐρήσετε πάλιν δεδεμένον
    ἐφ ἀν οὐδές οὖπω ἀνθρώπων ἐκδήθησεν

Sit. \{ λύσατε αὐτὸν
    καὶ φέρετε

Prob. \{ 3Kat ἐὰν τις ὑμῖν εἴη
    Τῇ ποιεῖτε τούτῳ

RepS. \{ εἴπατε

Prob. \{ 4Kat ἀξίθλουν

RepS. \{ καὶ εὐθὺς στὴρεμένοι εἰς αὐτὴν
    λύσασθαι αὐτὸν

Prob. \{ 5Kat τινες τῶν ἐκεῖ ἑστηκότων
    ἐλεγον αὐτοῖς
    λύσατε τὸν πάλιν

RepP. \{ ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει

Cons.? \{ καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὅσε

RepS. \{ 6οὶ δὲ εἰπαν αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἰπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς

Res. \{ καὶ ἀφῆμαν αὐτοῦς

Cons. \{ 7Kat φέρουσιν τὸν πάλιν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν
    καὶ ἐπιβάλλουσιν αὐτῷ τὰ ἵματα αὐτῶν

Cons. \{ 8Kat πολλοὶ τὰ ἵματα αὐτῶν ἐστρώσαν εἰς τὴν ὄδον
    ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδος
    κάθαντες ἐκ τῶν ἁγρῶν

Cons. \{ 9Kat οἱ πρόσγονες
    καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες
    ἔκραταν
        Ἡσαυνά
    Ἐὐλογημένοις ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνυματί κυρίου

    10Εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυὶδ
    Ἡσαυνά ἐν τοῖς ψυκτοῖς.
Verse 11:1a presents information about the setting; and vv. 1b-3, in which Jesus initiates the action of the story, is the situation statement. The reply to the situation is the disciples' response in v. 4. The question of the bystanders in v. 5 is the problem section. Verse 6a, which tells of the disciples' answer, is the reply-to-the-problem section. The permission to take the colt in v. 6b is the formal result statement, and vv. 7-10 present a series of consequence statements, ending with the confessional exclamations in vv. 9b-10. Again, the narrative pattern in its long form is quite clear. Verse 11, though closely related to the action of vv. 1-10, has distinct narrative structure of its own and is discussed later.30

A narrative such as 11:15-19,31 which contains a consequence statement (v. 19) that bears some resemblance to 11:11b, suggests that 11:11 as a whole could be understood as an expanded consequence statement to vv. 1-10. This alternative is a viable possibility; but since 11:11a contains a typical setting statement, and since setting statements conventionally preface stories in Mark's Gospel, it is preferable to regard v. 11 as a brief V2S narrative having distinct literary structure of its own.

If the narrative pattern, as it appears in 11:1-10, is used as a criterion for measuring narrative unity, some question arises about Taylor's view that the story of Jesus' entry contains two stories: the Sending for the Colt (vv. 1-6) and the story about the entry itself (vv. 7-11).32 Verses 1-6 end with a formal result statement in v. 6b, and there is no other narrative in Mark's Gospel that ends just with a result statement. Mark's stories in

30 See below, pp. 410-1.
31 See below, pp. 389-90.
long form, however, do end with consequence statements—sometimes confessional in character—and such a statement is found in vv. 7-10. The additional fact that these verses do not contain the narrative pattern stands against the view that the part about the entry is a story as such. In terms of the narrative pattern vv. 1-10 is the story about the colt and Jesus' ride on it. Only v. 11, which has brief narrative structure of its own, is explicitly a story about Jesus' entry into Jerusalem.

There are two remarkable features in 11:1-10. The first is the meticulous order that is evident in the design of the story. Jesus' directions in the situation statement (vv. 1b-3) are fulfilled in order in the next four narrative sections (vv. 4-6). The orderliness that is apparent in the presentation of ideas is not peculiar to this narrative but is discernible time and again in the Markan stories, and is a characteristic feature of Mark's narrative style. Matthew allows both the narrative pattern and Mark's careful arrangement of details to deteriorate by omitting the problem section, reply-to-the-problem section, and result statement of Mark's account (11:5f.), presumably to make room for the citation of Zechariah 9:9 in Mt. 21:4f. Luke alters the narrative structure of Mark's account by omitting the remark about sending the colt (Mk. 11:3b) and the related result

---

33Cf. Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 295, who considers the repetition of details in 11:4-7 as the style of folklore in that Jesus' prophecy is fulfilled 'exactly as prophesied'. While it is likely that Mark understood Jesus' directions as prophecy in a supernatural sense, the orderly presentation of ideas is not merely an expression of that understanding. As a matter of course, Mark frequently presents ideas in an orderly fashion. The order of ideas, or thematic structure, in the stories of Mark's Gospel is the subject of Part III of this dissertation, and will be discussed at length later. In anticipation of that discussion abedef abedef designations have been placed beside vv. 2-6 on p. 151 above to eliminate the need to duplicate this lengthy narrative. For the sake of space, similar 'ab' designations will be given beside many of the narratives illustrated in Part II of the dissertation, but these designations will not be explained until Part III.
statement (Mk. 11:6b). Luke further departs from Mark's account by placing material related to Mk. 11:9f. within a new narrative (Lk. 19:37-40), giving the impression of turning a Markan consequence statement into a situation statement. Both Matthew and Luke disrupt the order of Mark's account with regard to the narrative pattern as well as to Mark's careful arrangement of details.\(^{34}\)

The second noteworthy feature is the presence of the narrative pattern\(^{35}\) in Jesus' directions in the situation statement in 11:2f., an instance of the pattern within the pattern. This feature of Jesus' sayings containing the pattern appears elsewhere in Mark's Gospel\(^{36}\) and raises the interesting question of whether Jesus Himself used the narrative pattern in His teaching. Adequate treatment of this issue is beyond the scope of this dissertation, but a number of observations in the form of generalizations and conjectures that have arisen from study may be made at this point.

(1) The narrative pattern is evident—sometimes clearly and sometimes in its longest forms—in Jesus' teachings (especially parables) in Q, M, and

\(^{34}\text{Cf. Beare, p. 204. In Mark's carefully written narrative καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτοὺς is without a formal counterpart, if καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ἄδει is read in 11:3b. The fact that each statement in 11:4-6a, leading up to καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτοὺς, fulfills a declaration by Jesus, suggests that 11:6b was also originally understood by Mark as the fulfilment of a statement by Jesus. If so, the original reading for 11:3b will be found among those readings that do not contain πᾶλιν and therefore present the phrase as a consequence of Jesus' words, rather than as a part of His reply to the anticipated question, τί ποιέστε τοῦτο. Cf. Taylor's discussion of the variant readings, G.M., p. 454, and also his defense of πᾶλιν in spite of important manuscript evidence for its omission. Here is an instance where an understanding of structure may help to solve a problem of textual criticism.}

\(^{35}\)The form is either FPL or FPS, depending on whether one considers the original phrase about sending the colt in 11:3b to have been without πᾶλιν and therefore a consequence statement. If πᾶλιν is original, the form of the pattern is FPS.

\(^{36}\)See below, Mk. 6:10f., 10:32d-34, 13:5-37, 14:13-15, pp. 386, 253, 415-21, 392, respectively.
where Matthew and Luke in comparison with Mark tend to present the pattern in its shortest forms and in lesser degrees of purity. One can

In Q the pattern is apparent in Jesus' directions in the sending of the seventy (Lk. 10:8-12 [FPS]), in the story of the unclean spirit (Mt. 12: 43-45; Lk. 11:24-26 [FPL]), the parable of the faithful steward (Mt. 24:45-51; Lk. 12:42-46 [FPS]), the sayings about the narrow door (Lk. 13:23b-29 [FPL]), the parable of the great banquet (Lk. 14:15-24 [FPL]; cf. Mt. 22:1-10), and the parable of the lost sheep (Mt. 18:12-14; Lk. 15:4-7 [V2L]). Luke's accounts are more apt to have the pattern than Matthew's. When the accounts of both Matthew and Luke contain the pattern, it tends to be clearer in Luke's passages.

In M the pattern is evident in the parable of the weeds (Mt. 13:24-30 [FPS]), the parable of the hidden treasure (13:44 [V2S]), the parable of the pearl of great price (13:45 [V2S]), the parable of the net (13:47-50 [V2S]), the parable of the unforgiving servant (18:23-25 [FPS apparent twice]), the parable of the laborers in the vineyard (20:1-6 [FPS]), and the parable of the marriage feast (22:11-14 [FPS]).

In L the pattern is discernible in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10:30-35 [V2S]), the sayings about the friend at midnight (11:5-8 [V2S]), the parable of the rich fool (12:16-21 [FPS]), teachings on humility (14:8f. [V2L]; 14:10 [V2L]), the parables of the lost sheep (15:4-7 [V1L]) and lost coin (15:8-10 [V1L]), the parable of the unjust steward (16:1-9 [FPL]), the parable of the unjust judge (18:2-5 [V2S]), the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector (18:10-14 [V2L]), and the parable of the pounds (19:12-27 [FPS]).

It should be understood that in all these passages from Q, M, and L, the pattern appears in varying degrees of clarity and completeness. Sometimes the pattern in Jesus' teachings lacks a setting statement.

Examples of M narratives that contain brief forms of the pattern are the disciples' question about the Pharisees (Mt. 15:12-14 [V2S]), Pilate's washing of his hands (27:24f. [V2L]), the guard at the tomb (27:62-66 [V2L]), the bribing of the soldiers (28:11-15 [V2L]), and the command to baptize (28:16-20 [V2S]). Some L narratives with brief forms of the pattern are the story of the widow's son at Nain (Lk. 7:11-17 [V2L]), the return of the seventy (10:17-20 [V2S]), the blessedness of Jesus' mother (11:27f. [V2S]), the departure from Galilee (13:31-33 [V2S]), the approach to Jerusalem (19:37-40 [V2S]), and Jesus' weeping over Jerusalem (19:41-44 [V2S]).

Examples of M narratives where the pattern lacks clarity in a non-Markan fashion are the healing of two blind men (Mt. 9:27-31), the healing of a dumb demoniac (9:32-34), healings in the Temple (21:14-16) and the death of Judas (27:3-10). Examples of L narratives here are the rejection at Nazareth (Lk. 4:16-30), the miraculous catch of fish (5:1-11), the woman with the ointment (7:36-50), and the ministering women (8:1-3)—to list just a few.

One could also include here the many instances where Matthew and Luke abbreviate or alter the pattern in their parallels to Markan narratives. Reference will be made to some of these alterations from time to time in this part of the dissertation in the course of illustrating the pattern in the Gospel of Mark.

assume that Matthew and Luke, who were not inclined to present the pattern clearly and fully in Q and their own special material, were also not inclined to cast Jesus' teachings according to the pattern, so that when it appears with some clarity and fullness in Jesus' teaching in Q, M, and L, one can assume further that either Jesus Himself used the pattern, or that certain of His teachings were developed according to the pattern at some early stage in the tradition.

(2) The narrative pattern is evident in significant stories of the Old Testament,\(^39\) which makes it credible that Jesus learned and used this traditional pattern in His teaching through familiarity with the Scriptures.

(3) It is also possible that the Evangelists' use of the pattern stems from familiarity with the Scriptures rather than from any use Jesus might have made of the traditional pattern. In either case the stories of the Old Testament instead of Hellenistic culture or situations in the early Church may be seen as the fundamental Sitz im Leben of the structure of both Jesus' teaching and the Gospel narratives, especially those in Mark's Gospel, for Mark is the Evangelist who presents the pattern with the greatest regularity and fewest aberrations.

(4) It is more likely, however, that the use of the pattern in the early Church was conditioned by a number of factors: (a) cultural familiarity with the narration style of certain Old Testament stories; (b) Jesus' probable use of the traditional pattern in His teaching, particularly in His parables; and (c) interest in the Scriptures after the death of Jesus to understand His Messiahship and explain His death,\(^40\) an interest which no

\(^39\)See below, pp. 436-70.

\(^40\)See Acts 17:2f. See below, p. 465, n. 536.
That there was also a personal factor is suggested by Mark's regular use of the pattern and his orderly treatment of thematic structure. In comparison with Matthew and Luke, Mark seems to have been the Evangelist most interested in telling his stories in an orderly fashion; and the pattern in its flexibility suited his interest.

Mark's special interest in an orderly arrangement of his content within stories makes it especially difficult to judge whether the narrative pattern, when it appears in sayings of Jesus in Mark's Gospel, is to be attributed to Jesus or to Mark. It remains possible that Jesus used the pattern, and that the directions in Mk. 11:2f. reflect His use of it; but the order that is apparent in Mark's presentation of Jesus' directions and their fulfilment suggests that the clarity of the pattern in Jesus' directions is to be attributed to the redactional work of Mark in his composition of the story.41

---

41 The meticulous order that is apparent in 11:1-10 calls attention to that part of the Papias tradition which claims that Mark wrote 'accurately' what he remembered of the things said and done by the Lord, and also to the remark of Papias that Mark 'made it his one care to omit nothing that he heard ...'. See Taylor, G.M., p. 2. During the past one hundred years preoccupation with the questions of chronological order and connection between narratives has eclipsed the presence of considerable order of thought within Mark's narratives. Both the narrative pattern and thematic structure are evidence of such internal order and care in the composition of the stories. Though Mark's use of Greek is unsophisticated in comparison with Luke's, the order of thought in the Markan narratives witnesses both to an intelligent interest in design and to careful workmanship. Cf. the view of Étienne Trocmé, La formation de l'évangile selon Marc (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963), pp. 56-8, that Mark was a rustic writer who wrote without variety and casually. See also H. R. Rigg, Jr., 'Papias on Mark', Novum Testamentum, I (1956), 161-183. Rigg's suggestion that τάξει was originally τάξει prompts interest in the carefulness and accuracy of Mark's account, but apparently to support the order (arrangement) of Mark's Gospel (p. 170). No direct reference is made to internal evidence of order of thought within Mark's narratives. See further below, p. 511.
A third narrative that illustrates the long form of the Full Pattern is the story of the death of Jesus (15:33-41):

Set. \(3^3\) καὶ γενομένης ὡρας ἐκτης

Sit. \[3^4\] καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὡρᾳ ἔθισαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς τῆς γυναῖκος ἑαυτοῦ ἐς τῇ ἐνατῇ ὡρᾳ ἐκτης

RepS. \[3^5\] καὶ τοῖς τῶν παρεστάτων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον

Prob. \[3^6\] δρόμῳ δὲ τις καὶ γεμίσας σάρκι ἔδωκεν περιθεῖς καλῶς ἐπτύτητες αὐτῶν λέγων

RepP. \[3^7\] καὶ Ἰησοῦς ἀφεῖς φωνήν εἰς τὸν καθελεύτα αὐτῶν

Res. \[3^8\] εἴξεπνευσεν

Cons. \[4^0\] ἤσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρὸθεν θεωροῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαριὰ καὶ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσὴφος μήτηρ καὶ Σαλώμη

\[4^1\] ἢ ἰδέτε ήν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαϊᾷ ἡκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναφάσαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα.

The note about the sixth hour in v. 33a is the setting statement, and the
reference to the darkness in v. 33b is the situation statement. Jesus' cry in v. 34 is a formal reply-to-the-situation statement, which suggests that His cry was understood by Mark as partly a reaction to the darkness. Verses 35f. present the problem section, in which the sponge is offered to Jesus. The phrase about Jesus' loud cry in v. 37a is the formal reply to the problem, standing in contrast with Jesus' many authoritative commands that occur in corresponding locations in the reply-to-the-problem sections of other narratives. In v. 37b the mere verb, indicating that Jesus expired, is the result statement, similarly standing in contrast with those result statements at corresponding locations in other narratives where the direct effects of Jesus' commands are briefly told. Verses 38-41 are a lengthy consequence section, which consists of essentially three statements: (1) the reference to the rending of the curtain (v. 38); (2) the confessional remark of the centurion who witnessed the death of Jesus (v. 39); and (3) the comments about the women who witnessed Jesus' death from afar (vv. 40f.). Once again, the long form of the Full Pattern is evident with some clarity.

Three issues are of interest concerning the structure of this story: (1) the formal identity of the story; (2) the disruption of the pattern in Luke's Gospel; and (3) the form of Mk. 15:35f.

(1) If the narrative pattern is a valid criterion for determining the limits of narratives, the presence of the pattern in 15:33-41 is an indication that these verses are a narrative unit. Presumably Mark, whose other narratives consistently manifest the pattern in its various forms, also regarded 15:33-41 as a narrative in itself. If these assumptions, which arise from the pattern, are sound, there is some question about Taylor's view

42 The offering of the drink in the problem section gives the impression that Mark considered the act hostile.
that 15:21-41 is one narrative that 'consists of short separate scenes strung together in rapid succession'.\textsuperscript{43} In terms of the narrative pattern vv. 21-41 are structurally not one narrative but three: 15:22-24 (FPL), 25-32 (V1L), and 33-41 (FPL); and these stories are not the 'scenes' which Taylor envisages. It is true that the pattern is not as clear in 15:22-24 and 25-32 as it is in vv. 33-41,\textsuperscript{44} but the pattern is evident nonetheless. The presence of the pattern separately in 15:22-24, 25-32, and 33-41 speaks for the individual identity of these stories and weighs against the hypothesis that portions of these stories originally constituted a foundation narrative. It is significant that Taylor's proposed foundation narrative of the Crucifixion story (15:21-24, 26, 29f., 34-7, 39)\textsuperscript{45} does not, as a composite whole, manifest the narrative pattern.\textsuperscript{46} It is reasonable to assume that early attempts to tell about the Crucifixion would have conformed to the pattern to some extent, particularly if the pattern were culturally a traditional pattern and thereby an accepted manner of narration. Taylor's hypothetical narrative, consisting of a string of selected traditions, is somewhat amorphous and structurally does not resemble the narratives in the Gospels.


\begin{itemize}
  \item Taylor, G.M., p. 587.
  \item See below, pp. 199-200, 295-7.
  \item Taylor, G.M., pp. 587, 651, and 661f.
  \item The pattern is discernible in vv. 34-7, 39, but its presence here is readily explained as a consequence of its presence in vv. 33-41.
\end{itemize}
(v. 46a) becomes a reply to a consequence statement in the hands of Luke. Mark's sensitivity to the narrative pattern is made more evident by these departures from the pattern in Luke's parallel account. Matthew's parallel to the story of the death of Jesus (Mt. 27:45-56) for the most part retains the pattern. The form of Mark's problem section is lost, however, by Matthew's revision in vv. 48f., an alteration which has the effect of turning v. 49 into a reply-to-the-problem section. The retention of the pattern in Matthew's account may be seen as a consequence of his close verbal agreement with Mark. Matthew's special material in vv. 51-54 heightens the consequence section but does not disturb the pattern.

(3) The form of vv. 35f. in Mark's story of Jesus' death is interesting, for v. 36 is structurally parallel to v. 35, as can be readily seen in the following arrangement of the two verses:

\[
\text{καὶ τίνες τῶν παρεστῶν ἀκούσαντες} \quad \text{δραμὼν δὲ τὴς}
\]
\[
\text{καὶ γεμίσαις στόμοις δέως}
\]
\[
\text{περὶ βεβαίως καλῶς}
\]
\[
\text{ἐπάντισθεν αὐτῶν}
\]
\[
\text{ἐξευθύνων}
\]
\[
\text{Ἀφεῖτε}
\]
\[
\text{ὕλας καθελεῖν αὐτὸν (v. 36).}
\]

The parallel order of thought, or structure, of these two verses is another manifestation of Mark's characteristic orderliness. The structure of v. 35 appears to be the model for the structure of v. 36. Such parallel form makes it difficult to accept the view that v. 36a is an insertion within vv. 35 + 36b.\footnote{See C. E. B. Cranfield, The Gospel According to Saint Mark (hereafter cited as Saint Mark; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1959), p. 459. Taylor, G.M., p. 595, and Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 429, think only of a combination of traditions, without saying explicitly that v. 36a is an insertion. Cf. J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Marci (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1903), p. 140, who regarded v. 36a as an interruption of vv. 35 and 36b, which supposedly were inverted.} In its present form v. 36a does not have the appearance of an
insertion but is a necessary first member of the parallelism between the two verses. The excision of v. 36a clearly destroys the parallelism. It remains possible that several traditions have been combined, particularly if the person who offered Jesus the sponge were a Roman soldier who would not have understood the reference of Jewish bystanders to Elijah; but if a combination of traditions has taken place, it has become obscured by the parallel form of the two verses in Mark's account. This parallelism suggests, through the correspondence of τις with τινὲς, that the person who offered the sponge was one of the bystanders. The difficulty with this interpretation is that it requires that a Jewish bystander had access to Roman posca, if the vinegar were posca.

Before a presentation of a fourth narrative that contains the long form of the Full Pattern, it is instructive to call attention to the structural resemblance of the three narratives that have been illustrated. The thematic similarities of their narrative sections may be seen in the italicized and Greek portions of the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2:1-12 (P)</th>
<th>11:1-10 (S)</th>
<th>15:33-41 (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set.</strong></td>
<td>Place &amp; time reference</td>
<td>Place reference</td>
<td>Time reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sit.</strong></td>
<td>Preaching to crowd</td>
<td>Speaking to disciples</td>
<td>Darkness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing of paralytic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RepS.</strong></td>
<td>Sayings of Jesus</td>
<td>Disciples' response</td>
<td>Saying of Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prob.</strong></td>
<td>τινὲς</td>
<td>τινὲς</td>
<td>τινὲς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RepP.</strong></td>
<td>Sayings of Jesus</td>
<td>Reference to His saying</td>
<td>Reference to His cry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Res.</strong></td>
<td>Raised</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cons.</strong></td>
<td>Reference to God</td>
<td>Reference to followers</td>
<td>Reference to followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference to the Lord</td>
<td>Ref. to Son of God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The structural resemblance of these three narratives is striking. What is important is not that there are thematic similarities but that these similarities occur at corresponding locations and that the order of these similarities is therefore the same in each narrative.\textsuperscript{48} Such structural resemblance is especially of interest, since 2:1-12 is often regarded as a narrative from a pre-Markan complex (2:1-3:6)\textsuperscript{49} and 15:33-41 belongs to the Passion Narrative, which is also generally regarded as a pre-Markan formation, whose narratives are essentially different from those in the rest of Mark's Gospel.\textsuperscript{50} Only 11:1-10 is attributed to Mark with some confidence.\textsuperscript{51} The structural similarity of the three narratives suggests that, contrary to popular assumptions about the pre-Markan character of two of the stories, the composition of the three stories, as they now exist in Mark's Gospel, is to be attributed to the work of one writer, presumably Mark himself. It is difficult to think that three stories of separate origin would have such similar structure, unless one person, who worked with consistency and regularity, were somewhat responsible for the shaping and composition of these stories. The presence of similar features in most of the narrative sections is a strong indication that Mark bore some responsibility for the narrative

\textsuperscript{48}It should be noted, however, that the reference to the Son of God precedes the reference to the followers in 15:33-41.

\textsuperscript{49}See Albertz, p. 5. Cf. Wilfred L. Knox, \textit{The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, I, St Mark}, ed. H. Chadwick (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953, pp. 8f., 11. See also Taylor, G.M. pp. 91f., who considers Mark to have been the compiler of the complex before he wrote his Gospel. Taylor in 'Mark's Use of Gospel Tradition', \textit{Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Bulletin III} (Oxford: The Oxonian Press Ltd, 1952), p. 33, expresses the view that Mark possibly composed 2:1-3:6 in the fifties and later copied himself in the sixties when he wrote his Gospel.

\textsuperscript{50}For example, see Nineham, \textit{Saint Mark}, pp. 365f.

\textsuperscript{51}See Taylor, G.M., pp. 452f.
structure of each of the three stories and was more than a compiler who merely supplied editorial links at the seams of his stories that were formed before him.52

The formal similarity of the three FPL stories also shows that there is sometimes no essential difference in structure between a pronouncement story and stories about Jesus. It is evident on the one hand that two stories about Jesus do have recognizable structure and on the other hand that the structure of a pronouncement story is not distinctive. What is true here is true time and again elsewhere in other stories about Jesus and pronouncement stories, as will be demonstrated in forthcoming illustrations of the narrative pattern in its various forms.

There is a fourth story that contains the long form of the Full Pattern, the story of the burial of Jesus (15:42-47). The long form of the Full Pattern is not so clear in this story, as can be seen in the following illustration:

52As is well known, the view of Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 3, that the Gospel writers were primarily collectors and 'only to the smallest extent authors', has been rejected by Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist, pp. 15, 18-9, who prefers to regard Mark as an individual author (p. 18), who shaped tradition into a whole Gospel from a particular point of view (p. 21). Marxsen's view of Mark as an author nevertheless carries with it the assumption that the Passion Narrative and certain complexes existed in the tradition before Mark (p. 19). Presumably Mark played less of a role in the shaping of this material than he did in his redaction of 'anonymous individual traditions' (ibid.). The structural similarity of 2:1-12, 11:1-10, and 15:33-41 suggests, however, that Mark was somewhat responsible for the literary structure of certain stories that supposedly belong to pre-Markan groups. Marxsen's conception of Mark's authorship also allows Mark to have been the provider of editorial links or framework for stories in his Gospel. In this respect Marxsen's conception of Mark's editorial work has not progressed much beyond that of Schmidt. But Marxsen differs considerably from Schmidt in considering the framework to include any 'textual transformation' (p. 23) and in regarding this broader framework as significant for understanding its Sitz im Leben. For a recent study of the Markan seams to inquire positively about Mark's view of Jesus, see Ernest Best, The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, No. 2 (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1965), pp. 63-102.
There is no question about the setting statement in v. 42, the situation statement in v. 43, or the consequence statements in vv. 46f.; but there is some question about the reply-to-the-situation statement. Does it consist of vv. 44f. in their entirety? If so, the form of the pattern is V2L rather than FPL. Matthew's abbreviated parallel to this story (Mt. 27:57-61) is in V2L form, where the reply-to-the-situation statement is merely a brief reference to Pilate's command (v. 58b). It is possible, however, that the reply-to-the-situation statement in Mark's account consists only of 15:44a, for Pilate's questioning of the centurion is like several other problem sections;\(^{53}\)

\(^{53}\)See above, pp. 70-1.
the statement in 15:45a is an indication that a reply to Pilate's question was given, without presenting the reply itself; and v. 45b is conceivably a result statement. If this interpretation is valid, 15:42-47 may be seen as a FPL narrative that is close to being a V2L narrative through abbreviation. Whether the form of the pattern is to be understood as FPL or V2L, the pattern is there nonetheless in both Mark's and Matthew's versions of the story.

The matter is different, however, with Luke's account (Lk. 23:30-56). Luke substantially disturbs the pattern by placing after the situation statement (v. 52) what was for Mark a consequence statement: Joseph's act of putting Jesus in the tomb (v. 53; cf. Mk. 15:46). It will be recalled that Luke disrupted the pattern in a similar fashion in the previous story about the death of Jesus by locating immediately after the situation statement (Lk. 23:44b-45a) the reference to the rending of the curtain (v. 45b). The resultant form of Luke's account of Jesus' burial is a situation statement plus a consequence statement—a non-pattern form so far as it concerns the pattern that is evident in the Markan narratives. Another alteration by Luke is his turning the statement about the women—a consequence statement for Mark—into a brief V2S narrative by placing in v. 54 the setting statement about the day of preparation and presenting the women's return to prepare spices as a consequence statement (v. 56).

It seems that when the full form of the pattern was not clear in Mark's account, Matthew abbreviated his version to V2L form by reading Mk. 15:44f. as Pilate's reply and abbreviating that; and Luke altered the pattern radically in the direction just described. Mark's sensitivity to the pattern is especially evident in comparison with these alterations by Luke.

The four narratives that have been presented illustrate the long form
of the Full Pattern in regular form complete with result statements. There are some FPL narratives in regular form without result statements, and one of these narratives is the story about Jesus' Transfiguration (9:2-8):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \text{\textsuperscript{2}Kat} \ \text{μετά ήμέρας ἔξ} \\
& \quad \text{παραλαμβάνει ὁ 'Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον} \\
& \quad \text{κατ' τὸν 'Ἰδωμαβον} \\
& \quad \text{κατ' τὸν 'Ιωάννην} \\
& \quad \text{κατ' ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὅρος ὑψιλὸν κατ' ἱόλαν μόνους} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \text{κατ' ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὅρος ὑψιλὸν κατ' ἱόλαν μόνους} \\
\text{RepS.} & \quad \text{κατ' Ἰακώβου συλλαλοῦντες τῷ 'Ἰησοῦ} \\
\text{Prob.} & \quad \text{τῇ Ἰησοῦ} \\
& \quad \text{'Ραββί} \\
& \quad \text{καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς δόει εἶναι} \\
& \quad \text{κατ' επὶ τῆς γῆς ὦ ὑπναί συν αὐτῶς λευκάναι} \\
& \quad \text{sit} \ \text{μίαν} \\
& \quad \text{κατ' Ἰωάννη} \ \text{μίαν} \\
\text{6ού γὰρ ἦδει τῇ ἀποκριθή} \\
& \quad \text{ἐπιφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο} \\
\text{7οτὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιαζόμενη αὐτοῖς} \\
\text{RepP.} & \quad \κατ' ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης} \\
& \quad \text{οὐδές ἔστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου} \\
& \quad \text{ὁ ἀγαπητός} \\
& \quad \text{ἀκούσει αὐτοῦ} \\
\text{Cons.} & \quad \text{ἐξαίτηνα περιβλεψάμενοι} \\
& \quad \text{οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον} \\
& \quad \text{ἄλλα τὸν 'Ἰησοῦν μόνου μεθ' ἑαυτῶν.}
\end{align*}
\]

This story is a most difficult one to interpret, and consideration of the many problems of interpretation relating to the six days, the transformation of Jesus, the appearance of Elijah and Moses, the booths, the cloud, and the message from the cloud, are beyond the province of this dissertation. The purpose of the present discussion is to describe the literary structure of
the narrative as it now stands in Mark's Gospel, and the structure of this story conforms to the narrative pattern. The reference to six days and to Jesus' ascent with three disciples to a high mountain is the setting statement in v. 2a. His transformation in vv. 2b-3 is the situation statement. It is possible that the presence of Elijah and Moses (v. 4) is also regarded as part of the situation. If so, the story lacks a reply-to-the-situation statement and the form of the pattern is VIL rather than FPL. The reference to Elijah's and Moses' speaking to Jesus suggests, however, that the verse is better understood as the reply-to-the-situation statement. Verses 5f., which tell of Peter's inappropriate reaction, are the problem section. One should not be misled by the use of ἀποκρίνεται at the beginning of the problem section and think that this section is the reply-to-the-situation statement. The remarks of Peter are clearly problematical in character, manifesting fear and a lack of understanding, as is indicated explicitly in the comment in v. 6. The voice from the cloud and its message constitutes the reply-to-the-problem section in v. 8. One expects a reply from Jesus at this point, such as that given by Matthew in Mt. 17:7, for Jesus is the one who responds in so many of Mark's reply-to-the-problem sections. It is therefore tempting to think that at some stage in the tradition the content of v. 7 replaced an earlier reply of Jesus to Peter's remark. Verse 8, which tells of the sudden absence of unusual phenomena and Jesus' lone presence, is the consequence statement.

Mark's form of the pattern appears in the accounts of Matthew and Luke in spite of their developments of the story. The pattern is altered a little by Matthew, however, at the place where he presents material of his own in Mt. 17:7. Here Matthew tells of Jesus' reply to the fearful disciples, and so adds a reply section before the last consequence statement (Mt. 17:8).
Matthew also omits the comment about Peter's lack of understanding in Mark's problem section, but this omission does not alter the pattern. Luke's additions also do not disturb the pattern. His reference to the disciples' fear in entering the cloud (Lk. 9:34b) is an elaboration that blurs the line between Peter's remarks and the voice from the cloud in Mark's account, but the pattern is not changed by this development.

The story of Jesus' Transfiguration has often been thought of as a Resurrection story,\(^5^4\) and it is interesting that another FPL narrative in regular form without a result statement is Mark's story of the Resurrection (16:1-8):

\[^{54}\text{See Bultmann, } H.S.T., \text{ p. 259, and Taylor, } G.M., \text{ p. 387.}\]
In this story the brief note about the Sabbath in v. 1a is the setting statement; and the passage about the women, which includes their purchase of spices, their coming to the tomb, and their question about the stone (vv. 1b-3), is the situation statement. There is some question whether v. 4 is a reply-to-the-situation statement, since it neither contains sayings nor refers to any. For this reason it is tempting to think of the women's question about the stone in v. 3 as the reply-to-the-situation statement. Several factors discourage this possibility, however: (1) statements and questions are not uncommon in other situation statements;\textsuperscript{55} (2) reply-to-the-situation statements do not always contain sayings;\textsuperscript{56} and (3) the question of the women is in effect answered by the rolling away of the stone, which has already taken place. Verse 4, in telling of this answer to the women's question, may with some justification be regarded as the reply-to-the-situation statement. There is little doubt that v. 5, which refers to the amazement of the women, is the problem section; and vv. 5-7, in which the young man responds to their amazement, is clearly the reply-to-the-problem

\textsuperscript{55}See above, pp. 51-3.

\textsuperscript{56}See above, pp. 54-5, 62, 64.
section. The reference to the women's flight from the tomb and frightened silence in v. 8 is patently a consequence statement.

The clarity of the pattern in Mark's account becomes further apparent when one looks at Matthew's and Luke's versions of the story (Mt. 28:1-10; Lk. 23:56b-24:11). Matthew minimizes the situation statement about the women (28:1b) and heightens the reply-to-the-situation statement about the rolling away of the stone by making elaborate references to the angel of the Lord (vv. 2ff.). Here Matthew makes explicit in a reply-to-the-situation statement what is implicit in the reply-to-the-situation statement in Mark's account—the rolling away of the stone—and actually makes the pattern clearer at this point. The matter is different, however, as Matthew's story progresses. Those guarding the tomb become the subject of the problem section (v. 4); and the reply-to-the-problem section which follows (vv. 5-7) is awkwardly addressed to the women. The pattern becomes particularly diffuse at the end of Matthew's account when a reference is made to the appearance of Jesus in vv. 9-10. This brief passage does not manifest the pattern and appears unexpectedly after the consequence statement in v. 8. Such a structural postscript does not follow the pattern anywhere in Mark's Gospel.

The pattern is less apparent in Luke's version of the story. The sense of a reply to the situation is lost through the absence in Lk 24:1b-2 of either a question by the women to prompt a reply (as in Mark's account) or a reference to the rolling of the stone by the angel of the Lord (as in Matthew's version). There is no clearly defined problem section with the early reference to two men in v. 4b and with a second reference to the women's fear in v. 5a. Like Matthew, Luke adds a postscript in vv. 10f after the consequence statement in vv. 8f., and so goes beyond the pattern at this point. This addition differs from Matthew's sequel and calls to mind Mark's
statement in 15:41 about the women who followed Jesus and witnessed the Crucifixion. It is significant that the pattern is clearest in Mark's account, for its clarity is additional evidence of Mark's sensitivity to the pattern. It is not his pattern exclusively, but he tells his stories according to it with the greatest regularity.

It is also significant that the pattern is complete in Mark's story of the Resurrection. The presence of the Full Pattern in long form, lacking only a result statement but having a consequence statement, dispels any thoughts about the story's being incomplete structurally. In terms of the narrative pattern the story is not truncated. It is structurally complete with a consequence statement, whether or not ἔφοβοσκόντο γὰρ is a suitable ending. On that matter ἔφοβοσκόντο γὰρ is rhythmically parallel to ἐὰς ἔρχετο γὰρ αὐτῶς τρόμος καὶ ἕκτασμας and is a suitable ending so far as the thematic structure of the verse is concerned.57

If the narrative is structurally complete, Mark's Gospel seems incomplete, for the reply-to-the-problem section anticipates an appearance of Jesus in Galilee (v. 7).58 It is unlike Mark to leave strings untied in his narratives, and it is possible to assume with some caution that the reference to a subsequent appearance in Galilee implies both that Mark believed that such an appearance took place and that a story about this appearance was at least planned, if not written and lost. The fact that no

57 Analogous rhythmical endings are found in 15:20b-21 and 1:12f. See below, pp. 396, 379.

58 Cf. Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 285. Bultmann thinks that old tradition told of a flight to Galilee and the appearance of Jesus there, but makes the elaborate suggestion that v. 7 was an addition made by Mark 'to have the disciples artificially dispatched to Galilee' (ibid.) to harmonize a later tradition with the old tradition, which was replaced because the disciples had actually remained in Jerusalem (pp. 285f.).
Galilean appearance is mentioned in Mk. 16:9-20 may be an indication that Mark himself did not compose these verses.

It is significant, too, that the structure of 16:1-8 is not unique.\(^\text{59}\) In being a FPL narrative in regular form without a result statement, the story of the Resurrection is structurally like a number of other stories (9:2-8, 11:12-14, 12:28-34, 14:43-52) and is at the same time not much different formally from the FPL narratives that have result statements. In this respect the literary structure of 16:1-8 provides little support for the theory that 9:2-8 is a Resurrection story. These stories share a structure that is found in various stories that deal with widely different topics.

In connection with the question whether Mark anticipated a sequel to 16:1-8, it is interesting that the story of the cursing of the fig tree (11:12-14), which has a sequel in 11:20-25, has the same structure as 16:1-8—the long form of the Full Pattern without a result statement:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{12\text{Καὶ τῇ ἐκαύριον} \\
& \quad \text{ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Βηθανίας}\}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sit.} & \quad \text{ἐπείνασεν}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RepS.} & \quad \{13\text{καὶ ἔδως συκῆν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν} \\
& \quad \text{ἐχοῦσαν φύλλα} \\
& \quad \text{ἥληςεν εἰ ἄρα τι εὐρήσει ἐν αὐτῇ}\}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Prob.} & \quad \{\text{καὶ ἔλθος ἐπὶ αὐτήν} \\
& \quad \text{οὐδὲν εὑρεν} \\
& \quad \text{εἰ μὴ φύλλα}\}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cons.} & \quad \{\text{ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων}\}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RepP.} & \quad \{14\text{καὶ ἀποκρίθης} \\
& \quad \text{εἰπεν αὐτῇ} \\
& \text{Μὴκετι εἰς τῶν αἰῶνα} \\
& \text{ἐκ σοῦ μὴδες καρπὸν φάγοι}\}
\end{align*}
\]

\[^{59}\text{Cf. Taylor, C.M., p. 602, who believes that 16:1-8 is quite different from the Passion Narrative in character and content.}\]
It is hazardous to view the sequel in 11:20-25 as an argument for an assumed sequel to 16:1-8; the sequel in 11:20-25 only supports the possibility of a sequel to 16:1-8. What was just said about the structural similarity between 16:1-8 and 9:2-8 applies here as well concerning the structural similarity between 16:1-8 and 11:12-14. Arguments from structure at this point are of limited value inasmuch as these stories share a form of the pattern that is found in other stories.

What is important is the clarity of the pattern in 11:12-14. The reference to the next day and to Bethany in v. 12a is the setting statement. The mere statement in v. 12b that Jesus was hungry is the situation statement. Jesus' going to the tree to see if it had fruit is His nonverbal response to the situation (v. 13a). Verse 13b tells of the absence of fruit and is the problem section, which includes also the comment that it was not the season for figs. This comment is reminiscent of the comment about Peter's fear and lack of understanding at a corresponding location in 9:2-8 (v. 6).60 There is no result statement; its absence may reflect Mark's anticipation of the sequel in 11:20-25. The brief indication in v. 14b that the disciples heard is the consequence statement and also anticipates 11:20-25.61

Only Matthew has a parallel to this story (Mt. 21:18-22), which is parallel both to Mark 11:12-14 and to its sequel in 11:20-25, for Jesus' cursing of the tree and subsequent teaching are combined in Matthew's version. This combination results in a departure from the pattern, for Jesus' reply in vv. 21f. is a reply to the disciples' amazement in the consequence statement in v. 20. It is not Mark's practice to present replies to consequence state-

60Cf. the location of the comment about the size of the stone in the reply-to-the-situation statement in 16:1-8 (v. 4), p. 169 above.

61See Taylor, C.M., p. 460.
The clarity of the pattern in Mk. 11:12-14 shows that this story is structurally a narrative in itself. Its structural identity is not dependent on 11:20-25, which also has the pattern (V1S) and is likewise a self-contained story so far as narrative structure is concerned. The pattern in both places suggests that Mark regarded the cursing of the tree and its sequel as two stories rather than as two parts of one story. Bultmann's view that 11:12-14 originally ended with v. 20 is doubtful if Mark's use of the pattern mirrors any earlier use of the pattern, for v. 20 in its present form is a typical setting statement and situation statement but not a conventional consequence statement.

A fourth FPL narrative in regular form without a result statement is the story of Jesus' arrest (14:43-52), which is regarded by many scholars as a compilation:

Set. {καὶ εὐθὺς ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος

\[\text{παραγίνεται Ἰσδᾶς} \]

\[\text{ἐξ τῶν δώδεκα} \]

\[\text{καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ἕξιλων} \]

\[\text{παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερεῶν} \]

\[\text{καὶ τῶν γραμματέων} \]

\[\text{καὶ τῶν πρεσβύτερων} \]

Sit. 

62 Cf. Taylor, ibid., who asserts that Matthew's account is briefer. Matthew's material may be more economical in places, but his form of the pattern is extended through his addition of the result statement and especially the reply to the consequence statement. For an understanding of Matthew's differences it is not enough merely to make comparative judgements about content and style; it is necessary to consider differences in narrative structure. The narrative pattern provides a useful criterion for studying these structural differences.

63 See below, pp. 364-6.


65 Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 218.
The opening phrase with εὐθὺς and a reference to Jesus' speaking (14:43a) is a temporal setting statement. Judas' appearance with the armed crowd (v. 43b) is the situation statement, and his instructions in v. 44 are presented as his verbal response to the situation. His approach to Jesus and kiss (v. 45), the arrest of Jesus (v. 46), and the violent severing of the ear of the high priest's servant (v. 47), together make up the problem section. Jesus' sayings
in vv. 48f. are clearly His reply to the problem. There is some question whether v. 47 about the severing of the ear belongs to the problem section, for it is possible to regard the action of the bystander as an impulsive, nonverbal response to the arrest. The form of the pattern is not changed if v. 47 belongs to the reply-to-the-problem section. Both the hostile character of the act and the indefinite identity of the one who performs it suggest, however, that v. 47 is part of the problem section. The flight of presumably all the disciples in 14:50 is a consequence section, and the brief remark about the flight of a naked young man is also presented as a consequence statement.

Matthew's and Luke's differences are structural as well as verbal. The most conspicuous alteration of the pattern in Matthew's account (Mt. 26:47-56) is his fracture of the problem section and proliferation of the reply-to-the-problem section. Mark's problem section consists of three 'moments': the kiss of Judas, the arrest, and the severing of the servant's ear. In Matthew's story the first moment is separated from the second and third by a reply of Jesus in v. 50a. The second and third moments are presented together in vv. 50b-51 and are followed first by a reply of Jesus (vv. 52-54) to the third moment (the severing of the ear) and then by a reply of Jesus (vv. 55-56a) to the second moment (the arrest).

Luke's changes are more extensive in his version of the story (Lk. 22: 47-53). The approach of Judas (problem moment #1 for Mark) becomes a situation statement in v. 47b. Jesus' reply to Judas becomes a reply-to-the-situation statement in v. 48. The question about the use of the sword (v. 49) and the severing of the ear in v. 50 (problem moment #3 for Mark) make up the

---

66 Cf. v. 47 with the problem sections with τίνες, pp. 66-7 above. See also the use of εἶς in 9:17f., p. 73 above, and in 5:22f., p. 81 above.
problem section. Jesus' reply to the second moment of the problem is given in v. 51. Luke then awkwardly presents Jesus' reply to the arrest (vv. 52f.; problem moment #2 for Mark) without having narrated the arrest itself. Finally, Luke offers no consequence statement and so reduces the pattern from long form to short form.

It is interesting that Matthew's and Luke's accounts of the problem and the replies to it are somewhat alike in structure in spite of the differences in material. This similarity in comparison with Mark's account is visible in the following representation of the narrative sections in question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judas' kiss (14:45)</td>
<td>Judas' kiss (26:49)</td>
<td>Judas' kiss (22:47b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reply to kiss (50a)</td>
<td>Reply to kiss (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The arrest (46)</td>
<td>The arrest (50b)</td>
<td>.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severing of ear (47)</td>
<td>Severing of ear (51)</td>
<td>Severing of ear (49f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. to severing (52-4)</td>
<td>Rep. to severing (51)</td>
<td>Reply to severing (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reply to arrest (48f.)</td>
<td>Rep. to arrest (55-56a)</td>
<td>Reply to arrest (52f.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though Mark's account is conspicuously the least complete in the issues that are addressed in the reply-to-the-problem section, the pattern in his version is simplest and clearest with a unified problem section and a single reply-to-the-problem section.

The question arises whether Mark's narrative is the most distorted precisely because the pattern is clearest in his account. Do Matthew and Luke, with their departures from the pattern, actually give a clearer indication of what might have taken place during the event? To answer this question it is necessary to look closely at the alterations of the pattern

---

67A study of such structural, nonverbal agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark is beyond the province of this dissertation but may provide new insights for questions of the literary relationship between Matthew and Luke, if such a direct relationship ever existed.
in Matthew and Luke concerning Jesus' arrest. Luke's first addition to the pattern is the presentation of Jesus' reply to Judas' kiss (Lk. 22:48). This saying somewhat heightens the account through the reference to the Son of Man. Matthew's second alteration of the pattern is his presentation of a reply of Jesus to the severing of the ear (Mt. 26:52-54). This reply considerably heightens the story through the saying about the twelve legions of angels (v. 53) and by the comment about necessity and the fulfilment of Scripture (v. 54). Luke's parallel to this part of the story (Lk. 22:51) is even more heightened through the statement that Jesus healed the ear. It is evident that for both Matthew and Luke their departures from the pattern, as it is found in Mark's story, are in the direction of heightening out of theological interest. Mark's narrative, which shows the pattern most clearly, seems also the most primitive of the three versions. There appears to be here some correlation between pattern clarity and primitive character. It cannot be assumed that the pattern itself is a decisive criterion for affirming the historical value of narrative material, even if it can be shown that departures from the pattern generally manifest theological heightening in other stories; but if it can be established that the pattern in clear form is an indication of early tradition and that departures from the pattern generally contain secondary material, the pattern may at least be regarded as an aid for assessing the relative age of narrative material, and perhaps with that, its historical worth.

A difficulty for Mark's story is the fact that it is held to be a compilation. According to Taylor the story ends at v. 46, and vv. 47, 48-50, and 51f. are 'separate items of tradition which Mark has appended'.68 If the

narrative pattern is used as a criterion for evaluating Taylor's view, there is some question about the notion that the narrative proper ends at v. 46, which is part of the problem section. There is no story in Mark's Gospel that ends with a problem section, and it is difficult to think that the early Church circulated a story that had a problem section for an ending.\textsuperscript{69}

The question whether vv. 47, 48-50, and 51f. are appended is a different matter, since it is always possible that material has been combined from several or more sources in the formation of a story. Here the pattern may show how unified the story appeared to Mark and also whether a part of the story is essential to the pattern in Mark's redaction of the narrative. With regard to v. 47 it is not essential to the situation of the story, for vv. 45f. remain a problem section without v. 47, and the reply-to-the-problem section in vv. 48f. is not addressed to the content of v. 47. Jesus' reference to swords and clubs in v. 48 may be explained as an allusion to the content of v. 43b. Verse 47 can therefore be excised without affecting either the pattern or the thematic structure of the narrative. Verses 48f., however, present the/problem section, and their presence is essential to the pattern. Thematically they are bound with v. 43b through the reference to swords and clubs and with vv. 44 and 46 through the idea of Jesus' arrest. Such pattern and thematic ties indicate that these verses were not merely 'attached'.\textsuperscript{70}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{69}The view of Beare, p. 231, that vv. 43, 45f., and 50 are a 'unified, straightforward account of the Arrest', is to be rejected for a similar reason. The form of such a narrative is setting, situation, problem, consequence; and such a form is not apparent elsewhere in Mark's Gospel. It is difficult to think that the early Church formulated and transmitted a story that did not offer a reply-to-the-problem section in connection with a problem section. A problem is a kind of challenge, and the reply-to-the-problem section tells how the challenge is met. It seems unlikely that the early Church would have told a story about a problem without telling also how the problem was countered. Cf. 15:22-24 below, pp. 199-200.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{70}Taylor, G.M., p. 560. Cf. also Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 396.}
If Mark has combined vv. 48f. with vv. 43-46, he has closely integrated the several traditions according to the pattern and with a view to thematic structure.\textsuperscript{71}

There is also some question whether vv. 51f. are appended. Their presence is not essential to the problem, inasmuch as v. 50 is a satisfactory consequence statement in itself; but vv. 51f. are not merely tacked on at the end, since v. 52 is rhythmically and thematically parallel to v. 50. If Mark combined vv. 51f. with v. 50, he integrated the former with the latter instead of simply appending the last two verses.\textsuperscript{72}

Space will not be taken to illustrate a fifth FPL narrative in regular form without a result statement (12:28-34). This story about the first commandment is without a setting statement and begins with the situation statement: the approach of one of the scribes and his question about the first commandment (v. 28). Verses 29-31 clearly present Jesus' reply to the situation. One expects next a problem section, and indeed the scribe speaks in vv. 32f.; but his remarks are supportive of Jesus and not problematical. Thematically the scribe's positive endorsement of Jesus is 'no problem', and this endorsement displaces the problem section. Jesus' reply to this section is given in v. 34a; and v. 34b, which indicates that no one dared to ask Jesus any more questions, is the consequence statement.

Matthew's alteration of the pattern in his parallel (Mt. 22:34-40, 46) is substantial. In effect he turns the lawyer's question in the situation statement (vv. 34-36) into a problem section by referring to the question as a test (v. 35). The resultant form of Matthew's account is problem + reply

\textsuperscript{71}See further below, pp. 500-1.

to the problem, a form that is not found in Mark's Gospel. Matthew's consequence statement is not given until v. 46 after the story about the Son of David (vv. 41-45).

Like Matthew, Luke regards the lawyer's initial question as a problematical test of Jesus (Lk. 10:25). Jesus' reply is given in v. 26, but it is a question which makes the lawyer's further remarks a reply (v. 27). These remarks are followed by an additional reply of Jesus (v. 28). In effect the form of Luke's account is a problem section followed by a series of alternating replies, and the pattern that is evident in Mark's story disappears in Luke's account in spite of the similarities in content.

The story about the first commandment is the last of the five FPL narratives in regular form without a result statement. It is noteworthy that three of these narratives are labeled stories about Jesus (9:2-8, 14:43-52, 16:1-8); one is designated a miracle story (11:12-14); and one, a pronouncement story (12:28-34). In terms of the narrative pattern these five stories are structurally alike. Furthermore, the fact that one of the stories is from the Passion Narrative and one is the story of the Resurrection suggests that so far as narrative structure is concerned it is questionable to make a distinction between Passion Narrative stories and those in the rest of Mark's Gospel.

The stories that have been illustrated manifest the long form of the Full Pattern with or without a result statement. Their form has been regular in that the sections of the narrative pattern have been in the same order from story to story without any conspicuous addition to the pattern. There are, however, some FPL narratives that differ structurally by a particular extension of the regular form of the pattern. These extended narratives are illustrated next.
Regular form extended. There are three FPL narratives in regular form that differ from the other FPL narratives in having developments in the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections. One of the extended FPL narratives is the story of the feeding of the five thousand (6:35-44):

Set. \(\{35\text{Καὶ ἡ ὥρα πολλῆς γενομένης}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{προσελθόντες [αὐτῷ] οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ} & \\
\text{ἐλεγον δὲ} & \\
\text{Σφήμος ἐστιν ὁ τόπος} & \\
\text{καὶ ἡ ὥρα πολλή}
\end{align*}
\]

Sit. \(\{36\text{Απεδείξον αὐτοὺς} \}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἐγὼ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλους ἄρτους καὶ κύμας} & \\
\text{ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοὺς τὸ φάγωσιν}
\end{align*}
\]

RepS. \(\{37\text{δὲ ἀποκριθεῖς} \}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἐπὶ πολλοὺς αὐτοῖς} & \\
\text{Ἀπελθόντες} & \\
\text{ἀγοράσωσιν δηναρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους} & \\
\text{καὶ ἀδώσωμεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν}
\end{align*}
\]

Prob. \(\{38\text{δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς} \}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Πάσους ἄρτους ἔχετε} & \\
\text{ὑπάγετε ἵδετε}
\end{align*}
\]

Resp. \(\{\}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ γυνάκτες} & \\
\text{λέγουσιν} & \\
\text{Πέντε} & \\
\text{καὶ ὅσο ἱχθύας}
\end{align*}
\]

RepP. \(\{39\text{καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι πάντας} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{συμπόσια συμπόσια} & \\
\text{ἐπὶ τῷ χλαρῷ χέρτῳ}
\end{align*}
\]

Resp. \(\{40\text{καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασίατ πρασίατ} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{κατὰ ἐκατὸν} & \\
\text{καὶ κατὰ πεντήκοντα}
\end{align*}
\]

RepP. cont. \(\{41\text{καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους} \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ τοὺς ὅσο ἱχθύας} & \\
\text{ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν} & \\
\text{εὐλόγησεν}
\end{align*}
\]

Resp. \(\{\}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους} & \\
\text{καὶ ἐδόθου τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ]} & \\
\text{ἐνα παρατείθῳ αὐτοῖς} & \\
\text{καὶ τοὺς ὅσο ἱχθύας ἐμέρισεν πάσιν}
\end{align*}
\]
Verse 35a is clearly the setting statement, and the question of the disciples in vv. 35b-36 is the situation statement. Jesus' reply in v. 37a is the reply-to-the-situation statement. The disciples' question in v. 37b, which reflects some lack of faith on their part, is the problem section. Jesus' question in 6:38a marks the beginning of an extended reply-to-the-problem section (vv. 38-41), which is developed by responses of the disciples (vv. 38b, 40) and continuations of Jesus' reply (vv. 39, 41). The remark that all ate and were fed (v. 42) is the result statement, and the references to the number of baskets that were collected (v. 43) and to the number who ate (v. 44) constitute the consequence statement. The pattern is FPL with the narrative sections in their regular order. The only difference is the extension of the reply to the problem.

It is Mark's extended reply-to-the-problem section that is altered by Matthew and Luke in their parallels to the story (Mt. 14:15-21; Lk. 9:12-17). Matthew combines in a problem section (v. 17) material from Mark's first reply-to-the-problem section (Mk. 6:38a) and first response (v. 38b), and so eliminates these two sections. Matthew then combines material from Mark's two continuations of the reply section (Mk. 6:39, 41) into the only reply-to-the-problem section in Matthew's account (Mt. 14:19), presenting also at the end of that verse a response of the disciples in their distribution of the bread. Luke, like Matthew, alters the pattern at Mark's extended reply-to-the-problem section. Like Matthew, Luke places in a problem section (Lk. 9:13b) material corresponding to Mark's first reply-to-the-problem
section and first response. Luke places in v. 14a just after the problem section a remark about the five thousand—material which corresponds to a consequence statement in Mark's and Matthew's accounts. It will be recalled that Luke similarly placed early in the stories of Jesus' death and burial material corresponding to consequence statements in Mark's accounts. Unlike Matthew, however, Luke has a response section (v. 15) between the reply-to-the-problem section (v. 14b) and its continuation in v. 16, and so has structure resembling that of Mark's story at this location.

The narrative pattern is a useful criterion for determining the beginning of Mark's account. Bultmann considers Mk. 6:34 to be the editorial beginning of the story; but that is doubtful, since v. 34 is a reply-to-the-situation statement in 6:32-34, which manifests the pattern in V2S form. Also questionable is Taylor's suggestion that the beginning of the story is 6:31 for v. 31 is a reply-to-the-situation statement in 6:30f., which also manifests the pattern in V2S form, though without a setting statement. Taylor's second suggestion, that Mark has 'interwoven' the beginning of 6:35-44 with 6:30-34, is more likely, so long as it is recognized that 6:30-34 is composed of two brief narratives in V2S form and that 6:35-44 has its own structure. Taylor judges the beginning of 6:35-44 to be abrupt. This may

73 See above, pp. 160, 166.
74 Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 217.
75 See below, pp. 408-9.
76 Taylor, G.M., p. 322.
77 See below, pp. 407-8.
78 Taylor, G.M., p. 322.
79 Ibid.
be true so far as narrative continuity is concerned, but structurally the story begins no less abruptly than other stories that have setting statements in Mark's Gospel. The setting statement in v. 35a is a clear indication that Mark regarded v. 35 as the formal opening of this story.

The narrative pattern is also a useful criterion for assessing form-critical judgements about the form of this story. Bultmann considers it to be a miracle story 'according to form'. By this, Bultmann means that the story is in three parts: everything up to v. 40 is presumably the exposition, where tension is increased by 'the dialogue between Jesus and the disciples'; the miracle itself is illustrated in vv. 41f. in the distribution and consumption of the food; and the effect is presented in vv. 43f., which tell about the baskets left over and the number of those present. This analysis of structure is of limited value in comparison with an understanding of a more detailed pattern within the story. Such an awareness of the narrative pattern makes it possible to see more clearly the extent of Matthew's and Luke's redactional alterations of the pattern within the story concerning the problem and reply sections, as described earlier. It is a manifestation of Bultmann's limited conception of form that he sees Matthew's and Luke's alterations of Mark only at the beginning and ending of Mark's story.

Taylor's contrary judgement that this story 'has not attained the rounded form of a Miracle-story proper' has merit, since miracle stories

80 Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 217.
81 Ibid.
82 Ibid.
83 Ibid.
generally lack reply-to-the-situation statements and therefore tend to display an abbreviated form of the pattern (VII). It is likely, however, that Taylor's judgement has been prompted by the amount of material in the extended reply-to-the-problem section.

Space will not be taken to illustrate the story of the feeding of the four thousand (8:1-9), for the form of the pattern in it is the same as that in 6:35-44 in spite of the differences in content. Verse 1a is an indefinite temporal setting statement; and v. 1b, which tells of the crowd and their hunger, is the situation statement. Jesus' reply to the situation is given in vv. 1c-3. The question of the disciples, which expresses doubt, is the problem section (v. 4). Jesus' reply to the problem begins in v. 5a with a question, and the disciples' response is told in v. 5b. A continuation of Jesus' reply is narrated in most of v. 6, and the disciples' nonverbal response is indicated at the end of this verse. A second continuation of Jesus' reply is given in v. 7. The remark that the people ate and were fed is the result statement in v. 8; and the remaining remarks about the number of baskets left over, the number who ate, and the dismissal of the crowd (vv. 8b-9) are consequence statements. The identical form of this story is not surprising in view of Mark's apparent sensitivity to the pattern.

The alterations of the pattern in Matthew's parallel (Mt. 15:32-38[39]) are different from those in his parallel to the story of the feeding of the five thousand. Such differences are to be expected when Matthew seems less sensitive to structure and more interested in content, often in the abbreviation or telescoping of content that is found in Mark's narratives. Matthew's most conspicuous alteration of the pattern is his omission of both a setting statement and situation statement at the beginning of the story. He starts his account with material that is parallel to Mark's reply-to-the-
situation statement (Mk. 8:1c-3). None of Mark's narratives begins with a reply-to-the-situation statement. The verse before Mt. 15:32 is an obvious consequence statement to the preceding summary passage (Mt. 6:29-31), so it is clear that Matthew regarded 15:32 as the beginning of the feeding story. A second alteration of the pattern by Matthew is his telescoping into one continuation of the reply-to-the-problem section (15:35, 36a) material which corresponds to that found in the two continuations of the reply section in Mark's account. Matthew also alters the pattern by turning Mark's last consequence statement into a transitional setting statement for the next story.\(^8^5\)

The consistency with which Mark forms his narratives according to the pattern is quite evident in the two feeding stories in the light of such alterations of the pattern by Matthew.

The third extended FPL narrative in regular form is about the release of Barabbas (15:6-15). This story, which lacks a result statement, is worth illustrating and is given below:

Set. \{\(\text{Katá } δὲ \text{ ἐστὶν}\}

\begin{align*}
\text{ἀπέλυεν} & \text{ αὐτοῖς ἑνα δέσμιον} \\
& \text{ὅν καρπητοῦντο}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{Sit. } & \{7\text{ὴν } δὲ \text{ ὁ λεγόμενος Βαραβᾶς} \\
& \text{μετὰ τῶν στασιαστῶν δεδεμένως} \\
& \text{οἰτίνες ἐν τῇ στάσει φόνον πεπολίμακαν} \}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{8καὶ } & \text{ ἀναβᾶς ὁ ὄχλος} \\
& \text{ζητάτο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἔποιει αὐτοῖς}
\end{align*}

\(^{85}\text{Taylor, G.M., p. 360, considers Mk. 8:10 to be the ending to the story of the feeding of the four thousand; but 8:10 is a typical setting statement (see above, pp. 27-8) and is best regarded as the beginning of the story of the Pharisees' request for a sign (8:10-12). It is surprising that Taylor considers v. 10 as the end of 8:1-9, for he sees that the verse is similar in vocabulary with 6:45, which is the setting statement for the story of Jesus' walking on the water and is viewed by Taylor as the beginning of that story. Taylor's judgement concerning v. 10 illustrates the hazard in making comparisons of vocabulary without due attention to narrative structure. See also above, p. 29, n. 16.}
The remark about the feast in v. 6a is clearly a temporal setting statement. The references to the custom of releasing a prisoner, to the prisoner Barabbas, and to the request of the crowd in vv. 6b-8 comprise the situation statement. Pilate's reply to the situation is given in v. 9 along with an explanatory comment in v. 10. The priests' incitement of the crowd to release Barabbas in v. 11 is the problem section, and Pilate's question about the King of the Jews in v. 12 is the reply-to-the-problem section. At this point the pattern becomes extended with two developments of the problem and with replies to these developments. The shouting of the crowd for the Crucifixion of Jesus in v. 13 is the first developmental extension of the problem. Verse 14a presents Pilate's reply to this development. The increased intensity of the shouting in v. 14b is the second development of the problem, and Pilate's
reply to this development is given in v. 15. The use of ἐν in v. 15b is reminiscent of several other consequence statements,\textsuperscript{86} and it is possible to think of v. 15b as a consequence statement. If the whole verse is regarded as a reply statement, the form of the pattern is FPS rather than FPL.

In Matthew's parallel account (Mt. 27:15-26) the pattern is altered significantly at a place where Matthew adds material of his own. The absence of the request of the crowd (cf. Mt. 27:15b-16; Mk. 15:8) in the situation statement does not alter the pattern, for the references to the custom of releasing a prisoner and to Barabbas in Mt. 27:15b-16 constitute the situation statement in Matthew's account. The pattern is altered, however, by the addition of the sayings of Pilate's wife in v. 19. This special material belongs neither to Pilate's reply to the situation (v. 17) nor to the problem section in v. 20 and amounts to an interruption of the pattern. It is difficult not to think of the priority of Mark's narrative at this point.

Matthew's further additions—Pilate's question about a choice of prisoners (v. 21a = RepP.), the answer about Barabbas (v. 21b = first problem development), and Pilate's washing of his hands (v. 4 = his reply to a third problem development)—do not alter the pattern but extend the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections in the manner that is evident in Mark's Gospel. Matthew, however, has four problem developments (vv. 21b, 22b, 23b, 25), whereas Mark has only two.

The pattern in Luke's account is the same as that in Mark's if Lk. 23:13-25 is taken as a whole, for vv. 13-17 provide a situation statement (v. 13) and a reply-to-the-situation statement (vv. 14-16) for vv. 18-25.\textsuperscript{87} Without

\textsuperscript{86}See 7:36f., 5:42b-43, 8:30, pp. 111, 113.

\textsuperscript{87}Cf. Beare, p. 235.
vv. 13-17, vv. 18-25 begin in an unlikely fashion with a problem section (vv. 18f.). It is remarkable that Luke's form of the pattern is the same as Mark's in spite of such different material. An understanding of the narrative pattern makes it possible to see this structural resemblance between Mark's and Luke's accounts, a resemblance that is easily overlooked if a comparison is made solely on the basis of vocabulary and style.

All of the narratives that have been illustrated are FPL narratives in regular form; that is, they contain in proper order the narrative sections of the long form of the Full Pattern—sometimes with, sometimes without, a result statement. Several narratives have developed and recurrent problem and reply-to-the-problem sections, but the order of the sections is essentially not altered by these developments. There are, however, a few FPL narratives that have irregular form, and these are the next to be considered.

**Irregular form.** Seven FPL narratives (3:1-6, 5:24b-34, 6:14-29, 8:27-30, 9:14-29, 10:17-31, 15:22-24) have some irregularity in the pattern. This irregularity is either the dislocation of just one of the narrative sections (in 3:1-6, 5:24b-34, 10:17-31), where the section appears early in the story and so disrupts the order of the pattern, or the presence of unusual material that makes the pattern ambiguous in places (in 6:14-29, 8:27-30, 9:14-29, 15:22-24). In no instance does the irregularity blot out the pattern, and in most instances the pattern is rather conspicuous in spite of the irregularity. Like some of the FPL narratives in regular form, four of the narratives with irregular form (5:24b-34, 6:14-29, 9:14-29, 10:17-31) have extended problem and reply-to-the-problem sections and for that reason will be treated later as a separate group. For the present, the first FPL narrative in irregular form to be illustrated is the story
about the man with the withered hand (3:1-6):

Set. \(1\text{Kat} \varepsilon_{\sigma\theta\iota\lambda\eta\iota\nu} \nu\nu\iota\iota \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \; \tau\iota \; \acute{\lambda} \mu\alpha\nu\sigma\gamma\omega\gamma\nu\eta\nu\)

Sit. \(2\text{Kat} \; \acute{\iota} \; \varepsilon\iota\varsigma \; \acute{\alpha} \; \varsigma \; \acute{\iota} \; \varepsilon\iota\varsigma\nu\iota\nu\; \; \varepsilon\iota\varsigma\nu\iota\nu\; \tau\iota\; \acute{\lambda} \mu\alpha\nu\sigma\gamma\omega\gamma\nu\eta\nu\)

Prob. \(3\text{Kat} \; \pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\tau\omicron\theta\rho\omicron\omicron\nu\; \acute{a} \; \acute{\tau} \; \acute{o} \; \tau\iota\; \acute{\lambda} \mu\alpha\nu\sigma\gamma\omega\gamma\nu\eta\nu\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RepS. (4\text{Kat} ; \lambda\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu; \acute{a} ; \acute{\tau} ; \acute{o}\tau\iota; \acute{\lambda} \mu\alpha\nu\sigma\gamma\omega\gamma\nu\eta\nu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RepP. (5\text{Kat} ; \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\beta\lambda\epsilon\phi\omicron\mu\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu; \acute{\alpha} ; \acute{\tau} ; \acute{\gamma} ; \acute{\iota} ; \acute{\tau} ; \acute{o}\tau\iota; \acute{\lambda} \mu\alpha\nu\sigma\gamma\omega\gamma\nu\eta\nu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepP. (6\text{Kat} ; \epsilon\xi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\iota\nu; \acute{\alpha} ; \acute{\tau} ; \acute{\gamma} ; \acute{\iota} ; \acute{\tau} ; \acute{o}\tau\iota; \acute{\lambda} \mu\alpha\nu\sigma\gamma\omega\gamma\nu\eta\nu)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The note in v. 1a about Jesus' entering the synagogue again is the setting statement, and the reference in v. 1b to the man with the withered hand is the situation statement. One expects next a reply-to-the-situation statement, such as that given in v. 3; but what is presented is a problem in v. 2: the remark about those who were watching Jesus to accuse Him. This early appearance of the problem section before the reply-to-the-situation statement is the irregularity which makes the structure of this story different from that of the narratives illustrated so far. In all other respects the narrative pattern is regular in 3:1-6. Verses 4-5a present Jesus' reply to the
problem with a comment at the end of v. 4 to indicate the lack of a response by Jesus' antagonists. If this brief reference to their silence is a development of the problem, v. 5a may be seen as a reply to this development, and the form is extended. Verse 5b, which tells about the restoration of the man's hand, is the result statement; and the remark about the collusion of the Pharisees and Herodians in v. 6 is the consequence statement.

Matthew's major alteration of the structure of the story (Mt. 12:9-14) is the omission of a reply-to-the-situation statement. There is none either before or after the problem section in Mt. 12:10b. With the absence of such a statement the form of Matthew's account is VIL instead of FPL. Matthew also makes no mention of the silence of Jesus' antagonists—possibly because v. 12 ends with a statement rather than a question, and there is therefore less need for a response from the antagonists. With no response Jesus' reply to the problem is uninterrupted in vv. 11-13, and the possibility of extended form disappears in Matthew's account.

The structure of Luke's version of the story (Lk. 6:6-11) is not much different from that of Mark's. Like Mark, Luke has a reply-to-the-situation statement (Lk. 6:8b) that is preceded by a problem section (v. 7), but the character of the statement is modified somewhat by the heightening remark in v. 8a that Jesus knew the thoughts of His antagonists. This remark makes both v. 8a and 8b seem like a reply-to-the-problem section. Like Matthew, Luke makes no mention of the silence of the opponents, even though Luke, like Mark, has Jesus' reply to the problem end with a question in v. 9. Unlike both Mark and Matthew, Luke tells of a response of the man with the withered hand at the end of v. 8. The basic similarity in structure between the accounts of Mark and Luke is interesting in view of the wealth of Luke's own material in his account. If Luke used Mark as a source, and presumably he
did, the structure of Mark's story appears to have been inert, resisting the stylistic developments and additions in Luke's presentation. This inertia of form, which is made apparent by the narrative pattern as a criterion for comparing the Synoptic parallels, is evident now and then and will be pointed out on occasion as the discussion progresses.  

In spite of the one irregularity of the narrative pattern in Mk. 3:1-6, the pattern is evident, and its presence becomes an important measure for evaluating form-critical analyses of the form of this narrative. Taylor labels it a pronouncement story instead of a miracle story, 'because the healing is subordinate in interest to the religious question at issue',  

---

88 The conception of the inertia of form is an interesting one, for if the narrative pattern was somewhat inert for some of Luke's developments of Mark's accounts, was the pattern also inert for Mark in his use of tradition? The presence of the pattern and its abbreviated forms in Old Testament stories (see below, pp. 436-70) raises the question whether narratives about Jesus in the tradition before Mark were sometimes told according to the pattern of narration that is evident in stories of the Old Testament. If early stories about Jesus were shaped according to such a traditional pattern, and if this pattern were to some extent inert in the transmission of tradition, it becomes possible to ask whether the pattern in Mark's narratives preserves structures of pre-Markan narratives, especially in view of Mark's sensitivity to structure and interest in the order of thought within his narratives. With that question one must also inquire about the extent of Mark's own structuring of the tradition. Did Mark distort the structure of narratives formed before him, precisely because of his own apparent interest in order and regular use of the narrative pattern? The inertia of form is important when a story is in the hands of a redactor who is not so interested in structure. But is form inert when a story is being retold by someone who is interested in structuring his version of the story according to a pattern? If the pattern were Mark's own pattern, that would be a good reason for thinking that Mark's narratives distort the structure of earlier traditions. But since the pattern that he uses is a traditional pattern, it is possible to think that Mark is the Evangelist who best preserves the shape of stories that were formulated before him in accordance with the traditional pattern. Unfortunately, time does not allow an investigation of this interesting aspect of the narrative pattern. Such a study would be somewhat limited to conjectures about the shape of stories of the oral tradition, even if the pattern with its abbreviated forms is recognized as a significant criterion for estimating the structure of primitive reports about Jesus.

