MARK'S JESUS, DIVINE? A STUDY OF ASPECTS OF MARK'S CHRISTOLOGY WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HEBREW DIVINE WARRIOR TRADITIONS IN MARK, AND IN RELATION TO CONTEMPORARY DEBATES ON PRIMITIVE CHRISTOLOGY.

MARCUS OLIVER THROUP

Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

APRIL 2014

ABSTRACT

Within the wider framework of contemporary debates on primitive NT Christology concerning the early Christians' perception of the divinity of Jesus, this work investigates the influence of Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions (HDWT) on the Markan sea-miracles (Mark 4.35-41; 6.45-52) and exorcisms (Mark 1.21-28; 5.1-20; 7.24-30; 9.14-29). In a final form, narrative approach to the Markan text, this study seeks to demonstrate that as part of his "high" Christology, Mark draws on the HDWT in such a way as to liken Jesus to God the Divine Warrior in "Old Testament" and Second Temple Jewish texts. The present work argues that in the sea-miracles and exorcisms, Mark transfers divine attributes and operations to Jesus, claiming some form of divine identity for Jesus. The findings of this study are then considered in terms of their implications for Mark's Christology, and located in relation to the work of leading scholars on primitive Christology in general.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In different ways, several friends and colleagues have collaborated and interacted with me on the present project. First, I would like to give especial thanks to the Revd. Dr. Andrew Angel for supervising this PhD thesis, which on his own admission was risking our friendship of some years, a gamble which, thankfully, has paid off! Professor Roland Deines of the University of Nottingham deserves special mention for his very helpful critiques of this dissertation, as does Dr. Elizabeth Shively of the University of St. Andrews who examined the thesis, making several valuable observations. Thanks are also due to Dr. Stephen Travis who gave some encouraging comments on a draft, and the Revd. Dr. Ian Paul who advised at the earliest stage of the project. Similarly, I'd like to thank Prof. Simon Oliver of the University of Nottingham for aiding me on formatting issues regarding submission. I am grateful to Dr. Doug Ingram who first suggested that I might consider further research and helped me on the way. I would also like to thank Dr. Graham Cheesman, my friend John Lenschow and all those from the Belfast CTE class of 2009 (you know who you are!) for stimulating conversations and reflection as I mulled over my ideas with you in the first few months of the project. During the course of research, professors Joel Marcus, Richard Bauckham, Estevão Kirschner and my former tutor John Day kindly responded to e-mails, for which I am grateful. I'm thankful to Dr. André Holanda of the Catholic University in Recife, Brazil, for his friendship and encouragement. Similarly, I'd like to thank fellow post-graduate students, particularly the Revd. Jenny Corcoran, Suse McBay and Brandon Walker for their encouragement and fellowship. Naturally, the greatest thanks are owed to my family, my parents Brian and Lynne were a great help on practical matters, while my sister Jessica and her husband Luiz were a real encouragement throughout as were my grandmother Dorothy and Aunt Jennie. I remain extremely grateful to my wife Tamara for supporting me through thick and thin, any success which is mine is truly yours also. Rebekah Dutra and Mateus Jacob were born to us during the years I was working on this thesis, it is to them that I dedicate this work in the hope that they too might come to comprehend Mark's message about Jesus.

Soli Deo Gloria!

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: MARKAN CHRISTOLOGY, PRIMITIVE CHRISTOLOGY AND DIVINE WARRIOR CHRISTOLOGY

(1.1) Introduction

While certain New Testament (NT) texts indicate that early christological discussions concerned the legitimacy of Jesus' "humanity",[1] contemporary debates inquire if, in what sense, and to what degree the NT documents lay claim to "divinity" for Jesus.[2] Since studies on primitive Christology tend to prioritise the Pauline literary corpus and Johannine literature, the synoptic gospels sometimes receive less attention.[3] Nevertheless, insofar as Mark[4] and the other synoptic gospels recount the story of Jesus Christ, individually and in parallel, they make vital contributions to our understanding of early Christology. This holds true, whether the synoptic authors are taken as "conservative redactors" faithfully recording the kernel of eyewitness traditions, or as redactional "spin doctors" adapting traditional material in order to produce theological manifestos consonant with their specific agendas.[5]

There is good reason for studying Mark within the wider framework of debates on *primitive* Christology, since it is generally acknowledged to be the first gospel.[6] However, "Mark scholars" study the gospel as a largely independent sub-discipline, and few apply their research to wider debates on primitive Christology. An exception is Adela

---

[1] David Capes "YHWH texts and monotheism in Paul's Christology" in Stuckenbruck & North (eds.) (2004: 131), cites 2 John 7, and 1 John 4.2-3 in this connection. However, John 1.14 (also cited) may be a straightforward statement of belief with no apologetic intent.

[2] The titles/subtitles of several works in the debate confirm this: Larry Hurtado "How on Earth did Jesus become a God?"; James D.G. Dunn "Did the first Christians worship Jesus?"; Maurice Casey "From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God"; Richard J. Bauckham "God crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament".

[3] Hengel (1976) mainly discusses Paul in relation to christological origins. Hurtado (1988: 170) indexes just 12 references to synoptic texts, but has over 50 entries for 1 Corinthians alone! Casey (1991: 188-191) indexes several synoptic references, but his chapter headings (1991: 3-4) reveal a primary focus on Pauline and Johannine texts. Similarly, Stuckenbruck & North (2004), in their "Monotheism and the New Testament" section, consider John (two essays), Paul, and also Heb 1, but the synoptics are not among the essay titles (though Dunn's chapter does treat the synoptics). Conversely, the synoptics receive more attention in Fletcher-Louis 1997; Hurtado 2003; Hurtado 2005; Gathercole 2006; Collins & Collins 2008.

[4] Following scholarly convention, "Mark" refers either to Mark's Gospel or to its author (see 1.6 (c), p. 60 below).

[5] On the former see Byrskog 2000; Gerhardsson 2001; Bauckham 2006. On the latter see e.g. Wrede 1971 [1901]; Weeden 1971. Naturally, depending on one's viewpoint, conclusions regarding authorial motivation will differ considerably.

[6] For a comprehensive study on Markan priority see Head 1997. For the case against Markan priority see Stoldt 1977. There is a near consensus among commentators that Mark was written between 65 – 70 CE, on the issue of date, see e.g. Guelich 1989: xxxi- xxxii; Marcus 1999: 37-39. For a radical alternative, arguing for a date in the late thirties C.E., see Crossley 2004.

Yarbro Collins, who in a book concerned with messianism and primitive Christology carries over conclusions from her commentary on Mark.[7] Collins takes a literary and history of religions approach, reading Mark against the background of Jewish Old Testament (OT) and Greco-Roman traditions.[8] For Collins, particularly in the light of Greek religious traditions, aspects of Mark's portrayal suggest that Jesus is a divine figure.[9] Elsewhere, however, Mark's Jesus emerges as a human agent, divinely appointed to execute a prophetic and messianic mandate, but nothing like a preexistent divine being.[10] More generally, Collins infers that on the basis of a perceived transfer of divine functions to Jesus (e.g. king/warrior/judge), Jesus' divinity may have been conceived initially in functional terms, the notion of preexistence in turn intensifying the perception of Jesus' divine status in early Christianity.[11]

Within Mark studies, narrative treatments analyse the final form of the gospel, reading it as story, often with a focus on Christology.[12] Whereas some works concentrate on Christological titles, sometimes investigating these in relation to particular sections of the narrative, certain recent studies explore the dynamics of Markan characterization in terms of "narrative Christology."[13] Malbon's narrative critical study exemplifies the latter, which, while attributing a high christological perspective to particular characters (and the Markan narrator), tones down the claims made by Mark's Jesus himself.[14]

---

[7] Thus, Collins & Collins 2008: 128 n. 25; 129 n. 26 with references to Collins 2007.

[8] For Collins (2007: 44), particular Markan epithets and narrative accounts evoke distinct sets of associations, one from the perspective of Jewish scripture and tradition, another from that of Greek literature.

[9] See Collins & Collins 2008: 131-132, on the transfiguration. On the Markan sea-miracles in this connection see Collins 2007: 260, 333. On the motif of secrecy linked to the notion of a deity in disguise see Collins & Collins 2008: 132 with references.

[10] Collins & Collins (2008: 209) reject the notion of preexistence in Mark. Collins (2007: 48-50) explains that Mark often depicts Jesus as "eschatological prophet", paralleling Elijah-Elisha traditions. Cf. Collins 2007: 94 on the historical Jesus as "eschatological prophet".

[11] Collins & Collins 2008: 174.

[12] Narrative approaches to Mark's Christology or particular facets of it (e.g. Christological titles), include Hahn 1963; Peterson 1978; Rhoads & Michie 1982; Kingsbury 1983; Broadhead 1994, 1999; Collins 1992; Danove 2005; Davidsen 1993; Donahue 1973; van Iersel 1998; Malbon 1986; 2009; Naluparayil 2000. On narrative critical approaches to NT study generally, see e.g. Malbon & McKnight 1994; Rhoads & Syreeni 1999. For a critique of narrative, reader-centred criticism and an appeal to recover the "flesh-and-blood" reader, see Incigneri (2003: 22-34).

[13] On titles see Hahn 1963; Broadhead 1994, 1999. Kingsbury (1983), utilises aspects of narrative theory (e.g. "point of view," "reliable narrator"), in response to older treatments (e.g. Perrin 1974) of so called *theios aner* Christology in Mark. Malbon (2009) explores what she terms "Characterization as narrative Christology," distinguishing the type of Christology espoused by particular characters in the Markan narrative, and, contrasting the point of view of the Markan Jesus with that of the Markan narrator. On "characterization" in Mark/gospel studies more generally, see e.g. Rhoads & Michie 1982: 122-124; Merenlahti & Hakola, in Rhoads & Syreeni 1999: 13-48.

[14] Malbon 2009: 237, cf. 144-146; 150.

Indeed, there is an overall tendency to downplay, or counterbalance Mark's high Christology on the premise that God (i.e. the "Father") is the sole divine figure in Mark's story.[15]

Mark's high Christology is expressed in different ways. Narrative studies with a concentration on titles find Mark's titular Christology to be "high," where a confluence of christological titles (e.g. "Son of God," "Son of Man," "Christ," "Son of David," "King of the Jews") are applied to Jesus by different characters (e.g. 3.11, 5.7, 15.39; 2.10, 9.31, 10.45; 8.29, 14.61; 10.47; 15.2, 15.18, respectively).[16] Whereas older "corrective Christology" theories allege that titles judged to be inappropriate or incorrect are trumped by purportedly more appropriate designations as part of the narrative strategy,[17] the Markan titles are better understood as complementary aspects of a complex christological portrait.[18]

The latter seems to be the case since distinct christological titles/concepts combine at climactic points of the gospel. For example, in Mark 8.38 the notion of divine sonship (implied by the reference to "my father") is coupled uniquely with the "Son of Man" epithet. Again, in 14.61-62, in Jesus' exchange with the High Priest, the titles "Christ," "Son of the Beloved" (= "Son of God"), and "Son of Man" appear concatenated, together with an "I am" pronouncement.[19] Thus, while individual epithets and designations focus on singular dimensions of Jesus' identity, the ensemble of Markan christological titles make a forceful multifaceted claim concerning Jesus' ultimate christological identity as "Son of God," "King of the Jews", "Christ/Messiah", "Son of David", "Son of Man", "Servant," "Rabbi/Teacher," without excluding other roles such as prophet (cf. 6.4) and shepherd (cf. 6.34).

---

[15] Malbon 2009: 52, 202, 216.

[16] Comprehensive surveys of "titular Christology" include, Hahn 1963; Broadhead 1992. Cf. Kingsbury 1983.

[17] See, e.g., Weeden 1971; Perrin 1974.

[18] This is not to say that Mark makes no distinction between "major" and "minor" titles, nor is it to disqualify the possibility that one particular christological title might be key for Mark (see e.g. Rowe 2002: 232-233, in connection with the title "Son of God"). Clearly, given the limited occurrence of a title such as "Nazarene" (16.6), compared with the frequent "Son of God" title/concept (e.g. 1.11, 3.11, 5.7, 14.61, 15.39), the suggestion is that the latter is more significant within the Markan narrative schema. Nevertheless, despite infrequent usage of a particular title, related concepts may nevertheless obtain. In relation to "Nazarene," for example, it is stated in Mark 1.9 that Jesus "came from Nazareth" and in 16.6 Jesus is identified as "the Nazarene", where it may be that the geographical nuance has a deeper significance within the Markan schema (namely, a concern to tie the miraculous story of Jesus to the historical figure Jesus of Nazareth), so Broadhead 1999: 31-42.

[19] Similarly, Rowe 2002: 233.

In addition to christological titles, in Mark's storytelling, Jesus is sometimes compared with God himself. At the narrative level in terms of the "point of view" of particular characters, this may occur subtly, thus, in Mark 5.19-20, speaking of what "the Lord" has done for "Legion," Jesus seemingly refers to God (his Father), nevertheless, the healed demoniac takes "the Lord" to be synonymous with "Jesus."[20] Sometimes, the Markan Jesus' actions recall the actions of God himself. For example, in the Markan presentation of Jesus' appointment of the twelve in 3.13-19, Jesus' actions align him to some extent with God himself.[21] While this pericope might be framed generally as a "Mosaic parallel," since, like God, Mark's Jesus calls a select leadership nucleus to himself, strictly speaking his actions mirror those of God in Exod 19 (cf. Num 1).[22]

Mutatis mutandis, this may similarly be true of Jesus' forgiveness of the paralytic narrated in Mark 2.1-12, though ongoing debates surround the interpretation and implications of 2.7, i.e. whether Mark's Jesus appropriates a specifically *divine* prerogative or if he merely acts as a priestly or even angelic representative of God.[23] On the other hand, it is generally acknowledged that in Jesus' stilling of the sea and his walking on the water (4.35-41/6.45-52), Mark portrays Jesus in a manner directly reminiscent of Yahweh in the OT.[24] These events will be studied in detail in Chapter 3.

This thesis will examine the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms. The justification for treating these two sets of texts together is that these categories are linked literarily in the Markan narrative, as I intend to demonstrate in due course (cf. Chapter 4, pp. 166-167). These Markan stories will be studied in relation to Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions (HDWT), that is, the Hebrew version of the Combat Myth in which God

[20] See, e.g. Malbon 2009: 136-137.
[21] See, Malbon 1991: 84; Henderson 2006: 80-83, in reference to Exod 19. The same is true of the census in Num 1, God himself summons the tribal leaders, whom, as in Mark 3.13-19, are named.
[22] Henderson 2006: 80-83.
[23] That Mark 2.7 points to a divine identity for Jesus is disputed, those who disallow this connection include Malbon 2009: 152; Casey 2007: 163-165; Hägerland 2012. Conversely, it is defended by Johansson 2011: 351-374.
[24] E.g. Guelich 1989: 270-271, 350-351; Marcus 1999: 338, 432; Watts 1997: 160-162; Heil 1981: 15, 126-127; Malbon 1991: 77-78; Rhoads & Michie 1982: 66; cf. with regard to the Matthean parallels, Bornkamm; Barth & Held (1963: 52-57, especially 57 and n. 2); Angel 2011: 299-317. However, doubting the relevance of the possible mythological background Horsley (2001: 105) questions whether Mark strives to identify Jesus with God here.

portrayed as Divine Warrior (DW) battles and subjugates evil personified as the chaotic waters/sea or chaos sea monsters/dragons.[25]

The decision to study specifically the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms in connection with these traditions rests on the fact that although some scholars have noticed links between these stories and the traditions, to my knowledge no thoroughgoing investigation of the possible links between these Markan texts and the Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions has been attempted.[26] That is not to preclude the possibility that these traditions may have influenced other Markan texts, however, given the essential surface meaning of the sea-miracles i.e. Jesus has power over the sea and elements, and the exorcisms i.e. Jesus overcomes evil otherworldly beings, it was judged appropriate to explore these texts in relation to the HDWT wherein God is depicted overcoming the sea and otherworldly evil forces. Therefore, this thesis sets out to fully treat the possible connections between the Markan sea-miracles and these traditions which will be explained below in Chapter 2. Ultimately, it will test the hypothesis that Mark draws on the HDWT in order to bolster his "high" Christology and to represent Jesus as a powerful divine being.[27]

A limited few studies have recognised the programmatic significance in Mark of the portrayal of Jesus as a warrior figure who wrests and overcomes demonic forces.[28] Some have already drawn attention to the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms in this connection, finding that Jesus is depicted in a manner reminiscent of Yahweh the DW in the OT.[29] Nevertheless, the full extent to which Mark draws on particular traditions live in the Second Temple period in order to make a bold christological comparison between Jesus and Yahweh the DW is underappreciated, and merits more comprehensive study and statement.

---

[25] The nomenclature and category "Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions" will be explained in Chapter 2, pp. 71-72, n. 24. These traditions are roughly synonymous with the "Combat Myth" or "*Chaoskampf*".

[26] Scholars who argue that the Markan sea-miracles and/or exorcisms have been in some way and to some degree influenced by the Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions include Kee 1968; Heil 1981; McCurley 1983; Batto 1992; Rudman 2003 and Brower 2009. The relevant portions of these works are discussed and evaluated in Chapter 2, section 2.3.

[27] Loosely, "divine being" might signal any supernatural being belonging to the celestial realm. However, in the section below on debates concerning primitive Christology a more precise ontological categorisation (i.e. as a chief angel, or as the "second person" of the Trinity in orthodox Christianity) requires that a distinction be made between a "divine" and "angelic" identity for Jesus, see n. 56 below.

