

Eve-Marie Becker – Troels Engberg-Pedersen – Mogens Müller (eds.), *Mark and Paul. Comparative Essays Part II: For and Against Pauline Influence on Mark* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 199; Berlin–Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2014). Pp. 330 + VIII. \$ 140. € 99,95. ISBN 978-3-11-031455-7.

BARTOSZ ADAMCZEWSKI

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

This volume is thematically related to the preceding volume of the BZNW series (BZNW 198) in its analysis of the recent ‘hot topic’ of possible connections between Paul and Mark. It contains papers offered by mostly Danish and German scholars who try to place the question of the Pauline-Marcan relationship on a new scholarly level.

After introductory remarks of the editors of the volume (pp. 1-10), the late Anne Vig Skoven (pp. 13-27) presents Gustav Volkmar’s understanding of the Gospel of Mark in terms of allegorical rewriting of Paul. Skoven rightly argues that Martin Werner’s total rejection of Volkmar’s two-level interpretation of Mark as referring both to the historical Jesus and to Paul the Apostle was mainly motivated by the apologetic aim to defend the historicity of the Gospel story, and that a new literary way of interpreting the Marcan Gospel can help resolve the problem of the presence of evidently Pauline features therein.

Joel Marcus’s essay on Mark as an interpreter of Paul (pp. 29-49) is a corrected, updated, and expanded version of his article published in *NTS* 43 (2000) 473-487. In a discussion with Daniel Boyarin, Marcus convincingly argues that Mk 7:19c should be understood in the Pauline sense of declaring all foods kosher (cf. Rom 14:14.20).

Heike Omerzu (pp. 51-61) briefly sketches the history of research on the connection between Paul and Mark. She concludes that the future research on Paul and Mark should abandon the discussions concerning the ill-defined notion of ‘Paulinism’ in Mark, as well as the assumed pre-Marcian and pre-Pauline materials, but rather concentrate on defining the criteria for the relatedness of texts beyond a mere lexical level. The quest for such criteria, although certainly important, should not be an abstract literary-theoretical endeavour, but it should concentrate on the particular features of intertextuality in biblical writings.

Gerd Theissen (pp. 63-86) rightly notes that all Pauline data concerning the historical Jesus find their counterparts in the Marcan Gospel. He nevertheless attributes these correspondences to common oral traditions behind Paul and Mark because of some Marcan differences from Paul. However, Theissen himself seems to be aware that these alleged differences: assigning the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles to all disciples (Mk 13:10; 14:9; but see the passive voice there), addressing the gospel first to the Jews (Mk 7:27; but see the symbolism of Galilee and the sea in Mk 1:14-17), requesting financial support from the believers (Mk 10:28-30; but see the negative connotations of Zebedee, tax collectors, Jerusalem merchants and tenants, etc.), presenting the rejection of food laws as a secret instruction (Mk 7:17-19; but see Mk 7:14-15.20-23) etc. are in fact only apparent (cf. 1 Cor 9:14; Rom 1:16; Phlp 4:10-20; Gal 6:6; 1 Cor 8:1-13 etc.).

Eve-Marie Becker (pp. 87-105) notes the similarity in the polyvalent usage of the term εὐαγγέλιον in Paul and Mark. She also argues that the shift in literary genre from Paul's letters to Mark's Gospel corresponds to a change in authority, audience, and genre expectation. Alas, she does not discuss the influence of Josephus' widely known narrative-rhetorical-historical writings on this change in early Christian literary activity: not only from Paul to Luke, but also from Paul to Mark.

Mogens Müller (pp. 107-117) is apparently favourable to the opinion that the Gospel of Mark is a result of allegorical narrativization of the central concepts of the Pauline theology. He suggests that the Gospel of Mark was intended to be regarded as Scripture, used in Christian worship alongside the Jewish Bible, but he does not trace the implications of this suggestion for the understanding of the Gospel of Mark, similarly to the Old Testament narratives, as an authoritative narrativizing reworking of earlier authoritative texts. However, he hints at the strategy of 'rewriting Scripture' as a possible key to the understanding of the freedom with which Mark constructed and reconstructed the Jesus tradition.

Oda Wischmeyer (pp. 121-146) highlights the fact that the literary prescripts Rom 1:1-7 and Mk 1:1-3 both combine the 'gospel' with the Jewish 'scripture'. She also argues that Romans and Mark constitute the pillars of early Christian literature, which developed astonishingly early in the new religious movement. She fails to note, however, that this rapid development only occurred in the post-Pauline realm, with its intensive and innovative use of written media of communication, but not in the Jerusalem-oriented sphere of influence, which seems to have only relied on letters of recommendation (2 Cor 3:1).