89 Taylor, G.M., p. 220. Later in his discussion Taylor remarks that this story 'is an original narrative which, by its concentration on the issue of the Sabbath, is on its way to become a Pronouncement-story' (ibid.).
the question of Sabbath healing. Here the form of the story is seen in connection with one of its topics and not in terms of narrative structure. Apart from the inversion of the reply-to-the-situation statement and problem section, the structure of the story is FPL including a result statement. This structure is found in just one other pronouncement story (2:1-12), which also tells of a healing, and in three stories about Jesus (11:1-10, 15:33-41, 15:42-47). With some extension this structure is found also in two miracle stories (6:35-44, 8:1-9). So far as narrative structure is concerned, the design of 3:1-6 is not distinctively that of a pronouncement story.90

The classification of 3:1-6 as a pronouncement story or paradigm91 or apophthegm92 is based on the assumption that stories have one point of significance93 and that all else is subordinate to this point of interest. In Part III of this dissertation it will be shown that the thematic structure of the Markan narratives stands against this common assumption. In Mark's narratives there are generally several or more thematic interests that are given attention in the arrangement of the content in the stories. If this understanding of the thematic structure of the narratives is valid, the search for 'the point of the story' becomes an ill-advised quest as well as an oversimplification of the thematic concerns that are evident in the narratives.

90A form of the narrative pattern that is found in a number of pronouncement stories is V1S. See below, pp. 350-1, 376-7.

91Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 43.

92Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 12.

93See, for example, Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 50. Dibelius sees a singular 'point' especially in paradigms. Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 12, thinks of 'the main point of the story' in his discussion of 3:1-6. The search for the point of the story is not limited to form criticism but is a common enterprise that no doubt has been influenced by Jülicher's Die Gleichnisereden Jesu. See Archibald M. Hunter, Interpreting the Parables (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), pp. 37-9.
Mark 3:1-6 is a good example of a story that has a number of thematic interests that are considered in an orderly fashion. Three concerns are apparent in the problem section (v. 2): the Sabbath, healing, and hostility to Jesus. In characteristic fashion, Mark treats each of these three concerns in order. The saying of Jesus in the reply-to-the-problem section in v. 4 is directed to the question of the Sabbath. The continuation of Jesus' reply to the problem and the result statement in v. 5 are addressed to Jesus' healing of the man, and the reference to the plot against Jesus in the consequence statement in v. 6 is the place where Mark gives attention to the third concern about hostility to Jesus. It is the order in which these three interests are introduced and then treated in turn that constitutes the thematic structure of this story. Here the form of the story is understood not by a reference to a single topic but rather through the recognition of the order in which a cluster of topics is given consideration in the narrative.

An understanding of the structure of the story makes it possible to see the essential relation of v. 6 to the story. In terms of the narrative pattern, v. 6 provides the necessary consequence statement for the long form of the pattern. Without v. 6 the story would end with a result statement, and there is no other story in Mark's Gospel that ends with a result statement. For this reason Bultmann's view that 'οι δὲ ἔσωθέν in v. 4 and the healing in v. 5 are the natural ending is doubtful. With regard to the thematic structure of the story, v. 6 gives Mark's consideration of the third theme that is evident in v. 2: the theme of hostility. Here the plot of the Pharisees and Herodians is a consequence of presumably the Pharisees' desire

94See below, pp. 496-7.
95Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 12.
to accuse Jesus. Verse 6 is clearly essential to the thematic structure of
the story as well as to the narrative pattern. 96

There are two FPL narratives with irregular form that lack result
statements (8:27-30, 15:22-24). Both narratives are irregular because of
novel material that makes the narrative pattern ambiguous in places. The
first story is about Peter's confession (8:27-30):

Verse 27a is clearly a setting statement; and v. 27b, in which Jesus asks
His disciples about popular conceptions of His identity, is a situation state-
ment. 97 The disciples' answer in v. 28 is the reply-to-the-situation state-
ment. At this moment in the story one expects a problem section, but what is
presented is Jesus' question to the disciples about their estimate of His
identity. Is this question a continuation of the situation statement, or is
it a problem section? The former is not likely, since there is no other


97 See a similar situation statement in 9:33b-34, p. 51 above.
narrative in Mark's Gospel that has a continued situation statement; but Jesus' question in v. 29a is not an obvious problem section. It does, however, resemble some problem sections about questions concerning Jesus' identity and for this reason may be regarded as a problem section in this story. In problem sections questions are often put to Jesus, but in this section the opposite is true and Jesus interrogates His disciples. His question in v. 27b is not so charged as the one in v. 29a, where the disciples are asked to express their own opinion of Jesus' identity. If v. 29a is a problem section, v. 29b presents Peter's reply to the problem: his confession that Jesus is the Christ. The remark in v. 30 about Jesus' demand for silence is the consequence statement, which marks the end of the narrative unit.

Matthew in his parallel (Mt. 16:13-20) alters the pattern at the place where he adds a block of his own material (vv. 17-19). After Peter's reply

---

98See above, pp. 78-9.

99Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 374, who sees v. 33 as the end of the story. Although Taylor considers the possibility that v. 31 is the beginning of a new narrative or section, he follows Luke and sees v. 31 in connection with the prohibition in v. 30 (p. 377). The narrative pattern as a criterion for determining the limits of stories makes it possible to see that v. 30, a consequence statement (see above, p. 113), is the end of 8:27-30 and that vv. 31-32a, a situation statement (see above, pp. 48-9) that has no setting statement before it, are the beginning of a second narrative (8:31-9:1), which manifests the pattern in V1S form (see further below, pp. 362-4). The absence of a setting statement suggests that Mark considered the setting of 8:31-9:1 to be the same as that in 8:27-30. Cf. also Norman Perrin, What Is Redaction Criticism? (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 40-63. In a discussion to illustrate the methodology of redaction criticism, Perrin maintains that 8:27-9:1 is a narrative that has 'remarkably clear structure' (p. 41). Perrin's sample demonstration of 'redaction criticism at work' has the unfortunate side-effect of revealing the inability of redaction criticism to provide an adequate understanding of the structure of individual stories. It becomes apparent that redaction criticism is held back by the limited and ambiguous conceptions of 'form' that it inherited from form criticism. To achieve its goal of understanding the theological purpose of a narrative (p. 42), redaction criticism needs an adequate criterion for understanding narrative structure. The narrative pattern in its various forms is a most important tool for this task.
to the problem (vv. 16-17a) and before the consequence statement (v. 20).
Matthew presents a reply of Jesus to Peter's confession. In effect Jesus' answer here is a reply to a reply-to-the-problem section, and such a reply to a reply is alien to the pattern as it is found in Mark's narrative. It is clear that Jesus' reply to Peter disrupts the narrative pattern that is found with some ambiguity in Mark's story.\textsuperscript{100}

Luke's alterations in his parallel (Lk. 9:18-21[27]) are less conspicuous but more numerous. He begins his account without a setting statement and expands the situation statement with references to Jesus' praying and to the presence of the disciples (v. 18). Luke also binds Jesus' command for silence in v. 21—a consequence statement for Mark—with a passion prediction in v. 22, and so connects syntactically the story of Peter's confession with its sequel: Jesus' sayings about discipleship (vv. 22-27). In Luke's revision of the story he provides, like Matthew, a reply to Peter's reply. Apart from the ambiguity in Mark's problem section, the pattern is the most regular in his version of the story.

The second FPL narrative in irregular form without a result statement is the short account of the Crucifixion of Jesus (15:22-24):

\begin{verbatim}
Set. \{22\textit{κατ' θερούσιν αὐτόν ἐκ τῶν Ἑλλήνων κύριον}
        \textit{δὲ ἐστιν ἐμπερθημενούς ἐν Θεῷ τὸ Τέλος}
Sit. \{23\textit{κατ' ἐκείνου αὐτῷ ἐσμενοῦσαν οἶνον}
RepS. \{24\textit{δὲ} ὤν ἔλευθεν
Prob. \{24\textit{κατ' αὐτῷ}
Cons.? \{24\textit{διὰ} ἐμφανίζονται τὰ ἱματὶα αὐτοῦ
        \textit{ἐπὶ} αὐτῷ
        \textit{τές} τῇ ἁρη.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{100}Cf. Perrin, pp. 57-8. His assertion that Matthew's version is 'a complete reworking' of Mark's account (p. 58) seems excessive. The narrative pattern as a criterion enables one to see that Matthew's insertion of 16:17b-19 is the only major alteration of narrative structure.
The act of crucifying Jesus is told briefly in anticipation of the subsequent stories about the mocking of Jesus on the cross (15:22-32) and His death (15:33-41). The reference in v. 22 to Golgotha together with the explanatory comment is the setting statement, which marks the beginning of this narrative unit. In v. 23 the switch to the imperfect tense, which is often a feature in situation statements, is an indication that the remark about the offering of drugged wine to Jesus is the situation statement of this story. Jesus' reply is His refusal to take the sedative (v. 23b). One expects next a section about some negative reaction or hostile act, and the brief statement about the crucifying of Jesus appears at this location as the problem section (v. 24a). It is not clear, however, whether v. 24b is a reply-to-the-problem section or a consequence statement. The casting of the lot for Jesus' clothes could be taken as a nonverbal response to the Crucifixion. If so, the form of the pattern is FPS rather than FPL. But v. 24b has also the appearance of a consequence statement, telling what took place after the act of crucifying Jesus. If v. 24b is a consequence statement, the story is without a reply to the problem, and the form is notably irregular, since no other narrative in Mark's Gospel lacks a reply after a problem section. The ambiguity of the pattern precludes a sound choice between the two alternatives, and it seems best to leave the question open. It is significant, however, that the pattern is apparent in this brief story, even though the pattern is irregular in its ambiguity at the end of the narrative. The pattern is not clearly visible throughout, but it is unmistakably there to some extent. Its presence is further evidence of the fact that there is no story in Mark's Gospel that does not exhibit the pattern in some way.

The pattern is clearer in places in Matthew's parallel (Mt. 27:33-36). In v. 37a he makes Jesus' rejection of the wine an obvious reply-to-the-
situation statement and provides a conspicuous consequence statement at the end of the story (v. 36). Some ambiguity remains, however, in Matthew's fusion of the statements about the acts of crucifying Jesus and dividing His garments (v. 35). It is not clear whether Matthew has expanded a problem section or developed a consequence statement—or simply joined both—in his alterations.

Luke makes a notable change in his parallel (Lk. 23:33-35a), which should be seen in connection with Lk. 23:33-43 as a whole. In a situation statement (v. 36b) Luke refers to the crucifying of Jesus and so displays once more a tendency to place early in his stories material that corresponds to that found later in Mark's narratives. In this instance Luke's reference to the Crucifixion—a problem section for Mark—is displaced by Luke's own problem section in 23:35b-37. Actual departures from the pattern are apparent in Lk. 23:33-43 as a whole, where he places in the problem section (vv. 35b-39) a reference to the inscription over the cross (v. 38), which is part of a situation statement for Mark in Mk. 15:26, and also where Luke presents after the reply-to-the-problem section (vv. 40f.) both a request (v. 42) and a reply of Jesus to this request (v. 43). Such alterations violate the pattern and stand in contrast with the dislocations and ambiguities in Mark's irregular stories. Even when the pattern is irregular in Mark's narratives, it is generally more regular than the pattern in the stories of Matthew and Luke. Mark's conformity to the pattern is just as apparent in the four irregular FPL narratives that are extended. These are discussed next.

_Irregular form extended._ As indicated earlier, four of the FPL stories

---

101See above, pp. 160, 166, 185.
with irregular form have extended problem and reply-to-the-problem sections (5:24b-34, 6:14-29, 9:14-29, 10:17-31). The first of these narratives to be illustrated is the story about the rich man and eternal life (10:17-31):

Set. \{^{17} \text{Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδὸν} \}

Sit. \{ 
\begin{align*}
\text{προσόραμὼν εἰς} \\
\text{kai γονυπετήσας αὐτῶν} \\
\text{ἐπηρώτα αὐτῶν} \\
\text{Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ} \\
\text{τι ποιήσω} \\
\text{ἔνα ἔως αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω} \\
\end{align*} \}

RepS. \{^{18} \text{δὲ Ἰςους εἶπεν αὐτῷ} \\
\text{Tι με λέγεις ἀγαθόν} \\
\text{οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός} \\
\text{εἰ μὴ εἶς ὁ θεὸς} \}

Prob. \{^{19} \text{τὰς ἐντολὰς οὖδας} \\
\text{Μὴ φονεύσῃς} \\
\text{Μὴ μοιχεύσῃς} \\
\text{Μὴ κλέψῃς} \\
\text{Μὴ φευδομαρτυρήσῃς} \\
\text{Μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς} \\
\text{Tίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα} \}

RepP. \{^{20} \text{δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ} \\
\text{Διδάσκαλε} \\
\text{ταῦτα τάντα ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητος μου} \}

Prob. \{^{21} \text{δὲ Ἰςους ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ} \\
\text{ἤγαπησεν αὐτῶν} \\
\text{kai εἶπεν αὐτῷ} \\
\text{Ἐν σε ὑστερεῖ} \\
\text{ὑπαγε} \\
\text{διὰ ἔχεις τάλισον} \\
\text{kai δὸς [τῶν] πτωχῶν} \\
\text{kai ἔχεις ἁπαρίστου ἐν οὐρανῷ} \\
\text{kai θεός ἀνακολούθει μοι} \}

Cons./Prob. \{^{22} \text{δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ} \\
\text{ἀπῆλθεν λυποῦμενος} \\
\text{ἡν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά} \}

Dev. 1 \{ 
\text{πῶς δυσκολίας οἳ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες} \\
\text{eἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθοῦσαν} \\
\text{καὶ περιβλεφάμενος ὁ Ἰςους} \\
\text{λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ} \\
\text{Πῶς δυσκολίας οὶ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες} \\
\text{eἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθοῦσαν} \\
\text{πῶς δυσκολίας οὶ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες} \\
\text{eἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθοῦσαν} \}

Dev. 2 \{^{24} \text{οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐσπαθοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ} \}
This narrative consists of a FPL story (vv. 17-22) that is extended by a series of four problem developments together with replies of Jesus to these developments. The irregularity centres in the fact that the consequence...
statement in v. 22 serves as the first problem development. In all other respects the structure of 10:17-31 is that of an extended FPL narrative in regular form. Verse 17a is a brief setting statement, and the man's question in v. 17b is the situation statement. Jesus' answer in vv. 18f. is the reply-to-the-situation statement. The man's observation in v. 20 is the problem section, in which the problematical element is not hostility but a limitation of perspective. Jesus' answer, which shows the man what he must yet do, is the reply-to-the-problem section in v. 21; and the remark about the rich man's sad departure in v. 22 is the consequence statement. One expects the story to end at this point, for the pattern is complete with the consequence statement. The man's sadness over the prospect of giving up his wealth is, however, a development of the problem, and Jesus' reply to this development is given in v. 23. A second problem development in v. 24a is the disciples' amazement, which precipitates the reply of Jesus in vv. 24b-25. Their further amazement and question in v. 26 is a third problem development, which is answered by Jesus' reply in v. 27. Peter's declaration in v. 28 is a fourth development of the problem, and Jesus' reply is presented in vv. 29-31.

Neither Matthew nor Luke departs from the pattern in the parallels (Mt. 19:16-30, Lk. 18:18-30), but both agree structurally in their lack of Mark's second problem development and in their combination of two of Jesus' replies (Mt. 19:23f., Lk. 18:24f.).

An understanding of the extended pattern in Mark's narratives enables one to see the structural unity of Mk. 10:17-31. The presence of the long form of the Full Pattern in vv. 17-22 supports the possibility that these verses make up an individual story,102 but at the same time the appearance of

and vv. 28-30 as problem developments (vv. 24a, 26, 28) and replies to these developments (vv. 24b-25, 27, 29f.) is a formal indication that vv. 23-27 and vv. 28-30 are not merely supplements to vv. 17-22. They are presented with vv. 17-22 according to the pattern in Mark's redaction of the story. Verse 23 especially, as a reply to a problem, is bound to the problem in v. 22. Here the statement about the difficulty of entering the Kingdom of God is a fitting response to an occasion where a rich man turns down Jesus' challenge to abandon wealth and follow Him. Verses 23-37 and 28-30 are also closely bound to vv. 17-22 thematically. Interest in the Kingdom of God in v. 23 is a further manifestation of earlier interest in eternal life (v. 17b) and heaven (v. 21). Unlike the rich man (v. 22), the disciples have forsaken everything and followed Jesus (v. 28). The reply of Jesus in vv. 29f. about the rejection of family and wealth with the promise of eternal life provides an answer to the question of the rich man at the beginning of vv. 17-22 (v. 17b). In their present form vv. 23-27 and 28-30 are more than supplements, for they have these strong ties to vv. 17-22 in terms of both the narrative pattern and thematic concern.

The logion in v. 31, however, may be a supplement, since its connection with Peter's declaration in v. 28 and Jesus' reply in vv. 29f. is not obvious. But the saying is likewise relevant to the story as a whole. The sick man in his attachment to possessions and departure from Jesus is an example of the 'first' who will be last in the Kingdom of God; the disciples, who have left their families and homes to follow Jesus, are presumably representative of the 'last' who will be first. It is impossible to know whether the logion

\[103\text{Cf., for example, Schmidt, } R.G.J., \text{ p. 244, and Bultmann, } H.S.T., \text{ p. 22. See Taylor, } G.M., \text{ pp. 424-5, who regards vv. 23-7 and 28-31 as woven with vv. 17-22 into a whole story.}\]
originally belonged here or to another context, but one can infer from the relevance and location of the saying that Mark considered it to be applicable to this story in its entirety.\(^{104}\)

Another extended FPL narrative with irregular form is the story about the haemorrhaging woman (5:24b-34):

\[\text{Sit.} \quad \text{Res.} \]

\[\text{Καὶ ἥκολοῦθεν αὐτῷ ὁχλὸς πολὺς καὶ συνεσθίβον αὐτῶν}^{25}\]
\[\text{καὶ γυνὴ ὀσαὶ ἐν ὅσει αἵματος δείκει ἐς τῷ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ἄφετεῖσα}^{26}\]
\[\text{ἄλλα μᾶλλον εἶς τὸ ἀνέμος ἐλούσα}^{27}\]
\[\text{εἴλεγεν γὰρ ὅτι Ἔαν ἄμοιμαί κἀν τῶν ἵματων αὐτοῦ σωθῆσομαι}^{28}\]
\[\text{καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς}^{29}\]
\[\text{καὶ ἔγω ὑψὸς σώματι ὁτι λαται ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος}^{29}\]

\(^{104}\text{See below, pp. 500-4, where there are examples of a type of thematic structure in which a final saying or narrative statement summarizes in an orderly fashion thematic interests that have been evident in extensive material earlier in the story. Cf. the analyses of Knox, pp. 69-70, and Beare, pp. 194-5, who consider the structure of 10:17-31 to be tripartite (vv. 17-22, 23-27, 28-31) and see this threefold structure as an indication that the construction is pre-Markan, where Mark's editorial work is seen in the 'introduction in 17a' and 'the narrative framework of 23' (Knox, p. 70). The concept of threefold structure, a favourite among some scholars (especially Lohmeyer), is essentially alien to Mark's narratives, which are constructed according to a traditional pattern of narration that is evident in the Old Testament. Only the shortest form (V2S) of that pattern can be legitimately considered tripartite. The fact that the material in vv. 23-31 is presented with vv. 17-22 according to the pattern as problem developments and replies to these developments is a formal indication that Mark himself was responsible for the composition of 10:17-31 as a whole. Such a judgement is supported by the consistent presence of the pattern throughout Mark's narratives and by the occasional appearance of extended form in some of Mark's stories, where extension is accomplished in a similar manner through developments of the problem with replies to these developments.}\]
The irregularity in this story, which appears within a VII story (5:21-24a + 35-43), is the early presentation of the result statement in v. 29. One expects the statement to come after a command of Jesus, such as the one in v. 34; but the statement is presented early in connection with the woman's touching of Jesus' garment in the situation statement (vv. 24b-28). In other respects the story is a regular FPL narrative with extended form. There is no setting statement, presumably because Mark regarded the story

105 See further below, pp. 307-12.

106 It is interesting that Bultmann, H.S.T., pp. 214-5, is silent about the dislocation of the effect of the miracle in this story, especially since his concern is to show that this story along with the companion story about the raising of Jairus' daughter is a 'typical' miracle story. In a miracle story the effect is supposed to appear at the end of the story. Bultmann's silence is not the suppression of evidence but rather a manifestation of a predominant interest in characteristic motifs. In his attempt to show how the story of the woman is a typical miracle story through its motifs, Bultmann loses sight of the story's uniqueness, which is apparent structurally in the dislocated result statement.
about Jairus' daughter as the context for the story about the woman. Jesus' response to the woman's touch is the reply-to-the-situation statement in v. 30. The disciples' belittling remark in v. 31 is the problem section, and Jesus' undeterred survey of the crowd (v. 32) is his nonverbal reply to the disciples. The woman's trembling appearance before Jesus is a development of the problem in v. 33, and Jesus' reply to this development is narrated in v. 34. His reply is interrupted by a continuation of the story about Jairus' daughter, and accordingly no consequence statement is given at the end of the story of the haemorrhaging woman.

The structure of Luke's parallel (Lk. 8:42b-48) is essentially no different from Mark's account; here the form of Mark's story appears to have been inert in Luke's stylistic development of the story. The pattern in Matthew's version (Mt. 9:20-22) is considerably altered by his abbreviation of the story. Matthew presents only a situation statement (vv. 20f.), Jesus' reply to the situation (v. 22a), and a result statement (v. 22b). The irregularity of an early result statement is eliminated from Matthew's account, but his telescoping of the story reduces its structure to an eccentric variation of V2L form—a form which Mark does not use at all for miracle stories. The structural difference of Matthew's abridgment is significant, for it shows by contrast that Mark is more consistent in his use of the pattern. In general, alterations of the narrative pattern by the other Evangelists are important indications that the pattern is not a natural, inevitable way of story-telling that is found everywhere. Consistent use of the pattern with a high degree of regularity is a peculiar feature of Mark's narrative style.

A third extended FPL narrative with irregular form is the story about the epileptic boy (Mk. 9:14-29). There are three irregularities in this story: (1) the result statement in 9:26a is at the same time a fourth develop-
ment of the problem; (2) a second result statement appears in v. 27b; and (3) the consequence statement in v. 28 is also a fifth problem development. These irregularities are visible in the following arrangement of the story:

14καὶ ἔλθοντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐξοῦν ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτοῦς καὶ γραμματεῖς συζητοῦντας πρὸς αὐτοὺς

15καὶ εὗρον τὰς ὀχλοὺς ἱδρύμενες αὐτῶν ἐξεδιδακτήθησαν καὶ προστρέχοντες ἡσυχάζοντο αὐτῶν

16καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς Τί συζητεῖτε πρὸς αὐτοὺς

17καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἄλλα

18καὶ ὅπου ἔδωκαν αὐτῶν καταλήψις δῆσει αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφαίρεσι καὶ τρέξει τοὺς ἱδρύμας καὶ ἡσυχαστήσας καὶ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς σου ἵνα αὕτη ἐνθάλασσαι καὶ οὐκ ἀδύνατον

19ο δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς λέγει Ἡ γενεὰ ἀπίστως ἄποφυγαν καὶ ἤλεγχεν τοὺς ὑπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐνθάλασσαι καὶ οὐκ ἀδύνατον πρὸς με

20καὶ ἤρεμα ἀπὸ τῆς νερᾶς νερὰς τῷ πνεύμα τῳ πνεύμα συνεσπάραξεν αὐτῶν καὶ πέσον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκαλέσατο ἀφρόζων

21καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν τοῦ πατέρα αὐτοῦ πόσος χρόνος ἐστίν ὡς τούτο γέγονεν αὐτῷ
The story begins without a setting statement, which suggests that Mark understood this story to be in close connection with the previous narrative about the descent from the mountain (9:9-13). Verses 14f., which tell of the crowd and the disciples' debate with the scribes, are the situation statement.
At this point the story becomes extended by developments of the problem with replies to these developments. The developments extend from v. 20 to the end of the story, since vv. 28f., which may be several consequence statements, also present a fifth problem development (v. 28) and Jesus' reply to it (v. 29). The first development of the problem appears in v. 20, where the spirit, in seeing Jesus, torments the boy and throws him to the ground. Jesus' reply is His inquiry about the illness (v. 21a). In the second problem development (vv. 21f.) the father shows some doubt about Jesus' ability but asks for His help. Jesus' reply is a reaction to the use of Ἐλ ὑπνή (v. 23). The father's further plea for help and expression of mixed belief and unbelief is a third development of the problem (v. 24), and Jesus' command in v. 25 is His reply. Mention of the spirit's departure (v. 26) is the result statement; but the deathly appearance of the boy is a fourth problem development (v. 26b), which is answered by Jesus' raising of the boy (v. 27a). The remark in v. 27b that the boy arose is an uncommon, second result statement. As indicated earlier, the disciples' question in v. 28 is the fifth development of the problem (cf. with the problem section itself in v. 18), and Jesus' reply is given in v. 29. Verses 28f. may also be consequence statements, telling what supposedly took place after the exorcism. If these verses are not consequence statements, the form of the pattern remains FPL on the strength of the result statements. Such form, however, would still be irregular, since the story would be the only one in long form that has a result statement without a consequence statement.

In spite of the irregularities that have been mentioned the pattern in its extended form is quite evident in this story. Mark's consistency in his use of the pattern is apparent when one looks at the Synoptic parallels. In Matthew's version of the story (Mt. 17:14-21) the problem section (vv. 14b-16)
is fused syntactically with the situation statement (v. 14a), and with the absence of a reply-to-the-situation statement the form of the story is V1L rather than FPL. The most conspicuous difference in Matthew's account is its lack of Mark's first four problem developments. Matthew appears to have drawn from Mark's second problem development for the expansion of his own problem section (cf. Mt. 17:15 with Mk. 9:22). Like Matthew, Luke has no reply-to-the-situation statement in his version of the story (Lk. 9:37-43a). This alteration likewise reduces the form of the pattern to V1L. Also, like Matthew, Luke omits most of Mark's problem developments and replies but constructs a problem development of his own (Lk. 9:42a) with a reply of Jesus to this development (v. 42b), possibly drawing from Mark's first problem development (Mk. 9:20) and reply to the third problem development (Mk. 9:25).

The structural abbreviations of this story by Matthew and Luke are further indications of a tendency that has been apparent in the extended narratives that have been illustrated so far: extended form is clearest and most developed in Mark's narratives. It is often reduced and upset in Matthew's and Luke's abridgments, especially in Matthew's parallels to Mk. 6:35-44, 8:1-9, 10:17-31, 5:24b-34107 and in Luke's parallels to Mk. 6:35-44 and 10:17-31.108 Matthew's version of the story about Barabbas is more extended than Mark's,109 so it cannot be said that extended form is a phenomenon peculiar to Mark; but it is clear that the extended form of the pattern appears with the greatest consistency and fullness in his extended FPL narratives—both regular and irregular. In this respect the structure of Mark's

---

107See above, pp. 184, 187-8, 204, 208.

108See above, pp. 184-5, 204.

109See above, pp. 188-90.
extended narratives is the most impressive even though his Greek is inferior, especially in comparison with Luke's use of the language.

An understanding of the extended form of the pattern enables one to assess from a fresh perspective the question of the unity of 9:14-29. Its unity has been questioned especially by Bultmann, who considers it to be roughly a combination of two miracle stories: (1) vv. 14-20, a story which 'has as its point the contrast of the Master and the magician's disciples, whose inability to heal provided the foil for the master's power';\textsuperscript{110} and (2) vv. 21-27, 'more of an apophthegm', which is about 'the paradox of unbelieving faith'. Verses 28f. are said to be 'an editorial addition'. To support his hypothesis Bultmann presents three pieces of evidence. (1) The disciples are on hand in vv. 14-19, but afterwards 'pass from the scene'. The father, however, has a 'chief role' in vv. 21f. but plays only a minor part in vv. 17-19. (2) 'The illness is described twice in vv. 18 and 21f.' (3) The crowd is already present in v. 14, yet, according to v. 25, comes on the scene for the first time'.

Space does not permit full consideration of Bultmann's arguments against the unity of 9:14-29, but several observations can be made about his approach. (1) His hypothesis is founded on the questionable assumption that a story has only one point of interest. Bultmann perceives that the point of vv. 14-20 (the disciples' inability in contrast with the power of Jesus) is different from the point of vv. 21-27 (unbelieving faith) and sees this difference as an indication that these two sections were originally two separate stories. Bultmann's argument here appeals to theme rather than

\textsuperscript{110}Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, p. 211. This page is the source of all the quotations in the rest of this present paragraph about Bultmann's hypothesis.
structure, and it is on thematic grounds that his approach can be questioned. Is it true that 9:14-20 and 21-27 each have a single point of interest? At least three thematic concerns are evident in vv. 14-20: exorcism (vv. 17f.); Jesus' ability in contrast with the disciples' inability (v. 18); and unbelief (v. 19). In his singular attention to the inability of the disciples and Jesus' power, Bultmann disregards the interests of exorcism and unbelief. It is significant that the same three interests are evident in vv. 21-27. Exorcism is a thematic concern implicitly in vv. 21f. and explicitly in vv. 25f. The ability of Jesus is a conspicuous interest in vv. 22f., and the question of belief with unbelief is the centre of attention in vv. 23f. In his elevation of the theme of unbelieving belief Bultmann passes over the other two interests of Jesus' ability and exorcism. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the three themes are apparent also in vv. 28f. Exorcism and the inability of the disciples are explicit concerns in v. 28, and the concept of ability (through prayer) is evident in v. 29. The presence of the same three themes in the three sections in question points more to the unity of these sections than to their disunity.111

111Cf. Taylor, G.M., pp. 395-6, who regards exorcism, faith, and prayer as the leading ideas of 9:14-29 (p. 395). Taylor prefers the view that vv. 14-19 + 28f. are one narrative in which the 'main interest' is the 'inability of the disciples to effect a cure by reason of their neglect of prayer' and that vv. 20-27 are 'the miracle story proper', which is without its original ending (p. 396). Taylor suggests that the location of this story is based on traditional information, inasmuch as the leading ideas 'are not vitally concerned with the emphasis on Messiahship and suffering which is characteristic of viii. 27-x. 52' (p. 395). It is likely, however, that Mark thought of Jesus' ability in connection with his Messiahship and understood v. 19 as an indication of Jesus' forthcoming suffering. Taylor's suggestion is based on the assumption that Jesus' ability and anticipation of death are of little importance in comparison with the leading ideas, but the narrative pattern stands against this view. Jesus' expectation of death is expressed not in some corner of the story but in the important reply-to-the-problem section, and the theme of Jesus' ability is implicit in the problem section and explicit in the second development of the problem—places of special interest in the narrative pattern.
Bultmann's 'evidence' for his hypothesis is also subject to question. His first piece of evidence is based on three debatable assumptions: (1) that the silence about the disciples in vv. 21-27 implies necessarily their absence; (2) that vv. 28f., which refer to the disciples, are merely an editorial addition; and (3) that the father has only a minor role in vv. 17-19. The first assumption is doubtful; the second is itself in question and cannot really be seen in connection with evidence; and the third is not supported by the narrative pattern: the father is the subject of the important problem section and first problem development. The presumption behind Bultmann's first piece of evidence is that the conspicuous presence of the disciples and the father in both 9:14-20 and 21-27 would be a sign of the unity of 9:14-27. In a contrary fashion the presumption behind Bultmann's second and third pieces of evidence is that 9:14-20 and 21-27 are two stories precisely because there are allusions to a crowd and illness in both sections. Bultmann's second piece of evidence—the two references to the illness in vv. 18 and 21f.—would be of value if nothing new were learned in vv. 21f. The new information about the chronic and destructive nature of the illness justifies the second description. With regard to the third piece of evidence—the dual references to a crowd—Bultmann's argument would have force if the statement in v. 25 were without the definite article, as in v. 14 (cf. v. 15). It seems preferable to regard the use of ἐπισυντρέχει in v. 25 as an intensification of a crowd whose presence in some way is presupposed, rather than consider v. 25 as the first indication of a crowd that is arriving for the first time.

Bultmann's arguments against the unity of 9:14-29 are essentially appeals to the presence or absence of themes and have little to do with narrative structure. He asserts, however, that the end of the first story 'has been broken off, unless it has been put in v. 25, and so too has the end of the
second which has been replaced (in Mark) by vv. 28f.'s. If attention is
directed to narrative structure, the pattern as a criterion supports
Bultmann’s view that vv. 14-20 are an incomplete story. It is left hanging
in the air with an unanswered problem development. If v. 25 is the original
sequel to v. 20, at least v. 26a should be included with v. 25 to provide the
necessary result statement. Even with v. 26a the story is incomplete without
a customary consequence statement. The pattern as a criterion also enables
one to see that vv. 21-27 in themselves are not a likely narrative unit, as
they begin with a reply section and end with a result statement. Contrary to
Bultmann’s view that 9:21-27 is without an ending, the section has a partial
ending in the result statements in vv. 26a and 27b but lacks a beginning. In
fact, 9:21-27 is altogether without a beginning, unless vv. 14-20 provide the
first several sections of the pattern for the material in vv. 21-27.

With regard to vv. 28f., it is conceivable that they were once separate
from 9:14-27, for these two verses in themselves contain the pattern in V2S
form. The presence of V2S form in vv. 28f. is not, however, a clear
indication of earlier separate existence, since narrative sections now and
then manifest V2S and V2L forms of the pattern. Also vv. 28f. are
thematically too bound with v. 18 to be regarded as an addition to the story.
If several traditions lie behind this story, Mark’s composition has fully
integrated them into one new narrative according to the pattern in extended
form.

An understanding of the extended form of the pattern enables one to see

112Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 211.
113Taylor, G.M., p. 401, correctly notices that vv. 28f. have narrative
form.
114See, for example, 14:66-72, pp. 339-42 below.
not only the unity of 9:14-29 but also its structural similarity to 10:17-31.\textsuperscript{115} The resemblance is remarkable since the stories are far apart thematically. Dibelius lists the former among the Novellen\textsuperscript{116} and regards the latter as a paradigm of a 'less pure type'.\textsuperscript{117} When narratives are classified according to motifs, such structural similarity goes unnoticed.

The fourth extended FPL narrative in irregular form is the story of Herod and the death of John the Baptist (6:14-29). This story is unique in that it has dual FPL structure. Verses 14-20, which tell of Herod's reaction to Jesus and provide background information to vv. 21-29 through a string of comments, show traces of the pattern in FPL form. Verses 21-29, the story of the death of John, clearly manifest FPL form. Both the dual FPL structure of 6:14-29 and the faintness of the pattern in vv. 14-20 make the story irregular. The dual structure of 6:14-29 may best be illustrated by presenting first only vv. 14-20:

\begin{verbatim}
Sit.  \{ \textsuperscript{14}Καὶ ἠκούσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰωάννης, 

φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ 

καὶ ἔλεγον

διὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐν νεκρῶν 

καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ ὀνείρες ἐν αὐτῷ\}

RepS.  \{ \textsuperscript{15}ἀλλοὶ δὲ ἔλεγον

διὶ Ἡλίας ἐστὶν 

ἀλλοὶ δὲ ἔλεγον διὶ προφήτης ὡς εἰς τῶν προφητῶν 

ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης 

ἔλεγεν

"Ον ἔγει ἀπεκεφαλίσα Ἰωάννην πρὸς ἱγέμονα"
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{115}See above, pp. 202-3.

\textsuperscript{116}Dibelius, \textit{F.T.G.}, p. 72.

\textsuperscript{117}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 43.
The story is introduced without a setting statement; its absence may be due to the fact that the mission and return of the disciples is presented as the context for 6:14-29. Accordingly, the story begins with a situation statement (v. 14a): the remark that Herod heard about Jesus, for He was becoming well known. Verses 14b-16 contain a series of replies to this situation, ending with Herod's own reply in v. 16. Scholars commonly make a break at this point and treat vv. 17-29 as a section in itself. This division is essentially a topical distinction, which is based on the recognition that Jesus is the subject of vv. 14-16, and John, the centre of interest in 17-29. A different division becomes apparent if attention is given to narrative structure. Verse 21 marks the beginning of a section (vv. 21-29) that contains the long form of the Full Pattern, and vv. 17-20 with vv. 14-16 make up a second FPL section.

At first glance vv. 17-20 appear to be no more than a series of extended explanatory comments, but the order of thought in vv. 17-20 reflects the influence of the narrative pattern and indicates that Mark viewed these verses
in connection with 14-16. One expects after the reply-to-the-situation section a problem section that tells of some hostile act, and that section is presented in v. 17: the remark about Herod's arrest and imprisonment of John. After the problem section one expects further a reply section and one is given in v. 18. It is not, however, a reply to Herod's act but rather a reference to an earlier statement of John that occasioned the act. With this section about a statement by John the pattern convention of telling of a reply at this location in the story is fulfilled, even though the content of the reply to this problem section is temporally prior to the action of the problem section. In keeping with the pattern, one expects next a result statement that tells of the direct effect of a command or act. What is presented in v. 19 is a statement that Herodias wanted to kill John but was not able. This remark is very similar to a result statement in 6:1-6a, where it is said that Jesus was not able to perform any mighty work apart from some healings (6:5). Verse 19, then, is a formal result statement that tells of a desired result that has been frustrated in some way. The convention of narrating a result at this location is thus fulfilled even though there is no direct relation between the reply section and the result statement. One expects the structure of the section to end with a consequence statement, and what is presented is a comment about Herod's fear and desire to hear John that is reminiscent of several types of consequence statements. One type contains an expression of fear, and the other refers to hearing as an interest. Though somewhat irregular, Mk. 6:14-20 may be regarded as a section whose construction has been

---

118 See below, pp. 285-6.
119 See 9:32, 16:8, p. 112 above. See also 4:41, 5:13c-20, p. 110 above.
120 See especially 11:14b and 12:37b, p. 115 above. See also 6:29, p. 221 below.
guided by the long form of the Full Pattern.

As indicated earlier, this form of the pattern is clearly evident in 6:21-29, which is presented below:

Set. \[21\text{Kat γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαιρίων} \]
\[διε Ἰωάννου τοὺς γενεσίους αὐτοῦ\]
\[δεῖτον ἐποίησεν τοῖς μεγιστάσιν αὐτοῦ\]
\[καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις\]
\[καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς Γαλιλαίας\]

Sit. \[22\text{καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου}\]
\[καὶ ὀρχησαμένης\]
\[καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{εἶπεν} \; \text{o basileos tō korașīw} \\
\text{Αἴτισόν με ἡ ἔδαν τῆς} \; \{a\} \\
\text{kai ὅσω σοι} \; \{b\}
\end{align*}
\]

RepS. \[23\text{καὶ ὄψωσεν αὐτὴν [πολλά]}\]
\["Ο τι ἐδαν με αἰτήσης\] \{a\}
\[ὀσω σοι\] \{b\}
\[ἔως ἡμισοὺς τῆς βασιλείας μου}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{εἰπεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς} \\
\text{Τῇ αἰτήσομαι}
\end{align*}
\]

\[24\text{καὶ ἔξελθοῦσα} \]
\[εἰπεν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς\]
\[ἡ δὲ εἰπεν\]
\[Τῇν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτίζοντος\]

Prob. \[25\text{καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα εὕθες μετὰ σπουδῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα} \]
\[ἐπήσατο\]
\[λέγουσα\]
\[ἠθέλω\]
\[ἐνα ἔξαυτής ὅς μοι\]
\[ἐπὶ πίνακι τῇν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτίζοντο\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ περίλυποις γενόμενοι ὁ βασιλεὺς} \\
\text{διὰ τοὺς ὄρκους} \; \{a\} \\
\text{kai toîs ἀνακειμένους} \; \{b\}
\end{align*}
\]

RepP. \[26\text{καὶ εὐθύς ἀποστελλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπευσολῆτορα} \]
\[ἐπέταξεν ἐνέγκαι τῇν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ ἀπεθάνων} \\
\text{ἀπεκεφαλίσειν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ}
\end{align*}
\]

Res. \[27\text{καὶ ἤνεγκεν τῇν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι} \]
\[καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κορασίῳ\]
\[καὶ τῷ κοράσιον ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν} \; \{a\} \\
\text{ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ} \; \{b\}
\end{align*}
\]
Verse 21a is a temporal setting statement, and the remarks about Herod's birthday celebration and the pleasing dance of Herodias' daughter are the situation statement (vv. 21b-22a). Herod's oath is his reply to the situation (vv. 22b-23). The girl's request for the head of John on a platter is the problem section (vv. 24f.), which includes her brief visit to her mother for the idea. The statement about Herod's sorrowful command to have John beheaded is the reply-to-the-problem section (vv. 26-27a), and the narration about the execution, the platter, and the presentation of the head to the girl and in turn to her mother is the result statement (vv. 27b-28). Verse 29, which tells of the burial of John by his disciples, is the consequence statement.\textsuperscript{121}

It is most significant that the narrative pattern in FPL form is present and quite regular in this second section of 6:14-29, for scholars have imaginatively pictured vv. 17-29 as an account of whispers in 'bazaars or market-places of Palestine at the time';\textsuperscript{122} 'a piece of popular rumour';\textsuperscript{123} 'a popular report, frequently inaccurate, and with something of the character of the fairy tale';\textsuperscript{124} and as 'little more than a footnote to the reference to John's execution in the preceding sentence'.\textsuperscript{125} The narrative pattern in vv. 14-20 and then again clearly in vv. 21-29 is structural evidence that the

---

\textsuperscript{121}For examples of similar consequence statements, see above, p. 117.

\textsuperscript{122}Rawlinson, p. 82. Cf. Beare, p. 126, and Best, p. 76, n. 3.

\textsuperscript{123}Knox, p. 50.

\textsuperscript{124}Nineham, \textit{Saint Mark}, p. 173.

\textsuperscript{125}Beare, p. 126.
dual story about Herod and the death of John is *narrative*, not rumour. With FPL structure the form of vv. 21-29 is essentially the same as that of 2:1-12, 11:1-10, 15:33-41, and 15:42-47. According to Bultmann, 6:14-29 is 'a legend exhibiting no Christian characteristics' that has its origin in 'Hellenistic soil';\(^{126}\) but so far as narrative structure is concerned, the form of vv. 21-29 is the same as the stories of Jesus' death and burial.\(^{127}\) Inasmuch as the narrative pattern is clearly evident in stories of the Old Testament,\(^{128}\) the structure of vv. 14-20 and 21-29 is thoroughly Hebraic and much older than the events they portray.

The fact that the narrative pattern is a traditional pattern makes it possible to think that the story of the death of John was formulated in the tradition before Mark,\(^{129}\) but the regularity of the pattern in vv. 21-29 suggests that Mark himself was responsible for the composition of this story. The lack of any clear indication of the pattern in Luke's scrap of tradition about the imprisonment of John (Lk. 3:19f.) shows that the pattern is not freely and regularly found everywhere beyond the pale of Mark's Gospel. Apart from the fusion of a consequence statement with a result statement (Mt. 14:5, cf. Mk. 6:19f.), Matthew's parallel to Mk. 6:14-29 (Mt. 14:1-12) preserves the structure of Mark's account, even though Matthew considerably abbreviates Mark's story. The preservation of Mark's structure by Matthew may be attributed to his heavy dependence here on Mark's material and possibly also

---

\(^{126}\) Bultmann, *H.S.T.*, p. 301.

\(^{127}\) In this respect the narrative pattern provides novel support for the intriguing remark of Best, p. 76, n. 3, that the story of the death of John is 'a minor passion pointing to the greater Passion'.

\(^{128}\) See below, pp. 436-70.

\(^{129}\) See Grundmann, p. 127.
to the tendency of form to be inert in the hands of a redactor who seems more interested in content than structure.

The story of the death of John is the last of the FPL narratives. For a summary of the discussion of these stories, it is helpful to list them along with the letters that represent the classifications of Dibelius, Bultmann, and Taylor, respectively:130

FPL NARRATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:1-12</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>AC/HM</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2-8 (no res.)</td>
<td>MY</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:1-10</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12-14 (no res.)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:43-52 (no res.)</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:33-41</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:42-47</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:1-8 (no res.)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Regular Form Extended</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:35-44</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1-9</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:6-15 (no res.)</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Irregular Form</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:1-6</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:27-30 (no res.)</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:22-24 (no res.)</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Irregular Form Extended</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:24b-34</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14-29</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>(S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14-20 (no set.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:21-29 (regular)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:14-29 (no set.)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>HM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:17-31 (no res.)</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>AC/S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structurally these stories are alike in their manifestation of the long form of the Full Pattern. Admittedly, there are differences. Most of the stories are regular in that the order of the narrative sections is the same in each story, but some stories are irregular through a displaced section or ambiguity

130See above, p. 25.
in one or several sections. Some regular and irregular stories are extended through developments of the problem with replies to these developments. Some stories lack result statements but nevertheless have at least one consequence statement to make the pattern long. A few stories lack a setting statement, possibly as a sign of assumed connection with the preceding story. In spite of these differences, many of which are slight, the structure of these stories is essentially the same in terms of the narrative pattern. There is no story here which does not display for the most part the long form of the Full Pattern.

It is significant that there is no evident correlation between the long form of the Full Pattern and the form-critical classifications. This form of the pattern appears in pronouncement stories, miracle stories, and especially stories about Jesus. It can be seen, on the one hand, that certain pronouncement stories and miracle stories are not distinctive structurally, and on the other, that certain stories about Jesus do have similar structure. There is also no correlation between the long form of the Full Pattern and narrative length. This form of the pattern is found in a short narrative like 11:12-14 as well as in a longer story like 15:33-41. The extended form of the Full Pattern is found both in a long story like 10:17-31 and in a story as short as 15:6-15. Here no structural difference is evident between certain stories of the Passion Narrative and others from the rest of Mark's Gospel.

The long form of the Full Pattern is a useful criterion for determining with greater certainty the beginnings and endings of narratives, for assessing narrative unity, and for understanding more clearly Matthew's and Luke's alterations. In almost every instance the pattern is clearest in Mark's narratives. Mark is the Evangelist who uses the pattern with the greatest consistency and regularity.

Does the picture change, however, when one examines some of the larger
sections in Mark's Gospel like the group of parables in 4:1-34? Does the pattern disappear in collections of sayings in sections like 9:33-50, where sayings appear to be arranged through catchwords? Answers to these questions are found in the illustrations of narratives that manifest the short form of the Full Pattern (FPS).

B. Full Pattern Short Narratives

Ten stories in Mark's Gospel display the short form of the Full Pattern. It will be recalled that short form differs from long form through the absence of result and consequence statements. This difference may be seen in the following comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPL</th>
<th>FPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set.</td>
<td>Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit.</td>
<td>Sit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepS.</td>
<td>RepS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob.</td>
<td>Prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepP.</td>
<td>RepP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This representation makes it apparent that FPS form is not a different kind of structure but is merely a curtailment of the long form of the Full Pattern. FPS stories simply end with the reply-to-the-problem section. Inasmuch as the five sections of FPS stories occur in the same order as the corresponding sections in FPL stories, it is permissible to think of essentially one pattern of narration.

The categories that were used to differentiate the FPL narratives (regular form, regular form extended, irregular form, irregular form extended) are applicable to the FPS narratives. Most of these display regular form and are the first to be illustrated.

Regular form. Five narratives display FPS structure in regular form:
3:7-12, 4:1-34, 9:9-13, 9:33-50, 14:17-21. This form is evident in Mark's description of Jesus' ministry (3:7-12):

Set.  
7Kat ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν ἑθάλασσαν

Sit.  
κατ πολὸ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἡκολούθησεν ἦπα
κατ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας
κατ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰερουσαλήμ
κατ πέραν του Ἰορδάνου
κατ περὶ Τύρου κατ Σιδώνα
πλῆθος πολὺ
ἀκολουθεῖς ἦσα ἑποτεὶ
墡θον πρὸς αὐτὸν

RepS.  
9καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἦνα πλοῖα ὑπὲροχάτω αὐτῷ διὰ τῶν ὄχλων
ἀναμνήσθων αὐτῶν

10πλοῖον γὰρ ἐθεράπευσεν ἐστε ἑκπεντεῖα αὐτῷ ἦνα αὐτοῦ ἐφικταὶ ὅσοι ἤκουσαν μάστιγα

11καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἄκαθαρτα ἐναντίον ἐθεράπουν προσεπτεῖτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζεν

Prob.  

12καὶ λέγοντες

13διὸ σὺ ἐγὼ τὸν θεὸ

RepP.  

This story is generally regarded as a summary statement (Sammelbericht)\textsuperscript{131} rather than a narrative unit,\textsuperscript{132} but 3:7-12 has narrative structure. This fact is significant, for it shows that at times there is no structural difference between summary statements and narrative units. With this similarity the question arises whether 'summary statement' is a legitimate category so far as narrative structure is concerned. Such structure is quite apparent

\textsuperscript{131}See, for example, Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 105, and Taylor, G.M., pp. 85-6, 225-6.

\textsuperscript{132}See Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 112.
in 3:7-12. The reference to Jesus' withdrawal to the sea with His disciples (v. 7a) is a setting statement,\(^\text{133}\) which is followed by a situation statement (vv. 7b-8) that tells of a great crowd that came to Jesus from various districts.\(^\text{134}\) Jesus' response to the situation is His request for a boat for protection against the crowd (v. 9).\(^\text{135}\) This request, together with the explanatory comment in v. 10, is the reply-to-the-situation statement. The narration about the confession of the unclean spirits in v. 11 is the problem

\(^\text{133}\)It is less likely that v. 7a is a conclusion to 3:1-6, as Schmidt, *R.G.J.*, p. 107, has suggested as a possibility. Verse 6 is an adequate consequence statement for 3:1-6 as a whole, and v. 7a is an appropriate setting statement for 3:7b-12. Without v. 7a (for Schmidt it extends to ἡμολογήσας inclusively, reading the plural) the situation statement in 3:7b-8 is considerably impaired. Schmidt points to 1:28 and 1:45 as analogous conclusions to separate pericopae, but neither 1:28 nor 1:45 tells of Jesus' *motion* to a location, a feature that is characteristic of v. 7a and so many of the setting statements. Cf. Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, p. 63, who regards the connection of v. 7a with 3:1-6 as the only possibility.

\(^\text{134}\)For similar situation statements, see above, p. 43.

\(^\text{135}\)It is difficult to agree with Leander Keck, 'Mark 3 7-12 and Mark's Christology', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXIV (1965), 346, when he claims that the transition between vv. 8 and 9 is 'abrupt'. He sees both this abruptness and a lack of relation between vv. 10f. and 'the press of the crowds' as indications that Mark himself did not compose 3:7-12 but added vv. 11f. to a pre-Markan summary (3:7-10). The assumption is that Mark would not compose freely a paragraph with faulty logic and unclear structure (see pp. 345-6). The presence of the narrative pattern, however, enables one to understand more clearly the structure of 3:7-12 (the relation of vv. 7a, 7b-8, 9f., 11, and 12 to one another) and to see especially the relation of v. 8 and v. 9, where a reply-to-the-situation statement follows a situation statement in a conventional fashion. Through an understanding of the pattern one becomes alert also to the connection between v. 10 and 'the press of the crowds' (in v. 9 and through v. 9 to v. 8). Verse 10, as an explanatory comment in the reply-to-the-situation statement (see similar comments in 6:31 and 15:10 in reply-to-the-situation statements), tells why the people thronged about Jesus to the extent that he needed a boat to get away from the crush. Keck denies any parallelism between ἦνα μὴ θαλάσσως αὐτόν (v. 9) and ἦνα μὴ αὐτόν φανερῶν ποιήσωσιν (v. 12; see p. 346, n. 34) but is silent about the parallelism between the former and ἦνα αὐτὸν ἀφωναὶ δοῦσι εἶχον μάτης ἐστὶν in v. 10. This parallelism is a further sign of connection between vv. 9 and 10. The clear presence of the pattern in 3:7-12 also stands against the view that 3:7-10 was a pre-Markan summary that Mark embellished. His composition of 3:7-12 as a whole is quite conceivable in its manifestation of the pattern in regular FPS form.
section;¹³⁶ and v. 12, which tells about Jesus' reply to the spirits, is the reply-to-the-problem section. This section resembles some consequence statements,¹³⁷ but its location in this story immediately after the problem section suggests that it is better understood as a reply-to-the-problem section. If v. 12 is a consequence statement, the structure of the story is FPL rather than FPS, and the form would be irregular with the absence of a reply section after the problem.

The regularity of the pattern in Mark's account is conspicuous in a comparison with Matthew's and Luke's parallels to 3:7-12. Mt. 12:15f. appears to be a severe abbreviation of Mk. 3:7-12 to provide space for the prophetic citation in vv. 17-21. In Matthew's condensation there is no material corresponding to Mark's problem section (Mk. 3:11), but Matthew does present somewhat awkwardly (in 12:16) most of Mark's reply-to-the-problem section (v. 12). Consequently, in Matthew's arrangement Jesus rebukes spirits that are not mentioned. The form of Matthew's revision is setting (v. 15a), situation (v. 15b), reply to the situation (v. 15c), and reply to the problem (vv. 16-21); in the lack of the problem section the structure is noticeably irregular. The pattern is more irregular in Mt. 4:23-25 where a consequence statement (v. 24c) is presented early and where material corresponding to Mark's situation statement in 3:7-12 (vv. 7b-8) appears as an additional consequence statement (Mt. 4:25). Luke's parallel to Mark's narrative (Lk. 6:17-19) is quite irregular in its structure. It has a setting statement (v. 17a) and a situation statement (vv. 17b-18a), but these are followed by a possible result statement in v. 19. The absence of a reply section is

¹³⁶ See similar problem sections above, pp. 78-9.

¹³⁷ See above, p. 113.
quite irregular. In the light of these departures from the pattern by Matthew and Luke one can see that the pattern is most regular in Mark's account.

The disruptions of Matthew and Luke also show that the pattern is not an inevitable way of telling a story. If the pattern were simply a matter of 'popular' narration style, one would expect to find the pattern with relatively little disorder in the narratives of Matthew and Luke. As it is, the pattern is considerably regular only in Mark's narratives. This fact suggests that Mark himself was somewhat responsible for the extent of regular structure in his stories.

Is the narrative pattern, however, visible and regular in Mk. 4:1-34, which appears to be a collection of parables? One would not expect the pattern to be evident in a collection of sayings, especially in one that is so long; but 4:1-34 as a whole clearly displays the short form of the Full Pattern and is structurally a narrative. This interesting fact may be seen in the arrangement of 4:1-34 that follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set.</th>
<th>{1Kat πάλιν ἔρχετο διόδοσιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{καὶ συνάγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πλεῖστος}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{μόστε αὐτὸν εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆκαν εν τῇ θαλάσσῃ}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit.</td>
<td>{2Kat ἐδόθαν τοις αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλαὶ}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{Ἀκοῦετε}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{τὸ ἄρθρο ἐξηλθεν ὁ στιχῶν σπειραί}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπειραί}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>{1Kat ἠλεήθη τας κεφαλινα}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>{Kat κατέφαγεν αὐτῷ}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob.</td>
<td>{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set./Sit.</td>
<td>{5Kat ἄλλο ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{ὅπως οὐχ ἔχειν γην πολλὴν}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>{1Kat ἠθάνατε ἐξαινετέλευν}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepS.</td>
<td>{1}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>{Kat διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob.</td>
<td>{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>{Kat διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ὑζιν ἔξωθεν}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>{3}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9ος ἔλεγεν

10ος ἔγενετο κατὰ μύσας

11ος ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς

12ος ίμην τὸ μυστηρίον ὅδεται τὴς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ

13ος λέγει αὐτοῖς

14ος σπειρισθήκει τὸν λόγον σπειρεῖ
κατ' αι περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμεῖαι εἰσπορευόμεναι
συμπνεύσουσιν τοὺν λόγον
καὶ ἄκραπος γίνεται
καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν τριάκοντα
καὶ ἐν ἐξήκοντα
καὶ ἐν ἑκατόν

21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς
Μή τι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος
ἔνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόσιον τεθῇ
ἡ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίσιν
οὐχ ἔνα ἔπε τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ

22 οὐ γαρ ἐστιν ξυπτὸν ἅ
ἐάν μὴ ἔνα φανερῶθη ἁ
οὗθε ἐγένετο ἀπὸ κρύφου ἅ
ἀλλ’ ἔνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν ἃ

23 εἰ τις ἔχει διὰ αἰκονεῖν
ἀκουέτω

24 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς
Βλέπετε τὸ ἀκουέτε

ἐν ὃ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε
μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν
καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν

25 ὅσ γὰρ ἔχει
δοθῆσεται αὐτῷ ἃ
καὶ ὅσ οὐκ ἔχει ἃ
καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθῆσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἃ

26 καὶ ἔλεγεν
Οὕτως ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ
ὅσ ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ τὸν στήριον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
καὶ καθεδόθη καὶ ἐγείρθηθαι
νῦκτα καὶ ἡμέραν
καὶ ὁ στήριος βλαστῇ καὶ μηκύνηται
ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτὸς

27 καὶ ἔλεγεν
Εἴστεν στάχυν
Εἴστεν πλήρη σῖτου ἐν τῷ στάχυν

28 αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ

29 ἔσται ὃς παραδοτὸς ὁ καρπὸς

ἔυθὺς ἀποστέλλει τὸ ὀρέγανον

ὅτι παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμὸς
In modern study 4:1-34 is variously referred to as a 'book of parables',\textsuperscript{138} a 'complex',\textsuperscript{139} a 'composite discourse',\textsuperscript{140} and a 'parable-chapter'.\textsuperscript{141} A 'narrative element' is sometimes seen in vv. 1f., 10, and 33f.,\textsuperscript{142} but a striking fact is that the whole of 4:1-34 has been written according to the narrative pattern. Verse 1a is the setting statement, which tells of Jesus' teaching by the sea; and v. 1b, which refers to the crowd who came to Jesus, is the situation statement. The parable of the sower (vv. 2-8) along with the invitation to hear (v. 9) is presented as Jesus' reply to the situation. One expects at this point a problem section, and that is given in the disciples' question in v. 10. Verse 11 marks the beginning of a long reply-to-the-problem section (vv. 11-32), which contains Jesus' saying about teaching in parables.

\textsuperscript{138}Knox, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{139}Taylor, G.M., p. 249.

\textsuperscript{140}Cranfield, Saint Mark, p. 146.


\textsuperscript{142}Taylor, G.M., p. 249.
(vv. 11f.), the explanation of the parable of the sower (vv. 13 + 14-20), a cluster of sayings that are relevant to the teaching and hearing of parables (vv. 21-25), and two 'seed' parables about the Kingdom of God (vv. 26-32). The story ends with a narrative statement (vv. 33f.) that seems to be more an editorial comment than a consequence statement. If it is a consequence statement, the form of the narrative is FPL instead of FPS. That 4:1-34 is arranged in conformity with the narrative pattern is significant, for it is an indication that Mark regarded the whole of 4:1-34 as a narrative. If Mark conceived of 4:1-34 in its entirety as a narrative unit, then the views of scholars who see a 'narrative element' only in the so-called 'framework' (especially 4:1) appear to be ill-founded, or at least alien to Mark's apparent understanding of his own material.

One ought not to think, however, that 4:1-34 is necessarily descriptive of one event just because vv. 1-34 are one narrative structurally. A change of location is indicated in v. 10; and vv. 11f., whether they stem from Jesus or Mark, possibly point to a more hostile context than the situation

143Verses 21f. are two sayings that appear to be oriented to the speaking of parables. Parabolic teaching, like a lamp, is ultimately to be seen (v. 21); and what is hidden is obscured for eventual disclosure (v. 22). The invitation to hear in v. 23 is consonant with these positive goals of teaching in parables. Verses 24f., however, pertain to the hearing of parables. Reward is commensurate with performance (v. 24) and character (v. 25). The admonition about hearing in v. 24 is directed towards the quality of hearing with a view to the dual possibilities of reward and judgment (v. 25). Thematically vv. 21-25 are very relevant to the teaching and hearing of parables, although it is quite possible that the placement of these sayings here is secondary. See Jeremias, *Parables*, pp. 91, 110.


145See Jeremias, *Parables*, p. 13, and Willi Marxsen, "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Erklärung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie des Markus", in *Der Exeget als Theologe* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1968), p. 17. Marxsen (pp. 16f.) sees formal similarities between 4:1-20 and 7:14-23, but the resemblances are not actually parallel in terms of the narrative pattern. Mk. 7:14-23 is material from a reply-to-the-problem section, a problem development, and a reply to this development in an extended VIS story. See further below, pp. 371-6.
described in 4:1.\textsuperscript{146} Also, the sayings and parables in vv. 21-32 probably come from various occasions in Jesus' ministry, especially the two seed parables (vv. 26-32), which appear to have been placed here by topical association.

It should be pointed out that Mark's redactional arrangement of his material here is more complex than mere topical association. Verses 13-32 display a thematic structure \((ab\ a + b)\) that is one of Mark's favourite ways of ordering his material.\textsuperscript{147} The saying of Jesus in v. 13 contains two thematic

\textsuperscript{146} As is well known, scholars generally ascribe vv. 11f. to Mark. Cf. Taylor, G.M., pp. 254, 257, who considers the possibility that Mark's construction is based on tradition. So Best, p. 74. See also Geraint Vaughan Jones, The Art and Truth of the Parables (London: S·P·C·K, 1964), p. 229, who presents an informative appendix on the history of the interpretation of 4:10-12 (pp. 225-230). Full consideration of the question of teaching in parables is beyond the scope of this dissertation; however, several observations can be made. There are clear indications that Jesus wanted people to respond to His teaching with hearing and belief. The theme of hearing is mentioned too many times in 4:1-34 to think otherwise, or to assume that Mark himself did not have essentially a positive estimate of Jesus' teaching in public. See here Birger Gerhardsson, 'The Parable of the Sower and Its Interpretation', New Testament Studies, XIV (1967-68), 166, who rightly calls attention to the emphasis on hearing in connection with the parable of the sower. In this respect parables—even obscure parables—presumably could be occasions for hearing and faith in public for those who 'have ears to hear'. Such a view towards parables in public teaching is consonant with 4:33, which stands against the view that obscure parables in public teaching necessarily prevented everyone from hearing (cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 257, and T. A. Burkill, Mysterious Revelation (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1963), pp. 100-3, 110-5), and which may be thought of as commentary on vv. 11b-12. At the same time, however, there are indications of judgment in Jesus' teaching. Judgement is apparent in 4:26 towards 'him who has not', and in a parable such as 12:1-11, which is directed to a hostile audience (see 11:27-33, 12:12, and further below, pp. 321-9). Passages such as these suggest that Jesus used parables in public teaching as a form of judgement towards those who did not have ears to hear: those who were hardhearted, disbelieving, and hostile to Him. Verses 11b-12 possibly are best understood in this respect. They are descriptive of a judgemental role of parables in teaching—a role which did not apply to those in public who might have had ears to hear, and which was therefore not all-inclusive. Through the use of a parable with a veiled meaning, Jesus could provide a potential 'hearer' with an opportunity for hearing, but at the same time deny hearing to those who were resistant to hearing and set against Jesus. (See Gerhardsson, p. 193.) Such an understanding of Jesus' parabolic teaching arises from an attempt to hold together and make sense of various dimensions of His teaching that are evident in 4:1-34.

\textsuperscript{147} See below, pp. 488-94.
interests ('this parable', designated \(a\); and 'all the parables', designated \(b\), which are then considered in an orderly fashion: first \(a\), then \(b\). The explanation of the parable of the sower (vv. 14-20) is the second \(a\) member (concerning 'this parable') of the \(ab\) \(a + b\) structure, and vv. 21-32 (representative of 'all the parables') are the second \(b\) member. In this way Mark organizes the bulk of the content of the long reply-to-the-problem section.\(^{148}\) Such thematic structure is not present in Matthew's and Luke's parallels to this narrative.

An additional fact of great interest is the presence of traces of the pattern in both the parable of the sower and the explanation of the parable. The references to the way (vv. 4, 15), the rocks (vv. 5, 16), the thorns (vv. 7, 18), and the good soil (vv. 8, 20) are formal setting statements in the parable and its explanation, respectively. In v. 15 the phrase, \(\deltaικον\ \sigmaπειρόται \(\delta\ \lambda\gammaοσ\), has the appearance of a situation statement,\(^{149}\) and it is possible that the corresponding references to falling (\(\ξεπεσε\)) and seed (\(\mu\ε\nu \ldots \απα \ldots \απα \ldots \απα\)) in vv. 4, 5, 7, 8, and to the personages (\(\ουτοι \ldots \ουτοι \ldots \απα \ldots \ουτοι\)) and sowing (\(\sigmaπειρόται\) in v. 15; \(\sigmaπιερόμενοι\) in vv. 16, 18; and \(\sigmaπαρέντες\) in v. 20) in the explanation of the parable are descriptive of the situation. The matter should not be pressed, since apart from \(\deltaικον\ \sigmaπειρόται \(\delta\ \lambda\gammaοσ\), the references are not obvious situation statements. In their favour, however, is the fact that situation statements often refer to people, as in 4:1b, and are sometimes fused with setting statements, as is true in Luke's parallel to 4:1 (Lk. 8:4). The statements about growth (\(κατ\ \ευδος \ldots \gammaη\) in v. 5, and \(κατ\ \εδόου \ldots \alphaυξανομενα\)

\(^{148}\)Cf. Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 131, where it is held that 4:1-32 is a random arrangement of isolated fragments.

\(^{149}\)See also \(\deltaικον\ \sigmaυχ \(\epsilonιχε\) \(\gammaη\) \(\piολλη\) in v. 5.
in v. 8) and hearing (in vv. 15, 16, 18, 20) and receiving (in vv. 16 and 20) are reply-to-the-situation statements. One expects at this point a section about antagonists, and these are readily apparent in the references to the birds (v. 4), the scorching sun (v. 6), and the thorns (v. 7) in the parable itself, and in the corresponding statements about Satan (v. 15), persecution (v. 17), and worldly cares, love of wealth, and lust (v. 18) in the explanation of the parable. Lastly, the words about withering (v. 6), bearing no fruit (v. 7), and being productive (v. 8) in the parable, and the corresponding phrases about being 'scandalized' (v. 17), fruitless (v. 19), and fruitful (v. 20) in the explanation of the parable, are consequence statements. One should note that no reply-to-the-problem sections are evident in either the parable or its explanation, and it should be understood that the descriptions, FPL (for vv. 5f., 16f., 18f.), FPS (for v. 15), V1L (for v. 7), V1S (for v. 4b), and V2L (for vv. 8, 20), are all irregular in this respect.

The presence of the pattern in each of the four sections of the parable of the sower, and in the corresponding sections of the explanation, is of interest, for it shows that the structure of 4:1-34, in its conformity to the pattern, is essentially the same as that found in the leading parable in the narrative. One ought not to think of a direct connection here between the structure of the parable and that of 4:1-34, in the sense that the shape of the latter is derived from the structure of the sections of the parable and its explanation. It is more likely that the structure of the narrative is similar to that of the sections of the parable and its explanation because all three are expressions of a traditional pattern of narration that is evident in stories of the Old Testament.

If some of Jesus' sayings were shaped according to the traditional narrative pattern, and traces of the pattern in the parable of the sower
suggest that they were, it is possible to think on the basis of Mark's own sensitive use of the pattern that his rendition of the narrative element in Jesus' sayings is close to the original form of the sayings. How close cannot really be established, but it is apparent that Mark's version is closer than Matthew's and Luke's, if one looks at their parallels to the parable and its explanation.

Matthew's parallel to 4:1-34 (Mt. 13:1-35) has the same FPS structure as Mark's narrative, but there are alterations in Matthew's version of the parable of the sower and especially in the explanation of it. With regard to the parable of the sower (Mt. 13:3-9) there are two instances where the pattern is reduced in Matthew's version: (1) there is no consequence statement in the section about the thorns (v. 7); and (2) with the omission of the phrases about growth in v. 8 what was a reply to the situation in Mark's account (καὶ ἐδόθη . . . αὐξάνωμεν in Mk. 4:8) becomes in effect only a consequence statement (καὶ ἐδόθη . . . τριάκοντα) in Matthew's parallel (Mt. 13:8). In the explanation of the parable (Mt. 13:18-23) there is conspicuous distortion of the pattern in the section about the seed that is sown along the way (v. 19). The section begins with a reply-to-the-situation statement (παντὸς . . . συνείνοις) and ends with a fused setting and situation statement (οὗτος . . . ἔσορες). It is interesting that this distortion of the pattern through inversion occurs in that section of the explanation where Matthew is less dependent on Mark for vocabulary and introduces more material of his own. In this instance the pattern is clearer in Mark's version.150

In Luke's parallels to the parable of the sower (Lk. 8:4-8) and its

---

150 Cf. Gerhardsson, 'The Parable of the Sower and Its Interpretation', pp. 179, 181-2, 185, 190-1, where, in contrast with Matthew's presentation, Mark's is considered to be 'stereotyped', inelegant, imprecise, formally uneven, and like a 'vulgarization'.
explanation (Lk. 8:11-15) there are also departures from the pattern as it is found in Mark's account. With regard to the parable itself, the pattern is distorted in Luke's section about the seed that fell on the rocks (v. 6): there is no problem section, and the notion of a consequence (ἐξηνανθη) does not appear at the end. The pattern is diminished in the section about the thorns (v. 7) with the absence of a consequence statement here as well (cf. Mk. 4:7, Mt. 13:7). In Luke's explanation of the parable there are also two alterations of the pattern: (1) the loss of a reply-to-the-situation statement (through the combination of οἱ ἀκούσαντες with οἱ δὲ τὰ ἄνθρωπον ἀνανασάτῳ) in the section about the seed sown along the way (v. 12); and (2) the absence of a problem section in the part about the seed that fell on the rocks (v. 13). Luke's parallels, therefore, like Matthew's, show certain departures from the pattern both in the parable of the sower and its explanation. It is evident that in the redaction of both Matthew and Luke there is reduction of the pattern away from its forms in Mark's presentation of the parable and its explanation.

Finally, the presence of the pattern in both the parable and its explanation is significant, for it suggests that the explanation is closer in origin to the parable than is often maintained by scholars who prefer to regard the explanation of the parable of the sower as an allegorical interpretation of the early Church.\textsuperscript{151} One cannot claim on the basis of structural resemblance alone that Jesus Himself originally provided an explanation to this parable, and in particular this explanation, but the possibility is there, especially if Jesus Himself used the pattern in His teaching. Traces of the pattern in

\textsuperscript{151} Against the prevailing mood of scholars, Gerhardsson, \textit{ibid.}, p. 192, believes that the explanation of the parable of the sower is 'Jesus tradition'.
the parable of the sower suggest that He did and make the explanation of this parable seem less a complete creation of Jesus' followers.