[28] E.g. Marcus 1992, 1999; Watts 1997; Shively 2012.

[29] Brower 2009: 291-305; Rudman 2003: 102-107; Kee 1968; Watts 1997: 160-161.

As a narrative, final form study, this thesis takes its place alongside narrative focused studies (cf. n. 12), where within the wider context of Mark, the principal concern is to examine aspects of Mark's Christology in relation to the sea-miracles and exorcisms. While the approach of this thesis is broadly speaking narrative and literary, drawing at times on narrative critical tools e.g. "point of view", "characterisation", it is not strictly speaking a *narrative critical* study, insofar as typical distinctions i.e. "author/implied author," "audience/implied audience" and similar narrative critical constructs will not be taken up in a thoroughgoing manner.[30] Conversely, a traditional (historical) view of Markan authorship and audience (i.e. Roman) will be assumed throughout, though the argument in no way depends on this. Since this thesis will consider Markan Christology within the matrix of debates on primitive Christology, key players in these debates will become dialogue partners. In particular, the results of this study may confirm or challenge Collins' conclusions, sketched above.[31] In the interests of clarity and on the basis of the internal textual evidence, this thesis assumes that Mark's Jesus is authentically human.[32] Nevertheless, it also seeks to demonstrate that Mark's Christology is predominantly "high," possibly indicating, albeit paradoxically, that Jesus is ultimately a divine being.

Clearly, the portrait of Jesus in the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms, comprises one facet of his polyvalent Christology, which incorporates several significant aspects such as "king," "shepherd," "teacher," "servant," "prophet" as mentioned above. Indeed, a cursory glance at the overall structure of the gospel reveals that with one exception (9.14-29), the sea-miracles and exorcisms are confined to the first half (chapters 1-8), which fact tends to confirm that these are components of a more comprehensive Markan schema. It will be important to locate what may be termed as Mark's "Divine Warrior Christology" within that schema, particularly since there is a well-known mismatch between the portrayal of Jesus as a mighty exorcist, capable of stilling the sea and walking on the water in chapters 1-8, and the later depiction of Jesus as the suffering, crucified

[30] On these concepts see e.g. Malbon in Gooder 2008: 83-84.
[31] See below the review of Collins' Mark commentary.
[32] Clearly, Mark's is no docetic Christology since Jesus salivates (8.23), drinks wine (14.25 cf. 15.36), experiences grief (14.33-34), and breathes his last and dies (15.39). Indeed, Augustine *De consensu evangelistarum* I.9 associated the symbol of the man with Mark, in contrast with the eagle which attaches to the Gospel of John as a symbol of Jesus' divinity.

Son of Man/Servant figure who dies in apparent ignominy in the latter half of the gospel (chapter 8-16).[33]

(1.2) Thesis outline

The present chapter will provide a general survey of contemporary debates on primitive Christology, noting pertinent references to Mark. An immediate aim here is to identify key questions emerging from scholarly research on christological origins, which questions might provide a springboard for our evaluation of Markan Christology. Once identified, these questions will be taken up as a set and applied in a literature review geared towards studies on Mark in order to obtain a working assessment of Markan Christology. A summary of findings with responses will issue from the literature review. Lastly, a "Proposal" section, explaining the aim, approach, working assumptions, and method, indicates how this thesis will proceed in relation to the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms and the HDWT.

As a platform for the investigation of Mark's sea-miracles and exorcisms in subsequent chapters, Chapter 2 will introduce and explain the HDWT, stating the foundational assumptions of this thesis in regard to these traditions. Brief consideration will be given to the Ancient Near Eastern (ANE) background, and the HDWT will be presented in terms of nomenclature, nature, referent and form. The HDWT will then be located and described with reference to OT/Second Temple examples and scholarship which traces DW traditions to Hebrew texts. This will be followed by a discussion of criteria which will operate in this work to identify and ascribe texts to the HDWT, and a summary of this chapter's findings in tabular form for ease of consultation. The final section will evaluate works treating the putative influence of the HDWT on Mark.

Chapter 3 will consider the sea-miracles (4.35-41; 6.45-52), in order to establish the extent to which Mark draws on the HDWT in his presentation of these texts. Each story will be briefly set in context, and, following the methodological procedures outlined in chapters 1 and 2, the Markan stories will be scrutinised in order to establish whether and to what extent the evangelist draws on imagery and terminology belonging to the HDWT. I will endeavour to demonstrate that in 4.35-41/6.45-52, Mark likens Jesus to God/Yahweh the DW, a figure familiar to several OT and Second Temple texts. The

[33] On this "mismatch" and the notion that Mark's Gospel is an "apology of the cross," see Gundry 1993: 14-15.

findings of this enquiry pertaining to the sea-miracles will be examined within the wider framework of Markan Christology and checked against the question matrix set out in Chapter 1, in order to determine whether answers to christological questions are forthcoming.

Chapter 4 will begin with an introduction to the topic of Jesus' exorcisms, with an explanation of the approach adopted in this chapter. The Markan exorcisms themselves (1.23-28; 5.1-20; 7.24-30; 9.14-29) will be considered individually within the wider Markan context, with particular attention to the literary inter-relation of the sea-miracles and exorcisms. Since there is mention of Jesus' exorcistic activities beyond the actual exorcism episodes themselves (e.g. 1.32-34; 3.11; 3.22-30), consideration will be given to related texts and the overall shape and significance of the representation of Jesus as exorcist in Mark. The exorcism stories will be analysed in order to establish whether and to what extent the evangelist draws on imagery and terminology belonging to the HDWT. I will endeavour to demonstrate that in the Markan exorcisms, by association with the sea-miracles but also independent of them, the evangelist likens Jesus to God/Yahweh the DW. As in the preceding chapter, findings emerging from this consideration of Jesus' exorcisms will be examined within the wider framework of Markan Christology, and checked against the question matrix outlined in Chapter 1, in order to determine whether answers to christological questions are forthcoming.

Finally, in Chapter 5, the conclusions to this study will be restated, first in relation to the influence of the HDWT on the Markan sea-miracles, then with a statement of the possible implications for Markan Christology in dialogue with key players in the debates on Markan and primitive Christology. The same will be undertaken in relation to the influence of the HDWT on the Markan exorcisms, again outlining possible implications for Markan Christology with reference to scholarly debates. A third subsection will offer final considerations regarding DW Christology as a particular facet of Markan Christology, taking into account scholarly discussions. Finally, some avenues for further study will be suggested, along with the overall statement of conclusion to the thesis.

(1.3) General survey of contemporary debates on primitive Christology noting references to the Gospel of Mark

A century ago, Wilhelm Bousset provided one particular interpretation of NT Christology.[34] Bousset plotted christological data chronologically, finding an essentially developmental trend wherein the allegedly "low" Christology of the earliest "Palestinian" traditions gave way to "high" christological formulations embodied in Pauline and Johannine literature. Christological titles were located within the putative developmental process. Thus, for Bousset, in the Pauline "Christ mysticism", "Kyrios" superseded the titular "Son of Man" traceable to the original stratum of community tradition.[35] In a subsequent stage, the Pauline "Kyrios" was itself surpassed in the *fuller* "divinization" characteristic of the Johannine literary corpus.[36] On this view, then, the first Christians adapted their frustrated messianic ideal to accommodate beliefs about the "Son of Man", but as yet Jesus might not be considered "divine" in a full sense, for example, as a being to be worshipped.[37] Rather, under the influence of Hellenistic categories, beginning with Paul, later generations would gradually apprehend him as such.[38]

Highly influential in its day, some scholars still presuppose the basic evolutionary model proposed by Bousset.[39] Occasionally, treatments of primitive Christology display points of contact with the traditional theory.[40] However, in recent years, Bousset's thesis

[34] Bousset 1913 [references from the ET, 1970].
[35] Bousset 1913: 39; 121-122.
[36] Bousset 1913: 211-215; 236-244.
[37] Bousset 1913: 49-52. Thus, Bousset (1913: 51) downgrades references to the "worship" of Jesus in the gospels as "later touching up".
[38] Bousset 1913: 205. In the past, the *theios aner* concept was used to explain – albeit variously - the nature and emergence of Mark's Christology. Drawing on Bieler (1935-1936 *Theios Aner* I.4-5 I, 129, 141; II 113 I.73-97), Bultmann (1952a: 35, 130-131) posited that the Greco-Roman "divine man", a miracle-working human indwelt by a god/divine spirit, became a template for the Markan Jesus. However, given the Markan stress on Jesus' suffering and inglorious death, a second wave of scholars came to view the "divine-man" as a foil for the Markan Jesus, not a template. Thus, Mark's Christology was styled as "corrective Christology" whereby the Hellenistic *theios aner* notion was eschewed and reinterpreted through Mark's *theologia crucis* (cf. Kingsbury 1983:1-45). More recent approaches relegate or reject the Hellenistic *theios aner* as an interpretive matrix, e.g., Hooker (1991: 12-13, cf. 201) briefly addresses and dismisses Weeden's divine-man Christology; Marcus (2009: 1155 - 1159) in his "Index of Subjects" registers no category for either "divine-man" or "theios aner".
[39] Hurtado (2003: 16) cites Burton Mack, but several "historical Jesus" scholars, such as Marcus Borg (1984: 237) and Robert Funk (1996: 143) similarly insist that the historical Jesus was a sage/moral teacher who eventually became "divinized" in the early Church. On Bousset's earlier influence, see e.g. Bultmann (1952a: 124) who depends on his former teacher in relation to the title "Kyrios".
[40] Dunn (1980) and Casey (1991) presuppose an evolutionary model of Christology, e.g. Casey 1991: 9; Dunn 1980: 30.

has attracted damaging criticism from some quarters.[41] Since Hurtado offers a full critique, it will suffice here to briefly restate two major problems.[42] First, the diachronic scheme adopted by Bousset has been exposed as methodologically unsound.[43] Insofar as it posits a stage by stage christological progression, it misconstrues the evidence, since the earliest christological traditions enshrined in Pauline texts (e.g. Phil 2.6-11; Col 1.15-20; 1 Cor 16.22) are arguably among its "highest".[44] Secondly, Bousset argued that elements of NT Christology, (e.g. the title "Son of God"; the worship of Jesus as "Lord") were mainly appropriated from a Hellenistic religious milieu, and then back projected onto the OT.[45] But this reconstruction rested largely on the premise that there existed a fundamental dichotomy between "Hellenistic" and "Palestinian" Judaism, a view since found to be misleading.[46]

Therefore, since Hengel's critique of Bultmann and the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, some more recent explanations of the origins of NT Christology have abandoned Bousset's approach.[47] Larry Hurtado consciously works out his own position over against Bousset, focusing attention on the liturgical practice of early Christians.[48] Among other features, Hurtado cites the public worship of Jesus and the application of the divine name "Lord" to Jesus in order to advance his case that in a "mutation" of Jewish monotheism, earliest Christology envisaged Jesus as a second divine being alongside God.[49] In an

[41] See Hurtado 2003: 13-26. Hurtado's title, "Lord Jesus Christ" echoes Bousset's, "Kyrios Christos", cf. Hengel 1976: 10, 18, 77; Collins & Collins 2008: 71, 207.
[42] Hurtado 1979: 306-317; 2003: 6-25; 2005: 16-18.
[43] Hurtado 2003: 6-7.
[44] Hengel 1976: 18-19; Bauckham 2008: 20; Collins & Collins (2008: 207) contra Bousset. Bousset's student Bultmann (1952a: 52) recognises that 1 Cor 16.22 originates in the "earliest Church", though rather unconvincingly (especially in the light of 1 Cor 8.6) posits God, not Jesus, as referent of "Maranatha!" denying that the earliest Christians invoked Jesus as Lord.
[45] Bousset 1913: 138-152; 205-208, cf. Hurtado 2003: 22. Bousset (1913: 149) asserts that the title "Lord" appeared in Gentile regions owing to the influence of Hellenistic mystery cults, but was then *read back* into the OT to connect the sacred name of God with Jesus of Nazareth.
[46] Hengel 1976: 17-19; Hurtado 2003: 23-24.
[47] Hengel (1976: 25-30; 42) attacks Bultmann (e.g. Bultmann 1952a: 128-131) for asserting rather than demonstrating that early Christology was indebted to the Hellenistic "divine man" notion and the Gnostic "Redeemer" myth. Treatments examining christological origins from an OT/Second Temple Jewish background include Hengel 1976; Segal 1977; Hurtado 1988; 2003; 2005; Bauckham 2008; Fletcher-Louis 1997; Stuckenbruck 1995. A notable exception is Casey 1991, whom Hurtado (2003: 17) places in the tradition of Bousset. With regard to Mark's Gospel, Collins (2007) is a further exception since she interprets in the light both of Jewish and Greco-Roman paradigms.
[48] E.g. Hurtado 2003: 138-152.
[49] Hurtado (1998: 4) defines "worship" as "open, formal, public and intentional actions of invocation, adoration, appeal, praise and communion", arguing in various places (e.g. Hurtado 1988: 100-114; 2003: 137-152; 2005: 83-107) that Jesus received such worship in earliest Christianity. In this connection, Hurtado (1988: 101; cf. 2003:147-148) cites "Christ hymns" (e.g. John 1.1-18; Col 1.15-20; Phil 2.5-11). Again, Hurtado (e.g. 1988: 108-111; 2003: 112) cites references to Jesus which herald him as "Lord" in a

earlier phase of research, Hurtado conceptualised the early church's understanding of Jesus as "binitarian monotheism".[50]

Again, in agreement with Hurtado against Bousset, Richard Bauckham affirms the earliest Christology as the "highest possible".[51] Bauckham advocates a "Christology of divine identity", wherein Jesus is seen to participate directly in the unique identity of God.[52] This, he maintains, is achieved by the appropriation of uniquely monotheistic categories (e.g. God's sovereign act of creation, his sovereign rule, the Tetragrammaton, worship of the one God) and their application to Jesus in the early church as attested in the NT texts he examines.[53] For Bauckham, Christology is not merely "functional", i.e., a description of what Jesus *does*, but "ontic", i.e., a description of who Jesus *is*.[54]

In debates which focus around the genesis, nature and ultimate meaning of early Jesus devotion, Hurtado, Bauckham and other scholars appeal variously to OT/Second Temple Jewish precedents. Central are enquiries regarding the extent to which the conferral of a highly elevated status on Jesus represents a development or a departure from existing beliefs in the nexus of Second Temple Jewish religion.[55] Such investigations, in turn, help establish if the earliest Christian claims made on behalf of Jesus amount to affirmations of "divinity" i.e. that Jesus was a second god alongside the God of Israel, or to frame the matter after Bauckham, that he somehow participated in the

---

manner reminiscent of OT confessions made to YHWH (e.g. Acts 9.14, 21; 22.16; 1 Cor 1.2; Rom 10.13). On "mutation" see Hurtado 1988: 93-124; cf. 2005: 203.

[50] On "binitarian" Hurtado (2003: 151; cf. 2005: 202) clarifies that a "concern to define and reverence Jesus with reference to the one God is what I mean by the term 'binitarian.'''

[51] Bauckham 2008: x, 20.

[52] E.g. Bauckham 2008: 26, 36-37, 58.

[53] E.g. Bauckham (1998: 35-40) on the participation of the "preexistent Christ" in God's unique act of creation. Bauckham (2008: 22-27), considers, for example, the use of Ps 110.1 in the NT (e.g. Acts 2.34-36; Heb 1.13; Mark 12.36-37) which allegedly points to Jesus' participation in the unique divine sovereignty over all things, and 1 Cor 8.6 as a christological redefinition of monotheism.

[54] Bauckham 2008: 30-31.

[55] Fletcher-Louis (1997: 2 n. 5) lists Hurtado, Bauckham and Dunn as scholars who emphasise the *discontinuity* between Jewish monotheism and christological developments, over against Rowland, Fossum, and Barker who see greater *continuity*. Evidently, the views represented by each scholar vary considerably. Again, even those who argue that early Jesus devotion constitutes a significant break with Jewish monotheism accept that particular traits within Second Temple Judaism exercised limited influence on the emergence of Christology, cf. discussion of Hurtado and Bauckham below.

divine identity.[56] In these discussions, a consideration of the meaning of Jewish "monotheism" becomes expedient.[57]

"Monotheism" defined as belief in the existence of one God such that it is the antonym of "polytheism", sometimes attracts the predicates "pure", "absolute" or "exclusive".[58] However, in OT and Second Temple texts, unambiguous statements of "exclusive monotheism" are exceedingly rare (e.g. Ps 96.4-5, cf. Wis 12.27-13.5; 2 Macc 7.37).[59] As a heuristic category, "exclusive monotheism" becomes serviceable when defined more broadly as the tendency to focus on the one God of Israel (actively as sovereign in creation and human history, passively as sole recipient of devotion), such as to minimise the role and importance of other transcendent beings i.e. angels. This propensity may be observed in the *Psalms of Solomon* where in contrast to the Qumranic literature, God/the Lord acts as deliverer and judge unaided by angel hosts which go unmentioned.[60] Again, much of later rabbinic literature is "exclusivist" in tone insofar as it plays down the significance of angelic intermediaries, emphasising instead the

[56] For clarity, the terms "divine"/ "divinity" will be used strictly in this sense unless otherwise indicated. Accordingly, angels and demons will not usually be categorised as "divine beings". Admittedly, angels are occasionally referred to as *elohim/elim* ("gods") in the OT (e.g. Ps 82.1; Ps 8.6 MT, Ps 8.5 LXX translates "angels"), in Qumranic literature e.g. *4Q286*.2.II; and in *Apoc. Ab.* where the indwelling of the divine name in the angel "Yahoel" (or "Iaoel") might suggest "divinity". Nevertheless, *Apoc. Ab.* does not confer on Yahoel divinity in the sense of entitling him to cultic devotion (Hurtado 1988: 84) and, as in other texts, the unrivalled majesty and "otherness" of the one God is repeatedly affirmed at Qumran (e.g. *1QM* 13.13-14; *1QH*^{a} 3.7; *1QH*^{a} 17.16-17; *1QH*^{a} 18.8-11; for wider surveys of Second Temple texts affirming the uniqueness of God see Cohon 1955: 428-438; Rainbow 1991: 81-83). To do justice to the distinction between God and "his angels" (e.g. the vav suffix as a possessive pronoun at *4Q185* 1.VIII) angels are best described as "transcendent", "celestial" or "supernatural" beings. On the semantic range of "divine" and "god" in ancient Greek literature, see Price 1984.