Jan Doehorn (pp. 147-168) argues that the progression from Davidic Christology to God Christology in Mk 2:23-28 has a parallel in Rom 1:3-4.

He also suggests that the juxtaposition of Man and Son of Man in Mk 2:27-28 finds a Pauline parallel in 1 Cor 15:22-28.47. Dochhorn's argument is quite convoluted, mainly because such juxtaposition can evidently be traced in Ps 8:5, but not necessarily in 1 Cor 15:22-28.47. The reference to Hebr 1:1-2:9 does not support this argument, since Hebr 1:1-2:9 is a later, post-Lucan text, based on Acts 1-2 with its prologue, references to wind/Spirit and flames of fire, and Christological use of scriptural quotations (Ps 110[109]:1 et al.).

Kasper Bro Larsen (pp. 169-187) argues that the halacha in Mk 7:1-23 is close to Pauline and post-Pauline (esp. Col 2:8.20-22) dietary halacha, but it is not specifically Pauline in the New Testament because it has the features which are also present in First Peter, Luke, Matthew, and John. However, Larsen does not demonstrate that the latter writings were not influenced by Paul's halachic ideas.

Troels Engberg-Pedersen (pp. 189-209) argues that only the recognition of particularly Pauline motifs in Mk 8:34-9:1 (being metaphorically crucified with Christ: Gal 2:19-20; 6:14; gaining or losing one's life: Phlp 3:7-8; not being ashamed of Christ's words: Rom 1:16 etc.) leads to an adequate, metaphorical interpretation of this Marcan text. This observation implies that Mark generalized what Paul had said of himself so as to make it cover all Christ followers and then put that generalization back into the mouth of Jesus. Alas, although Engberg-Pedersen notes the philosophical significance of Mk 8:34-9:1, he does not explain the function of the allusion to Plato, *Apol.* 29d-30b in Mk 8:36-37.

Gitte Buch-Hansen (pp. 213-242) notes the differences between Paul's and Mark's pneumatology and attitude to Judaism. Alas, she does not answer the key question concerning possible connections between Paul and Mark.

Ole Davidsen (pp. 243-272) argues that Paul's interpretation of Jesus' death was influenced by the Adam narrative, and therefrom, by suggesting that Paul must have used some narrative in his kerygma, he surprisingly infers that the Adam narrative played a *decisive* role in the birth and formation of the Christ narrative. Davidsen also suggests that Paul may have used some traditional Adam-Christ typology, and therefrom, with no further proof, he infers that both Paul and Mark actually relied on such pre-Pauline typology. Davidsen's argumentative logic is here evidently strained.

Jesper Tang Nielsen (pp. 273-294) rightly argues that the Marcan theology of the cross, which combines the 'vertical' idea of Christ's obedience with the 'horizontal' one of giving his life as ransom for many, together with the idea of Christ's death on the cross as a model for the reversal of values in the Christian community, is essentially Pauline. On the other hand, Nielsen's attempt to identify the distinctive features of Paul's theology by way of

isolating particularly 'dense' Christological formulae (e.g. Phlp 2:6-11) and suggesting that they reflect pre-Pauline traditions, against whose background Paul's theology allegedly developed, is alas less convincing.

Finn Damgaard (pp. 295-310) argues that Mark's portrait of Peter is not thoroughly negative because the evangelist wanted to present Peter's failings as comparable to Paul's portrayal of himself as a persecutor of the church. However, whereas Paul only four times referred to his persecution of the church, and elsewhere he presented himself as a model to be imitated, Mark depicted Peter as repeatedly failing to understand and imitate Jesus, and his final reference to Peter does not evidently rehabilitate him.

In brief, the book offers some new insights into the vexed question of the relationship between Paul and Mark. Most articles follow the particular way of conceptualizing this problem as it was paved by Joel Marcus's discussion with the arguments of Martin Werner. Against this background, especially insightful is Troels Engberg-Pedersen's suggestion that the Pauline-Marcian connection should be traced not only in the more or less evidently Pauline ideas in the Marcan narrative, but also in the intriguing elements of the Marcan work, which require an interpretation that can best be provided by the assumption of their Pauline background.