A narrative that is similar in structure to 4:1-34 is 9:33-50, which manifests rather clearly the short form of the Full Pattern. That 9:33-50 is one narrative unit is evident in the following arrangement:

Set. {33Καὶ ἐλθον εἰς Καφαρναοῦμι

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος} & \text{ ἐπιρώτα αὐτοῖς} \\
\text{Τῇ ἐν τῇ οὐδῇ ἀγελογίζεσθε} & \text{ ἐπιρώτα αὐτοῖς} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Sit. \{34οὶ δὲ ἐσιώπων

\[
\text{πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ ἀγελολάθησαν ἐν τῇ οὐδῇ τῶς μελζών} \}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ καθίσας} & \text{ ἐφώνησεν τοὺς ἀδελφάν} \\
\text{καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς} & \text{ ἐξῆκαν πάντων ἔσχατοι} \\
\text{Εἴ τις ἔλεει πρῶτος εἰναι} & \text{ κατ' ἑαυτῶν διδάκτους} \\
\end{align*}
\]

RepS. \{35καὶ λαβὼν παιδίου

\[
\text{ἐστήκειν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν} \\
\text{καὶ ἐναγαμαλλονεῖς αὐτὸν} \\
\text{ἐπίπεν αὐτοῖς} \\
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
37'ος ἀν ἐν τῶν τοιούτων παιδέων δέχεται ἐπ' τῇ ὀνόματί μου} & \text{ ἐμὲ δέχεται} \\
38καὶ δὲ ἂν ἐμὲ δέχεται & \text{ ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστειλέλατά με} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[36εφὶ αὐτῷ ὁ 'Ἰωάννης \\
\text{Διδάσκαλε} \\
\text{ἐξόμεν τινα ἐν τῇ ὀνόματι σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια} \\
\text{καὶ ἐκπωλοῦρον αὐτὸν} \\
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ὁτι οὐκ ἦκολοῦθει ἦμῖν} & \text{ ἦλει} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Prob. \{39δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν

\[
\text{Μὴ καλύψετε αὐτὸν} \\
\text{oὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐστὶν 'ὅς ποιήσει ἀδύναμιν ἐπὶ τῇ ὀνόματι μου} \\
\text{καὶ ὄνυμηται ταχὺ κακολογησαί με} \\
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
40'ὅς γὰρ οὐκ ἐστιν καθ' ἦμῖν} & \text{ ὑπὲρ ἦμῶν ἐστὶν} \\
41'ὅς γὰρ ἂν ποτὶς ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ἄθατος} & \text{ ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἦστε} \\
\text{ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν} & \text{ ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Understanding the principles of arrangement of 9:33-50 has been a problem for scholars. Some regard 9:33-50, or portions of it, as a 'catena of sayings of Jesus'.\textsuperscript{152} Similarly Best describes 9:33-50 as 'an amalgam of sayings held together by a number of key-words'.\textsuperscript{153} Taylor regards 9:30-50 as 'sayings-material topically arranged, with a narrative element at the beginning'.\textsuperscript{154}


\textsuperscript{153}Best, p. 81.

\textsuperscript{154}Taylor, G.M., p. 99. See also Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, p. 149, who regards vv. 33f. and v. 36 as Mark's contributions to a catechetical source, which he 'turned into a scene in the life of Jesus'. Cf. Dibelius, \textit{F.T.G.}, pp. 260-1, where 9:33ff. is thought of as 'words of Jesus in a narrative setting'.
But like 4:1-34, 9:33-50 is one narrative unit in terms of the narrative pattern. Verse 33a is the setting statement, and the discussion about precedence in vv. 33b-34 is the situation. Jesus' reply to the situation is given to the Twelve in vv. 35-37: (1) he who desires first place will find himself in last place as servant of all the others (v. 35); and (2) in the manner of overstatement not only next in rank but 'identical' with Jesus, even with God Himself, is someone who is least of all, such as a child (vv. 36f.).

John's declaration about rejecting an outsider in v. 38 is the problem section, and Jesus' reply to the problem is given in vv. 39-41 together with sayings about offence (vv. 42-48) and salt (vv. 49f.). Sympathetic strangers are not to be rejected; they, who may appear to be among the 'least', are also welcome and will be rewarded (vv. 39-41). But those who offend a least person, or are offended by hand, foot, or eye, will be in danger of not enjoying life in the Kingdom of God (vv. 42-48). For the time being, it is

155A difficulty in 9:33-50 is the reference to the calling of the Twelve in v. 35, when disciples are already present in vv. 33f. See Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 230. The difficulty is a problem if one wants to find smooth, historical progression in Mark's narratives; but if Mark was not really interested in making a continuous, biographical presentation, the difficulty is not significant. Schmidt saw the reference in v. 35 as a 'new beginning' (ibid.), but it may be nothing more than the beginning of a new narrative section. Certain other reply-to-the-situation statements (8:1c-3, 9:31, 14:13-15, 3:9f.) begin in a similar fashion with references to the disciples, and one section in particular (10:32-34) refers to the Twelve after a statement about disciples. It is possible to attribute the indication in 9:35 merely to the narrative style of Mark, but such a judgement seems unnecessary, inasmuch as the various references to the disciples in the reply-to-the-situation statements are different in spite of their similarity. The presumption is that the references would be more uniform if Mark had invented them. See Cranfield, Saint Mark, p. 308, who offers several possible explanations for the reference to the Twelve.

156Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 406. Thoughts about the 'trustfulness' of children are beside the point. It is also questionable whether 'doing services to insignificant people' is the issue here: see Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 252.

important to be at peace with one another (v. 50b). In this way the material 
in vv. 33-50 is arranged according to the short form of the Full Pattern.

There are several indications that Mark himself composed 9:33-50 as one 
FPS narrative. (1) The structural resemblance of 9:33-50 with 4:1-34 and 
3:7-12 suggests that Mark, who probably composed 3:7-12, and whose hand is 
evident also in the thematic structure of 4:1-34, was the one who arranged the 
content of all three narratives. (2) The reduction of the pattern in Matthew's 
parallel (Mt. 18:1-9) to V2S form is an indication that FPS form was not an 
inevitable structure for 9:33-50. One may infer that its presence in 9:33-50 
is to be attributed to Mark. FPS structure is apparent in Luke's parallel 
(Lk. 9:46-50), but probably because he relied heavily on Mark's narration 
about John's problematical remark and Jesus' reply (see Lk. 9:49f.). (3) The 
closely knit progression of thought in 9:33-50, where theme builds on theme, 
is characteristic of Mark's methodical treatment of thematic elements in his 
narratives and points to Markan responsibility here. For example, 
διελεξθησαν in v. 34 is closely related to διελεγήσες in v. 33b; and the 
reference to the child in v. 36 builds on the saying about the last of all and 
servant of all in v. 35. The various verbal links or catchwords (ἐπὶ τῷ 
ὄνοματι μου/ἐν ὀνόματι δέι Χριστοῦ ἐστε; σκανδάλισσ/σκανδάλιζη; πῦρ/πυρὶ; 
ἀλας/ἀλα) are expressions of conscious thematic arrangement, but it is con-
ceivable here that the topical groupings were made before Mark at an earlier 
stage in the tradition. In general, the narrative pattern is not a 
criterion that can be used by itself to determine various sources of sayings

158 Mark's arrangement of thematic material is discussed at length in 
Part III. See above, p. 142, where attention is called to the progression 
of thought in 2:1-12.

159 See Taylor, G.M., p. 409. See also Beare, pp. 149-50.
when these occur within the same narrative section. One can note, however, the appropriateness of these sayings at this location in this story. A command of Jesus is a dominant characteristic of many reply-to-the-problem sections, and commands are present here in vv. 39, 43, 45, 47, and 50. The appearance of these commands in this long reply-to-the-problem section is evidence which shows that vv. 39-50 are not simply an artificial string of sayings but have been presented in close conformity with the narrative pattern.

(4) Finally, Mark's hand is to be seen in the last command to the disciples to be at peace with one another. Mark tends to bring long narratives to a close with a saying or narrative statement that refers back to an initial concern, and this tendency is apparent here.

A brief FPS narrative is about the descent from the mountain (9:9-13):

Set. { ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους

Sit. { διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς

RepS. {[καὶ τὸν λόγον ἔκρατησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς

Prob. {[καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτῶν

RepP. [ο ἔγραφαν ἑνεπτυχακαὶ πάντα}

See above, pp. 196-7, 205-6, 214.
Taylor maintains that 9:9-13 'cannot be classified on the basis of its form'.\textsuperscript{161} In the language of form criticism this is to say that 9:9-13 exhibits no features that enable the critic to assign the story with confidence to a particular narrative class. If attention, however, is given to the structure of the story—the order of its sections, it can be readily seen that 9:9-13 has discernible narrative structure: that of a FPS narrative in regular form.

The beginning of the story is the setting statement in v. 9a, and the reference to Jesus' instructions in v. 9b is one of those situation statements in which an initiating act of Jesus is the occasion of the story.\textsuperscript{162} The disciples' response to Jesus' charge is presented in v. 10: the reply-to-the-situation statement. Their question in v. 11 is the problem section,\textsuperscript{163} and vv. 12f. are Jesus' reply to the problem.

Only Matthew has a parallel to this story (Mt. 17:9-13), and two structural differences are noticeable in his account. (1) The pattern is abbreviated to a Variation #1 story through the absence of a reply-to-the-situation statement. The problem section (v. 10) immediately follows the situation statement (v. 9b). (2) Matthew adds, however, a consequence statement in v. 13, making the form of his story VIL. Here is another instance where the pattern is altered at the place where Matthew offers material of his own. For the most part, the presence of the pattern in Matthew's account may be attributed to his apparent dependence on Mark's version of the story.

\textsuperscript{161}Taylor, G.M., p. 393. Elsewhere, however, (p. 83) Taylor classifies this story as a Markan construction. Cf. Taylor, F.G.T., p. 150, where 9:9f. is considered to be part of the Transfiguration story.

\textsuperscript{162}See above, pp. 46-7.

\textsuperscript{163}See above, p. 76.
With regard to Mk. 9:9-13, there is some question whether v. 11 is the beginning of a separate tradition that was combined with the rest of the story. But in terms of the narrative pattern there is no reason to see a break in the narrative at v. 11. The verse marks the beginning of a new narrative section, and possibly the discontinuity that is sometimes seen here is nothing more than that occasioned by the beginning of the next formal section. Thematically, vv. 11f. are not so remote from vv. 9f. as some scholars maintain. Both v. 9b and v. 12 allude to the suffering and death of the Son of Man.

The last FPS narrative in regular form is the story in which Jesus speaks of the betrayal (14:17-21):

Set. \{17\text{Καὶ ὁ ὄφλας γενομένης} \}
\text{ἐρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα}

Sit. \{18\text{καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν} \}
\text{καὶ ἑσθιόντων}

RepS. \{ \text{ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔπεθεν} \}
\text{ ''; ἀμὴν λέγω ύμῖν} \text{ ὅτι εἰς ἐξ ἡμῶν παραδώσει με} \text{ ὅ ἑσθιόν μετ' ἐμοῦ} \}

Prob. \{ \text{καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἰς κατὰ εἰς} \text{ καὶ ἐγὼ} \}

RepP. \{ \text{ὄ ὄτι ἔπεθεν αὐτοῖς} \text{ εἰς [ἐκ] τῶν δώδεκα} \}
\text{ ὅ ἐμβαπτίσμων μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον}\}
\text{ὄτι ὅ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει} \text{ καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ} \text{ ὅτι ὅ ὦ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται} \text{ καὶν αὐτῷ εἰ ὦς ἐγεννηθεὶ ὁ ἀνθρώπος ἐκείνος.}\}

According to Taylor, 14:17-21 is 'little more than a prophecy in a narrative


165 See, for example, Nineham, Saint Mark, pp. 239-40.
setting'; but vv. 17-21 are one narrative that displays the Full Pattern in short form. Verse 17, in which Jesus comes with the Twelve, is the setting statement; and the reference to their reclining and eating is the situation statement (v. 18a). Jesus' prophecy of betrayal is His reply to the situation in v. 18b; and the disciples' question, which is expressed by them one by one, is the problem section (v. 19). Verses 20f. present Jesus' reply to their problematical question. With these narrative sections 14:17-21 has FPS structure that in broad lines is the same as that in 4:1-34 and 9:33-50. In this respect 14:17-21 is a full-fledged story.

Matthew's parallel (Mt. 26:20-25) has the structure of a FPS narrative with extended regular form. The saying of Judas in v. 25a is a problem development, and Jesus' answer in v. 25b is His reply to the problem development. Once again the pattern is altered at the place where Matthew presents material of his own. Apart from extended form and a fused setting and situation statement in v. 20, the structure of Matthew's account is the same as Mark's.

Luke's version (Lk. 22:14-23) has different structure with v. 19 and the special material of vv. 15-18. The sayings in vv. 21f., which correspond to sayings in Mark's reply-to-the-problem section (Mk. 14:20f.), are presented in Luke's story without a problem section. The disciples' questioning appears as a consequence statement at the end of the story (Lk. 22:23). In effect, the form of Lk. 22:14-23 is V2L. Of the three versions, it is Mark's narrative that has the most regular form.

Whether vv. 18-21 in Mark's account are the original sequel to v. 17,
has been variously questioned,\textsuperscript{167} but there is no structural reason for doubting the unity of 14:17-21. Such a question arises from the similarity between v. 18 and v. 22. Here it seems preferable to regard 14:22-25 as an extended V2S narrative that has no setting statement, probably because vv. 17-21 were regarded as the context for vv. 22-25.\textsuperscript{168}

Five narratives have manifested FPS structure in regular form (3:7-12, 4:1-34, 9:33-50, 9:9-13, and 14:17-21). There are several FPS stories that have extended regular form, and these are considered next.

\textit{Regular form extended.} Three regular FPS narratives in Mark’s Gospel are extended by developments in the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections (8:13-21, 10:1-12, and 10:32-45). In 8:13-21, the story about the loaves, the narrative is extended through responses and continuations of the reply to the problem:

\begin{verbatim}
Set. \{ \textsuperscript{13}Καὶ ἀφεῖς αὐτοῖς
          πάλιν ἐμβὰς
          ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν
\}

Sit. \{ \textsuperscript{14}καὶ ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους
          καὶ εἰ μὴ ἔνα ἄρτον οὖν ἐξομολογήθη ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ
\}

RepS. \{ \textsuperscript{15}καὶ διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς
        λέγων
        ὁρατε
        Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν φαρισαίων
        καὶ τῆς ζύμης ἦριφδον
\}

Prob. \{ \textsuperscript{16}καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἄλληλους ἂν
        ὅτι ἄρτοις οὐκ ἔχομεν ἂν
\}

\textsuperscript{16}καὶ γνοῦς
        λέγει αὐτοῖς
        τὸ διάλογος ἐσθήθη ἂν
        ὅτι ἄρτοις οὐκ ἔχετε ἂν
\}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{167}See, for example, Taylor, G.M., p. 539; Cranfield, \textit{Saint Mark}, p. 423; and Nineham, \textit{Saint Mark}, p. 378.

\textsuperscript{168}See further below, pp. 430-1.
Most commentators regard v. 14 as the beginning of this story,169 but it is better to see v. 13 as the introductory setting statement.170 That the disciples had only one loaf with them in the boat is the occasion, and the


170 See similar setting statements above, pp. 29-30. Inasmuch as the pattern in most of Mark's narratives begins with a setting statement, it is generally preferable to regard setting statements in question at the edges of stories as introductory setting statements rather than consequence statements, particularly when there is some indication of motion to a place. There are exceptions, of course, when motion to a place is found in a consequence statement (see especially 1:12f., 7:30, 14:16). Cf. 1:28, 8:26, 15:38-41 (v. 41). Some statements may be transitional, such as 1:39 (see tentatively this verse with 1:40-45 and cf. with 7:31-37). Obviously, one should not be dogmatic here, and the decision to regard 8:13 as the introductory setting statement for vv. 14-21 is to be understood as a matter of preference that is based on the predominance of introductory setting statements in the use of the narrative pattern.
remark about it in v. 14 is the situation statement. Jesus' charge in v. 15 is presented as a reply-to-the-situation statement, although, apart from the thematic connection between 'bread' and 'leaven', it is not clear how His reply relates to the situation as it is described in v. 14.\textsuperscript{171} The questioning of the disciples in v. 16 is the problem section; and Jesus' reply to the problem is narrated in vv. 17-19a, with responses of the disciples in vv. 19b, 20b, and continuations of Jesus' reply in vv. 20a, 21.

Only Matthew has a parallel account (Mt. 16:5-12), and several differences in structure are noticeable. Matthew makes 16:4b a conclusion to the preceding story about the search for a sign from heaven by dissociating ἀπελθεν from motion to a place and providing a fused setting and situation statement in 16:5. The most conspicuous difference in Matthew's account is the lack of extension of the reply-to-the-problem section. Jesus' reply is given without responses in vv. 8-11. Also, Matthew provides a consequence statement in v. 12, making the form of the story FPL instead of FPS.

An interesting fact about Mark's version of the story is its structural similarity to 6:35-44 and 8:1-9.\textsuperscript{172} The resemblance becomes apparent if attention is given to narrative sections instead of features and motifs. It will be seen that the three stories have the same narrative structure up through the extended reply-to-the-problem section of each story. The two feeding stories, however, differ structurally from 8:13-21 in having result and consequence statements after the extended reply-to-the-problem sections—that is, in having the long form of the Full Pattern.


\textsuperscript{172}See above, pp. 183-4, 187.
The structural similarity of 6:35-44, 8:1-9, and 8:13-21 is important for several reasons. (1) It illustrates clearly the fact that there is no real difference between FPL and FPS stories. The former differ structurally from the latter only through closing result and consequence statements. Fundamentally, it is a question of just one pattern of narration. (2) The structural resemblance of 6:35-44 (M), 8:1-9 (M), and 8:13-21 (MC) is an instance where there is no essential structural difference between two miracle stories and a Markan construction. The form-critical classifications here are valid to the extent that 6:35-44 and 8:13-21 are about different kinds of experiences. Structurally, however, the classifications cannot be sustained at this point.\footnote{An appeal cannot be made here to the result and consequence statements of 6:35-44 and 8:1-9 to buttress the weakened miracle story category, inasmuch as result and consequence statements are found in long forms of the pattern in various kinds of stories. A better approach to support the category is to ask whether 8:1-9 (perhaps more than 6:35-44) was used as a structural model for the composition of 8:13-21. Such a strategy for the redaction of 8:13-21 is conceivable, particularly since the story displays interest in the content of the feeding stories.} (3) On the basis of the structural similarity of the three stories one may assume that 8:13-21 was a unity for its composer. The presumption is that the structure of 8:13-21 may be considered unified, since the same structure appears unified in the other two stories. (4) In comparison with Matthew's alterations, the presence of the same structure in Mk. 6:35-44, 8:1-9, and 8:13-21 is prime evidence for illustrating the regularity of Mark's use of the pattern.

The second extended FPS narrative with regular form is the story about the question of divorce (10:1-12):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{ \text{Katē ἐκείθεν ἀναστάς} \\
& \quad \text{ἐρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας} \\
& \quad \text{[Kat] πέραν τοῦ Ἰωάννου} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{ \text{καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὀχλοὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν} \}
\end{align*}\]
Verse 1a is the setting statement,\footnote{See similar setting statements above, p. 24.} even though the itinerary of Jesus is not clear.\footnote{See Taylor, G.M., pp. 416-7, for detailed discussion of the possible interpretations. So far as narrative structure is concerned, it does not matter whether καὶ is read or omitted.} The remark about the coming of the crowds to Jesus in v. 1b is the situation statement,\footnote{See similar statements above, pp. 43-4.} and the reference to Jesus' teaching is a brief
reply-to-the-situation statement. The antagonistic question of the Pharisees in v. 2 is the problem section, and Jesus' reply to the problem is given in vv. 3-4a. At this point the narrative becomes extended with a development of the problem in v. 4b. Jesus' reply to this problem development is presented in vv. 5-9. The disciples' question in v. 10 is a second development of the problem, and Jesus' reply is narrated in vv. 11f.

The structure of Matthew's parallel (Mt. 19:1-12) is substantially the same as Mark's. Matthew presents in 19:8f., a reply to the first problem development (v. 7), material (in v. 9) that corresponds to Mk. 10:11. Matthew then offers his own second development of the problem (Mt. 19:10) and reply (vv. 11f.): the question about celibacy and the sayings about eunuchs. The similar structure of Matthew's account is to be seen in connection with its considerable agreement with Mark in vocabulary.

A number of scholars regard Mk. 10:10-12 as an appendix to 10:1-9. It is possible that vv. 10-12 (or more likely vv. 11f.) were once separate

---

177See similar statements above, p. 62. The view of Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 238, that 10:1 can be a conclusion to 9:33-50 is improbable in terms of the narrative pattern. Verse 1 contains material that is common to the first three narrative sections of the pattern and is properly seen in connection with 10:2-12. Elsewhere it is not Mark's practice to end narratives with material that is customarily found in setting statements, situation statements, and replies to the situation. There is also some question about Schmidt's further suggestion that 10:1 should be separated from 10:2-12 and regarded as a summary statement (ibid.). To make this 'incision' is to amputate the first three narrative sections, leaving only a torso that begins with a problem section. It is also not Mark's practice to start stories with problem sections. The violence that Schmidt's suggestion does to the structure of the story arises from his preoccupation with detecting the 'seams' of stories without adequate attention to structure throughout the stories. Schmidt's examination of Mark's Gospel as an alleged continuous presentation has enabled scholars to realize more than ever before that Mark's narratives are units; but when consideration is given to the structure of these narrative units—to the tissue and its internal arrangement as well as to the supposed 'sutures'—some of Schmidt's critical judgements, such as those pertaining to 10:1, are found to be questionable.

178See, for example, Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 221, and Taylor, G.M., p. 419.

in the tradition. It is clear, however, that Mark closely associated vv. 10-12 with 10:1-9 in his redaction of his material. As indicated earlier, vv. 10-12 are presented after vv. 1-9 in conformity with the narrative pattern as a second problem development and a reply to it. Furthermore, vv. 10-12 complete a thematic structure that encompasses vv. 2-12.180 Without vv. 10-12 Mark's arrangement is incomplete. If vv. 10-12 originally were not related to the event described in vv. 1-9, one ought not to think of simple appending. Verses 10-12 are structurally integrated with vv. 1-9 in Mark's version of the story.

The third extended FPS narrative with regular form is the story about

the request of James and John (10:32-45):

Set.  
\{ 32\text{α}Τελευταίον δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ \\
ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα
\}

Sit.  
\{ bκαὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτῶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς \\
σκαὶ εὐαμβοῦντο \\
o δὲ ἀπολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο
\}

\{ dκαὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα \\
ἵππατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν
\}

Set.  
\{ 33\text{α}Τελευταίον δὲ ἐναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα
\}

Sit.  
\{ bκαὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπος παραδόθηκεν τοῖς ἁρχιερεύσιν \\
καὶ τοῖς γραμματεύσιν
\}

RepS.  
\{ cκαὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ
\}

Prob.  
\{ dκαὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἐθνείσιν
\}

RepP.  
\{ 34\text{α}καὶ ἐμπαξοῦσιν αὐτῷ \\
καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐτῷ \\
καὶ μαστίγωσον αὐτὸν \\
καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν
\}

Cons.  
\{ bκαὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται
\}

\{ 35καὶ προστερεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης \\
oi uioi Zebedaiou \\
λέγοντες αὐτῷ \\
Διδάσκαλε \\
θέλουμεν ἵνα ὁ ἐν αἰτήσωμέν σε πολιτικά ἡμῖν
\}

---

180See below, pp. 491-2.
This story has structure that is especially interesting. The remark in v. 32a about going up to Jerusalem is the setting statement, and v. 32b-c is descriptive of the situation: Jesus' leading the way and the disciples' apprehension.
Their fear precedes Jesus' reply to the situation—the third passion prophecy—in vv. 32d-34, which display in themselves traces of the long form of the Full Pattern. The approach of James and John in v. 35 is the problem section, and Jesus' reply to their overture is given in v. 36. Their 'selfish' request in v. 37 \[181\] is the first of three developments of the problem. Jesus' reply to their request is presented partly as a question in v. 38. In v. 39a their answer, which shows misunderstanding, \[182\] is a second problem development; and Jesus' reply is narrated in vv. 39b-40. The third development of the problem is the statement about the hostile reaction of 'the Ten', which prompts Jesus' reply in vv. 42-45.

An understanding of the way in which the pattern is extended enables one to see that 10:32-45 is one narrative in Mark's presentation of his material. In terms of the pattern vv. 35-45 are not in themselves a narrative but only a series of problems and replies, and for this reason it is unlikely that Mark regarded vv. 35-45 as a self-contained story. Verses 35-45 do become a story, however, when they are joined with vv. 32-34, which provide the first three sections of the narrative pattern. Here it is apparent that the third passion prophecy plays an important structural role within 10:32-45 and should not be lifted from the story as 'framework'.\[183\]

---

\[181\]See Nineham, *Saint Mark*, p. 278. Nineham observes that the reaction of the other ten is 'equally selfish', but favors the view that vv. 41-45 are an appendix to vv. 35-40 (pp. 279-80).


\[183\]According to Schmidt, *R.G.J.*, p. 218, 10:32-34 can be detached from 10:35-45. His judgement is based on the supposition that Jesus did not utter the prophecy in vv. 33f. For Schmidt, the behaviour of the disciples and the women in 16:1 is understandable only if Jesus did not speak of His Resurrection. The validity of this interpretation depends on the nature and extent of the disciples' unbelief and the women's fear. When attention is given to narrative structure, it becomes evident that the disconnection of 10:32-34 does violence to a narrative unit whose limits are defined objectively by the conventional requirements of the narrative pattern.
It is interesting that the FPL form of the pattern is faintly evident in Jesus' prophecy in vv. 33f. The reference to going up to Jerusalem in v. 33a is the setting statement, and the indication that the Son of Man will be delivered to the chief priests and scribes (v. 33b) is descriptive of the situation. The statement about their response of sentencing Jesus to death (v. 33c) is the reply-to-the-situation statement. Parallel to v. 33b is the prediction of delivery to the Gentiles (v. 33d). This remark is either a development of the situation or a problem section. Inasmuch as Mark rarely extends a situation statement, the latter is preferable; but since there is little difference between v. 33b and v. 33d, a decision should not be forced. To think that the Gentiles are thematically more problematical than the Jewish leaders is unwarrantable. What matters is that traces of the pattern are evident here. It is seen further in the response of the Gentiles to Jesus in v. 34a, which is parallel to v. 33c and is either a reply to a problem section or a reply to a developed situation statement, depending on how v. 33d is regarded. Finally, the prophecy of the Resurrection in v. 34b is a consequence statement, which brings to a close the sayings that are in narrative form.

It is important to recognize here that the various predictions with third person plural verbs are not simply a series of statements but are presented in conformity with the narrative pattern. This judgement is supported by the rhythmical order of thought in vv. 33a-34a, where v. 33d is parallel to v. 33b, and where v. 34a is parallel to v. 33c. This rhythmical order is a reflection of the narrative pattern in its movement of thought.

The presence of the pattern in vv. 33f. raises the interesting question of responsibility. Are the traces of the pattern in these verses to be attributed to Mark or to the tradition? It is most likely that Mark himself
was the one who shaped vv. 33f. in conformity with the pattern. His regular use of the pattern in his other narratives in comparison with Matthew and Luke encourages one to think that Mark structured vv. 33a-34b as he would narrate a story of greater length. The interplay between v. 32a and v. 33a in this narrative is an internal indication that Mark exercised some redactional control over the composition of this story. If Mark was the person responsible for the structure of these verses, the traces of the pattern may be seen as support for the view that 10:33f. is a *vaticinium ex eventu*, although it is not necessary to assume that redactional control implies the complete absence of traditional information.  

While it is most likely that Mark composed vv. 33f. according to the narrative pattern, the possibility that this pattern is a traditional one that Jesus Himself used raises the further question whether there may be some remote connection between Jesus' teaching and the content of vv. 33f. If Jesus Himself did use the pattern in some way, it may be seen as a hitherto unrecognized criterion for detecting traces of Jesus' teaching in or behind such verses as 10:33f.

Mark's responsibility for structure becomes more evident in a look at the parallel accounts of Matthew and Luke. Matthew's version (Mt. 20:17-28)

---

agrees extensively with Mark's story and has the same overall structure, but there is some alteration of the structure of the passion prophecy. Matthew fuses in v. 19 the references to the Gentiles and their treatment of Jesus, and so disrupts the rhythmical structure that is apparent in Mark's account. In effect, Matthew combines the problem section and the reply to the problem. In Mark's story these sections (Mk. 10:33d and 34a) are distinguishable from one another, although the problem section is not clearly different from the situation statement (10:33b).

Alteration of the pattern is noticeably greater in Luke's parallel to Mk. 10:32-34 (Lk. 18:31-34). Luke's version begins with material (v. 31) that corresponds with the start of the reply-to-the-situation statement in Mark's account (Mk. 10:32d-33b). Luke also ends his brief parallel with a comment in Lk. 18:34. With regard to the passion prophecy in 18:31b-33, the pattern is both less clear and less complete. Luke's silence about the Jewish leaders and his introduction of material about the prophetical writings (v. 31) make the situation statement diffuse. With no remark about a death sentence, the passage lacks a reply-to-the-situation statement. The use of future passive verbs in v. 32 weakens the reply-to-the-problem section, which extends to v. 33a. Clearly the pattern has suffered from Luke's additions and stylistic revisions; his differences are developments away from the pattern. In comparison with both Matthew and Luke there is little doubt that the pattern is clearest and the most regular in Mark's narrative. The pattern is clearest so frequently in Mark's narratives that the conclusion that Mark himself was responsible for its clarity seems unavoidable.

Possibly Mark was somewhat responsible for the location of 10:45 at the end of his story. Some of his narratives have near or at the end a saying or comment that refers back to an initial concern of the story to tie the knot at
the end.\textsuperscript{185} Mk. 10:45 brings to final focus the thought of Jesus' death, which was a concern in the passion prophecy in 10:33f. The location of the saying in v. 45 is nevertheless topically relevant to the sayings about service in vv. 43f. and to a wider context in vv. 37-40.\textsuperscript{186}

In all the FPS narratives that have been illustrated, the narrative sections of the pattern have appeared in regular order. There are two FPS stories with irregular order (10:13-16, 14:32-42). The story about Jesus in Gethsemane (14:32-42) is both irregular and extended, and it will be treated after brief consideration of the story of Jesus and the children (10:13-16).

**Irregular form.** That there is only one story in this category is further testimony to the predominance of regular form in Mark's narratives.

What makes 10:13-16 irregular is the dislocation of just one of its sections—the reply-to-the-situation statement, as can be seen in the following arrangement of the story:

\[
\text{Sit.} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{Kat προσέφερον αύτῷ παιδιά} \\
\text{Ἰνα αὐτῶν ἀφηται}
\end{array} \right. \right\} a
\]

\[
\text{Prob.} \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{οἳ δὲ μαθηταί ἐπετύμησαν αὐτοῖς}
\end{array} \right. \right\} b
\]

\textsuperscript{185}See, for example, above, pp. 196-7, 205-6, 214. 243.

\textsuperscript{186}Wellhausen's well-known judgement that the step from service to self-sacrifice as a ransom is a μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος (\textit{Das Evangelium Marci}, p. 91) is based on too narrow an interpretation of διάκονησαί (merely serving at meals) and too rigid a distinction between this interpretation and the idea of self-surrender. If consideration is given to δοῦναι in v. 45, the relevance of Jesus' saying to its literary context becomes readily apparent (see the use of Δος in v. 37 and δοῦναι in v. 40). The notion of Jesus' selfless giving of His life is to be seen in contrast with James' and John's selfish desire to be given the highest positions available to men in Jesus' glory. And whereas it is presumably the Father's prerogative to give preferred places to whomever He pleases, it is the Son of Man's mission to give His own life as a ransom for many. See further Taylor, \textit{G.M.}, p. 443, who regards the saying in v. 45 as genuine and an integral part of 10:41-45. See also his 'detached note' on pp. 445-6. Cf. Beare, p. 199, who accepts as unquestionable Wellhausen's comment on v. 45.
This story begins without a setting statement. Sometimes when a story lacks a setting statement there are grounds for assuming that the preceding story was regarded as the context for the narrative that is without explicit fixation. But there is little reason to think that 10:1-12 (v. 10) was the setting for 10:13-16.187 The view that this story, which is about children, follows naturally a story about marriage188 is not convincing, particularly since 10:1-12 is more about divorce and adultery than marriage. Another possibility is that 10:13-16 is to be associated with 10:32-45, if these two narratives—combined and inverted—are in some way a doublet of 9:33-37.189 In any case, 10:13-16 is without clear orientation in Mark's Gospel.

Without a setting statement, the story opens with a situation statement: the remark about the bringing of children to Jesus for Him to touch them. One expects a reply-to-the-situation statement at this point—some response of Jesus to the children. What follows the situation statement, however, is


188 Taylor, G.M., p. 422.

189 For brief references to various doublet theories relating to 9:30-50 and 10:32-45 see Rawlinson, p. 144; Beare, p. 199; and Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 269.
a problem section (v. 13b) in which the disciples attempt to keep the children away from Jesus. His reply to the problem is presented in vv. 14f. Actually, the order of the narrative sections is regular so far, since with the absence of a reply-to-the-situation statement the form of the story is that of VIS stories. But the structure of 10:13-16 becomes irregular with the unexpected appearance of the reply-to-the-situation statement after Jesus' reply to the problem.

Matthew's parallel (19:13-15) shows an attempt to offset the irregularity in Mark's story. Up through 19:14 the structure of Matthew's story is the same as that in Mark's, but in v. 15 the reply-to-the-situation statement about Jesus' laying His hands on the children is partially turned into a consequence statement with the addition of ἐπορεύθη ἐκείνων, making the pattern long instead of short. Luke in his account (Lk. 18:15-17) simply omits any reference to Jesus' touching the children. It is unlikely that Luke's omission was an attempt to correct the structural irregularity in Mark's story, for the frequent irregularity of the pattern in Luke's narratives displays little interest in matters of structure, so far as the pattern is concerned. His wholesale adoption of the sayings of Jesus in Mark's account stands in contrast with Luke's lesser dependence on Mark's narrative statements in Mk. 10:13-15. Luke's independence is asserted further by his complete silence about the narrative statement in Mk. 10:16. It is not necessary to think that Luke ignored this verse to correct an irregularity. The resultant structure of Luke's story (situation, problem, reply to the problem) is, however, that of a regular VIS narrative without a setting statement.

It is important to note that the pattern is apparent in Mk. 10:13-16, even though the reply-to-the-situation statement is deferred to the end. Irregularity does not mean the absence of the pattern, and this fact is true
also in the extended irregular story of Jesus in Gethsemane.

**Irregular form extended.** As indicated earlier, there is only one irregular FPS story with extended form, the story of Jesus in Gethsemane (14: 32-42). The only pattern irregularity is the development of the reply to the situation in v. 39. Apart from this development, the story is an extended FPS narrative with regular form. An interesting feature of the structure of this story is the fact that the narrative sections display the pattern in V2S form. This feature together with the overall FPS structure of the story is evident in the following arrangement:

```
Set. {}  32Kat ἔρχονται εἰς χώραν οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γέθσεμαν

Set. {}  καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
         Καθέσατε ὥσε ἐως προσεύξωμαι

Set. {}  33Kat παραλαμβάνει τὴν Πέτρον
         καὶ [τὸν] Ἱδικμόν
         καὶ [τὸν] Ἰωάννην μετ' αὐτοῦ

V    Sit. {}  καὶ ἤρεματο εὐθαμβεῖτειαν
       καὶ ἀδημονεῖν

Sit. 2   34Kat λέγει αὗτοῖς
         Περὶλυπὸς ἐστιν ἡ φυχὴ μου ἐως θανάτου
         μείνατε ὥσε
         καὶ γρηγορεῖτε

Sit. 2   35Kat προελθὼν μικρῶν
         ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
         καὶ προσηύχετο

Sit. {  }  ἵνα εἰ δυνατόν ἐστιν
         παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα
         }a

RepS. {}  36Kat ἔλεγεν
         ΛΑΒΒΑ
         ὁ πατὴρ

RepS. {  }  πάντα δυνατά σοι
         παρένευγε τὸ ποτήριον τούτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ
         }a

RepS. {  }  ἀλλ' οὕ τι ἐγὼ θέλω
         ἀλλά τι σύ
         }b

Prob. {}  37Kat ἔρχεται

Set. {  }  καὶ εὐφράσθηκεν αὐτοὺς καθευδοντας
```
With regard to the overall structure of the story, the note in v. 32a about coming to Gethsemane is the setting statement. This indication is followed by a lengthy situation statement (vv. 32b-34) that reveals Jesus' desire to pray (v. 32b), His anxiety (v. 33b), and apprehension of death (v. 34a). The situation statement also names the participants (v. 33a) and mentions their assignment to watch while Jesus prays (v. 34). Verses 35f. tell of His praying, which may be seen as His response to the situation. His praying fulfils His intention to pray, which was part of the occasion of the story. The statement about the disciples' sleeping (v. 37a) is the problem section,
and Jesus' reply to their inability to watch is given in vv. 37b-38. His departure to pray a second time amounts to a development of His reply to the situation and is the feature that makes the pattern irregular in this story. The remark in v. 40 about the return of Jesus and the disciples' drowsiness is a development of the problem. Jesus' reply to the development (vv. 41f.) is not given immediately but only after He comes to the disciples for the third time. In broad lines, therefore, the story of Jesus in Gethsemane is a FPS story that is both irregular through a development of the reply to the situation and extended with a problem development and accompanying reply.\(^{190}\)

As indicated earlier, some of the narrative sections display the V2S form of the pattern. Sometimes the V2S form is not altogether clear, but traces of setting-situation-reply narration are evident enough. The situation statement (vv. 32b-34) is the first section that manifests V2S structure. The use of ἡσυχίας as a place reference in v. 32b makes this brief section a formal setting statement within vv. 32b-34. The remark about the anxiety of Jesus in v. 33 is a miniature situation statement, and the saying of Jesus in v. 34 is an internal reply-to-the-situation statement.

The reply-to-the-situation statement (vv. 35f.) of the whole narrative also manifests in itself the pattern in V2S form. The phrase about Jesus' moving a short distance away in v. 35a is the setting statement. Probably the note about His falling on the ground is another part of the setting statement, but it is possible that the note belongs to the situation statement: the remark about Jesus' prayer. The prayer itself in direct speech in v. 36 is the formal reply-to-the-situation statement. Again the setting-situation-reply

\(^{190}\)Cf. the analysis of structure by Lohmeyer, pp. 313-4. In characteristic fashion Lohmeyer divides the story into three parts (vv. 32-34, 35-41, 41-42) and further sees threefold structure in each part. See also Johnson, p. 235, who elaborates on the 'rule of three'.
rhythm of V2S structure is evident within a narrative section.

This form of the pattern is further apparent within the next two narrative sections combined (vv. 37a-38). The phrase καὶ ἔρχεται is a characteristic that is present in a number of setting statements\(^{191}\) and is a hint of a setting statement in this V2S section. The reference to the sleeping of the disciples is the situation statement, and Jesus' reply to Peter is the reply-to-the-situation statement within the section.

The fourth V2S section is found in miniature in v. 39, the irregular development of the reply to the situation of the whole story. The phrase καὶ πάλιν ἡπελθὼν is the setting statement, and Jesus' praying is the situation. The content of His prayer is only alluded to in the phrase τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἶπον, which is formally the reply-to-the-situation statement.\(^{192}\)

This V2S section is minute, but the setting-situation-reply movement of thought of V2S form is there nevertheless.

In the fifth V2S section (v. 40) the phrase καὶ πάλιν Ἐλθὼν is the setting statement; and the sleeping of the disciples is the situation statement. The comment about the disciples' not knowing how to reply is formally a reply statement in that it indicates that no reply is given. With the absence of a situation in vv. 41f., the last section does not have V2S form.

Internal pattern structure is thus visible several times in this narrative. Such a feature is not unique with this story but is evident in other narratives and conspicuously so in the story of Jesus' baptism and temptation (1:9-13)\(^{193}\) and the story of Peter's denial (14:66-72)\(^{194}\)—narratives that

---

\(^{191}\)See above, p. 24.

\(^{192}\)Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 555, who considers this phrase to be a gloss.

\(^{193}\)See below, p. 379.

\(^{194}\)See below, pp. 339-42.
are thematically relevant to 14:32-42.\textsuperscript{195}

The presence of FPS and V2S form in 14:32-42 is an aid for understanding more clearly the redaction of Matthew and Luke. Three alterations of structure are noticeable in Matthew's account (26:36-46). (1) The reply to the situation is developed twice (26:42 and 44) to emphasize the idea that Jesus prayed three times. Matthew's interest stands in contrast with Mark's concern, which is to show that the disciples slept three times, a concern that is consonant with his interest elsewhere in calling attention to the disciples' unbelief and lack of understanding during Jesus' ministry. (2) Matthew presents a reply to a problem development (vv. 45f.) but not right after the problem development (v. 43). The two sections are separated by Matthew's addition of the second reply-to-the-situation development (v. 44). Here is another instance where Matthew's added material alters narrative structure. (3) V2S structure is lost in the problem development in Matthew's account. It has a setting statement (καὶ ἐλθὼν πάλιν) and a situation statement (ἐδρευ... βεβαιμένοι) but no reply to the situation statement through silence about the disciples' loss of words. The deterioration is possibly a further consequence of the addition of v. 44.

Luke's account (22:40-46) is considerably different from Mark's story, and there is some question whether Luke used Mark as a source.\textsuperscript{196} Luke's story manifests the FPS form of the pattern but without extension. His account also displays internal V2S form (v. 41 and vv. 45f.) but less of it. There is a conspicuous structural irregularity in Luke's story at the place where there is a block of special material (vv. 43f.). These verses, which


have the appearance of a series of comments, separate the problem section (v. 45) from the reply-to-the-situation statement (v. 41) and so interrupt the narrative pattern. In their disturbance of the pattern, vv. 43f. appear secondary. Here the pattern as a criterion suggests that the codices, A B W, and other witnesses, are correct in omitting these verses.¹⁹⁷

The narrative pattern is useful also as a criterion for evaluating the hypothesis of K. Kuhn that Mark's story of Jesus in Gethsemane is derived from two sources (Source A = vv. 32, 35, 40f.; and Source B = vv. 33f., 36-38), which have been interwoven and expanded by Mark into a threefold story to call attention to the value of threefold prayer.¹⁹⁸ Kuhn detects two three-part reports (exposition + prayer scene + pointed saying).¹⁹⁹ There is some question whether this concept of three-part structure is adequate to account for the structural features (such as V2S form) that are evident in Mark's story, but the two sources which Kuhn isolates are in some respects convincing—moreso than several of Kuhn's arguments to establish these sources. For example, his appeal to later silence about the first group of disciples as an argument against the originality of two groups and for double expositions is of questionable worth. The argument is based on the (biographical?) presupposition that Mark would have resolved the distinction between the two groups and mentioned all the disciples later in the story, if they had actually

¹⁹⁷Cf. Leaney, p. 273.

¹⁹⁸See Karl Georg Kuhn, 'Jesus in Gethsemane', Evangelische Theologie, XII (1952-53), 263-7. See also Barbour, p. 234. There is some question whether Mark can be credited with such concern for threefold prayer. As indicated above, Matthew's structural developments make explicit Jesus' praying three times, but Mark's structure shows interest in Jesus' coming three times and finding the disciples asleep on each return. Kuhn possibly has interpreted Mark through Matthew here. In any case Kuhn's observation about threefold prayer is relevant more to Matthew's account than to Mark's.

¹⁹⁹Kuhn, pp. 266-7.
been divided. Where Kuhn's two sources are plausible is in their narrative structure—not because of the broad, three-part sections that are delineated by Kuhn but in the fact that both sources manifest the FPS form of the narrative pattern. Source A has a setting statement (v. 32a), situation statement (v. 32b), reply-to-the-situation statement (v. 35), problem section (v. 40 without παλιν), and a reply-to-the-problem section (v. 41). Source B has no setting statement but does have a situation statement (vv. 33f.), a reply-to-the-situation statement (v. 36), a problem section (v. 37a), and a reply-to-the-problem section (vv. 37b-38). Here the narrative pattern supports Kuhn's hypothesis of two sources.

If, however, the pattern supports Kuhn's sources in their overall structure, the V2S form of the pattern presents difficulties for Kuhn's own conception of the sources' overall structure. The sections of both sources disrupt V2S sections in Mark's narrative and do not manifest in themselves V2S structure as much as Mark's sections. Whether these facts tell against the validity of these sources—or against the redaction of Mark—depends on one's estimate of V2S structure as a primitive, traditional form. If it is regarded as a purely redactional form, its presence in 14:32-42 may be nothing more than Mark's contribution to the material in his integration of sources such as those which Kuhn proposes. But if V2S form is a primitive, traditional form of narration, one has to reckon with its extensive presence in Mark's story as it now stands and to evaluate more critically Kuhn's sources for their comparative lack of V2S structure and frequent disruption of it in Mark's account.

For a summary of the discussion of the FPS narratives it is useful to

---

200 See Kuhn, p. 263.
list them together with the symbols of the form-critical classifications.201

**FPS NARRATIVES**

1. **Regular Form**
   - 3:7-12
   - 4:1-34
   - 9:9-13
   - 9:33-50
   - 14:17-21
   --- | --- | ---
   SU/IR | EF | SS
   EP | EF | SC
   EP | SY | MC
   EP/EX | AS | MC/SY
   PS | L | S

2. **Regular Form Extended**
   - 8:13-21
   - 10:1-12
   - 10:33-45
   EP | EF | MC
   D | AC | P
   EP/PA- | EF/A | MC/S

3. **Irregular Form**
   - 10:13-16
   PA | AB | P

4. **Irregular Form Extended**
   - 14:32-42
   PS | L | S

This part of the discussion has shown that these stories have essentially the same structure. The same kinds of narrative sections appear in the same order. In this respect there is no fundamental difference between these stories and those with FPL structure. The only difference is that FPS stories lack result and consequence statements at the end. FPS structure is simply an abbreviation of the long form of the Full Pattern, not a new structure.

The structure of these FPS narratives is quite regular. The order of the sections is regular in all but two of the stories. In the two irregular stories the irregularity is due either to the dislocation of just one narrative section or to the development of the reply to the situation. Only one FPS story lacks a setting statement.

The regularity of FPS form makes it a useful criterion. It helps to show that 3:7-12, 4:1-34, 9:33-50, and 10:32-45 are single narratives that have essentially the same structure. FPS form as a criterion reveals new

---

201See the chart above, p. 25.
instances where stories that have different form-critical labels have basically the same structure. Among the FPS narratives pronouncement stories, stories about Jesus, and Markan constructions are alike in their narrative structure.

The consistency with which FPS form is regular in Mark's stories over against Matthew's and Luke's parallels is evidence which suggests that Mark himself was mainly responsible for the pattern's regularity in his stories. Of interest are places where the pattern appears within narrative sections, especially where some form of the pattern is present in sayings of Jesus. Its presence here raises the question whether the pattern is to be attributed wholly to Mark at this point, or whether it in some way stems from earlier stages of the tradition, possibly from Jesus Himself.

While the FPS narratives are quite regular in the order of their narrative sections, the VIL narratives are even more regular: only one out of twenty-one VIL stories has irregular form. These stories are the next to be illustrated.

C. Variation #1 Long Narratives

One of the several ways in which the Full Pattern is abbreviated is through the omission of the reply-to-the-situation statement. In telling a story, the narrator proceeds from the situation statement directly to the problem section. This form of the narrative pattern has been designated Variation #1 Long (VIL) and may be compared with FPL structure in the following representation of the two forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FPL</th>
<th>VIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set.</td>
<td>Set.</td>
<td>Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit.</td>
<td>Sit.</td>
<td>Sit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepS.</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepP.</td>
<td>RepP.</td>
<td>RepP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This comparison enables one to see that V1L form is essentially not a different kind of structure but is merely a simple abbreviation of the Full Pattern. As long as corresponding narrative sections appear in the same order, there is warrant for thinking of one basic pattern of narration.

As indicated above, twenty-one narratives in Mark's Gospel exhibit V1L structure: nine with regular form, eleven with extended regular form, and one with irregular form. In order to comment on all these stories it will be necessary to limit discussion whenever possible. For this reason, reference will be made to Matthew's and Luke's parallels only on occasion, and the evaluation of others' hypotheses about the structure of Mark's narratives will be held to a minimum. The main purpose of the discussion continues to be the illustration of the structure of Mark's stories as they now exist in his Gospel, so that the pattern's remarkable presence and characteristics can be fully recognized and appreciated. Illustration of the V1L narratives begins with those that have regular form.

Regular form. Of the nine narratives with regular V1L structure, five are miracle stories (1:21-28, 1:29-31, 1:40-45, 6:45-52, 7:31-37), three are known as stories about Jesus (1:35-39, 6:1-6a, 15:25-32), and one is regarded as a Markan construction (14:26-31). Three stories do not have result statements (1:35-39, 14:26-31, 15:25-32), and those that do are illustrated first, beginning with the story of the man with the unclean spirit (1:21-28):

Set. \(21\text{Kat eisporo\'ontai eis Kafarvao\'u}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kat e\'u\theta\'e ti\z o\z e\'s o\beta\beta\a\'i\nu} \\
[\varepsilon\i\sigma\varepsilon\ell\o\nu] e\i\z t\i\z n\ \varepsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\varepsilon\gamma\i\nu \\
\text{et\'\i\z a\'i\nux}
\end{align*}
\]

Sit. \(22\text{Kat ee\pi\l\i\o\s\o\nu\o\t\o e\pi t\i\z \delta\i\delta\a\k\h\i\z a\u\to\u}\i\nu}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\'h\i\z ge\p\i\v\i\o\d\a\k\h\i\z a\u\to\u\d\i\z \w\i\z e\x\o\u\s\o\l\a\v e\x\i\nu} \\
\text{kat o\u\x \w\i\z o\i\g\r\a\r\m\a\m\a\t\e\i\z}
\end{align*}
\]
The narrative pattern is rather evident in this story. Verse 21a is the setting statement, and vv. 21b-22 are the situation statement. The comment in v. 22b is close to being a reply-to-the-situation statement that would make the form of the pattern FPL instead of V1L, but it is preferable to regard the comment as part of the situation statement on the strength of the periphrastic construction.\textsuperscript{202} Verses 23f., which tell of the man with the unclean spirit, are the problem section.\textsuperscript{203} Jesus' reply to the problem—a command—is given in v. 25, and the immediate result of the command is told in v. 26. The story ends with a confessional consequence statement in v. 27 with an additional

\textsuperscript{202}See similar situation statements above, pp. 39-40.

\textsuperscript{203}See similar problem sections above, pp. 78-9.
consequence statement in v. 28.204

Among the form critics, however, there is some question about the classification of this story. Dibelius lists 1:23ff. among the paradigms of a 'less pure type',205 assuming that the miracle is subordinate to the idea of preaching.206 Bultmann classifies the story as a miracle story, considering the motif of authoritative teaching to be secondary.207 In an early analysis Taylor classifies 1:23-27 as a miracle story,208 but in his commentary of Mark's Gospel he maintains that the form of the story is anterior to that of a miracle story: 'In it [1:21-28] we see a stage before it has become a popular narrative, one nearer to the original eyewitnesses'.209 The presence of the narrative pattern in VIL form in 1:21-28 supports Taylor in his judgement about the unity of the story. Verses 21f., which provide the setting and situation statements, are essential to the pattern within 1:21-28 as a whole.

204See similar consequence statements above, pp. 109-11. To v. 28, cf. 5:20. While it is true that v. 28 is not necessary to the pattern in 1:21-28, since v. 27 is an adequate consequence statement in itself, the presence of two or more consequence statements within one story is not uncommon in Mark's narratives. See, for example, 7:56f., 11:7-10, 15:38-41, 1:43-45, 5:42b-43, 11:18f., 12:12, 15:46f., 14:50-52, 6:43f., 8:8b-9, p. III above, et passim.
205Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 43.
206Ibid., p. 290.
207Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 209.
208Taylor, F.G.T., p. 121.
209Taylor, G.M., p. 171. Cf. Best, p. 68. With regard to Taylor's analysis, the question is not whether 1:21-28 is like or unlike miracle stories in structure, but whether miracle stories have more complex structure than that detected by form-critical analysis—that is, whether miracle stories in general have structure that is more like 1:21-28 as a whole. The presence of VIL form of the pattern both in 1:21-28 and a number of miracle stories shows ultimately that miracle stories have essentially the same structure as other kinds of narratives in Mark's Gospel.
Many scholars, however, consider vv. 21f. to be merely an editorial 'seam' and regard v. 23 as the actual beginning of the report. The notion that vv. 21f. are a seam is based on the assumption that a continuous presentation—whether wholly arbitrary or in broad lines genuine—was one of Mark's chief concerns in his editing of his stories. According to this view, the introductions and conclusions of Mark's stories were used to make a continuous story—not with the precision and interests of a modern biographer but with primitive attempts at connecting some of the stories and giving the whole presentation a sense of movement. The formal role of the seams was to provide connection and transition. Such a view has become almost axiomatic in Markan studies.

Another way of understanding verses like 1:21f. is suggested by the narrative pattern in its recurrence throughout Mark's Gospel. These verses may be seen as conventional sections of a pattern of narration, where their primary orientation is not to connection but to the customary requirements of the pattern itself. According to this interpretation, an overwhelming majority of Mark's stories begin with setting statements and situation statements because this was the way stories generally were told. If stories have

210See, for example, Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 50, and Lohmeyer, p. 34. Taylor also, G.M., p. 173, sees v. 23 as the beginning of the 'story proper'. See also the recent article by Robert H. Stein, 'The "Redaktionsgeschichtlich" Investigation of a Markan Seam (Mc 1 21f.)', Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXI (1970), 70-94. Stein, however, does not think that v. 23 was the original beginning (p. 86). With the use of various 'canons' Stein determines that 1:21f. is a Markan seam and then infers on the basis of apparent redaction in vv. 22, 23, and 27 that 'Mark by his redaction emphasizes Jesus' teaching at the expense of his exorcizing' (pp. 90-1). An aspect of redaction that Stein does not discuss is Mark's overall arrangement of his material in 1:21-28. The thematic structure of this story (a + b ab; see below, pp. 500-1) manifests sustained, dual interest in Jesus' teaching and exorcism. From this thematic structure one can infer that for Mark Ἰησοῦς Ναζαρηνός both taught with authority and had control over the unclean spirits because He was ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. See Taylor's detached note on Ναζαρηνός and Ναζωραῖος, G.M., pp. 177-8.
setting statements and situation statements in Mark's Gospel, it is not because the stories have been endowed with these statements for the first time for the sake of connection, but because these stories have had these or similar statements before Mark in conformity with the traditional way of telling a story. Furthermore, if Mark has contributed information to the setting and situation statements of some of his stories, he has done so primarily in keeping with the narrative pattern and only secondarily in the interest of connection. Whether his contributions of content (vocabulary and style) and understanding of the various settings and situations are based on authentic information cannot be known. The appearance of comments from time to time in the setting and situation statements indicate, however, a distinction on the part of Mark between two levels of narration (information and explanation), which suggests that at least Mark himself valued his information.

Important grounds for supporting this understanding of setting and situation statements are found in the narrative sections that manifest in themselves within stories some form of the narrative pattern. For example, setting and situation statements that are present in V2S structures within narratives, and are in no way seams between stories, are evidence that setting statements and situation statements are fundamentally not links between stories but rather part of a setting-situation-reply pattern of narration, which has come to be recognized in this investigation as a brief form of a longer, traditional pattern. If this interpretation of the setting

211Comments in setting statements are present in 15:16a, 22, 42. Comments are found in situation statements in 1:16b, 1:21b-22 (in v. 22), 6:47f. (in v. 48), 7:2-4 (vv. 3f.), 12:18a, 12:41b-42, 14:53b-56 (v. 56).

212An illustration is 14:32-42, pp. 262-3.
and situation statements is valid, they should be regarded first of all as part of the particular pattern in which they are found, and then afterwards as possible instances of connection and transition when there are grounds for such a consideration.

With regard to the idea that v. 23 is the actual beginning of the story, the verse is not a probable beginning in terms of the narrative pattern. It is not Mark's practice to start his other stories with problem sections; and if the pattern is a traditional pattern, it is not likely that an earlier form of the story began simply with a problem section.\(^\text{213}\)

The second narrative with regular VIL form is the story about the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (1:29-31):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{29\text{καὶ ἐλθὼς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες} \\
& \quad \text{稹θον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου} \\
& \quad \text{μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{30\text{ἡ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο πυρέσουσα} \}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Prob.} & \quad \{31\text{καὶ ἔλεγος ἀυτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς} \\
\text{RepP.} & \quad \{31\text{καὶ προσέλθών} \\
& \quad \text{ἠγείρειν αὐτὴν} \\
& \quad \text{κρατήσας τῆς χειρός} \}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Res.} & \quad \{31\text{καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετὸς} \}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cons.} & \quad \{31\text{καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς}. \}
\end{align*}
\]

This brief narrative is a model VIL story. Verse 29 is the setting statement, and the reference to the illness of Peter's mother-in-law is the situation statement (v. 30a). No reply-to-the-situation statement is presented. Instead the narrator proceeds directly to the problem section: the statement that the disciples tell Jesus about the woman, presumably informing Him of

\(^{213}\text{Cf., however, brief traditions with situation (problem?) and reply structure (= V2S form without a setting statement) in Q (Mt. 12:38-42; Lk. 11:29-32), M (Mt. 15:12-14), and L (Lk. 17:20f.).} \)
her illness (v. 30b). Jesus' raising her by the hand is His reply to the problem (v. 31a), and the indication that the fever left her is the result statement (v. 31b). The remark about her serving the men (v. 31c) is the consequence statement.

With corresponding narrative sections in the same order, 1:21-28 and 1:29-31 have the same narrative structure. Here it is evident that there is no relation between the pattern and narrative length. V'IL form appears just as well in average length stories like 1:21-28 and short narratives like 1:29-31. That both stories have similar structure is not due to the fact that both are about miracles, but rather because both are told according to a conventional pattern of narration that is evident in various kinds of stories throughout Mark's Gospel.

That V'IL form is not an inevitable structure for 1:29-31 is shown by Matthew's account (Mt. 8:14f.), where there is no indication of the disciples' speaking to Jesus about Peter's mother-in-law. The story therefore lacks a problem section. Jesus learns of the woman's illness directly by seeing her in her stricken condition, and this action is narrated in the situation statement (8:14b). The resultant structure of Matthew's story is V2L, a form of the pattern that does not appear in miracle stories in Mark's Gospel.

The story about the healing of Peter's mother-in-law is generally considered to be primitive and close to the historical reminiscences of Peter. If 1:29-31 is a primitive report, the presence of V'IL form is of particular interest, for it means that the structure of the other V'IL stories

---

214See similar problem sections above, pp. 80-1.
216See, for example, Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 56, and Taylor, G.M., p. 178.
is essentially that of an early report. If, however, as Nineham suggests, the story 'reached St Mark, like the rest of his material as part of the general oral tradition of the Church',\(^{217}\) the presence of VII form in 1:29-31 may be simply another manifestation of narration according to a fundamental pattern, which Mark has used with regularity in his composition of his stories. It cannot be known whether the VII form of this story stems from Mark or from the oral tradition. Matthew's alteration of the structure of his story is an indication that the Evangelists had some control over the formation of their narratives, and one may infer that the form of the pattern in Mark's account is to be attributed to Mark himself. But with the fact that the narrative pattern is evident in the Old Testament,\(^{218}\) it is conceivable that the story was structured in the oral tradition according to this traditional, Old Testament pattern. If so, it is further conceivable that Mark preserved the oral structure of the story through his consistent and regular use of the pattern. Certain knowledge is impossible here; but if there is ever a way to determine the structure of the narrative units in the oral tradition, it would seem that the route of access is through an understanding of the pattern in Mark's narratives, particularly since Matthew's and Luke's alterations of the pattern are often departures from it.

The third VII narrative with regular form is the story about the healing of the leper (1:40-45):

\[
\text{Sit. } \{^{40}\text{Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς}
\]
\[
\quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν} \\
\quad [\text{καὶ γονυπετῶν}]
\end{array} \right. \\
\quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{καὶ λέγων αὐτῷ} \\
\quad \text{δι’ ἐὰν θέλησ}
\quad \text{δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι}
\end{array} \right. \\
\]
\]

\(^{217}\)Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 81.

\(^{218}\)See below, pp. 436-70.
This story lacks a setting statement and is without any orientation. There are no apparent grounds for assuming that 1:35-39 was regarded as the context for 1:40-45. This absence of fixation is not aided by the possibility that 1:39 is the setting statement for 1:40-45.\(^\text{219}\) This idea has merit, for if v. 39 is joined with 1:40-45, the resemblance between this story and 7:31-37 is increased.\(^\text{220}\) Furthermore, the statement tells about motion to a place, and this feature is characteristic of many setting statements. Possibly Mark wrote 1:39-45 after he had completed 1:35-38, composing v. 39 as a setting statement for 1:40-45 with v. 38 in mind. But even if the story about the leper is 1:39-45, v. 39 does not localize the story except in the most general way, implying that Jesus' encounter with the leper took place somewhere in

\(^{219}\)See Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 63.

\(^{220}\)See 7:31-37 below, p. 282.
Galilee. So far as the pattern is concerned, if v. 39 is the setting statement for 1:40-45, the structure of the story of the leper remains V1L, but the form of 1:35-38, deprived of the consequence statement in v. 39, becomes V1S instead of V1L. A second possibility is to regard v. 39 simply as the conclusion to 1:35-38. Verse 39 is an appropriate consequence statement for 1:35-38, particularly since the verse fulfils v. 38 thematically. If theme is the chief criterion for a decision, v. 39 is best seen as the conclusion to 1:35-38. As the simplest solution, it has been adopted provisionally for the illustration of these stories. A third possibility is to consider whether v. 39 had a dual role for Mark: concluding 1:35-38 thematically in the fashion of a consequence statement, but serving also as a setting statement for 1:40-45 without thematic relatedness to the content of the story. If there is substance to this third possibility, v. 39 may be seen as a sign of Mark's attempt to make a continuous presentation. In such a presentation v. 39 is not a simple note of transition but is a statement that is made in conformity with the narrative pattern. If the pattern is the sole criterion for a decision, the first possibility seems the best solution; but the other two possibilities remain viable alternatives.

Whether v. 39 is the setting statement for 1:40-45 or not, the remark about the leper's coming to Jesus in v. 40a is the situation statement, which is fused syntactically with the problem section in v. 40b: the statement about the leper's plea for cleansing. Both Matthew and Luke attempt

221See 1:35-39 below, pp. 290-1.

222Interest in connection is implicit also in the first possible way of understanding the structural role of v. 39.

223See similar situation statements above, pp. 43-4.

224See similar problem sections above, pp. 80-1.
to define more clearly the situation through elaboration. Matthew refers to many crowds in Mt. 8:1b, and Luke mentions that the man was 'full of leprosy' (Lk. 5:12b). In Mark's account Jesus' reply to the problem is given in v. 41. That this verse is a reply-to-the-problem section is structural support for reading δρώσεις with D,225 although the pattern offers no clue as to why Jesus responded with anger. The remark about the immediate disappearance of the leprosy and cleansing is the result statement in v. 42,226 which is followed by two long consequence statements in vv. 43f.227 and v. 45.228 In this manner the pattern is present in 1:40-45.

According to Taylor 1:40-42 (and possibly v. 45) is a miracle story, while 1:43f. appears to be a pronouncement story; and he suggests 'that i. 40-5 is a group of cells in the primitive tradition in process of bifurcation'.229 The pronouncement story in vv. 43f. is 'ready to be detached and to become like the five stories in ii. 1-iii. 6 . . . '.230 The pattern as a criterion supports the possibility that vv. 40-42 + 45 are a miracle story in themselves, but stands against the view that vv. 43f. are close to being a separate story. Structurally the two verses are only a consequence statement in 1:40-45 and conceivably could be a reply section in some other narrative. Being only one narrative section in themselves, they are hardly a 'story' so

---

226See similar result statements above, pp. 105-6.
227With regard to vv. 43f., see similar consequence statements above, pp. 113-4.
228Consequence statements like v. 45 are 5:20 and 7:36, pp. 110, 111 above, respectively.
229Taylor, G.M., p. 185.
230Ibid.
far as the pattern is concerned; and as a section, they do not resemble structurally the stories in 2:1-3:6.

The story of the leper and the story of the deaf mute are much alike, and it is fitting to illustrate just now the pattern in the latter (7:31-37):

Set. \[31\text{Kai } πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὅριων Τύρου}

Sit. \[32\text{kai φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν}

Prob. \[33\text{kai παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν}

RepP. \[34\text{kai ἀκολούθως αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀχλου κατ’ ἱδαν ἔβαλεν τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ἄτα αὐτοῦ}

Res. \[35\text{kai ἑλθῆν ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ}

Cons. \[36\text{kai ὑπερπερισσῶς ἔξεστίσσοντο}

In this story v. 31 is the setting statement, and the narration about the bringing of the deaf mute (v. 32a) is the situation statement. It is followed immediately by a problem section: the remark about the request for Jesus to touch the man (v. 32b). Jesus' reply—a command in addition to touch—is given

\[231\text{Cf. Bultmann, } H.S.T., pp. 64-5, 213. See also above, p. 28, n. 15.}
in vv. 33f., and that is followed by the immediate result of Jesus' command: the correction of the man's hearing and speech (v. 35). Verses 36f. are consequence statements that tell of subsequent actions: the proclamation of Jesus' healing in spite of His demand for silence (v. 36), and the confessional statement about Jesus' activity (v. 37). The VIL form of the pattern is very clear.

It is not surprising that the narrative pattern, which has been so regular in Mark's narratives, should appear clearly and in regular form in this narrative, which has no parallel in Luke's Gospel and only a distant echo in Matthew's summary in 15:29-31. A narrative such as 7:31-37 supports the view that Mark is distinguished among the Evangelists in that he composed his stories in close conformity with the narrative pattern. When one thinks of the pattern, one thinks immediately of Mark as its chief proponent.

Some scholars consider 7:32-36 to be the original unit. Dibelius sees the end of the story in v. 35. Schmidt, however, is cautious with regard to v. 31. He detects editorial work in this verse but maintains that the story was associated with the Decapolis before Mark received the narrative from the tradition. Schmidt observes that if Mark had simply invented v. 31, he would not have made it so complicated. There is also some question whether v. 37 should be severed from the rest of the story. According to

---

232See Beare, p. 133.

233See, for example, Taylor, G.M., p. 352; Cranfield, Saint Mark, p. 250; and Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 202. Nineham considers vv. 32-36 (35?) to be the original form of the story with v. 36 as a doctrinal addition.

234Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 76.


236Ibid., p. 200.
Dibelius v. 37 implies knowledge of other stories and is secondary, but the verse could just as well be a reference to other events and reflect primitive perspectives. If redactional work is to be seen in v. 37, it may best be observed in the verse's inclusion in a thematic structure that yokes together vv. 32-37. In this redactional arrangement v. 37 is bound to vv. 32-35, and Mark himself was probably responsible for the order of thought in v. 37. Here it is interesting that v. 36 interrupts the thematic structure, which raises the question whether an earlier form of the story might have been vv. (31)32-35 + 37. Taylor, however, maintains that Jesus' command is 'part of the original story'. If the command is original, the role of v. 37 within the thematic structure of the story is that of a concluding narrative statement, which ties the knot through final reference to earlier interests of the story—a frequent tendency in Mark's narratives.

According to Taylor the form of 7:31-37 is 'that of a Miracle-story', but with VIL structure this story is not distinctively a miracle story. It is about a miracle but has narrative structure that is in conformity with the fundamental narrative pattern, which is present through abbreviation in all kinds of stories. That the VIL form of the pattern is not found only in miracle stories is readily apparent in the story about Jesus' rejection at Nazareth (6:1-6a):

\[
\text{Set. } \left\{ \begin{align*} \text{Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν} \\ \text{καὶ ἐρχεται εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ} \end{align*} \right. 
\]

---

237 Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 76.

238 See further below, p. 508.

239 Taylor, G.M., p. 352. See also pp. 355-6.

The indication in v. 1a that Jesus entered his home town is the setting statement. Closely related to this statement is the remark about the disciples in v. 1b, which is part of the description of the situation: the picture of Jesus' being followed by His disciples. The other part is presented in v. 2a, which tells of Jesus' teaching in the synagogue on the Sabbath. Verses 2b-3 are the problem section, which indicates that presumably local citizens found it difficult to reconcile Jesus' powers with His background and reacted with unbelief and hostility. His reply to the problem is given in v. 4; and v. 5, which discloses that Jesus was unable to perform a mighty work there apart from a few healings, is the result statement. Verse 5 is a result statement
even without the reference to the few healings. Mere interest in a result, accomplished or not, at this location in the story is all that is necessary to establish this verse as the formal result statement. Finally, the remark about Jesus' amazement in v. 6a is the consequence statement. Often consequence statements tell of amazement at Jesus, but here the matter is reversed.

For Dibelius this story is a paradigm of a less pure type. Bultmann considers the story to be a biographical apophthegm and 'a typical example of how an imaginary situation is built up out of an independent saying'. According to Taylor 'the narrative cannot be more exactly described than as a Story about Jesus'. The missing element in this search for a category is adequate consideration of narrative structure. If attention is given to structure, it becomes evident that 6:1-6a has a structure (VIL) that is found in some (VIL) miracle stories (1:21-28, 1:29-31, 1:40-45, 6:45-52, 7:31-37). The classification of stories according to features and motifs has prevented form critics from seeing that 6:1-6a and certain miracle stories have essentially the same structure. This is not to say that 6:1-6a should be classified as a miracle story. The issue is that 6:1-6a and several miracle stories have the same structure because they, as all the other stories in Mark's Gospel, have been told according to a conventional pattern of narration. So far as this pattern is concerned, the form-critical categories are of little significance.

Four of the five miracle stories that were just mentioned have already been illustrated. The fifth is the story about Jesus' walking on the water (6:45-52):

241Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 43.
243Taylor, G.M., p. 298.
Taylor notes in this story 'a generic difference in the portrayal of Jesus as compared with the healing stories of i. 21-39'. This observation has validity with regard to the story's unusual features, but in terms of the narrative pattern this story has essentially the same structure as certain healing stories in 1:21-39 (1:21-28, 1:29-31, 1:40-45). Verses 45f. are setting statements, which indicate that Jesus went to a mountain to pray, while the disciples started to cross to Bethsaida; and vv. 47f. are situation

244Taylor, G.M., p. 327.
statements. They call attention to the separation of Jesus from His disciples (v. 47), to their difficulty in rowing because of the wind (v. 48a), and to Jesus' approach on the water (v. 48b).\footnote{See similar situation statements above, pp. 43-6. The approach of people is a characteristic of a number of situation statements, and Jesus' approach is a manifestation of this feature. If His approach should be considered a nonverbal reply to the situation, the form of 6:45-52 is FPL instead of V1L.} The narration in vv. 49-50a about the disciples' conclusion that Jesus was an apparition and fright is the problem section.\footnote{See a similar problem section above, p. 77, and also the discussion on p. 78, n. 67.} Jesus' reply to the problem is presented in vv. 50b-51a: His command to fear no more and His boarding the boat. The brief remark in v. 51b that the wind ceased is the result statement; and the reference to the disciples' astonishment, together with the explanatory comment about the loaves and hardheartedness, is the consequence statement (vv. 51c-52).

The story has been told according to the pattern and manifests the V1L form of the pattern, whether the story is classified as a Novelle by Dibelius,\footnote{Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 71.} or a miracle story by Bultmann\footnote{Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 216.} and Taylor;\footnote{Taylor, G.M., p. 326.} whether the story 'attained its present form under the influences of preaching and teaching'\footnote{Ibid.} or not; and whatever motives were 'at work in shaping the original Markan account'.\footnote{Ibid., p. 330.} The structure of the story is fundamentally \textit{narrative} structure. Inasmuch as such structure is evident in the pattern in certain Old Testament stories, the pattern itself provides objective grounds for...
thinking that the narrative structure of Old Testament stories was the most important influence on the structure of Mark's narratives. In this respect it is possible to think of the Scriptures and devotion to them as a wider *Sitz im Leben* (of a larger, continuing community of faith) that influenced the story-telling style of both the early Church and Jesus Himself, particularly the style of His narrative parables. If one is to think of a *Sitz im Leben* within the early Church, more consideration should be given to the knowledge and reading of the Scriptures (in connection with the Church's interest in Jesus) as perhaps the most important influence on the design of the Gospel narratives. Mark's narratives are of special interest, because they have been written in closest conformity with the traditional pattern.