[57] Hayman (1991:1-15) and Barker (1992) find a latent ditheism in ancient and Greco-Roman Judaism, questioning the usefulness and applicability of the term "monotheism" to Jewish religion. However, Hurtado (1998: 6) infers that people who consider themselves "monotheists" ought to be taken as such, even if modern critics might pinpoint "anomalies" in their beliefs and religious practice.

[58] E.g. In critiques of ideological opponents Hurtado (e.g. 1988: 22; 2005: 120) speaks of "pure" monotheism. Day (2000: 226-233) discusses "absolute" monotheism, while William Horbury "Jewish and Christian Monotheism in the Herodian Age" in Stuckenbruck and North 2004: 16-44, uses the category "exclusive" monotheism cf. Bauckham 2008: 108-109. Cf., Wright (1992: 248-252), on "creational monotheism", and "providential" and "covenantal" monotheism in the "exclusive" sense.

[59] Some consider the affirmation in the *Shema* that God is "One" (Deut 6.4) ambiguous, since the thought expressed may be closer to "monolatry" or "henotheism" (the worship of one God without eliminating the possibility of the existence of other deities), see Moberly "How appropriate is 'Monotheism' as a category for biblical interpretation?" in Stuckenbruck and North 2004: 227-231; Wright 1992: 259.

[60] Charlesworth (1983b: 640-641) dates the text to the first century B.C.E. or early first century C.E. Collins (1998a: 143) says *Pss. Sol.* displays "no interest" in the angelic or celestial realm. Admittedly, the Davidic king is presented as God's agent in *Ps. Sol.* 17.21-33, but God himself remains the chief protagonist, poignantly brought to the attention of the reader in *Ps. Sol.* 17.34, lest there be any doubt as to who ultimately reigns.

sovereignty of the one God. A case in point is *y. Ber.* 9.13a-b which bans appeals to the angels Michael and Gabriel insisting that such appeals be made exclusively to God.[61]

On the other hand, discrete streams of Second Temple Judaism (e.g. the Qumran Literature; Philo; *1 En.*; Tob; *Jos. Asen.*) attest the currency of what Horbury terms "inclusive" monotheism.[62] Broadly speaking the "inclusive" tendency recognises the supreme position of the God of Israel as *the* Lord, but manifests heightened interest in transcendent powers or supernatural beings.[63] The latter include principal angels (e.g. Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Sariel/Uriel/Phanuel),[64] glorified patriarchs (e.g. Abraham, Enoch, Moses), and personifications of specific attributes of God (e.g. "Wisdom"; "Logos"). An extensive body of secondary literature encompasses this topic, sometimes referred to as "divine agency".[65] Here it will suffice to sketch an overview of the three intermediary genuses (principal angels/ exalted patriarchs/ divine attributes) most frequently featured in scholarly discussions, but with the caveat that other categories (e.g. Jewish messianism) could similarly be explored.[66]

In several Second Temple texts, principal angel figures are ascribed an especially exalted status alongside God in ways which may broadly prefigure NT conceptions of Jesus as an exalted being, second only to God (e.g. Heb 1.3-4; Acts 2.32-36; Phil 2.9-11).[67] For example, a prominent warrior angel (*1QM* 17.6-8), Michael is outstanding in seniority/greatness (Dan 12.1; *2 En.* 22.6; 33.10).[68] Gabriel is God's special envoy and

[61] For this and similar examples see Stuckenbruck (1995: 57-64; 70-75). Segal (1977:8 n. 8) clarifies that rabbinic conservatism is not averse to angels *per se*, rather it militates against the idea that angels could exercise authority independent of God.

[62] Horbury "Jewish and Christian Monotheism in the Herodian Age", in Stuckenbruck and North 2004:17. Cf. Bauckham (2008: 87) who speaks of "monotheistic dynamism" in a comparable way.

[63] "Inclusive" monotheism can be understood against the background of e.g. Ps 82.1; Job 1.6, 2.1, which depict Yahweh as the supreme deity who presides over a "divine council" of lesser celestial beings or "gods". Cf. Horbury "Jewish and Christian Monotheism in the Herodian Age", in Stuckenbruck and North 2004: 19-21.

[64] For Dunn (2010: 68) these are the four chief angels; the fourth angel is identified by three alternative names.

[65] Hurtado (1988: 12) appears to have coined the term.

[66] The tripartite categorisation is fairly standard, see Hurtado 1988: 17; Dunn 2010: 60. However, Collins & Collins (2008: xii) criticise Hurtado for omitting "Messiah" as a "principal agent" category. In the literature review there will be some discussion of works which understand Markan Christology in the light of messianic traditions.

[67] A related topic studies Danielic/Ezekelian/ Enochic references to a "Son of Man" figure ("one like a Son of Man/ the Son of Man") in relation to NT usage of the epithet e.g. in Mark 13.26. The "Son of Man" question has become a vast sub-discipline in NT studies such that analysis here is beyond the scope of this introduction, for a full treatment see, Casey 2007.

[68] Michael is also mentioned as one powerful angel among others in *1 En* 9.1 cf. 10.11; 20.5; 24.6. In later works e.g., *Gk. Apoc. Ezra* and *3 Bar.* (on the date of these see Charlesworth 1983: 563; 655-656) multiple references attest the power and prowess of Michael e.g. *Gk. Apoc. Ezra* 4.24; *3 Bar.* 11.2-9; 13.5.

interpreter of visions (Dan 8.16-26; 9.20-27 cf. Luke 1.19, 26).[69] Yahoel bears the "ineffable" divine name (*Apoc. Ab.* 10.3-4, 8-17).[70] The unnamed angel in *Jos. Asen.* 14.7-9 is depicted as second only to God himself.[71] Therefore, though some NT writers explicitly or implicitly distinguish Jesus from the angels (e.g. Heb 1.1-14; Mark 1.13 cf. 1.11), the very fact that principal angels could operate as God's "second in command" might help explain how the first Christians conceived Jesus' lordship and his proximity to God.[72]

Closely linked to this are debates concerning whether principal angels became the object of cult worship in the intertestamental period.[73] One possibility is that angel devotion or "worship" influenced early Christian devotion to Jesus.[74] Hurtado finds this unlikely, insisting there is insufficient evidence that angels were "worshipped" in the

[69] Luke 1.26 makes explicit what is implicit in the Danielic texts, i.e. that Gabriel is sent *by God.* In the OT pseudepigrapha Michael is named over a hundred times but there are merely 11 nominal references to Gabriel (e.g. *1 En.* 9.1; 10.9; 20.7, *Jub.* 2.1; 48.1), and when Gabriel is mentioned it is often in connection with Michael.

[70] Charlesworth (1983: 683) suggests a late first century C.E. date for *Apoc. Ab.* The name "Yahoel" apparently melds the divine names Yahweh/El, so Hurtado 1988: 79; Barker 1992: 77.

[71] A similar viceroy idea apparently attaches to Melchizedek in *11QMelchizedek* (Collins & Collins 2008: 79-86), for in *11QMelch.* 2.10 Melchizedek is apparently referred to as "elohim" alongside God, though this is contested, (e.g. Carmignac 1970: 343-378; Manzi 1997: 96-101). However, an angelic identity for Melchizedek in this text is uncertain, (cf. the discussion and defence of an angelic identity for Melchizedek in Collins & Collins 2008: 79-86). *3 En.*, a later work from outside our period (see Charlesworth 1983: 225-229), describes the angel Metatron as the little or lesser *Yahweh* (*3 En.* 12.5).

[72] For Hurtado (1998: 4) the analogy between principal angels and Jesus as the risen/exalted plenipotentiary of God is "useful (though limited)". Bauckham (2008: 10) remains unconvinced that principal angel figures form the background to NT Christology, since rather than "sharing in" God's rule, angels "serve". On the other hand, Collins & Collins (2008: 189-194) infer that Jesus is identified with the principal angel figure in Revelation. Charlesworth (1980: 144) notes that Christian texts outside the NT (e.g. *T. Sol.* 22.22; *Gos. Thom.* 13) portray Jesus as or likened to the principal angel figure. While Gieschen (1998: 324-325) reads "Christ Jesus" in Gal 4.14 epexegetically suggesting an identification of Christ with "God's angel" other interpretations avail (cf. Cole 1989: 171). Since Christ is nowhere else identified with God's angel in Paul, better sense is made of the text if "Christ Jesus" is taken as an intensifier, i.e. the Galatians received Paul "as an angel of God, *even* as Christ Jesus *himself*."

[73] The argument for an *Engelkultus* i.e. organised devotion to angels in the Second Temple period is traceable to Bousset 1926: 302-357. The notion is sometimes revisited (e.g. Hayman 1991: 5-7) or faintly echoed in studies on Adam-devotion (e.g. Steenburg 1990: 95-109 cf. Fletcher-Louis 1997: 141-142). Against the existence of formal angel worship in the time preceding and contemporaneous to the NT period, are Hurtado 1988: 24-35; 2005: 126-129; Carrell 1997: 75; Casey 1991: 83; Dunn 2010: 72. Stuckenbruck (1995: 201-202) takes an intermediate position, claiming that the documentary evidence disqualifies the hypothesis of angel worship as a common practice, but allows for *specific* contexts in which angel worship could find varied expression without threatening the worship of the one God. Unconvinced by the *Engelkultus* concept, Fletcher-Louis (1997: 9-15) nevertheless retains the angelic category as influential for early Christology since he believes that the NT ascribes angelic attributes to Jesus who is "angelomorphic".

[74] See e.g. Chester 1991: 17-89.

Second Temple period in a manner comparable to early Christian worship, where *worship* is defined as "formal", "public" acts of adoration, appeal, praise and communion.[75]

On the other hand, the "prohibitions" logged by Richard Bauckham (e.g. *Apoc. Zeph.* 6.15; *Jos. Asen.* 15.12; Rev 19.10; 22.8-9), might comprise negative evidence that some Second Temple Jews were in fact tempted to infringe monotheistic convention by offering some form of worship to angels.[76] Tobit (c. 200 BCE) provides an interesting case study in this respect.[77] As Raphael reveals his angelic identity he is shown emphatically to deflect attention away from himself, redirecting praise towards God, i.e. "he is the one whom you must bless as long as you live, he the one that you must praise" (Tob 12.18b; cf. 12.6; 12.17-20).[78] This is possibly an attempt to curb temptation towards angel veneration or even its *de facto* practice, perhaps an older form of that evidenced in later magical texts in which angels are reverenced as "theoi".[79]

Ultimately, however, there is no concrete evidence of an *Engelkultus* in the period, and the meaning of NT texts (e.g. Col 2.18; Heb 1.5-14) sometimes adduced as evidence for angel veneration is disputed.[80] Thus, while Jewish angelology may have been influential in the development of some Christian ideas concerning the elevated status and intermediary role of Jesus, the paucity of evidence for the cultic veneration of

---

[75] Hurtado 2005: 112, definition from n. 4. Similarly, Hurtado (1988: 37-39), opposes Jarl Fossum (1985), who traces the roots of the Gnostic demiurge to first century C.E. Jewish and Samaritan traditions concerning the Angel of the Lord and the divine name, positing an incipient duality in the Godhead. Hurtado denies the existence of a second divine being *qua* divine being in these traditions, disallowing the possibility that the alleged worship of angels was properly a precedent for early Jesus devotion.

[76] Bauckham 1980: 322-341. Cf. Gieschen 1998: 35; Chester 1991: 17-89. Hurtado (1988: 30-32) remains unconvinced that the "prohibitions" lend any real credence to the notion that there was in the Second Temple period *de facto* cultic veneration of angels, and reiterates his position contra Chester in Hurtado (2005: 126).

[77] On the date, see *NJB* 448.

[78] The translation is from *NJB*, compare Fitzmyer (2003: 286) G^{II}: "… it was not owing to any favour of mine that I was with you, but to the will of God. So praise Him and sing to Him all your days." Cf. Bauckham 1980: 325. Fitzmyer (2003: 297) comments that Raphael "insists that he has merely been an agent of the gracious God who has been providing for them." It is just possible that in Tob 12.18 Raphael offers a corrective to Tobit's inclusion of angels in the benediction at Tob 11.14.

[79] See Betz (1992: 5, 22, 164-165), *PGM* 1.74-95 where "angel" and "god" are synonymous; *PGM* III.145-153 features the following descriptions, "god Michael", "god Souriel", "god Gabriel"; *PGM* XII.285 where in line 302, IAO SABAOTH is hailed "greatest god" but later in line 333-334 appeal is made to plural gods, "O gods".

[80] Against the hypothesis that Col 2.18 concerns the worship of angels (see e.g. Bousset 1913: 148), F.O. Francis (1975: 163-195) cited with approval in Hurtado 1988: 32-33, reads θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων (Col 2.18) as referring to the heavenly liturgy performed by angels rather than to human worship of angels. Stuckenbruck (1995: 118-119) questions this, while Dunn (1996: 178-85), prefers the view of Francis. Neither Bauckham ("Monotheism and Christology in Hebrews 1" in Stuckenbruck and North 2004: 167-185), nor Stuckenbruck (1995: 123-134) find reason to infer that Heb 1.5-14 presupposes the formal worship of angels.

angels in Second Temple Judaism makes it highly improbable that early devotion to Jesus was ever predicated on the latter.[81]

In addition to studies on the exalted status of principal angels and the possibility that such beings received worship, a related line of enquiry examines the characteristic forms and imagery of angelic manifestation in Jewish apocalyptic literature and compares this to NT descriptions of Jesus arguing for or against an "angel Christology" or "angelomorphic Christology".[82] Fletcher-Louis argues that Adam and the High Priest are represented as angelomorphic quasi-divine intermediaries, finding an "angelomorphic" portrait of Jesus in Luke-Acts.[83] Again, Sullivan reads the Markan Transfiguration narrative in terms of angelomorphic Christology.[84] On a different tack, Carrell, commenting on Tobit, suggests that the descent of Raphael to earth in human guise and his performing of miraculous deeds comprises a background model for Christology.[85] Again, though Carrell's observation might be applied to Mark in view of Dibelius' famous verdict that the gospel is a "Buch der geheimen Epiphanien", a caveat pertains: in Tob 12.15 Raphael self-identifies as an *angel* – clearly this is not the case in respect to Mark's Jesus.[86]

Although this survey merely scratches the surface of research on principal angels, given the role and status attributed to archangels in Second Temple texts and in view of debates concerning the extent of angel veneration, from these discussions it is already possible to identify a key question for Christology. That is, whether Jesus was venerated/worshipped as a transcendent or divine being, perhaps analogous to or even identified as a *de facto* principal angel. As discussed above, Hurtado concludes negatively

[81] Hurtado 1988: 32, 91-92; 2005: 111-112. Contra Stuckenbruck 1995: 201-202.
[82]Several subjects might be treated here, e.g. OT Angel of the Lord traditions (e.g. Fossum 1985; Gieschen 1998), later Jewish developments of these traditions and their bearing on Jewish "monotheism" (cf. Barker 1992), and arguments concerning the possibility of some form of angelic identity for Jesus. For an introduction to the themes of angelophany and "angel Christology" see Rowland 1982: 94-113.
[83] Fletcher-Louis 1997: 140-142; 2006; 2007. Cf. On the worship of Adam as "the image of God", Steenburg (1990: 95-109).
[84] Sullivan 2004: 116. Cf. Stuckenbruck (1995: 77) who suggests that the Matthean redaction of Mark's Transfiguration story (Matt 17.6-8 cf. Mark 9.8) might be evidence of angelophanic prohibitions. However, the description of Jesus' dazzling white clothes (Mark 9.3) might simply be on account of his physical proximity to God (cf. the description of the "glory of God" in Exod 24.17. Similarly, in *1 En.* 38.4, the "Lord of Spirits" shines on the "holy ones", making them shine). Fletcher-Louis (1996: 251-252) argues for a "Moses Christology" here, finding that Jesus' description recalls Moses and features of Exod 24. This typological explanation similarly rescinds the angelomorphic interpretation, unless Moses is regarded as "angelomorphic" (e.g. in Exod 34.35).
[85] Carrell 1997: 63.
[86] Dibelius 1919: 232.

that Jesus was worshipped in a distinctive, largely unparalleled manner, though he allows that statements about the risen/exalted Christ may presuppose Jewish attitudes towards principal angel figures.[87] However, Hurtado's argument concerning the distinctiveness and character of the early "worship" of Jesus has been challenged.[88] In particular, James D.G. Dunn questions the assumption that the first Christians *worshipped* Jesus.[89] Similarly, John and Adela Yarbro Collins critique Hurtado's conclusions on the basis of language specificity and, in particular, issues bound up with the semantic range of the Greek term προσκύνησις.[90]

Clearly, then, this is a live issue at the heart of debates on earliest Christianity. Therefore, the question of whether Jesus was *worshipped* comprises the first in the set of questions which this thesis proposes to address. Thus, it will be enquired if in the Gospel of Mark, there is evidence that Jesus was venerated/worshipped as a divine being alongside God, holding open the possibility that the evangelist may have understood him as in some way "angelic" or "angelomorphic", or as a figure similar to God's principal angel.[91]

The next genus of "divine agency" concerns the divine attributes "Wisdom" and "Logos". In Jewish literature dated c. 200 B.C.E - c.100 C.E., both are highly esteemed and sometimes pictured in an intermediary role (Wis 9.10; Sir 24.34; Philo *Fug.* 101-102; *QG* 4.110-111). The personification of "Wisdom" in Sir 24 and Wis 6.12-11.1, presumably evolved from Prov 8-9. Here "Wisdom" claims to be the first of the Lord's creative acts (Prov 8.22), is personified as God's companion at the dawn of time (Prov

[87] E.g. Hurtado 2005: 111-112.
[88] E.g. J. Lionel North in Stuckenbruck & North (2004: 186 – 202), see especially (2004: 202 n. 32).
[89] For Dunn (1991: 204-206; 2010: 41 cf. 84-90), "Christ hymns" (e.g. Phil 2.6-11; Col 1.15-20) are *about* Christ, not sung *to* Christ. Dunn (2010: 56) notes the absence of sacrifice to Christ, taking this as evidence that Jesus was not worshipped, concluding that by and large Christians *did not* worship Jesus, (Dunn 2010: 150). However, the usefulness of Dunn's category of "sacrifice" linked to worship of Jesus is questionable in the light of the very complex issues surrounding the meaning of Jesus' death in the NT, indeed his own discussion points to these complexities (Dunn 2010: 55-56). Again, since Dunn (2010: 57) admits that early Christian prayers and hymns "naturally included praise of Christ" his conclusion that Jesus is subject but not recipient of such manifestations seems too clear-cut.
[90] Collins & Collins (2008: 212) cite Rev 3.9 as evidence that the term does not necessarily mean "worship" in the full sense.
[91] Cf. Rowland (1982: 103) who, commenting on Rev 1.1, 22.16, claims that the *function* of the risen Christ "is not too different from the angelic intermediaries, who guide the apocalypticists on their heavenly journeys and reveal to them the secrets of God".

8.23-31), and is contrasted with "Folly" (Prov 9.1-12 with 9.13-18). The personification of "Wisdom" in Proverbs functions solely as a literary and rhetorical device.[92]

The same is probably true of the phenomenon as featured in Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon. Nevertheless, particular developments of the imagery in these works could suggest that the metaphorical has converted into the metaphysical i.e. that "Wisdom" emerges as a distinct divine entity.[93] Thus, in an apparent development of Prov 8.27-29, Sir 24.4-5 depicts "Wisdom" as a more autonomous female counterpart, who claims to have dwelt in high places (ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατεσκήνωσα), to have circuited heaven and strolled through the depths of the abyss *by herself* (γῦρον οὐρανοῦ ἐκύκλωσα μόνη καὶ ἐν βάθει ἀβύσσων περιεπάτησα). In relation to Sir 24.5-6, Ben Witherington finds a connection with Mark 6.45-52 where Jesus walks on the sea.[94] For Ben Witherington, the Markan story represents an early christological move to identify Christ with God's Wisdom.

Similarly, given NT texts usually understood to claim Jesus' preexistence (e.g. Phil 2.5-11; Col 1.15-17; John 1.1), it is significant that in Sir 24.9 Wisdom boasts "Before the age (time?), from the beginning he created me" (πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς ἔκτισέν με). While the famous identification of Wisdom with Torah at Sir 24.23 (ταῦτα πάντα βίβλος διαθήκης θεοῦ ὑψίστου νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς) probably mitigates the force of the earlier statements in the chapter, it could potentially be taken to mean that Torah itself is imputed with a form of semi-independent creaturely existence.[95]

Turning to Wisdom of Solomon, in 9.4, "Wisdom" is described as the "consort" of God's throne.[96] In Wis 9.10, Solomon asks that God send "Wisdom" from heaven and from his throne of glory in order that she accompany him and labour with him that he might know what is pleasing to God: ἐξαπόστειλον αὐτὴν ἐξ ἁγίων οὐρανῶν καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης σου πέμψον αὐτήν ἵνα συμπαροῦσά μοι κοπιάσῃ καὶ γνῶ τί εὐάρεστόν

[92] See e.g. Crenshaw 1998: 80-82; Dunn 1980: 176. Contra Fossum (1985: 345-346), who views "Wisdom" as an independent entity in Proverbs.
[93] On "Wisdom" as an independent or semi-independent heavenly being in Sir 24 see Casey 1991: 89; Hurtado 1988: 44. Similarly in Wisdom of Solomon, see Crenshaw 1998: 168; Hurtado 1988: 44; Casey 1991: 89-90. Dunn (1980: 176) disallows the possibility that pre-Christian Judaism ever understood "Wisdom" as a divine being independent of Yahweh. Wright (1991: 110) suggests these wisdom traditions were designed to preserve Jewish monotheism from foreign pantheistic or dualistic outlooks.
[94] Ben Witherington 2001: 221 n. 67. On Sir 25.3-7, see Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 332-333.
[95] On the "demonic" role of Torah in the Pauline epistles see Caird 1956: 40-43; Wright (1991: 265) speaks of the "absolutised" Torah as a "demonic gaoler".
[96] Translation follows *NJB*.

ἐστιν παρὰ σοί. Clearly, these and other statements (e.g. Wis 7.22-8.1) presuppose, but ultimately go beyond "Wisdom" personified in Prov 8-9, since a more clearly independent mode of existence is claimed.[97] Strikingly, Wis 10-11 ascribes to "Wisdom" the role of deliverer usually attributed to God himself in key events of salvation history. In Wis 10.18, even the foundational Red Sea rescue is ascribed to "Wisdom"!

Thus, certain passages from Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon could suggest that the original metaphor has been extended, even *mythologised* so as to imbue "Wisdom" with independent creaturely status.[98] However, these texts must be read within their immediate contexts. Therefore, though "Wisdom" enjoys independence in Sir 24.4-6, the descriptions are prefaced with the statement in Sir 24.3 that "Wisdom" originates with the Most High [as his life-giving spirit/word?] (ἐγὼ ἀπὸ στόματος ὑψίστου ἐξῆλθον). This preserves the notion that "Wisdom" is ultimately an attribute of God. Again, in Wisdom of Solomon, the consistent employment of divine genitives in the eulogy is a reminder that "Wisdom" is contingent, a divine attribute, (e.g. "a breath of the power of God, immaculate emanation of the Almighty's glory" ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής Wis 7.25).[99] Indeed, given the force of texts such as Isa 43.11-17 cf. 51.10; Ps 106:8-11 which, in the light of the exodus event underline that salvation is God's exclusive prerogative, probably, "Wisdom" could only be credited with the exodus deliverance on the assumption that she be properly understood as an attribute of God.

Though this perusal of the "Wisdom" tradition is illustrative, not exhaustive, it already elicits questions linked to early "high" Christology. In particular, the characterisation of "Wisdom" as God's preexistent vicegerent invites comparison with NT claims concerning Jesus' status as a preexistent being with an executive role in accomplishing God's creative and salvific purposes (e.g. Col. 1.15-17; Heb 1.2, 2.10; cf. John 1.1-3). While Bauckham plays down the paradigmatic, formative influence of "Wisdom" and other *Mittelwesen* on NT Christology, his position is questionable.[100] J.J

[97] This is particularly the case in Wis 7.27 where it is claimed that "alone" Wisdom "can do everything", and in Wis 8.1 where Wisdom is said to "govern the whole world".
[98] Casey (1991: 90) agrees, adding that "Wisdom" is not actually hailed as a goddess to avoid violating Jewish monotheism.
[99] Cf. Dunn 1980: 176; Hurtado 1988: 47.
[100] Bauckham (e.g. 2008: 22, 56, 160, 178) eschews "divine agency" paradigms (especially principal angel parallels) majoring instead on the *distinctiveness* of Christian statements about Jesus, where the preferred parallel is with God the Father himself.

Collins and A.Y. Collins object that Bauckham's "theological language" of participation obscures historical specificity.[101] But even if the concept of "participation" were retained, since Wisdom personified *participates* in the creative activity of God (e.g. Prov 8.22 LXX; Wis 7.25ff.), enjoying a role in salvation history normally ascribed directly to God (e.g. Wis 10.15-11.3), it seems proper to speak in terms of a "precedent" to NT christological statements such as those given in parentheses above, rather than merely a "parallel".[102]

Further to the first question on "worship", then, against the background of the Wisdom tradition, for the purposes of this thesis, a second question may inquire of NT texts, and *in casu* Mark, if there is evidence of Jesus' preexistence. In view of Ben Witherington's suggestion, since "Wisdom" is sometimes depicted in roles usually reserved for God (e.g. as walking on/sovereign over the abyss/waves in Sir 24.5-6; Wis 10-11.1) a third question concerns whether there is evidence in the NT/Mark of the transfer of divine operations and attributes to Jesus and if so, what this might imply. Again, in the light of the striking reprogramming of Exod 15 at Wis 10.18-19, a related, fourth question, inquires if in the NT/Mark, particular OT texts are reprogrammed such that Jesus becomes the referent in place of God.

Analogous to the personification of "Wisdom" are late Second Temple works (i.e. first/second century B.C.E. – first/second century C.E.) concerning God's "Logos", where discussions invariably gravitate around Philo of Alexandria.[103] Philo clearly represents the divine Word as God's vizier.[104] Moreover, in *QG* 2.62, Philo describes the "Logos" as the "second god" (τὸν δεύτερον θεόν). If Philo's language is taken literally, then it would confirm that he, and perhaps other Jews, envisaged a second divine entity ("Logos") alongside God.[105] However, since elsewhere (*Somn.* 1.229) Philo explains that to speak of *gods* is to speak *figuratively*, the language is better taken metaphorically, as a description of divine operation rather than ditheism.[106] In support of the latter, since

[101] Collins & Collins 2008: 213.
[102] Bauckham (2008: 165 -172, 176) considers the exalted figures of Wisdom (e.g. *1 En.* 84.2-3 cf. Wis 9.4, 10) and the Son of Man (e.g. Dan 7.13; *1 En.* 46.5; 48.5; 62.6, 9) "parallels" to NT Christology but not "precedents".
[103] E.g. Hurtado 1988: 44-48; Casey 1991: 84-85; Dunn 2010: 81-84. Fuller treatment of "Logos" is beyond the scope of this thesis, the present treatment will concentrate exclusively on the concept in Philo.
[104] See *Fug.* 101-102; *QG* 4.110-111. Cf. the identification with a chief angel figure, *Conf.* 146; *Somn.* 1.239; *Cher.* 3, 35; cf. *Migr.* 174-175.
[105] Barker 1992: 114-133 .
[106] Cf. Casey 1991: 85; Hurtado 1988: 37, 48. On *Somn.* 1.229 see below.

Philo's agenda was apologetic, in his attempt to defend the legitimacy of the Jewish faith he may have considered exigent that which might otherwise comprise an atypical/problematic application of theological language.[107]

Particularly revealing is the fact that, somewhat ironically, the controversial texts are precisely those in which Philo defends the unique transcendent inaccessible reality of the one God, so from his standpoint the terminology used to describe intermediaries would hardly compromise his "orthodoxy".[108] Moreover, in *Somn.* 1.227-230, expounding Jacob's dream at Bethel, Philo explains, "There is one true God, but those which are erroneously called (gods) are many" (*Somn.* 1.229 - ὁ μὲν ἀληθείᾳ θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν, οἱ δ᾽ ἐν καταχρήσει λεγόμενοι πλείους).[109] Philo's statement perhaps presupposes *Let. Aris.* 132 – 140, where Eleazar is said to defend the oneness of God (μόνος ὁ θεός ἐστι – 132), and uses the phrase "true God" (ἀλήθειαν θεόν – 140), demonstrating that in contrast to "ourselves" i.e. Jews, the rest of humanity believes in many gods (πολλοὺς θεούς – 134).[110] While a fuller exploration of Philo's theology is beyond the scope here, on the basis of *Somn.* 1.229 one might make a preliminary judgment that similar to *Letter of Aristeas*, Philo should properly be understood as a "monotheist".[111] In this case, Philo's "Logos" operates as forceful metaphor communicating the *modus operandi* of God, in a manner conversant with Hellenistic philosophy.

---

[107] Winston (1981: 1) says Philo's aim was to "establish the validity and integrity of Jewish religious thought in the face of the counterclaims of the intellectually powerful Greek tradition". Again, Winston (1981: 3) explains that some of Philo's apparent inconsistencies are "variations allowed in the Middle Platonic Tradition" though others were "generated by the exigencies of his exegetical requirements". Apparent inconsistency appears, for example, in *Fug.* 68 – 72, where there is some attempt to accommodate the creation of humankind in Gen 1.26 to essentially Platonic categories. Philo's presentation seems confused insofar as it states both that God is the sole Creator of humanity and that humanity was created by a plurality of powers under God's auspices. Philo wrestles with the idea of the origin of good and evil, his underlying concern being to avoid tracing the origin of evil to God himself.

[108] Thus, in *QG* 2.62, the "Logos" concept is harnessed to explain how humanity was created in the "image" of God given that, totally transcendent, God could not be represented directly. A passage like *Conf.* 170-175, which emphasises that there is "one creator, and one father, and one master" but which also acknowledges an "ineffable number of powers" around God, suggests, to use Horbury's idiom (in Stuckenbruck & North 2004: 16-44), that Philo was an "inclusive monotheist" whose understanding of divine activity owes much to the OT concept of the "heavenly court". Philo, then, appears to have conceptualised a divine attribute "Logos" in terms of a or *the* chief entity in the court but there is no suggestion that this figure could receive cultic worship, cf. Hurtado 1998: 46.

[109] The discussion in its wider context deals with anthropomorphism (*Somn.* 1.234-237) and the manifestation of God's "angel word" (*Somn.* 1.237-238) who (cf. *QG* 2.62) mediates the presence of the inaccessible God to human beings. Cf. *Decal.* 65.

[110] Winston (1981: 4) states Philo was "fully aware" of *Letter of Aristeas.*

[111] For those who see Philo ultimately as a "monotheist" see Hurtado 1988: 48; Casey 1991: 85. Conversely, Thyssen (2006: 143-144) asserts that the reference to "metaphorical" language in *Somn.* 1.229 is intended by Philo to "dissimulate" his real opinion, as expressed in *QG* 2.62!

For the present purposes, whether or not the "Logos" is properly speaking a second deity for Philo, the fact that in Philo, "Logos" appears in such highly exalted terms, prefigures or at least parallels some NT claims about Jesus, such as the initial statements in the prologue of John or Col 1.15. Here again, the question particularly of preexistence and the transference of divine operations and attributes comes to the fore.[112]

In discussions concerning divine agency, in addition to principal angels and personified divine attributes a third category is exalted patriarchs. Second Temple Jewish texts present, among others, Adam, Abraham, Jacob, Enoch and Moses, but especially Enoch and Moses, as glorified celestial figures who sometimes emerge as agents of God.[113] Thus, Philo portrays Moses as God's vicegerent (*Mos.* 1.155), and Sir 45.2 seemingly places Moses on a par with angels (ὡμοίωσεν αὐτὸν δόξῃ ἁγίων). Ezekiel the Tragedian 79-80 has "a multitude of stars" fall before the enthroned Moses, and *Testament of Moses* speaks of him being "prepared from the beginning of the world", designating him "the great messenger" (*T. Mos.* 11.17).[114] In Enochic literature, *1 En.* 40.3 has an angel reveal to Enoch "all the hidden things" and in *1 En.* 41.1, Enoch beholds "all the secrets in heaven".[115] In a later development within the tradition, *3 En.* 12.5 identifies Enoch with the angel Metatron who is described as the "lesser YHWH".[116]

In relation to Enoch, the *Similitudes* (*1 En.* 37-71) contains potentially significant material for discussions on the genesis of Christology.[117] Here the glorious "Son of Man" figure comes into view. Scholars debate whether Enoch himself should be identified with

[112] Dodd (1953: 71-72, 276-281) argued that the "Logos" Christology in John's Prologue is mainly dependent on Philo, cf. Thyssen 2006: 133-176. Again, Thyssen (2006: 168) argues that the "image" of God in Col. 1.15 is firmly connected with the doctrine of the "Logos", drawing attention to *Conf.* 147 and the fact that Philo uses "image" as a cipher for "Logos".

[113] Relevant texts dated in Charlesworth (1980) to the Second Temple period include *Life of Adam and Eve; Apocalypse of Abraham; Ladder of Jacob; 1, 2, Enoch;* Ezekiel the Tragedian*; Testament of Moses.*

[114] Citation of Ezekiel the Tragedian from Charlesworth 1980b: 812. Citations of *Testament of Moses* from Charlesworth 1980: 927, 934.

[115] Citations of *1 Enoch* are from Charlesworth 1980: 32.

[116] *3 Enoch*, a late (5th. century C.E.) text, is merely illustrative of the development of the Enochic tradition.