It is also true that the Evangelists put their own stamp on their stories, and Mark's personal influence is especially noticeable in 6:45-52. For example, (1) Mark's hand is visible in the explanatory comments with γνώριμον in vv. 48, 50, and 52. (2) Characteristic of Mark's narrative style is the step development of thought across narrative sections. The distinction between the disciples in the boat and Jesus on the land in the setting statements (vv. 45f.) is mentioned again in the first situation statement (v. 47). The reference to Jesus' walking on the water at the end of the second situation statement (v. 48) is restated at the beginning of the problem section. At the end of this section the comment about the disciples' fear is echoed in Jesus' reply to the problem. Such progression of thought helps to knit the narrative sections together. (3) Apparent also is Mark's tendency

---


253 So Matthew (14:24).
to close stories with a final reference to earlier interests. In this instance the references to the wind and the boat in v. 51 resolve the tension that is related to these things in the situation statements (vv. 47f.). That such resolution is conscious and not simply a matter of course is suggested by Mark's comment in v. 52, which extends farther and recalls interests in the previous story about the feeding of the five thousand. (4) Mark's influence is apparent also in the thematic structures in 6:45-52, but this matter is discussed in Part III.254

There are three V1L stories in regular form that lack result statements. One is the story about Jesus' departure from Capernaum (1:35-39):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{35\text{καὶ πρω̇ ένυινα λέαν αναστάς} \\
& \text{εξηλθεν} \\
& \text{καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον τόπων}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{\text{kakei prosopuxeto}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Prob.} & \quad \{36\text{κατεδώξειν αὐτόν ἑσμιν} \\
& \text{καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Prob.} & \quad \{37\text{εὕρον αὐτόν} \\
& \text{καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ} \\
& \text{ὅτι πάντες ξηπούσιν σε}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RePP.} & \quad \{38\text{λέγει αὐτοῖς} \\
& \text{"Ἀγορεύν ἄλλαχον εἰς τᾶς ἑχομένας κωμοπόλεις"} \\
& \text{[να καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω} \\
& \text{εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξηλθον}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cons.} & \quad \{39\text{καὶ ἠλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν} \\
& \text{εἰς θλίψιν τὴν Γαλιλαίαν} \\
& \text{καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.}
\end{align*}
\]

According to Bultmann 1:35-39 is an 'editorial section' that 'gives us no particular scene and no particular saying, but describes a transition, or the motive and general character, of Jesus' ministry'.255 Taylor considers 1:35-39 to be a story about Jesus but asserts that 'it is not self-contained, but

---

254 See below, pp. 471-515.

derives its significance from the three preceding stories'.256 With regard to the narrative pattern 1:35-39 is a V1L narrative that differs structurally from the other V1L stories only through the absence of a result statement. Verse 1:35a is the setting statement, and the brief indication in v. 35b that Jesus was praying is the situation statement. The pursuit of Simon and his problematical declaration257 is the problem section (vv. 36f.), and Jesus' reply to the problem is narrated in v. 38. The remark in v. 39 about Jesus' preaching and exorcising is the consequence statement, unless the verse is connected in some way with 1:40-45.258 Support for the view that v. 39 is the consequence statement for 1:35-38 is the fact that v. 39 is in close thematic relationship with v. 38.259

The structure of 1:35-39 is that of a narrative. Verse 39 is undoubtedly a summary, but this fact does not make the whole story a summary formulation. Bultmann's judgement seems unduly harsh in this respect. Apart from v. 39, the level of narration in vv. 35-38 is no less particular than that in many other stories in Mark's Gospel. There is validity, however, to Taylor's assessment. While 1:35-39 has the structure of a self-contained story, the narrative itself is not self-contained but makes sense only in its connection with the preceding stories.

That the structure of 1:35-39 is narrative structure is supported by the presence of V1L form without a result statement in another narrative—the story about Jesus' prophecy of Peter's denial (14:26-31):

256Taylor, G.M., p. 182.
257See Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 84.
258See the discussion above, pp. 279-80.
259See below, pp. 485-6.
Bultmann declares that the tradition behind the story is 'an historical account with legendary traits', and elsewhere refers to the story itself as a 'faith legend'. Taylor classifies the narrative as a Markan construction and observes that it 'consists almost entirely of sayings'. If 14:26-31 is classified according to its structure, it is a regular VIL narrative without a result statement. The story begins with a setting statement in v. 26. Verses 27f. are a situation statement in which Jesus takes the initiative and says something to His disciples. Peter's fragile pledge of

---


261Ibid., p. 306.


263Cf. Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 266.

264See similar statements above, pp. 51-2. See also 11:1b-3, p. 151.
loyalty (v. 29) is the problem section, which is followed by Jesus' reply in v. 30: the prophecy of Peter's denial. The story ends in v. 31 with two brief consequence statements: the subsequent remarks of Peter and the others, confessing loyalty and rejecting the idea of denial.

The VIL form of the pattern without a result statement is thus evident in this story. A result statement, if one were given, probably would be about Peter's denial; and the absence of the statement anticipates the story of his denial in 14:66-72. Without a result statement and with VIL form, the structure of 14:26-31 is the same as that in 1:35-39, a story that likewise refers to Peter and Galilee.

Mark's technique of uniting narrative sections through step development of thought is evident to a degree in 14:26-31. Jesus' prophecy about offence in the situation statement is considered by Peter in the problem section, and Jesus' prophecy about denial in the reply-to-the-problem section is denied by Peter and by all in the consequence statement. Taylor speaks here of 'psychological links' that 'give continuity to the story' and probably 'depend ultimately on Petrine testimony'. The presence of step development in other narratives suggests that it is more a literary feature of Mark's narration style than a psychological dimension of Petrine testimony. It is nevertheless conceivable that step development in connection with the narrative pattern might have been an aid to memory in the oral stage of the tradition, and may be a reflection of oral transmission.

There is some question whether v. 28 is part of the original story. It is missing in a papyrus fragment, and is said to break up the coherence of


the story. Mark might have inserted v. 28 'to prepare the way for xvi. 7', to interpret 14:27 in terms of a Galilean Parousia, or to point to the Risen/Exalted Christ who gathers His Church in Galilee.

The argument that v. 28 disrupts the continuity of thought is itself questionable, for the progression of thought in Mark's narratives—even where there is step development—is generally not rigid and may present in its original context a saying that appears unrelated to its literary setting. Furthermore, behind the argument lies the (modern, biographical) assumption that an authentic report would manifest only coherence and close continuity; but it is doubtful whether even the earliest reports would have displayed such unity and connection, if the earliest narrators were not interested in such things as biography and the meticulous reporting of historical events. Here it would seem that if a critic is prepared to deny Mark such biographical interest, it is only fair methodologically that the critic should deny himself the idea of coherence as a criterion for testing authenticity in Mark's stories. Too often scholars deny Mark biographical interest, then judge his narratives for not manifesting close historical connection. If it is true that Mark was not interested in biographical connection according to modern notions of biography, the absence of coherence means little and is a questionable measure for detecting inauthenticity. It seems preferable on the basis of such phenomena as step development of thought or the absence of a result statement in anticipation of a later story to assume that Mark was


268See Taylor, G.M., p. 549, for this and other possible interpretations.

269Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist, pp. 89-90.

270See Best, pp. 173-7.
interested in connection in a rudimentary way but not rigid continuity.  
When a statement or saying such as v. 28 appears to disrupt coherence, the 
disruption may be nothing more than a manifestation of loose, primitive 
narration rather than a sure sign of redactional insertion. 

A structural argument for thinking that v. 28 is an insertion is the 
fact that the saying appears at a location in the narrative pattern where 
there are sometimes explanatory comments: at the end of the situation state-
ment. Verse 28 is not an explanatory comment, and this argument may not 
apply for this reason; but v. 28 stands at a location where Mark probably 
would have inserted material of his own, had he desired to do so.  

E. Best thinks that v. 27b is also an insertion, but the thematic 
structure of the story stands against this idea. The saying of Peter in the 
consequence statement is thematically parallel with the saying in v. 27b, 
which suggests that this saying, so far as Mark's redaction is concerned, is 
an essential part of the story rather than an insertion. If the saying is an 
integral part of Mark's arrangement, there is some reason for thinking that 
the saying is original. 

The third regular VIL narrative without a result statement is the story 

---

271Similar anticipation is evident in the relation of 11:20-25 to 11:12-
14. Step development and the anticipation of later episodes manifest some 
interest in sequence as well as rudimentary connection, but the apparent dis-
orientation of stories such as 1:40-45 and 10:13-16, together with topical 
groupings such as the representative parables in 4:21-32, are indications 
that Mark was not altogether interested in the proper sequence of his material. 
Cf. Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 281, where the arrangement of Mark's stories is thought 
to be wholly arbitrary.  

272See, for example, 1:16b, 1:22b, 1:33, 2:15b, 3:32a, 5:28, 6:48, 8:11, 
9:34, 12:18a, 12:42, 14:56. 

273Other likely locations for comments are the ends of the various 
narrative sections, especially reply-to-the-situation statements, problem 
sections, and consequence statements. 

274Best, pp. 157, n. 3; 158; 173.
about the mocking of Jesus on the cross (15:25-32):

Set. \{^{257}\text{n oθ \varepsilon τρίτη} \}

\[\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ ἐσταὐρωσαν αὐτὸν} \\
\text{καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη} \\
'O\text{ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων} \\
\end{align*}\]

Sit. \{^{257}\text{ο\varepsilon τρίτη} \}

\[\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο λῃστάς} \\
\text{ἐνα ἐκ δεξιῶν} \\
\text{καὶ ἐνα ἐξ εὐνώμων αὐτοῦ} \\
\end{align*}\]

Prob. \{^{257}\text{ο\varepsilon τρίτη} \}

\[\begin{align*}
\text{οὐδέ ὁ καταλόγων τὸν ναὸν} \\
\text{καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις} \\
\text{σάδωσον σεαυτόν} \\
\text{καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ} \\
\end{align*}\]

RepP. \{^{257}\text{ο\varepsilon τρίτη} \}

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ὁ Ἰσραὴλ} \\
\text{καταβὰς τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ} \\
\text{ἔσωσεν} \\
\text{ἔσωσεν} \\
\text{οὐ δύναται σῶσαι} \\
\end{align*}\]

Cons. \{^{257}\text{ο\varepsilon τρίτη} \}

Taylor regards these verses as part of 15:21-41,\textsuperscript{275} but they contain in themselves the narrative pattern. The reference to the third hour in v. 25a is a temporal setting statement, and the situation statement is presented in vv. 25b-27. It tells of Jesus’ Crucifixion (v. 25b), the inscription (v. 26), and those who were crucified with Him (v. 27).\textsuperscript{276} There is no reply-to-the-situation statement; and v. 28, which is neither a reply to the situation nor a problem section, is best omitted with Ν A B C D \upsilon and other witnesses.\textsuperscript{277}

\textsuperscript{275}Taylor, G.M., pp. 590-2. See also pp. 649-51.

\textsuperscript{276}See similar situation statements above, pp. 39-40.

\textsuperscript{277}See further Taylor, G.M., p. 591.
A problem section is given in vv. 29f., in which passers-by wag their heads at Jesus and taunt Him with the idea of saving Himself by coming down from the cross. A cursory reading may lead one to think, on the basis of ἀμωτίς, that vv. 31-32a are a continuation of the problem section; but when it is realized that the chief priests' words 'answer' the statement of the passers-by, it becomes evident that vv. 31-32a are a formal reply-to-the-problem section. The reply character of vv. 31-32a is seen in the thematic structure of vv. 29-32a, where ἀλλοι in v. 31b answers σῶσον σεαυτόν in v. 30a, and where ὁ Χριστός ... πιστεύσωμεν in v. 32a presents the chief priests' response to the thought in v. 30b about Jesus' descent from the cross. The narrative ends with the consequence statement in v. 32b, which indicates that those who were crucified with Jesus subsequently reproached Him. In this way vv. 25-32 manifest the VIL form of the pattern and probably were understood by Mark as a narrative in themselves. The pattern is thus most useful here in determining the limits of a story within 15:21-41.278

To see that VIL form is not an inevitable structure for 15:25-32, one needs only to look at Luke's story of the Crucifixion (Lk. 23:33-43), where corresponding material appears in different order and within two different pattern units (23:33-37, 38-43). Matthew's account (Mt. 27:37-44), however, has the same pattern structure as Mark's, although the thematic structure is altered with the references to Jesus as the Son of God in vv. 40 and 43.

Regular form extended. Eleven out of twenty regular VIL narratives have extended structure. As was true for extended FPL and FPS narratives, the pattern is extended through developments of the problem and reply-to-the-

278 Cf. Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 273, and Taylor, G.M., p. 591, who regard 15:29-32 as a section in itself. The pattern, however, does not support such a judgement.
problem sections. Five of the extended V1L narratives (4:35-41, 5:1-20, 5:21-24a + 35-43, 8:22-26, 10:46-52) are miracle stories and have result statements. The remaining six lack result statements and are either stories about Jesus (7:24-30, 14:53-65, 14:66-72, 15:1-5) or pronouncement stories (11:27-12:12, 12:13-17) according to Taylor's analysis.

With regard to the five miracle stories extended V1L form is evident in the story about Jesus' stilling of the storm (4:35-41):

Set. 
{Kat λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν ἑκέννῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡφίασις γενομένης
Διελθώνει εἰς τὸ πέραν

Sit. 
{Kat ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον
παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἢν ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ
καὶ ἄλλα πλοία ἢν μετ' αὐτοῦ

Prob. 
{Kat έγειρουσίᾳ αὐτόν
Kat λέγουσιν αὐτῷ
Διδάσκαλε
οὗ μέλει σοι
ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα

RepF. 
{Kat ὀλεγέρθεις
ἐπετίθησαν τῷ ἀνέμῳ
Kat εἴπεν τῇ θαλάσσῃ
Σιώπα
κεφλύμωσο

Res. 
{Kat ἐκστασεν ὁ ἀνέμος
Kat ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη

RepP. cont. 
{Kat εἴπεν αὐτοῖς
Τῇ δειλοίς ἔστε
οὐκ ἔχετε πλέστιν

Cons. 
{Kat ἐφοβηθησαν φίδιον μέγαν
Kat ἔλεγον πρὸς ἄλληλους
Τις φα οὕτως ἔστιν
ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος
Kat ἡ θάλασσα
ὑπακούει αὐτῷ.
Although a direct saying of Jesus is presented within v. 35, the whole verse is the formal setting statement for the story. Verses 36-38a are descriptive of the situation: Jesus' departure in the boat, the presence of other boats, the storm, the flooding, and Jesus' sleep. Verse 38b, which tells of the disciples' disturbance of Jesus and harsh question, is the problem section. Jesus' reply to the problem is given in v. 39a: His dual commands to the wind and the waves. The immediate results of His commands—the ceasing of the wind and a great calm—are indicated in v. 39b. At this point the story is extended in v. 40 with a continuation of Jesus' reply to the problem: a question to the disciples about their fear and unbelief, which were evident in their harsh question in v. 38b. It is very possible that Jesus' question in v. 40 is nothing more than a consequence statement.\(^{279}\) If so, the form of 4:35-41 is VIIL and regular but not extended. If v. 40 is instead a continuation of Jesus' reply, the form is extended and slightly irregular, since the continuation appears after the result statement. The story is not listed as an irregular narrative because of the former possibility.

Matthew's account (Mt. 8:18-27) is another instance where structure is changed with the addition of a block of Matthaean material. Verse 18 is made the setting statement of a new narrative, whose form is either FPS, if the story ends with v. 22, or FPL, if v. 23 is a consequence statement. In either case Matthew's story of the stilling of the storm is separated from the setting statement in v. 18 by the special material in vv. 19-23. Luke's parallel (Lk. 8:22-25) has essentially the same structure as that in Mark's account, apart from some recasting of the setting and situation statements,

\(^{279}\)Direct sayings of Jesus in consequence statements may be seen elsewhere in 1:43-45, 5:13c-20 (v. 19), and 8:26. Direct sayings by others are found in 1:27f., 4:41, 7:36f. (v. 37), 11:7-10 (vv. 9f.), 14:63-65, and 15:38-41 (v. 39).
where the disciples' departure is presented as a response (κατ ἀνήκχησαν). Beare suggests that Mk. 4:35-41 may be based on 'a pattern of sea-wonders'; but inasmuch as the story of the stilling of the storm has VII structure, it is not necessary to think of a pattern other than the narrative pattern that is evident throughout Mark's Gospel.

An extended narrative with very complex structure is the story of the Gerasene demoniac (5:1-20), which not only manifests overall VII structure but also consists of five movements that display in themselves various forms of the narrative pattern. These features are evident in the following arrangement of the story:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{ \text{Set.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Set.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Set.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Set.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Set.} \} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{ \text{Sit.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Sit.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Sit.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Sit.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Sit.} \} \\
\text{V} & \quad \{ \text{V} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{V} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{V} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{V} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{V} \} \\
\text{L} & \quad \{ \text{L} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{L} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{L} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{L} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{L} \} \\
\text{RepS.} & \quad \{ \text{RepS.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{RepS.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{RepS.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{RepS.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{RepS.} \} \\
\text{Cons.} & \quad \{ \text{Cons.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Cons.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Cons.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Cons.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Cons.} \} \\
\text{Prob.} & \quad \{ \text{Prob.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Prob.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Prob.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Prob.} \} \\
& \quad \{ \text{Prob.} \} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[280\text{Beare, p. 121.}\]
301

[1] ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ

"Ἐξελέξε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου"

[2] καὶ ἔπηρότα αὐτὸν

Τὰ δυομά σοι

[3] καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ

Λέγειν δυομά μοι

ὁτι πολλοὶ ἔσμεν

[4] 10 καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτῶν πολλὰ

ἐνα μὴ αὐτοὺς ἀποστείλῃ ἐξω τῆς χώρας

[5] 

Prob. Dev.

Set. Sit. {11} ἢ ὅ ἐκεῖ προς τῷ ὄρει ἁγιὰ χοιρῶν μεγάλη βοσκουμένη

12 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτῶν

λέγοντες

πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν χοίρον

[6] εἰς τὸν χοίρον ἐνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσελθομενη

[7] 

RepP. Dev.

Set. Sit. 13 καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς

καὶ ἔξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα

εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸν χοίρον

[8] καὶ ἔπνευσαν ἡ ἁγιὰ κατά τὸν κρημνὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν

ὡς διστόλες

καὶ ἐπνεύσατο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ

[9] 

RepP. Dev.

Set. Sit. 14 καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοὺς ἐφυγον

καὶ ἀπῆγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν

καὶ εἰς τὸν θηρίον

καὶ ἤλθον ἵδεν τῇ ἑστίᾳ τὸ γεγονέν

[10] καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν

καὶ θεωροῦσιν τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον

καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐλεηθήσαν


καὶ ἔφοβοθήσαν

[12] 

Cons.

Reps. {16} καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ ἱδόντες

τῶν ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ

καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων

[13] 17 καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν

ἀπελθέτιν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν

[14] 

Cons.

Set. 18 καὶ ἐμβαινοῦσος αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον

Sitt. 

Prob. 

παρεκάλει αὐτὸν ὁ δαιμονιζόμενος

ἐνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ἢ
According to Knox this story 'shows every sign of being an extraneous interpolation into the Gospel tradition',\(^{281}\) but apart from the problem development and reply in vv. 9b-13 the overall structure of 5:1-20 is essentially the same as that in the story about the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (1:29-31).

The obvious difference between the two stories is the greater amount of material in the narrative sections of 5:1-20. Verse 1 is the setting statement, even though there is some uncertainty about the actual location of the story.\(^{282}\) Verses 2-5, which tell of the demoniac and the severity of his condition, are the situation statement. The statements about his approach to Jesus and loud crying are the problem section (vv. 6f.), and Jesus' reply to the problem is given in vv. 8f. It is possible that v. 8, which is a comment, should be regarded as part of the problem section and not as part of Jesus' reply. It is also possible that v. 8, which points to a reply that would have been made prior to the problem section, may be regarded as a displaced substitute for a reply-to-the-situation statement. If so, the overall form of 5:1-20 is FPL and irregular. But insasmuch as v. 8 is a comment and not clearly a self-standing section, it is preferable to consider it in connection with the problem section or to associate it with Jesus' reply to the problem. The latter possibility is favoured, since v. 8 refers to an action of Jesus. At

\(^{281}\)Knox, p. 39.

\(^{282}\)See, for example, Cranfield, *Saint Mark*, p. 176.
this point the pattern becomes extended with a development of the problem in vv. 9b-12: the dual request about the expulsion of the unclean spirits. Jesus' reply to the problem development—His permission—is indicated briefly in v. 13a. The reference to the spirits' entry into the swine is the result statement (v. 13b), and the remark about the herd's descent into the sea and drowning (v. 13c) is the first of a number of consequence statements. Verses 14-17 are a cluster of consequence statements, which tell of actions that follow the exorcism and destruction of the herd: the publicizing of what took place and public reaction. Verses 18-20 are a second cluster of consequence statements, which tell of a final request of the healed demoniac, Jesus' reply, and the subsequent actions of the demoniac and the public.

With regard to 5:1-20 Taylor observes that 'in a rudimentary form we have the beginnings of a little drama in four acts'; but if the narrative pattern is used as a criterion, five sections are discernible in the story. An abbreviated form of the pattern is apparent in vv. 1-5. Verse 1 is the setting statement; and vv. 2-3a, which refer to the demoniac and his living in the tombs, are the situation statement. The remark in vv. 3b-4 alludes to attempts to subdue the man and is a formal reply-to-the-situation statement even though the attempts prove unsuccessful. Failure to overcome the demoniac results in his continual clamour and self-mutilation, and the statement about this predicament in v. 5 has the air of a consequence statement. With setting, situation, reply-to-the-situation, and consequence statements, this part of the story has V2L form.

Another abbreviated form of the pattern is evident with some irregularity in vv. 6-10. The use of ἀπὸ μοῖχοςεν in v. 6a makes this portion of the verse

---

a setting statement, and the indications of the man's approach in v. 6b are descriptive of the situation. His words to Jesus in v. 7 constitute the problem section, and vv. 8-9a present Jesus' reply to the problem. The remark of the demoniac in v. 9b is a problem development, which makes the form extended. There is no reply to this development, and the pattern in vv. 6-10 is irregular in this respect. Verse 11, which tells of the demoniac's intense desire to have the spirits sent away, is the consequence statement. With setting and situation statements, problem and reply-to-the-problem sections, a problem development, and a consequence statement, the form of the pattern in vv. 6-10 is V1L, extended, and irregular. If the comment in v. 8 is regarded as a reply-to-the-situation statement, the form is FPL instead of V1L.

Regular V1L form is clearly apparent in vv. 11-13, the third segment of the story. Verse 11 contains information about both a setting and a situation, and the request of presumably the spirits in v. 12 is the problem section. Jesus' permission in v. 13a is His reply to the problem, and the departure of the spirits and their entry into the swine make up the result statement in v. 13b. The descent and destruction of the herd in v. 13c is the consequence statement. Once again an internal portion of the story is told in keeping

---

284 Taylor, G.M., p. 277, asserts that vv. 6f. 'read almost like the beginning of a separate account' and regards this feature as an indication of 'unevenness', which suggests that the narrative is close to eyewitness information. The 'beginning' in v. 6, however, may be explained simply as the setting statement of an internal portion that contains in itself an abbreviated form of the narrative pattern. The presence of a setting statement (in v. 6a) in a pattern (in vv. 6-10) within the pattern (pertaining to the story as a whole) is not necessarily a mark of unevenness that is peculiar to this story but is a narrative feature that appears in a number of Mark's stories. See 14:32-42, pp. 262-3 above, as a clear example of this phenomenon, where story segments manifest in themselves the narrative pattern. If v. 6(a) is to be understood as a conventional setting statement for a pattern within the pattern, the value of the verse as a sign of eyewitness information becomes diminished.

285 See a similar consequence statement in v. 17.
with the narrative pattern.

Regular V2L form is evident in vv. 14-17, the fourth segment, which is at the same time one of the lengthy consequence statements of the story as a whole. The references to the city and hamlets in v. 14a are the setting statement, and the indications in vv. 14b-15 about those who come to Jesus and see the demoniac constitute the situation statement. Verse 16 tells of a reply to the situation: the witnesses' narration of what happened to the demoniac and the swine. Verse 17 is a consequence statement in that it refers to a subsequent action of the public: the request that Jesus leave the territory.

The fifth segment (vv. 18-20), which is the last consequence statement in 5:1-20 as a whole, displays in itself regular V1L form. Information about the setting (ἐν τῷ πλατεία) and situation (καὶ ἐμβαδονιατος αὐτοῦ) are presented in v. 18a; and the demoniac's request to stay with Jesus is the problem section even though the request is devoid of hostility. Jesus' reply to the demoniac's petition is given in v. 19, and v. 20 is the consequence statement. It is possible to think of the statements in v. 20a about the demoniac's departure and preaching as result statements—the direct result of Jesus' commands in v. 19—and to regard the remark about public amazement in v. 20b as the consequence statement. Such a distinction is a refinement that is permissible according to the definitions of result and consequence statements that are set forth in Part I.286

The narrative pattern is thus evident in 5:1-20 as a whole and in five internal segments or movements that display in themselves various abbreviated forms of the pattern. To understand the pattern is to understand more clearly the narrative structure of the story of the Gerasene demoniac.

286See above, pp. 103-5, 109.
Another principle of arrangement is evident in the fact that the five movements, which contain in themselves the pattern, are presented in a sequential, step-developmental manner, where the ending of one movement prepares for the beginning of the next. In vv. 1-5 the reference to the clamour (ἡ νοσοῦν) of the demoniac in v. 5 prepares the way for mention of his loud crying (κοροῦσεν μεγάλη) in v. 7.\textsuperscript{287} In a similar fashion the narration in v. 10 about sending the spirits away\textsuperscript{288} anticipates the spirits' request to be sent into the swine (v. 12). The drowning of the herd in v. 13a precipitates the subsequent events that are reported in vv. 14-17, beginning with the swineherds' flight and announcement in the city. At the end of the fourth movement (v. 17) the public request that Jesus leave prompts His departure, which is referred to at the beginning of the last movement (v. 18).\textsuperscript{289} In this way step development of thought, a structural feature that has been observed in other narratives,\textsuperscript{290} is evident in this story.

According to Bultmann the story of the demoniac is pre-Markan apart from vv. 1, 8, and 18-20;\textsuperscript{291} but the use of the pattern—both in the story's overall structure and five movements—and step development of thought in 5:1-20 suggest that Mark was somewhat responsible for the internal arrangement of the story as

\textsuperscript{287}Cf. Mt. 8:28f. and Lk. 8:27f.

\textsuperscript{288}On this point there is no parallel in Matthew's account. See, however, Lk. 8:31f.

\textsuperscript{289}Cf. Dibelius, \textit{F.T.G.}, p. 87, who regards v. 17 as the original end of the story. Cf. also Nineham, \textit{Saint Mark}, p. 150, who prefers to see the original ending in v. 15, following Lightfoot. Both the pattern within vv. 14-17 and the \textit{a + b ab} thematic structure of the story stand against the view that v. 15 was the original ending. Both structures are interrupted and left incomplete if the story ends with v. 15.

\textsuperscript{290}See, for example, above, pp. 289, 293-5.

\textsuperscript{291}Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, pp. 210, 419.
it now stands in his Gospel. This judgement is supported by still another principle of arrangement \((a + b ~ ab)\) thematic structure) that is discussed in Part III.\(^{292}\) These various structural features become apparent when attention is given to the order of thought in Mark's stories. Such an examination reveals that 5:1-20 is not 'an extraneous interpolation into the Gospel tradition'\(^{293}\) but manifests structural characteristics that are found time and again in other narratives in Mark's Gospel.

A third extended VII narrative is the story about the raising of Jairus' daughter (5:21-24a + 35-43), which also contains movements that display forms of the narrative pattern. The presence of the pattern in both overall structure and internal movements is evident in the following arrangement of the story:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \{ \text{Set.} \{ 21\text{Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ 'Ιησοῦ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπὶ αὐτὸν} \\
\text{Sit.} & \{ \text{Sit.} \{ καὶ Ἰν παρὰ τὴν ἡδασάν} \\
\text{Prob.} & \{ \text{Prob.} \{ 22\καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἄρχισυναγώγων ὄνοματι 'Ιδίρος καὶ ἑδὼν αὐτὸν} \\
\text{V} & \{ \text{I } 23\καὶ παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλά} \\
\text{Prob.} & \{ \text{Prob.} \{ λέγων} \\
\text{RepP.} & \{ \text{RepP.} \{ 24\καὶ ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αὐτοῦ} \\
\text{Dev. 1} & \{ \text{Sit.} \{ 25\έτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος} \\
\text{Prob.} & \{ \text{Prob.} \{ ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχισυναγώγου} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{292}\)See below, pp. 500-4.

\(^{293}\)It will be recalled that the phrase is that of Knox, p. 39.
With regard to the overall structure of the story v. 21a is the setting statement, and the references in v. 21b to the presence of the crowd and Jesus are the situation statement. Verses 22f., which tell of the approach and anxious
request of Jairus, are the problem section. Jesus' nonverbal reply to the problem—His departure with Jairus—is given in v. 24a. After the incident with the haemorrhaging woman in vv. 24b-34, the story about Jairus' daughter is both continued and extended. The passage about the news of the girl's death (v. 35) is the first of several developments of the problem. Jesus' twofold reply to this development is narrated in vv. 36f.: (1) He tells Jairus to believe without fear and (2) dismisses all followers except Peter, James, and John. The indication in v. 38 of a disturbance is a second development of the problem. Jesus' reply to this development appears in v. 39, which exhibits thematic parallelism in connection with v. 38. The remark about laughter at Jesus in v. 40a is a third development of the problem. Jesus' reply to this development is given in vv. 40b-41. Excluding everyone but the girl's parents and presumably the three disciples, Jesus goes to the child and commands her to get up. Verse 42a, which tells of her rising and walking, is the result statement; and vv. 42b-43 are consequence statements, which refer to subsequent amazement and Jesus' demand for silence plus His suggestion that the girl be given something to eat. In this way 5:21-24a + 35-43 has overall V1L structure that is extended in a conventional manner with problem developments and replies to these developments.294

---

294 Cf. Mt. 9:18-26 and Lk. 8:40-56. The overall structure of Matthew's account is essentially the same as that of Mark's. Matthew's parallel, however, begins without a setting statement and is further abbreviated through the absence of material that corresponds with the first development of the problem and reply in Mark's version (Mk. 5:35-37). In Luke's account there is noticeable deterioration of the pattern. Like Matthew's version, Luke's begins without a setting statement; but unlike Mark and Matthew, Luke makes no reference to a reply of Jesus to Jairus' initial request. This absence of a reply-to-the-problem section is a conspicuous pattern irregularity. Another irregularity appears in Lk. 8:51, where Luke presents setting and situation statements that interrupt the series of problem developments (vv. 49, 52a, 53) and replies to these developments (vv. 50, 52b, 54). The pattern is fullest and most regular in Mark's version of the story.
The narrative pattern is evident also in four scenes within the story about Jairus' daughter. Verses 21-24a, regarded as a scene in themselves, manifest the V1S form of the pattern with a setting statement, situation statement, problem section, and reply-to-the-problem section. V1L structure is evident in vv. 35-37, a second scene. There is no setting statement as such. Instead a notion of time is implied in the opening phrase in v. 35 (ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος), which is a brief situation statement for this segment of the story. Verse 35b is a problem section, offering the report that the girl is dead; and v. 36 presents Jesus' reply to Jairus. Within vv. 35-37, v. 37 functions as a consequence statement, indicating an action of Jesus that is subsequent to His reply. A third scene, which displays clearly the pattern in V2L form, is 5:38-40a. Verse 38a is a self-evident setting statement, and the reference in v. 38b to the turmoil is a situation statement.295 Jesus' reply is given in v. 39, and the note in v. 40a about the laughter of the people is a consequence statement. The last scene of the story (vv. 40b-43) also displays the pattern in V2L form. Verse 40b is a fused setting and situation statement: where the child lay is the setting of the scene, and Jesus' selection of a small group to go with Him to see the girl is the situation. His words to her is a reply-to-the-situation statement within this scene. As was true for the story as a whole, v. 42a is a result state-

295This passage well illustrates how a particular statement can have several roles in terms of the pattern. Within 5:21-24a + 35-43 as a whole, v. 38 is located where problem sections customarily appear; but within vv. 38-40, v. 38b is a situation statement. The dual role of v. 38b may seem self-contradictory, especially if structure is thought of simply in terms of content and the presence of motifs. With this point of view it is difficult to think that a passage can be both a situation statement and a problem section. But when structure is understood primarily in connection with the location of material, a statement can have at the same time several formal functions, depending on the position of the statement within the story as a whole and within a section that manifests in itself some form of the narrative pattern.
ment; and vv. 42b-43 are consequence statements. In this way the story about the raising of Jairus' daughter contains four scenes that manifest in themselves various forms of the narrative pattern.296

The intercalation of 5:24b-34 within 5:21-24a + 35-43 is distinctive,297 but the phenomenon seems less striking if the story in 5:24b-34 is regarded in the light of the scenes in both 5:1-20 and 5:21-24a + 35-43. As was shown above,298 5:1-20 as a whole has extended V1L structure and at the same time consists of five scenes that display forms of the pattern. The extended V1L story of the raising of Jairus' daughter has four such scenes plus a fifth 'scene' in the story of the haemorrhaging woman. The structure of the two adjacent stories is thus somewhat similar in spite of different content. An understanding of the narrative pattern here enables one to recognize the structural similarity between 5:1-20 and 5:21-43 and to see that the presence of the story of the haemorrhaging woman as one of five scenes within 5:21-43 is not unusual so far as literary structure is concerned. The question is not simply one of the 'sandwiching' of one story within another but of the

296 With the omission of material corresponding to Mk. 5:35-37, the number of scenes in Matthew's account is three instead of four; but Matthew's three scenes display for the most part those forms of the pattern that are present in Mark's scenes. The matter is considerably different in Luke's version of the story. Luke's first scene (Lk. 8:40-42), having only a situation statement (v. 40) and a problem section (vv. 41f.), does not exhibit the pattern except in an irregular, truncated fashion. Luke's second scene (vv. 49f.) displays V1S form without a clear consequence statement. What was a consequence statement for Mark—the reference to the exclusion of all followers except Peter, James, and John in Mk. 5:37—is turned into a situation statement through Luke's prior reference to entry into the house in Lk. 8:51a. Luke's scene in vv. 52f. has V2L form but lacks a setting statement, and his last scene in vv. 54-56 fails to display the pattern through the absence of setting and situation statements. The scenes in Mark's account manifest in themselves forms of the pattern with the greatest fullness and regularity.


298 See above, pp. 300-5.
presentation of scenes that manifest the pattern within a story whose overall structure also displays the pattern.

A fourth narrative with extended V1L structure is the story about the healing of the blind man (8:22-26):

Set. {22aΚαὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἐπόμενον

Sit. { ἐκεῖ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλὸν

Prob. { Καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτὸν ἵψηται

 RepP. { 2καὶ ἔπιλαβόμενος τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ τυφλοῦ ἐξήνεγκεν αὐτὸν ἐξ ἑαυτῆς τῆς κοιμήσεως καὶ πτύσας εἰς τὰ δυτικὰ αὐτοῦ ἐπιθέσες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν ἔπειτα βλέπεις

 Prob. { 24καὶ ἀναβλέψας ἔλεγεν

 Dev. { Βλέπω τοὺς ἄνθρωπος δὲ ταῦτα δὲν διὰ δένδρα δρόμον περιπατοῦντας

 RepP. { 25εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ

 Res. { καὶ διέβλεψεν καὶ ἀπεκατέστη καὶ ἐνέβλεπεν τηλαυγὼς ἀπαντά

 Cons. { 26καὶ ἀπεστέλλεν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον αὐτοῦ λέγων Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κοίμησιν εἰσέλθης.

It is not surprising to find the pattern so clear and regular in a story that has no parallel in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. In Mark's story v. 22a is a common setting statement, and the remark in v. 22b about the bringing of the blind man is the situation statement.299 The request in v. 22c that Jesus touch the blind man is the problem section,300 and Jesus' reply to the problem is presented in v. 23: His leading the blind man away by the hand, spitting on

299See above, p. 44, n. 35.

300See similar problem sections above, pp. 80-1.
his eyes, laying His hands on him, and questioning him about his vision. Verse 24, which suggests that the man's sight is only partially restored, is a development of the problem. Jesus' reply to this development is narrated in v. 25a: He touches once more the blind man's eyes. Verse 25b is the result statement, indicating the direct result of this reply of Jesus; and v. 26 is the consequence statement in which Jesus requests secrecy.

The narrative pattern provides a new criterion for understanding the similarity and differences between 8:22-26 and 7:31-37. Bultmann notes that there are unusual features in the story about the blind man but regards it as a variant of the story about the deaf mute. 301 According to Taylor, Mark or someone before him used the 'framework supplied by vii. 32-7 302 for the story about the blind man. Taylor believes that 'by this bold hypothesis alone we do justice to the literary agreements between vii. 32-7 and viii. 22-6 and the no less striking differences between the two stories'. 303 Both Bultmann and Taylor, paying attention to features and thematic resemblances, assume that the story of the blind man is to be understood with reference to the story of the deaf mute; but if consideration is given to literary structure, the presence of V1L form in both stories suggests that the similarity of the two stories is to be attributed to their conformity with the narrative pattern. The question is not whether one story is a variant of, or patterned after, the other, but whether both stories structurally resemble one another—and other V1L stories such as 1:40-45304—because both have been told according

301 Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 213.
303 Ibid.
304 See above, pp. 278-9.
to the VIL form of the narrative pattern.305

With regard to the differences between 8:22-26 and 7:31-37, an understanding of how the pattern is customarily extended enables one to see that the former differs from the latter through the extension that is occasioned by the partial restoration of the man's sight. At the same time, however, the extension is conventional as far as narrative structure is concerned. Although the partial restoration of sight does not appear elsewhere in the Gospels, the extension of the pattern through a problem development and a reply to this development is a commonplace in Mark's Gospel. Structurally, therefore, 8:22-26 is not distinctive in its dissimilarity with 7:31-37.

The story about the healing of another blind man, Bartimaeus, is a fifth VIL narrative (10:46-52) with extended form:

Set. \[46\text{Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰεριχώ}
    \begin{align*}
    \text{καὶ ἐπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἰεριχῶ} \\
    \text{καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ} \\
    \text{καὶ ὀφλοὺ ἱκανοῦ} \\
    \text{ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου} \\
    \text{Βαρτιμαῖος} \\
    \text{τυφλὸς} \\
    \text{ἐκάθετο παρὰ τὴν οἴκον} \\
    \text{προσαίτων}
    \end{align*}

Sit. \[47\text{καὶ ἀκουόντων ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνὸς ἔστιν} \\
    \text{ἤρετα ἐρώτειν} \\
    \text{καὶ λέγειν} \\
    \text{Υἱὸς Δαυίδ Ἰησοῦ} \\
    \text{ἐλεηθήνει} με

Prob. \[48\text{καὶ ἐπτειλομένων αὐτῷ πολλοὶ} \\
    \text{ἐνα σιωπήσῃ}

305 The structural resemblance between 8:22-26, 7:31-37, and other VIL narratives provides no support for the view of Walter E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 290, that the stories about the deaf mute and the blind man come from a 'later apocryphal stage of tradition'. Also, the presence of VIL structure in 7:31-37 and 8:22-26 stands against the judgement of Nineham, *Saint Mark*, pp. 216-7, that the two stories differ from most of the healing stories in the Gospels.
Dibelius classifies this story as a paradigm of a less pure type, but Bultmann and Taylor regard 10:46-52 as a miracle story. If the narrative is classified in terms of its structure, 10:46-52 is a VII story in its lack of a reply-to-the-situation statement. That part of v. 46 which tells of Jesus' entry into Jericho is the setting statement. The remainder of the verse is descriptive of the situation of the story: Jesus' departure from Jericho with His disciples and a crowd, and the presence of Bartimaeus along
the way. Verses 47f. are the problem section, which displays several problematical actions: the beggar's call to Jesus, the Son of David, for mercy; the negative reaction of those who try to silence the beggar; and his second, greater attempt to catch Jesus' attention. Jesus' reply, the command to call the beggar, is given in v. 49a. At this point the structure becomes extended with the indication in v. 49b of a response to Jesus' command. Bartimaeus' approach to Jesus in v. 50 is a development of the problem, and v. 51a presents Jesus' reply to this development. The beggar's request for sight in v. 51b is a second problem development, and Jesus' command and declaration in v. 52a are His reply to this second development. Verse 52b, which tells of Bartimaeus' ability to see, is the result statement; and v. 52c is the consequence statement, indicating a subsequent action of the healed beggar. In this way the story of Bartimaeus manifests extended VIL structure.

Dibelius and Bultmann judge the story to be legendary in its naming the beggar Bartimaeus. Considering the references to Jericho and the Son of David to be further signs of late formulation, Bultmann asserts that 'it is hardly possible to believe that there is an original, conventionally narrated miracle story at the basis of this passage'. Structurally, however, there are no grounds for thinking that 10:46-52 with extended VIL form is either of late origin or unconventional. Taylor regards the story as an eyewitness report that 'has not yet attained the rounded form of a Miracle-story

---

308 The reference to 'the way' in v. 52c echoes the use of παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν in v. 46b and illustrates again Mark's tendency to 'tie the knot' at the end of a story by referring to an earlier interest. It is not surprising that explicit closing reference to the way is missing in the parallel accounts of Matthew and Luke. See also Mark's similar use of 'village' in 8:22-26 (vv. 23, 26).

309 Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 115, and Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 213.

310 Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 213.
proper'. One can only conjecture whether the story is to be traced to eyewitness reporting, but it is possible to be more precise than to say that the form is not 'rounded'. As shown above, the length of the story may be explained as conventional extension of the pattern through developments of the problem with replies to these developments.

An understanding of how the pattern is extended in 10:46-52 provides a new criterion for assessing the redactional work of Matthew and Luke in their parallels to this story (Mt. 20:29-34; Lk. 18:35-43). Both Matthew and Luke abbreviate the structure of the story by limiting the extension of the problem to one development (Mt. 20:33; Lk. 18:41b) and a subsequent reply (Mt. 20:34a; Lk. 18:42). Luke, however, expands the situation statement. This additional extension, which is found in the dialogue in Lk. 18:36f., is distinctive, for Mark customarily extends the pattern in the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections.

With regard to the interpretation of the story, there is a tendency for scholars to call attention to the activity of Bartimaeus and to regard his response as the point of interest in the story. But features of the pattern that give prominence to Jesus in other stories are no less apparent in this story: (1) interest in Jesus' identity in the problem section (see both vv. 47f. and v. 51b); and (2) authoritative commands of Jesus in reply-to-the-problem sections (see vv. 49a, 52a). When these structural

---

311 Taylor, G.M., p. 447.
313 See, for example, Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 52 (cf. pp. 87 and 290), and Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 283.
314 See above, pp. 75, 78-9.
features are seen in connection with recurrent references to Jesus throughout the story, it is difficult to endorse the view that Bartimaeus is the centre of interest. Here, as elsewhere, it is more fitting to inquire about a number of thematic concerns to avoid the oversimplification of focusing on just one interest.

As indicated earlier, six of the eleven regular V1L narratives with extended form lack result statements and are either stories about Jesus or pronouncement stories according to Taylor's classification.\(^{316}\) One of the six narratives is the story about the Syro-Phoenician woman (7:24-30):

\[24\text{Εξειδεν δὲ ἀναστάς}\
\text{ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια Τύρου}\
\]
\[καὶ εἴσελθὼν εἰς οἰκίαν}\
\text{οὐδένα ἤθελεν γυναῖ}\
\]
\[καὶ οὐκ ὤνυνηθῇ λαβεῖν}\
\]
\[25\text{ἀλλ' εὑρίσκει ἀκοῦσας γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ}\
\text{ὅς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς κνεύμα ἀκάθαρτον}\
\text{ἐλθοῦσα}\
\text{προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ}\
\]
\[26\text{ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἴνα ἔλθῃ}\
\text{Ελληνίς}\
\text{Σοφοφολνίκισσα τῇ γένει}\
\]
\[καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτοῦ}\
\text{ἐνα τῷ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλῃ ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς}\
\]
\[27\text{kai ἐλεγεν αὐτῇ}\
\text{Ἀρει πρῶτον χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα}\
\text{οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἁρτοῦ τῶν τέκνων}\
\text{kai τοῖς κυναρίοις βαλεῖν}\
\]
\[28\text{ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῇ}\
\text{Κύριε}\
\text{kai τὰ κυνάρια ὕποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης}\
\text{ἔσθεσον ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχῶν τῶν παιδίων}\
\]
\[29\text{kai εἶπεν αὐτῇ}\
\text{Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ὑπαγε}\
\text{ἔσεληλυθεν ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου τῷ δαιμόνιον}\
\]

\(^{316}\text{See above, p. 298.}\)
Bultmann regards this story as 'a controversy dialogue of a sort'\(^{317}\) and a variant of Mt. 8:5-13,\(^{318}\) judging both to be imaginary scenes that were invented by the Church.\(^{319}\) Taylor similarly considers the story to be 'more akin in form to the Pronouncement-story than to the Miracle-story'\(^{320}\) but claims that the account of the Syro-Phoenician woman 'is still a narrative proper containing details which stamp it as primitive'.\(^{321}\) Apart from the absence of a result statement, however, the structure of the story of the Syro-Phoenician woman is essentially the same as the extended V1L miracle story about the healing of the blind man of Bethsaida (8:22-26);\(^{322}\) and without a result statement, 7:24-30 has the same structure as two stories about Jesus (14:53-65, 15:1-5).\(^{323}\) As far as narrative structure is concerned, these form-critical categories are not distinctive.

The extended V1L structure of 7:24-30 is clearly evident. Verse 24a is the setting statement, and vv. 24b-25 describe the situation: Jesus' desire to be unnoticed; His inability to escape detection; and the approach of a woman whose daughter has an unclean spirit. Verse 26 is the problem section, which tells of two 'difficulties': (1) the woman's Gentile status as a Syro-

\(^{317}\)Bultmann, *H.S.T.*, p. 38.

\(^{318}\)Ibid.

\(^{319}\)Ibid., p. 39.

\(^{320}\)Taylor, *G.M.*, p. 347.

\(^{321}\)Ibid.


\(^{323}\)See below, pp. 333-4, 343.
Phoenician by birth; and (2) her request that Jesus exorcise her daughter's demon. Jesus' reply to the first difficulty is His saying in v. 27 about feeding the children instead of the dogs. The woman's persistent remark in v. 28 is a development of the problem. Jesus' response in v. 29 is a reply to this development and also offers a solution to the second difficulty in v. 26. His admiration of the woman's witty remark is accompanied with the declaration that the demon has left her daughter. This declaration precludes the need for a result statement. Accordingly, the story ends in v. 30 with a consequence statement, which tells of the woman's subsequent action of going home and finding her daughter without the demon.

The structure of Matthew's parallel (Mt. 15:21-28) differs from Mark's account in three respects. (1) In Matthew's version the situation statement and problem section are fused in v. 22, which refers both to the woman's approach and to her request for mercy. (2) Matthew's story is more extended with two additional problem developments (vv. 23b, 25) and replies (vv. 24, 28a). (3) Matthew's account ends with a result statement (v. 28b) instead of a consequence statement. Each structural difference occurs in connection with material that is peculiar to Matthew's version.

With regard to the question whether Mark's story of the Syro-Phoenician woman is a variant of the story of the centurion's servant, both Mt. 8:5-13 and its parallel (Lk. 7:1-10) have extended V1L structure—that of Mk. 7:24-30.

---


325 See similar consequence statements above, p. 117.

326 The reply in v. 28a is Jesus' reply to the third problem development in v. 27, which corresponds with the only problem development in Mark's story (see Mk. 7:28).
Here the narrative pattern seems to support the notion that 7:24-30 is a variant of Mt. 8:8-13. The details of the two stories, however, are so different in spite of their structural similarity and mutual interest in Gentile faith that it is difficult to think of the stories as variants.

A second extended VIL story without a result statement is the narrative about Jesus' authority (Mk. 11:27-12:12):

Set. { 27
  καὶ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα
  καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔρημῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ
  ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ αρχιερεῖς
  καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς
  καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι
}

Sit. { 28καὶ ἐλεγον αὐτῷ
  Ἡ τῆς σοι ἐδώξει τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην
  ἦν ταύτα ποιῆς
}

Prob. { 29δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
  Ἐπερώτησέ μοι ἕνα λόγον
  καὶ ἀποκρίθητε μοι
  καὶ ἔρω ὕμεν ἐν πολλῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ταύτα ποιῶ
}

RepP. { 30τῷ βαπτίσμα τῷ Ἰωάννου εἷς οὐρανοῦ ἤν
  ἢ ἐς ἀνθρώπον
  ἀποκρίθητε μοι
}

Prob. { 31καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς
  λέγοντες
  Ἐὰν εἶπομεν
  Ἐξ οὗρανοῦ
  ἐρεῖ
  Διὰ τὸ [οὐ] οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ
  ἀλλὰ εἶπομεν
  Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων
}

Dev. { 32ἀλλα εἶπομεν
  Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ
  ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ὄχλον
  ἀπαντεῖς γὰρ εἴχον τὸν Ἰωάννην
  ὅτι προφήτης ἦν
  καὶ ἀποκρίθεντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ
  λέγουσιν
  οὐκ οἶδαμεν
}

RepP. { 33καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς
  Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν πολλῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ταύτα ποιῶ

Dev. {
12:1 καὶ ἡρῴατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν

- 'Ἀμπελῶνα ἀνήρωτος ἐφύτευσεν
- καὶ περιέδηκεν φραγμὸν
- καὶ ὄρυξεν ὑπολίγυον
- καὶ ὄκιοδήμησεν πῦργον
- καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς
- καὶ ἀπεδῆμησεν

- καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς τῷ καλῷ δοῦλον
- ἐνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος

3 καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν
- ἔδειραν
- καὶ ἀπέστειλαν κενὸν

- καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον

4 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον

5 καὶ ἄλλον ἀπέστειλεν

6 καὶ πολλοὶς ἄλλους

- δότας μὲν δέροντες
- ὁδὸς δὲ ἀποκτέννοντες

- ἠνέπεινοι δὲ ὁι γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν
- δότι οὕτως ἔστην ὁ κληρονόμος
- δεύτε ἀποκτέννωμεν αὐτὸν
- καὶ ἠμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία

- καὶ λαβόντες
- ἀπέκτειναν αὐτὸν
- καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος

- ἐξὺδεταὶ
- καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς
- καὶ ἄρεσε τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις

- ὡδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε
- λέειν ὕμων ἀπεδοκύμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες
- οὕτως ἐγενήθη ἐλς κεφάλής γυνῶς

- παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὐτή
- καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστή ἐν ἀφθαλμοίς ἡμῶν
Most scholars treat 11:27-33 and 12:1-12 separately; but when the narrative pattern is regarded as a criterion for identifying the limits of stories, it becomes evident that 11:27-12:12 is one narrative unit in Mark's arrangement of the material.

Verse 11:27a is a common setting statement; and v. 27b is a situation statement in its reference to the participants of the event: Jesus and various leaders who presumably represent the Sanhedrin. The double question in v. 28 is the problem section, and Jesus' reply to the first aspect of the double question (*'Ev πολὺ εξουσία ταύτα ποιεῖς*) is narrated in vv. 29f. The leaders' inability to answer Jesus' reply, a counter-question, is a development of the problem in vv. 31-33a. Jesus' reply to this problem development—His refusal to speak explicitly of His authority—is given in v. 33b. In 12:1 there is a continuation of Jesus' reply to the problem, and

---

327 Some interpreters see some relationship between the parable and 11:27-33. See, for example, Lohmeyer, pp. 244, 247, and Cranfield, *Saint Mark*, p. 364. Others, however, see no inner connection between the parable and 11:27-33. See, for example, Schmidt, *R.G.J.*, pp. 287-8; Bundy, p. 436; and Grundmann, p. 238. Grundmann nevertheless observes a connection between 12:12b and the story about the question of authority.


329 See J. Vernon Bartlet (ed.), *St. Mark* (Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, Ltd., [1922]), p. 324, where two questions are perceived in v. 28: the first is about 'the kind of authority' Jesus possesses; and the second is about 'the source of his authority'. Lohmeyer, p. 241, and Taylor, *G.M.*, p. 470, recognize the double form of the question but fail to see the important thematic difference between the two parts of the question. Taylor merely asserts that the second part is more personal.
vv. 1-11 present His answer to the second part of the double question in 11:28 ('η τις σοι έδωκεν την ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ταύτα ποιήσης). This answer consists of the parable of the wicked husbandmen (12:1-9) and the quotation from Psalm 118:22f. (Mk. 12:10f.); both the parable and the quotation imply that it is 'the Lord' who has given Jesus, the rejected Son, the authority to perform His works. The idea of divine authority is implicit in the parable in the reference to 'the lord of the vineyard' in v. 9. On the literal level the lord of the vineyard is the 'man' of 12:1, but allegorically ἡ κυρίος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος corresponds with the Lord of Psalm 118:23. Here the

330With regard to the thematic structure of this narrative see further below, pp. 488-92. The type of thematic structure that is evident in connection with the double question in 11:28 appears in a number of Mark's stories and provides grounds for thinking that Mark bore some responsibility for the arrangement of the material in 11:27-12:12.

331C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (London: Nisbet & Co. Ltd., 1950), p. 127, questions 'whether xii. 9b is an integral part of the authentic tradition', inasmuch as 'it was not the practice of Jesus to answer the questions to which His parables so often lead up', and because 'it is the practice of the evangelists to point the moral of parables'. Dodd's investigation is, of course, concerned with parables; but it should be noted that there are a number of reply-to-the-problem sections in which Jesus asks a question and answers it Himself—generally with a saying but sometimes with a command to heal. See, for example, 3:4-5a, 3:23-26 (parabolic sayings), 5:33-35, 4:30-32 (a parable), 5:39, 7:18-23, 9:12f., 12:24-27, 14:37b-38. The list is not exhaustive. Of special interest is an additional example in 14:48f., for there is some structural similarity between 14:43-52 (see above, pp. 175-6 and 11:27-12:12 as a whole—a fact that further suggests that 11:27-12:12 is to be regarded as a narrative unit. Both narratives have situation statements that refer to representatives of the Sanhedrin (11:27b, cf. 14:43); reply-to-the-problem sections that contain in the same order a question of Jesus, a statement of Jesus, and an allusion to Scripture (12:9-11, cf. 14:48f.); and consequence statements that contain καὶ ἀφεντες αὐτῶν (12:12, cf. 14:50-52). Still another example is 11:17. Here there is some structural similarity between 11:15-19 (see below, p. 389) and 11:27-12:12 as a whole. The validity of Dodd's remark about pointing the moral of the parable depends on whether parables have only one point and on whether Jesus Himself did not occasionally draw attention to thematic interests in His parables.

332Scholars are divided over the question of allegory in this parable. For a brief discussion of the question see Taylor, G.M., p. 472. See also Cranfield, Saint Mark, p. 367, who maintains that the parable was probably allegorical in its original form.
phrase παρὰ κυρίου in v. 11 is significant as the climax of Jesus' answer to the second aspect of the double question in 11:28. The whole story ends in 12:12 with a consequence statement about the leaders' hostile intentions and departure. In terms of the narrative pattern, therefore, 11:27-12:12 is one narrative with extended V1L structure.

The unity of 11:27-12:12 is not undermined by the interesting fact that extended V1L structure is apparent within the parable itself. Lacking a setting statement, the parable begins with a situation statement (vv. 1a-2), which tells of the planting of the vineyard and the owner's attempt to get some of the fruit. The remark in v. 3 about the hostile reception that was given by the tenants is a problem section. At this point the structure of the parable becomes extended with developments of the situation—a manner of extension that is unusual in Mark's narratives—and developments of the problem. The statement in v. 4a about the sending of another servant is the first development of the situation, and the indication of the beating of this servant is the first problem development in v. 4b. The sending of a third servant is the second development of the situation in v. 5a, and the remark about his murder in v. 5b is the second problem development. Although v. 5c is a scant allusion to the sending of many other servants, it is structurally the third situation development; and v. 5d, which is an economical reference to the hostile conduct of the tenants, is the third problem development. In

333Cf. Jeremias, Parables, p. 71, who sees a climax in the killing of the third servant.

334Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 177, observes that 12:1-9 'is in pure narrative form'; that is, the parable is a narrative in that it tells a story. Bultmann's use of 'form' here has nothing to do with narrative structure. The parable, however, not only tells a story but displays a form of the narrative pattern.

335Cf. the situation statement in 12:13, p. 330 below.
v. 6 is presented the fourth and most important development of the situation: the statement about the sending of the owner's beloved son. Verse 8, which tells of his murder and rejection by the tenants, is the fourth development of the problem. Jesus' question and answer in v. 9 about the lord of the vineyard's judging response is the reply-to-the-problem section of the parable. Verses 10f. appear as a consequence statement, which implies on the allegorical level that the rejected Son has been elevated to a position of chief importance. That these verses are to be regarded as a consequence statement is suggested both by the location of the quotation and by the theme of amazement in v. 11, a characteristic that is found in a number of consequence statements.336

The parable itself thus manifests extended VIL structure, but 12:1-12 is not a narrative in itself. In Mark's arrangement of the material the parable in 12:1-9 and the Psalm citation in vv. 10f. are presented as Jesus' reply to the second part of the problem in 11:28, and v. 12 is the consequence statement for 11:27-12:12 as a whole.337 It is possible to think of 11:27-33 as a separate narrative in terms of the pattern. The story about Jesus' authority makes sense if the narrative ends at 11:33, for vv. 27-33, deprived of the consequence statement in 12:12, make up a narrative with extended V1S structure. But 12:1-12 does not have credible pattern structure apart from 11:27-33. By itself 12:1-12 is a reply section with a consequence statement, and there is no other narrative with such truncated structure in Mark's Gospel. The case for the separate identity of 12:1-12 is not helped if

336 See above, p. 112.

337 Here the reference to the crowd in v. 12 is reminiscent of the allusion to the crowd in 11:32b and may be another instance that displays Mark's tendency to conclude a narrative with a reference to a theme that was of interest earlier in the story.
12:1-11 is thought of as a situation statement, where Jesus takes the initiative and presents a parable,\textsuperscript{338} for such a situation statement is followed only by the consequence statement in v. 12, and there is no other narrative in Mark's Gospel that has such eccentric structure. So far as the narrative pattern is concerned, 12:1-12 is best seen as part of 11:27-12:12 as a whole.

It is not surprising that there are structural differences in the parallel accounts of Matthew and Luke, where Mark's focus is lost through the fusion, addition, and omission of material. In Matthew's account (Mt. 21:23-46) the setting statement, situation statement, and problem section are fused grammatically in v. 23; and Jesus' reply to the problem is further extended through responses in vv. 32 and 41. Matthew presents as part of Jesus' reply to the problem the parable of the two sons in vv. 28-32. This parable has little to do with the question of divine authority behind the mission of Jesus and blurs the thematic structure that is evident in Mark's version. In Matthew's account, however, the connection of the parable of the wicked husbandmen with the story of the question about Jesus' authority is clearer with the absence of ἐξέτασιν in v. 28 for an introduction to the parables. Similar alterations are evident in Luke's account (Lk. 20:1-19). The setting and situation statements are fused in v. 1, and a response is presented in v. 16b. With the absence of πασὴ ἡμῶν through Luke's citation of only Psalm 118:22, Mark's thematic interest in the divine authority of Jesus becomes lost at this climactic point.

A different interpretation of the parable of the wicked husbandmen is prompted by the recognition that Mk. 11:27-12:12 is structurally one narrative

\textsuperscript{338}Cf. the situation statements with ἐξέτασιν or ἐξαντλητικά, pp. 48-9.
and that the parable is presented as Jesus' answer to the second part of the double question in 11:28. Some scholars maintain that the parable is about Jesus' authority as the Messiah. Others look upon Jesus' death as the main interest. Still others see the point in v. 9 with regard to the giving of the vineyard to Gentiles. All these themes are evident and should be considered in a search for the full meaning of the parable. But another thematic concern—the divine authority of Jesus—is given prominence in Mark's arrangement through the presence of Psalm 118:23 as part of Jesus' answer to the double question in Mk. 11:28. In this arrangement attention is drawn to the Lord Who has given Jesus the authority to perform His extraordinary works. The parable is thus about Jesus' authority to show that it is derived ultimately from God Himself.

According to Albertz 11:27-33 once belonged to a pre-Markan collection

339 See, for example, Allan Menzies, The Earliest Gospel (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1901), pp. 215-8. Menzies rightly recognizes that the parable is presented in answer to the question in 11:28 about Jesus' authority (p. 216) but thinks of His authority mainly in connection with His Messiahship.

340 See, for example, Cranfield, Saint Mark, p. 368, and Schniewind, p. 120.


342 Hunter, Interpreting the Parables, pp. 94-5, correctly rejects the notion that only one point is to be found in a parable. Cf. p. 118, where Hunter later draws attention to the theme of the Jewish leaders' 'awful responsibility in rejecting God's Kingdom and Messiah'. Hunter's interest in a particular theme is justifiable, for the view that there may be a number of thematic interests in a parable does not preclude special consideration of a particular thematic concern.

343 In Rawlinson's discussion of the parable (see pp. 161-3), his occasional references to Jesus as 'our Lord' are reverent but misleading. They cloud the important distinction between Jesus and the Lord Who has given Jesus His authority.
of controversy-dialogues; but in view of the narrative and thematic structure of 11:27-12:12 as a whole, one is led to think that Mark was responsible for the composition of 11:27-12:12 as it now stands in his Gospel. His redactional work is to be seen not simply in the provision of introductions and conclusions but in the overall formation of the story as it conforms with the narrative pattern and in the orderly arrangement of the material according to a particular thematic structure that is often found elsewhere in Mark's Gospel. The fact that both the extended V1L narrative structure and the \( ab_a+b \) thematic structure of 11:27-12:12 appear elsewhere in Mark's Gospel in stories other than controversy-dialogues, stands against Albertz's hypothesis and supports instead the view that one person—presumably Mark himself—participated in the structuring of the stories in his Gospel.

The subsequent story about the question of tribute to Caesar (12:13-17) is a third narrative that has extended V1L form without a result statement, as is readily seen in the following arrangement of the story:

---

\(^{344}\)Albertz, pp. 16-7.


\(^{346}\)See further below, pp. 488-92. Cf. Werner Georg Kümmel, 'Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weinärtndern (Mark. 12. 1-9)', *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne, Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire* (Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1950), p. 126, who considers Mark's presentation of the parable to be the least orderly and therefore the most primitive in its narration about the sending of the servants. Such a judgement is based on the assumption that greater order is found in the triple structure of Luke's version of the sending of the servants (see pp. 124-5). It should be noted, however, that Mark's extension of the story at this point is quite orderly even though there is no threefold structure. The alternation between situation developments and problem developments in 12:4-7 is rather methodical. It is thus possible to think that Mark's presentation of the parable is both primitive and orderly.
This story has no setting statement but begins with the situation statement in v. 13, which tells of the approach of some Pharisees and Herodians and their intention to trap Jesus. Their statement and question in v. 14 make up the problem section, and Jesus’ reply to the problem begins in v. 15. The reply is extended by responses of His opponents in vv. 16a, 16c, and by continuations of His reply in vv. 16b, 17a. The story ends in v. 17b with a brief consequence statement about His opponents’ amazement. The V1L form of the narrative pattern is clearly evident.
The pattern's presence is significant, for it provides unequivocal grounds for regarding 12:13-17 as a full-fledged narrative. According to Taylor 'the narrative element is reduced to almost the barest essentials', and everything in this pronouncement story 'is subordinated to the answer of Jesus to the burning question whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Caesar'. But 12:13-17 is unquestionably a narrative in terms of the pattern. Except for the absence of a setting statement, the story has all the narrative sections that are found in the other VIL stories.

The presence of the pattern in 12:13-17 also enables one to see that the structure of this pronouncement story is not distinctive. Similar extension of the pattern is apparent elsewhere in two miracle stories (6:35-44, 8:1-9) and a Markan construction (8:13-21). So far as narrative structure is concerned, these form-critical categories mean little.

In addition, the pattern in 12:13-17 serves as a measure for understanding the structural differences of Matthew's and Luke's parallels. Basically, both parallels have extended VIL structure, but there are some differences that appear mostly in connection with the special material in each parallel. Matthew's account (Mt. 22:15-22) contains a brief temporal note with the use of τὸ ἐξέλθε, which is embedded in the situation statement in v. 15. In v. 16 material that corresponds with Mark's situation statement is

---

351 Cf. Beare, p. 212, who considers the changes of Matthew and Luke, apart from some developments of perspective in Luke's account, to be 'no more than verbal and stylistic'.

fused with Matthew's problem section (vv. 16f.). More alteration is apparent in Luke's account (Lk. 20:20-26). The amount of pattern extension is reduced through the omission of the opponents' response of bringing the coin to Jesus and through the combination of Jesus' question about the coin with His request for it. In effect, Luke also provides a result statement with the remark that Jesus' opponents were unable to catch Him (v. 26a). To say that they were not able is to say that no result took place. Structurally, the indication that there was no result is functionally a result statement.

In both Matthew's and Luke's accounts the question of the opponents in the problem section is simpler than the question in Mark's version. The unique presence of δωμεν ἡ μὴ δωμεν in Mk. 12:14 is significant, for it makes the question another double question, which is given dual consideration in the rest of the narrative. In Mark's account the question of the lawfulness of paying tribute to Caesar is differentiated from a second question about whether or not one should pay the tax. Verses 15f. present Jesus' answer to the first part of the double question: the markings on the coin clearly indicate that it is lawful to pay the tax to Caesar. It is his coin through his image and the inscription, and he is entitled to the tax. Verse 17a gives Jesus' answer to the second part of the double question: one should give to Caesar the things that are his, and also give to God the things that are His. The hostile attitude of Jesus' opponents shows that they have been deficient in this latter aspect. Presumably, if they had given God the things that are His, they would have been sincere in their praise of Jesus.

This brief description of one of the thematic structures in Mark's

\[352\]Cf. Bundy, p. 440, who thinks that 'the whole point to Jesus' reply is its ingenuity in evasion'. Bundy, however, rightly observes that the production of the coin is a part of Jesus' response.
account is presented here in anticipation of Part III to show that the concerns of the story are more complex than interest in Jesus' pronouncement about paying tribute to Caesar. The common assumption that the story leads up to its point in Jesus' saying is an oversimplification of the rich thematic texture of this narrative. It is also apparent that Mark's complex thematic structure is lost in Matthew's and Luke's parallels with their reduction of the question of the opponents. Characteristically, Mark's version is quite orderly in its internal arrangement of the complex thematic material, although his account lacks the sophisticated language of Luke's parallel.

With the references to God and Jesus' true teaching of the way of God, Mk. 12:13-17 is thematically a fitting sequel to 11:27-12:12 as a whole. In both stories Jesus' special relation to God is of particular importance. This perspective is lost when attention is directed exclusively to the saying of Jesus in 12:17a. Such attention may be appropriate to form-critical assumptions about pronouncement stories but does not do justice to the thematic features that are evident in this story.

A fourth extended VII narrative without a result statement is the story about Jesus before the Sanhedrin (14:53-65):

Set. \begin{verbatim}
\{53\text{καὶ ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰσσωῦν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα} \\
\{καὶ συνέρχονται πάντες οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς} \\
\{καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι} \\
\{καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς\} \\
\end{verbatim}

Sit. \begin{verbatim}
\{54\text{καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρῶθεν ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ} \\
\{ἐὼς ἐσώ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως\} \\
\{καὶ ἦν συγκαθημένος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν} \\
\{καὶ θερμαίνετο τος τὸ φῶς\} \\
\end{verbatim}

353See further below, pp. 476, 481, 490, 502-3.
55οι δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ δλον τὸ συνεδρίουν ἔξητον κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσσοῦ μαρτυρίαν εἰς τὸ θανατῶσαι αὐτὸν καὶ οὐχ ἡπισκόποιν

56πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐφευσμαρτύρον κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἴσα αἱ μαρτυρίαι οὖν ἤσαν

57καὶ τινὲς ἀναστάντες ἐφευσμαρτύρον κατ' αὐτοῦ λέγοντες

58ἀν ἡμεῖς ἧκοναμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος δὲ τὴν καταλύσα τὸν καθὸ τοῦ τὸν χειροποίητον καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἠμερῶν ἄλλων ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω

Prob. 59καὶ οὐδὲ οὖτες ἦσαν ἢ καὶ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν

60καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρίζησεν τὸν Ἰσσοῦν λέγων

61ἀν ἄπορκρινή οὖδέν τι οὐδότας σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν

RepP. 61ο δὲ έσωπα καὶ οὐκ ἄπεκρύβανο οὖδέν

Prob. 62καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ

Dev. 62ο δὲ Ἰσσοὺς εἶπεν εὖς εἰμι καὶ ἄφεσο τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνδρότου ἐν δεξιῶν καθημένον τῆς δινάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενοι μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

63ο δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς διαρρήκτας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ λέγειν

64καὶ ἠπεσίησαν ἐξομον μαρτυρῶν τίς ἱκοσαμενας τούς ἐν διώκειν καθημένων τῆς δινάμεως τῷ υἱῷ παῖδεται

Cons. 65καὶ ημεῖς τινὲς ἐμπτopenid αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ

66προφήτευσον καὶ οἱ υποτείναι δαπέδομαι αὐτοῦ ἔλαβον.
A discussion of the many historical difficulties of this story of Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin is beyond the scope of this investigation. Attention must be limited to the task of describing the literary structure of this narrative as it now stands in Mark's Gospel. Presumably a sound understanding of the structure of this story is fundamental for evaluating hypotheses about the story's disunity and for making deductions about the historical element in the story. An understanding of the structure of 14:53-65 arises from a consideration of two important issues: (1) the narrative structure of 14:53-65 itself; and (2) the structural relation between this story and its sequel in 14:66-72.

With regard to the first concern, one may speak of 14:53-65 as a narrative because it displays the narrative pattern. The remark in v. 53a that Jesus was led away to the high priest is the setting statement, and vv. 53b-56 make up the lengthy situation statement. Features that are found in other situation statements are apparent here: some indication of the participants; a periphrastic construction with ἴπτετον; the use of some form of ἱπτετον; and an explanatory comment. The false charge against Jesus and the high

---

355Representative discussion of the various problems relating to the trial of Jesus may be found in Lightfoot, H.I.G., pp. 142-51; Bundy, pp. 516-20; Taylor, G.M., pp. 644-6; Nineham, Saint Mark, pp. 397-405; Burkill, Mysterious Revelation, pp. 280-318; and E. Schweizer, G.N.M., pp. 321-8. See also Günther Bornkamm, Jesus of Nazareth, trans. Irene and Fraser McLuskey with James M. Robinson (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1960), pp. 163-4.


357See an analogous setting statement in 15:16a, p. 35.

358See above, p. 37; see also p. 45, n. 36.

359See above, pp. 39-40.

360See 8:11 and 14:1b.

priest's question in vv. 57-60 are the problem section,\textsuperscript{362} and the statement about Jesus' silence is the reply-to-the-problem section.\textsuperscript{363} Extension of the pattern occurs with a development of the problem in v. 61b: the second question of the high priest; and Jesus' reply to this development is given in v. 62.\textsuperscript{364} Verses 63-65 contain consequence statements that tell of various actions that took place after Jesus' reply to the high priest's second question.\textsuperscript{365} In this manner 14:53-65 manifests extended VIL form without a result statement and thus has regular pattern structure. For this reason this story is to be distinguished from its sequel, the story of Peter's denial, which also contains in itself the narrative pattern.\textsuperscript{366}

It is important to understand also the structural relation between these two stories. Some scholars believe that v. 54 was possibly once joined with vv. 66-72;\textsuperscript{367} and the present relationship between these stories is variously thought of as a 'sandwich',\textsuperscript{368} a parenthetical insertion,\textsuperscript{369} an

\textsuperscript{362}See similar problem sections above, pp. 66-7.

\textsuperscript{363}See above, p. 102, n. 98. Also cf. 15:5a, a reply to a problem development, p. 343.