[117] The adjective "potentially" indicates the uncertainty surrounding the date of the *Similitudes*. Collins (1998a: 178) dates them prior to 70 C.E, Isaac in Charlesworth (1980: 7) dates them to the end of the first century C.E. Nickelsburg (2001: 14) notes the references to the Greek version in *Epistle of Barnabas* thus, inferring 135-138 C.E. as the *terminus ad quem* of the work, but mentions also the quotation of 1.9 in Jude 14-15 and the use of Enochic material in Revelation in support of a date pre 100 C.E. for the Greek translation of the Aramaic original. The issue for Christology, then, is whether the *Similitudes* predate the synoptic gospels, in view of the "Son of Man" epithet which these texts have in common.

this glorious "Son of Man".[118] At any rate, the "Son of Man", "to whom belongs righteousness" (*1 En.* 46.3), who will remove "the strong ones from their thrones" (*1 En.* 46.4 cf. 62.9; 63.11), who received a name before creation (*1 En.* 48.2-4) and who will be enthroned in glory (*1 En.* 69.29) is apparently the same figure described sometimes as the "Righteous One" (e.g. *1 En.* 38.2,3; 53.6), frequently as the "Chosen One" (e.g. *1 En.* 39.6; 40.6; 45.3-5; 49.3; 51.3) and occasionally as "Messiah" (*1 En.* 48.10; 52.4).[119] This is possibly significant, since early Christian writings employ comparable descriptions in reference to the risen Jesus (e.g. Col 1.15-17; Phil 2.9-11; Eph 1.21-22; 1 Pet 1.20).

The section of *1 Enoch* referenced above raises again the issue of the transfer of divine attributes/functions to a viceroy, since the "Son of Man"/ "Chosen One" is described sitting on the throne of glory, i.e. God's throne, (e.g. 1 *En.* 61.8; 69.29), and it is now this figure who sits in judgment over the terrestrial kings.[120] Further considerations emerge regarding "titular Christology", since *1 Enoch* may provide part of the background to designations used in the NT, such as "Son of Man", (e.g. Mark 8.38, 13.26, 14.62), "Messiah/Christ", (e.g. Mark 8.29; 14.61), "Righteous One" (e.g. Acts 7.52; 1 John 2.1), where these titles converge around a single heavenly, possibly preexistent (cf. *1 En.* 48.2-4; 62.7) protagonist.[121] Thus, for our inquiry, a fifth and final question in relation to NT Christology arises, namely, if, against the background of *1 Enoch* and related texts (e.g. Dan 7.13), particular titles or the combination of titles attributed to Jesus in the NT/Mark imply the heavenly provenance/preexistence and ultimately the divinity of Jesus.[122]

From this basic outline of discussions on divine agency, the following conclusions obtain. First, with the likely exception of magic, while the thought-world of Second Temple Judaism disallowed additional gods *qua* gods to coexist with God, an inclusive

[118] Collins (1998a: 187-191) considers scholarly solutions to the issue of Enoch's possible identification with the "Son of Man". Hurtado (1988: 54) straightforwardly assumes the identification with Enoch on the basis of *1 En.* 71.14-17.
[119] Hurtado 1988: 53; Collins 1998a: 183.
[120] Rowland 1982: 104 – 107.
[121] On preexistence here see Bousset 1913: 44, 46; Casey 1991: 80. Alternatively, Hurtado (1988: 53) refers to "preordained status in God's plans". Collins (1998a: 188-189 n. 42) speaks only of "alleged preexistence".
[122] Collins (1998a: 192) doubts the *Similitudes* exercised much influence on the NT, but, notes (1998a: 183) that in *1 Enoch* the application of various titles ("messianic" or otherwise) to a single figure is exceptional in Jewish apocalypses, and (1998a: 178) that the "Son of Man" texts in Matt 19.28 and 25.31 are dependent on the *Similitudes*.

monotheism reverenced highly exalted intermediary figures as divine agents.[123] Secondly, these *Mittelwesen* may have influenced early Christian devotion to Jesus in various ways, though the nature and extent of this influence is debated. Thirdly, in connection with christological origins, five questions have been identified which can now be grouped in question form: Is there evidence in the NT/Mark, (1) that Jesus was venerated/worshipped as a transcendent or divine being? (2) that Jesus was regarded as preexistent? (3) that divine operations and attributes were transferred to Jesus and if so, what this might imply? (4) that particular OT texts are reprogrammed in such a way that Jesus becomes the referent in place of God? (5) that particular titles and/or the combination of titles attributed to Jesus in the NT/Mark imply Jesus' divinity?[124]

This sketch of contemporary debates on primitive Christology indicates the wider framework within which this thesis will examine Mark. The subject areas under consideration here are representative and will provide some initial indications of how Mark understood Jesus to be divine, if, indeed, "divinity" is a legitimate category for Mark's Christology. It will be pertinent to gauge the extent to which Mark's Christology may or may not be indebted to "divine agency", and it must be established whether this or other categories (e.g. Jewish messianism) best account for the type of Christology which Mark expounds. The particular contribution of this thesis consists in the testing of the hypothesis that, without necessarily excluding other paradigms, Mark draws on the HDWT in order to construct his "high" Christology. Finally, engaging with Bauckham and Hurtado, in terms of a general objective, this thesis asks if Mark's Christology may be framed as "participation" in the divine identity, or as "binitarian monotheism", or if no such category obtains.

[123] Cf. On magic texts, n. 79 above.

[124] Sections and entire books have treated each question, e.g. on (1) see Dunn 2010; (2) see Gathercole 2006; (3) see Bowman & Komoszewski (2007: 185-266); (4) see David Capes "YHWH texts and monotheism in Paul's Christology" in Stuckenbruck & North (2004: 120-137); (5) see Cullmann 1963; Hahn 1963. As a set, however, these questions are seldom used to evaluate Markan Christology, though Gathercole (2006), puts these questions or something like them to Mark and other NT authors, but concentrates on question (2), see further the review of Gathercole below. The set might prove more indicative than exhaustive, and during the course of study there may be reason to modify it, possibly adding further questions. For now, it will suffice as a working grid against which Mark's Christology may be gauged.

(1.4) The Christology of the Gospel of Mark: A Survey of the Literature

This literature review presents major scholarly works on the Christology of Mark's Gospel. Secondary literature on Markan Christology is vast, thus, owing to limitations of space, only works whose significance is widely recognised in the field will be considered.[125] Each work will be assessed generally, but more particular comment appertains where an author addresses one or more of the key questions identified above. To recapitulate the set of questions, applying them specifically to Mark: In the Gospel of Mark is there evidence (Q1) that Jesus was venerated/worshipped as a transcendent or divine being? (Q2) that Jesus was regarded as preexistent? (Q3) that divine operations and attributes were transferred to Jesus and if so, what this might imply? (Q4) that particular OT texts are reprogrammed in such a way that Jesus becomes the referent in place of God? (Q5) that particular titles or the combination of titles attributed to Jesus in Mark imply Jesus' divinity?

It is expected that answers to at least some of these questions will emerge from this review. At the end of the review a summary of findings with responses will collect and briefly discuss the data relevant to our questions. The summary effectively closes the panoramic consideration of secondary literature. After the summary of findings with responses, in a separate section and subsections but with the five questions still in view, the aims, working assumptions, approach, scope and shape of this thesis will be detailed.

WILLIAM WREDE

Wrede's epoch-making *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* broke with prevailing trends which credited Mark's Gospel with historical fidelity on the premise of Markan priority.[126] For Wrede, it is axiomatic that Mark presents a largely non-historical essentially dogmatic portrait of Jesus.[127] Wrede's central thesis held that the Markan secrecy motif is unhistorical and already in the pre-Markan tradition a back-projected device intended to explain away the tension between the allegedly non-messianic nature of Jesus' ministry and the fact that his disciples came to view him as Messiah post-resurrection. Initially, Wrede's theory gained both vigorous support and vigorous

[125] A degree of subjectivity is inevitable here, but the survey is restricted to pertinent or landmark works of "senior scholars" within the fraternity.
[126] Wrede (1901) [ET 1971: 253-286), dialogues with prior German language scholarship in a series of appendices.
[127] E.g. Wrede 1901: 5, 9; 49; 67-68; 129; 131-132.

opposition. Today, scholarly opinion remains polarised.[128] Though contemporary scholarship often modifies the particulars or redefines the rationale behind the secrecy motif, it remains enshrined within Mark studies.[129] It might further be observed that methodologically, if Wrede paved the way for redaction criticism, he also prefigured to some extent the sweep of post-modern approaches which emphasise narrative and rhetorical considerations over against historical ones.[130]

For the present inquiry Wrede's study comprises background material, nevertheless, one of his conclusions merits closer attention here. In regard to our fifth question concerning christological titles (Q5), Wrede supplies an explanation for the blasphemy charge in Mark 14.61-64 which has apparently been missed or dismissed by subsequent commentators but which may deserve a second look. Wrede asserts that "Messiah" is without connotations of divinity within Jewish thought, but posits that divinity attaches to the messianic title "Son of God" in its Markan conception.[131] In short, for Mark, Jesus' acceptance of the title "Son of the Blessed" (= "Son of God") is tantamount to a blasphemous claim of equality with God.[132] Wrede apparently misses the significance of Jesus' reply to the High Priest in Mark 14.62b with its arguably blasphemous reference to the Son of Man seated at the right hand "of the power" coming with the clouds of heaven.[133] However, since the "Son of God" idea and the title "Son of Man" converge in the logion at Mark 8.38, it may be that Wrede was partially correct and that later interpreters have missed the deeper significance for Mark of Jesus' acceptance of *divine* sonship in 14.62a.[134]

---

[128] Kingsbury (1983: 2-11) logs early reactions to *Messiasgeheimnis*; Wrede's chief endorser was Bultmann, his chief opponent Schweitzer. More recently, Wright (1996: 28-29) projects Wrede as an ideological opponent, whereas Perrin (1974: 41-56) and Funk (1996) share some of his fundamental assumptions, indeed, Funk (1996: 219-220) seemingly outguns Wrede for scepticism when he questions the historicity of the crucifixion, "The crucifixion of Jesus is not entirely beyond question" and then the existence of Jesus, "Even the existence of Jesus has been challenged more than once and not without some justification".

[129] Collins (2007: 170-172) examines how subsequent scholarship has received, tweaked or recast Wrede's basic idea on the messianic secret in Mark. Her own view is that it is a Markan literary device designed to call attention to the simultaneously revealed and concealed identity of Jesus.

[130] Naturally, the extent to which contemporary exponents of narrative and rhetorical criticism share or depart from Wrede's characteristic historical scepticism varies. Allowing a post-modern categorisation and a nod to Bultmann (1952: 26), it may even be said that such is a matter of private faith of one sort or other.

[131] Wrede 1901: 74-75.

[132] Wrede 1901: 75.

[133] On this see Bock 2000: 201-202.

[134] As it stands in the text, the constellation of ideas and titles as a whole in Mark 14.61-62 likely provokes the blasphemy charge, even if historically one element may have been more offensive to the High Priest than another.

In a nuanced section, Wrede explains that independent of its historical meaning and despite the lack of the definite article, the Centurion's confession that Jesus is "Son of God/ a son of (a) god" (15.39) has a rhetorical function for Mark since it shows that the Centurion was obliged to recognise and testify to the truth of the Christian faith.[135] Where Wrede differs from many contemporary commentators is in his insistence that "Son of God" in Mark is a "metaphysical" and "supernatural" predicate, which at first glance would imply that Mark's is more an "ontic" than a "functional" Christology.[136] Thus, calling to mind debates on primitive Christology, it is interesting that Wrede should credit Mark with this apparently "high" christological outlook. On the other hand, Wrede's classification of the "Son of God" title is tempered somewhat by his broadly adoptionist reading of the Markan baptism scene.[137] On Wrede's view, the Markan Jesus undergoes ontological change during his baptism, *becoming* a supernatural being.[138] Thus, without making the connection himself, Wrede opened the way for the so called *theios aner* (divine man) Christology, developed by Rudolf Bultmann.[139]

THEODORE WEEDEN

Developing an earlier article, Weeden's seminal work *Mark – Traditions in Conflict*, examines Markan Christology from a redaction critical perspective.[140] On Weeden's reconstruction, the Markan community experiences a faith crisis caused by persecution and the parousia delay.[141] The crisis deepens with the arrival of "interlopers" proclaiming an alien *theios-aner* Christology.[142] In response, the evangelist pens his gospel to address pastoral concerns and refute christological distortions. Pastorally, Mark's *theologia crucis* is designed to affirm suffering as the authentic emblem of messiahship and discipleship.[143] As polemic, Weeden posits that Mark's Christology undermines a *theios aner* Christology so as to expose opponents who claim that authentic discipleship consists in miracle-working and pneumatic experiences. For Weeden, in a "stroke of genius", Mark back projects his contemporary christological dispute onto the

[135] Wrede 1901: 76.
[136] Wrede 1901: 75-76 cf. 25.
[137] Wrede 1901: 72-73; cf. 25, 223.
[138] Wrede (1901: 73) does not specify what *type* of supernatural being Jesus became.
[139] See further Kingsbury 1983: 26; Bultmann 1952a: 35.
[140] Weeden 1971. Cf. Weeden 1968.
[141] Weeden 1971: 116; 159-160.
[142] Weeden 1971:159-160. Weeden hyphenates *theios-aner*.
[143] Weeden 1971: 52-53.

interrelation of Jesus and his disciples.[144] Thus, by having Jesus undermine the disciples' authority, Mark effectively discredits the *theios aner* preachers whom, according to Weeden, claimed to have received their kerygma from the disciples themselves.

Though influential in its day, Weeden's study is fraught with difficulties. First, given its central importance to Weeden's thesis, the concept of "*the* Hellenistic *theios aner*" [emphasis mine] ought to have been subject to critical examination and demonstration. Instead, Weeden offers a footnote listing scholars who develop this idea and transfers to Mark the conclusions of Georgi's study on 2 Corinthians regarding Paul's alleged *theios aner* opponents.[145] Weeden assumes the *theios aner* concept existed as a fixed category in the first century C.E.[146] In an influential monograph, Holladay demonstrates the opposite to be the case, since the phrase never occurs in either the Greek OT or NT, seldom occurs in Jewish sources, and, where it does occur, is capable of at least four possible meanings ("divine man"; "inspired man"; "a man in some sense related to God"; "an extraordinary man").[147] Thus, the *theios aner* category is no longer serviceable as such, and claims embodied in the statement that the disciples had a "*theios-aner* Christology and *theios-aner* lifestyle", seem misguided.[148]

A second major difficulty concerns the hypothesis that Mark has a "vendetta" against the disciples who are purportedly "surrogates" for Mark's contemporary opponents.[149] Here problems abound. For the argument to function at any level Weeden must be taken at his word on a string of debatable propositions: i.e. that Mark was a polemical writer who in his narrative dramatization has Jesus undermine the "surrogate" disciples, thus answering "opponents" who self-identified as the heirs of apostolic tradition(s). However, there is no evidence of the *de facto* existence of these putative Markan *opponents*. While Mark's portrayal of the disciples is frequently negative, other explanations obtain. For instance, the perceived negative bias could be more

[144] Weeden 1971: 162.
[145] Weeden 1971: 55 n. 3. Weeden (1971: 62, 68, 75, 168) consistently compares Georgi's portrait (1964) of Paul's opponents with his reconstruction of Mark's opponents (and Jesus' disciples). This, however, reads like oversimplification for convenience.
[146] Weeden (1971: 55 n. 4) explains that *theios aner* is preferred to the English "divine man" judging the latter to be ambiguous given the possibility of multiple contemporary applications. Ironically, Holladay (1977: 237) has since shown that *theios aner* was a fluid expression with at least four possible meanings.
[147] Holladay 1977: 237-238. Holladay (1977: 4 n. 5) cites Kee (1970: 134) and Cullmann (1959: 272) among other prior commentators who similarly reject the notion that *theios aner* should be understood as a technical term.
[148] Weeden 1971: 68.
[149] Weeden 1971: 163. On this "vendetta" see Weeden (1971: 50, 52).

straightforwardly hortatory, or on a traditional view of authorship it might be accounted for in relation to Peter's personal input, and need not be styled in terms of a "polemical vilification".[150] Moreover, the notion of a Markan "vendetta" against the disciples, judged to be "no more than heretics", fails to account for texts which depict the twelve more favourably (e.g. 3.13-19; 4.11; 6.7-13; 6.30-31; 6.41; 16.7).[151] Again, Weeden's suggestion that Mark omits resurrection appearances in a ploy to avoid "rehabilitating" the disciples fails to reckon with the force of Mark 16.7 where, at least implicitly, Jesus *does* reinstate the disbanded group.[152]

Similarly, Weeden's reading of the Markan parables is unconvincing.[153] Nothing in the text necessitates or even remotely indicates that Mark 4.11-12; 14-20, 34 "belonged to Mark's *theios-aner* opponents".[154] Moreover, Weeden states his opinion that *ho logos* is Mark's opponents' term for their secret gospel, but provides no evidence for this claim. To the contrary, in order to apprehend *ho logos* in this way, one first has to "recognize" that 4.14-20 functions as an allegorical apologetic of Mark's *theios-aner* opponents.[155] Thus, the argument is brittle insofar as it depends on assertion, highly speculative given the lack of hard evidence, and ultimately circular since successive hypotheses are stacked up one on the other in a bid to buttress the reconstruction which Weeden imposes on the text.

[150] The quote is from Weeden (1971: 69). Henderson (2006: 259-261) concludes her study on Christology and Discipleship citing the gospel's hortatory purpose with no hint of the kind of reconstruction proposed by Weeden. Bauckham (2006: 175-176) rejects Weeden's view and draws attention to "sympathetic notes of explanation", for him, texts such as Mark 9.6, 14.38, 40, where the disciples' failure is mitigated. Again, Bauckham (2006: 177-179) thinks it distinctly possible that the negative reflections on Peter in Mark, come from the apostle himself, though he balances this viewpoint, claiming that insufficient attention has been paid to the "transformative" nature of the experience which Peter undergoes in the gospel.
[151] Weeden 1971: 164.
[152] Weeden 1971: 51, 164; cf. 101-117. Other explanations for the lack of post-resurrection appearances to the disciples are more convincing, for example, Marcus (2000: 480) suggests that Mark prescinds from describing such appearances because the cross is his focus; Wright (2003: 617-624) considers the possibilities that a longer ending featuring resurrection appearances was either intended, or actually written and lost.
[153] Weeden 1971: 144-154.
[154] Weeden 1971: 147.
[155] Weeden 1971: 150.

JACK DEAN KINGSBURY

Kingsbury's study *The Christology of Mark's Gospel* begins with the "messianic secret" and a summary and critique of treatments concerning the *theios aner* concept.[156] He rejects approaches which understood *theios aner* as a Markan category contiguous with Pauline Christology (Bultmann), and subsequent negative approaches (Weeden/Perrin) which envisage Mark correcting a "divine man heresy".[157] Both categories are judged to be methodologically flawed since they impose external, artificial concepts on Mark. For Kingsbury, the Markan text itself disqualifies the view that Jesus is a "divine man" in the mould of Hellenistic Judaism, indeed the term *theios aner* is absent from the Gospel.[158] Equally, there is no evidence that the evangelist "corrects" the "Son of God" title with the title "Son of Man".[159]

Kingsbury approaches Mark's Christology from a literary-critical perspective.[160] In relation to (Q5), christological titles are discussed within, rather than in isolation from their narrative contexts.[161] "Messiah" is judged to be the "most general" of Mark's christological categories.[162] This title is explicated by others placed in apposition to it, i.e. "King of the Jews/Israel" (e.g. 15.32), "Son of David" (e.g. 12.35) and "Son of God" (1.1; 14.61).[163] For Kingsbury, against Räisänen, the "messianic secret" is a misnomer since the Markan secrecy motif really concerns Jesus' "divine sonship".[164] Jesus is the "royal Son of God", on Kingsbury's reading "Son of God" is crucial for understanding Jesus' identity since this is the sole title that constitutes the normative "evaluative point of view" of both supernatural (God and demons) and human beings.[165]

---

[156] Kingsbury 1983: 1-46.
[157] E.g., Bultmann 1952: 130; Weeden 1971: 81, 144; Perrin 1974: 112-113.
[158] Kingsbury 1983: 44. Cf. Holladay (1977: 237-238), noting that the term is entirely absent from the Greek OT and the NT.
[159] For Kingsbury (1983: 71), corrective Christology "runs afoul of literary-critical considerations". Since in the baptismal scene God declares Jesus to be his "Son", the suggestion that the title "Son of God" requires "correction" makes God an "unreliable narrator" – an untenable proposition.
[160] Kingsbury (1983: 46) elaborates, "...by this I mean no more than that I shall endeavor to read Mark by looking to the story it tells for the primary clues of meaning".
[161] Compare Broadhead (1999: 27) who calls for a holistic approach to Christology, finding that titles appear in "narrative packages". Contrast, the well-known work of Cullmann (1963), whose systematic treatment of christological titles is flatly rejected in Wright (1996: 614).
[162] Kingsbury 1983: 15.
[163] Kingsbury 1983: 55, 98.
[164] Kingsbury 1983: 14-15. Cf. Räisänen 1976: 147-148.
[165] Kingsbury 1983: 173.

Kingsbury also discusses the title "Son of Man". Since this title is exclusively Jesus' self-designation it stands apart from the others in literary-critical terms as Jesus' "phraseological point of view".[166] While a "title of majesty", Kingsbury urges that "Son of Man" is not "confessional" in the same way as the other titles, that is, Mark does not use it to explain the identity of Jesus.[167] It is rather a public title by which Jesus shows himself to be "the man/human being" who asserts divine authority in the face of suffering and rejection.[168] Thus, Kingsbury argues that "Son of Man" has an "outward orientation" which complements the "inward orientation" of "Son of God".[169]

Kingsbury's study provides a corrective to earlier works which gave credence to *theios aner* concepts, but there are problems with his alternative view. Though the focus is Mark's Christology as opposed to a discussion of the latter within debates on primitive Christology, the lack of definition of terms remains a pronounced weakness. For example, there is insufficient discussion of the nature and OT background of the "royal Son of God"/messianic model for Markan Christology which the author tends to presuppose rather than establish.[170] It is not clear what exactly is meant by Jesus' "divine sonship". The problem is particularly acute since in connection with the Markan secrecy motif Kingsbury attempts to distinguish between the notion of Davidic sonship and "divine sonship". Clearly, given the importance of textual precedents such as Ps 2.7 in the Markan baptismal scene, any attempt to drive a wedge between "Davidic" and "divine" sonship ought to occasion careful explanation and argument, but here there is none.[171]

Again, Kingsbury offers no disclaimer for his rather cursory treatment of the "Son of Man" epithet.[172] While in some ways "Son of Man" is distinct from the other christological titles, it is hard to believe that Mark allows it no rhetorical value in the disclosure of Jesus' identity. The difficulty arises because Kingsbury reads "Son of Man" primarily as a synonym of archetypal man, playing down the Danielic associations which

[166] Kingsbury 1983: 167.
[167] Kingsbury 1983: 159-160, 164-167.
[168] Kingsbury 1983: 170.
[169] For Kingsbury (1983: 175) the "outward orientation" encapsulates Jesus' activity in the public sphere whereas the "inward orientation" concerns the Markan secrecy motif and the rightful confession of Jesus' identity.
[170] Kingsbury (1983: 35-37 cf. 66 n. 87) devotes less than a page and a half to this and simply adopts the claim of Fitzmyer (1979: 105-106), that on the basis of particular Qumran texts "son of God" can be seen as both "titular" and "royal", carrying this over into Mark studies.
[171] Kingsbury 1983: 20.
[172] Kingsbury 1983: 157-173

would lend it a more "confessional" character (cf. Dan 7.13 with Mark 13.26; 8.38). While Mark's Jesus uses the title openly in public, the ambiguity which surrounds "Son of Man" suggests it is hardly devoid of an "inward orientation".[173] More likely, for Mark, the "Son of Man" designation does reveal important facets of Jesus' identity, particularly in eschatological perspective where Jesus is seemingly depicted as the Danielic figure, and in connection with Mark's servant Christology (e.g. 8.31; 9.31; 10.45).

Finally, in terms of method, Kingsbury rejects tradition-critical models for superimposing artificial constructs onto the text, but on at least one occasion his predilection for literary patterns leads him into the same error. For example, on the gradual revealing of Jesus' identity, Kingsbury identifies a "contrapuntal pattern" of demonic cries and human questions in Mark 1.24 + 1.27; 1.34 + 2.7; 3.11 + 4.41; 5.7 + 6.3. However, as he himself concedes, 1.34 is a summary statement not a demonic cry, and since 64 verses separate 3.11 and 4.41, and 38 verses separate 5.7 and 6.3 this is indicative more of over-reading than of conscious authorial design.[174]

RIKKI E. WATTS

In *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, Watts argues that the Isaianic New Exodus motif is the interpretive key and *Grundlage* to Mark, the blueprint for a comprehensive schema within which a central element is the identification of the Markan Jesus with the Isaianic Yahweh-Warrior.[175] Though Watts' objective is to demonstrate Isaianic influence on Mark, much of his study comes into the orbit of our Q3 and Q4, and occasionally he touches on the question of Jesus' identity, noting how the Markan Jesus can be identified with "the presence of Yahweh himself".[176] For Watts, the Isaianic Yahweh-Warrior/Jesus association is foremost in the Beelzebub controversy (3.22-30) where the "strong man" saying in Mark 3.27 is read in the light of Isaiah 49.24ff.[177] Mark's Jesus further appears as the Isaianic Yahweh-Warrior in the exorcisms (especially 5.1-20) and in the sea-epiphanies.[178] Taking up Duff's argument regarding the presence of a divine warrior motif in Mark 11.1-11, but playing down the Zecharian associations, Watts interprets

[173] Cf. Kingsbury 1983: 175. The title "Son of Man" is intrinsically ambiguous since it can be a circumlocution for "I", can represent archetypal man, and recalls the mysterious "one like a Son of Man" figure of Dan 7.13.
[174] Kingsbury 1983: 86-87.
[175] Watts 1997. See especially, Watts 1997: 140 – 169.
[176] Watts (1997: 87) in connection with Mark 1.2-3, and specifically the citation of Isa 40.3.
[177] Watts 1997: 144-156.
[178] Watts 1997: 157-163.

Jesus' entry into Jerusalem as the entry of the victorious divine warrior.[179] The Markan Jesus' voluntary surrender and death at the hands of his enemies represents a radical inversion of the prophecies concerning the divine warrior, but ultimately and paradoxically Jesus is the victor.[180]

Watts' determination to read Mark preponderantly through the lens of the Isaianic New Exodus appears to have coloured his judgment in places.[181] For instance, he admits that various OT texts inform the Markan sea-miracles but frames Mark's Jesus specifically in terms of the "*Isaianic New Exodus* Yahweh-Warrior".[182] This seems to be an unjustifiably narrow classification since Mark 4.35-41, and specifically Jesus' rebuke of the elements, is read routinely in the light of texts from the Psalms (e.g. Pss 18.15; 104.7; 106.9; 107.23-32), and Job 26.11-12.[183] It is also frequently read in connection with the Jonah story, and while some see echoes of Isa 50.2; 51.9-10, there is no evidence that the Markan account is dependent on any Isaianic text as opposed to non-Isaianic texts.[184] Once more, on Mark 6.45-52, John Paul Heil reads 6.48 in relation to Job 9.8 LXX, but Watts considers only Heil's comments on possible parallels with Isa 43.1-11, where strictly speaking, Heil's treatment concerns Matt 14.22-33.[185] Similarly, Mark 5.1-20 is taken primarily in the light of Isa 65.1-7, but another approach sees the programmatic influence of Exod 14.1 – 15.22 LXX on Mark 5.1-20.[186] Moreover, Watts suggests that demon possession evokes the Isaianic theme of Israel's bondage to the nations on account of apostasy to idols but this goes beyond the evidence.[187]

Clearly, in addition to alleged "Deutero-Isaianic" references to a new exodus, given the direct citations of Isaiah in Mark (e.g. Isa 6.9 at 4.12; Isa 29.13 at 7.6), there is no question that Isaianic themes have influenced Mark significantly. However, in the

[179] Watts 1997: 308 – 309. Cf. Duff 1992: 55-71.
[180] Watts 1997: 291.
[181] Watts 1997: 144 – 156.
[182] Watts 1997: 160, 231, [emphasis mine].
[183] E.g. Nineham 1963: 146-147; Marcus 1999: 338; Boring 2006: 143; Brower 2009: 295-296. Collins (2007: 262) finds a connection between Mark 4.39 and Ps 106.9 (105.9 LXX). Rudman (2003: 105) reads Mark 4.35-41 against a *Chaoskampf* background, drawing attention to Ps 104 in this connection.
[184] On the alleged connections between Mark 4.35-41 and the biblical Jonah story see, Marcus 1999: 334, 336-338; Guelich 1989: 266-267; van Iersel 1998: 194; Ben Witherington 2001: 175-176; Boring 2006: 143. Marcus (1999: 338) includes Isa 50.2/51.9-10 among OT texts which may underlie the Markan styling of the event.
[185] Watts 1997: 161-162; Heil 1981: 40-41; 59. Cf. Watts (1997: 231) where Job 9.8 is mentioned, but only in passing.
[186] Watts 1997: 157-162. Marcus (1999: 349) makes the case for an Exodus typology.
[187] Watts 1997: 157-162.

light of examples such as those enumerated above, in this work it will be important to give due consideration to other, non-Isaianic intertextual connections. The texts discussed by Watts in this connection will be explored more fully in the present work.[188]

EDWIN K. BROADHEAD

Broadhead's *Naming Jesus* surveys christological titles in Mark with analysis primarily of their "narrative foreground" and limited comment on their "historical background".[189] His conception of titles permits the inclusion of categories such as "Priest" and "Suffering Servant of God" although these, he acknowledges, are never used of Jesus in the Gospel and are not titles *per se*.[190] Broadhead describes his method as "formalist", and seeks to establish the function of the titles within the Gospel. Guiding factors such as "distribution", "association" and "development" facilitate the identification of the narrative function of the titles.[191] Each term is evaluated within Mark's wider literary strategy and there is assessment of the individual contribution of each title to the overall characterisation of Jesus in the Gospel.

At the close of the work Broadhead organises his titular Christology under four subheadings. The first, "Embedded Titles", includes titles which for him make a limited contribution to the story ("Holy One of God", "Greater One", "Son of David"), others, he argues, exert more extensive influence over the plot ("Prophet", "Priest", "Teacher", "Shepherd", "Suffering Servant", "Lord"). Broadhead adds that the "King" title is considered and rejected within the Markan story. "Framework Titles" ("Son of God"/ "Christ") frame the gospel at key narrative junctures, providing a grid through which to read the stories about Jesus. "Climactic Titles" occur in climactic moments of the narrative, Broadhead points to "Christ" and "Son of God" in Mark 14.61-62 and Jesus as the "Crucified One" (16.6). Finally, "Extending Titles" are those which Broadhead thinks point beyond the narrative, i.e. "Risen One". The "Son of Man" is also included since for Broadhead it signals a reality which stands apart from the Markan story both temporally and ideologically.[192]

[188] Watts (137-182) styles Jesus the "Yahweh-Warrior", and his treatment of texts such as Mark 4.35-41; 5.1-20 and 3.22-30 will be revisited in chapters 3 and 4 of this study.
[189] Broadhead 1999.
[190] Broadhead 1999: 63-74; 101-108. Cf. 160, 162.
[191] Broadhead 1999: 30.
[192] Broadhead 1999: 165-166.

In his conclusion, Broadhead rejects the notion that pre-packaged messianic titles articulate the Gospel's view of Jesus.[193] Rather, diverse images are shaped, reworked and "hermeneutically realigned" in the narrative construction of names for Jesus which comprises one facet of the overarching characterisation strategy.[194] Most Mark scholars would agree that there is strategic use and development of christological titles in the Gospel, however, the extent to which particular titles undergo hermeneutical realignment in the "narrative foreground" is much more contentious. For example, Broadhead downplays the importance of the title "Son of David" in Mark, and finds incongruence between the historical meaning of the term and its meaning as (re)defined in the Gospel narrative insofar as the quality of *mercy* can attach to it in the latter (e.g. 10.47).[195] However, since the Davidic messiah in pre-Christian tradition is frequently portrayed as a deliverer whose actions effect the liberation of Israel, that an Israelite protagonist associates *mercy* with "Son of David" need not signal a "contrast to the background of this title".[196]

Broadhead's analysis sometimes leads to unlikely conclusions. For example, the claim that the term "king" is *abandoned* by the Gospel of Mark since it is applied to Jesus only by his enemies misunderstands Markan irony.[197] Congruously, Broadhead fails to do justice to positive royal associations which attach to the Markan Jesus (11.1-11).[198] Similarly misguided is the double inference that "the greater one" (ὁ ἰσχυρότερός) in Mark 1.7 is solely associated with the status of John, and that it is precisely in Jesus' "prophetic activity" that he surpasses the Baptist.[199]

In terms of (Q5) of the question matrix outlined above, Broadhead gives no hint that christological titles signal Jesus' divinity in Mark, though he concludes that the

[193] Broadhead 1999: 159.
[194] Broadhead 1999: 159, 167.
[195] Broadhead 1999: 114-115; 162.
[196] Broadhead 1999: 162. Collins (1995: 52-78) discusses Jewish Messianism from the Hasmonean period to the first century C.E. where the Messiah is pictured as a deliverer figure, he considers texts such as *Pss. Sol.* 17, *4 Ezra* 11-13, *2 Bar.* 40, 72 and several Qumran documents/fragments, e.g. *4Q285*, *1QSb*.
[197] Broadhead 1999: 78-80. On irony as characteristic of Mark's Gospel see Camery-Hoggatt 1992. On the ironical use of the "king" title and associated royal imagery see Marcus 2006, though cf. Collins 2009: 550-554.
[198] Broadhead (1999: 78) insists that Mark's "king" concept is wholly negative, but overlooks the fact that the Markan Jesus himself initiates a royal role-play in 11.1-11 where the crowds' response in 11.9-10 alludes to the royal messianic Ps 118 (Ps 118.26); on this, see Watts in Beale & Carson (2007: 206-208). While the conclusion of the pericope (11.11) suggests that Mark's Jesus might frustrate some first century messianic expectations (cf. *Ps. Sol.* 17; *4 Ezra* 12.31-33) Mark hardly *abandons* the royal motif *per se* (cf. the allusion to Ps 2.7 in 1.11).
[199] Broadhead 1999: 61-62. Mark 1.7 will be discussed in Chapter 4.

Gospel's claims are "kerygmatic".[200] Broadhead notes that the "Son of Man" title converges with the "Son of God" designation in Mark.[201] Here as elsewhere this connection has been insufficiently studied: it follows that the interface of the two key "son" titles at crucial narrative junctures likely elucidates the nature of Jesus' "sonship" in the Gospel.