\textsuperscript{364}Cf. Wellhausen, \textit{Das Evangelium Marci}, p. 132, where it is held that 14:61f. is a secondary interruption. Cf. Rawlinson, p. 220.

\textsuperscript{365}See similar consequence statements above, p. 115. It is possible that v. 65 was appended but as a consequence statement and according to the narrative pattern. Not containing any form of the pattern, v. 65 probably was not circulated as a narrative beforehand in the tradition. Cf. Taylor, \textit{G.M.}, p. 570.

\textsuperscript{366}See further below, pp. 339-42.

\textsuperscript{367}See, for example, Bundy, p. 520. Cf. Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, p. 269, who connects vv. 53f. with vv. 66-72. Cf. also Taylor, \textit{G.M.}, pp. 564, 572, and Nineham, \textit{Saint Mark}, p. 398, who consider the original fusion of v. 54 with vv. 66-72 as one of several possibilities.

\textsuperscript{368}Best, p. 94.

\textsuperscript{369}Winter, p. 99.
interweaving or 'intertwining' of the trial story with the denial story,\textsuperscript{370} or an arrangement where the story of Peter's denial is a 'framework around the trial of Jesus'.\textsuperscript{371} A new way of explaining the relationship between the two stories arises from an understanding of the thematic structure of Mark's narratives. It is Mark's recurrent practice to present two or more issues and then deal with them in a thorough, orderly manner. In this particular instance 14:53-65 and 66-72 are yoked together by a thematic structure in which two situations, Jesus' appearance before the Sanhedrin (a) and Peter's remote following as far as the courtyard of the high priest (b), which apparently were understood by Mark as historically concurrent, give rise to events that are treated in an orderly (a + b) manner. In this arrangement the second a member is the remainder of the story of the trial (vv. 55-64) and the second b member is the denial story. On the basis of this thematic structure there is warrant for thinking of 14:53-72 as a unit,\textsuperscript{372} although a distinction between 14:53-65 and 66-72 as two narratives must be maintained with the narrative pattern as a criterion.

It is also possible to view the relationship between the two stories as an instance where Mark displays anticipation of subsequent narrative material. Anticipation on the part of the storyteller has been seen in the step development of thought that appears from time to time in Mark's stories. Such development of thought is quite evident in the story of Jesus' trial. The remark about the high priest in the setting statement in v. 53a prepares the


\textsuperscript{371}E. Schweizer, \textit{G.N.M.}, p. 321.

\textsuperscript{372}See Johnson, pp. 239-46; Beare, pp. 232-3; Nineham, \textit{Saint Mark}, pp. 397-410; and E. Schweizer, \textit{G.N.M.}, pp. 319-333, who consider 14:53-72 as one section.
way for the various references to the chief priests, the high priest, and the Sanhedrin in the situation statement (vv. 53b-56). Mark's comment about false witness at the end of the situation statement (v. 56) anticipates the example of false witness in the problem section (vv. 57-60).\(^{373}\) The reference to Jesus' silence by the high priest at the end of the problem section (v. 60) anticipates the remark about Jesus' silence in the reply-to-the-problem section in v. 61a. The two dimensions of the chief priest's question in v. 61b (Messiahship and Sonship) appear also in Jesus' reply to the problem development, but here it is not clear whether in Mark's presentation the question anticipates the answer, or whether the answer is formulated according to the question. With such anticipatory remarks within the trial story there are grounds for regarding v. 54 as another instance of anticipation where Mark prepares the way for the story that follows. This anticipation of the subsequent story of Peter's denial is significant, for it shows that Mark was interested in the connection of these events and that the question of the connection of narratives in Mark's Gospel is more than a simple matter of links between narratives.\(^{374}\) The story of the trial was written with the story of Peter's denial in the mind of the narrator, who integrated the two stories thematically and presented them as two related events. The picture of Mark as a mere collector of tradition patently does not fit here. His

\(^{373}\)Cf. Bultmann, *H.S.T.*, p. 270, who thinks that vv. 57-9 are 'a particularization of v. 56', and that 'v. 59 is a feeble and senseless repetition of the motif of v. 56'. The question, however, is not one of particularization and senseless repetition but of Mark's recurrent practice of connecting narrative sections through anticipatory remarks and the step development of thought.

\(^{374}\)To meet the objection that these two stories are from the Passion Narrative, where connection is generally closer, it should be pointed out that a similar combination of two stories is apparent in the relationship between 3:20-50 and 31-35. See further below, pp. 557-62.
orderly combination of these two stories is an indication that he bore some responsibility for both their composition and arrangement.

With such a close relationship between the stories of Jesus' trial and Peter's denial, it is not surprising that the latter also has extended VII structure without a result statement:

```
Set. { Set. {66} καὶ ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ
Set. { Sit. { ἔρχεται μία τῶν παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως
Prob. { { V Prob. {67} καὶ ἴδουσα τὸν Πέτρον ἑρμαινόμενον
Prob. { { 1 S έμβλέψασα αὐτῷ
Prob. { { 68} δὲ ἤρμηνεστο
Prob. { { RepP. { λέγων
Prob. { { RepP. { οὔτε οἶδα
Prob. { { RepP. { οὔτε ἐπισταμαι
Prob. { { RepP. { οὔτε τὰ λέγεις
Prob. { [Sit.]{ [καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν]
Dev. 1 { V 69} καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἴδουσα αὐτὸν
Dev. 1 { 1 S ήρέσαι πάλιν λέγειν τοῖς παρεστώσιν
Dev. 1 { RepP. { δι' οὗτος εἰς αὐτῶν ἐστιν
RepP. { RepP. {70} δὲ πάλιν ἤρμηνετο
RepP. { RepP. {71} δὲ ήρέσαι διὰ θεωρήματι ζεισιν
RepP. { RepP. { καὶ ὑμνοῦμεν
RepP. { RepP. { δι' οὗ εἰς αὐτῶν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον ἐν λέγεται
RepP. { RepP. {72} καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν
Cons. { V RepS. { καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήμα
Cons. { L ὡς εἶκεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
Cons. { RepS. { δι' πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φώνησαι διὸς
Cons. { RepS. { τρίς μὲ ἀπαρνησία
Cons. { RepS. { καὶ ἐπιβαλῶν
Cons. { έκλαιεν.
```
Bultmann judges this story to be 'legendary and literary', and Bundy detects in it 'conventional threefold structure of ancient dramatic composition'; but the story of Peter's denial not only manifests the narrative pattern in overall structure but also displays shorter forms of the pattern in internal narrative sections. The reference to Peter's presence below in the courtyard in v. 66a is the setting statement, and the remark in v. 66b about the approach of one of the high priest's maids is the situation statement. Verse 67, which presents further information about the situation in the phrase about Peter's warming himself by the fire, is mainly a problem section in that it leads up to the girl's troublesome question about Peter's association with the prisoner from Nazareth. Peter's first denial in v. 68a is the reply-to-the-problem section. At this point the pattern becomes extended with a development of the problem in vv. 68b-69, which tell of the maid's second accusation. Peter's second denial in v. 70 is his reply to this problem development. A second development of the problem is narrated in v. 70b, which contains the charge that is made by bystanders. Peter's third denial in v. 71 is his reply to this problem development. The story ends with a consequence statement in v. 72, which refers to a series of actions that took place after his reply to the second problem development: (1) the sound of the cock for the second time; (2) Peter's remembrance of Jesus' prediction; and (3) Peter's weeping. These three subsequent actions complete the VIL form of this story.

Shorter forms of the narrative pattern are apparent in internal sections of the story. Its first four sections in vv. 66-68a make up the VIS form of

375Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 269.
376Bundy, p. 521.
the pattern, which is essentially the V1L form without a consequence statement. V1S form appears again in vv. 14:68b-70a, which constitutes the first development of the problem and the subsequent reply. The remark in v. 68b about Peter's withdrawal to the porch is an internal setting statement. If καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν is read in v. 68b on the basis of A C D K Δ Θ Π f f13 and many other witnesses, the phrase provides a situation statement for this internal section. If, however, the phrase is omitted with B L W ψ 892 syr8 and others, the V1S form of vv. 68b-70a is irregular without a situation statement.377 The problem development itself is referred to in v. 69; and, as indicated earlier, v. 70a tells of Peter's reply to this development. Irregular V1S form without a situation statement is apparent in the second problem development and the subsequent reply (vv. 70b-71). The phrase καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν is a temporal setting statement; and the reference to the bystanders and their remark is the problem development itself. As indicated above, Peter's reply to this problem development is given in v. 71. The absence of a situation statement provides support for the omission of καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν in v. 68b. V2L structure (setting, situation, reply to the situation, consequence) is evident in v. 72, the consequence statement for the whole story. The words καὶ εὐθὺς are a brief temporal setting statement, and the indication about the second cock-crowing is a situation statement.378 Peter's response to this cock-crowing—his recollection of Jesus' prediction—is a reply-to-the-situation statement; and the note about Peter's weeping is

377 See further Taylor, G.M., pp. 574, 576-7, who considers the detail about two cock-crowings to be original.


a consequence statement within v. 72. Thus another story displays the pattern within the pattern.

An understanding of the narrative pattern enables one to gain a new insight about the shamefulness of Peter's denial, at least from the narrator's point of view. There is a tendency for a statement about Jesus' Messianic status or Sonship to appear in the reply-to-the-problem section of narratives.\textsuperscript{379} Such a statement is not limited to this particular section of the narrative pattern\textsuperscript{380} but is found predominantly in this section. Where many Gospel narratives witness to Jesus' Messianic status, Peter rejects Jesus as τὸν ἀνθρώπου τοῦτον. The fact that Peter's most intense denial of Jesus as 'this man' occurs at that point where in other stories there is some reference to Jesus as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the Son of God, the Christ, or the King of the Jews, reveals by contrast the extent of Peter's denial of Jesus. This denial is not simply disloyalty but also an expression of disbelief. Peter, who once in a reply-to-the-problem section confessed Jesus as the Christ, now at a corresponding narrative location denies His Messiahship as well as his own relationship with Jesus. Both failings lie at the bottom of Peter's deep humiliation and regret.

\textsuperscript{379} Statements about the Son of Man appear in several reply-to-the-problem sections: 2:8-11 (v. 10); 2:25-28 (v. 28); 8:33-9:1 (8:38); 9:12f. (v. 12); 10:42-45 (v. 45), a reply to a problem development; 14:20f. (v. 21); 14:41f. (v. 41), a reply to a problem development; and 14:62, another reply to a problem development. References to Jesus as My Son, the Beloved are found in two reply-to-the-problem sections: 9:7 and 12:1-11 (v. 6). Sayings about Jesus as the Christ are presented in three reply-to-the-problem sections: 8:29b; 14:62, a reply to a problem development; and 15:31-32a (v. 32a). Remarks about Jesus as the King of the Jews are evident in the reply-to-the-problem sections in 15:12 and 15:31-32a (v. 32a).

The last extended VfL narrative without a result statement is the story about Jesus' trial before Pilate (15:1-5):

Set. 1\(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma\) πρωτ'  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{συμβούλιον} & \text{ποιήσαντες} \text{ο} \text{ι} \\
\text{μετά} & \text{τω} \text{ν} \text{πρεσβυτέρω} \text{ν} \\
\text{καὶ} & \text{γραμματέω} \text{ν} \\
\text{καὶ} & \text{δολο} \text{ν} \text{τ} \text{ο} \text{ς} \text{συνεδρι} \text{ο} \text{ν} \\
\text{δήσαντες} & \text{τ} \text{ω} \text{n} \text{'} \text{Ιο} \text{σ} \text{σ} \text{o} \text{υ} \\
\text{άπη} \text{γεγαν} & \\
\text{καὶ} & \text{παρέδωκαν} \text{Πιλάτου} \\
\end{align*}\]

Sit. 2\(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma\) ἐπηρώτα αὐτῶν ὁ Πιλάτος  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ΣΩ έλ} & \text{ο} \text{Βασιλεὺς} \text{τω} \text{n} \text{'} \text{Ιουδαίων} \\
\end{align*}\]

Prob. 3\(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma\) ὅ δὲ ἀποκρύθησις αὐτῷ  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{λέγει} & \\
\text{ΣΩ λέγεις} \\
\end{align*}\]

RepP. 4\(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma\) καὶ κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πολλά  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ὅ δὲ Πιλάτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτα αὐτῶν} \\
\text{λέγαν} \\
\text{Οὐκ ἀποκρύθη οὐδὲν} \\
\text{Ἰδὲ τόσα σου κατηγοροῦσιν} \\
\end{align*}\]

Dev. 5\(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma\) ὅ δὲ Ιωσήφ οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἀπεκρίθη} \\
\end{align*}\]

Cons. 5\(\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma\) ὅπως θαυμάζειν τὸν Πιλάτον.

Taylor and other commentators regard 15:1-15 as a unit;\(^{381}\) but if the narrative pattern is used as a guide, 15:1-5, which displays the pattern, may be seen as a narrative in itself\(^{382}\) even though it is closely related to the

---


\(^{382}\)Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 580, who thinks that the structure in vv. 2-5 is 'loose'. Taylor regards Matthew's use of 'ὅ δὲ Ἰωσήφ έστάθη ἐμπροσθέν τοῦ ἡγεμόνος' as an attempt to improve his source, but it is questionable to cite Matthew's addition as an argument for the looseness of Mark's account in vv. 2-5. Matthew's addition is better seen as a requirement that was necessitated by his return to the story of Jesus' trial after having digressed to tell of the death of Judas (Mt. 27:3-10). Cf. Luke's irregular parallel to Mk. 15:1-5 (Lk. 23:1-5), where the VfL form of the pattern is not visible.
story about the release of Barabbas (15:6-15).\textsuperscript{383} Καὶ ἔδωκεν πρῶτον in v. 1a is a brief temporal setting statement; and v. 1b, which refers to the Sanhedrin's deliberation and deliverance of Jesus to Pilate, is the situation statement. Pilate's question in v. 2a is the problem section, and Jesus' answer in v. 2b is the reply-to-the-problem section. The pattern becomes extended with a development of the problem in vv. 3f., which tells of the chief priests' accusations and Pilate's second question.\textsuperscript{384} The remark in v. 5a that Jesus made no answer is structurally a reply to this problem development even though nothing is said. Verse 5b, which alludes to Pilate's amazement, is clearly a consequence statement. Thus again it can be readily seen that a story has been told according to the narrative pattern—in this case the VIL form of the pattern without a result statement.

As indicated at the outset of the discussion of VIL structure, there is only one VIL narrative that has irregular form. This narrative, the story about Jesus' landing at Gennesaret (6:53-56), will be illustrated next.

\textsuperscript{383}See above, pp. 188-9. If 15:1-15 were a story that, like 14:66-72, was composed of a number of sections that displayed in themselves brief forms of the narrative pattern, there would be warrant for regarding 15:1-5 as merely a VIL section of 15:1-15; but inasmuch as 15:6-15 alone has extended FPL structure, it is preferable to view 15:1-5 and 6-15 as two related narratives that manifest separately a long form of the pattern. Taylor, G.M., p. 577, by asserting that 'the same ideas dominate the account from 2-15', attempts to show that the two stories are 'closely integrated'; but this effort is questionable. Two of the three ideas that Taylor sees in vv. 2-15 ('the emphasis on the silence of Jesus' and 'the reluctance of Pilate to pass sentence') are evident only in vv. 6-15. If one, however, inquires about the narrative structure of 15:1-15, it becomes apparent that 15:1-5 and 6-15 should be distinguished from one another. There are no structural grounds for considering vv. 1-5 and 6-15 to be 'integrated' even though the two episodes are closely related, with mutual interest in Jesus as the King of the Jews, the chief priests' desire to destroy Jesus (the third idea that is detected by Taylor), and Pilate's jurisdiction.

\textsuperscript{384}Cf. Taylor, \textit{ibid.}, p. 579, who asserts that 'the reference to the accusations of the chief priests is awkwardly introduced in v. 3'. But this reference is fitting in its location as part of the development of the problem and prepares the way for Pilate's question in this development section.
Irregular form. As can be seen in the following presentation of 6:53-56, the story is irregular through the absence of a reply-to-the-problem section:

Set. \{53\text{καὶ διαπεράζοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν} \n\text{ἐλθον εἰς Γεννησαρὲτ} \nκαὶ προσωμισθένσαι\} 

Sit. \{54\text{καὶ ἐξελεύθυτοι αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου} \nεὐθὺς ἐπιγνώτες αὐτῶν \n55\text{περιέβαλον ὅλην τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην}} \nκαὶ ἤρξαντο ἐπὶ τοῖς κραβάττοις \nτοὺς καλῶς ἔχοντας περιφέρειν} \n56\text{ἐκ τοῦ κραβάττου} \nὅπου ἤκουσαν ὅτι ἐστὶν \n
Prob. \{5\text{καὶ ἔποιη} \text{ἀν εἰσεπερευετο εἰς κόμας} \n
\text{ἡ εἰς πόλεις} \n
\text{ἡ εἰς ἄγροις} \n
ἐν ταῖς ἄγοραις ἐπέθεσαν τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας} \n
καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτῶν \n
ἐνα κἂν τοῦ κραβάττου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται \n
Cons. \{ καὶ ὅσοι ἦν ἤφαντο αὐτοῦ ἔσφυντο. \}

The story begins conventionally with a setting statement in v. 53, the remark about the mooring at Gennesaret.\textsuperscript{385} Verses 54f., which refer to the bringing of the sick to Jesus, are the situation statement.\textsuperscript{386} In v. 56a the narration about the requests to touch the hem of Jesus' garment is the problem section.\textsuperscript{387} One now expects a reply-to-the-problem section where Jesus acknowledges the requests by some saying, command, or action; but no such reply section is

\textsuperscript{385}To drop v. 53 is to omit the setting statement of the story. Cf. Bundy, p. 270. This verse should be seen in terms of its structural role as a setting statement for the pattern in 6:53-56. To omit the verse to satisfy the interest of historical continuity on the part of the modern interpreter is to do violence to the structure of the story that has been told according to the narrative pattern.

\textsuperscript{386}See similar situation statements above, pp. 49, 39, 43.

\textsuperscript{387}See similar problem sections above, pp. 80-1. Verse 56a is not the mere repetition of v. 55 but rather another manifestation of Mark's thematic parallelism, where in this instance two interests are restated in an orderly manner. Cf. Bundy, pp. 270-1. This thematic structure is lost in Matthew's parallel (Mt. 14:34-36).
presented. Jesus' permission is assumed, and the narrator proceeds directly to the consequence statement in v. 56b, which tells of subsequent healings that took place whenever the sick touched Jesus. This remark is conceivably a result statement; but with the idea that many requests occurred in many localities on different occasions, together with the absence of a specific healing after a particular command of Jesus, it is preferable to regard v. 56b as a consequence statement.

It is significant that the pattern is evident even though it is irregular. Except for the absence of the reply-to-the-problem section, the story displays conventional V1L form. With the pattern 6:53-56 has narrative structure and is not simply a 'generalization',388 'editorial formulation',389 'summary statement',390 or 'generalizing summary'.391 Although the story is in part (especially v. 56) a summary of public response to Jesus for healing, the whole account has been told according to the narrative pattern and—apart from its one irregularity—is structurally no less a narrative than the other V1L stories.

With the presentation of 6:53-56 the illustration of the V1L narratives comes to an end. The discussion has been lengthy mainly because there are more V1L narratives than any other kind of story in Mark's Gospel. Before illustrating the Variation #1 Short narratives, it is fitting to summarize briefly the discussion of the V1L stories. For this summary it is useful to list them with the letters that stand for the form-critical classifications.

388Dibelius, F.T.G., p. 224.
389Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 341.
390Cranfield, Saint Mark, p. 229.
391Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 186.
## VIL Narratives

1. **Regular Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:21-28</td>
<td>PA- HM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:29-31</td>
<td>- HM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35-39 (no res.)</td>
<td>- EF S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40-45 (no set.)</td>
<td>T HM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1-6a</td>
<td>PA- AB S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45-52</td>
<td>T NM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:31-37</td>
<td>T HM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:26-31 (no res.)</td>
<td>PS L MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:25-32 (no res.)</td>
<td>PS L S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Regular Form Extended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:35-41</td>
<td>T NM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1-20</td>
<td>T HM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21-24a + 35-43</td>
<td>T HM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:24-30 (no res.)</td>
<td>EP/EX A S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22-26</td>
<td>T HM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:46-52</td>
<td>PA- HM M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:27-12:12 (no res.)</td>
<td>EP/EX AC P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:13-17 (no set.; no res.)</td>
<td>PA AC P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:53-65 (no res.)</td>
<td>PS L S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:66-72 (no res.)</td>
<td>(T) L S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:1-5 (no res.)</td>
<td>PS L S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Irregular Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:53-56 (res.?)</td>
<td>SU EF MC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the VIL narratives differ from the FPL narratives through the absence of a reply-to-the-situation statement. Narration proceeds directly from the situation statement to the problem section. Inasmuch as the order of the VIL narrative sections is the same as that of the FPL narratives, it is permissible to think of one essential pattern of narration, of which VIL structure is simply an abbreviation of the Full Pattern through the omission of the reply-to-the-situation statement.

Quite evident is the regularity of the VIL narratives. Only one is irregular through the absence of the reply-to-the-problem section. VIL structure is evident in this story in spite of this irregularity.

A majority of the VIL stories have extended structure. As was true for the FPL and FPS narratives, the extension occurs through the development of
the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections. In one instance within sayings of Jesus (12:1-8) extension is found in developments of the situation statement and problem section.

There is no relation between this form of the pattern and narrative length. VIL structure is just as apparent in a short narrative like 1:29-31 as in a longer story like 1:21-28. It has been shown that even long extended narratives like 5:1-20 and 11:27-12:12 essentially have VIL structure.

There is no clear correlation between VIL structure and any one form-critical classification. Most of the VIL stories are either miracle stories or stories about Jesus according to Taylor's classification. A clear tendency, however, is the presence of a result statement in miracle stories. With the exception of 6:1-6a, which is a story about Jesus, only the miracle stories here have result statements. Apart from this tendency no one kind of story is structurally distinctive. Both miracle stories and stories about Jesus have regular or extended VIL structure. The presence of several pronouncement stories and Markan constructions among the VIL narratives indicates that there is no distinctive connection between VIL structure and miracle stories and stories about Jesus.

As with the FPL and FPS narratives there is no structural difference between stories of the Passion Narrative and those that appear earlier in the Gospel. VIL structure is evident at various points throughout the Gospel.

In comparison with the parallels of Matthew and Luke, Mark's VIL narratives display the greatest consistency in the use of the narrative pattern. Other recurrent features, such as step development of thought, the pattern within the pattern, and orderly thematic structure, support the view that Mark was somewhat responsible for the orderly arrangement of the material within his stories.
Another feature, not mentioned until now, also suggests that Mark had some control over the formation of his stories. This feature is the striking fact that most of the VIL narratives appear in clusters. The two stories, 1:21-28 and 1:29-31, are adjacent narratives and thus form a small cluster. Other clusters of two stories are 1:35-39, 1:40-45; 6:45-52, 6:53-56; 7:24-30, 7:31-37; and 11:27-12:12, 12:13-17. A cluster of three VIL stories consists of 14:53-65, 14:66-72, and 15:1-5. A large cluster of four VIL narratives is found in 4:35-41, 5:1-20, 5:21-24a + 35-43, and 6:1-6a. The four remaining VIL stories (8:22-26, 10:46-52, 14:26-31, 15:25-32) do not belong to a cluster.

Such clusters appear in all the other forms of the narrative pattern but are most conspicuous in the VIL stories. The number of clusters among the VIL narratives suggests that the phenomenon is not accidental but is possibly a manifestation of the control of one person over the formation of his narrative material. It appears that Mark had some control over the composition of his stories and sometimes used the same pattern variation for two or more stories in a row. If Mark's Gospel were merely an arbitrary compilation of originally separate pericopae, one would not expect to find so many adjacent narratives with the same literary structure. It is difficult to think that Mark grouped stories on the basis of similar structure, since structure itself is not a likely criterion of arrangement. It is more natural to assume

392 There is one cluster of three FPL narratives (15:33-41, 15:42-47, 16:1-8); a cluster of three FPS narratives (9:33-50, 10:1-12, 10:13-16); two clusters of VIS stories (2:15-17, 2:18-22, 2:23-28; and 3:20-30, 3:31-35); two clusters of V2L stories (1:16-18, 1:19f.; and 14:10f., 14:12-16); and two clusters of V2S narratives (6:30f., 6:32-34; and 12:38-40, 12:41-44, 13:1f., 13:3-37, 14:1f.). The last cluster is the largest, consisting of five stories. There is no apparent connection between this phenomenon of clustering and the form-critical classifications. Miracle stories, stories about Jesus, proclamation stories, and Markan constructions are all found in the various clusters, which furthermore appear both in the Passion Narrative and the rest of the Gospel—in every chapter except chapter eight.
that Mark participated in the formation of his stories and sometimes used the same pattern variation for two or more stories in a row.

With only one irregular story, the V1L narratives are quite regular; but all the VIS narratives have regular pattern structure, and these are illustrated next.

D. Variation #1 Short Narratives

The essential characteristic of Variation #1 narratives is the absence of a reply-to-the-situation statement. VIS stories differ from V1L stories through the additional absence of result and consequence statements. In this respect VIS stories are like FPS narratives. The following representation illustrates VIS structure in comparison with the long form of the Full Pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPL</th>
<th>VIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set.</td>
<td>Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit.</td>
<td>Sit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepS.</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob.</td>
<td>Prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepP.</td>
<td>RepP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the order of the sections, it can readily be seen that VIS form is not essentially a different kind of structure but rather a further abbreviation of the fundamental narrative pattern. As in V1L narratives, the narration proceeds from the situation statement directly to the problem section; but unlike V1L narratives, the VIS stories end with the reply-to-the-problem section. Inasmuch as the concluding reply-to-the-problem sections of the VIS stories contain sayings of Jesus, it is not surprising to find most of these stories classified as paradigms, apophthegms, or pronouncement stories\(^{393}\)—labels that have been devised for stories that lead up to a climactic saying of

\(^{393}\)See the list of VIS stories below, p. 376.
Jesus. The apparent connection between VIS structure and paradigms, apophthegms, or pronouncement stories may be misleading, since these labels are sometimes assigned to stories that end with a consequence statement instead of a saying of Jesus (2:1-12, 3:1-6, 11:27-12:12, 12:13-17, 12:35-37). Also the fact that most of the VIS narratives are labeled paradigms, apophthegms, or pronouncement stories should not lead one to think that VIS structure owes its existence to a particular kind of story such as the form critics envisage with these labels. VIS structure is intelligible fundamentally with reference to the narrative pattern as an abbreviation of it. Here the pattern serves as an objective criterion for evaluating the form-critical category in question with its various labels: paradigm, apophthegm, or pronouncement story.


Regular form. The first narrative to be presented, the account of Jesus' eating with tax collectors and sinners (2:15-17), \(^{394}\) clearly illustrates VIS structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{\text{και γίνεται κατακείσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ} \\
& \quad \{\text{καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἀμαρτωλοὶ} \\
& \quad \text{συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ} \\
& \quad \text{καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{\text{ὁ σαι γὰρ πολλοὶ} \\
& \quad \text{καὶ ἡκολουθοῦν αὐτῷ}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{394}\) Inasmuch as 2:13 in itself has V2S structure (see below, p. 405) and 2:14 has V2L structure (see below, pp. 383-4), there is warrant for considering 2:15-17 separately, especially since 2:15-17 displays in itself the VIS form of the pattern. Although 2:13, 2:14, and 2:15-17 individually have pattern structure and are thus illustrated separately, they are closely related in Mark's arrangement of these stories and may be regarded as a miniature complex in his Gospel. The saying in v. 17 about calling sinners is conspicuously relevant to the calling of Levi the tax collector in 2:14.
The remark in v. 15a about Jesus' reclining in presumably Levi's house is the setting statement, and v. 15b is the situation statement in that it tells about the participants and occasion of the story: the reclining of many tax collectors and sinners with Jesus and His disciples. At the end of this narrative section is one of Mark's editorial comments, which echoes both παλι' at the beginning of v. 15b and the theme of following Jesus in 2:14. Verse 16 presents the problem section in which the scribes of the Pharisees complain to Jesus' disciples about His eating with tax collectors and sinners; and v. 17 contains Jesus' reply to this problematical charge: His parallel sayings about the sick and the sinners. The story ends with this reply-to-the-problem section; no consequence statement is given. Such is the structure of a VIS narrative.

Taylor makes a distinction between 'a narrative framework in v. 15' and 'a Pronouncement-story' in vv. 16f.; but it is difficult to dissociate v. 16 from v. 15b. The charge of the opponents in v. 16 makes sense only in connection with a situation such as that mentioned in v. 15b. Bultmann radically regards vv. 15f. as a story that was invented for the second saying

---


396 Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 205, who regards the comment as a 'summary phrase'.

397 Ibid., p. 203.
If it were simply a matter of invention, a story such as the calling of Levi would have provided a more suitable situation for the saying about the coming of Jesus to call sinners. The very fact that the saying in v. 17b is not found within a story such as 2:14 is an indication that the question of the content in 2:15f. is more than a matter of invention. Of more substance is the fact that VIS structure is apparent in a narrative such as the story of the anointing at Bethany, a story that 'rests on good tradition'. Such a story provides external structural grounds for asking whether a VIS story like 2:15-17 had VIS structure earlier in the tradition and was founded on 'good tradition' rather than fiction.

Another VIS narrative is the story about fasting (2:18-22):

\[\text{Sit.} \{ \text{Kαὶ ἦσαν οἱ μάθηται Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες} \]

\[\text{Prob.} \{ \text{kαὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ} \]

\[\text{Διὰ τὸ οἱ μάθηται Ἰωάννου} \]

\[\text{kαὶ οἱ μάθηται τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν} \]

\[\text{οἱ δὲ σοὶ μάθηται οὐ νηστεύουσιν} \]

\[\text{(19)καὶ εἴπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς} \]

\[\text{Μὴ ὀδυνᾶται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος} \]

\[\text{ἐν δὲ ὁ νυμφὸς μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν} \]

\[\text{νηστεύειν} \]

\[\text{ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφῶν μετ' αὐτῶν} \]

\[\text{οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν} \]

\[\text{20Εἶπεν οὖν οἱ μάθηται Ἰωάννου} \]

\[\text{ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφὸς} \]

\[\text{kαὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ} \]

\[\text{(19)καὶ εἴπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς} \]

\[\text{Μὴ ὀδυνᾶται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος} \]

\[\text{ἐν δὲ ὁ νυμφὸς μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν} \]

\[\text{νηστεύειν} \]

\[\text{ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφῶν μετ' αὐτῶν} \]

\[\text{οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν} \]

\[\text{(20)Εἶπεν οὖν οἱ μάθηται Ἰωάννου} \]

\[\text{ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφὸς} \]

\[\text{kαὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ} \]

\[\text{21οὐ̄δείς ἐπίβλημα ὀδύσεως ἀγαθοῦ ἐπιράπτει} \]

\[\text{ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν} \]

\[\text{εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀφημε τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ} \]

\[\text{τὸ καινὸν τὸ παλαιόν} \]

\[\text{kαὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται} \]

\[\text{(22)καὶ οὐ̄δείς βάλλει οἶνον νέου εἰς ἁρκοῦς παλαιοῦς} \]

\[\text{εἰ δὲ μὴ ῥήσεi ὁ οἶνος τοῦ οἶνου} \]

\[\text{kαὶ οἶνος ἀπελλυται} \]

\[\text{kαὶ οἱ άσκοὶ} \]

\[\text{ἄλλα οἶνον νέου εἰς ἁρκοῦς καινοῦς}. \]

398Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 383. Cf. p. 18, where v. 15 is regarded as the invented story.

399Taylor, G.M., p. 529.
This story, one of four VIS narratives (2:18-22, 3:31-35, 8:31-9:1, 12:18-27) that lack a setting statement, begins with a situation statement in v. 18a: the indication that John's disciples and Pharisees were fasting. Verse 18b, which contains a question that is put to Jesus, is the problem section, and vv. 19-22 are presented as Jesus' reply. With such VIS structure this story conforms to the pattern even though the narrative lacks statements about a setting, reply to the situation, result, and consequence. So far as the pattern is concerned, 2:18-22 is clearly a narrative unit.

Subtle structural changes are evident in the parallel accounts of Matthew and Luke. In Matthew's version (Mt. 9:14-17) a temporal note is supplied with the use of τὸ τέλος in the situation statement in v. 14a, which is fused with the problem section in v. 14b. In other respects, the pattern structure of Matthew's account is the same as that in Mark's. Luke's version (Lk. 5:33-39) has neither a setting statement nor a situation statement but begins in a non-Markan fashion with a problem section in 5:33. The structure of Luke's account (problem + reply to the problem) is a structure that is not found in Mark's Gospel. In comparison with the parallels of Matthew and Luke, VIS structure is clearest and most regular in Mark's version.

A third VIS narrative is the story about plucking corn on the Sabbath (2:23-28):

400 Taylor, G.M., p. 208, on the basis of the impersonal plural ἔρχονται, thinks that v. 18b 'would make quite a good beginning to the narrative'. See also Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 87; cf. p. 88. In terms of the narrative pattern, however, v. 18b, which is clearly a problem section, is an inappropriate narrative beginning; and v. 18a, a situation statement, is a suitable opening for a story that does not have a setting statement. Here the pattern as an objective criterion of structure is more useful than judgements about style to determine the beginning of a story.

401 For a brief discussion of the thematic unity of 2:18-22, see below, pp. 490-1.
This story begins with a setting statement in v. 23a, the remark about Jesus' going through grainfields on the Sabbath. The second half of the verse is a situation statement, which tells of His disciples' picking grain. In v. 24 the hostile question of the Pharisees constitutes the problem section, and vv. 25-28 are offered as Jesus' reply to the problem. As David did what was unlawful—to eat when he and his men were hungry, so Jesus' disciples may pluck grain on the Sabbath to make their way through cornfields. The Sabbath was instituted for the benefit of man; and Sabbath regulations, which belong to the category of 'what is lawful', may be set aside when they conflict with human need. In this respect the Son of Man, who makes such a pronouncement and whose disciples so act, is Lord of the Sabbath. This story thus manifests VIS structure and, so far as the pattern is concerned, is plainly a narrative
After a discussion of the many difficulties of this narrative, Beare asserts that it owes 'its present form and most of its substance to complex adaptations in the course of transmission, in the service of Christian apologetic against Jewish (Pharisaic) criticism'. Whatever factors influenced the selection and development of the material in 2:23-28, it is apparent that the story owes its structure to the narrative pattern, which was perhaps the most important formative influence. In the light of Mark's regular use of the pattern in other stories of his Gospel in comparison with Matthew and Luke, there is reason to think that Mark himself bore some responsibility for the shape of this story.

Here, however, the parallels of Matthew and Luke have VIS structure in spite of additional material in Matthew's version (Mt. 12:1-8) and stylistic developments in Luke's account (Lk. 6:1-5). Inertia of form—the tendency of structure to resist change in the hands of a redactor whose revisions are primarily stylistic—is evident in the assumed use of this story by Matthew and Luke, and the question arises whether Mark's story transmits a pre-Markan...

\(^{402}\) In general, scholars question the unity of the story. For a brief discussion of the thematic unity of 2:23-28, see below, pp. 479, 494, 496.

\(^{403}\) Beare, p. 93.

\(^{404}\) Here it should be kept in mind that Beare's conception of 'form' pertains more to style than structure (the shape of the story through the order of its material). To speak of the pattern's formative influence is to refer to its relation to the structure of the story rather than to its style. In this respect 'form' and 'structure' are regarded as synonymous.

\(^{405}\) Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 214, who maintains that 'attempts are made to give the story a more literary form' in the parallels of Matthew and Luke. Here it is clear that Taylor's understanding of 'form' has little to do with the structure of the story but pertains to the stylistic addition of certain phrases by Matthew and Luke. The discussion of narrative structure begins when attention is given to the location and order of recognizable sections within a narrative.
account whose structure was similarly inert in the hands of Mark. A decision here depends somewhat on inferences that are gained from a study of the pattern in Mark's narratives in comparison with Matthew and Luke, and recurrent signs of greater regularity and order within Mark's narratives suggest that Mark himself was responsible for the regularity of the pattern in this story. Since, however, the pattern is evident in narratives of the Old Testament and apparently was a traditional pattern, there remains the possibility that the story was told in some way according to the pattern in the tradition before Mark.

A fourth VIS narrative is the story about Jesus and His relation to the spirits (3:20-30):

Set. {\textsuperscript{20}καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον

Sit. \{ καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν ὄχλος

\[\begin{align*}
\\text{ἔως ἔναθάναι αὐτοῦς μηδὲ ἄρτον ψαγεῖν}
\end{align*}\]}

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἐξῆλθον κρατήσαι αὐτόν}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἔλεγον γάρ ὅτι ἐξῆστῃ}
\end{align*}\]

Prob. \{ καὶ ἀχοούσαντες οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ

\[\begin{align*}
\\text{ἐξῆλθον κρατήσαι αὐτόν}
\end{align*}\]}

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεσσαλονῆ ἔχει}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαίμονιν}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαίμονια}
\end{align*}\]

406See further below, pp. 436-70.

407Cf. Albertz, pp. 9-10. In general, Albertz rightly detects a question and an answer in the controversy stories but fails to see the way in which these features as problem and reply-to-the-problem sections, respectively, are part of a conventional pattern of narration that is evident as well in the other stories of Mark's Gospel. In this respect the structure of the controversy stories is essentially not distinctive.
The setting statement in v. 20a is the beginning of this story, and the remark in v. 20b about the gathering of a crowd is the situation statement. Verses 21f., which tell of the hostile reactions of both Jesus' relatives and scribes from Jerusalem, are the problem section. In v. 21 the reference to the conflict between Jesus and His relatives anticipates the subsequent story about Jesus' true relatives (3:31-35). In this respect the thematic connection between 3:20-30 and 3:31-35 resembles that between 14:53-65 and 14:66-72. The scribes' accusations are twofold: (1) Jesus is possessed by Beelzebul; and (2) Jesus' exorcisms are accomplished with the help of the

---

3:31-35 = }a

---

\[\text{The statement about Jesus' entering a house is clearly the beginning of the story, whether the statement is assigned to v. 19 or v. 20.}\]

ruler of the demons. Verses 23-30 are given as Jesus' reply to both aspects of the problem. With regard to the charge that the ruler of the demons is behind Jesus' exorcisms, He points out that an arrangement where Satan works against Himself would lead inevitably to Satan's self-destruction (vv. 23b-26). Such an arrangement is obviously not the state of affairs. Furthermore, just as a house cannot be plundered unless its owner is bound, so by implication demons cannot be cast out unless their ruler is subdued (v. 27). Here Jesus is to be seen not in partnership with the ruler of the demons but at odds with Satan and with authority over him. Against the charge that Jesus' spirit is the unclean spirit of Beelzebul, Jesus replies that such an accusation amounts to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and is unforgivable. All other sins and blasphemies, possibly such as the charge that Jesus is beside Himself, are forgivable (vv. 28-30). In this manner VLS structure is clearly evident in this story.

The regularity of the pattern in Mark's account is readily apparent in a comparison with the Q versions of Matthew and Luke (Mt. 12:22-32; Lk. 11:14-23 + 12:10). In Matthew's account vv. 22f. have in themselves V2L structure, and v. 24 begins as a problem section. Mark would shy away from presenting a problem section immediately after result and consequence statements. Greater irregularity is apparent in Luke's account. Like Matthew, Luke presents in Lk. 11:14 a narrative before the problem section in v. 15, but the structure of the narrative is elliptical: there is no setting statement and no reply-to-

---

410 This interpretation of the story is prompted by its thematic structure. See further below, p. 495.


412 In Mt. 12:22 τότε . . . καὶ δέκτης is a fused setting and situation statement; καὶ . . . αὐτόν is a reply-to-the-situation statement; and ίστε . . . θλεπέτων is a result statement. Verse 23 is a consequence statement.
the-situation statement. The brief narrative consists only of a situation statement (καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων ... κωφὸν), a result statement (ἐγένετο ... κωφὸς), and a consequence statement (καὶ ἔσωσαν οἱ ἄχλοι). Like Matthew's version, Luke's problem section in v. 15 stands immediately after the consequence statement in v. 14; but unlike Matthew, Luke expands the problem section with a statement about others who were tempting Jesus by seeking a sign from Him. This material is hostile in tone but also has the appearance of a situation statement. Such structural eccentricities in the Q versions of Matthew and Luke reveal by comparison the regularity of the pattern in Mark's narrative.

As a comparatively regular phenomenon in Mark's Gospel, the pattern is an objective criterion for evaluating Taylor's view that 3:19b-30 consists of two narratives (3:19b-21, 3:22-26) and a group of sayings (3:27-30) that are 'loosely attached to one another'. In terms of the pattern neither 3:19b-21 nor 3:22-26 has independent narrative structure such as is found in the other stories in Mark's Gospel. Verses 3:19b-21 contain a setting statement, a situation statement, and a problem section (v. 21). Such pattern structure is incomplete without some reply to the problem. Verses 22-26 have a problem section (v. 22) and a reply to the problem (vv. 23-26), but this pattern structure is also incomplete in comparison with Mark's use of the pattern elsewhere. One may therefore question whether it is legitimate to regard 3:19b-21 and 3:22-26 as narratives. Without some complete form of the pattern, vv. 19b-21 and 22-26 probably were not regarded by Mark as narratives in themselves.

---

413 Taylor, G.M., p. 235.

414 With regard to the sayings in vv. 27-30, the thematic structure of the relationship between these sayings and 3:20-26 makes doubtful Taylor's view that these sayings are 'loosely attached'. See below, p. 495.
The sequel to 3:20-30, the story about Jesus' true relatives (3:31-35), also has VIS structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Sit.} \quad \{ \text{καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι αὐτοῦ} \}ab \\
&\quad \{ \text{καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες} \}b \\
&\quad \{ \text{ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν} \}b \\
&\quad \{ \text{καλοῦντες αὐτὸν} \}b \\
&\text{Prob.} \quad \{ \text{'Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου} \}a \\
&\quad \{ \text{καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι σου} \}a \\
&\quad \{ \text{ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε} \}b \\
&\text{RepP.} \quad \{ \text{'Ἰδε ἡ μήτηρ μου} \}a \\
&\quad \{ \text{καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι μου} \}a \\
&\quad \{ \text{ὀδοτος ἄδελφος μου} \}b \\
&\quad \{ \text{καὶ ἄδελφη} \}b \\
&\quad \{ \text{καὶ μήτηρ ἑστίν.} \}a \\
\end{align*}
\]

Precisely the absence of a setting statement implies close connection with the preceding story.\(^{415}\) Verse 31 is the situation statement. It tells of the coming of Jesus' mother and brothers and their attempt to gain His attention. Verse 32 is not a redundant restatement of the narration in v. 31 but is structurally a problem section in which Jesus is informed of the attempt of His mother and brothers to reach Him.\(^{416}\) Jesus' reply is presented in vv. 33-38: His true family consists of those who do the will of God. Presumably such persons would not think that Jesus was beside Himself and try


\(^{416}\text{Cf. Bundy, p. 216, who states that 'Mark's style of narration in 3:31-35 is unusually redundant and expansive'. The repetition of thought in this story is a consequence of both Mark's adherence to the demands of the narrative pattern and thoroughness in his treatment of themes.}\)
to restrain Him.\textsuperscript{417} Once again a story clearly displays VIS structure.\textsuperscript{418}

A sixth VIS narrative is the story about Peter's attempt to restrain Jesus (8:31-9:1):

\begin{verbatim}
31 Kai ἡρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοῦς
    ὅτι δεὶ τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν
    καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων
    καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων
    καὶ τῶν γραμματέων
    καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι
    καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήναι

Sit. 

32 Kai παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει

Prob. 

καὶ προσλαβάθηκεν ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν
    ἡρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ

33 ὃ δὲ ἐπιστραφεῖ καὶ Ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ
    ἐπιτίμησεν Πέτρῳ
    καὶ λέγει
    ὧπαγε ὁ πίσιον μου Σάτανα
    ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ
    ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων

34 Kai προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον
    σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ
    εἶπεν αὐτοῖς
    Εἰ τὸς θέλει ὁ πίσιον μου ἔλθειν
    ἀπαρνησόμεθα ἑαυτοῦ
    καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ
    καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι

35 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι,
    ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν \(a\)

36 ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ
    ἐνέκει \(a\) ἐμοὶ καὶ \(b\) τοῦ εὐαγγελίου
    σῶσει αὐτὴν

37 τοῖς γὰρ ὄφελεί ἄνθρωπον
    περιδῆκα τὸν κόσμον δλον
    καὶ ζημιώθηκα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ

RepP. 

417 Thematically v. 35 is antithetically parallel to ἔξω ἐπιτιμῶν σε. For a brief discussion of the thematic structure of this story, see below, pp. 483, 488, 509.

418 The parallels of both Matthew and Luke (Mt. 12:46-50; Lk. 8:19-21) also manifest VIS structure with much verbal agreement with Mark's story.
This story has in itself V1S structure and so is considered apart from 8:27-30, which manifests the FPL form of the pattern.419 The two stories are closely related, and once again connection is implied by the absence of a setting statement. The story begins instead with a description in vv. 31-32a of a new situation: Jesus' bold teaching of anticipated suffering, death, and resurrection.420 Verse 32b, which refers to Peter's attempt to restrain Jesus, is a problem section; and vv. 33-9:1 are given as Jesus' reply to the problem.

Verse 33 is addressed solely to Peter; vv. 34-38 are directed to all the disciples and the crowd; and the saying in 9:1 is presented as being spoken to this larger group. Because Jesus' reply is aimed in different directions, the pattern is close to being extended in this story; but without any problem development, the narrative does not really have extended structure.421


420Cf. Bundy, p. 296, who maintains that this prophecy of Jesus' death, as well as the other two predictions in 9:31 and 10:32f., 'can be lifted without disturbing the flow of Mark's narratives'. In effect, to excise 8:31 from 8:31-9:1 is to rob the story of its situation statement. The remark in v. 32a about Jesus' bold speech is not in itself an adequate situation statement but exists as commentary about Jesus' preceding saying about suffering and death. Without both setting and situation statements the sequel to the story of Peter's confession begins with a problem section, which is not a likely narrative beginning so far as it concerns the other stories in Mark's Gospel.

421For a brief discussion of the thematic structure of 8:31-9:1, see below, pp. 475, 500-1.
Apart from a fused setting and situation statement in Mt. 16:21, Matthew's account (Mt. 16:13-28) has basically the same VIS structure. Luke's parallel (Lk. 9:21-27), however, is different. It is joined with the story of Peter's confession (Lk. 9:18-20) and cast only as a reply of Jesus first to His disciples (vv. 21f.) and then to all (vv. 23-27). The regularity of the pattern in Mark's story is seen mainly in comparison with Luke's version.

Another VIS narrative is the story about the withered fig tree (11:20-25):^{422}

Set. {20}καὶ παραπομπὸν πρωτό

Sit. { έλευσεν τὴν συκῆν ἐξηραμένην ἐκ ἀῤῥέων

Prob. {21}καὶ ἀναμνῄσκεις ὁ Πέτρος

 apologized, and the remark in v. 20b about the sight of the tree withered from the root is

22 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

λέγει αὐτῷ

Ei ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ

23 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν

适宜 ἔσται ἀμὴν

οἵτινες ἀν ἐγὼ ῥύομαι διὰ μυροῦ

Contrary καὶ βλήψητε εἰς τὴν ἁλάσσαναν

οἵτινες ἀν ἐγὼ διακρίνω ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ

Contrary καὶ μὴ διακρίνω ἐν τῷ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ

οἵτινες ἀν ἐμφανίζω ἐν τῷ λαλεῖ γίνεται

οἵτινες ἀν ἐμφανίζω ἐν τῷ λαλεῖ γίνεται

οἵτινες ἀν ἐμφατίζω ἐν τῷ λαλεῖ γίνεται

οἵτινες ἀν ἐμφατίζω ἐν τῷ λαλεῖ γίνεται

In v. 20a the opening phrase about passing by early is the setting statement, and the remark in v. 20b about the sight of the tree withered from the root is

^{422}Verse 26, which appears to have been added from Mt. 6:15, is not included here. See Taylor, G.M., p. 467.
the situation statement. This statement prepares the way for Peter's expression of surprise in v. 21, which is the problem section. Verses 22-25 are offered as Jesus' reply. VIS structure is thus quite regular and clear in this story.

According to Taylor, 11:20-22 is 'the second part of the story of the Fig Tree in xi. 12-14'. To support his view that a single story has been divided into two parts, Taylor refers to 5:1-20 and 5:21-24, 35-43 as other examples of narrative division. The narrative pattern serves as an objective criterion for questioning Taylor's analysis. Against the supposition that 11:12-14 and 11:20-22 are one story, is the fact that 11:12-14 and 11:20-25 individually manifest a form of the narrative pattern. As was shown earlier, 11:12-14 displays FPL structure, and the VIS structure of 11:20-25 has just been illustrated. On the basis of the pattern one can assume with some confidence that Mark regarded 11:12-14 and 11:20-25 as two narratives even though the two are related, and the latter is the sequel of the former. Because 11:12-14 and 11:20-25 individually display some form of the pattern, they are unlike 5:1-20 and 5:21-24a + 35-43.

Taylor also thinks that the arrangement of the sayings in vv. 22-25 is 'artificial'. It is possible that some of the sayings, especially the saying in v. 25, had some other origin and were later associated with this story and

---

423 See similar situation statements above, pp. 46-7.
425 Ibid.
426 See above, pp. 173-4.
incorporated as part of Jesus' reply. It is interesting, however, that the
sayings in vv. 23-25 are rhythmically parallel with one another. The under-
lying idea is the twofold notion that what is expressed (a) will happen (b).
The rhythmical structure begins with Peter's observation that the fig tree
which Jesus cursed (a) has withered (b). In v. 23 Jesus' saying expresses
the thought that a believing command to the mountain (a) will result in the
fulfillment of the command (b). Similarly in v. 24 there is the idea that
whatever is petitioned in faith (a) will occur (b). Verse 25 perpetuates the
rhythm of these sayings with the notion that one's forgiveness of others (a)
will lead to God's forgiveness of one's own trespasses (b). The ab rhythmical
structure is sustained throughout the sayings. These sayings thus resemble
one another structurally and not simply through a few catchwords.429 Such
resemblance makes it easier to think that the sayings in this story arose
from one occasion, but it is also possible that vv. 23-25 are an artificial
arrangement of sayings with similar structure. With numerous indications of
Mark's orderliness in his use of the pattern and presentation of ideas, it is
difficult to determine whether the recurrent ab order of ideas in the sayings
in 11:23-25 stems from Jesus or is to be attributed to Mark.430 Nevertheless,
if sayings have been appended in this story, the question is not simply one of
topical arrangement through catchwords but also of the juxtaposition of sayings
that manifest the same thematic structure.

Still another VIS narrative is the story of the Sadducees' question

429Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 467. Taylor's conception of structure here
pertains to artificial arrangement by key words, but such a notion of structure
does not do justice to the sayings' underlying thematic structure—their
recurrent order of ideas. Attention to this rhythmical order enables one to
see that these sayings are not only topically related but also structurally
similar.

430See further below, pp. 506-7.
about resurrection (12:18-27):

Sit.

18 Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαίοι πρὸς αὐτὸν
οὕτως λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι

καὶ ἐπηρτών αὐτὸν
λέγοντες

Αἰδάσκολε
Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν
ὅτι εἶν τῶν ἁδερφῶν ἀποθάνῃ
καὶ καταλύῃ γυναῖκα
καὶ μὴ ἀφῇ τέκνουν

ίνα λάβῃ ὁ ἁδερφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα
καὶ ἑξαναστήῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἁδερφῷ αὐτοῦ.b

20 ἐπὶ ἁδερφοὶ ἦσαν
καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἔλαβεν γυναῖκα
καὶ ἀποθέασαν
οὐκ ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα

21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν
καὶ ἀπέθανεν
καὶ μὴ καταλύῃ σπέρμα

καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἦσαντάς

καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα

ἔσχατον πάντων καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν

23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει
[ὅταν ἀναστάσειν]
τῶν αὐτῶν ἦσαν γυνὴ
οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ ἑσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα 

24 Ἐφι οὗτοι ὁ Ἰησοῦς

Οὐ διὰ τὸν τόπον πλανάθη
μὴ εἴδοτες τᾶς γραφὰς
μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ

25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσειν
οὕτω γαμοῦσιν
οὕτω γαμίζονται,
ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

RepP.

26 περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν ὁτι ἐγείρονται
οὐκ ἀνέγνωσέ ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσεως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου
πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς

'Εγὼ ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ
καὶ [ὁ] θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ
καὶ [ὁ] θεὸς Ἰακὼβ
Although it lacks a setting statement, this story also has conventional VIS structure. Verse 18a, which refers to the coming of Sadducees and their disbelief in resurrection, is the situation statement. Their difficult question about resurrection and marriage in vv. 18b-23 is the problem section, and vv. 24-27 are presented as Jesus' twofold reply to this problem. So far as the question of marriage is concerned, there will be no marriage in the Resurrection (vv. 24f.). As for the question of resurrection itself, the possibility of resurrection is assured by God's being the God of the living (vv. 26f.). This story is thus another narrative that displays VIS structure and an orderly presentation of ideas.

Both Matthew and Luke augment the structure of the story by providing a consequence statement at the end. The structure of their parallels is thereby VIL instead of VIS.

One more narrative with regular VIS structure is the story about the anointing at Bethany (14:3-9):

Set. {3Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ

κατακεκλεμένου αὐτοῦ

Τοῦ γυνή

Sit. { Ἐξούσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς

κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ τῆς κεφαλῆς

431Taylor, G.M., p. 480, rightly perceives that 'the original question requires a twofold answer', and with warrant distinguishes between the 'fact' of resurrection (concerning vv. 26f.) and the 'manner' of resurrection (vv. 24f.). It is interesting that Taylor, who correctly detects the thematic structure of this story, does not notice similar thematic structure in many other stories of Mark's Gospel. For further description of this kind of thematic structure, see below, pp. 494, 496.

432See Mt. 22:23-33 (v. 33) and Lk. 20:27-40 (vv. 39f.). Matthew also provides a general setting statement in Mt. 22:23.
The reference in v. 3a to Bethany and Simon's house is the setting statement; and v. 3b, which tells of Jesus' reclining, the coming of a woman, and her anointing of Jesus, is the situation statement. Verses 4f. are the problem section, which raises two issues: (1) the question of why the ointment was wasted, and (2) the alternate possibility of having sold the ointment for a donation to the poor. The problem section ends with a statement about the antagonists' hostility towards the woman. Verses 6-9 are presented as Jesus' reply. First He responds to the antagonists' animosity towards the woman by commanding them to leave her alone because her deed was essentially good (v. 6). Jesus then addresses the issue of the sale of the costly ointment for the poor. The point that He makes is that one can help the poor at any time because there are always people who are poor; but one cannot always anoint Jesus, for He will die some day (v. 7). In this respect the woman's anointing of Jesus is an appropriate act. Jesus' answer here prepares the way for His
reply to the question of why the ointment was wasted: the anointing served as preparation for His burial (v. 8). Here it is evident that Jesus regarded His death as imminent. The saying in v. 9 is not addressed to any issue in the problem section but echoes the use of ἐποιήσεως in v. 8 and provides Jesus' commentary on the woman's deed. Without a consequence statement, the form of the story is clearly VIS.

A comparison of Mark's narrative with Mt. 26:6-13, Lk. 7:36-50, and Jn. 12:1-11 is enlightening. Matthew's parallel, which resembles Mark's account verbally at many points, has the same VIS structure. Luke's independent story shows a number of pattern differences and irregularities. With a consequence statement in v. 49, Luke's narrative has VIL structure, which is extended in vv. 40b-48 with problem developments and replies to these developments. Irregularities are evident in the presence of a situation statement (v. 36a) before the setting statement (v. 36b), in the development of the situation (vv. 37f.), and in the narration of a reply of Jesus (v. 50) after the consequence statement. It appears that in the hands of Luke without the guidance of Mark, the narrative pattern tends to become irregular.

The story of the anointing of Jesus in Jn. 12:1-11 is most interesting, for the account has VIL structure in which each narrative section either contains or is followed by a narrator's comment. Verse 1a is the setting statement with a comment in v. 1b, and v. 2a is the situation statement with a comment in v. 2b. The description of the situation is continued in v. 3a, which is followed by a comment in v. 3b. Verses 4a, 5a make up the problem section.

\[433\] In view of the dual nature of Jesus' reply in response to two issues in the problem section, it is questionable to look for 'the point of the story'. Cf. Dibelius, *F.T.G.*, pp. 56, 60; cf. p. 178. Cf. also Bultmann, *H.S.T.*, p. 36; cf. p. 263.

\[434\] Cf. Mk. 7:1, p. 371, below.
with vv. 7f. as the reply-to-the-problem section, which is followed by a comment in v. 9. Verse 10 is the consequence statement, and the story ends with a comment in v. 11. In this way the Fourth Evangelist makes use of the pattern in his version of the story. The presence of the pattern in Jn. 12:1-11 and other stories in John's Gospel\textsuperscript{435} supports the view that the narrative pattern is a traditional pattern that was widely used in the Church. Differences in the use of the pattern, such as those that are apparent in the accounts of Luke and John, make it possible to appreciate the regularity of the pattern in Mark's narratives.

As indicated at the outset of the discussion of the VIS narratives, there is one story that has extended VIS structure, and this story is discussed next as the last VIS narrative.

\textit{Regular form extended.} The story about eating with unwashed hands (7:1-23) has extended VIS structure as can be seen in the following arrangement of the story:

\begin{verbatim}
Kai suvagontai prōs autōn oi Farisaioi
καὶ τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων
ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων

2 Kai lêðntes tinvās tōn mathētōn autōū
στὶ κοιναῖς χερσίν
τοῦτ᾽ ἐστὶν ἀναπτοῖς
ἐσθίουσιν τοὺς ἄρτους

3 Oi γάρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι
ἐὰν μὴ πυγμὴ νύσσεται τὰς χεῖρας
σὺν ἐσθίουσιν
κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{435}See, for example, Jn. 2:23-25 (V2S, with comment); 3:1-21 (VIS extended, with comments); 5:2-9 (FPL, with comments); 9:1-7 (VIS, with irregular, extended continuation in vv. 8-41); 10:22-39 (FPL extended); 20:19-23 (FPS, with comment); and 20:26-29 (FPS). The list is by no means exhaustive. A thorough study of the narrative pattern in John's Gospel is beyond the limits of this dissertation. Such a study should prove to be a most interesting project for further research.
καὶ αὐτῷ ἀγορᾶς
ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται
οὐκ ἐσθίονσιν

καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἐστὶν ἅ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν
βαπτίσμοις ποτηρίων
καὶ ξεστῶν
καὶ χαλκῶν
[καὶ κλινῶν]

5καὶ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν ὁι Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς
διὰ τῇ οὐ περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου
κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων
ἀλλὰ κοινώτατης χερσίν ἐσθίονσιν τόν ἄρτον

6ο δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷς
Καλῶς ἐτροφήσεσθε Ἡσαΐας περὶ ύμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν
ὡς γεγραμμένα ἦτι.
Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσθιν με τιμᾶ
ἥ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ
7μάθην δὲ σέβονται με
διάδοσεν τοὺς διδασκάλους ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων
8ἀφέντες τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ
κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων

9καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτῷς
Καλῶς ἀθετείτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ
ἐνα τὴν παράδοσιν ύμῶν στήσητε

10Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν
Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου
καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου
καὶ
'Ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἡ μητέρα
θανάτῳ τελευτᾶτω

11ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε
'Εάν εἴπῃ ἀνθρώπος τῷ πατρὶ 'Ἡ τῇ μητρὶ
Κορβᾶν
ὁ ἐστὶν Δῶρον
6 ἐὰν εἴῃ ἐμοὶ ὡφέλησής
12οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτοῦ ὦδεν ποιήσαι τῷ πατρὶ 'Ἡ τῇ μητρὶ
13ἀνυφότερος τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ
τῇ παραδοθῇ υμῶν ἢ παρεδώκατε
καὶ παράδοσια τοιαύτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε

14καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάλιν τὸν ὥρκον
ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς
'Ακοῦσατε μου πάντες
καὶ σύνετε

15οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐξωθεὶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ἐκπορευθέντα εἰς αὐτὸν
｀ὁ δὲ συνήθεις κοινώθει αὐτῶν
ἄλλα τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευθέντα
ἐστὶν τὰ κοινωνύμια τῶν ἀνθρώπων
Verse 1 is the setting statement but begins with preliminary information about the situation:\(^{436}\) the coming of Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem. The main body of information about the situation is given in vv. 2-4: the grammatically incomplete remark about the disciples' eating with unwashed hands (v. 2) and the lengthy comment about the customs of the Pharisees and other Jews (vv. 3f.). Verse 5, which contains the question of the Pharisees and scribes, is the problem section of the story, and Jesus' reply is given in vv. 6-15. Here vv. 14f. are addressed to 'the crowd'. In v. 17 the pattern

\(^{436}\)See above, p. 47, n. 38.
becomes extended in a conventional manner with a development of the problem: the disciples' question about the parabolic saying in v. 15. Verses 18-23 are offered as Jesus' reply to the problem development. Extended VIS structure is thus readily apparent in this story. Except for the extension of the pattern, the structure of 7:1-23 is essentially the same as that in the other VIS narratives.

The pattern in 7:1-23 is evidence that Mark regarded this story as one narrative. Further evidence of the unity of the story is found in the interesting thematic structure of the story. It is advantageous to describe at this point the narrative's thematic structure prior to general discussion of this feature in Part III. The type of thematic structure that is twice apparent and interrelated in this story is \( ab \) \( a+b \) structure in which a dual \( ab \) question or command is answered or considered in an \( a+b \) manner. The first \( ab \) \( a+b \) structure begins with an \( ab \) question in the problem section. Two issues are raised by the question: (1) the issue of why the disciples do not act according to the tradition of the elders, and (2) the issue of eating with unwashed hands. In Mark's arrangement of the story vv. 6-13 are presented as Jesus' reply to the first aspect of the problem. Here Jesus appeals both to prophetic tradition and the Law. In the light of the teaching of Isaiah it becomes apparent that the tradition of the elders is contrary to the command of God. The disciples do not follow human tradition that is in conflict with the command of God (vv. 6-8). The tension between human tradition and the command of God is apparent also in the light of the teaching of Moses. His

---

\(^{437}\)

divine word about the honoring of parents is contradicted by the human
tradition of the practice of qorban. The implication is that this and other
human traditions are unworthy and are therefore not observed by Jesus' 
disciples (vv. 9-13).\textsuperscript{438}

In Mark's narrative Jesus now gives attention to the second aspect of
the problematical question in v. 5: the issue of unwashed hands. In broad
lines, vv. 14-23 are presented as Jesus' reply to this second dimension of
the question. Now it is most interesting that Jesus' reply here manifests in
itself \textit{ab a + b} thematic structure. The saying in v. 15 calls attention to
two aspects of the question of unwashed hands and uncleanness: (1) whatever
enters a man is not able to defile him; rather (2) defilement occurs through
things that erupt from within man. In an orderly manner and as part of Jesus' 
reply to the problem development in v. 17, vv. 18f. present Jesus' elaboration
of the first aspect of the question of uncleanness. Food, as an example of
what is external, does not defile a man but merely passes through his system.
Verses 20-23 present Jesus' elaboration of the second aspect of the question
of uncleanness. A man is made unclean by the evil that arises from his heart.
In this respect the antagonists of v. 5, who are so concerned about external
cleanness, are defiled by their hostility towards Jesus and His disciples.

With such an understanding of the thematic structure of 7:1-23, one is
able to see that the material in this story is carefully arranged and closely
knit.\textsuperscript{439} Inasmuch as this type of thematic structure is apparent in a number
of other narratives in Mark's Gospel, it is difficult to accept the view that

\textsuperscript{438}Nineham, \textit{Saint Mark}, p. 189, correctly recognizes that Jesus' reply
is in two parts at this point of the story.

\textsuperscript{439} Cf. Taylor, \textit{G.M.}, p. 342, who regards the sayings in vv. 14-22 as
merely appended on the basis of 'similar topics'. Cf. also Dibelius, \textit{F.T.G.},
pp. 220-1.
7:1-23 is a pre-Markan complex.\textsuperscript{440}

The possibility that Mark himself was somewhat responsible for the arrangement of his material is supported by the deterioration of this thematic structure in Matthew's parallel (Mt. 15:1-20). The pattern is further extended in Matthew's version through an additional problem development and reply in vv. 12-14. This additional material, which is about the judgement of blind Pharisees, disrupts the second $ab$ $a + b$ thematic structure that is evident in Mark's narrative. The new material is presented between the $ab$ parabola of Jesus in v. 11 and the $a + b$ elaboration of the two themes in vv. 17-20. Consequently, the second thematic structure in Matthew's story is $ab$ $c + a + b$, which is an irregular structure in comparison with the thematic structure of a number of Mark's narratives. Here in 7:1-23 Mark displays a greater regard for an orderly presentation of the ideas in the story.

In summary, the VIS narratives, which have just been illustrated, are listed below with the letters that represent the classifications of Dibelius, Bultmann, and Taylor.

\begin{center}
\textbf{VIS NARRATIVES}
\end{center}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{1. Regular Form}
  \begin{itemize}
  \item 2:15-17
  \item 2:18-22 \textit{(no set.)}
  \item 2:23-28
  \item 3:20-30
  \item 3:31-35 \textit{(no set.)}
  \item 8:31-9:1 \textit{(no set.)}
  \item 11:20-25
  \item 12:18-27 \textit{(no set.)}
  \item 14:3-9
  \end{itemize}

\item \textbf{2. Regular Form Extended}
  \begin{itemize}
  \item 7:1-23
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

The illustrations have shown that in contrast with the VIL narratives,

\textsuperscript{440}Cf. Taylor, \textit{G.M.}, pp. 96, 344.
the VIS stories lack result and consequence statements and end with the reply-to-the-problem section. One is impressed by the regularity of the pattern in the VIS stories. The pattern is regular and clear in all these stories, including the one story that is extended in the conventional manner of a development of the problem with a reply to this development. Pattern regularity in Mark's VIS narratives becomes further evident in comparison with parallel and similar accounts in Matthew and Luke. Matthew's parallels tend to have essentially the same structure, especially when there is considerable verbal agreement with Mark's narratives; but Luke's versions often display conspicuous irregularities in the pattern.

Also striking is the order of ideas in the VIS stories. Many present two-pronged questions or issues that are considered separately in turn. Such a feature is not found only in the VIS stories but is a manifestation of the general orderliness of the arrangement of material within Mark's narratives. One needs only to look at the parallel accounts of Matthew and especially Luke to see frequent deterioration and disruption of the order of thematic material in their versions.

Most of the VIS narratives are paradigms, apophthegms, or pronouncement stories according to the classifications of form critics and thus display a tendency for this kind of story to have setting-situation-problem-reply structure. The fact, however, that stories with the same labels manifest other forms of the pattern both precludes any rigid identification of this form-critical class of narratives with VIS structure and indicates that this class does not have distinctive narrative structure.

There is one other basic way in which the Full Pattern is abbreviated, and the description and illustration of the second main variation of the pattern is considered next.
E. Variation #2 Long Narratives

As indicated at the beginning of Part II, one of the ways in which the Full Pattern is regularly abbreviated in Mark's narratives is through the absence of a problem and a reply to the problem. It so happens that Mark's V2L narratives also lack a result statement, but their form is long by virtue of a concluding consequence statement. The following representation of V2L form illustrates the way in which it differs from FPL form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPL</th>
<th>V2L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set.</td>
<td>Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit.</td>
<td>Sit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepS.</td>
<td>RepS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob.</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepP.</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>Cons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In V2L stories the narration proceeds from the reply-to-the-situation statement directly to a consequence statement. It should be noted that V2L structure is not a different kind of narrative structure but is rather a more extensive abbreviation of the Full Pattern. So long as the sections of V2L stories appear in the same order as the corresponding sections of the Full Pattern, it is permissible to continue thinking of only one, fundamental pattern of narration.

In Mark's Gospel there are twelve narratives with V2L form. Eleven have regular form and are labeled stories about Jesus (1:16-18, 1:19f., 1:32-34, 2:14, 11:15-19, 14:12-14, 15:16-21), Markan constructions (6:6b-13, 9:30-32, 14:10f.), and material from a small complex (1:9-13) according to Taylor's classification. The remaining story (12:35-37) has irregular form and has been classified as a pronouncement story.

Regular form. The first narrative that illustrates regular V2L form
is the story about Jesus' Baptism and Temptation (1:9-13):

Set. 

9 Kai ἐγένετο ἐν ἑκέναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου

Sit. 

2

Set. 

{10 Kai εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὑδάτος εἶδεν σχισομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστεράν καταβαίνον εἰς αὐτόν}b

Sit. 

{11 Kai φωνή ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ΕУ εἰ ὁ οὐδὲς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν σοι εὐδόκησα}a

RepS. 

{12 Kai εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον}a

Cons. 

2

Set. 

{13 Kai ἦν ἐν τῇ ἔρημῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας}a

Sit. 

καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν ἡρῴων b

RepS. 

καὶ οἱ ἀγγελοὶ δίηκόνουν αὐτῷ. b

The narration in v. 9 is clearly a setting statement. Verse 10, which indicates that Jesus saw the heavens opening and the Spirit like a dove descending upon Him, is the situation statement.\textsuperscript{441} The remark in v. 11 about the heavenly voice and its message of Good News about Jesus is the reply-to-the-situation statement. Verses 12f., which tell of Jesus' departure to the wilderness and temptation by Satan, are the consequence statement.

It is conceivable that 1:12f. is a narrative in itself; but it is preferable to think of 1:12f. as a consequence statement that displays in itself V2S structure. Here 1:12 is the setting statement; v. 13a (up to and including the reference to the wild beasts) is the situation statement; and v. 13b, which tells of the nonverbal response of the angels, is the reply-to-the-situation statement.

There are several grounds for regarding 1:12f. as a consequence statement within 1:9-13 as a whole. (1) Verses 12f. appear as the second $b$ member of an $ab a + b$ thematic structure in which the $a$ theme pertains to the 'heavens', and the $b$ theme is concerned with the Spirit. (2) Verses 12f. tell

\textsuperscript{441}See similar situation statements above, p. 46. The internal V2S form in vv. 10f. is self-evident.
of an action that is supposed to have taken place immediately after the reply to the situation in v. 11. (3) Certain features of 1:12f. are evident in consequence statements of other stories in Mark's Gospel. If one selects for comparison the consequence statements of just the other V2L stories, the use of εὐθὺς is apparent in 1:18; and a departure is mentioned in 1:18, 1:20b, 2:14d, 6:12f., 11:19, 14:16, and 15:20f. Place statements are given as well in two of these consequence statements (11:19, 14:16). Furthermore, Jesus is referred to as an object of thought or action in 1:18, 1:20b, 1:34b, 2:14d, 9:32, 12:37b, 14:11b, and 15:20f. The thought in 1:12f. is thus very much like the consequence statements of the other V2L narratives.442

The presence of V2L structure in 1:9-13 is interesting, for it raises some question about the view of R. H. Lightfoot that 1:1-13 is the introduction

---

442See also the parallelism in 1:12f. and 15:20f., p. 477 below.