JOEL MARCUS

Marcus' two volume Anchor Bible commentary is a significant recent contribution to Mark studies.[202] The evangelist's outlook is described as "apocalyptic eschatology" or "cosmic apocalyptic eschatology".[203] Accordingly, salvation means liberation from the cosmic powers that oppress humanity where Jesus as God's eschatological agent emancipates the earth from demons.[204] Combined demonic/human opposition culminates in Jesus' death, which Marcus intriguingly describes as "exorcistic".[205] For Marcus, the crucifixion, an apparent victory for Satan, is paradoxically Jesus' victory over him (Mark 15.38-39; cf. 1 Cor 2.8).[206]

With regard to (Q1), commenting on Mark 3.11-12, Marcus notes that human and demonic reactions to Jesus are conveyed via similar verbs insofar as suffering people *fall upon* (ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ) Jesus, hoping to touch him and be healed, and unclean spirits *fall before* (προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ) him while shrieking out his "divine identity".[207] From this, Marcus postulates that the evangelist operates with a conception similar to the "pre-Pauline hymn" in Phil 2.10-11, where earthly and otherworldly creatures bow before Jesus, confessing his "eschatological lordship".[208] Whether this might amount to "worship" Marcus does not say. In any case, where humans or demons fall down before Jesus in Mark (e.g. 1.40; 3.11-12; 5.6; 5.22; 10.17; 15.19) there is no *prima facie* reason for supposing a connection with "worship" since, except for 5.6; 15.19, the term

[200] Broadhead 1999: 172.
[201] Broadhead 1999: 121, 129 n. 15.
[202] Marcus 1999 and Marcus 2009.
[203] Marcus 1999: 71 – 73.
[204] Marcus 1999: 72.
[205] Marcus 2009: 1068, cf. 1063. See further Chapter 4, section 4.8, pp. 194-196.
[206] Marcus 1999: 73.
[207] Marcus 1999: 258-259.
[208] Marcus 1999: 259.

προσκυνεῖν (to prostrate oneself, in obeisance or worship) is lacking.[209] Nevertheless, the observation merits inclusion since the notion of falling before Jesus is probably the nearest thing to a suggestion of the worship of Jesus in Mark, thus demonstrating negatively that the Gospel provides no clear evidence of the cultic worship of Jesus.[210]

In relation to (Q4), reiterating aspects of an important earlier work, Marcus examines the composite scriptural quotation in Mark 1.2-3.[211] This pericope has attracted much debate in recent years to the extent that it has become paradigmatic for discussions on hermeneutics.[212] Despite the different approaches brought to bear on the text, most interpreters accept that Mark 1.2-3 is a conflation of Exod 23.20, Mal 3.1 and Isa 40.3.[213] Marcus thinks that in Mark 1.2 the "technically incorrect" ascription of the conflated text to "Isaiah the prophet" betrays a deliberate attempt to set the story in an Isaianic context.[214] Mark places the mixed quotation after the opening formula and before the introduction of John the Baptist in such a way that it parenthetically establishes the advent of John and Jesus as the fulfilment of OT prophecy. Again, Mark's strategic placement of OT citations link Jesus' "way" to "the way of the Lord".[215]

Appealing to subsequent Markan passages which involve Jesus' subordination to God (10.18, 40; 13.32; 14.36; 15.34), Marcus maintains that in 1.2-3 there is a distinction between "your way" (Jesus' way) and "the way of the Lord" (God's way). However, it is only by recourse to these texts that Marcus can argue this. The logic of his own argument tends to flow in the opposite direction since Marcus identifies the "way of the Lord" in Isa 40.3 as a subjective genitive, carrying over this understanding to Mark 1.2-3 in such a way as to imply that Jesus comes (physically) in what is the Lord's physical, rather than

[209] Similarly, Gathercole 2006: 69. Bultmann (1963: 358) however, apparently accepts Mark 5.6 as evidence that men *worship* Jesus, but cautions (overlooking or disregarding the mock veneration of the soldiers in 15.19) that this is the "only" such instance in Mark.
[210] It is difficult to distinguish between "obeisance" and "worship" regarding προσκυνεῖν. In Mark 15.19 the soldiers may pay mock homage to a "king", but given the associations of divinity attaching to Roman "kings" such as Augustus, and infamously, Caligula, (see Suetonius *C. Caligula* 22) their derision might also entail mock "worship" i.e. the adoration of a divinity.
[211] Cf. Marcus 1992.
[212] Marcus 1992; Schneck 1994; Watts 1997; Hatina 2006. See Moyise (2008: 6-20) for Mark 1.2-3 as a test case for distinct hermeneutical approaches.
[213] See, the critical apparatus in NA[27] which detects these three texts at Mark 1.2-3. Moyise (2008: 6-20) mentions several critics who variously read the pericope; while there may be some debate as to who ultimately was responsible for the conflation (i.e. Mark or his tradition) all those cited by Moyise recognise the three OT texts as source texts.
[214] Marcus 1999: 147.
[215] Marcus 1999: 147.

ethical way.[216] Clearly, the scriptural citation in Mark 1.3 ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου ("prepare the Lord's way") parallels the prior statement in 1.2, where there is mention of a messenger, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ("who shall prepare *your* way").[217] Contextually, there is no reason to procure different referents for the genitives here (i.e. "Jesus" and then "God"), rather, on a natural reading, according to the manner in which the mélange of scriptural texts has been arranged, the κυρίου in 1.3 is epexegetical, clarifying the identity of the σου in 1.2. Thus, understood in the Markan context where John the Baptist is the messenger who heralds the coming of Jesus (1.4-8), Mark 1.2-3 stands out as an example of the reprogramming of OT prophetic texts wherein Jesus becomes the referent ("the Lord") substituting Yahweh/God.[218] Against Marcus, then, it seems over subtle to urge a distinction between Jesus' way and the Lord's way in 1.2-3. Rather, Mark identifies Jesus with Yahweh "the Lord", even though in subsequent pericopes (not least Mark 1.9-11) this identification is nuanced, and further qualified.[219]

On (Q3), and in anticipation of Chapter 3 of this thesis, Marcus draws attention to texts in which Jesus' words and actions liken him unmistakably to God.[220] Here, the sea-miracles (4.35-41; 6.45-52) are read against the background of OT texts.[221] Marcus sees that in evoking such texts the Markan narrative points to Jesus' divinity insofar as functions properly belonging to Yahweh/God are transferred to Jesus.[222] In an earlier work, though stopping short of a total identification of Jesus and Yahweh, Marcus argues that in 4.35-41/6.45-52 Mark's Jesus comes in the guise of God the DW familiar to OT traditions.[223] However, in his commentary, if this association is made at all, it is much more implicit.[224] In Chapter 3 of this thesis a view similar to that espoused in Marcus'

[216] Marcus (1992:27, 29) refers to the background in Deutero-Isaiah as "proto-apocalyptic" insofar as Yahweh marches through the wilderness as the DW to restore Israel. Marcus (1999: 148-149) states that the Lord's way is "Jesus' way", where "way" connotes the physical path through the desert rather than an "ethical" way to which people might adhere. For a contrasting view, see Hatina 2006.
[217] Similarly, Gathercole (2006: 244, 248).
[218] Similarly, Kingsbury (1983: 57-58), states that contextually John the Baptist is the referent of "my messenger" and Jesus the referent of "Lord". Broadhead (1999: 49) on the basis of the citation from Isa 40.3 notes that John may be (and was in some quarters) understood as the forerunner of God.
[219] Cf. Marcus (1999: 148) who claims the "best way" to describe Mark 1.2-3 is to say that "where Jesus is acting, there God is acting". This conclusion is too vague and risks skating over the glaring truth that Mark applies a medley of OT texts whose chief referent is Yahweh to the subject of his Gospel, Jesus Christ.
[220] Marcus 1999:338-339, 430-435; 2009: 908-909.
[221] Marcus 1999: 338-339, 430-434.
[222] Marcus 1999: 432.
[223] Marcus 1992: 144-145.
[224] In Volume I of the commentary, in the "Index of Subjects" no entry is found for "Divine Warrior", while in Volume II (Marcus 2009: 1156) the title does appear but with only three page references. Compare Marcus (1992: 144-145) where it is specifically acknowledged that in the Markan sea-miracles Jesus uses

earlier work will be thoroughly developed, with a detailed treatment of the sea-miracles and the relation of the Markan Jesus and the OT DW therein.

Though generally commended, Marcus' commentary has been criticised for over-interpretation and the back-projection of much later Jewish sources.[225] Thus, the comparison between Jesus' actions in Mark 4.35-41 and Jonah threatening Leviathan in Jewish legends (*Pirqe R. El.* 10; *Tanḥ* on Leviticus, 8) is of little value for interpreting Mark, since the rabbinical literature is centuries older.[226] Again, in places it seems that the author too readily allows for rather subtle allusions, thus, in Mark's "Legion" story, the demons' request to "enter" the pigs (5.12) is read as "sexual innuendo" where a connection is made with the crime of rape by invading armies.[227] Similarly, Moloney complains that a reference to the silence of a bystander in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* (7.4.2.4) does little to illumine Jesus' silence in Mark 14.61.[228] Consequently, while Marcus offers an original contribution reading Mark as "apocalyptic eschatology", the evidence produced in support of particular theses must be carefully reviewed.

SIMON J. GATHERCOLE

In his monograph *The Preexistent Son*, Gathercole strives to "recover" the christologies of the Synoptic Gospels.[229] Challenging the general consensus that the synoptic evangelists do not attribute preexistence to Jesus, Gathercole offers a final form analysis which argues that all three attest Jesus' preexistence. Gathercole's treatment of Jesus' preexistence in Mark is a good place from which to address (Q2), particularly since there is some interaction with debates on primitive Christology.

The four-part study begins with synoptic texts which portray Jesus as a "transcendent" being in a bid to show that the preexistence concept is not *a priori* implausible.[230] With Bauckham, Gathercole finds that the language used in the

---

the language of and acts out OT DW theophanies. Does the move away from DW and "holy war" language in the commentary signal a change in opinion?

[225] Gundry (2000: 386-391), praises the commentary, but cites several instances of alleged over-interpretation. Moloney (2010: 382-383) commends it, though questions the tendency to read back much later Jewish texts.

[226] Marcus 1999: 337.

[227] Marcus 1999: 352. Gundry (2000: 389-390) makes a similar criticism.

[228] Moloney 2010: 383.

[229] Gathercole 2006.

[230] Gathercole 2006: 23-79.

transfiguration (Mark 9.2-8) points to Jesus' "heavenly identity".[231] Gathercole argues that this heavenly identity is not merely proleptic of the resurrection or parousia, but a present reality in Jesus' ministry bound up with his "divine sonship".[232] In support of the view that Jesus is a heavenly being like God and the angels it is claimed that the "ignorance logion" (13.32) reveals a hierarchy of heavenly beings i.e. "Father – Son – Angels".[233] The fact that demons identify Jesus as the "holy one of God"/ "Son of God" (1.24; 3.11) is taken as further indication of Jesus' celestial provenance as a "permanent member" of the heavenly council.[234]

Gathercole then considers that which this thesis calls the "transfer of divine attributes to Jesus" (Q3) and the "reprogramming of OT texts" (Q4), where Jesus becomes the referent in place of God. Thus, in Mark 3.13 Jesus *elects* the twelve, in 2.1-12 he forgives sins and claims authority to do so. In 14.63-64 (read alongside 2.1-12) the charge of blasphemy purportedly concerns Jesus' claim to a heavenly throne, and in 4.35-41/ 6.45-52 Jesus acts in ways which identify him closely with Yahweh.[235] For Gathercole, attempts to explain such texts in terms of a "functional christology" where Jesus merely acts on God's behalf are fallacious, since some of these functions (e.g. election, walking on water) belong "exclusively and uniquely" to God in the OT.[236] Against the "functional" view, Gathercole cites Mark 13.6, πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν ("many will come in my name saying 'I am (he)' and many shall be deceived") where, positing an analogy with Ps 118.26, Jesus' name (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου) allegedly "stands in for" the name of Yahweh (ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ps 117.26 LXX).[237]

---

[231] Gathercole 2006: 48-49.
[232] Gathercole 2006: 49 – 50.
[233] Gathercole 2006: 50.
[234] For Gathercole (2006: 53-54), the titles "holy one of God"/ "Son of God" do not in themselves require a heavenly sense, but imply one in that throughout the gospel Jesus' filial identity is affirmed only by heavenly figures (i.e. God and demons).
[235] Gathercole 2006: 55-64.
[236] Gathercole (2006: 76) cites reactions to Jesus' words/actions (i.e. in Mark, the charge of blasphemy from opponents e.g. 2.7) as confirmation that such divine prerogatives could not normally be claimed.
[237] Gathercole 2006: 65-67. Since commentators e.g. Cole (1961: 274-275); Nineham (1963: 345-346); Lane (1974: 456-457); Myers (1988: 331-333); Hooker (1991: 306-308); Collins (2007: 602-605); Marcus (2009: 875-881) omit any reference to Ps 118.26 in relation to Mark 13.6, Gathercole's confident assertion (page 67), that Jesus is "*clearly* drawing an analogy between coming in his own name and the coming in the name of Yahweh mentioned in the Psalm" (italics mine) seems misplaced. Since the evangelist knew Ps 117.26 LXX (quoted verbatim in 11.9) had he intended the reader to make this connection one might expect the Greek of 13.6 to reproduce Ps 117.26 LXX more exactly (e.g. to use ἐν + Dative rather than ἐπὶ + Definite Article + Dative), and for the titular participle εὐλογημένος ("blessed") to feature somewhere in Mark 13.6, which it does not.

The second part of the argument presents the "I have come + purpose formula" as the "strongest evidence" for a preexistence Christology.[238] Gathercole claims the "I have come" sayings (e.g. Mark 1.38; 2.17; cf. 10.45, 1.24) are formulaic.[239] On Gathercole's reading, these sayings concern Jesus' entire earthly activity where preexistence is a necessary implication.[240] Alternative explanations relating the sayings to the prophetic or Messianic dimensions of Jesus' ministry are discussed and dismissed.[241] Gathercole then documents Second Temple and rabbinic texts in which angels use the "I have come + purpose formula".[242] He argues that these are analogous to Jesus' use of the phrase and that Jesus' coming is comparable to angel visitations insofar as he too comes from heaven, where there is a "corresponding idea" of preexistence. To corroborate his theory Gathercole discusses the related issue of Jesus being "sent" from the Father, citing texts such as Mark 12.6 where the Father in the Parable of the Tenants sends his "beloved son" to the vineyard.[243]

Part three of the work rejects arguments for preexistence which use the model of Wisdom Christology, here there is little discussion of Markan texts.[244] Finally, in part four, Gathercole examines the titles, "Christ", "Lord", "Son of Man" and "Son of God".[245] For Gathercole, "Lord" in Mark can suggest a close identification of Jesus with Yahweh (e.g. 1.2-3; 2.28).[246] In relation to Mark 1.2-3 and 12.35-37, Gathercole rehearses arguments which find a connection with Jesus' preexistence and posits that 12.35-37 (par.) likely presupposes Jesus' preexistence as "Christ" on the basis of the connection with Ps 109 LXX, read as a whole with the references to Melchizedek.[247] While the title "Son of Man" may hint at Jesus' heavenly preexistence, "Son of God" is

[238] Gathercole 2006: 83.
[239] Gathercole 2006: 85-86. In Mark, (as Gathercole recognises) strictly speaking the *formula* "I have come + purpose" occurs only in 2.17, but the texts Gathercole includes are congruous.
[240] Gathercole 2006: 87.
[241] Gathercole 2006: 92-109.
[242] Gathercole 2006: 113 – 147. For instance, Gathercole (2006: 119-121) considers Danielic references, e.g. Dan 9.20-21; 10.12, 14; Gathercole (2006: 121-122) discusses Tob 5.5; and Gathercole (2006: 129-132) discusses *Tg. Jos. 5.14* and *Midrash Tanḥ to Exodus 6 (Parashah Mishpatim).*
[243] Gathercole 2006: 185-188.
[244] Gathercole 2006: 193 – 227.
[245] Gathercole 2006: 231 – 283.
[246] Gathercole 2006: 244.
[247] Gathercole (2006: 250-252) cautions that the focus of Mark 1.2-3 and 12.35-37 might be eschatological i.e. the divine testimony is to be regarded as speaking into the future in which Jesus comes (Isa 40.3/Mal 3.1) and is vindicated (Ps 110.1) rather than as evidence of a preexistent Christ. However, Gathercole (2006: 238, 294) ultimately reads these pericopes, and particularly 12.35-37, as suggestive of preexistence.

thought to evoke the latter, especially since Mark 12.6 interpreted contextually, implies God's sending Jesus (from heaven) into the world.[248]

In relation to Mark, Gathercole's thesis is interesting but not wholly convincing. In the "Prolegomena" section, while Mark 9.2-8 and 13.32 plausibly suggest a heavenly dimension to Jesus' identity, it is unclear if this edges us closer to a preexistence motif.[249] Gathercole rightly sees that exclusively divine attributes/functions are transferred to Jesus in some texts (e.g. 2.1-12; 4.35-41/6.45-52), but connects this with preexistence only indirectly.[250] Regarding the "I have come + purpose" sayings, Gathercole fails to do justice to evidence which damages his angel visitation argument.[251] Dunn draws attention to Josephus' statement in *J.W.* 3.400, where Josephus explains to Vespasian ἐγὼ δὲ ἄγγελος ἥκω σοι ("But I come to you as a messenger") and classifies himself as ὑπὸ θεοῦ προπεμπόμενος ("sent by God").[252] Again in Ps 40.7 (Ps 39.8 LXX), the Psalmist (David) declares, ἰδοὺ ἥκω ('Behold I come'). Clearly, in these cases there is no thought of preexistence, rather a human "divine agent" uses this language in reference to his particular purpose or mission at a particular point in time. The same is presumably true, *mutatis mutandis* of John the Baptist's "coming" in Mark 9.11-13.[253] Thus, the Markan "I have come + purpose" logia could be idiomatic, conveying a sense of Jesus' divine commission in connection with his public ministry, without any connotation of preexistence.