J. Weiss, Das älteste Evangelium (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903), p. 135, appears to have been the first to call attention to the parallelism in 1:13. Weiss' discussion of the parallelism centres in a contrast in v. 13 between the angels and the wilderness with its beasts, and he argues that in Mark's account the angels accompanied Jesus during the entire forty days of His Temptation. Lohmeyer, pp. 26-7, also notices rhythmical parallelism in the two verses and correctly perceives that ἦν ἐν τῇ ἔρημῳ (p. 26) and that οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουσιν αὐτῷ and 'πεπαρασκευαζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου' (pp. 26-7) are antithetical. But later in a contrary fashion (p. 27) Lohmeyer recognizes a connection between the beasts and Satan and accordingly, like Weiss, sees an antithesis between the angels and the beasts (pp. 27-8). Taylor, G.M., p. 163, notices the parallelism between the temptation by Satan and the ministering of the angels but is silent about any parallelism between the beasts and the wilderness, considering instead possible associations between the beasts and either evil powers or angels (p. 164).

Lohmeyer's first observation, however, seems most in keeping with the poetic structure of v. 13. The phrase καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων is parallel to καὶ ἦν ἐν τῇ ἔρημῳ τεσσαράκοντα ημέρας. If the parallelism is synonymous, and this appears to be so, the phrase about the beasts is essentially no more than a restatement of the idea that Jesus was in the wilderness. The phrase about the angels' ministering to Jesus and the remark about the temptation by Satan are parallel antithetically. Discussion of any contrast between the beasts and the angels is of secondary importance and obscures the parallelism between the beasts and the wilderness.
to Mark's Gospel. At the same time, however, the thematic relationship between 1:9-13 and 1:1-8 supports Lightfoot in his rejection of the wide gap that was placed between v. 8 and v. 9 by Westcott and Hort.

A second V2L narrative is the story of Jesus’ call of Simon and Andrew (1:16-18):

Set. {16καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν ὕδασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας

Sit. {εἶδεν Σίμωνα
καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος
ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ
ήσαν γὰρ ἄλλες

Reps. {17καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
Δεῦτε ὑπίσω μου
καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἄλλες ἀνθρώπους

Cons. {18καὶ εὐθὺς ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα
ηκολούθησαν αὐτῷ

It is fitting to illustrate also the companion V2L story of Jesus’ call of James and John (1:19f.):

Set. {19καὶ προβὰς ὄλγου

Sit. {εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον τοῦ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου
καὶ Ἰωάννην τοῦ ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ
καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ
κατάρτιζοντας τὰ δίκτυα

---

443 See R. H. Lightfoot, H.I.G., pp. 61-5, and The Gospel Message of St. Mark, pp. 15-8. See Taylor, G.M., p. 151. Cf. Leander Keck, 'The Introduction to Mark's Gospel', New Testament Studies, XII (1966), pp. 352-70, who tries to establish that 1:1-15 is the introduction to Mark's Gospel. A conspicuous deficiency in Keck's argument is his scant discussion of the narrative structure of the introduction itself, where in a sentence he makes merely a topical distinction between 1:1-8 and 1:9-15, the first dealing with John and the second with Jesus (p. 367). Keck discusses the question of structure elsewhere in his article (see, for example, pp. 355-6, 362-3), but structure there apparently does not mean the structure of individual narratives but rather the arrangement and outline of the Gospel as a narrative or story about Jesus. It is precisely the study of the structure of individual narratives that is necessary for understanding the structure of the opening verses of Mark's Gospel. If the pattern is regarded as a criterion here, 1:1-8, 1:9-13, and 1:14f. will be seen as three closely related narratives.

444 See further below, pp. 401-4.
Each story has V2L structure. In 1:16-18 the remark in v. 16a about Jesus' passing by the Sea of Galilee is the setting statement, and the indication that He saw Simon and Andrew casting a net in the sea is the situation statement, which ends with an explanatory comment. Verse 17 presents Jesus' reply to the situation: His decisive command to follow Him with the prospect of becoming fishers of men. The narration in v. 18 about the brothers following Jesus is a consequence statement that concludes the story. In the companion narrative, 1:19f., the note in v. 19a about going a little farther is the setting statement. Verse 19b, which refers to Jesus' sight of James and John mending nets, is the situation statement; and v. 20a is a reply-to-the-situation statement that refers to Jesus' reply but does not give it. The statement in v. 20b about the departure of James and John to follow Jesus is the concluding consequence statement.

The presence of V2L structure in both 1:16-18 and 1:19f. is significant, for this form of the pattern provides objective grounds for recognizing that it is the command of Jesus that is decisive, not the response of the disciples. See Swete, p. 15; Cranfield, *Saint Mark*, pp. 69-70; Bornkamm, pp. 144-5; Beare, pp. 46-7; Best, p. 69; and E. Schweizer, *G.N.M.*, pp. 48-9. Cf. Taylor, *G.M.*, pp. 169-70, and Nineham, *Saint Mark*, p. 72.

Cf. R. Pesch, 'Berufung und Sendung, Nachfolge und Mission. Eine Studie zu Mk 1, 16-20', *Zeitschrifte für katholische Theologie*, 91 (Jan., 1969), pp. 8-9, who in a form-critical analysis of 1:16-20 detects three-part structure in 1:16-18 and again in 1:19f. Pesch's conception of tripartite structure betrays anew the limitations of form criticism as a method for the analysis of narrative structure. If one suspends the popular notion of three-fold form for a fresh investigation of narrative structure, *four* conventional sections become apparent in both 1:16-18 and 1:19f. These sections constitute an abbreviation of a larger narrative pattern that underlies the structure of the other stories in Mark's Gospel.
1:16-18 and 1:19f. are two narratives instead of one.\footnote{Cf. Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, pp. 28, 57; cf. p. 64. Cf. also p. 62, where Bultmann distinguishes between 1:16-18 and 1:19f. His distinction, however, is based on the consideration of a 'variation of motif' rather than narrative structure. Bundy, pp. 70-72, also regards 1:16-20 'as a single separate unit of tradition' (p. 70) and refers to 1:16-18 and 1:19f. as episodes (p. 72). Cf. p. 70, where Bundy thinks of 1:16-20 as 'a single episode'. The pattern supports Taylor, \textit{G.M.}, p. 167, in his judgement that 'strictly speaking, this story includes two narratives, 16-18 and 19f.'}{447}

V2L structure in 1:16-18 and 1:19f. is also important, for it serves as a measure to test the view that I Kings 19:19-21 was a model for the call stories in Mark's Gospel.\footnote{See Pesch, pp. 8-11. Cf. Taylor, \textit{G.M.}, pp. 167-8.}{448} If the story of Elijah's call of Elisha has been a model for 1:16-18 and 1:19f., it has been so with regard to motif rather than structure. In terms of the pattern the structure of I Kings 19:19-21 is FPL instead of V2L.\footnote{See below, pp. 441-2.}{449} There are, however, some Old Testament V2L stories that could have served indirectly as structural models for V2L narratives such as 1:16-18 and 1:19f.\footnote{See, for example, below, pp. 455-9.}{450}

Furthermore, V2L structure in 1:16-18 and 1:19f. is significant, for it shows that one does not have to look beyond the narrative pattern to account for the structure of these stories.\footnote{Cf. Lohmeyer, p. 33, who asserts that 1:16-18 has been written in the style of an epiphany story.}{451} The two call stories display conventional pattern structure and differ from FPL stories mainly through the absence of problem and reply-to-the-problem sections.

A similar story about the call of Levi (2:14) also has V2L structure:

\[
\text{Set. } \{14\text{α} \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\omega\nu\}
\]

\[
\text{Sit. } \{\begin{array}{c}
\text{δείδευν Δευτ \tau\omega \tau\alpha \rho \alpha \lambda \delta \alpha \omicron \upsilon \ \kappaα\theta\iota\mu\eta\mu\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\tau \ \tau\omicron \ \tau\ell\omega\nu\iota\omicron\nu
\end{array}\}
\]
The phrase in v. 14a about passing along is a setting statement in its reference to the itinerant action of Jesus, and the remark about Jesus' observation of Levi sitting at the tax office is the situation statement. Verse 14c, which presents Jesus' command, is the reply-to-the-situation statement; v. 14d is a concluding consequence statement that tells of the departure of Levi to follow Jesus. This brief story clearly displays V2L structure.

It is possible that 2:14 was patterned after 1:16-18 and 1:19f., but it is preferable to explain the structure of all three stories by reference to the narrative pattern. The three stories have similar structure because all three have been told in conformity with the pattern.

A fifth V2L narrative is the story about Jesus' healings after sunset (1:32-34):

Verse 1:32a is plainly a temporal setting statement presumably to indicate

452See Bundy, p. 143.
that the Sabbath has ended. The narration in vv. 32b-33 about the crowded gathering of the sick and the possessed to Jesus is a description of the situation. Verse 34a tells of Jesus' nonverbal response to the situation, and the closing remark in v. 34b about Jesus' subsequent silencing of the demons is a consequence statement. Displaying the V2L form of the pattern, 1:32-34 has narrative structure and should not be regarded as merely a 'summary', or 'editorial formulation', or 'a fragment of the tradition'.

Conspicuous structural alterations are made by Matthew and Luke in their parallels to this story (Mt. 8:16f.; Lk. 4:40f.). In Matthew's version the form of the story becomes V2S instead of V2L with the presentation of the editorial comment about the fulfillment of prophecy in place of a consequence statement. Once again Matthew's added material alters narrative structure. Luke's addition of a confession of the demons in 4:41a gives that section the appearance of a problem section and consequently makes Jesus' command for silence seem like a reply-to-the-problem section. Accordingly, the form of Luke's parallel is FPS instead of V2L. That the narration about Jesus' desire for silence is a consequence statement in Mark's story but is a reply-to-the-problem section in Luke's account, illustrates the principle that similar statements can have different structural roles, depending on the

---

453Bultmann, *H.S.T.*, pp. 226, 228. Cf. Rawlinson, p. 18 ('a generalized account of a typical scene'), and R. H. Lightfoot, *H.I.G.*, p. 70 (a 'generalizing section'). Taylor, *G.M.*, p. 180, correctly perceives that 1:32-34 is a narrative that is 'connected with a particular time and place which records things recalled at the close of a memorable day'.

454Ibid.

455Lohmeyer, p. 41. Lohmeyer attempts to determine whether 1:32-34 is a story by asking whether its vocabulary appears in other narratives. The question of whether 1:32-34 is a narrative can be settled on structural grounds. It is a story in its manifestation of a regular abbreviation of the narrative pattern, which is the primary organizational principle of the other stories in Mark's Gospel.
location of the material and its relation to other narrative sections. It is not enough to recognize motifs in a story. The relative location of the motifs is the decisive thing for understanding narrative structure.

The story about the mission of the disciples (6:6b-13) has interesting V2L structure in the fact that in the reply-to-the-situation statement Jesus' directions display FPS structure:

Set. { Καὶ περιήγην τὰς κώμας κύκλω διόδασκων
{ 7καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα
καὶ ἢρξατο αὐτοῖς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο
καὶ ἐδόθων αὐτοῖς ἐξοσέλισαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων
8καὶ παρῄγειλεν αὐτοῖς
ίνα μηδέν ἄφωσιν εἰς ὄχθων
εἰ μή ἀρκόδον μῦσον
μὴ ἥρτον
μὴ πήραν
μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκὸν
9ἀλλὰ ὑποδεδεδεέμονος σαμάλα
καὶ μὴ ἐνόδοσασθαι δύο χιτῶνας
Sit. }

Reps. { Καὶ ἐλεγεν αὐτοῖς
{ 10καὶ ἐσελήνησεν εἰς οίκιάν
Sit. }

RepS. { ἐσώ τὰν ξέληθητε εἰς οἰκίαν
Prob. { 11καὶ ἐσώ τὸν σῶματο πᾶς οἴς εἶσπεραί υμᾶς
S }

RepP. { ἐκτίναται τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑπ'οκάτω τῶν ποδῶν υμῶν
eἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς
Cons. { 12καὶ ἐξελθώντες ἐκήρυξαν ἵνα μετανοεῖσθαι
13καὶ ὁμόνως πολλὰ ἐξήθησαν
καὶ ἦλεθοι ἐλαίως πολλοὺς ἀρωματους
καὶ ἐβρατεύον.

The story begins in v. 6b with a setting statement about Jesus' itinerant teaching mission in surrounding villages. Verses 7-9 are the situation statement, which tells of Jesus' establishment of His disciples' mission: their division into pairs, endowment with authority over the unclean spirits (v. 7),

456Cf. Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 162, who regards v. 7 as the beginning of the story, which is therefore without any chronological and topographical orientation.
and instructions for travel (vv. 8f.). Verses 10f., which present Jesus' directions for entering homes, are the reply-to-the-situation statement. The movement from indirect discourse in vv. 7-9 to direct discourse in vv. 10f. is a reflection of narration according to the narrative pattern as the storyteller passes from a description of the situation (in indirect discourse) to the reply to the situation (in direct discourse). The statement in vv. 12f. about the disciples' departure and successful activity is a consequence statement, which brings the story to a close. V2L structure is thus readily apparent in 6:6b-13, and it is therefore difficult to accept the view of Taylor that the story 'is little more than a framework for the Mission Charge to the Twelve'.

A narrative element is apparent even within Jesus' sayings, for, as indicated earlier, His reply to the situation in vv. 10f. displays the FPS form of the pattern. The statement about entering a house is a setting statement, and the phrase about remaining there is a miniature situation statement. Presented next is the remark about leaving the house, which has the air of a nonverbal response. At the beginning of v. 11 the statement about hostile responses is a problem section, and the instructions about how to react to this hostility is a reply-to-the-problem section, which resembles somewhat the brief reply-to-the-situation statement. Such FPS structure is disrupted

457Cf. Schmidt, R.G.J., p. 163, who considers the shift from indirect discourse to direct discourse as a sign of Mark's redaction of tradition. Cf. p. 164. Bundy, p. 252, sees here a 'confusion of direct and indirect discourse' and supposes that the story is 'a documentary patchwork'. His assumption that 'any author writing with a free hand could surely contrive to maintain a flow of discourse through these verses' reflects modern notions of authorship and continuity. The idea that Mark wrote 'with a free hand' is somewhat inappropriate if he were both presenting traditional information and fulfilling the conventions of the narrative pattern.

in Matthew's parallel (see Mt. 10:11-15) through the additional material in vv. 12f. but is evident in Luke's version (see Lk. 9:4f.). The presence of the pattern in a saying of Jesus raises again the interesting but ultimately unanswerable question of whether Jesus Himself used the pattern in His teaching.

The second prediction of Jesus' suffering and death (9:30-32) is another brief story that has V2L structure:

Set. {\[30\]Καὶ ἠκούσαν ἔξελθόντες παρεπεσάντων διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας

Sit. { καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ
\[31\]εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθηται εἰς χείρας ἀνθρώπων

RepS. { καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποκαταθείησις μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται

Cons. {\[32\]οί δὲ ἤγνωσον τὸ ῥήμα καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσαν.

Verse 30a patently is a setting statement. The indication in v. 30b that Jesus did not want to be recognized is the situation statement.459 His teaching about suffering, death, and resurrection in v. 31 is the reply-to-the-situation statement. The reference in v. 32 to the disciples' lack of understanding and fear is the concluding consequence statement. With the V2L form of the pattern, 9:30-32 has narrative structure and may justifiably be regarded as a narrative.460

The alterations by Matthew and Luke are structural and not simply

---

459 See a similar situation statement in 7:24b, p. 50 above.

460 Cf. Bundy, p. 315, who thinks that 9:30-32 is like 'a doctrinal fragment' or 'an extract from a sermon'. Taylor, G.M., p. 402, correctly recognizes that 9:30-32 is a narrative.
In Mt. 17:22f. Matthew presents a fused setting and situation statement at the very beginning of the story. Luke starts his parallel (Lk. 9:43b-45) without a setting statement. The V2L form of the pattern is clearest and the most regular in Mark's version of the story.

V2L structure is evident in the story about Jesus' cleansing of the Temple (11:15-19):

Set. {15καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα

καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν

ἡμέραν ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας

καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ

Sit. καὶ τὰς τραπέζις τῶν κολυβιστῶν

καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλοῦντων τὰς περιστέρας κατέστρεψεν

16καὶ οὐχ ἤφιεν

ἐνα τῆς διενέγησης σκέυος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ

καὶ ἔδόθαισέν

καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς

οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι

Ὁ οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πάσιν τοῖς ἔλευσιν

ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον λῃστῶν

17καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς

καὶ ἔζητον πᾶς αὐτῶν ἀπολέσωιν

ἔφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτῶν

πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ

Cons. καὶ διὰν ὡδὲ ἐγένετο

ἐξεπορεύοντο ἐξω τῆς πόλεως.

The note in v. 15a about entering Jerusalem is the setting statement; and vv. 15b-16 describe the situation: Jesus' expulsion of money changers and sellers from the Temple, destruction of their places of business, and prohibition of anyone who attempted to carry a vessel through the Temple. Verse 17, which expresses Jesus' judgement of the Temple merchants, is a reply-to-the-situation statement. Both the remarks about the leaders (v. 18)

and the narration about the departure from the city (v. 19) are consequence statements.

The regularity of V2L form in Mark's account stands in contrast with pattern irregularities in the parallels of Matthew and Luke. In Mt. 21:12-17, a FPS narrative (vv. 14-16) is inserted in the V2L story about the cleansing of the Temple (vv. 12f., 17). Characteristically, Matthew's additional material disrupts the pattern as it is known in Mark's narrative. Luke in his parallel (Lk. 19:45-48) presents a fused setting and situation statement (v. 47a) at the beginning of the consequence statement (vv. 47f.). Such a feature is an irregularity that does not occur in Mark's stories.

The brief story about Judas' visit to the chief priests (14:10f.) also has V2L structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.?} & \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
{10} \text{Καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰςκαριώτης} \\
& \text{ἔξε τῶν δώδεκα} \\
& \text{ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχιερεῖς}
\end{array} \right\} \alpha \\
\text{Sit.} & \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{ἐνα αὐτὸν παραδός [αὐτοῖς]}
\end{array} \right\} \beta \\
\text{RepS.} & \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
{11} \text{οὶ ἄνοιγματες}
\end{array} \right\} \alpha \\
\text{Cons.} & \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{καὶ ἔξητει πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαλύψας παραδός.}
\end{array} \right\} \beta
\end{align*}
\]

With the use of ἀπῆλθεν, v. 10a has the appearance of a setting statement in which it is said that Judas went away to certain people rather than a place.\textsuperscript{462} In this case the brief note of intention in v. 10b is the situation statement. It is also possible, however, to regard the whole of v. 10 as the situation statement, for a number of situation statements tell of people approaching other persons, especially the person of Jesus.\textsuperscript{463} If the whole of v. 10 is

---

\textsuperscript{462}See above, p. 30, n. 17.

\textsuperscript{463}See above, pp. 43-4.
read as a situation statement, the story begins without a setting statement. Either way, the structure of vv. 10f. is V2L. The remark in v. 11a about the chief priests' delight and promise to reward Judas is a reply-to-the-situation statement that portrays a nonverbal response, and the note about Judas' search for an opportune time to betray Jesus is the concluding consequence statement.

Inasmuch as 14:10f. has V2L structure of its own, there is some question about the popular view that 14:10f. should be regarded in connection with 14:1f. as originally one narrative.464 Verses 1f. display in themselves the V2S form of the pattern465 and thus are a narrative unit. On structural grounds, therefore, it is preferable to regard 14:1f. and 14:10f. as two narratives. Structurally they do not merge well, even though they are related in their interest in Judas and the plot to betray Jesus. An adequate judgment here depends on an understanding of narrative structure and not simply the recognition of similarities of content.

The subsequent story about preparations for the Passover (14:12-16) also has V2L structure, which is particularly interesting, for the FPL form of the pattern is clearly evident in Jesus' directions in the reply-to-the-situation statement (vv. 13-15). These features may be seen in the following arrangement of the story:

Set. \{^{12}Καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἁζώμων ὑπὲρ τὸ πάσχα ἔσων \ \\
\{ δὲ τὸ πάσχα ἔσων \ \\
\{ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ ὁ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ \ \\
Pοὺ δέλεις \ \\
ἀπελθόντες \ \\
ἐτοιμάσωμεν \ \\
ἴνα φάγης τὸ πάσχα \ \\
\}

Sit. \{ a \ \\
\}

\{ b \ \\
\}

464See, for example, Bultmann, H.S.T., p. 262; Bundy, p. 485; Taylor, G.M., p. 534; Beare, p. 221; and Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 370.

465See below, p. 400.
The story begins with a temporal setting statement in v. 12a, and the question of the disciples in v. 12b is the situation statement.\textsuperscript{466} Jesus' reply is given in vv. 13-15a; and v. 16, which tells of the subsequent actions of the two disciples, is the consequence statement. With such V1L structure 14:12-16 is clearly a narrative in itself, even though it might never have been isolated in the tradition.\textsuperscript{467}

Matthew's parallel (Mt. 26:17-19) also has V2L structure, but Luke's version (Lk. 22:7-13) displays the V1L form of the pattern with a problem section in v. 9, making Jesus' instructions a reply-to-the-problem section in vv. 10-12.\textsuperscript{468}

\textsuperscript{466}See similar situation statements above, pp. 52-3.


The pattern is evident also in Jesus' directions in the reply-to-the-situation statement (Mk. 14:13-15). In v. 13 the command to enter the city is the setting statement, and the remark about meeting a man carrying a pitcher of water is the situation statement. The instruction to follow him is the reply-to-the-situation statement. Verse 14, which tells of the question to be asked to secure a room for the Passover, is the problem section. In v. 15a the statement about the nonverbal response of the householder is the reply-to-the-problem section, and in the last part of the verse the instruction to make preparation is the consequence statement.

Such FPL structure is also apparent in Jesus' instructions in Luke's version of the story. At this point in Luke's parallel there is considerable verbal agreement with Mark's story, which suggests that the FPL structure of Jesus' directions in Luke's account might have been derived from Mark's narrative. It is interesting that in Matthew's parallel, which shows less verbal agreement with Mark's story, FPL structure is not apparent in Jesus' directions for the Passover (Mt. 26:18). With a fused setting and situation statement that is followed only by a reply-to-the-situation statement, the form of Jesus' instructions in Matthew's parallel is V2S. Matthew's abbreviation of content thus manifests also a reduction in pattern structure. In view of both Luke's verbal agreement with Mark and Matthew's alteration, it appears that the FPL form of Jesus' instructions in Mark's narrative is to be attributed to Mark; but inasmuch as the narrative pattern seems to have been a traditional pattern, one cannot be completely certain that Jesus Himself did not use the pattern from time to time in His teaching.

The question of Mark's responsibility is entertained by Taylor, who, in

opposition to any doublet theory, sees Mark's hand in verbal agreements between 11:1-6 and 14:13-16 and considers these similarities as an illustration of 'the tendency of Mark to repeat himself'.\(^470\) An understanding of the narrative pattern enables one to perceive more clearly the similarities and differences between the two stories in question. In the light of the pattern it becomes evident that the verbal parallels that Taylor detects are not always parallel in terms of the narrative structure of the two stories. Jesus' instructions appear in the reply-to-the-situation statement in the story about preparations for the Passover but are presented in the situation statement in the story about the colt.\(^471\) The material of 14:16 is given as a consequence section, but the similar and identical phrases of 11:4, 6, are found in the reply-to-the-situation statement and reply-to-the-problem section, respectively. Within the instructions of Jesus, the use of εἰπάτε and ὁ διώδεκαλος in 14:14 occurs in a problem section, but ἔιπατε ὁ κύριος . . . is set forth in a reply-to-the-problem section in 11:3. Such structural differences show that a mere comparison of vocabulary does not provide an adequate understanding of the similarities and differences between the two stories.\(^472\) Of greater significance is the location of similar and identical vocabulary within the stories. The presence of similar content in different locations is a sign of different structure, which makes the stories different\(^473\) and shows that Mark is not simply repeating himself.

\(^470\) Taylor, G.M., p. 536. See also Cranfield, Saint Mark, p. 420, who asserts that 'the tendency to repeat the same patterns is of course a common feature of story-telling'.

\(^471\) See above, pp. 150-3.

\(^472\) Cf. Beare, p. 223.

\(^473\) Cf. Bundy, p. 488.
The pattern as a measure for comparison also enables one to recognize other parallels—in this instance within the instructions of Jesus. Taylor notices the similar use of ὑπάγετε in 11:2 and 14:13. The verb appears in the setting statement of each pattern within the pattern. Taylor also sees the similarity between καὶ ... ἐγρήγορε in 11:2 and καὶ ἀκούσας ὑμῖν in 14:13. These phrases are presented in the situation statement of each pattern within the pattern. Here one could also call attention to the reference to a man in each situation statement. Other less conspicuous parallels not mentioned by Taylor are the commands in reply-to-the-situation statements (λύσατε and φέρετε in 11:2; ἀκολουθήσατε in 14:13) and the use of ἔδω and a question in the problem sections in 11:3 and 14:14. The fact that the instructions of Jesus are structurally so similar in two stories that manifest structural differences in spite of verbal resemblances, raises afresh the question of whether the pattern in Jesus' teaching is a manifestation of some use of the pattern by Jesus. Whether or not Jesus Himself was guided by the pattern, its clarity in His instructions in the two stories under discussion probably should be attributed to Mark, who used the pattern with considerable regularity elsewhere. At all events, the similarity of the pattern in Jesus' instructions is not simply a matter of Mark's repeating himself but rather a manifestation of his sensitivity to one, fundamental pattern of narration.

The last regular V2L narrative is the story about Jesus' mockery by the soldiers (15:16-21):

\[
\text{Set.} \quad \begin{cases} 
160' \ δὲ \ στρατιώται \ ἀπῆγαγον \ αὐτὸν \ ἔσω \ τῆς \ αὐλῆς \\
\quad \ οὐ \ εἴστιν \ πραξίμιον 
\end{cases}
\]

\[47^a\text{Taylor, G.M., p. 536.}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sit.</th>
<th>RepS.</th>
<th>Cons.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ συγκαλοῦσιν ὅλην τὴν στρατιάν</td>
<td>καὶ ἡρῴαντο ἁσπάζεσθαι αὐτὸν</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐνθιδύκουσιν αὐτὸν πορφύραν</td>
<td>Χαῖρε</td>
<td>ἵνα σταυρωθῇ ἐπὶ αὐτὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ περιτιθέσαιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινου στέφανου</td>
<td>βασιλεὺ τῶν Ἰουδαίων</td>
<td>ἵνα ἀφῇ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indication in v. 16a that the soldiers led Jesus away into the palace court is the setting statement, which includes the brief explanatory comment about the praetorium. Verses 16b-17 offer a description of the situation: the assembling of the cohort and the dressing of Jesus in a purple robe and crown of thorns. Verses 18f. portray the soldiers' reply to the situation, a response that is both verbal and nonverbal. They hail Jesus as King of the Jews (v. 18) and torment Him both through physical violence and mock worship (v. 19). The last two verses of the story are consequence statements that tell of a series of subsequent actions: the clothing of Jesus in His own garments (v. 20a), the removal of Jesus to crucify Him (v. 20b), and the impressment of Simon of Cyrene to carry Jesus' cross (v. 21). Scholars commonly consider v. 21 apart from vv. 16-20, but the rhythmical, thematic parallelism between vv. 20 and 21 is an indication that Mark regarded 15:16-21

---

475See, for example, Taylor, G.M., pp. 584, 587; and Nineham, Saint Mark, pp. 418, 420-2.
as a narrative unit. Matthew (Mt. 27:32) and Luke (Lk. 23:26), however, present the statements about Simon of Cyrene as a separate narrative with V2S structure.

Before the illustration of the V2S stories in Mark's Gospel, brief mention may be made of Mark's one irregular V2L narrative.

Irregular form. The one irregular V2L narrative is the story about the question of whether Christ is the Son of David (12:35-37). Among the irregular narratives the form of this story is the most irregular, as is evident in the following arrangement:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(Sit./ Set.)} & \quad \text{πώς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς} \\
\text{(Prob.)} & \quad \text{ὁ Χριστὸς υἱὸς Δαυὶδ ἔστιν} \\
\text{(RepS.)} & \quad \text{ἐπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου} \\
\text{(RepP.)} & \quad \text{καὶ σὺ ἔστιν υἱός} \\
\text{Cons.} & \quad \text{καὶ ὅποιος ὁ χιλιούς ἰκουν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως.}
\end{align*}
\]

This story appears to be nothing more than a reply-to-the-situation statement (vv. 35-37a) and a consequence statement (v. 37b);[477] but since a brief indication of the setting and situation (διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) is given in inverted order within the reply-to-the-situation statement, the story has irregular V2L structure. It is interesting that in Jesus' sayings here His

---


question resembles somewhat the questions of problem sections, and His answer to His own question in vv. 36f. is like a reply-to-the-problem section. The story thus has the flavour of a FPL narrative, even though the internal fused setting and situation statement, question, and answer all occur within the context of Jesus' reply to a situation. The narrative pattern is thus evident in this story in spite of the fact that the form of the pattern is quite irregular.

Luke's parallel (Lk. 20:41-44) is even more irregular: it is presented only as a reply of Jesus. Matthew's version (Mt. 22:41-46), however, displays extended V1L form with a situation statement about the assembling of the Pharisees at the beginning of the story (v. 41a), a problem section in the question of Jesus (vv. 41b-42a), a reply by the Pharisees in v. 42b, a problem development in vv. 43-45, a reply in the sense of a reference to no reply in v. 46a, and a consequence statement in v. 46b. Here is a rare instance where Matthew's version is more regular than Mark's.

As part of a summary of the discussion of the V2L narratives it is useful to list the stories and their form-critical classifications.

V2L NARRATIVES

1. Regular Form
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V2L structure—setting, situation, reply, and consequence—is an abbreviated form of the Full Pattern that occurs in twelve stories in Mark's Gospel. All but one of the twelve stories have regular form, and no V2L has extended form.

The V2L stories tend to be legends, apophthegms, or editorial formulations according to Bultmann's classification and stories about Jesus or Markan constructions according to Taylor. The legend category is slightly prominent in the analysis of Dibelius. Whatever categories are assigned to these stories, they all have essentially the same narrative structure.

The pattern has proved to be a useful criterion for identifying narratives, recognizing structural similarities and differences between stories, and understanding more clearly alterations and developments in the versions of Matthew and Luke. Through the use of the pattern as a criterion it becomes further evident that the comparison of stories merely on the basis of vocabulary is inadequate for understanding similarities and differences between narratives. Of more importance is the location of material within a story. Knowledge of the location and order of vocabulary provides an understanding of the structure of a story and so offers a more substantial basis for comparing narratives.

In the comparative study of the parallels of Matthew and Luke, structural alterations generally occur in Matthew with the addition of special material and in Luke with the greatest irregularity.

An interesting feature in two of the V2L stories (9:30-32, 14:12-16) is the presence of some form of the pattern in sayings of Jesus. This fact encourages one to ask whether Jesus Himself used the pattern in His teaching, but the regularity of the pattern in both instances suggests that Mark was responsible for at least the clarity of the pattern in Jesus' sayings.
The presence of the pattern in Jesus' sayings is a feature that appears also in one of the stories with V2S structure, and this last recurrent form of the narrative pattern is considered next.

F. Variation #2 Short Narratives

The characteristic feature of Variation #2 structure is the absence of problem and reply-to-the-problem sections. V2S structure differs from V2L form through the additional absence of any consequence statement. It will be recalled that no V2L story had a result statement, and V2S narratives are without this narrative section as well. Through the lack of result and consequence statements the V2S stories resemble FPS and VIS narratives. The difference between V2S structure and the long form of the Full Pattern is represented in the following comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPL</th>
<th>V2S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set.</td>
<td>Set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit.</td>
<td>Sit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepS.</td>
<td>RepS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepP.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons.</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V2S structure is another abbreviation of the long form of the Full Pattern. A V2S story ends with the reply-to-the-situation statement. There is no narration of a problem and a reply to the problem, which are found in Full Pattern and Variation #1 narratives. Also, there are no result and consequence statements, whose absence is the distinguishing characteristic of any short form of the pattern.

In Mark's Gospel there are fourteen stories that have V2S structure. Thirteen of the stories (1:1-8, 1:14f., 2:13, 3:13-19, 6:30f., 6:32-34, 8:10-12, 11:11, 12:41-44, 13:1f., 13:3-37, 14:1f., 14:22-25) have regular structure. The
last of these is also extended. The remaining narrative (12:38-40) has irregular form. Most of the V2S narratives are understandably brief, but 13:3-37 is exceptionally long. It is interesting that this story, which displays in broad lines the shortest form of the pattern, is the longest narrative in Mark's Gospel. This feature and others become apparent in the forthcoming illustrations of the regular V2S stories.

Regular form. The first V2S narrative that is presented is the first narrative in Mark's Gospel, the story of John the Baptist (1:1-8). Its three sections also display V2S structure—another instance of the pattern within the pattern—as can be seen in the following arrangement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set.</th>
<th>Sit.</th>
<th>RepS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RepS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verses 1-3, which refer to the beginning of the Gospel (Good News) about Jesus (v. 1), to its location in the prophecy of Isaiah (v. 2), and to the voice crying in the wilderness (v. 3), serve as the setting statement.
for the story. The statements in vv. 4f. about John's baptizing and preaching (v. 4) and about the people who went out to him (v. 5) are features of the situation statement. Verses 6-8, which are descriptive of John's preaching, are the reply-to-the-situation statement. With such overall V2S form, 1:1-8 has narrative structure and may be thought of as the first story in Mark's Gospel.

It is also true that each narrative section within 1:1-8 manifests in itself V2S structure. In vv. 1-3 the reference in vv. 1-2a to the beginning of the Gospel and its location in Isaiah is a formal setting statement. The passage in 1:2b about the sending of a messenger by divine initiative to prepare the way is a situation statement, and the message in v. 3 of the

478 See similar situation statements above, pp. 43-4.

479 The setting-situation-reply form of 1:1-3 suggests that Mark regarded v. 1 not as a title but rather as the first, integral part of vv. 1-3, a narrative section in which Isaiah's prophecy itself is thought of as the beginning of the Gospel about Jesus. The first Good News about Jesus is Isaiah's Good News about Jesus. The absence of an article before ἄρχει and of a copula are indications that Mark's style in his first story is declaratory and not expository. His language here is that of announcement and poetry instead of explanation and prose. See Carrington, p. 53. See also Ulrich Mauser, Christ in the Wilderness, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 39 (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1963), pp. 85 and 96, n. 3. Also, if ἐγεέρση is not read in 1:11 (see Taylor, G.M., p. 161), there is a second place where a message is introduced in a syntactically abrupt manner. Cf. Austin Farrar, St Matthew and St Mark (London: Dacre Press, 1954), p. 199, who regards the initial sections of Mark's Gospel as 'prose stanzas', which are unlike the 'standard paragraphs' that are found in the rest of Mark's Gospel. In his original and novel analysis, both in this work and in A Study in St Mark (London: Dacre Press, 1951), Farrar is more interested in the arrangement of the stories than in their narrative structure and fails to see that 1:1-8 and 1:9-13 are written according to the same pattern of narration that is evident in the other stories of Mark's Gospel.

480 The internal V2S structure of 1:1-3 is a sign that Mark considered the composite citation from Ex. 23:20a and Mal. 3:1 as an essential part of vv. 1-3. If the citation is excised as a later insertion, the V2S structure of this section is seriously disrupted. Here the structural role of the citation as a situation statement stands against theories of insertion by a later hand (see, for example, Rawlinson, p. 5, and Taylor, G.M., p. 153).
voice crying in the wilderness is a reply-to-the-situation statement.\textsuperscript{481} In vv. 4f. the statement about John's appearance in the desert (v. 4) is a setting statement, and the remark about those who went out to him (v. 5a) is a situation statement. Both the indication of those who came to him, and the note about the confession of sins, make up a reply-to-the-situation statement. Verses 6-8, the third internal V2S section, lack a setting statement, probably because Mark considered the setting to be essentially no different from that given in v. 4a. The description of John's appearance in v. 6 is the situation statement,\textsuperscript{482} and his preaching in vv. 7f. is a reply-to-the-situation statement.\textsuperscript{483}

The presence of the same form of the pattern in each section in 1:1-8 suggests that Mark himself was responsible for the composition of this story. His method appears to have been more than the selection and arrangement of material with additional touches here and there. The formal similarity of

\textsuperscript{481}An understanding of the narrative pattern makes it possible to see how Mark could present both the Exodus-Malachi citation and the quotation from Isaiah after \textit{έν τῷ Ἰσαάκ τῷ προφήτῃ}. The V2S structure of the unit indicates that Mark made a formal distinction between the Exodus-Malachi citation and the prophecy of Isaiah. The citation, as a situation statement, is only a description of a situation for the prophecy of Isaiah and structurally is not part of the prophecy itself. The prophecy is given only in v. 3, the reply-to-the-situation statement. In this way Mark could refer both to the composite citation and to the prophecy of Isaiah and regard only the latter as the first Good News about Jesus. If this interpretation is valid, the variant reading, \textit{έν τοῖς προφήταις}, may be seen as an expression of early misunderstanding of Mark's passage rather than as a correction of it.

\textsuperscript{482}See similar situation statements above, pp. 38-41.

\textsuperscript{483}This reply-to-the-situation statement presents John's Good News about Jesus: Jesus is the Stronger One, who will baptize with the Holy Spirit. John himself is not the beginning of the Gospel (cf. Rawlinson, pp. 5-6), nor is his ministry the beginning. Cf. James M. Robinson, \textit{The Problem of History in Mark}, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 21 (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957), p. 23. John merely preaches Good News about Jesus. The message of John is the second of a series of three Gospel pronouncements about Jesus. The third pronouncement is the heavenly voice's Good News about Jesus in 1:11: He is the beloved Son of God.
the internal narrative sections is a sign that Mark structured both 1:1-8 and its sections according to the narrative pattern. In this sense they are his formulations.\textsuperscript{484}

Mark's brief reference to the beginning of Jesus' preaching mission in Galilee (1:14f.) is also cast as a V2S narrative:

\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{14\text{Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθήναι τὸν 'Ἰωάννην} \\
& \quad \text{ἡλθεν ὁ 'Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{\text{κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ} \\
\text{RepS.} & \quad \{15\καὶ λέγων δὲ τι πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς} \\
& \quad \text{καὶ ἦγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ} \\
& \quad \text{μετανοεῖτε} \\
& \quad \text{καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.}
\end{align*}

Verse 14a is clearly a setting statement in its temporal note about the cessation of John's activity and geographical note about Galilee. The phrase in v. 14b about Jesus' preaching is a brief statement about the situation, and v. 15 is a reply-to-the-situation statement in its capsule description of Jesus' message. With V2S form 1:14f. may be thought of as a narrative and not simply a summary.\textsuperscript{485} The V2S form of the story is an indication that

\textsuperscript{484}Cf. Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist, pp. 30, 32, and 36, who freely thinks of Mark's composition in connection with the introduction to his Gospel. Marxsen even refers to Mark's reshaping of the material (pp. 30, 53) but does not seem to have in mind here Mark's structuring of the narrative units themselves. Marxsen sees Mark's role as one who collected diverse pieces of material from sources, combined them with additions of his own, and above all connected them 'from a topical viewpoint' (p. 52). Mark's redaction is noticed primarily in his arrangement of the material. Marxsen agrees with the view of Bultmann that 'Mark was not yet master of his material' (p. 53) and considers Mark's reworking of the material to be only 'slight' (ibid.). Although at this point Marxsen refers to Mark's reshaping of the tradition, it is apparent that Marxsen does not envisage any structuring of the narrative units themselves by Mark.

Mark not only found a place for the story but also gave the story its shape in keeping with the narrative pattern.  

Like 1:14ff., 2:13 is another brief portion of Mark's Gospel that manifests V2S structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{ \text{Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{ \text{καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὀχλος ἠρχέτο πρὸς αὐτὸν} \\
\text{RepS.} & \quad \{ \text{καὶ ἔδοχασεν αὐτοὺς.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The note about Jesus' departure to the sea is the setting statement, and the reference to the crowd that came to Jesus is the description of the situation. The remark that Jesus was teaching the people is a reply-to-the-situation statement that tells of Jesus' response but gives no example of what He said. Verse 13 thus has in itself narrative structure. Taylor makes a distinction between v. 13 as 'an editorial statement' and v. 14 as the story of the call of Levi; but, strictly speaking, both v. 13 and v. 14 are stories in terms of the narrative pattern. It is conceivable that v. 13 is only a V2S section within 2:13-17 as a whole narrative, but the fact that 2:14 and 2:15-17 each have narrative structure stands against this possibility. It is preferable to regard 2:13-17 as a cluster of three narratives (2:13, 2:14, and 2:15-17) that were closely associated in the mind of Mark. If Mark composed v. 13 in anticipation of the stories in v. 14 and vv. 15-17, he did so according to

---


488 Taylor, G.M., p. 201.


the narrative pattern and treated v. 13 as a miniature story in itself.

A fourth V2S narrative is the story about Jesus' calling of the Twelve (3:13-19):

Set.  
{\text{13}} καὶ ἀναβαλεῖ εἰς τὸ ὄρος  

Sit.  
{\text{14}} καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὗς ἤθελεν αὐτὸς  
 καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν  

Reps.  
{\text{14}} καὶ ἐποίησεν δίδεκα  
 [οὐς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὑνόμασεν]  
 ἵνα δοῦν μετ' αὐτοῦ  
 καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς  
 κηρύσσειν  
{\text{15}} καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια  

{\text{16}} καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δίδεκα  
 καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Ἐκμωνίῳ Πέτρου  
 καὶ Ἰάκωβου τοῦ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου  
 καὶ Ἰωάννην τοῦ ἄδελφου τοῦ Ἰακώβου  
 καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὑνόματα Βοανηργές  
 δ' ἐστὶν Ὁ λοὶ Ἐρντής  
{\text{18}} καὶ Ἀνώρδαν  
 καὶ Φιλίππου  
 καὶ Βαρθολομαίου  
 καὶ Μαθαίου  
 καὶ Θωμᾶν  
 καὶ Ἰάκωβου τοῦ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου  
 καὶ Θαδαδαίου  
 καὶ Σίμωνα τοῦ Καναγώνου  
{\text{19}} καὶ Ἰουδαν Ἰσκαριζή  
 δ' καὶ παρεδώκειν αὐτῶν.

The story begins in v. 13a with the setting statement about Jesus' climbing a mountain. Verse 13b, which refers both to Jesus' selection of followers and their approach to Jesus, is the situation statement.\textsuperscript{491} The indication that the selected followers went away to Jesus may alternately be thought of as a response statement. If so, the form of the story is slightly extended. Since, however, some remark about persons who came to Jesus is a recurrent feature of situation statements, there is warrant for considering both

\textsuperscript{491}See similar situation statements above, pp. 43-4, 48-50.
sentences in v. 13b as parts of the situation statement. Verses 14-19 present Jesus' reply to the situation: (1) His appointment of twelve to accompany Him and share in His preaching and healing mission; and (2) His naming of the Twelve. No direct discourse is given in vv. 14-19, but it is presupposed in the naming of the Twelve. For this reason, the response of Jesus in vv. 14-19 should not be termed nonverbal.492

Brief mention may be made of the structural alterations by Matthew and Luke. Matthew's parallel (Mt. 10:1-4) lacks a setting statement and presents the names of the Twelve (vv. 2-4) as a comment rather than as part of Jesus' reply to the situation. Luke alters the structure of the story through the addition of the passage about Jesus' going up a mountain to pray (Lk. 6:12). This verse, which has a setting statement and a situation statement but not a reply-to-the-situation statement, has incomplete V2S structure; but the V2S form of the pattern is apparent in vv. 13-16. Here, therefore, is an instance where in Luke's Gospel pattern irregularity is evident in conjunction with special material. As Luke innovates, the pattern deteriorates.

When the narrative pattern is acknowledged as a valid criterion for identifying narratives, it becomes apparent that 6:30-34 should be thought of as two closely related narratives instead of one. The first is the story of the return of the disciples (6:30f.):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sit.} &
\begin{cases}
30 \text{καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν} \\
31 \text{καὶ ἀπῆγγελλαν αὐτῷ πάντα ὅσα ἔποιήσαν καὶ ὅσα ἔδειδας}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RepS.} &
\begin{cases}
30 \text{καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς} \\
31 \text{Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοῖ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ ἀναπαύσασθε ὅλῳ
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

\[492\]The V2S structure of this story is not dependent on any one of the variant readings in the reply-to-the-situation statement.
There is no setting statement. The story begins instead with a situation statement (v. 30), which tells of the return of the disciples to Jesus and their report of all that they did and taught. Verse 31 presents Jesus' reply to the situation: His command to come to a remote place and rest awhile. The narrative ends with an explanatory comment, which indicates that there were so many people coming and going that there was no time even to eat.\(^{493}\)

Verses 32-34, which are closely related as a sequel to vv. 30f., also exhibit V2S structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{ & \text{32} & \text{καὶ ἀκηλθοῦν ἐν τῷ πλοὺς εἰς ἔρημον τόπον καὶ θάλασσαν} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{ & \text{33} & \text{καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτοῖς ὑπάγοντας} \\
& & \text{καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοῖς} \\
& & \text{καὶ πεζῆ ἀπὸ παρῴων τῶν πῶλων συνεδραμὸν ἕκει} \\
& & \text{καὶ προῆλθον ἀυτοῖς} \\
\text{Set.} & \quad \{ & \text{34} & \text{καὶ έξέλθον} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{ & \text{35} & \text{ἔλεγεν πολὺν ὄχλον} \\
& & \text{καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς} \\
& & \text{ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα} \\
& & \text{μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα} \\
& & \text{καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοῖς πολλά.}
\end{align*}
\]

Verse 32 is the setting statement, which at the same time shows the fulfilment of the command of Jesus in the preceding story. Verse 33 is descriptive of the situation: (1) the public's knowledge of the location of Jesus and His disciples; and (2) the approach of a vast crowd. Jesus' reply to the situation is narrated in v. 34. He responds both with compassion and much teaching. With such V2S structure vv. 32-34 may legitimately be considered

\(^{493}\) Cf. Bundy, p. 260, who thinks that v. 31 'might well be joined to 32-33 as an introduction rather to 30 as a conclusion'. Verse 31 does anticipate the setting statement in v. 32, but Jesus' saying in v. 31a is presented as a response to a situation that is indicated in v. 30 and explained in v. 31b. Except for the irregular story, 12:35-37 (see above, p. 397; cf. 12:38-40 below, pp. 431-2), it is not Mark's practice to begin a narrative with a saying of Jesus.
a narrative and distinguished from 6:30ff.\textsuperscript{494}

The individual narrative identity of 6:32-34 is not altered by the fact that V2S structure is evident also in Jesus' reply to the situation in v. 34. The phrase καὶ ἔξελθὼν is a brief setting statement and the remark that Jesus saw a great crowd is a short situation statement. The narration about Jesus' compassion and teaching is a reply-to-the-situation statement. Jesus' reply in 6:32-34 thus has internal V2S structure and is another instance where the pattern occurs within the pattern. Here it is not a question of v. 34 being a narrative in itself on account of its V2S structure, since v. 34 is necessary for the completion of the V2S form of 6:32-34. Elsewhere Mark does not present a situation statement without a reply to the situation.\textsuperscript{495}

V2S structure is clearly evident in the story about the Pharisees' search for a sign (8:10-12):

\[ \text{Set. } \\
\{ 10 \text{Καὶ ἔξελθες ἐμβάς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἠλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαμασκουάδα }\]

\textsuperscript{494} Schmidt, R.G.J., pp. 187-8, sees as a sign of discontinuity and 'stylistic roughness' between v. 31 and v. 32 a discrepancy between ἀπῆλθον (v. 32), which—in the mind of Mark—refers to Jesus and His disciples, and ἀναπαύσασθε ὁλίγον (v. 31), which applies only to the disciples. Schmidt's interpretation rests on the questionable assumption that Jesus' command in v. 31 pertains only to the disciples, but Jesus' use of δεῦτε implies that both He and the disciples are to retire to a lonely place. If so, it is a question of Jesus and His disciples in both v. 31 and 32, and there is no real discontinuity in literary perspective even though v. 32 is structurally the beginning of a new narrative. Cf. Taylor's criticism of Schmidt's interpretation, \textit{G.M.}, p. 319. Inasmuch as the issue centres on whether it is a question of Jesus and His disciples in v. 31, the concern of Taylor to show that ὑμεῖς αὐτοῖς refers only to the disciples is beside the point.

\textsuperscript{495} Cf. Cranfield, \textit{Saint Mark}, p. 213, who prefers to see the end after v. 33 and connects v. 34 with what follows. Although v. 34 could conceivably be a narrative beginning with V2S form, v. 35 is a much better opening statement (see above, p. 32), and v. 34 is appropriate both as a reply-to-the-situation statement and as a narrative ending. See similar notions of departure in narrative conclusions in 1:12f., 1:43-45 (v. 45), 2:12b, 2:27f. (v. 28), 3:6, 6:12f., 11:18f. (v. 19), 14:16, and 16:8.
The remark in v. 10 about embarking and entering the district of Dalmanoutha is the setting statement. Verse 11 portrays the situation: the appearance of the Pharisees and their request for a sign. Jesus' reply is presented in v. 12, in which He indicates that no sign shall be given to this generation. With such V2S structure 8:10-12 may justifiably be regarded as a narrative in itself.496

A very short V2S narrative is the story of Jesus' brief look at the Temple before retiring to Bethany (11:11):

Set. \{11^a καὶ εἰσήλθεν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν \}

Sit. \{ ἐκεῖ περιβλεφάμενος πάντα ὡφιλὼν ἣν οὕσας τῆς ἡμέρας \}

RepS. \{ καὶ εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν ὀδών \}

The story begins conventionally with a setting statement about Jesus' entry into Jerusalem and the Temple. Verse 11b is the situation statement in its reference to Jesus' survey of the Temple and the lateness of the hour. Here is an instance where a temporal note is descriptive of the situation instead of the setting. Jesus' nonverbal response to the situation is presented in v. 11c in the statement that Jesus withdrew to Bethany with the Twelve. Verse 11 thus has V2S structure and may be thought of as a narrative in itself.

496See above, p. 29, n. 16.
in spite of its brevity, which suggests that nothing of significance occurred during this visit of Jesus to the Temple.

Regular V2S structure is evident in the story of the poor widow (12:41-44):

Set. \{^1\text{Kai} \text{kathôsas} \text{katevánti} \text{tou} \text{gazophulákion} \}

\begin{align*}
\text{Sit.} & \{^2\text{kai} \text{elthousa} \text{mia} \text{chíra} \text{ptwkh} \\
& \text{ébalen} \text{lepta duo} \\
& \text{O} \text{éstin} \text{kodrântis} \}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{RepS.} & \{^3\text{Kai} \text{proskaleosámeneis} \text{toûs} \text{madhtas aútou} \\
& \text{ékei aútois} \\
& \text{'Amên leâw ýmîn} \\
& \text{óst ò chíra aúth ò ptwkh pleiou pántwn ébalen} \\
& \text{tôn ballôntwn eis tò gazophulákion} \}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{44kântes gar ék tou} \text{perispeýontos aútois ébalon} \\
& \text{aúth dé ék tòs ústerhêsews aúthès pánta désa eîxên ébalen} \\
& \text{ðlon tôn blon aúthès.} \\
\end{align*}

The reference in v. 41a to Jesus sitting opposite the treasury is the setting statement. Verses 41b-42 depict the situation: (1) Jesus' observation of those who were putting money in the treasury; (2) the rich people's presentation of large offerings; and (3) the poor widow's contrasting gift of two mites. In vv. 43f. Jesus' comment about the widow's meagre but significant contribution is the reply-to-the-situation statement. With clear V2S structure 12:41-44 is plainly a narrative in itself.

Luke's parallel (Lk. 21:1-4) lacks a setting statement but essentially has V2S structure also with a situation statement in vv. 1f. and a reply-to-the-situation statement in vv. 3f. With the absence of a setting statement, however, Luke's alterations are in part structural and not 'purely verbal and stylistic'.

\footnote{\text{497Cf. Beare, p. 215.}}
The following story of Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the Temple (13:1f.) has V2S structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{\text{Καὶ ἐκταρευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{\text{λέγει αὐτῷ ἐξ] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ} \\
& \quad \text{(Διδόσκωλε} \\
& \quad \{\text{καὶ ποιημαὶ λόγου} \}} \text{a} \\
& \quad \{\text{καὶ ποιημαὶ ὀἰκοδομαὶ} \}b \\
\text{Rep.} & \quad \{\text{καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπευν αὐτῷ} \\
& \quad \text{ἤλεξες ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας ὀἰκοδομᾶς} \}b \\
& \quad \{\text{οὐ μὴ ἄφην ἀδε λόγος ἐπὶ λόγον} \}a \\
& \quad \{\text{ὅς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.} \}
\end{align*}
\]

The indication in v. 1a that Jesus was leaving the Temple is the setting statement, and in v. 1b the question of one of the disciples is the situation statement. Jesus' reply, which displays thematic parallelism with the question, is given in v. 2. In terms of the narrative pattern 13:1f. is a story in itself.\(^{498}\)

An interesting feature about this story is that Mark presents the question of the situation, whereas Matthew and Luke merely report that there was some discussion about the beautiful buildings and features of the Temple.\(^{499}\) Mark's account has 'presence'. The narrator gives the impression of being close at hand; whereas in the versions of Matthew and Luke, the narrators appear to be farther removed from the scene and looking back. The closer literary perspective of Mark's story is, of course, no guarantee that Mark's

\(^{498}\)Cf. Nineham, *Saint Mark*, p. 343, who regards 13:1-4 as an 'introduction to the discourse proper'. Cf. Beare, p. 215, who considers 13:1-4 to be a 'composite section' in which vv. 1f. are 'a self-contained narrative, centred in the prediction'. Cf. also Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, p. 162, who sees vv. 1-5a as 'an unusually broad introduction'. Marxsen's analysis at this point illustrates the quandary of redaction criticism without an understanding of the fundamental structure of Mark's narrative. The limitation of redaction criticism here may be traced to the failure of form criticism to provide such an understanding.

\(^{499}\)See Mt. 24:1a and Lk. 21:5.
narration offers firsthand tradition. It is also interesting that the thematic parallelism between question and answer is lost in the versions of Matthew and Luke, who merely tell of a discussion. The parallelism in Mark's account is also no sure sign of original tradition, since it is always conceivable that Mark, in his narration of the story, composed the answer of Jesus in terms of the question, or, what is more likely, formulated the question in anticipation of the saying of Jesus that had been handed down in the tradition. The closeness in perspective and the orderliness of Mark's account are striking, nevertheless, whether these features are judged to be signs of tradition or the redactional work of Mark.

It is interesting that the story of Jesus' teaching about the destruction of the Temple and the End (13:3-37) has been written according to the shortest form of the pattern (V2S), as can be seen in the following abbreviation of the narrative:

Set. \[ \text{3Kai kathimevoν autoj elis to } "\text{OroS taw } '\text{ElaioN} \text{ kata}\acute{\nu}νται toj 'Ieroj} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{epirwta autoj kat'} \text{ idiaN Pteros} \\
\text{kai } '\text{Iakwboς} \\
\text{kai } '\text{Iw} \acute{\alpha}ννης \\
\text{kai } '\text{Andreias} \\
\text{Eitov } \acute{\eta}μιν πoτε ταυτa } \acute{\xi}σται \\
\text{καj } \text{tj } \text{toj } \text{σημειον } \text{dian } \text{μελλη ταυτa } \text{συντελεσθαι } \text{παντα)}b
\end{align*} \]

Sit. \[ \begin{align*}
\text{repS. } \text{5o de } '\text{I} \acute{\iota} \text{soiS } \text{h} \acute{\epsilon}ξατo } \text{l} \acute{e}γειn } \text{autojS} \\
\text{Bleπete ktl.} \end{align*} \text{(vv. 5-37)} \]

In v. 3a the reference to the location of Jesus on the Mount of Olives opposite the Temple is the setting statement, and the question of the disciples in vv. 3b-4 is the occasion of the story. Their question is twofold, and the second part of the question has two dimensions to it. They want to know (a) when the destruction of the Temple will occur, and (b1) what will be the
sign \((b^2)\) when all things will come to an end. In broad lines vv. 5-37 are presented as Jesus' reply: (a) a period of suffering with Messianic pretenders (vv. 5-8) and painful witness (vv. 9-13) will culminate in serious days of affliction and upheaval when 'the abomination of desolation' is evident in the Temple (vv. 14-20); \((b^1)\) preceding the end of all things will be the appearance of false Christs and false prophets (vv. 21-23), but the true sign will be the coming of the Son of Man, who will gather the Elect (vv. 24-27); and \((b^2)\) the End is near (vv. 28-31), but only God knows when the Son of Man will come (vv. 32-37). The story thus has V2S narrative structure—the same as that in 12:41-44 and 13:1f.—and \(ab a + b\) thematic structure, in which Jesus' discourse answers the several dimensions of the question of the disciples in v. 4.

As indicated above in the brief résumé of Jesus' discourse, His reply to the question of the disciples consists of seven sections (vv. 5-8, 9-13, 14-20, 21-23, 24-27, 28-31, 32-37). These sections are delimited not simply on topical grounds but primarily on the fact that each section exhibits some form of the narrative pattern. The following description of the pattern in the seven sections is offered as a fresh understanding of the structure of Jesus' discourse.

---

500 See C. E. B. Cranfield, 'St. Mark 13', Part I, Scottish Journal of Theology, VI (1953), 195-6. Cranfield correctly recognizes that the double question pertains to the destruction of the Temple and the sign of the End but does not see that the second part of the question has two dimensions that are considered in turn in the \(b\) part of Jesus' reply. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1963), pp. 260-2. Manson sees vv. 32-37 as 'an appendix' (p. 261) that may 'represent the original answer of Jesus to the question put to him in v. 4' (p. 262, n.), and so limit the end of the Little Apocalypse at v. 31. See also Marxsen, Mark the Evangelist, p. 168, who like Cranfield rightly perceives the two-part question but does not detect the two issues of the second part of the question. Cf. John A. T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1957), p. 121, who maintains that the disciples' question in v. 4 refers only to the destruction of the Temple.

The first section (vv. 5-8) has rather irregular FPS structure:

\[\text{Verse 5a marks the beginning of the discourse, and v. 5b is an injunction that introduces the section. This injunction, however, is thematically related to v. 6 and is possibly an inverted reply-to-the-situation statement that pertains to v. 6, which is part of the situation statement. Together, vv. 6-7a are}\]

---

descriptive of the situation: (1) the appearance of Messianic imposters and (2) the hearing of news and rumours of wars. Verse 7b indicates a proper response to the situation: one should not be alarmed, since these things are necessary. This reply-to-the-situation statement closes with the comment that the End is not yet. In v. 8 Jesus' prediction of political strife, earthquakes, and famines is a problem section, which ends with the comment that these things are the first pangs of suffering. There is no reply-to-the-problem section; and this absence, together with the possible inversion of a reply-to-the-situation statement, makes the pattern structure quite irregular in this first section of the discourse.

Regular FPL form is apparent in the second section of the discourse (vv. 9-13):

Reps.? { 9βλέπετε δὲ ύμεις ἑαυτοὺς
   παραδώσουσιν ύμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια
   καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς διαρήσεσθε
   καὶ ἐπὶ ἤγεμονών καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε
   ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ
   εἰς μαρτύριον ἑαυτῶν
Sit.}  
10καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐννη πρῶτον
   δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον
11καὶ ὅταν ἤγγισιν ύμᾶς παραδώσουσι
   μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τὴ λαλήσει
Reps.}  
12ἀλλὰ ἐὰν δοθῇ ύμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ
   τοῦτο λαλεῖτε
   οὐ γὰρ ἔστε ύμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες
   ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀγιὸν
13καὶ παραδώσει ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον εἰς θάνατον
   καὶ παθήρ τέκνου
   καὶ ἐπαναστήσεσθαι τέκνα ἐπὶ γυνεῖς
   καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτοὺς
Prob.}  
14καὶ ἔσεσθαι μισοδέμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων
   διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου
15ὅ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος
RepP.}  
16σώθησαι.
The section begins in v. 9a with an injunction to take heed, which in this instance appears to be more a general plea for caution than a possible reply-to-the-situation statement. Verses 9b-11a portray various situations of persecution that are in store for those who witness to Jesus.503 This situation statement also contains references to various settings (εἰς συνέδρια, εἰς συναγωγάς, εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη). Verse 11b (μὴ ἰδοὺ), which indicates how witnesses to Jesus are to reply in the face of persecution, is the reply-to-the-situation statement. This section ends with an explanatory comment about the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Verses 12-13a have the air of a problem section in their portrayal of hostility and persecution unto death. The remark in v. 13b about whoever endures to the End is a reply-to-the-problem section, and the note in v. 13c about his being saved is a consequence statement. Taylor observes that 13:9-13 'consists wholly of sayings',504 but it is also true that these sayings manifest the pattern of narration that is evident in the stories of Mark's Gospel. This section thus has narrative structure even though it contains only sayings.505

The third section (vv. 14-20) displays the FFS form of the narrative pattern:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{14\text{εἶπαν δὲ ἡμὶν τὸ βοῶπα τῆς ἐρημώσεως} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{ἐπισημάτα ὧκου οὐ δεῖ} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{o ἀναγινωσκόν νοεῖσθω} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{εὐαγγέλισαν εἰς τὰ ὅρια} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad 15\text{δὲ [δὲ] ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου μὴ καταβάτω} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{μὴ ἐξερχόμενος ὥσπερ} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{τὸ εἰς τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ} \\
\text{RepS.} & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{16καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸν ἄγρον} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{μὴ ἐπιστρέφατο εἰς τὰ ὅπλα} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{ἄρα τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ}
\end{align*}
\]

503See Cranfield, Saint Mark, p. 397.
504Taylor, G.M., p. 505.
The reference in v. 14a to the presence of 'the abomination of desolation' is the situation statement, which includes the comment that is addressed to the reader. Verses 14b-18, which tell of proper responses, are the reply-to-the-situation statement. In this section v. 17 appears as a comment. Verse 19 is the problem section in its allusion to days of extreme tribulation, and v. 20 tells of a divine reply to the problem: the Lord's shortening the days for the sake of the Elect.

FPS structure is apparent also in vv. 21-23, the fourth section of the discourse:

Set. \{^{21a}\text{καὶ} \text{τότε} \}

Sit. \{ \text{δὲ} \text{έδω} \text{τις} \text{μὴν} \text{εἶπη} \\
\text{"Ιδε} \text{δὲ} \text{ο} \text{χριστός} \\
\text{"Ιδε} \text{έκει} \}

RepS. \{ \text{σμὴ} \text{πιστεῦετε} \}

Prob. \{^{22}\text{ἐγερθήσονται} \text{γὰρ} \text{φευγόχριστοι} \\
\text{καὶ} \text{φευγόπροφηται} \\
\text{καὶ} \text{δόξασυν} \text{σημεῖα} \text{καὶ} \text{τέρατα} \\
\text{πρὸς} \text{τὸ} \text{ἀκοπλανάν} \\
\text{εἰ} \text{δυναντῖν} \\
\text{τοὺς} \text{ἐκλεκτούς} \}

RepP. \{^{23}\text{ὑμεῖς} \text{δὲ} \text{βλέπετε} \\
\text{προείρηκα} \text{ὑμῖν} \text{πάντα} \}.
The brief temporal note καὶ τότε in v. 21a is the setting statement, and v. 21b depicts a situation: unfounded reports of the appearance of the Christ. In v. 21c the command not to believe is a reply-to-the-situation statement that gives guidance on how to respond to the false reports. Verse 22 is the problem section, which refers to the coming of false Christs and false prophets who will attempt to deceive the Elect. The injunction in v. 23a to take heed indicates a proper response to the problematical activities of the false figures and is thus a reply-to-the-problem section, which ends with Jesus' comment about forewarning. The narrative pattern is thus quite regular in this particular section of the discourse.

The VIΣ form of the pattern is evident in vv. 24-27, which may therefore be regarded as the fifth section of the discourse:

Set. {24} ἄλλα ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις
metὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκεῖναν

Sit. {25)ο ἤλιος σκοτισθήσεται
καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς
καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἀποτελοῦνται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πλέοντες
καὶ οἱ δύναμες αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται

Prob. {26} καὶ τότε ὄφωνται τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις
metὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ ὁξιᾶς

RepP. {27} καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἄγγελους
καὶ ἐπισυναχθεῖ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς [αὐτοῦ]
ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων
ἂπ᾿ ἀκροὺ γῆς
ἐις ἀκροὺ οὐρανοῦ.

In v. 24a the temporal reference to those days after the period of tribulation is the setting statement, and vv. 24b-25 portray a situation of celestial upheaval: (1) the darkening of the sun and moon, and (2) the disruption of stars and heavenly bodies. There is no reply-to-the-situation statement. Instead there is the saying in v. 26 about the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds with great power and glory. This saying may be thought of as a problem
section, particularly in the light of the corresponding passage in vv. 32-37 (v. 36) in which the coming of the 'lord of the house' is pictured as problematical for those who are found sleeping. Verse 27 has the appearance of a reply-to-the-problem section in its reference to the divine acts of sending the angels and gathering the Elect.

Verses 28-31 are a sixth section, which has FPL structure:

Com. \{^{28a}\text{καὶ ἡ ἐκφύη τὰ φύλλα} \}

Sit. \{^{28}\text{διὰ τὴς σφηκῆς μέθετε τὴν παραβολὴν} \}

RepS. \{^{30}\text{γενόμενα} \}

Prob. \{^{29\text{οὗτος καὶ ὑμεῖς}} \}

RepP. \{^{30}\text{γενόμενα} \}

Cons. \{^{31}\text{οὐφανδὶ καὶ ἡ γενεά ἡ γενεά αὐτὴ μέχρις ὧν τὰτα πάντα γένηται} \}

At the beginning of the section in v. 28a is an injunction to learn a parable from the fig tree. The remark in v. 28b about the condition of the leaves is a situation statement; and v. 28c, which calls for the response of knowing that summer is near, is a reply-to-the-situation statement. Verse 29a (οὗτος ... γενόμενα) is a problem section in that it alludes to those events that will precede the coming of the Son of Man. This interpretation is supported by the fact that v. 29a appears at that location where in the other sections in Jesus' discourse there is some reference to a problem or threat. 506 Verse 29b is a reply-to-the-problem section that is parallel to the reply-to-the-situation statement in v. 28c. The section ends in vv. 30f. with a saying

506 See 13:8, 12f., 19, 22, 26, 36.
of Jesus that has the appearance of a consequence statement in its affirmation that the forthcoming, final events shall come to pass.

Irregular FPS structure is apparent in vv. 32-37, the seventh and last section in Jesus' discourse:

Set. { 32περὶ δὲ τῆς ἠμέρας ἐκείνης
             ἦ τῆς ὕματος
            οὐδεὶς οἶδεν
            οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ
            εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ

Sit. 33βλέπετε
       ἀγρυπνεῖτε
       οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρὸς ἐστίν
       34ὡς ἀνθρωποὶ ἀπόδημοι ἄφετος τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ
       καὶ δοῦς τοῖς δοῦλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν
       ἐκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ
       καὶ τῷ θυρωρίῳ ἐνετελέσατο ἵνα γρηγορῆῃ

RepS. 35γρηγορεῖτε οὖν
       οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται
             ἦ ὁφι
             ἣ μεσονύκτιον
             ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας
             ἢ πρωΐ

RepP. 36μὴ ἐλθῶν ἐξαίφνης
       εὐρη ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας

Prob. 37ὃ δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω
        πᾶσιν λέγω
        γρηγορεῖτε.

The reference to that day or the hour in v. 32a is a temporal setting statement, and the remainder of the verse is a situation statement in its description of the state of affairs in which only the Father is knowledgeable. Verses 33f. are a reply-to-the-situation statement, which calls for the responses of taking heed and being watchful. The section ends with an explanatory comment about not knowing the time. At v. 35 the pattern becomes irregular with the presentation in v. 35 of a reply (γρηγορεῖτε οὖν) and an explanatory comment before the problem section in v. 36: the statement about the threat of the lord
of the house coming and finding people sleeping. Verse 37 appears as a final comment at the end of vv. 32-37.

Thus Jesus' reply-to-the-situation statement in 13:5-37 consists of seven sections that display in themselves various forms of the narrative pattern—a rather striking example of the pattern within the pattern. The pattern is not always regular in these seven sections, nor is the pattern always as clear as it generally is in the other stories of Mark's Gospel, but the pattern is nevertheless evident from section to section. It is apparent that Jesus' discourse is not simply an arrangement of groups of sayings but rather a presentation of seven groups which individually display the pattern of narration that is evident in the other stories of Mark's Gospel. One must think of narrative structure when considering Jesus' eschatological discourse. Any sharp distinction here between sayings and stories is bound to be misleading.

The seven groups of sayings do not merely display separately some form of the narrative pattern; the groups resemble each other structurally with regard to the order of their content. (1) Five of the sections (vv. 5-8, 9-13, 14-20, 21-23, 28-31) begin with some verb or pronoun reference to the disciples. Three of the sections open with a temporal setting statement (vv. 21-23, 24-27, 32-37). (2) There is then a situation statement that is sometimes Christological (in vv. 5-8, 9-13, 21-23; cf. ἁλίτος in vv. 32-37) but always negative in character (in vv. 5-8: the leading astray of many in the name of Jesus; 9-13: the painful witness of the disciples for the sake of Jesus; 14-20: the manifestation of the abomination of desolation; 21-23: the claims of the presence of false Christs; 24-27: the signs of turmoil in the heavens; 28-31:

507Cf. Nineham, *Saint Mark*, p. 358, who regards vv. 28-37 as a group of sayings that have been arranged artificially on the basis of catchwords.
the tenderness of the leaves; and 32-37: the ignorance about the day or the hour). There is some question here whether the tenderness of the leaves in vv. 28-31 is negative in character, but contextually it is related to the nearness of a sudden disclosure of the Son of Man, which is negative in character for those who are not watching. Also, it is noteworthy that four of the situation statements (in vv. 5-8, 9-13, 14-20, 28-31) begin with διαν. (3) There is next a reply-to-the-situation statement that presents negative directions with μη (in vv. 5-8, 9-13, 14-20, 21-23) or statements about the disciples' knowing or seeing (in vv. 28-31, 32-37). In four instances the reply-to-the-situation statement ends with a comment (in vv. 5-8, 9-13, 14-20, 32-37). (4) A problem section is then presented, which is negative in character. The section in vv. 5-8 pictures nation against nation, kingdom against kingdom, earthquakes, and famines. The problem section in vv. 9-13 speaks of brother against brother, father against son, and children against parents. The corresponding section in vv. 14-20 refers to days of tribulation, and in the same location in vv. 21-23 there is mention of false Christs, false prophets, and signs and wonders to lead astray the Elect. At the same point in vv. 24-27 the coming of the Son of Man with power and glory corresponds antithetically with the dubious ability of the false Christs to lead astray the Elect with signs and wonders. In vv. 28-31 the problem section alludes to all the negative things that will happen; and the corresponding section in vv. 32-37 points to the sudden coming of the Lord of the house and the threat of being found sleeping. (5) There is then a reply-to-the-problem section that tells either of an activity on the part of the disciples (in vv. 9-13: their enduring to the End; in 21-23, 32-37: their watching508) or

508It will be recalled that in vv. 32-37 the order of the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections is inverted.
of a divine act (in vv. 14-20: cutting short the days; in 24-27: sending angels and gathering the Elect). (6) In two instances (in vv. 9-13, 28-31) the pattern ends with a consequence statement; and three of the seven sections close with a comment (in vv. 5-8, 21-23, 32-37). In vv. 21-23, 28-31, and 32-27, Jesus addresses His disciples.

The structural resemblance of the seven sections is striking in their presentation of similar ideas in the same order. Especially conspicuous is the ὅταν ... μὴ ... ἀλλὰ ... γὰρ sequence in vv. 5-8, 9-13, and 14-20 (where there is δὲ instead of ἀλλὰ) and the movement of thought through the pattern to a statement about salvation (in vv. 9-13, 14-20), the Elect (in vv. 14-20, 21-23, 24-27), and a forewarning of Jesus (in vv. 21-23, 28-31, 32-37). Also noteworthy is the use of certain vocabulary at approximately the same location within the sections. Of interest is (1) the recurrence of δὲ in vv. 5-8, 9-13, 14-20, which indicates that its use in v. 10 is not unusual; (2) the presence of γῆ and οὐφανῶς in vv. 24-27, 28-31; and (3) the parallel relationship between γίνασκετε in vv. 28-31 and οἴδατε in vv. 32-37.

Another interesting structural feature is the fact that the overall shape of some of the sections reflects the order of ideas in the disciples' request in v. 4: Εἰδὼν ἡμῖν ἐστε τὰῦτα ἐσταί, καὶ πᾶς τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα. (1) In connection with Εἰδὼν ἡμῖν are to be seen the second person plural verbs and pronouns that appear at the beginning of sections 5-8, 9-13, 14-20, 21-23, 28-31, and 32-37. (2) With regard to τὸ σημεῖον are to be seen the false and anticipatory signs presented in the situation statements: the false claimants in 5-8; the hardships of the disciples in 9-13; the abomination of desolation in 14-20; the false Christs in 21-23; the upheaval of the heavens in 24-27. These signs lead up to the appearance of 'the sign' in 24-27: the coming of the Son of Man—the sign
that all these things will be brought to completion with the salvation of the Elect. (3) As for the word ὅταν, it is used four times in situation statements and once in a problem section (vv. 28-31). (4) The phrase τά αὐτά συντελεῖσθαι τάντα is mirrored by the thematic concerns of the reply-to-the-problem sections and final comments (the use of 'these things', 'all', 'the end', 'saved', 'the Elect', and the passing away of heaven and earth). Such orderliness in the presentation of ideas is evident in the thematic structure of many of Mark's narratives.\(^5\)

The overall V2S narrative structure of 13:3-37, the \(ab\ a + b\) thematic structure of 13:4-37, the presence of the pattern in seven discernible sections of Jesus' discourse in vv. 5-37, the structural resemblance of these sections, and the correspondence between the order of ideas in these sections and the order of thought in the question of the disciples in v. 4, together suggest that Mark, whose other narratives display similar features of order and regularity, was responsible for arranging 13:3-37 as a whole, and that he even bore some responsibility for shaping the sections within Jesus' discourse in vv. 5-37. Such structural features in 13:3-37 cast a shadow over the view that Mark 13, or some portion of it,\(^6\) was a pre-Markan apocalypse that Mark simply incorporated into his Gospel. Whatever were the sources of the material in Mark 13,\(^7\) Mark has structured the material in an orderly fashion.

The orderliness of Mark's presentation becomes further evident in a look at Matthew and Luke. A detailed discussion of the similarities and differences

\(^5\)\textit{See Part III below, pp. 471-515.}

\(^6\)\textit{See Beasley-Murray, pp. 15-6, for a summary of various opinions about the contents of an 'earlier apocalypse'.}

\(^7\)\textit{To maintain that Mark arranged and composed 13:3-37 is, of course, not to deny that the discourse may be composite. See Hunter, \textit{The Gospel according to Saint Mark}, p. 123.}
between 13:3-37 and the parallels in Matthew and Luke goes beyond the bounds of this dissertation, whose main purpose is to point out the structure of Mark's narratives as they now stand in his Gospel. Several observations can be made, however, about Matthew's and Luke's versions of Jesus' discourse.512

The order of material is essentially the same in Matthew's parallels to Mk. 13:5-8 (see Mt. 24:4-8), 13:14-20 (Mt. 24:15-22), 13:21-23 (Mt. 24:23-25), 13:24-27 (Mt. 24:29-31), and 13:28-31 (Mt. 24:32-34); but Matthew's presentation has different order in his parallels to Mk. 13:9-13 (cf. Mt. 24:9-14 and 10:17-22) and 13:32-37 (cf. Mt. 24:36, 25:14f., 24:42, 25:13). Matthew also adds material in 24:26-28 (cf. Luke 17:23f.) after his parallel to Mk. 13:21-23. In this parallel of Matthew there is no reply-to-the-problem section. In general, when Matthew agrees closely with Mark in content, the pattern is evident in Matthew's parallels except for an occasional minor change; but when Matthew presents unique material or material that is shared with Luke, the pattern does not appear with the purity that is found in Mark's account.

Luke's parallels to the sections of Jesus' discourse in Mark's Gospel show a greater variety of treatment. One of Luke's parallels (Lk. 21:29-33) has essentially the same pattern structure as Mark's section (Mk. 13:28-31). Another parallel (Lk. 21:7-11, cf. Mk. 13:5-8) has only minor alterations. In two parallels (Lk. 21:12-19, cf. Mk. 13:9-13; Lk. 21:25-28, cf. Mk. 13:24-27) there is a tendency for Luke's versions to have the same structure in spite of much different content. Possibly these two parallels are instances which illustrate the inertia of structure that persists in the hands of a redactor who is more interested in content than the order of content. In another

512For a basic description of the parallels see Beare, pp. 216-7.
parallel (Lk. 21:20-24, cf. Mk. 13:14-20), however, the pattern is altered with the addition of new material: a consequence statement, making the pattern long, is provided with the addition of new material in Lk. 21:24. With regard to two sections in Mark's version of the discourse (Mk. 13:21-23, cf. Lk. 17:23f., 37b; Mk. 13:23-37, cf. Lk. 21:34-38), Luke's parallel material is considerably different both in content and pattern structure.

The high degree of regularity of the pattern in Mark's sections of Jesus' discourse is conspicuous in comparison with the parallels of Matthew and Luke. One is encouraged to hold that Mark was somewhat responsible for the regularity and clarity of the pattern in his version of the discourse, especially since the pattern is for the most part clearest and most regular in the other stories of Mark's Gospel in comparison with Matthew and Luke.

The possibility that the narrative pattern was a traditional pattern that Jesus could have used, raises the question whether the pattern in the sections of Jesus' discourse is a reflection of Jesus' own use of the pattern and not altogether Mark's handiwork. One can only consider possibilities with this question. It is intriguing to think that the pattern structure of the sections possibly echoes some earlier use of the pattern by Jesus in His teaching, but it seems best to attribute much of the order that is evident in 13:3-37 to Mark on the grounds that a concern for an orderly presentation is apparent in many of his other stories in comparison with Matthew and Luke.

Once these structural characteristics of 13:5-37 are recognized, it becomes difficult to accept Taylor's hypothesis of compilation from various sources through insertion and addition. According to Taylor, the Discourse is a compilation of four groups of sayings: (A) Signs Preceding the Parousia

---

(vv. 5-8, 24-7), which was possibly a Jewish-Christian apocalypse, liturgical poem, or early Christian sermon; (B) Sayings on Persecution (9-13), which were compiled at Rome; (C) The Abomination of Desolation (14-23), which was a group of sayings from Jerusalem; and (D) Sayings and Parables on Watchfulness (28-37), compiled by Mark to encourage watchfulness.\textsuperscript{514} Taylor suggests that Mark broke A into two parts, inserted B and C, and then added D, using various editorial links at 8c, 9a, and 24a in the process of compiling the Discourse.\textsuperscript{515}

It has been shown that 13:5-37 does not consist merely of groups of sayings but of sayings that are presented according to the narrative pattern within recognizable sections. It is precisely the presence of the narrative pattern which makes it possible to evaluate with some objectivity Taylor's hypothetical groups. With regard to Group A, it is difficult to accept the theory that vv. 5-8 and 24-27 were once one group of sayings, for 5-8 and 24-27 individually have narrative structure which resembles that of 9-13, 14-20, and 21-23. Taylor's Group C also is formally two sections instead of one; 14-20 and 21-23 separately have structure which resembles that of 5-8, 9-13, and 24-27, with some similarity with the last two sections, 28-31 and 32-27. These last two sections stand against Taylor's view that Group D is one unit within the Discourse, for both 28-31 and 32-37 have individual narrative form.

Taylor's theory seems based almost solely on considerations of content, not structure. He apparently does not see that the sections, 5-8, 9-13, 14-20, 21-23, 24-27, 28-31, and 32-37, resemble each other structurally with regard to the order of the content within the sections. This formal resem-

\textsuperscript{514}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 638-42.

\textsuperscript{515}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 642-3.
blance presents the main difficulty for the theory of compilation from various sources. One wants to ask why the sections resemble each other in structure if the sections within vv. 5-37 came from sources of different origin. The fact that the sections have similar structure suggests that they are not of different origin so far as their present literary state is concerned. If the content did come from different sources, Mark did more than just bring the traditions together through insertion, addition, and the provision of occasional links; he shaped the sections according to the narrative pattern, which he used with considerable regularity in his Gospel. His work of redaction was composition in conformity with the pattern, not just compilation.

The subsequent story about the plot of the chief priests and scribes (14:1f.) is the last narrative with regular V2S structure:

Set. \{ \begin{align*}
& \text{Hv \ δε τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄχμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας} \\
& \text{καὶ ἐξήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς} \\
& \text{πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν ὀξυφρόνῃ κρατήσαντες} \\
& \text{ἀποκτείνωσιν}
\end{align*}\}

Sit. \{ \begin{align*}
& \text{2ξελεγον γάρ} \\
& \text{Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἐορτῇ} \\
& \text{μὴποτε ἔσται ἄρμος τοῦ λαοῦ.}
\end{align*}\}

The note in v. 1 a about the feast of the Passover and the unleavened bread is a temporal setting statement, and the remark in v. 1 b about the quest of the leaders for a way to seize and kill Jesus is the situation statement. Verse 2 is an explanatory comment but serves as a reply-to-the-situation statement in its reference to what the leaders were saying. With V2S narrative structure, 14:1f. may be regarded as a story in itself.\textsuperscript{516}

The regularity of the pattern in Mark’s account stands in contrast with the pattern in Matthew’s version (Mt. 26:1-5), where the reference to the

Passover is presented within a reply-to-the-situation statement (vv. 1b-2) that precedes V2S narrative structure in vv. 3-5. This irregularity accompanies Matthew's presentation of unique material in vv. 1f. Luke's parallel (Lk. 22:1f.) has irregular structure through the absence of a reply-to-the-situation statement that is occasioned by the alteration of the explanatory comment to refer to the fear of the leaders instead of their speech. Only Mark's account, therefore, has regular V2S structure.

As indicated at the outset of the presentation of the V2S narratives, one of the thirteen regular stories has extended form. Brief consideration may now be given to this particular story.

Regular form extended. Generally in Mark's Gospel the pattern is extended through developments of the problem section with replies to these developments. A less frequent manner of extension is the presentation of some indication of a response which is then followed by a continuation of the reply section that has been interrupted.517 Such extension is evident in the V2S story about the Last Supper (14:22-25):

Sit.  
\{^{22}Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν

\begin{align*}
\text{λαβὼν} & \text{ ἄρτον} \\
\text{εὐλογήσας} & \text{ ἐκλάσας} \\
& \text{καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς} \\
& \text{καὶ ἔτεν} \\
\text{λάβετε} & \text{τοῦτο ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα μου}
\end{align*}

RepS.  
\{^{23}καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον \\
\text{εὐχαριστήσας} \\
& \text{ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς}
\}

Resp.  
\{ καὶ ἔκλειον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες\}

517See, for example, the extension of the pattern in 6:35-44, pp. 183-4 above.
The story lacks a setting statement, possibly because the scene of 14:17-21 was understood as the setting for the events of vv. 22-25. Without a setting statement, the story begins with a situation statement in v. 22a: the phrase that indicates that Jesus and His disciples were eating. Verse 22b marks the beginning of Jesus' reply to the situation. His reply, which is both nonverbal and verbal, is interrupted by a remark in v. 23b about the disciples' drinking from the cup. After this response statement Jesus' reply is continued in vv. 24f. and brings the story to a close. With such extended V2S structure vv. 22-25 may legitimately be thought of as a narrative in itself.

Both Matthew and Luke have regular V2S form without extension. Matthew presents the reference to the disciples' drinking as a part of Jesus' command (Mt. 26:27). Luke's account (Lk. 22:15-20) also has no indication of a response of the disciples but merely presents in v. 17 Jesus' command to the disciples to divide the cup among themselves. Luke also prefaces his account with a setting statement in v. 14a.

The last story to be illustrated has irregular V2S form and is also discussed briefly.

**Irregular form.** The one V2S narrative that has irregular form is the story of Jesus' warning about the scribes (12:38-40):

\[\text{Sit.} \text{?} \quad \text{Εξέγεν} \]

\[\text{Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν ἡσυχῶν ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἄσπασμος ἐν ταῖς ἁγοραῖς}\]
There is no setting statement and the story begins in v. 38a with only the hint of a situation statement. The lack of a clear situation statement makes the form irregular. Taylor prefers to include v. 37b as the beginning of this story. If it should be the opening of the story, the reference to the crowd would make a conceivable situation statement and render the form regular. It seems best, however, to regard v. 37b as a consequence statement to the preceding story on the basis of the theme of hearing, which is a feature of several consequence statements. For the most part, the story is a reply-to-the-situation statement.

For a summary of the discussion of the V2S narratives, they may be listed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V2S NARRATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Regular Form</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:14f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:13-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30f. (no set.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:32-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:41-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:1f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:3-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:1f.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2. Regular Form Extended** |
| 14:22-25 (no set.) | PS | L | S |

| **3. Irregular Form** |
| 12:38-40 (no set.) | EP/EX | MS | SY |

---


519 See above, p. 115.
Except for several stories that lack setting statements, the V2S stories have in common setting-situation-reply structure, which is not a different structure but an abbreviated form of the narrative pattern. Such structure is not found in any one form-critical class of narratives but appears in several different kinds of stories according to the classifications of Dibelius, Bultmann, and Taylor. Whatever labels are given to the V2S stories, they have essentially the same structure.

Although most of the V2S narratives are comparatively short, there is no necessary connection between V2S structure and brevity, for such structure is evident in the longest story of Mark's Gospel (13:3-37).

With one exception the order of the sections of the V2S stories is regular. Only one of the regular stories has extended structure, and the extension occurs through a response statement. Once again the regularity of the pattern is striking.

The regularity of the pattern in Mark's V2S stories is a further manifestation of pattern regularity that has been conspicuous in most of Mark's other stories. Such regularity stands in contrast with some of the parallels of Matthew and Luke, whose versions tend to display the pattern with less purity when unique or shared (Q) material is presented.

The frequency of pattern regularity in Mark's V2S stories in comparison with Matthew and Luke is further evidence which suggests that Mark himself was responsible for the regularity of the pattern in his stories. The presence of the pattern in sayings of Jesus raises once more the interesting question of whether Mark's presentation reflects an earlier use of the pattern by Jesus. One, however, can only speculate about Jesus' use of the pattern. If Mark is to be credited with responsibility for the regularity of the pattern in his stories, it seems likely that he also was somewhat responsible
for the *regularity* of the pattern when it appears in sayings of Jesus. Such a conclusion does not preclude some earlier use of the pattern by Jesus but does hold Mark largely responsible for the regularity of the pattern in Jesus' sayings in Mark's presentation of the material.

The laborious task of illustrating the narrative structure of Mark's stories comes to an end with the summary of the discussion of the V2S narratives. At the risk of being unduly repetitive, it is fitting to summarize at this point the findings of the discussion of all six forms of the narrative pattern.

**Summary**

All the stories in Mark's Gospel have essentially the same narrative structure. They have been told according to one fundamental pattern of narration that in its fullest form consists of seven sections: setting, situation, reply to the situation, problem, reply to the problem, result, and consequence. Not all the narratives manifest all these sections. Instead, most of the stories individually display one of five abbreviated forms of the Full Pattern. Inasmuch as the order of sections is the same both in the Full Pattern and its abbreviated forms, it is legitimate to think of one fundamental pattern of narration.

This pattern and its limited number of forms appear just as well in brief narratives as in long stories. There is no necessary correlation between any one form of the pattern and narrative length. The longest narrative (13:3-37) displays the shortest form (V2S) of the pattern, and the long form of the Full Pattern is evident in such a brief story as 11:12-14. The pattern also is just as evident in Passion Narrative stories as in stories in the rest of Mark's Gospel. The stories throughout Mark's Gospel have essentially
the same narrative structure.

The pattern serves as a useful criterion for identifying stories on the basis of their narrative structure. Eighty-six stories may be identified as having some form of the narrative pattern. Included among the eighty-six stories are passages that are commonly regarded as summary statements but manifest narrative structure no less than stories about specific events.

One is impressed by the regularity of the pattern in Mark's narratives. Seventy-four of the eighty-six stories (86%) have regular form; that is, their sections of the pattern appear in the proper order. Nineteen of the seventy-four regular stories are extended for the most part through developments of the problem and replies to these developments. Only twelve of the eighty-six stories have irregular structure generally through some dislocation of the order of sections or through some ambiguity. Five of the twelve irregular stories are extended as well as irregular. The method of extension is essentially the same as that in the regular stories. All the irregular stories yet manifest the pattern even when the pattern is irregular. There is really no story in Mark's Gospel which does not show the influence of the narrative pattern.

The regularity of the pattern in Mark's stories becomes further evident in the light of the parallels in Matthew and Luke. Matthew's stories often exhibit the same structure as Mark's stories when there is much verbal agreement with Mark, but the pattern frequently is different with the presence of unique material in Matthew's versions. Apparently Matthew's addition of material occasioned alterations of the pattern as it is found in Mark's accounts. Luke's parallels display a greater number of pattern irregularities and sometimes show the same tendency to have altered pattern structure with the addition of special material. Time and again the pattern is the most regular
and clearest in Mark's stories in comparison with Matthew and Luke. Such consistency provides grounds for attributing to Mark the clarity and regularity of the pattern in his stories.

Other features from time to time support the view that Mark himself was largely responsible for the regularity of the pattern in his stories. Such features are the step development of thought, orderliness in the presentation of ideas, the clustering of stories with the same form of the pattern, and the presence of the pattern within the pattern.

Another feature of interest is the presence of the pattern in sayings of Jesus, which raises the question of whether Jesus Himself ever used the pattern in His teaching. If so, it may further be asked whether the pattern in Jesus' sayings is a reflection of His earlier use of the pattern. While it is possible that Jesus did use the pattern in some ways in His teaching, it seems best to attribute to Mark the regularity and clarity of the pattern when it appears in Jesus' sayings.

Grounds for considering the possibility of Jesus' use of the pattern are to be found in the fact that the pattern and its various forms as they are known in Mark's Gospel are evident in narratives in the Old Testament. The presumption is that Jesus could have known of the pattern as a manner of storytelling through familiarity with the Scriptures and could have thus assimilated the pattern within His teaching. The next and last section of Part II is devoted to illustrating in English some Old Testament stories that display the narrative pattern in the forms that are found in Mark's Gospel.

III. THE ILLUSTRATION OF THE NARRATIVE PATTERN IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

This portion of the dissertation is essentially a presentation of a small selection of Old Testament stories that display the various forms of the narra-
tive pattern that are evident in the stories of Mark's Gospel. The selection is not based on an exhaustive study of the narratives in the Old Testament. Such a study lies beyond the limits of this dissertation and for a thorough investigation requires the attention of someone who is at home with the narrative traditions of the Hebrew Old Testament. The present selection arises instead from a reading of some of the narratives in the Old Testament for representative examples to illustrate the fact that the narrative pattern and its forms that are evident in Mark's stories are apparent in certain narratives of the Old Testament. It should be understood that the illustrations are a choice selection of examples that exhibit the various forms of the pattern most clearly. The pattern does not appear everywhere in the Old Testament; and when the pattern is evident, it is not always so clear and regular.

The long form of the Full Pattern is evident in certain stories from the Pentateuch. One example is the story about the prophesying of Eldad and Medad (Num. 11:26-30):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{Now two men remained in the camp,} \\
\quad \text{one named Eldad,} \\
\quad \text{and the other named Medad,}
\end{array} \right. \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\quad \text{and the spirit rested upon them;} \\
\quad \text{they were among those registered,} \\
\quad \text{but they had not gone out to the tent,} \\
\quad \text{and so they prophesied in the camp.}
\end{array} \right. \\
\text{RepS.} & \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\quad \text{And a young man ran and told Moses,} \\
\quad \quad \text{"Eldad and Medad are prophesying in the camp."}
\end{array} \right. \\
\text{Prob.} & \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\quad \text{And Joshua the son of Nun,} \\
\quad \quad \text{the minister of Moses,} \\
\quad \quad \text{one of his chosen men,} \\
\quad \quad \text{said, "My lord Moses, forbid them."}
\end{array} \right. \\
\text{RepP.} & \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\quad \text{But Moses said to him,} \\
\quad \quad \text{"Are you jealous for my sake:} \\
\quad \quad \text{Would that all the LORD'S people were prophets,} \\
\quad \quad \text{that the LORD would put his spirit upon them!"}
\end{array} \right. \\
\text{Cons.} & \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\quad \text{And Moses and the elders of Israel returned to the camp.}
\end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
\]
The story begins in v. 26a with a setting statement that locates the action "in the camp". \(^{520}\) Verse 26b, which tells of the prophesying of the two men, is the situation statement. In v. 27 the young man's report to Moses about the prophesying is a reply-to-the-situation statement. Joshua's complaint to Moses in v. 28 is a problem section that resembles some problem sections in Mark's narratives. \(^{521}\) Moses' reply to Joshua's problematical remark is given in v. 29, and v. 30 is a consequence statement about the return to camp.

In addition to FPL narrative structure this story manifests \(a + b + c\) thematic structure, an inverted form of a type that is found in some of Mark's narratives. \(^{522}\) Such orderliness in the presentation of ideas is evident time and again in Mark's stories.

Another FPL narrative from the Pentateuch is the story about Esau's selling his birthright to Jacob (Gen. 25:29-34). The structure of this story is interesting, for the pattern is extended, as can be seen in the following arrangement of the story:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sit.} & \begin{cases}
\text{29}\text{Once when Jacob was boiling pottage,} \\
\text{29}\text{Esau came in from the field,} \\
\text{29}\text{and he was famished.}
\end{cases} \\
\text{Set.} & \begin{cases}
\text{30}\text{And Esau said to Jacob,} \\
\text{30}\text{"Let me eat some of that red pottage,} \\
\text{30}\text{for I am famished!"} \\
\text{30}\text{(Therefore his name was called Edom.)}
\end{cases} \\
\text{RepS.} & \begin{cases}
\text{31}\text{Jacob said,} \\
\text{31}\text{"First sell me your birthright."}
\end{cases} \\
\text{Prob.} & \begin{cases}
\text{32}\text{Esau said,} \\
\text{32}\text{"I am about to die;} \\
\text{32}\text{of what use is a birthright to me?"}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{520}\)The Revised Standard Version is used for this narrative and the forthcoming examples from the Old Testament.

\(^{521}\)See Mk. 8:32b, 9:38, 10:13b, 10:47f., p. 74 above.

\(^{522}\)See Type IV thematic structure below, pp. 500-4.
Jacob said, "Swear to me first."

So he swore to him, and sold his birthright to Jacob.

Then Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentils,

And he ate and drank, and rose and went his way.

Thus Esau despised his birthright.

In this story v. 29 is a fused setting and situation statement that refers both to some location ('came in from the field') and the occasion of the story: Jacob's cooking and Esau's hunger. Esau's exclamation in v. 30 is his response to the situation. This reply-to-the-situation statement ends with a comment about Edom, which calls to mind the comments that now and then appear after narrative sections in Mark's stories. In v. 31 Jacob's demand for the sale of Esau's birthright is the problem section, and Esau's reply is given in v. 32. Jacob's reiteration of the demand in v. 33a is a development of the problem, and Esau's acquiescent reply to this development is narrated in v. 33b. The remark in v. 34a about Jacob's giving the food to Esau has the appearance of a result statement, and v. 34b is a consequence statement that indicates a series of subsequent actions. The narrative ends with a concluding comment about Esau's attitude towards his birthright.

An additional feature of this story is the step development of thought that is apparent in conjunction with the narrative sections. The remark in the situation/setting statement that Esau was famished anticipates the content of his exclamation in the reply-to-the-situation statement. Each remaining section prepares the way for each subsequent section up to the closing comment in v. 34. Such closely knit progression of thought is a feature that has been
noted above a number of times in the discussion of the pattern in Mark's narratives.

FPL structure is evident in narratives of the historical books of the Old Testament. One example is the story of the reaction to Gideon's destruction of the altar of Baal (Judges 6:28-32):

Verse 28a is a temporal setting statement in its reference to early morning, and v. 28b portrays the situation: the wreckage of the altar of Baal and the Asherah. The men's reply to the situation is presented in v. 29. This
statement is a bit unusual in comparison with Mark's reply-to-the-situation statements, for here in v. 29 the statement contains within itself a question and an answer. In v. 30 the men's demand for the death of Gideon is the problem section, and v. 31 gives Joash's reply to the problem. The reference in v. 32a to the subsequent act of naming is a consequence statement, which ends with an explanatory comment in v. 32b. FPL structure is clearly present in this story.

The story of Elijah's call of Elisha (I Kings 19:19-21) is a FPL story:

Set. {19aSo he departed from there,

b and found Elisha the son of Shaphat,

who was plowing

Sit. 

with twelve yoke of oxen before him,

and he was with the twelfth.

RepS. { 0Elijah passed by him

and cast his mantle upon him.

Prob. { 20And he left the oxen,

and ran after Elijah,

and said,

"Let me kiss my father and my mother,

and then I will follow you."

RepP. { And he said to him,

"Go back again;

for what have I done to you?"

Cons. { 21And he returned from following him,

and took the yoke of oxen,

and slew them,

and boiled their flesh

with the yokes of the oxen,

and gave it to the people,

and they ate.

Then he arose

and went after Elijah,

and ministered to him.

After an itinerary setting statement in v. 19a, there is a statement in v. 19b that is descriptive of the situation: Elijah's encounter with Elisha and his oxen. Elijah's response of casting his mantle on Elisha is told in v. 19c
which is the reply-to-the-situation statement. The narration of Elisha's request in v. 20a is the problem section, and Elijah's reply is given in v. 20b. Verse 21, which tells of what took place afterwards, is the consequence statement.

Another FPL narrative is the story of Elisha's purification of the pottage (II Kings 4:38-41):

Set. (38c) And Elisha came again to Gilgal when there was a famine in the land.

Sit. And as the sons of the prophets were sitting before him, he said to his servant,

RepS. "Set on the great pot, and boil pottage for the sons of the prophets."

Resp. One of them went out into the field to gather herbs, and found a wild vine and gathered from it his lap full of wild gourds, and came and cut them up into the pot of pottage, not knowing what they were.

Prob. And they poured out for the men to eat.

But while they were eating of the pottage, they cried out, "O man of God, there is death in the pot!"

And they could not eat it.

He said, "Then bring meal!"

And he threw it into the pot, and said, "Pour out for the men, that they may eat."

And there was no harm in the pot.

In this story the note at the beginning of v. 38 about Elisha's return to Gilgal is the setting statement, and the remarks in v. 38b about the famine and the presence of the sons of the prophets are descriptive of the situation. Elisha's command to set out the great pot and boil pottage is his reply to the situation in v. 38c. Verses 39-40a tell of the response to Elisha's
command. This narration about the response is much longer than the response statements that are presented in several of Mark's extended narratives. The complaint in v. 40b that the pottage is deadly, together with the remark that it was inedible, is the problem section; and Elisha's reply—both verbal and nonverbal—is narrated in v. 41a. The brief indication in v. 41b that the food was no longer dangerous is a consequence statement, which brings the story to a close.

It is interesting that FPL structure is apparent also in the subsequent story about Elisha's feeding of the hundred (II Kings 4:42-44):

Set. {A man came from Baal-shalishah,

Sit. { bringing the man of God bread of the first fruits,  
       twenty loaves of barley,  
       and fresh ears of grain in his sack.

RepS. { And Elisha said,  
        "Give to the men,  
        that they may eat."

Prob. {But his servant said,  
        "How am I to set this before a hundred men?"

RepP. { So he repeated,  
        "Give them to the men,  
        that they may eat,  
        for thus says the LORD,  
        'They shall eat and have some left.'"

Res. {So he set it before them.

Cons. { And they ate,  
        and had some left,  
        according to the word of the LORD.

The story opens with a setting statement, then portrays a situation in which a man brings bread and grain to Elisha. The command of Elisha to give the bread to the men is his reply to the situation. Verse 43a, in which the servant expresses doubt about feeding a hundred men, is the problem section; and Elisha's reply is presented in v. 43b. The remark in v. 44a about the setting
of food before the men is the result statement, and v. 44b is a consequence statement that tells of their eating and of the surplus.

It is interesting that the scepticism of the servant is similar to that of Jesus' disciples in Mk. 6:37 and 8:4. The question is not simply one of a similar motif but of the presence of a similar motif at the same structural location within the various feeding stories. With regard to structure, it is also interesting that the two feeding stories in Mark's Gospel are likewise FPL narratives.

Also noteworthy is the fact that II Kings 4:38-41 and 42-44 are two adjacent stories that have FPL structure. The phenomenon of clustering has been noted above in Mark's presentation of his stories, and this feature is apparent in these two stories from II Kings, where the same form of the pattern occurs within two stories in a row.

Another FPL narrative is the story of Esther's petition for the hanging of the ten sons of Haman (Esther 9:11-15):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & \quad \{ ^{11}\text{That very day} \\
\text{Sit.} & \quad \{ \text{the number of those slain in Susa the capital} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{was reported to the king.} \\
\text{RepS.} & \quad \{ ^{12}\text{And the king said to Queen Esther,} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \{ ^{db}\text{In Susa the capital} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \{ ^{a}\text{the Jews have slain five hundred men} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \{ ^{c}\text{and also the ten sons of Haman.} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \{ ^{d}\text{What then have they done in the rest} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{of the king's provinces!} \\
\text{Prob.} & \quad \{ ^{13}\text{And Esther said,} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \text{"If it please the king,} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{let the Jews who are in Susa} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{be allowed tomorrow also}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{523}\text{See above, pp. 349-50.}\)
to do according to this day's edict.
And let the ten sons of Haman
be hanged on the gallows."

RepP. { 
14So the king commanded this to be done;
a decree was issued in Susa,

Res. { 
and the ten sons of Haman were hanged.

Cons. { 
15The Jews who were in Susa
gathered also on the fourteenth day of the month of Adar
and they slew three hundred men in Susa;
but they laid no hands on the plunder.

The story begins in v. 11a with a brief, temporal setting statement that indicates the day of the event, and v. 11b gives information about the situation: the report to the king of the number of those slain. Verse 12 presents the king's reply to the situation, in which he asks Esther whether she has a request. Her petition is narrated in v. 13 and is a problem section in its request that the ten dead sons of Haman be hanged on the gallows. The king's reply—his command that the request be fulfilled—is set forth in v. 14a, and the brief note that Haman's ten sons were hanged is a result statement. Verse 15 is a consequence statement that tells what the Jews did the next day.

An interesting feature in this story is that extended FPS structure is evident in the king's reply to the situation, providing an example of the pattern within the pattern. The note about Susa in v. 12b is a setting statement, and the reference in v. 12c to the slain men is descriptive of the situation. The remark in v. 12d about what the Jews have done elsewhere expresses the king's reaction to the situation. Verse 12e is a problem section in that it alludes to a possible petition of Esther instead of presenting the petition itself. Such a petition does appear in v. 13 as the problem section for the story as a whole. Verse 12f refers to a nonverbal response to the petition and is thus a miniature reply-to-the-problem section. The problem is developed in v. 12g with the possibility of an extension of the request, and
v. 12h points to a reply to this anticipated problem development. Thus in miniatura the movement of thought of extended FPS structure is apparent in the king's reply-to-the-situation statement. This feature calls to mind those instances in Mark's Gospel where the pattern within the pattern appears in sayings of Jesus in the reply-to-the-situation statement.524

FPL structure is evident also in the prophetical writings. One example is the story about the turning back of the sun (Isa. 38:1-8):

Set. {1aIn those days

Sit. { bHezekiah became sick
and was at the point of death.

cAnd Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz
 came to him,
 and said to him,

RepS. { "Thus says the LORD:
 Set your house in order;
 for you shall die,
 you shall not recover."

Prob. { 2Then Hezekiah turned his face to the wall,
 and prayed to the LORD,
 3and said,
 "Remember now, 0 LORD,
 I beseech thee,
 how I have walked before thee in faithfulness
 and with a whole heart,
 and have done what is good in thy sight."
 And Hezekiah wept bitterly.

"Then the word of the LORD came to Isaiah:
 5"Go and say to Hezekiah,
 Thus says the LORD,
 the God of David your father:
 I have heard your prayer,
 I have seen your tears;
 behold, I will add fifteen years to your life.

RepP. { 6I will deliver you and this city
 out of the hand of the king of Assyria,
 and defend this city.

"This is the sign to you from the LORD, that the LORD will do this thing that he has promised:

Behold, I will make the shadow cast by the declining sun on the dial of Ahaz turn back ten steps."

So the sun turned back on the dial the ten steps by which it had declined.

The pattern is quite clear in this story. After a brief temporal setting statement in v. 1a, there is a situation statement in v. 1b about the illness of Hezekiah. Isaiah's reply to the situation is given in v. 1c. Hezekiah's request in vv. 2f. is the problem section, and the Lord's reply to the problem is presented in vv. 4-8a. Verse 8b is a consequence statement in its reference to the subsequent turning back of the sun. This particular statement could just as well be thought of as a result statement, should the turning back of the sun be regarded as the immediate effect of the Lord's promise.

Another example of FPL structure from the prophetical writings is the story about the cruelty and restraint of Ishmael, the Son of Nethaniah, after the murder of Gedeliah (Jer. 41:4-8):

"On the day after the murder of Gedaliah, before any one knew of it,

eighty men arrived from Shechem and Shiloh and Samaria, with their beards shaved and their clothes torn, and their bodies gashed, bringing cereal offerings and incense to present at the temple of the LORD.

And Ishmael the son of Nethaniah came out from Mizpah to meet them, weeping as he came.

As he met them, he said to them, "Come in to Gedaliah the son of Ahikam."

When they came into the city, Ishmael the son of Nethaniah and the men with him slew them, and cast them into a cistern."
But there were ten men among them who said to Ishmael, "Do not kill us, for we have stores of wheat, barley, oil, and honey hidden in the fields."

So he refrained and did not kill them with their companions.

Verse 4 is plainly the setting statement; and v. 5, which refers to the arrival of eighty men to present offerings at the Temple, is the situation statement. Ishmael's reply is given in v. 6. The narration in v. 7 of the atrocities of Ishmael and his men is the problem section, and the reply of ten men to the cruelty of Ishmael is told in v. 8a. The remark in v. 8b that Ishmael refrained from further killing is a consequence statement.

The short form of the Full Pattern may be seen in one example from the Old Testament, the story of Gideon's encounter with the officials of Succoth (Judges 8:4-7):

Set. "{And Gideon came to the Jordan and passed over, he and the three hundred men who were with him, }\text{a}

Sit. \{\begin{align*}
&\text{faint} \quad \text{\text{b}} \\
&\text{yet pursuing.} \quad \text{\text{c}}
\end{align*}\}

RepS. \{\begin{align*}
&\text{So he said to the men of Succoth,} \quad \text{\text{a}} \\
&\text{"Pray, give loaves of bread to the people who follow me; for they are faint,} \quad \text{\text{b}} \\
&\text{and I am pursuing after Zebah and Zalmunna, the kings of Midian."} \quad \text{\text{c}}
\end{align*}\}

Prob. \{\begin{align*}
&\text{And the officials of Succoth said,} \quad \text{\text{a}} \\
&\text{"Are Zebah and Zalmunna already in your hand, that we should give bread to your army?"} \quad \text{\text{b}}
\end{align*}\}

RepP. \{\begin{align*}
&\text{And Gideon said,} \quad \text{\text{a}} \\
&\text{"Well then, when the LORD has given Zebah and Zalmunna into my hand,} \quad \text{\text{b}} \\
&\text{I will flail your flesh with the thorns of the wilderness and with briers."} \quad \text{\text{c}}
\end{align*}\}

The opening note in v. 4a about the Jordan is the setting statement, and v. 4b is the situation statement in its portrayal of the conditions of Gideon and his three hundred men and reference to their pursuit. Gideon's verbal
response to the hunger of his men is set forth in v. 5. The Succoth officials' refusal to provide bread is narrated as a problem section in v. 6, and v. 7 presents Gideon's reply to the officials of Succoth: the promise of flailing their flesh when he returns victorious.

In addition to FPS structure this story exhibits orderly \textit{abe abe} thematic structure, a kind that is found in some of Mark's narratives.\footnote{See below, pp. 486-7.} In this structure the narrative material in the setting and situation statements anticipates in a rhythmical fashion the sayings in the reply-to-the-situation statement. This phenomenon of anticipation, in which narrative material thematically anticipates the content of subsequent sayings, is evident in some of Mark's narratives.\footnote{See below, pp. 482, 495.}

Variation \#1 structure is also apparent in stories of the Old Testament. An example of \textit{VIL} form is found in the story of the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11:1-9):

\begin{quote}
Comm. \{ Now the whole earth had one language and few words. \\
Set. \{ And as men migrated in the east, \\
\hspace{1cm} they found a plain in the land of Shinar and settled there. \\
Sit. \{ And they said to one another, \\
\hspace{1cm} "Come, let us make bricks, \\
\hspace{1cm} and burn them thoroughly." \\
\hspace{1cm} And they had brick for stone, \\
\hspace{1cm} and bitumen for mortar. \\
Prob. \{ Then they said, \\
\hspace{1cm} "Come let us build ourselves a city, \\
\hspace{1cm} and a tower with its top in the heavens, \\
\hspace{1cm} and let us make a name for ourselves, \\
\hspace{1cm} lest we be scattered abroad \\
\hspace{1cm} upon the face of the whole earth." \\
\hspace{1cm} And the LORD came down to see the city and the tower, \\
\hspace{1cm} which the sons of men had built. \\
\end{quote}
And the LORD said,
"Behold, they are one people,
and they have all one language;
and this is only the beginning
of what they will do;
and nothing that they propose to do
will now be impossible for them.

Come, let us go down,
and there confuse their language,
that they may not understand one another's speech."

So the LORD scattered them abroad from there
over the face of all the earth,
and they left off building the city.

Therefore its name was called Babel,
because there the LORD confused the language
of all the earth;
and from there the LORD scattered them abroad
over the face of all the earth.

A comment, which has the air of a situation statement, stands at the beginning
of this story. The narrative pattern, as it is known in Mark's Gospel, starts
with a setting statement in v. 2, which tells about the migration of men to
Shinar. Verse 3 is a situation statement which indicates the preparations
that were made and the materials that were on hand for the project of con¬
structing a tower. The saying in v. 3 should not lead one to think that this
section is a reply-to-the-situation statement, for the saying has meaning
only in anticipation of the making of bricks, whose presence is regarded as
the occasion for the enterprise of building the tower. Verse 4, which expresses
the ill-advised plan to build the tower, is the problem section; and vv. 5-7
are presented as the Lord's reply to this problematical venture. Verses 8f.
make up a consequence statement that tells of the subsequent scattering of
the people and the naming of the tower.

Another example of V1L structure is the story of David's return from
his victory over Goliath (I Sam. 18:6-9):

As they were coming home,
when David returned from slaying the Philistine,
the women came out of all the cities of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet King Saul, with timbrels, with songs of joy, and with instruments of music.

7And the women sang to one another as they made merry, "Saul has slain his thousands, And David his ten thousands."

8And Saul was very angry, and this saying displeased him; he said, "They have ascribed to David ten thousands, and to me they have ascribed thousands; and what more can he have but the kingdom?"

9And Saul eyed David from that day on.

Verse 6a is a brief indication of the setting, and v. 6b is a situation statement in its portrayal of the women's jubilant approach to King Saul. Their remark in v. 7 about the greater achievement of David is the problem section. Saul's angry reply is given in v. 8. The story closes in v. 9 with a consequence statement about Saul's subsequent suspicion of David.

Extended VIL structure is evident in the story of Abraham's attempted sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22:9-14):

9When they came to the place of which God had told him, Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son, and laid him on the altar, upon the wood.

10Then Abraham put forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son.

11But the angel of the LORD called to him from heaven, and said, "Abraham, Abraham!"

12He said, "Do not lay your hand on the lad or do anything to him; for now I know that you fear God, seeing you have not withheld your son, your only son, from me."
And Abraham lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, behind him was a ram, caught in a thicket by his horns; and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered it up as a burnt offering instead of his son.

So Abraham called the name of that place The LORD will provide; as it is said to this day, "On the mount of the LORD it shall be provided."

After a setting statement in v. 9a, there is a situation statement in v. 9b that tells of Abraham's preparations for the sacrifice. As is characteristic of V1L form, there is no reply-to-the-situation statement; the narrator proceeds directly to a reference to a problematical action: in this story, the seizing of the knife to slay Isaac. In v. 11a the angel's call to Abraham is a reply-to-the-problem section; and Abraham's response, which extends the pattern, is given in v. 11b. The reply of the angel is continued in v. 12; and the last two verses of the story are consequence statements that tell of the appearance of a ram and Abraham's naming of the place.

VIS structure is evident as well in certain stories of the Old Testament. One example is the story about the report of the five men who went to observe Laish (Judges 18:7-10):

Then the five men departed, and came to Laish, and saw the people who were there, how they dwelt in security, after the manner of the Sidonians, quiet and unsuspecting, lacking nothing that is in the earth, and possessing wealth, and how they were far from the Sidonians and had no dealings with any one.

And when they came to their brethren at Zorah and Eshtaol, their brethren said to them, "What do you report?"
They said,
"Arise,
and let us go up against them;
for we have seen the land,
and behold, it is very fertile,

And will you do nothing?
Do not be slow to go,
and enter in
and possess the land.

When you go,
you will come to an unsuspecting people.

The land is broad;
yea, God has given it into your hands,
a place where there is no lack
of anything that is in the earth."

The story opens in v. 7a with the setting statement about the coming of the five men to Laish; and v. 7b is the situation statement, which indicates what the five men saw when they observed Laish. Such a situation statement calls to mind those situation statements in Mark's Gospel where the sight of a particular person or object is a distinctive feature. In v. 8 the question of the brethren of Zorah and Eshtaol is the problem section. The problematical character of their question is made clear in the reply-to-the-problem section in vv. 9f., in which it becomes apparent that the brethren are hesitant about possessing the land.

Another narrative with VIS structure is the story about a series of calamities that befell Job (Job 1:13-22). The interesting feature of this story is the fact that the four announcements of tragedy make up the problem section, as can be seen in the following arrangement of the story:

Set. {13Now there was a day
   when his sons and daughters were eating
Sit. } and drinking wine
      in their eldest brother's house;

527 See above, pp. 46-7.
and there came a messenger to Job, and said, "The oxen were plowing and the asses feeding beside them;

And the Sabeans fell upon them and took them, and slew the servants with the edge of the sword; and I alone have escaped to tell you."

While he was yet speaking, there came another, and said, "The fire of God fell from heaven and burned up the sheep and the servants, and consumed them; and I alone have escaped to tell you."

While he was yet speaking, there came another, and said, "The Chaldeans formed three companies, and made a raid upon the camels and took them, and slew the servants with the edge of the sword; and I alone have escaped to tell you."

While he was yet speaking, there came another, and said, "Your sons and daughters were eating and drinking wine in their eldest brother's house; and behold, a great wind came across the wilderness, and struck the four corners of the house, and it fell upon the young people, and they are dead; and I alone have escaped to tell you."

Then Job arose, and rent his robe, and shaved his head, and fell upon the ground, and worshiped.

And he said, "Naked I came from my mother's womb, and naked shall I return; the LORD gave, and the LORD has taken away; blessed be the name of the LORD.

In all this Job did not sin or charge God with wrong.
This story begins with a simple setting statement in v. 13a, which is followed in v. 13b by a short description of the situation: the eating and drinking of Job's sons and daughters. Verses 14-19 make up the problem section, which, as indicated earlier, contains a series of four messages of tragic events. Job's reply to the problem—both nonverbal and verbal—is narrated in vv. 20f., and the story ends with a comment in v. 22. Should this comment be thought of as a consequence statement, the form of the story is V1L instead of V1S; but inasmuch as the statement in v. 22 makes a judgement about Job's reply, it is preferable to regard the closing remark as a comment instead of a consequence statement.

Variation #2 structure, in which the pattern is curtailed through the absence of a problem and a reply to the problem, is also apparent in some stories of the Old Testament. One of several brief examples is the story of Noah's departure from the ark (Gen. 8:14-19):

```
14 In the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, the earth was dry.

Then God said to Noah,
16 Go forth from the ark, you and your wife, and your sons and your sons' wives with you.

Bring forth with you every living thing that is with you of all flesh—
birds and animals and every creeping thing that creeps on the earth—that they may breed abundantly on the earth, and be fruitful and multiply upon the earth."

So Noah went forth, and his sons and his wife and his sons' wives with him.

And every beast, every creeping thing, and every bird, everything that moves upon the earth, went forth by families out of the ark.
```
Verse 14 contains both the temporal setting statement and the brief situation statement that the earth was dry. Verses 15-17 are presented as God's reply to the situation: the dual commands to Noah to take (a) his family and (b) the animals out of the ark. The narration in v. 18 about (a) the departure of Noah and his family and then (b) the removal of the animals is a consequence statement that shows the fulfilment of God's commands and brings the story to a close. This story thus manifests both V2L narrative structure and orderly thematic structure.

An additional feature is the fact that V2L structure is evident also within the reply-to-the-situation statement in the Lord's directions to Noah. The note in v. 16a about the ark is a setting statement, and the reference in v. 16b to those who are to accompany Noah is the situation statement. Verse 17a tells of what is to be Noah's nonverbal response to the situation, and v. 17b is a consequence statement that alludes to the subsequent propagation of all living things.

A miniature V2L narrative is the story about Jacob's encounter with the angels of God (Gen. 32:1f.):

Set. { Jacob went on his way

Sit. { and the angels of God met him;

RepS. {2}and when Jacob saw them
he said,
"This is God's army!"

Cons. { So he called the name of that place Mahanaim.

Verse 1a is a setting statement in the sense that it speaks of the resumption of Jacob's journey, but no reference to a place is mentioned—possibly because the place is without a name until the end of the event. The remark in v. 1b about Jacob's confrontation with the angels of God is the situation statement, and Jacob's reply is indicated in v. 2a. His subsequent act of naming the
place is told in a consequence statement in v. 2b.

Another short V2L narrative is the story about Saul's attempt to spear David (I Sam. 18:10f.):

Set. {10a\text{And on the morrow}}

\begin{align*}
&\text{b\ an evil spirit from God rushed upon Saul,} \\
&\text{and he raved within his house,} \\
&\text{while David was playing the lyre,} \\
&\text{as he did day by day.}
\end{align*}

Sit. \{Saul had his spear in his hand; \}

RepS. \{and Saul cast the spear,} \\

for he thought, \\

"I will pin David to the wall."

Cons. \{But David evaded him twice.\}

After the setting statement about 'the morrow' in v. 10a, there is a situation statement in v. 10b that informs the reader of David's daily practice of playing the lyre and Saul's sudden possession by an evil spirit. Saul's reply to the situation is given in vv. 10c-11a: both his throwing the spear and expression of intent. The remark in v. 11b about David's successful evasion after this and another attempt by Saul is the consequence statement, which ends the story.

V2L structure is clearly apparent in a narrative told by the Chronicler in I Chron. 14:13-17, the story about David's waiting for the sound of marching in the balsam trees before his successful rout of the Philistine army:

Set. \{\text{And the Philistines yet again made a raid in the valley.}\}

Sit. \{And when David again inquired of God,\}

\begin{align*}
&\text{God said to him,} \\
&\quad \text{"You shall not go up after them;} \\
&\quad \text{go around} \\
&\quad \text{and come upon them opposite the balsam trees.}
\end{align*}

RepS. \{And when you hear the sound of marching} \\

\begin{align*}
&\text{in the tops of the balsam trees,} \\
&\text{then go out to battle;} \\
&\text{for God has gone out before you} \\
&\text{to smite the army of the Philistines.}"
\end{align*}
16 And David did as God commanded him, and they smote the Philistine army from Gibeon to Gezer.

17 And the fame of David went out into all lands, and the LORD brought the fear of him upon all nations.

The setting statement in v. 13 tells of the raid in the valley, and the reference in v. 14a to David's inquiry is the occasion for the reply that follows in vv. 14b-15. The narration about David's victory over the Philistines and fearful fame make up the consequence statement in vv. 16f.—a conclusion that calls to mind those consequence statements in Mark's Gospel that refer to the fame of Jesus528 and to fear.529

One more example of V2L structure is the story of the kind treatment of Jehoiachin by Evil-merodach (Jer. 52:31-34):

31 And in the thirty-seventh year of the captivity of Jehoiachin king of Judah, in the twelfth month, on the twenty-fifth day of the month,

Evil-merodach king of Babylon, in the year that he became king, lifted up the head of Jehoiachin king of Judah and brought him out of prison;

32 and he spoke kindly to him, and gave him a seat above the seats of the kings who were with him in Babylon.

33 So Jehoiachin put off his prison garments. And every day of his life he dined regularly at the king's table; as for his allowance, a regular allowance was given to him by the king according to his daily need, until the day of his death as long as he lived.

528 See, for example, 1:27f. and 1:43-45.

This story contains sayings but nevertheless displays V2L form. Verse 31a is a temporal setting statement, and v. 31b is a situation statement that refers to the release of Jehoiachin from prison. In v. 32, the reply-to-the-situation statement, there is an allusion to a reply, but no saying is presented. The story ends in vv. 33f. with a consequence statement that tells of the well-being of Jehoiachin until his death. In addition to V2L form, the story manifests ab ab thematic structure, a kind that appears frequently in Mark's narratives.530

Several V2S stories may be illustrated to show that this form of the narrative pattern is also evident in the Old Testament. One example is the story of the Lord's promise to Abram (Gen. 15:12-16). An interesting feature of this story is the fact that the reply of the Lord to Abram displays in itself V2L structure, as may be seen in the following arrangement of the story:

Set. \{ 12As the sun was going down, 
  a deep sleep fell on Abram; 
  and lo, a dread and great darkness fell upon him.

Sit. \{ 13Then the LORD said to Abram, 
  b"Know of a surety that your descendants will be sojourners 
  in a land that is not theirs, 
  and will be slaves there, 
  and they will be oppressed for four hundred years;

RepS. \{ 14but I will bring judgment on the nation which they serve, 
  and afterward they shall come out with great possessions.

L \{ 15As for yourself, you shall go to your fathers in peace; 
  you shall be buried in a good old age.

Cons. \{ 16And they shall come back here in the fourth generation; 
  for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet complete."

With regard to the overall V2S structure of the story, the reference in v. 12a to the going down of the sun is a temporal setting statement, and v. 12b indi-

530See below, pp. 478-88.
cates the situation: Abram's deep slumber. Verses 13-16 are presented as the Lord's reply to the situation.

As indicated above, this reply manifests in itself the V2L form of the pattern. The reference to the 'land' in 13b is the setting statement, and the prediction in v. 13c of slavery and oppression is a brief description of a situation. Verse 14a tells of the Lord's nonverbal reply to the situation: His promise of judgement of the oppressors. In vv. 14b-16 the sayings about the departure of Abram's descendants with possessions, the burial of Abram after a long life, and the return of his descendants, are consequence statements. With V2L structure in the reply-to-the-situation statement, this story provides a clear example of the pattern within the pattern.

Another interesting aspect of this story is the fact that the subsequent story about the Lord's covenant with Abram is also a V2S story, and is thus another instance which displays the phenomenon of clustering, when at least two stories in a row display the same form of the narrative pattern. An additional feature of interest is the fact that the reply-to-the-situation statement in the second story displays in itself V2S structure—still another instance of the pattern within the pattern. These features may be seen in the following arrangement of the story:

```
Set.         17When the sun had gone down
Sit.          and it was dark,
               behold, a smoking fire pot
               and a flaming torch passed between these pieces.

Set.         18On that day
Sit.         Bthe LORD made a covenant with Abram,
               cisaying,
"To your descendants I give this land,
from the river of Egypt to the great river,
the river Euphrates,
the land of the Kenites,
the Kenizzites,
the Kadmonites,
the Hittites,
the Perizzites,
```
In v. 17a the narration about the darkness after sunset is a temporal setting statement, and the reference in v. 17b to the passing of the fire between the severed pieces portrays the situation. Verses 18-21 are offered as the Lord's reply to the situation: His gift of land to Abram's descendants.

V2S structure is apparent as well in the reply itself. In v. 18a the note 'on that day' is a temporal setting statement, and the remark in v. 18b about the making of the covenant is the situation statement. Verses 18c-21 are a reply-to-the-situation statement within the reply section as a whole.

Another pair of V2S narratives is found in the book of Ezekiel. The first of the two narratives is the story about the women weeping for Tammuz (Ezek. 8:14f.):

Set.   Then he brought me to the entrance of the north gate of the house of the LORD;

Sit.   and behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz.

RepS.  Then he said to me,
      "Have you seen this, O son of man? You will see still greater abominations than these."

The remark in v. 14a about the north gate is clearly the setting statement, and the reference in v. 14b to the weeping women is the situation statement. Verse 15 is the reply-to-the-situation statement, which promises greater abominations.

The subsequent story about the twenty-five sun worshipers (Ezek. 8:16-18) displays similar V2S structure:

Set.   And he brought me into the inner court of the house of the LORD;
      and behold, at the door of the temple of the LORD,
between the porch and the altar,
were about twenty-five men,
with their backs to the temple of the LORD,
and their faces toward the east,
worshipping the sun toward the east.

Then he said to me,
"Have you seen this, O son of man?
Is it too slight a thing for the house of Judah
to commit the abominations which they commit here,
that they should fill the land with violence,
and provoke me further to anger?
Lo, they put the branch to their nose.
Therefore I will deal in wrath;
my eye will not spare,
nor will I have pity;
and though they cry in my ears with a loud voice,
I will not hear them."

In v. 16a the reference to the inner court is the setting statement; and v. 16b is the situation statement, which describes the occasion of the story: the worshiping of approximately twenty-five men, who, in their devotion to the sun, turned their backs to the temple of the Lord. Verses 17f. are the reply-to-the-situation statement, which promises divine judgement. Traces of V2S structure are evident within this reply to the situation. Verse 17b is descriptive of a situation in its reference to the abominations of the house of Judah, and v. 18 in itself anticipates the divine reply of judgement. Without a setting statement, however, V2S structure is not so evident within the reply section of this particular story. But V2S structure is clearly apparent within the story as a whole.

Enough Old Testament narratives have now been presented to show that the various pattern forms that are apparent in Mark's Gospel are evident as well in the Old Testament. There is a need for a thorough investigation of the Old Testament with regard to the narrative pattern to determine where it occurs elsewhere and to detect other possible forms of the pattern. For the time being, several brief observations and conjectures may be made on the basis of
the present brief survey. These comments are offered not as definite solutions but as observations to show the need for reconsideration of some past positions and to generate further research.

First of all, it is apparent that one does not have to look at Rabbinic analogies or Hellenistic parallels to account for the structure of Mark's narratives.\textsuperscript{531} The structure of his stories is essentially the same as that found in certain narratives of the Old Testament, and it seems valid to assume that the narrative traditions of the Old Testament had a direct, formative influence on narration style in the early Church.\textsuperscript{532}

In its presence in stories of the Old Testament, the narrative pattern was a traditional pattern. It belonged to the literature of Israel and was part of the cultural heritage in which Jesus and the early Church were born. In this respect the narrative traditions of the Gospels have a pre-history in the traditional narratives of the Old Testament. The cultural context in which the Gospel narratives about Jesus were structured was therefore much broader and older than the various situations and needs of the early Church.\textsuperscript{533}

\textsuperscript{531}Cf., for example, Bultmann, \textit{H.S.T.}, pp. 41-6, 57-60, 234-241. One must keep in mind that Bultmann's interest in Rabbinic and Hellenistic parallels centres in the detection of similar motifs and stylistic features, such as questions and counter-questions, not in a thorough study of the order of content or structure of such parallels. When attention is given precisely to narrative structure, it becomes apparent that the narratives in Mark's Gospel have been written according to a pattern of narration that is evident in certain stories of the Old Testament. One does not need to look beyond the Old Testament to understand the structure of Mark's narratives.

\textsuperscript{532}See Martin Dibelius, \textit{A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature} (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), pp. 16-7, and \textit{F.T.C.}, pp. 184-5. Cf. Bultmann, \textit{Form Criticism}, p. 30. See also Martin Dibelius, 'The Structure and Literary Character of the Gospels', \textit{The Harvard Theological Review}, XX, No. 3 (July, 1927), 161. The question is not whether unliterary men created a narrative style but whether they used a manner of narration that was culturally well known in the narratives of the Scriptures.

\textsuperscript{533}Cf. Koch, pp. 27-8.
One must therefore not think of the *structure* of the Gospel narratives as an *ad hoc* product of the early Church but rather recognize that various traditions about Jesus—especially those in Mark's Gospel—were patterned after a manner of narration that was evident in the Scriptures and therefore originally antecedent to the life of the early Church.

It is conceivable that Jesus Himself was familiar with this traditional pattern of narration and assimilated it within His teaching. It is interesting that the Old Testament stories that have been illustrated are generally significant passages; that is, they are narratives that are concerned with some of the great figures of the Old Testament: Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, Gideon, David, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. It is likely that Jesus was familiar with at least some of the stories that have been illustrated, and it is possible—even probable—that His own narration, particularly in His narrative parables, was somewhat influenced by His familiarity with the narrative traditions of the Scriptures.

The narrative pattern as a traditional way of telling a story possibly influenced the formation of the earlier oral reports and stories about Jesus. If so, one must be wary of the distinction between oral and written tradition. If a narrative pattern of the Scriptures was used for oral accounts about Jesus, the oral traditions underlying the Gospel narratives resemble in structure written traditions of the Old Testament.

If oral traditions of the early Church were patterned after narratives of the Scriptures, the narrative pattern would have been a controlling influence on the formation of the oral traditions. Early reports about Jesus could have originated with Full Pattern structure inasmuch as the FPL or FPS forms

---

534 See Koch, p. 87.
of the pattern were conventional options for storytelling. By the same token, some of the earliest reports about Jesus could have been brief and endowed with V2L or V2S form, inasmuch as these forms of the pattern were conventional options with precedents in brief V2S stories in the Scriptures. It is therefore not necessary to explain the brevity of some Gospel narratives as a matter of attrition or rounded form.\textsuperscript{535} V2S structure can be as original as FPL structure in narration that is patterned after conventional narration in the Old Testament.

Whether or not the Old Testament narrative pattern was an influence in the formation of the earliest reports about Jesus, it is likely that the pattern was an influence when the followers of Jesus, after His departure, began to search the Scriptures for information about His Messianic status and mission. Such an investigation of the Scriptures would have generated further familiarity with Old Testament narratives as models for storytelling. Those who participated in the Hellenistic mission appear to have been engaged in searching the Scriptures in synagogue preaching and teaching.\textsuperscript{536}

It is possible to think that the \textit{kerygma} of the early Church was influenced by the Old Testament narrative pattern. Such a view is supported by the


\textsuperscript{536}See Acts 17:2f. It is interesting that Paul's two chief concerns—(1) explaining the necessity of Jesus' Crucifixion and Resurrection and (2) affirming the Christhood of Jesus—taken in reverse order display the main themes of the two halves of Mark's Gospel in which Peter's confession is the turning point. In this respect the overall arrangement of Mark's Gospel is consonant with Paul's preaching and teaching mission in the synagogue at Thessalonica. It is hazardous to argue that Paul's mission had a direct influence on the overall structure of Mark's Gospel, but it may not be insignificant that Mark was with Paul not very long before Paul undertook this particular mission (Acts 15:36-41). It seems preferable, however, to regard the overall arrangement of Mark's Gospel as a reflection of the kerygmatic mission of the early Church at large rather than of a specific mission of any one person.
fact that the narrative pattern is evident in certain speeches in Acts.  

FPL structure is found in Peter's speech in Acts 10:36-43:

36τον λόγον [ὅν] ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ
ἐναγγελίζομεν εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
οὗτος ἐστὶν πάντων κύριος

37ὁμείος οὖδατε

Set. { τὸ γενειμνοῦν ἡμῖν καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας
ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας
μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὁ ἐκχύοντεν Ἰωάννης

38Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ
ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦματι ἀγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει

Sit. { ὅσ διήλθεν εὐεργετών
καὶ ἤμενος πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου
ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐν μετ' αὐτοῦ

39καὶ ἤμεν καὶ μάρτυρες πάντων ὅν ἐποίησεν
ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ

RepS. { 'ὅν καὶ ἀνεῖλαν
κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου

39τοῖς ὁ θεὸς ἔγειρεν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι

40τοῖς πάντων ὁ θεὸς ἔγειρεν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ
καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι

41οἱ πάντες τῷ λαῷ
ἀλλ' μάρτυρες πάντων προσκεκλησίας ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ
ὁμίν οἰκίνες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπάγομεν αὐτῷ
μετὰ τὸ ἀναστήσαντι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν

RepP. { καὶ παρῆγγελεν ἐμίνι θηρύπαι τῷ λαῷ
καὶ διεμαρτυροῦμαι
ὅτι οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ ὑπομνήμασιν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίτης εἰμῶν
καὶ νεκρῶν

42καὶ παρῆγγελεν ἐμίνι θηρύπαι τῷ λαῷ
καὶ διεμαρτυροῦμαι
ὅτι οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ ὑπομνήμασιν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίτης εἰμῶν
καὶ νεκρῶν

Cons. { ἀφεσίν ἀμαρτίων λαβέτε διὰ τοῦ ὑπόμνημα αὐτοῦ
πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν.

The pattern begins in v. 37b with a setting statement that mentions Judea and Galilee as the sphere of the event of Jesus. Verse 38 is a situation statement in its reference (1) to Jesus' divine endowment with the Holy Spirit and

power and (2) to the divine activity of healing. In v. 39a the indication that Peter and his associates are witnesses to Jesus' activity is an expression of their continuing response to Jesus and is thus a reply-to-the-situation statement. Verse 39b, which alludes to the hostility of the Jews and the Crucifixion of Jesus, is the problem section; and vv. 40-42 tell of the reply of God to the death of Jesus. The narration in v. 43 about the possibility of forgiveness is a consequence statement.

FPL structure is found also within Paul's speech in Acts 13:23-31:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Set.} & : \quad [23] \text{τοῦτού ὧν ἔδεσ ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος} \quad \text{καὶ ἐπαγγέλλαν ἤγαγεν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ σωτῆρα} \quad \text{Ἰσράὴλ} \quad \\
\text{Sit.} & : \quad [24] \text{προηγούμενος Ἰωάννου πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ} \quad \text{βάπτισμα μετανοίας πάντες τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραὴλ} \quad \\
\text{RepS.} & : \quad [25] \text{δὲ ἐπλήρωσεν Ἰωάννης τὸν όρθόν} \quad \text{ἔλεγεν} \quad \text{Τῷ ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἴναι} \quad \text{οὐκ εἰμὶ ἕγω} \quad \text{ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετ' ἐμὲ} \quad \text{οἶδα ἐμὴ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόθημα τῶν ποιῶν λύσαι} \quad \\
\text{Com.} & : \quad [26] \text{Ἀνδρεὺς ἀδελφός} \quad \text{υἱὸς γένους Ἀβραὰμ} \quad \text{kαὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβοῦμενοι τῶν θεῶν} \quad \text{ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἔξαπεστάλη} \quad \\
\text{Prob.} & : \quad [27] \text{οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ} \quad \text{kαὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν} \quad \text{τούτων ἁγιοσάντες} \quad \text{kαὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν} \quad \text{τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας} \quad \text{κρίναντες} \quad \text{ἐπλήρωσαν} \quad \\
\text{RepP.} & : \quad [30] \text{δὲ θεὸς ἔγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν}
\end{align*}
\]
The opening remark in v. 23, which refers to Israel, is the setting statement; and v. 24 describes the situation: the preparatory preaching of John the Baptist. John's reply is set forth in v. 25, which is followed by a comment in v. 26. Verses 27-29 are the problem section in which there is reference to the hostility of the Jews and the death and burial of Jesus. God's reply—His raising of Jesus—is indicated in v. 30, and v. 31 is a consequence statement that tells of Jesus' subsequent appearance and the present witness of

---

538Cf. C. H. Dodd, 'The Framework of the Gospel Narrative', New Testament Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), pp. 9-10, who sees in these speeches in Acts a summary outline of Jesus' ministry. Dodd suggests that such an outline was transmitted by the early Church as part of the kerygma and was later used by Mark as a framework for his Gospel. See also Dodd's The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments (London: Hodder & Stoughton Limited, 1960), pp. 46-7. In his brief but influential article on 'The Framework of the Gospel Narratives', Dodd detects the framework of Mark's Gospel in a series of summary statements that were recognized as Sammelberichte by Schmidt (pp. 6-8). It should be noted that Schmidt's conception of framework included not only the Sammelberichte but also various time and place notes that generally appear at the beginning of narratives. See, for example, Schmidt, R.G.J., pp. 13, 41, 152, 303. Dodd's exclusive attention to the Sammelberichte is a departure from Schmidt's notion of the framework of Mark's Gospel. The presence of the narrative pattern in certain speeches in Acts does not rule out the possibility that summary outlines of the ministry of Jesus belonged to the primitive kerygma, but evidence of the pattern in these speeches suggests that the structure of such outlines was not determined solely by the course of Jesus' ministry. They were shaped to some extent by the traditional manner of narration that was known in the Scriptures. Dodd's particular outline of Sammelberichte is questionable because it—unlike Acts 10:37-41 and 13:23-31—does not manifest the narrative pattern. If that pattern is used as a standard of measurement, it becomes apparent that Dodd's string of summary statements is a conglomerate of various kinds of pattern sections and whole narratives in unconventional order. Cf. the criticism of Dodd's essay by D. E. Nineham, 'The Order of Events in St. Mark's Gospel—an examination of Dr. Dodd's Hypothesis', Studies in the Gospels, Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), pp. 223-239. Nineham's essay is essentially a demonstration that the precise order of events in Mark's Gospel cannot be accounted for by Dodd's suggested outline. The force of Nineham's arguments is weakened by the fact that Dodd does not argue for the order of events on such a particular level. Dodd's concern, in reply to Schmidt, is to establish grounds for thinking that Mark's outline is reliable 'in broad lines'. Cf. Nineham, Saint Mark, p. 28, n. †.
Paul and his associates.

If these speeches are not simply a reflection of Luke's use of Mark but are to some extent indications of the structure of the *kerygma*, then there is evidence here that primitive preaching was shaped according to the traditional narrative pattern. In this respect there is essentially no difference in structure between the content of primitive preaching and Mark's narratives, and this structure may be traced to narratives in the Old Testament. One may therefore alter Fascher's phrase *Am Anfang war die Predigt* and say, 'In the beginning was the narrative'. Antecedent to the *kerygma* were Old Testament narratives which provided a pattern for both the *kerygma* and Gospel narratives about Jesus.

It is difficult to assess the influence of the pattern on the teaching of the early Church. On the basis of the regularity of the pattern in Mark's narratives one might infer that the traditional pattern was an aid to memory in the teaching of traditions about Jesus, but alterations of the pattern in the parallels of Matthew and Luke make one wary of claiming too much for the pattern as a mnemonic device.

The picture that emerges is that the narrative pattern may be traced to the narratives of the Old Testament. By way of conjecture, it is possible that Jesus assimilated the Old Testament pattern into His own style of storytelling, especially with regard to His narrative parables. The disciples themselves were familiar with the Old Testament pattern; they also heard Jesus present parables according to the pattern. The disciples' familiarity with the pattern was reinforced when they later searched the Scriptures for information about the Messianic character and mission of Jesus. When the
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539See Taylor, G.M., p. 18.
disciples told stories about Jesus, they used quite naturally the pattern of narration that was known in the Scriptures. Culturally, it was the way to tell about events in the ministry of Jesus. The pattern, especially in its fullest form, was most suitable for telling about the redemptive, 'Gospel' character of Jesus' activities. The movement of the pattern from the setting to the situation to the reply to the situation and so on to the final consequence was Good News. The pattern became regarded in this sense as a Gospel pattern, in which a human dilemma was answered by an authoritative, redemptive word or act of Jesus. Mark, having an orderly mind and being a careful writer, was sensitive to the pattern and found it to be a useful, flexible tool for ordering his material. When he wrote down the traditions that he knew, he presented them according to the pattern with great regularity. Possibly, in the process of writing, Mark gave some of the narratives more order than they previously had, or had at the time that they were passed on to him. On occasion, Mark might have been the Evangelist who best preserved the structure of the story or parable that might have been told according to the pattern before him. Such a picture is a conjecture, but it has been suggested by the literary phenomena that have become apparent in a study of the order of content in Mark's narratives.

Further evidence may be cited to substantiate the view that Mark was an orderly writer. Such evidence is found in a study of the thematic structure of Mark's narratives. This aspect of structure is the subject of Part III, which is presented next.
Part III

THEMATIC STRUCTURE IN MARK'S NARRATIVES

INTRODUCTION

An examination of the order of content in Mark's narratives reveals that the ideas in Mark's stories are presented in an orderly manner. To study this order of ideas is to study the thematic structure of the narratives. Thematic structure is distinguished from narrative structure, which pertains to the order of sections of the narrative pattern. Both thematic structure and narrative structure, however, are concerned with the order of material in Mark's narratives and come to light through the definition of structure as the order of content.

The notion of a study of the order of themes is not new. Gunkel showed interest in the order of contents in the story of Eden and advised the contemporary reader 'to heed the systematic arrangement of parts'.¹ The study of the thematic structure of Mark's stories is at the same time a study of the arrangement of material in his narratives.

The present discussion of thematic structure in Mark's narratives is based on a study of the order of ideas in each narrative that has been determined by the narrative pattern as a criterion for identifying narratives. Space, however, allows only a sketch of the findings of this aspect of the investigation of structure. It is hoped that such a sketch will precipitate further study of the thematic structure of the narratives in all four Gospels.

¹Gunkel, The Legends of Genesis, p. 49.
I. THE ANALYSIS OF THEMATIC STRUCTURE

In brief, the method of analysis is to assign a letter to a theme, the next letter to a subsequent theme, and so on, to note any recurrence and order in the presentation and consideration of themes. For example, the following question of Jesus in Mk. 3:4b has thematic structure that is designated \textit{abab}:

\begin{verbatim}
"Εξετιν τοις σύμβασιν ἀγαθον ποιησαι \textit{a}
     ἡ κακοποιησαι \textit{b}
     φυχὴν σώσαι \textit{a}
     ἡ αποκτέων \textit{b}.
\end{verbatim}

The idea of saving life corresponds with doing good and both are assigned the letter 'a'. Similarly, 'to kill' corresponds with 'to do evil' and both are designated 'b'.

It will be recognized that the question of Jesus exhibits synonymous parallelism, in which the phrase about saving life or killing is parallel to the phrase about doing good or doing evil. Thematic structure in Mark's narratives is grounded in parallelism,\textsuperscript{2} and various types of thematic structure that are evident in Mark's stories are extensions of \textit{parallelismus membrorum}.\textsuperscript{3}

When certain structures are found not simply in sayings but in the narrative element of stories, it is permissible to speak of the poetic prose of Mark's narratives.\textsuperscript{4}


\textsuperscript{4}Gunkel, pp. 10-1, noticed the poetic character of narratives in Genesis.
The question of Jesus in 3:4b is *rhythmical* in character and could just as well have been written in the following manner:

```
α Ἐξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι | ἣ κακοποιῆσαι
β ὕψην σῶσαι | ἣ ἀποκτείναι.
```

Rhythm is seen here in the correspondence between members of the parallel lines.⁵ In this respect there is often a 'close relation between parallelism and rhythm'.⁶ Frequently, however, in Mark's narratives there is rhythm that extends beyond the bounds of conventional parallelism when two or more themes are considered a second time in turn within the rest of the story. Here one may speak of the rhythmical character of Mark's narratives. The order of content within his stories is often rhythmical order.

When thematic structure is understood as the order of ideas within Mark's narratives, it is permissible to consider the possibility of several thematic structures in a passage that contains a number of themes. The detection of several thematic structures with regard to a given passage should not be viewed as a contradiction but rather as a sign of the thematic complexity of both the narrative and Mark's arrangement of it.

This method of studying thematic structure is not a search for 'the point of the story' but is instead an attempt to take account of various themes that are present in a narrative. Such an investigation reveals time and again that the concept of a single point does violence not only to the parallelism in Mark's stories but also to the rhythmical character of his prose when two or more themes are considered in turn a second time. Such a feature becomes apparent in the following discussion of the types of thematic structure.

---

⁵See Burney, pp. 100-8.

II. THE DESCRIPTION OF THE TYPES
OF THEMATIC STRUCTURE

In broad lines, five types of thematic structure are apparent in Mark's stories:

I. \(abab\)
II. \(ab\ ab\)
III. \(ab\ a + b\)
IV. \(a + b\ ab\)
V. \(ab\ ab\ ab\).

The first four types have inverted forms (\(abba, ab\ ba, ab\ b + a, a + b\ ba\)), in which the second \(b\) member precedes the second \(a\) member; and Types I, II, III, and V have extended forms (e.g., \(abcaba, abc\ abc, abc\ a + b + c, ab\ ab\ ab\ ab\)). These features are explained in the forthcoming descriptions of each type.

**Type I - \(abab\)**

This type of structure is the simplest of the five types and consists fundamentally, but not exclusively, of four lines, in which the third line is parallel to the first, and the fourth line is parallel to the second. Generally, the parallelism is synonymous between alternate lines, but sometimes there is antithetic parallelism, especially between the second and fourth lines.

There is a tendency for this type of thematic structure to appear in sayings of Jesus. A model example is Jesus' saying in 10:43f.:  

\[43\text{ουχ ὦτως δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν} \]
\[ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν ἔλημῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν]a
\[ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος \]b
\[44\]καὶ ὃς ἂν ἔλημῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος]a
\[ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος.]b

In this rhythmical saying, the thought in the third line about desiring to be first is synonymous parallel to the idea in the first line of wanting to be great, and in the fourth line the second \(b\) member about being slave of all is
synonymously parallel to the first $b$ member in the second line about being servant of all. Similar $abab$ thematic structures are found in 10:42, 7 2:17, 8 and 4:22. 9 Antithetic parallelism is evident in 4:25. 10

Some of the $abab$ structures in Jesus' sayings are longer than four brief lines. An example is 3:27, 11 which is introduced with a phrase that is part of the saying. Another example is found in the lengthy saying in 8:38, 12 in which the parallelism between the second and fourth lines is antithetic. In 10:39 13 Jesus' $abab$ saying about the cup and baptism is not complete in itself but leads to a climactic remark about the preferred places at His right and left in the Kingdom of God. Jesus' saying in 9:37 about receiving a child 14 is still another example of $abab$ thematic structure that is longer than four brief lines.

Inverted $abab$ structure ($abba$) is evident in two sayings of Jesus. One (13:20) 15 is brief, but the second (8:35) 16 is lengthened through the reference to the Gospel—an expansion that distorts the rhythm of the parallelism.

Extended $abab$ structure ($abcabe$) is found in several sayings of Jesus.

7See above, p. 254.
8See above, p. 352.
9See above, p. 231.
10See above, p. 231.
11See above, p. 358.
12See above, p. 363.
13See above, p. 254.
14See above, p. 239.
15See above, p. 418.
16See above, p. 362.
One is His saying about adultery in 10:11f., in which three \textit{abe} members in v. 12 are rhythmically parallel to corresponding \textit{abe} members in v. 11. In two other extended structures (in 2:21f. and 4:12) \textit{aboba} rhythmical parallelism is not complete in itself but leads to a climactic saying.

Five Type I thematic structures appear in sayings of persons other than Jesus. One is presented in the prophetic citations in 1:2f. The Exodus-Malachi quotation in its \textit{abab} arrangement with the prophecy from Isaiah does not seem out of place in view of the many thematic structures in Mark's Gospel. The quotation does not appear to be a rude insertion as far as thematic structure is concerned. A second \textit{abab} structure is evident in a saying of Pharisees and Herodians in 12:14. Another saying of theirs in the same verse is one of three inverted, \textit{abba} structures in sayings of persons other than Jesus. The other two \textit{abba} structures are found in the sayings of demons in 5:7 and of John the Baptist in 1:7f. Except for the \textit{abab} structure in 12:14, these particular Type I structures witness to Jesus' special relation to God.

A third group of \textit{abab} structures contains narrative material instead of sayings and presumably reflects more of Mark's own use of rhythmical parallelism in narratives. It is possible that such parallelism is derived from the tradition, but the presence in Mark's narratives of many thematic structures that

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{17}{See above, p. 251.}
  \item \footnote{18}{See above, p. 353.}
  \item \footnote{19}{See above, p. 230.}
  \item \footnote{20}{See above, p. 401.}
  \item \footnote{21}{See above, p. 330.}
  \item \footnote{22}{See above, p. 300.}
  \item \footnote{23}{See above, p. 401.}
\end{itemize}
frequently are imperfect or lost in the parallels of Matthew and Luke, suggests that Mark himself was responsible for much of the rhythmical parallelism in the narrative material in his stories. Grounds for this assertion about Matthew and Luke will be presented from time to time in the course of the discussion of thematic structure.

The *abab* structures in narrative material tend to occur at the end of a narrative and to have antithetic parallelism between the second and fourth lines. An example is the editorial comment in 4:33f. at the end of the narrative about Jesus' teaching in parables.\footnote{See above, p. 232.} Similar examples are found in consequence statements in 1:13\footnote{See above, p. 379.} and 7:36.\footnote{See above, p. 282.} Another example without antithetic parallelism appears in the consequence statement in 15:20f.\footnote{See above, p. 396.} One *abab* structure is presented in a situation statement (4:1) and consists of less than four lines.\footnote{See above, p. 229.} The first line refers to both the *a* theme (Jesus) and the *b* theme (the crowd). The second line presents the second *a* member with further information about Jesus; and the third line is the second *b* member, which tells about the location of the crowd. An inverted (*abba*) structure occurs in another situation statement in 5:3f.\footnote{See above, p. 300.} An interesting feature of this structure is the fact that *abba* thematic order is evident within the *b* members:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{*a*} & \text{*b*} \\
\hline
\pi\acute{e}\delta\alpha\varsigma & \acute{a}l\lambda\sigma\varepsilon\alpha\nu \\
\hline
\acute{a}l\lambda\sigma\varepsilon\iota\varsigma & \pi\acute{e}\delta\alpha\varsigma \\
\end{array}
\]
It is noteworthy that these structures in narrative material are for the most part incomplete or absent altogether in Matthew and Luke. Matthew's parallel to 4:1 (Mt. 13:2) has abab structure with much verbal agreement with Mark, but Mark's abab structure in 4:33f. is lost in Mt. 13:34 in connection with the additional material in v. 35 about the fulfilment of prophecy. Mark's abab structure in 15:20f. is not apparent in Matthew's parallel in Mt. 27:32, in which there is considerable Matthaean material. The abab structure in Mk. 1:13 is lost in Mt. 4:1-11 in connection with the addition of much Q material. Matthew has no parallel to Mark's abab structure in 7:36 and to the abba structure in 5:3f. With regard to Luke, the abab thematic structure in Mk. 1:13 is lost in Lk. 4:1-15 in connection with the addition of Q material. Mark's abab structure in Mk. 15:20f. is lost in Luke's stylistic revision of the episode in Lk. 23:26. Also Mark's abba structure in Mk. 5:3f. is lost in Luke's parallel passage in 8:29, in which there is much unique material. Luke has no parallels to Mk. 4:1, 4:33f., and 7:36.

In general, what was true with regard to Matthew and Luke and the narrative pattern is apparent also here in connection with thematic structure. Mark's structures are sometimes found in parallels in Matthew when there is much verbal agreement with Mark but deteriorate or are lost with the addition of special material in Matthew's parallels. Mark's thematic structures are less evident in Luke's parallels and are lost through stylistic revision and the addition of material found only in Luke. Space does not allow frequent reference to Matthew and Luke in this sketch of thematic structure in Mark's narratives, but some reference will be made from time to time to illustrate these tendencies.

Type II - ab ab

The second type of thematic structure may be seen as an extension of
abab parallelism in that the second a and b members are noticeably separated from the first a and b members. On occasion, the first set of themes appears near the beginning of a narrative; and the second set is offered near the end of the story. Such thematic structure suggests that Mark was conscious of the thematic content of his material and was interested in arranging this material in an orderly, rhythmical manner.

Some of the ab ab structures appear in sayings of Jesus. A good example is 2:25f.,30 in which the two a members refer to David and the two b members pertain to those who were with him. In this structure the second a and b members correspond rhythmically with the first a and b members. Other ab ab structures in sayings of Jesus are found in 14:18-20,31 10:38f.,32 and 13:28f.33 The structure in 14:18-20 is readily apparent. With regard to 10:38f., this structure is not complete in itself but leads to the climactic saying in 10:40. The structure, however, indicates that the references to the cup and baptism are made in a rhythmical, ab ab manner.

Two ab ab structures are found in a saying of some person in connection with a saying of Jesus, in which the order of thought in Jesus' saying is rhythmically the same as that in the saying of the other person. In 10:28f.,34 Peter's assertion in v. 28 has two dimensions to it: (a) the remark that he and other disciples have left all things; and (b) his statement that they have followed Jesus. Jesus' saying in v. 29 answers rhythmically Peter's assertion

30See above, p. 355.
31See above, p. 245.
32See above, p. 254.
33See above, p. 420.
34See above, p. 203.
by dealing first with the a issue of leaving one's home, family, and possessions, and then with the b issue of doing all of this for the sake of Jesus and the Gospel. In 14:61f.\(^\text{35}\) Jesus' statement 'Εγώ εἰμι in v. 62 corresponds with the high priest's phrase ἐδώ καὶ ὁ κριστός in v. 61b; and Jesus' saying about the Son of Man is related rhythmically to the high priest's phrase ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Εὐλογητοῦ.

If Mark's presentation is not opaque—reflecting only his own thoughts—but to some extent transparent, revealing something of the order and content of Jesus' sayings, it may be inferred on the basis of rhythmical structure in this saying that Jesus Himself possessed an orderly mind and that His teachings were sometimes orderly in character. It is conceivable that Mark, with an apparent interest in order, might have been the Evangelist who best transmitted the original order of Jesus' teachings, if any original order of His thought had been preserved in the tradition before Mark. One can only speculate about the transparency of Mark's material, but the orderliness of his material is open to the eye of the investigator and can be seen in a number of ab ab structures that contain narrative material.

Several ab ab structures are found in some combination of sayings and narrative material. In two instances sayings precede narrative material. For example, in 5:12f.\(^\text{36}\) the ab request of the demons in v. 12 is followed by two narrative statements that manifest consideration of the a and b dimensions of the request. The remark about Jesus' permission in v. 13a corresponds with the request to be sent, and the indication that the spirits entered the swine is rhythmically related to the b part of the request concerning such an entry.

\(^{35}\)See above, p. 334.

\(^{36}\)See above, p. 301.
The second example, which occurs in 12:14f., contains mostly sayings. In v. 14a the statement of the Pharisees and Herodians about Jesus as a true teacher of the way of God is the first a member, and their question in v. 14b about the lawfulness of paying tribute to Caesar is the first b member. The narrative statement in v. 15a about the hypocrisy of the opponents is the second a member, which suggests that their hypocrisy is to be seen in their words about Jesus as a true teacher. Jesus' saying in v. 15b provides the second b member of the structure and pertains to the question about tribute, which, in the rhythmical relationship between the two b members, is seen as the element of temptation.

Most of the ab ab structures with sayings and narrative material begin with narration. Some begin with narration and end with a saying of Jesus. In 8:16f. Jesus' saying about (a) questioning and (b) not having loaves addresses rhythmically the problem of the disciples in v. 16. Similarly, in 10:13f. Jesus' saying about (a) bringing children to Him and (b) not forbidding them is related rhythmically to these two issues, which are referred to in v. 13. Here the thematic correspondence between Jesus' saying and the preceding narration is readily apparent. Other examples are found in 5:38f. and 8:11f. The ab ab thematic structure of the former is also easily recognized. In the latter, the correspondence between the two a members concerning a sign is obvious; but the relationship between the b members is not self-evident.

37See above, p. 330.
38See above, p. 247.
39See above, pp. 259-60.
40See above, p. 308.
41See above, p. 410.
Jesus' saying about the absence of a sign, however, is rhythmically parallel to the phrase about tempting Him, and His refusal to give a sign may be seen as His reaction to the temptation of the Pharisees. Still another example is found in 14:35f., in which Jesus' saying in v. 36 about (a) what is possible for God and (b) the avoidance of the cup corresponds rhythmically with the narration about these two interests in v. 35. One may say here that the narration anticipates the content of Jesus' saying in the manner of the step development of thought.

In several ab ab structures with narrative material and a saying, the saying is followed by additional narration that is part of the structure. An example is 9:33f., in which οἱ δὲ ἐστίν οὗν in v. 34a is parallel rhythmically to ἐπιστῆσαν in v. 33b. The statement in v. 34b about the disciples' discussion in the way clearly corresponds with Jesus' question in v. 33b. In this example the narrative comment in v. 34 provides the second a and b members of the structure and suggests that the rhythmical character of this narration is to be attributed to Mark. This thematic structure is not found in the parallel material of Matthew and Luke. Other examples of ab ab structure in which narrative material and a saying are followed by further narration are 1:43-45; 15:26f., 32; 14:55, 63f.

More complex combinations of narrative material and sayings in ab ab

42See above, p. 262.
43See above, p. 239.
44Cf. Mt. 18:1f. and Lk. 9:46f.
45See above, p. 279.
46See above, p. 296.
47See above, p. 334.
structures are found in 4:38-41, 7:26-30, and 3:31f. In 4:38-41 the a members refer to the raising of Jesus, and the b members are concerned with the fear of the disciples: (1) their frightened words to Jesus in v. 38b, and (2) His question about their fear in v. 40. The second example in 7:26-30 has a members that pertain to the Gentile status of the woman and b members that display thematic interest in the exorcism of her daughter's demon.

Rhythmical, thematic parallelism is evident in an ab ab manner in 3:31f., in which references in v. 31 first (a) to Jesus' family and then (b) to their calling to Jesus recur in the same order in v. 32.

Many of the ab ab structures appear only in narrative material. One example is 1:30f., in which two themes, (a) the reclining of Peter's mother-in-law and (b) her fever, are mentioned in v. 30a and then are referred to again in the same order in vv. 31a and 31b. Four of the narrative ab ab structures have in common the theme of following Jesus: 14:50-52, 3:7f., 1:16-18, and 1:19f. The rhythmical character of 14:50-52 is self-evident. In 3:7f. the references to (a) the large multitude and (b) its following of Jesus are the two themes that are considered again at the end of v. 8.

Rhythmical structure is apparent in 1:16-18, where the phrase in v. 18a about

---

48 See above, p. 298.
49 See above, pp. 318-9.
50 See above, p. 361.
51 See above, p. 276.
52 See above, p. 176.
53 See above, p. 226.
54 See above, p. 381.
55 See above, pp. 381-2.
leaving the nets corresponds with the thought in v. 16b about casting nets in the sea, and where the remark in v. 18b about following Jesus indicates the fulfilment of the command to follow Jesus in v. 17. The thematic structure of 1:19f. is essentially the same as that in 1:16-18.

Five other narrative ab ab structures are 1:32-34, 6:45-47, 6:55f., 9:9f., and 14:10f. As was true for 3:7f., three of the five structures (1:32-34, 6:55f., and 6:45-47) refer to a crowd. The first two of these tell of the sick who were brought to Jesus. In 6:45-47 the a members are concerned with the disciples in the boat, and the b members display interest in Jesus. The rhythmical character of 9:9f. is self-evident. In 14:10f. the thematic similarity between the b members is readily apparent. The correspondence between the two a members lies in common interest in the chief priests.

Space does not allow a comparison with Matthew and Luke at every point, but if one compares these narrative ab ab structures with the parallels of Matthew and Luke, it becomes readily apparent that such rhythmical narration is much less evident in the parallel versions of the two other Evangelists. Of Mark's nine narrative ab ab structures, Matthew has only one in 4:18f. (cf. Mk. 1:16-18). In four instances (Mt. 26:56, cf. Mk. 14:50-52; Mt. 12:15, cf. Mk. 3:7f.; Mt. 17:9, cf. Mk. 9:9f.; Mt. 14:35, cf. Mk. 6:55f.), Matthew's account presents only the first ab members. Three of Mark's structures are inverted in Matthew's parallels (Mt. 8:14f., cf. Mk. 1:30f.; Mt. 14:22-24,

---

56See above, p. 384.
57See above, p. 287.
58See above, p. 345.
59See above, p. 243.
60See above, p. 390.
cf. Mk. 6:45-47; Mt. 8:16, cf. Mk. 1:32-34). In the last of these structures the rhythm is lost in Matthew through the absence of the first \( a \) member. With this abbreviation, there is the addition of new material in Mt. 8:17 about the fulfilment of prophecy. Matthew's parallel to Mk. 14:10f. (Mt. 26:15f.) has slightly different \( ab \ ab \) structure, in which the \( a \) members are concerned specifically with the money that the chief priests offer to Judas.

Luke's parallel to this story (Lk. 22:4-6) is the only one that has \( ab \ ab \) structure. With regard to the other eight structures, Luke has no parallel to Mk. 14:50-52, 9:9f., 6:45-47, and 6:55f. Luke's version of Mk. 3:7f. (Lk. 6:17) has both \( a \) members but no \( b \) members. The \( ab \ ab \) rhythm of Mk. 1:30f. is both inverted and imperfect in Lk. 4:38f. with the absence of the first \( a \) member. Mark's \( ab \ ab \) structure is also not apparent in Luke's special material in 5:1-11, in which there is no specific reference to the theme of following Jesus. Luke's parallel to Mk. 1:32-34 (Lk. 4:40f.) has \( aa \ bb \) thematic structure. Mark's structures are thus even less apparent in Luke's Gospel. In comparison with the parallels of both Matthew and Luke, Mark's stories are the ones which most frequently exhibit certain rhythmical, thematic structures. The predominance of rhythmical narration is a distinctive feature of Mark's Gospel.

Some of Mark's narratives, however, have inverted \( ab \ ba \) structure. Two structures are found only within sayings of Jesus (14:36,\(^61\) 12:35-37\(^62\)). Another two structures appear in sayings of Jesus in connection with other sayings (7:27f.,\(^63\) 13:1f.\(^64\)). Six of the \( ab \ ba \) structures present sayings

\(^61\)See above, p. 262.
\(^62\)See above, p. 397.
\(^63\)See above, p. 318.
\(^64\)See above, p. 412.
with narrative material (1:38f., 65 10:52, 66 14:60f., 67 10:13f., 68 6:2-5, 69 15:17-2070). Just one structure (11:15)71 is found only in narrative material. Most of these structures are self-evident. The ab ba structure of 14:60f. is not so apparent. The two a members are clearly about Jesus' not answering, but it is only a possibility that δ δε έσωπα in v. 61a is a second b member that expresses Jesus' reaction of silence to the false charges against Him. In 6:2-5 the a members refer to the theme of Jesus' mighty works, and the b members are concerned with the questions of Jesus' identity and His rejection by people of His own village.

Type II structure also has some extended forms in which more than two themes are presented and then considered again in the same order. Three structures exhibit abc abc thematic structure: 14:41f.,72 1:25f.,73 and 7:29f.74 In 14:41f. the rhythmical correspondence between δπέχει and έγειρεθείε suggests that δπέχει was thought of in connection with the disciples' sleep. Also δγωμεν is rhythmically related to ήλιος ή ήρα and should be understood as a course of action that was appropriate on account of the hour. In 1:25f. the

65See above, p. 290.
66See above, p. 315.
67See above, p. 334.
68See above, pp. 259-60.
69See above, p. 285.
70See above, p. 396.
71See above, p. 389.
72See above, p. 263.
73See above, p. 272.
74See above, pp. 318-9.
convulsive tearing of the spirit is rhythmically parallel to Jesus' rebuke, suggesting that the tearing is direct rebellion against the word of Jesus. Similarly the loud cry is antithetically parallel to Jesus' command to be silent and appears to be an indication of conflict and defiance. The third *abc abc* structure in 7:29f. is self-evident with *a* members about the return of the woman to her house, *b* members about her daughter, and *c* members about the demon.

There is one structure (in 10:37, 40)\(^{75}\) that has an inverted, *abc aba* order of ideas, in which the *a* members are about the giving of a special favor, the *b* members are about the preferred places at the right and left of Jesus, and the *c* members are about sitting in these places.

Two narratives have extended, *abed abed* structure in 14:13-16\(^{76}\) and 4:4-8, 15-20.\(^{77}\) In 14:13-16 four themes relating to Jesus' directions recur at the end of the story: (a) the departure of the two disciples; (b) their entrance into the city; (c) their finding of a place for the Passover; and (d) their preparation for the Passover. The themes recur in order in a rhythmical fashion. The other *abed abed* structure is found in the correspondence between the parable of the sower and the explanation of the parable. Further correspondence between the parable and its explanation is evident within the *abed* members and is designated by numerals. For example, the reference to Satan (1) in 4:15 corresponds with 'the birds' (1) in 4:4. It will be noted that an alteration in the order of ideas is apparent within the second *b* member in 4:16f.

\(^{75}\)See above, p. 254.

\(^{76}\)See above, p. 392.

\(^{77}\)See above, pp. 229-31.
Extended, abode abode structure is found in 3:32-33. In this arrangement, the second e member about doing the will of God is parallel antithetically to the first e member about Jesus' relatives' search for Jesus.

There is abode(f?) abodef structure in 11:1-10 with regard to Jesus' directions and their fulfilment concerning the securing of a colt. The abodef members of the disciples' response is rhythmically parallel to the abode(f?) form of Jesus' directions. The extent of the parallelism between the abode members suggests that καὶ ἀφήνων αὐτοῖς in 11:6b was parallel as an f member to an original reading without πάλιν in v. 3b. A reading with πάλιν disrupts possible abodef abodef structure by weakening the parallelism between the f members. Such disruption is not characteristic of Mark's thematic structures.

The most important type of thematic structure for understanding the arrangement of material within narratives is Type III, which is described next.

_Type III - ab a + b_

The third type of thematic structure is a very interesting one. The first ab members are underlined to indicate that they appear close together within a two-pronged question or a statement that has two dimensions to it. The "+" sign between the second a and b members indicates that the two issues are treated in turn at some length. Type III structure may be seen as an extension of Type II structure in the sense that the second a and b members are generally treated more extensively than the second a and b members of ab ab structure. Sometimes the line is fine between ab ab and ab a + b.

78 See above, p. 361.
79 See above, p. 151.
80 See above, p. 154, n. 34.
structure, as may be seen in the $ab \ a + b$ structure in 4:40f.\textsuperscript{81} Here it is difficult to decide whether the structure is simply $ab \ ab$, or whether it is a miniature $ab \ a + b$ structure. The latter alternative is preferable because of both the proximity of the first $a$ and $b$ members within Jesus' saying and the fact that the second $b$ member is somewhat longer than the second $a$ member. In this structure, ἔχετε πίστιν is thematically parallel to θείλοι ἐστε. The question of the disciples in v. 41 is rhythmically parallel to οὐκ ἔχετε πίστιν, and this relationship suggests that their lack of faith was a matter of not trusting in Jesus because they did not understand that He was the Messiah.\textsuperscript{82}

A striking feature of the $ab \ a + b$ structures is the fact that most of them are negative in tone. They tell of questions put to Jesus to test Him, accusations, and other expressions of hostility to Jesus. These structures also portray events relating to the Temptation, betrayal, arrest, denial, and Crucifixion of Jesus.

The negative tone of the Type III structures occurs in connection with the additional fact that the $ab$ part of the structure generally appears in the problem section of the narrative pattern, and the second $a$ and $b$ members often appear in the reply-to-the-problem section. This tendency of narration in Mark's stories manifests a relationship between thematic structure and the narrative pattern.\textsuperscript{83} To perceive this relationship between Type III structure and the narrative pattern is to understand more clearly the arrangement of material within Mark's stories. Such an understanding would seem to

\textsuperscript{81}See above, p. 298.

\textsuperscript{82}Cf. Taylor, G.M., p. 276.

\textsuperscript{83}The relation between thematic structure and the narrative pattern is discussed at the end of Part III. See below, pp. 513-5.
be necessary for adequate consideration of the redactional work of Mark.

Fifteen \( ab \ a + b \) structures have been indicated in the presentation of Mark's narratives in Part II of the dissertation. Five of the structures appear in the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections of the narratives: 15:30-32, \(^8^4\) 12:14-17, \(^8^5\) 2:18-22, \(^8^6\) 7:5-23, \(^8^7\) and 7:15-23. \(^8^8\)

In 15:30-32 the taunt of passers-by in v. 30 contains a twofold, \( ab \) cry to Jesus (a) to save Himself, (b) coming down from the cross. The reply of the chief priests and scribes refers first to the issue of Jesus' saving Himself (v. 31) and then to the question of Jesus' descent from the cross (v. 32).

In 12:14-17 there is a question in v. 14 that has two dimensions to it: (a) the issue of whether it is lawful to pay tribute to Caesar, and (b) the issue of whether one should give or not. Jesus first presents His answer to the initial issue by asking for a coin. Its inscription shows that the coin is ultimately Caesar's already, and the implication is that the paying of tribute to Caesar is lawful. Jesus then offers His answer to the second issue: give the things of Caesar to Caesar, and the things of God to God (v. 17).

The question in the problem section in 2:18-22 refers (a) to John's disciples and (b) to the disciples of the Pharisees. Jesus' reply in vv. 19f. about the lack of fasting with the presence of the bridegroom would have been of special significance to John's disciples, whose own leader was no longer

---

\(^8^4\)See above, p. 296.

\(^8^5\)See above, p. 330.

\(^8^6\)See above, p. 353.

\(^8^7\)See above, pp. 372-3.

\(^8^8\)See above, pp. 372-3.
with them. Possibly this part of Jesus' reply was directed to John's disciples. Furthermore, the sayings in vv. 21f., which presumably are about the new ethic that Jesus brings, would have been of special interest to the disciples of the Pharisees. It is possible that the second part of Jesus' reply was associated with them.\(^89\)

A description of the thematic structures of 7:5-23 and 7:15-23 has already been given above in Part II.\(^90\) These two structures are particularly interesting, for 7:15-23 is the second \(b\) member of the first structure in 7:5-23, providing an instance of a structure within a structure. It should be noted that 7:15-23 appears in a problem development and the reply to this development.

Two \(ab\) \(a + b\) structures (10:2-12,\(^91\) 11:28-12:11\(^92\)) begin in a problem section, but their second \(a\) and \(b\) members extend beyond the subsequent reply-to-the-problem section. In 10:2-12 there are two dimensions of the question in 10:2 that are considered throughout the rest of the story: (a) the issue of the lawfulness of divorce, and (b) the topic of divorce itself. Verses 3-9 present Jesus' reply to the issue of the legality of divorce. He anticipates and counters the Pharisees' main argument for divorce (Moses permitted it).

---

\(^89\)In another possible interpretation, \(ab\) \(b + a\) thematic structure may be seen in this story. The combined references to John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees constitute the first \(a\) member, and the reference to Jesus' disciples in v. 18 is the first \(b\) member. Verses 19f., which allude to Jesus' disciples, present the second \(b\) member; and vv. 21f., the second \(a\) member, are given to show that, in striking contrast with the conventional morality of John's disciples and those of the Pharisees, Jesus' disciples do not fast as an expression of the new conduct that is appropriate with the coming of Jesus.

\(^90\)See above, pp. 374-5.

\(^91\)See above, p. 251.

\(^92\)See above, pp. 321-2.
Verses 10-12 present Jesus' views on the aspect of the question, the matter of divorce itself and its relation to adultery.

In the second structure in 11:28-12:11, a double question is presented in 11:28. Jesus' reply to the part of the question—about the authority behind His works—is given in vv. 29-33. His reply is a refusal to reply overtly to the first part of the question, but He implies by His counter-question that He acts by heavenly authority. The parable in 12:1-11 is Jesus' reply to the part of the double question: the question of who gave Jesus this authority. His answer is given climactically in v. 11: παρὰ ἐνῷ, echoing ὁ ἤσιος in v. 9. It is a veiled answer like the first reply, and the absence of any charge of blasphemy in v. 12 suggests that Jesus' antagonists missed the point. They became preoccupied instead with the parallel between themselves and the husbandmen in the parable. The presence of ab a + b structure within 11:28-12:11 is significant, for it shows that Mark considered 12:1-12 to be essentially related to 11:27-33 and not merely appended. Also the structure shows that Jesus' special relation to God—rather than the death of Jesus or some other issue—is the chief thematic concern of the parable.

Three ab a + b structures are found in situation and reply-to-the-situation statements of narratives: 1:4-8,93 1:10-13,94 and 13:4-37.95 In 1:4-8 the dual themes of baptism and preaching are set forth in an ab fashion in v. 4. Verse 5, which gives further consideration to John's baptizing in the Jordan, is the second a member of the structure; and vv. 6-8, the second b member, elaborates on John's preaching. In the subsequent story of Jesus'

93See above, p. 401.
94See above, p. 379.
95See above, p. 413.
Baptism and Temptation, v. 10, the situation statement, contains a narrative statement with two interests: (a) Jesus' vision of the opening of the heavens, and (b) the descent of the Spirit. Verse 11 gives further attention to the theme of heaven, and vv. 12f. begin with a second reference to the Spirit. The third structure in 13:4-37 has already been discussed at some length above.96

There is one ab a + b structure (14:53-72) that begins in a situation statement but extends beyond the reply-to-the-situation statement and includes the story of Peter's denial as the second b member. The ab a + b thematic structure of this story has likewise been discussed above in Part II97 and is especially interesting, for two narratives are yoked together through ab a + b arrangement.

The last four of the fifteen ab a + b structures begin in reply sections. Two structures (14:44-46,98 14:18-2199) start in reply-to-the-situation statements and are concerned with the betrayal of Jesus. In 14:44-46 two interests are mentioned in v. 44: (a) Judas' instructions about his intended kiss, and (b) his command about the arrest of Jesus. Verse 45 then tells of Judas' kiss, and v. 46 refers to the arrest. The second structure in 14:18-21 similarly displays two interests in the reply-to-the-situation statement in v. 18b: the ideas that (a) one of the Twelve (b) will betray Jesus. Verses 19f. are devoted to the question of which disciple will be the guilty one, and v. 21 gives further consideration to the theme of betrayal. Two other

96See above, pp. 413-4.
97See above, pp. 336-7.
98See above, p. 176.
99See above, p. 245.
structures (4:13-32 and 4:40f.\textsuperscript{100}) begin in reply-to-the-problem sections. Both have already been discussed above, and there is no need to describe them further. The structure in 4:13-32 is especially intriguing, for it provides a clue for understanding the arrangement of much of the material within the narratives about Jesus' teaching in parables.

Six Type III structures have inverted, $\overline{ab} b + a$ structure: 9:11-13,\textsuperscript{101} 3:22-30,\textsuperscript{102} 3:21-35,\textsuperscript{103} 12:23-27,\textsuperscript{104} 14:4-8,\textsuperscript{105} and 2:23-28.\textsuperscript{106} In these structures the second $b$ member precedes the second $a$ member. As in $\overline{ab} a + b$ structure, the first $a$ and $b$ members are stated together either as a statement or a question. The tone is negative, and all six structures are found in the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections of the narratives. The structure in 3:21-35, however, includes also the narrative, 3:31-35.

In 9:11-13 the disciples' question in v. 11 has two dimensions to it: (a) the question of why the scribes say (b) that it is necessary for Elijah to come first. Verse 12a reiterates the idea that Elijah must come first, and vv. 12b-13 are presented as Jesus' answer to the $a$ part of the question. (1) The scribes may say that Elijah comes first, because Elijah has already come, presumably as John the Baptist. (2) Furthermore, warrant for such an outlook is provided in the Scriptures, which also allude to the suffering of

\textsuperscript{100}See above, pp. 230-2, 298.
\textsuperscript{101}See above, p. 243.
\textsuperscript{102}See above, pp. 357-8.
\textsuperscript{103}See above, pp. 357-8.
\textsuperscript{104}See above, pp. 367-8.
\textsuperscript{105}See above, p. 369.
\textsuperscript{106}See above, p. 355.
the Son of Man.

With regard to 3:22-30, the accusation of the scribes in v. 22 has two aspects to it: (a) the charge that Jesus is possessed by Beelzebul, and (b) the complaint that Jesus casts out demons by the ruler of demons. Attention is first given to the second aspect of the accusation, and vv. 23-27 are presented as Jesus' reply to the complaint that His exorcisms are implemented by the ruler of demons. This notion is shown to be absurd. To cast out demons by the ruler of demons is ultimately a matter of Satan's casting out himself, and such an arrangement is unthinkable. Furthermore, the casting out of demons is accomplished not by the power of Satan but because Satan has been overpowered by Jesus. The implication of v. 27 is that Jesus is able to cast out demons—the household of Satan—because Jesus has 'bound' Satan (the strong man). Verses 28-30 are offered as Jesus' answer to the first part of the accusation in v. 22. The charge that Jesus is possessed by Beelzebul is tantamount to saying that the Holy Spirit is unclean. Such a charge is unforgivable blasphemy.

Another ab b + a structure is evident in 3:21-35, in which this story and the subsequent story about the search of Jesus' family for Jesus (3:31-35) are connected thematically. In 3:21 the reference to Jesus' relatives is the first a member, which anticipates the story in vv. 31-35 about Jesus' family. The thematic relationship between v. 21 and vv. 31-35 suggests that the search of Jesus' family for Jesus is in conflict with the mission of Jesus. Verse 22, which refers to the scribes and their accusations, presents the first b member of the structure; and vv. 23-30 give consideration to the accusations in the

---

107 If this interpretation is valid, 'Lord of the dwelling' may be the proper translation of Βεσλέζεβολ, to be derived from Ζέβ. See Taylor, G.M., p. 239.
In a manner described above.

Inverted, \( ab \ b + a \) structure is also evident in 12:23-27. The problem contains in v. 23 a question with two dimensions: (a) the issue of resurrection, and (b) the issue of marriage in the Resurrection. Verses 24f. are presented as Jesus' reply to the second issue. The point that He makes is that there will be no marital ties when the dead are raised. Verses 26f. are offered as Jesus' reply to the first dimension of the question. His position is that resurrection is a valid concept inasmuch as God is God of the living.

The fifth \( ab \ b + a \) structure appears in 14:4-8. Verses 4f. contain a question that displays two concerns: (a) the question of why the ointment was wasted, and (b) interest in the welfare of the poor. Verse 7 is offered as Jesus' reply to the issue of aiding the poor, and v. 8 is given as His answer to the question of why the ointment was used. It was used in preparation for His burial.\(^{108}\)

In a sixth structure (2:23-28), two themes, (a) the Sabbath and (b) what is lawful, are given further consideration in inverted, \( b + a \) order.

Two Type III structures (3:2-6,\(^{109}\) 10:17-21\(^{110}\)) have extended, \( abc \ a + b + c \) structure, in which three themes are first stated together and then referred to again in the same order with some expansion of thought in the second members of the structure. In 3:2-6 the problem section in v. 2 displays three interests: (a) the question of working on the Sabbath, (b) the issue of healing, and (c) the hostility of the antagonists. Verse 4 expresses by

\(^{108}\)If it is valid to regard \( καὶ ἐνεβριμόντο αὐτῇ \) as a first \( c \) member and to think of v. 6 as Jesus' reply to this reaction of the antagonists to the woman, then 14:4-8 has extended, \( abc \ a + b + a \) structure.

\(^{109}\)See above, p. 192.

counter-question and implication Jesus' view about working on the Sabbath: beneficial work is lawful. Verse 5 tells of Jesus' reply to the issue of healing: He healed the man's hand so that it was restored. Verse 6 gives further consideration to the hostility of the antagonists, who join hands with Herodians to find a way to destroy Jesus. In this structure v. 6 is rhythmically the second e member and, in terms of the arrangement of material within the narrative, does not appear to be an untimely addition to the story.

In the second structure in 10:17-21 three interests are presented in the situation statement in v. 17b: (a) the reference to Jesus as a good Teacher, (b) the question of what must be done to inherit eternal life, and (c) the theme of eternal life itself. Verse 18 presents Jesus' reply to the first issue: no one is good except God. Verses 19-21a are offered as Jesus' answer to the b part of the question: one must not only keep the commandments but also sell everything and give to the poor. In v. 21b Jesus' reference to having treasure in heaven is an allusion to inheriting eternal life and completes the structure. The rest of the narrative, however, gives further consideration to the question of eternal life, which is mentioned explicitly in v. 30.

A noteworthy feature of the Type III structures is the fact that one half of them appear in adjacent narratives (1:18, 1:9-13; 2:18-22, 2:23-28; 4:1-34, 4:35-41; 11:27-12:12, 12:13-17, 12:18-27; 14:45-52, 14:53-72). This feature of clustering, in which a particular type of structure is presented in two or more narratives in a row, was noted above in connection with the narrative pattern. Here, as there, the presence of the same structure in two or more stories in a row suggests that Mark had some control over the formation of his narratives and was himself responsible for the presence of the same

\[11^{11}\]See above, pp. 349-50. See also p. 444.
structure in two or more consecutive narratives. It is difficult to think that such repetition of structure would have occurred if Mark had merely brought together various stories that had already been formed in the tradition before Mark.

The view that Mark himself was somewhat responsible for the thematic arrangement of the material in his narratives is supported by the fact that many of the Type III structures are lost or not present in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, especially in Luke's Gospel. Matthew has approximately one half of the Type III structures that have been discussed (in Mt. 26:48-50, cf. Mk. 14:44-46; Mt. 26:21-24, cf. Mk. 14:18-21; Mt. 19:3-9, cf. Mk. 10:2-12; Mt. 26:57-75, cf. Mk. 14:53-72; Mt. 15:2-20, cf. Mk. 7:5-23; Mt. 15:11-20, cf. Mk. 7:15-23; Mt. 3:16-4:11, cf. Mk. 1:10-13; Mt. 24:3-6, cf. Mk. 13:4-57; Mt. 17:9-13, cf. Mk. 9:11-13; Mt. 22:28-32, cf. Mk. 12:23-27; Mt. 26:8-12, cf. Mk. 14:4-8; Mt. 12:10-14, cf. Mk. 3:2-6; Mt. 19:16-21, cf. Mk. 10:17-21).

Generally, in these parallels of Matthew there is much verbal agreement with Mark. In a few instances where Matthew has Type III structure, the structure becomes altered through the addition of new material. For example, Matthew has \( ab \ a + b \) structure in 26:21-24, but this structure is altered with the addition of 26:25 (a \( ba \) section) at the end. With regard to 19:3-9, the addition in vv. 10-12 goes beyond the theme of divorce. Matthew has \( ab \ a + b \) structure in 15:2-20, but this structure is interrupted with the addition in vv. 12-14 of a question about the Pharisees' offense and Jesus' reply. This addition at the same time interrupts the \( ab \ a + b \) structure in 15:11-20. Two other structures are altered through the addition of material. In 27:40-42 \( ab \ a + b \) structure is disrupted with the addition of the theme of the Son of God in vv. 40 and 45. In 21:23-42 \( ab \ a + b \) structure is interrupted through the addition of the parable of the two sons in vv. 28-32. In Mt. 12:2-8 (cf. Mk. 2:23-28) \( ab \ b + a \) structure is altered through revision and addition (vv. 6f.).
There are seven parallels in which $ab_a + b$ structure is lost through the absence of one or more members of the structure (in Mt. 13:18-33, cf. Mk. 4:13-32; Mt. 8:26f., cf. Mk. 4:40f.; Mt. 22:17-21, cf. Mk. 12:14-17; Mt. 9:14-17, cf. Mk. 2:18-22; Mt. 3:4-12, cf. Mk. 1:4-8; Mt. 12:22-32, cf. Mk. 3:22-30; Mt. 12:22-32, cf. Mk. 3:21-35). In Mt. 9:14-17 the structure is altered with the absence of a reference to the disciples of John in the question in v. 14, and in 12:22-32 the $ab$ sense of the question is lost through revision.


In this study of Mark's Type III structures in comparison with those of
Matthew and Luke, it is apparent that this type of structure is found mostly in Mark's narratives. Mark's structures are also the most regular with the least amount of disruption through material that appears unrelated or peripheral to the themes of the structures. Mark's structures display the greatest interest in the presentation of two or more themes and subsequent consideration of these issues in a thorough, orderly manner.

Methodical and thorough interest in the order of ideas is apparent in a fourth type of thematic structure.

*Type IV - \(a + b \ ab\)*

This type of structure may be seen as the converse form of \(ab \ a + b\) structure. In \(a + b \ ab\) structure, one theme and then another are considered at some length. Then both are restated or summarized by a saying or narrative statement that places the two themes together in capsule form. The second \(a\) and \(b\) members are written as \(ab\) and underlined to call attention to their juxtaposition. As with most of the Type III structures, most of the Type IV structures are negative in tone, portraying various acts of hostility towards Jesus or alluding to Jesus' suffering and death. All but one of the Type IV structures begin in the situation statement and end in either the reply-to-the-problem section or the consequence statement. Generally these structures are spread throughout most of the narratives in which they are found and are thus useful for understanding the overall arrangement of their respective narratives.

There are five \(a + b \ ab\) structures that have been indicated in Part II of the dissertation: 14:43-49;\(^{112}\) 1:21-27;\(^{113}\) 5:2-13, 16;\(^{114}\) 14:55-64;\(^{115}\) and

---

\(^{112}\)See above, pp. 175-6.
\(^{113}\)See above, pp. 271-2.
\(^{114}\)See above, pp. 300-1.
\(^{115}\)See above, p. 334.
In 14:43-49 the first a member is the narration about the use of swords and clubs in the situation statement in v. 43. The first b member in vv. 44-47 is concerned with the issue of seizing Jesus. Jesus' saying in vv. 48f. economically refers to both issues in an ab manner.

In 1:21-27 the a members show interest in Jesus' authoritative teaching, and the b members pertain to Jesus' exorcism. The first a and b members of the structure are considered at length; the second a and b members are brief statements in juxtaposition. The presence of a + b ab structure in 1:21-28 suggests that Mark considered vv. 21f. to be essentially connected with the rest of the narrative. To separate the first two verses from the rest of the story is to violate its thematic structure so as to render it incomplete. The a + b ab structure of the story should be considered in an evaluation of the relation of 1:21f. to the rest of the narrative.

With regard to the third a + b ab structure in 5:2-13, 16, vv. 2-10 (a) tell of the demoniac, and vv. 11-13 (b) depict the destruction of the herd of swine. In v. 16 there is an ab statement about the demoniac and the swine that completes the structure.

The a + b ab structure in 14:55-64 has a members (vv. 55-61, 63) that display interest in the issue of false witness and b members (in vv. 62, 64) that are concerned with the question of blasphemy in connection with Jesus' admission of Messiahship. Again, the second a and b members are brief statements next to one another which bring into focus the issues that are of chief concern in the first a and b members.

In 8:31-9:1, the fifth a + b ab structure, a lengthy section in 8:33-37

116See above, pp. 362-3.
about (a) Jesus' anticipation of death and the possibility of death in discipleship is followed in v. 38 by a statement about (b) the coming of the Son of Man in the glory of His Father with the holy angels. In 9:1 Jesus' allusion to (a) the death of certain bystanders and to (b) the coming of the Kingdom of God with power restates in capsule form the main thematic interests of the story. In this structure the idea of the coming of the Kingdom of God is rhythmically parallel to the notion of the future coming of the Son of Man, which suggests that Mark, if not Jesus also, regarded the two events as future and related, if not essentially the same event. The Kingdom of God will have come in power when the Son of Man comes in glory.

Type IV thematic structure sometimes appears in an inverted, \(a + b \text{ ba}\) form. As in the regular form, the narrator gives consideration first to one issue and then to another; later he presents at the end of the structure a succinct statement that brings the two issues together. In this way, the narrator resolves the concerns that have been of chief interest within the structure. In inverted form, however, the \(b\) theme is recapitulated first, and then the \(a\) theme.

Inverted, \(a + b \text{ ba}\) structure is evident in 6:21-26\textsuperscript{117} and 12:14, 17,\textsuperscript{118} It is probably coincidental and not significant that both show thematic interest in Herod. In the first structure (a) 6:21b-22a tell of Herod's birthday banquet for his leaders, and (b) vv. 22b-23 are concerned with the oaths that Herod makes to the girl. Conceivably, this first \(b\) member could include vv. 24f. as material that is related to the oaths. The structure ends with a \(\text{ba}\) statement in v. 26, which refers first to the oaths and then to the guests

\textsuperscript{117}See above, p. 220.

\textsuperscript{118}See above, p. 330.
who were reclining.

In 12:14, 17, the a members refer to God as a thematic concern, and the b members display interest in Caesar. The capsule ba saying of Jesus in v. 17a concludes the structure.

With regard to the parallels of Matthew and Luke, Matthew has four of the seven Type IV structures (in Mt. 26:47-57, cf. Mk. 14:43-49; Mt. 26:59-66, cf. Mk. 14:55-64; Mt. 16:21-28, cf. Mk. 8:31-9:1; Mt. 22:16-21, cf. Mk. 12:14, 17) with much verbal agreement with Mark. Two of the seven structures are lost in Matthew's versions through curtailment (in Mt. 7:28f., cf. Mk. 1:21-27) and the absence of the first a member (in Mt. 14:6-9, cf. Mk. 6:21-26). The seventh structure is altered in Mt. 8:28-34 (cf. Mk. 5:2-13, 16). In Matthew's shorter version, there is no explicit reference to the swine in v. 33. If πῶντα is an implicit reference to the swine, it precedes the remark about the demoniac and makes the structure inverted with an a + b ba order of ideas.


In comparison with both Matthew and Luke, Type IV structure is most evident in Mark's narratives. Here again, a study of the recurrent order of ideas reveals that Mark was the Evangelist most interested in presenting ideas
in a thorough, orderly manner. The rhythmical character of his presentation of ideas in an \(a + b\ \text{ab}\) manner displays systematic care on his part in narration to keep in view issues of early importance and to 'resolve' these issues through some final restatement. Such carefulness in narration calls to mind the many instances when Mark 'ties the knot' near the end of a narrative through some final reference to an initial concern.\(^{119}\)

Mark's thoroughness in his presentation of ideas is evident in a fifth type of thematic structure, which is the last to be described.

*Type V - ab ab ab*

This type of thematic structure is an extension of \(ab\ \text{ab}\) (Type II) structure. The \(a\) and \(b\) themes are repeated, as in \(ab\ \text{ab}\) structure; but the themes are repeated more than once. Apart from several structures that appear only within sayings of Jesus in reply-to-the-problem sections, the Type V structures tend to span much of the narratives in which they are found. With two ideas recurring in the same \((ab)\) order as many as four times throughout most of the narrative, a story with such Type V structure is quite rhythmical in character. Rhythmical narration is best seen in stories with Type V structure.

Several structures (in 15:7-15,\(^{120}\) 1:40-42,\(^{121}\) 6:49f.,\(^{122}\) 14:55-59\(^{123}\)) have \(ab\ \text{ab}\ \text{ab}\) form, in which two ideas recur twice. In 15:7-15, v. 7 refers

\(^{119}\)See, for example, above, pp. 243, 258-9.

\(^{120}\)See above, pp. 188-9.

\(^{121}\)See above, pp. 278-9.

\(^{122}\)See above, p. 287.

\(^{123}\)See above, p. 334.
to Barabbas, and v. 9 contains an allusion to Jesus as the King of the Jews. These two interests, (a) Barabbas and (b) Jesus, recur in the same order in vv. 11f. and then again in v. 15.

In 1:40-42 the leper's statement in v. 40 about (a) the will of Jesus and (b) His ability to cleanse the leper introduces two themes that are twice restated in the same order in vv. 41f. The recurrence of the theme of cleansing is self-evident. In v. 42 the willingness of Jesus to heal the leper is evident in the disappearance of the leprosy. Rhythmically, the remark about the departure of the leprosy is parallel to the statement about the will of Jesus.

The structure in 6:49f. begins in v. 49 with an a member about the disciples' vision of Jesus, and a b member (καὶ ἀνέκραξαν), that is expressive of their fear. These two interests, (a) the image of Jesus and (b) the fear of the disciples, are twice considered again in the same order in vv. 50f. In this structure Jesus' assertion, ἔγω εἶμι, is parallel to the statement that the disciples thought that He was an apparition. The fact that the narrator's explanatory comment in v. 50a is in ab order, shows that Mark was interested in presenting his material in an orderly, rhythmical manner.

The fourth ab ab ab structure, which is found in 14:55-59, displays two interests: (a) the quest for false witness against Jesus, and (b) the inability of Jesus' antagonists to find accusers who agreed in their false testimony against Jesus. The two themes are stated together in v. 55 and repeated in the same order in vv. 56, 57-59. Again, the fact that the explanatory comment in v. 56 displays ab order and belongs to the structure, is an indication that Mark was interested in an orderly presentation.

There are two ab ab ab structures in sayings of Jesus (2:19f.,124

124 See above, p. 353.
3:24-26\textsuperscript{125}). In 2:19f. the \textit{a} members refer to the \textit{bridegroom}, and the \textit{b} members are about \textit{fasting}. In 3:24-26 the issue of \textit{division} appears in the \textit{a} members, each of which are followed by a \textit{b} statement about the \textit{inability to stand}. Both of these structures in Jesus' sayings are compact, and the \textit{ab} members are not separated from one another. Conceivably, therefore, the structure of these sayings is \textit{ababab}. If so, this structure may be seen as an extension of Type I (\textit{abab}) structure, in which four rhythmical members are presented together. It makes little difference, however, whether the structure of these two sayings is an extension of Type II or Type I structure. What is important is that the order of ideas is rhythmical and that rhythmical order is distinctively apparent time and again in Mark's narratives.

In several of Mark's stories two themes are stated and then recur three times. Such \textit{ab ab ab ab} structure is evident in 11:21-25,\textsuperscript{126} 12:19-22,\textsuperscript{127} 14:12-16,\textsuperscript{128} and 6:38-44.\textsuperscript{129} With regard to 11:21-25, Peter's observation in the problem section in v. 21 has two aspects to it: (a) the reference to Jesus' cursing of the fig tree, and (b) its withered condition. In brief, what Jesus (a) \textit{said}, (b) \textit{took place}. These two ideas recur in a rhythmical manner three times in Jesus' subsequent sayings in the reply-to-the-problem section in vv. 22-25. The first saying in v. 23 expresses the idea that what is \textit{said} to the mountain with faith will \textit{happen}. Similarly, the saying in v. 24 conveys the notion that what is \textit{prayed and asked} with faith will \textit{occur}. The

\textsuperscript{125}See above, p. 358.
\textsuperscript{126}See above, p. 364.
\textsuperscript{127}See above, p. 367.
\textsuperscript{128}See above, pp. 391-2.
\textsuperscript{129}See above, pp. 183-4.
rhythm is preserved in the third saying in v. 25 when Jesus indicates that a person must forgive in order to be forgiven. The rhythm in Jesus' sayings reflects the order of ideas in Peter's observation, and the rhythmical order of thought is maintained throughout the narrative. While it is likely, in view of such sayings as these in 11:23-25 and those in 2:19f. and 3:24-26, that Jesus' original sayings sometimes displayed rhythmical order, it is also conceivable that Mark, whose narratives so frequently manifest rhythmical order, was in part responsible for the rhythmical order of thought of Jesus' sayings. If in places the rhythm goes back to Jesus, Mark's accomplishment was that of preserving original order through his own sensitivity to rhythmical order and thoroughness. It is significant that such ab ab ab ab structure is not apparent in Matthew's parallel in Mt. 21:20—the only parallel to Mk. 11:21-25.

In 12:19-22 ab ab ab ab structure is evident in the question of the Sadducees. The a members have in common the idea of a brother taking the woman for a wife, and the b members indicate that each marriage was unfruitful. The ab rhythm, which reflects the order of ideas in the teaching of Moses in v. 19, is sustained within the problem section.

The story about the preparation for the Passover contains in 14:12-16 ab ab ab ab structure that is very clear. The ab order of ideas is established in the question of the disciples in v. 12b when they ask about (a) where they should go (b) to prepare for the Passover. These two ideas recur in the same order twice in Jesus' instructions in vv. 14f. and once in the consequence statement in v. 16 at the end of the narrative. The rhythm is sustained throughout the story.

In 6:38-44 (a) the loaves and (b) two fish are two themes that recur in rhythmical order. Mark is careful to refer to both the loaves and the fish
throughout the passage. Such a concern is not apparent in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Matthew in two places (Mt. 14:18, 19b) refers to the loaves but not to the fish. Both Matthew and Luke eliminate some of Mark's references to both the loaves and the fish. The thorough, methodical manner of Mark's writing is evident once again.\textsuperscript{130}

Two themes recur four times in Mk. 4:37-41.\textsuperscript{131} Such \textit{ab ab ab ab} structure begins with references to (a) the wind and (b) the waves in the situation statement in v. 37. The rhythm is maintained in explicit references to the wind and the sea in vv. 39 and 41. The rhythm suggests that the remark in v. 39b about the 'great calm' is descriptive of the condition of the water after the wind ceased. The rhythm of the structure also suggests that Mark considered \(\text{Εἰκόνα} \) to have been addressed to the wind, and \(\text{εἴποι} \) to the waves.

Similar thematic structure is evident in 7:32-37.\textsuperscript{132} The \textit{a} members refer to deafness and hearing; the \textit{b} members, to dumbness and speaking. There is some disruption of the order of ideas within the structure, for there is no explicit command for the tongue to become free—a command one would expect to find in the rhythmical structure of Mark's narrative. With no such command, the structure is \textit{ab ab a- ab ab}. It is interesting to ask whether Mark associated the groaning of Jesus with the speechlessness of the man (cf. the speechless groaning in Rom. 8:26). If so, Jesus' groaning was understood as an act to correct the man's speech problem, and Mark inverted the order of ideas at this point, giving the narrative \textit{ab ab \(\overline{ba} \)} ab \textit{ab ab} thematic structure.\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{130}If the doubtful reading, \(\tauο\deltaς \overset{\text{ς}}{\alpha\rho\tauο\upsilonς} \), is read in 6:44, the thematic structure of the story is \textit{ab ab ab ab a}.

\textsuperscript{131}See above, p. 298.

\textsuperscript{132}See above, p. 282.

\textsuperscript{133}Cf. Taylor, \textit{G.M.}, p. 355.
Another Type V structure that shows some inversion in the order of ideas is found in 3:31-35.\textsuperscript{134} The \textit{a} members refer to Jesus' mother, and the \textit{b} members are the allusions to His brothers. The \textit{ab} rhythm is sustained until v. 35, where the order of ideas becomes inverted and expanded with a reference to Jesus' true (\textit{b}) brother, (\textit{c}) sister, and (\textit{a}) mother.

One group of Jesus' sayings in 9:42-47\textsuperscript{135} has extended, \textit{abc abc abc abc} thematic structure, in which three ideas recur in rhythmical order. In this structure the \textit{a} members express the idea of 	extit{offense}, the \textit{b} members have in common the word \textit{\pi\alpha\lambda\delta\nu}, and the \textit{c} members depict the unpleasant end of being cast into the \textit{Sea} or \textit{Gehenna}. Such rhythmical order suggests that Jesus Himself had an orderly mind and presented ideas in an orderly manner, but it is difficult to determine whether the order stems from Jesus or from Mark, inasmuch as Mark's narratives display interest in rhythmical order on the part of the narrator.

Mark's concern for rhythmical order becomes more evident in a look at Matthew's and Luke's parallels to the Type V structures. Only two of Matthew's versions have Type V structure as it is found in Mark's narratives (in Mt. 12:25f., cf. Mk. 3:24-26; Mt. 12:46-50, cf. Mk. 3:31-35). Matthew's other parallels to Mark's narratives with Type V structure do not have the same thematic structure. Generally, the structure is lost through a reduction of the number of references to the themes in question, even though there is often much verbal agreement with Mark's narratives. In one instance (Mt. 27:16-23, cf. Mk. 15:7-15) the number of references is increased in Matthew's parallel.

Interest in the rhythmical order of ideas is even less apparent in Luke's

\textsuperscript{134}See above, p. 361.

\textsuperscript{135}See above, p. 240.
parallels to Mark's stories with Type V thematic structure. Luke almost has
the same structure in Lk. 22:8-13 (cf. Mk. 14:12-16) with much verbal agree-
ment with Mark's account, but Luke loses the structure at that point (Lk. 22:8)
where he offers much of his own material. With regard to the other Type V
structures, they are either lost in Luke's parallels through curtailment or
absent altogether because Luke has no parallels to the passages in question.
In comparison with the parallels of both Matthew and Luke, Mark's narratives
with Type V structure display the greatest amount of interest in the presen-
tation of ideas in a rhythmical, orderly manner.

Summary

When a study is made of the order of ideas in Mark's narratives, five
types of thematic structure become evident: (I) abab, (II) ab ab, (III) ab
a + b, (IV) a + b ab, and (V) ab ab ab. Each type has inverted forms. Every
type except Type IV has extended forms. Two of the extended forms have
inverted forms. The various forms of thematic structure are illustrated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGULAR FORM</th>
<th>INVERTED FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>abab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abcabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>ab ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abc abc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abcd abcd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abode abode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abode(f?) abodef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>ab a + b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abc a + b + c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IV</td>
<td>a + b ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type V</td>
<td>ab ab ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ab ab ab ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ab ab ab ab ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ab ab ab ab ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abc abc abc abc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These structures are *rhythmical*. Ideas and themes recur in an orderly manner that either preserves or inverts the order of an initial series of ideas. Mark rarely introduces into his stories material that disrupts rhythmical order.

These thematic structures are *complete*. They are not left unfinished. They seem to have been completed in a thorough fashion. The completeness of Mark's structures calls attention to that part of the Papias tradition which claims that Mark wrote 'accurately all that he remembered of the things said and done by the Lord', and also to the remark of Papias that Mark 'made it his one care to omit nothing that he had heard ...'. \(^{136}\) Whether or not Mark's narratives reflect proper chronological order, the thematic structures are evidence of considerable order within his stories and give the impression that Mark wrote his narratives with meticulous care.

Mark's thematic structures are often *negative in tone*. They frequently are found in material about the disciples' fear and unbelief, antagonists' hostility, and Jesus' suffering and death. Several structures show interest in Jesus' special relation to God and Messianic status. Mark's thematic structures thus accentuate the chief thematic concerns of his Gospel, namely, the Messiahship of Jesus and His suffering and death.

Recognition of the various thematic structures increases understanding of the *arrangement* of material within Mark's narratives. Such understanding would appear to be prerequisite for an adequate investigation of the redactional work of Mark.

Mark's thematic structures also provide clues for the *interpretation* of his stories, since the structures draw attention to recurrent interests that

by their recurrence are shown to be of some significance.

Some of the thematic structures appear in *sayings of Jesus*, which suggests that Jesus' teachings displayed rhythmical order from time to time. On account of Mark's apparent interest in order, it is difficult to determine whether rhythmical order in sayings stems altogether from Jesus or arises in part from Mark's own tendency to repeat a series of ideas in a rhythmical fashion. It is conceivable that with a sensitivity to rhythmical order, Mark best preserved any original order of ideas in Jesus' teachings that happened to reach Mark in the transmission of tradition, but to consider this aspect of thematic structure is to enter the realm of speculation.

One can measure, however, the rhythmical order in Mark's narratives through comparisons with Matthew and Luke, and it becomes readily apparent that various types of thematic structure that are known through Mark's narratives are frequently imperfect, lost, or absent altogether in the parallels of Matthew and Luke. When the other Evangelists do have the same thematic structure, it appears in a passage in which there is also much verbal agreement with Mark's narratives, and it seems reasonable to assume that the structure has entered the parallel account through dependence on Mark. Matthew and especially Luke show little interest in rhythmical order, particularly when thematic structure is frequently lost in parallels in spite of much verbal agreement with Mark. Mark's narratives, however, consistently display interest in presenting ideas in an orderly, rhythmical manner. The regularity of the thematic structures witnesses to methodical workmanship, and the completeness of his structures is evidence of his thoroughness and carefulness as a writer.

Mark's workmanship may also be seen in certain relationships between the thematic structures and the narrative pattern. This last concern of the dissertation is given brief consideration in the next section.
III. THE RELATION BETWEEN THEMATIC STRUCTURE  
AND THE NARRATIVE PATTERN

If Mark was somewhat responsible for the formation of his stories, if he wrote them in close conformity to the narrative pattern with its limited number of variations, and if he was responsible for much of the rhythmical order of thought within his narratives, one would expect to find noticeable relationships between the thematic structures and the narrative pattern, manifesting his control over the composition and arrangement of his material; and a number of relationships are evident.

With regard to the Type I structures, all the structures in sayings of Jesus (in 4:12, 22:25; 9:37; 10:11f.; 10:39, 42, 43f.; 2:17; 2:21f.; 3:27; 8:35, 38; 13:20) appear in reply sections—mostly reply-to-the-problem sections. Type I structures in sayings by persons other than Jesus (in 5:7; 12:14; 1:2f., 7f.) are offered either in reply-to-the-situation statements or problem sections. Also, there is a tendency for abab structures in narrative material to appear in consequence statements (in 7:36, 1:13, 15:20f.; cf. 4:1, 33f.).

Relationships between thematic structure and the narrative pattern are evident concerning the Type II structures. When this type of structure appears only within sayings of Jesus (in 14:18-20; 10:38f.; 2:25f.; 13:28f.; 12:35-37; 14:41f.; 10:37, 40; 4:4-8, 15-20; 11:2-6), it is presented in reply sections of the narrative pattern. When ab ab structure appears only in narrative material (in 14:50-52, 3:7f., 9:9f., 1:30f., 6:45-47, 6:55f., 1:16-18, 1:19f., 1:32-34, 14:10f.), the structure almost always begins in the situation statement; and several structures (1:16-18, 1:19f., 1:32-34, 14:10f.) have members that appear also in reply-to-the-situation statements and consequence statements.

It has already been noted above in the description of the Type III
structures that most of these structures appear in the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections of the narrative pattern. This fact, plus the fact that many of the Type III structures are clustered in adjacent narratives, plus the additional fact that Type III structure is found mostly in Mark's narratives in comparison with Matthew and Luke, suggests that these structures are indicative of Mark's contribution to the arrangement of material within his narratives. In effect, this is to assert, on the basis of $ab$ $a + b$ structure as a criterion, that Mark himself was largely responsible for the arrangement of material within such lengthy narratives as the story about Jesus' teaching in parables (4:1-34), the story about eating with unwashed hands (7:1-23), and the story of Jesus' eschatological discourse (13:3-37).

Most of the Type IV thematic structures begin in the situation statement and extend across much of the narrative, ending either in some kind of a reply-to-the-problem section (in 14:43-49; 8:31-9:1; 6:21-26; 12:14, 17) or a consequence statement (in 1:21-27; 5:2-13, 16; 14:55-64).


All these relationships between thematic structure and sections of the narrative pattern show a measure of consistency in the written presentation of Mark's narratives. This consistency is another indication which suggests that Mark bore considerable responsibility for the formation of his stories. One would expect to find much less consistency if Mark were merely a compiler of various traditions that had been formed before him by different members of the
early Church in the course of the tradition.

With this consideration of certain relationships between thematic structure and the narrative pattern, this investigation of the structure of Mark's narratives comes to an end. It is fitting to terminate the dissertation with a brief conclusion.
CONCLUSIONS

Ever since the work of the form critics there has been a need to study the structure of all the narratives of Mark's Gospel. The form critics did not consider the structure of all the stories; and when attention was given to the paradigms or apophthegms and tales or miracle stories, the stylistic schemes that were seen were much too broad.

If one presents Mark's narratives in colometric form and compares the narratives closely, seven kinds of narrative sections are evident in Mark's stories: a setting statement, situation statement, reply-to-the-situation statement, problem section, reply-to-the-problem section, result statement, and consequence statement. Types of each kind of narrative section are discernible through stylistic tendencies that appear at corresponding locations in Mark's narratives. In the various types of each kind of section there is for the most part a lack of correlation between characteristic tendencies of these sections and the narrative categories of form criticism. Except for the result statement, which appears mostly in miracle stories, there is no correlation time after time between recognizable types of the narrative sections and the form-critical categories. In view of this general absence of correlation, one may conclude that the narrative categories of form criticism are structurally not distinctive.

The seven kinds of narrative sections—setting, situation, reply to the situation, problem, reply to the problem, result, and consequence—usually appear in that order in Mark's narratives and so constitute a pattern of narration. Not all the narratives have all these sections. Instead, most of
the stories individually display one of five abbreviated forms of the Full Pattern. In one variation the reply-to-the-situation statement is omitted. In a second variation the problem and reply-to-the-problem sections are omitted. Sometimes the Full Pattern or either of the two variations appears in a short form without result and consequence statements. Inasmuch as the order of sections is the same, both in the Full Pattern and its abbreviated forms, one may conclude that all the stories in Mark's Gospel have been written according to one pattern of narration and thus have essentially the same narrative structure.

The pattern in its six forms (Full Pattern Long, Full Pattern Short, Variation #1 Long, Variation #1 Short, Variation #2 Long, Variation #2 Short) is evident throughout Mark's Gospel—in long narratives as well as short ones, in stories in the Passion Narrative as well as in the rest of Mark's Gospel. Once the pattern is understood, it becomes a useful criterion for identifying stories on the basis of their narrative structure.

The pattern is very regular in Mark's narratives. In seventy-four of eighty-six identifiable stories the sections of the pattern appear in their proper order. Nineteen of the seventy-four regular stories are extended generally through developments of the problem with replies to these developments. Five of the twelve irregular stories are extended as well as irregular. Even the irregular stories manifest the pattern. There is therefore no story in Mark's Gospel that does not show the influence of the narrative pattern.

The regularity of the pattern in Mark's stories becomes further apparent in comparison with the parallels of Matthew and Luke. When Matthew's parallels have the same structure as Mark's stories, there is often much verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark; but Matthew's structure is frequently different
with the presence of special Matthaean material. Sometimes Luke's parallels also have different structure with material found only in Luke, but generally his parallels manifest the greatest number of pattern irregularities. Time and again the pattern is most regular and clearest in Mark's stories in comparison with Matthew and Luke.

The regularity and clarity of the pattern in Mark's narratives suggest that Mark himself was somewhat responsible for the composition of his stories. This conclusion is supported by other recurrent signs of order, such as the step development of thought, the presentation of ideas in an orderly manner, the clustering of stories with the same form of the pattern, the restatement of an initial concern near the end of a story, and the presence of the pattern within the pattern.

The occasional appearance of the pattern within sayings of Jesus suggests that Jesus Himself might have used the pattern in His teaching. Although it is possible that Jesus did use the pattern in some way in His teaching, it seems best to attribute to Mark the regularity and clarity of the pattern when it is evident in Jesus' sayings.

Grounds for thinking that Jesus could have used the pattern Himself, however, are found in the fact that the narrative pattern and its various forms are evident in significant stories of the Old Testament. In this respect the structure of Mark's narratives is essentially the same as that of certain stories of the Old Testament, and one does not need to look to Rabbinic analogies or Hellenistic parallels to account for the structure of Mark's narratives.

In its presence in stories of the Old Testament, the pattern was a traditional pattern that would have been culturally known to both Jesus and His disciples through their familiarity with the Scriptures. It is possible
to ask whether Jesus assimilated the pattern and used it in His teaching. It is also possible to ask whether the pattern as a traditional way to tell a story influenced the formation of early reports about Jesus and controlled somewhat the shape of these reports in the transmission of the tradition. Furthermore, it is possible to think the pattern might have been an influence on the formation of stories about Jesus, particularly when Jesus' followers searched the Scriptures for insight about Jesus' Messianic status and mission.

The possibility that the *kerygma* of the early Church was influenced by the traditional pattern is suggested by the presence of the pattern in certain speeches in Acts. In portraying a human dilemma that was answered by an authoritative, redemptive saying or act of Jesus, the traditional pattern would have been useful as a Gospel pattern for use within the *kerygma*.

Signs of regularity and order in the structure of Mark's narratives make it possible to ask whether Mark, with an apparent sensitivity to order, might have been the Evangelist who best transmitted tradition that might have been ordered according to the pattern before him. Such thoughts about Jesus, the tradition, and Mark's use of it are not conclusions based on evidence but rather possibilities that are suggested by literary phenomena in Mark's narratives.

Further evidence which indicates that Mark was an orderly writer is seen in the thematic structure of Mark's narratives. The definition of structure as the order of content enables one to consider as thematic structure the orderly recurrence of ideas in Mark's narratives, as these have been delineated by the narrative pattern.

In a study of the order of themes in Mark's stories, it becomes apparent that themes recur after the manner of rhythmical parallelism. Instead of there being 'a point to the story', most of the narratives have at least two
ideas that are restated in a rhythmical fashion.

Five types of thematic structure may be detected in Mark's stories: (I) abab, (II) ab ab, (III) ab a + b, (IV) a + b ab, (V) ab ab ab. Each type has inverted forms. Every type except Type IV has extended forms. Two of the extended forms have inverted forms.

These structures are rhythmical, complete, and negative in tone. Thematically these structures accentuate the chief thematic concerns of Mark's Gospel: the Messiahship of Jesus and His suffering and death.

An understanding of the thematic structures enables one to understand more clearly the arrangement of material in Mark's stories. The structures also provide clues for interpretation by drawing attention to recurrent interests in the stories.

Thematic structures in sayings of Jesus suggest that His teachings displayed rhythmical order from time to time; but on account of Mark's apparent interest in order, it is difficult to determine whether rhythmical order in Jesus' sayings stems from Jesus or from Mark.

The thematic structures are most apparent in Mark's stories in comparison with the parallels of Matthew and Luke. The structures are frequently imperfect, lost, or absent altogether in the parallels of the two other Synoptists, especially Luke. The regularity of the thematic structures may be seen as another sign of Mark's methodical workmanship, and the completeness of these structures is evidence of his thoroughness and carefulness as a writer.

Mark's workmanship may also be seen in certain relationships between the thematic structures and the narrative pattern. These relationships display consistency in the written presentation of Mark's stories. Such consistency is another indication that Mark himself was somewhat responsible for the formation of his narratives.
As for suggestions for possible areas of further research, it would seem profitable for those expert in appropriate fields to engage in a thorough search for the narrative pattern—and no doubt other narrative patterns and variants—in M, Q, and L; in John's Gospel; in other literature of the New Testament; in Rabbinic and Hellenistic literature; in the Old Testament; in Babylonian literature, inasmuch as the pattern is located in the story of the Tower of Babel, which has roots in Babylonian culture; in short, in any available literature that was culturally antecedent to Jesus, the early Church, and contemporary culture of the times.

As objective criteria the narrative pattern and the various types of thematic structure should prove to be useful tools for studying afresh and in greater detail the work of Matthew and Luke in comparison with Mark.

The pattern may prove to be a useful tool for distinguishing between tradition and redaction, once traditional and redactional forms of the pattern have been detected with some degree of certainty.

Both the pattern and the thematic structures, in promoting the understanding of structure, should provide meaningful criteria for assessing more adequately the redactional activity of the Evangelists in connection with their theological interests and so give impetus to the study of redaction criticism.

Finally, the discovery of the narrative pattern and certain structures through literary analysis of the order of content is a positive indication that the analysis of literary structure is not simply a matter of aesthetics but is a most important method of investigation of biblical literature. Continuing examination of the order of content in biblical and extra-biblical literature should prove to be a rewarding enterprise for understanding more clearly Jesus and His followers' traditions about Him.
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*Narratives in parentheses are discussed but not illustrated.*
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