Gathercole's monolithic reading of the "I have come" sayings leads to some doubtful exegesis in places. Thus, Mark 1.38, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον ("And he said to them, 'Let us go elsewhere into the neighbouring towns that I may preach there also, because it is for this reason I came out'") is interpreted as an angelic type announcement when it

[248] On "Son of Man", Gathercole 2006: 258-259. On "Son of God", Gathercole 2006: 273-276.
[249] Given Jewish speculation regarding Elijah and Moses e.g. *Apoc. El.* (4.7, 4.15); cf. *1 En.* 90.31 (Broadhead 1992: 48 n. 28), Elijah and also Moses, probably have a "heavenly identity" in Mark 9.2-8, but are presumably not meant by the evangelist to be preexistent figures i.e. co-existing with God from eternity.
[250] Gathercole (2006: 79) "...the extremely exalted portrait of the Son here should, as has been mentioned, cause readers of the Synoptic Gospels to be less suspicious of potential evidence for preexistence...".
[251] Dunn 2007: 379.
[252] Dunn 2007: 379.
[253] Dunn (2007: 379) asks if we are to think of John the Baptist as "preexistent" since in Mark 9.11-13 he "comes" as Elijah. Cf. Collins & Collins (2008: 124) make a similar criticism in relation to Gathercole's exclusion of Matt 11.18-19/ Luke 7.33-34 as a "red herring".

most naturally refers back to 1.35-37 (compare 1.35 ἐξῆλθεν with ἐξῆλθον).[254] In other words, especially in view of the perhaps implicitly interrogative tone of the preceding verse – "everybody is searching for you" – Mark 1.38 should be understood as Jesus' explanation to Peter and the others as to why he has set out so early from the house.[255] Thus, Jesus' "coming out" has a local referent so that a statement of preexistence is unlikely here.[256]

Read with the other Markan "I have come" sayings, (1.24, 10.45), 2.17 could feasibly hint at preexistence, but is neither predicated on it, nor clear evidence for it. Rather, since the stress falls on the purpose of Jesus' coming, i.e. the calling of sinners, the topographical origin which precedes the coming is undetermined, undeterminable, and arguably immaterial.[257] On the other hand, Mark 1.24 is an instance of the so called "demonic secret" and while not the only interpretation possible, probably does hint at Jesus' heavenly status/preexistence, where one "heavenly being" recognises another, particularly since "holy ones" ("I know who you are the *holy one* of God") are usually angelic beings in the OT.[258]

Again, Gathercole pushes the comparison between Jesus' "I have come + purpose" sayings and those of angels, and recognises in relation to Mark 1.24 that "holy ones" are usually angels in the OT, but demurs on the possibility that Jesus' is an angelic identity.[259] Gathercole endorses Bauckham's idea that Jesus is included within the divine

[254] Gathercole (2006: 155) admits that the logion is unlike angel pronouncements insofar as it concerns preaching to the multitude rather than enigmatic revelation to an individual, nevertheless, he would still fit it into the pattern of angelic announcements.
[255] Hooker (1991: 76-77) suggests, that Mark 1.38 refers back to Jesus' exit of Nazareth in 1.9, rather than to his leaving the house in 1.35, since in 1.35 Jesus sets out to pray rather than to preach. While this is possible, it is likely that Jesus' time in prayer is a preparation for the preaching (cf. 14.32-39 where prayer, similarly, is the precursor to action), thus, there is no need to divorce the ἐξῆλθον in 1.38 from the ἐξῆλθεν in 1.35.
[256] Collins & Collins (2008: 124-125), object to Gathercole's exegesis here for a different reason. They contend that the "coming" sayings are idiomatic and convey the notion that particular individuals are "sent" by God to accomplish particular God-given missions. In connection with this concept of divine commission they further suggest that Mal 3.1 might stand behind Mark 1.38 since it is most likely alluded to in 1.2-3, and posit that Luke's rewriting of Mark 1.38 "for this [purpose] I was sent" tends to confirm this.
[257] Similarly, in Mark 12.6 the provenance of the "beloved son" is ultimately undeterminable. Despite Gathercole's insistence (e.g. Gathercole 2006: 296) that this verse strongly implies preexistence, this only works on the assumption that God's addressing Jesus as his "beloved son" in the baptism and transfiguration scenes is clear-cut evidence for Jesus' preexistence, but the preexistence of the character(s) involved cannot be presumed merely because a scene is imbued with a heavenly or apocalyptic flavour (Cf. Acts 9.3-5; Rev 1.10-16), just as the designation "son of God" cannot be presumed to convey either divinity or preexistence.
[258] On the "demonic secret" in Mark, see Danker 1970: 48-69.
[259] On "holy ones" and Mark 1.24 see Gathercole 2006: 152 n. 9. On the demurral see Gathercole 2006: 116.

identity, adopts Bauckham's phrase "christology of divine identity" and maintains that Jesus is neither an angel nor a second being worthy of worship in addition to God. Nevertheless, he insists that by sharing in the identity of God, Jesus goes beyond the "God-creation divide".[260] Further clarification is required on how Jesus as "divine son" is distinct from the angels in Mark, particularly since the "sons of God" in the OT can be angelic beings (e.g. Gen 6.2; Job 1.6, 2.1).[261] A related difficulty is Gathercole's handling of the "divine sonship" category since there is insufficient argument to persuade the reader that "Son of God" necessarily or probably points to Jesus' heavenly provenance.[262]

On balance, Gathercole succeeds in raising the preexistence question but his answer has shortcomings. Like any case dependent on its cumulative force, Gathercole's suffers when the vulnerability of particular planks in the argument is exposed. As argued above, contrary to Gathercole's position, the "I have come + purpose" sayings do not (at least in Mark) comprise the "strongest argument" for a Christology of preexistence. A potentially stronger indication of preexistence is the fact that heavenly beings i.e. demons instantly recognise Jesus (e.g. Mark 1.24; 5.7) in contrast with the generalised human incapacity to perceive who Jesus truly is. Thus, against Gathercole, and bearing in mind (Q2) of this thesis, the preexistence of Jesus is not explicitly stated in the Gospel of Mark, although it is arguably presupposed or hinted at in places (see further, below pp. 57-58).

[260] Gathercole 2006: 76. In his review, Dunn (2007: 380) objects to Gathercole's use of "identity" terminology which he complains is undefined as a category and "slippery".

[261] Gathercole (2006: 116) infers that a common heavenly provenance and an analogous coming to earth do not imply that Jesus and angels are ontologically similar, but prior to this he has argued for the "heavenly" identity of Jesus. While Gathercole (2006: 55) does maintain Jesus' true human, earthly identity, with regard to the more exalted aspects of Jesus' identity more specificity is required.

[262] Gathercole (2006: 50) posits Jesus' "divine sonship" (implying his heavenly identity) in connection with his baptism but fails to anticipate the objection that this might be messianic without divine connotations cf. for example, Collins & Collins 2008: 127-128; 131-132; 209. Again, if Jesus' sonship is taken in terms of the OT messianic ideal, then Mark 13.32 (cf. Gathercole 2006: 50) would point not to a "heavenly hierarchy" but simply to a hierarchy in which the Messiah "Son" outranks the angels. It is not intrinsically problematic that a human figure outrank angels since in apocalyptic literature and in the NT, angels are sometimes conceived of as "fellow servants" (e.g. *Ascen. Isa.* 8.5; Rev 19.10; 22.9), again, 1 Pet 1.12 shows that on occasions humans are privy to information which is withheld from angels. On the other hand, according to Heb 2.7-9, during his earthly ministry Jesus was made "a little lower than the angels" where the context suggests that angels are superior to humans in the ontological hierarchy.

SUZANNE WATTS HENDERSON

In *Christology and Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark*, Henderson explores two major Markan themes in tandem.[263] She claims that studies which present Jesus as "Suffering Messiah" neglect the first half of the gospel, and fail to treat or merely caricature other dimensions such as the relational dynamics of Jesus and his disciples. Henderson's overall approach to Markan Christology is indebted to Joel Marcus' understanding of Mark as apocalyptic eschatology, thus Jesus can be described as a "battalion commander" involved in a cosmic struggle with Satan.[264]

Of general interest is Henderson's discussion of the background and Markan understanding of the term "gospel". Without denying other, "secular" nuances, it is claimed that the Hebrew בשר the equivalent of the Greek εὐαγγελίζομαι terminology belongs to "the lexicon of the battlefield".[265] With regard to the εὐαγγέλ- word group itself, Henderson notes that the neuter singular substantive εὐαγγέλιον is absent from the LXX.[266] However, the neuter plural substantive εὐαγγέλια appears in 2 Sam 4.10 where it conveys news of military victory, with a similar meaning the feminine singular εὐαγγελία occurs in 2 Sam 18.20, 25,27; 2 Kgs 7.9.[267] Moreover, Henderson states that the cognate verb εὐαγγελίζω typically relates to Yahweh's victories over enemies (e.g. 2 Sam 18.31; Isa 40.9 (x2); 52.7 (x2) 60.6; 61.1; cf. MT Isa 41.27), and a wider study of the εὐαγγέλ- word group in the LXX broadly confirms this view.[268] The real issue for interpreters concerns how much of this OT background carries over into the gospel and wider NT usage of εὐαγγέλιον. For Henderson, at least, when the Markan Jesus proclaims the "gospel of God" (1.14-15) this entails "cosmic divine victory" with implications for the earthly sphere.[269]

---

[263] Henderson 2006.
[264] Henderson 2006: 34,
[265] Henderson 2006: 41.
[266] Henderson 2006: 41.
[267] Henderson 2006: 41 n. 48.
[268] Henderson 2006: 41 n. 49, though the military nuance is more explicit in Isa 40.9 cf. 10 LXX than it is in the other Isaianic texts cited. A widening of Henderson's term search reveals that of the three occurrences of the verb in the LXX psalms, Ps 67.12 cf. 13 LXX communicates the notion of military victory, (Pss 39.10; 95.2 LXX refer more generally to deliverance). Similarly, excluding the Isaiah texts, of the three other occurrences of the verb in the prophets, Nah 2.1 LXX (1.15) is clearly associated with victory in war; Joel 3.5 LXX (2.32) also has a military connotation bound up with judgment as confirmed by the wider context (e.g. Joel 3.9, 15-16 LXX (4.9, 15-16), on the link between divine justice and war here see Allen 1976: 115); though contrast Jer 20.15 LXX where there is no military dimension.
[269] Henderson 2006: 47 cf. 48.

Further to this, in relation to Mark 3.13-19, Henderson finds that Jesus bestows authority on the Twelve in their "end-time warfare" against demons (cf. 3.15).[270] She argues that Jesus' mountaintop appointment of the disciples affords both "divine disclosure" and "divine empowerment", since Jesus "serves as both Moses [...] and God himself".[271] Noting the verbal links between Exod 19.3 LXX and Mark 3.13, Henderson observes that like Moses, Jesus ascends the mountain (ἀναβαίνειν).[272] However, she urges that Jesus is cast in a "double role" here, since προσκαλεῖται ("he (Jesus) called to himself [those whom he wanted]") corresponds to God's summons to Moses ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς (Exod 19.3 LXX), and by extension to God's *call* (καλειν) i.e. election of Israel (cf. Isa 41.8-9).[273] If Henderson's conclusions stand, consonant with (Q3) and (Q4), remarkably, the divine prerogative of "election" is appropriated by Mark for Jesus.

Again, relevant to the present study, Henderson discusses the Markan sea-miracles (4.35-41/6.45-52) finding a battle motif.[274] In Mark 4.35-41 Jesus' command of the storm is "God-like".[275] But, with a view to (Q3), Henderson does not mean by this that Mark's Jesus is portrayed as "divine". Rather his sleep signals trust in God and Jesus *participates* in the "divine victory over cosmic adversarial forces like the storm at sea".[276] Similarly, in 6.45-52, Henderson detects a "chaos motif" bound up with Jesus' power over the demonic realm.[277] Once more, with regard to the debated use of ἐγώ εἰμι at Mark 6.50 and in relation to (Q3), Henderson states that Mark apparently "demurs" from an "overt claim of Jesus' divinity". Instead, appealing to the Markan Father-Son dichotomy (1.11; 9.7; 14.36; 15.39; cf. 10.18) she finds that the ἐγώ εἰμι should be read as Jesus' "allusive identification" with God's salvific power.[278]

[270] Henderson 2006: 81.
[271] Henderson 2006: 83.
[272] Henderson 2006: 79-80.
[273] Henderson 2006: 80.
[274] Henderson 2006: 138-142; 204-237.
[275] Henderson 2006: 11.
[276] Henderson 2006: 141.
[277] Henderson 2006: 218-222.
[278] Henderson 2006: 230.

ADELA YARBRO COLLINS

Adela Yarbro Collins' commentary on Mark in the *Hermeneia* series is a major recent contribution to Mark studies.[279] The gospel is described as an "eschatological historical monograph" since it is held that the evangelist transformed the model of biblical history infusing it with an eschatological and apocalyptic perspective but simultaneously adapting it to Hellenistic historiographical and biographical traditions.[280] Collins proposes that the Gospel was written around the time of the Jewish War in order to "reassert" and "redefine" the messiahship of Jesus over against messianic pretenders and to interpret *de facto* or expected persecution as integral to discipleship in imitation of Christ.[281]

Throughout Collins' work the Markan Jesus is understood against the background of OT traditions, particularly Elijah-Elisha stories.[282] The Qumran materials illumine our understanding of the Markan Jesus' role as a sort of eschatological prophet.[283] Thus, in the prologue the citation from Isa 40.3 is "analogous" to its use in *1QS* 8.12-16 (cf. *1QS* 4.16-23);[284] the first exorcism in 1.21-28 is compared and contrasted with Qumranite exorcistic practice;[285] the appointing of the Twelve in 3.13-19 is read in the light of a passage from the *Temple Scroll* (*11QT* 57.2-15),[286] and comment on 13.1-2 occasions recourse to *11QT*^{a} [*11Q19*] 29.6-10.[287] Consistent with Collins' view of the Gospel's genre, the commentary also discusses analogies from the Greco-Roman cultural and literary milieu.

While in Gospel studies one might expect to find points of contact with wider non-Jewish culture, for some commentators, older scholarship is now thought to have exaggerated the influence of Hellenistic materials on the gospel authors.[288] Elsewhere,

---

[279] Collins 2007.
[280] Collins 2007: 18, 1.
[281] Collins 2007: 101 – 102. Cf. Marcus 1999: 33-37. Despite general similarities, Collins' reading of the Markan *Sitz im Leben* differs from that of Marcus, for example, whereas the latter thinks of the "appalling desolation" as referring to Eleazar's occupation of the Temple, Collins (2007: 610) explicitly rejects this view, thinking it more likely to refer to the placing of the statue of a pagan deity in the Temple.
[282] See especially, Collins 2007: 48-50.
[283] Collins 2007: 44 – 48.
[284] Collins 2007: 137 – 138.
[285] Collins 2007: 167.
[286] Collins 2007: 215 - 216.
[287] Collins 2007: 601.
[288] See Wright (1997: 14 – 15) for a critique of this in Rudolf Bultmann. Hurtado (2003: 13-25) has a similar critique of Wilhelm Bousset.

Collins has been criticised for suggesting that non-Jewish ideas about divine heroes and divinized humans were adapted "unreflectively" by early Jewish Christians – that is, she has been charged with overplaying the influence of Hellenistic thought on early Christianity.[289] Again, in this commentary, the relevance of certain alleged Greco-Roman parallels is in doubt. For instance, it is unclear what is achieved by the comparison of Mark 9.16-19 with an incident in which Asclepius' servants remove a woman's head in order to extract a tapeworm from her, only to find themselves incapable of reattaching the head.[290] Though some general comparisons may be more helpful, this thesis contends that the predominant influence on Markan Christology was OT/Jewish traditions rather than Greco-Roman myth.[291]

In relation to (Q1) above, commenting on Mark 15.39, Collins assesses the argument of H.L. Chronis who detected a subtly cultic force in the description of the centurion as ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ.[292] Chronis read this as an idiomatic expression for entering the Temple and standing "in the presence" or "before the face" of God. However, he conceded that where there is a cultic connotation the LXX favours ἐναντίον. Collins adds that ἐξ ἐναντίας has cultic force only in 1 Kgdms 26.20, where David begs Saul not to let his blood fall to the ground "away from the presence of the Lord" (ἐξ ἐναντίας προσώπου κυρίου).[293] Thus, Collins rejects the possibility that the words ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ have any cultic significance in Mark 15.39 since the common usage in the LXX is from narrative contexts describing battles. Therefore, if the phrase is in any way figurative here, it signifies the initial role of the centurion as one who is inimical to Jesus,

[289] Hurtado 2003: 93 n. 34.
[290] Collins 2007: 437, with references to Aelian *De natura animalium* 9.33. Similarly, Collins strains to make a link between the literary framework of Mark and the structure of Aristotelian tragedy describing the "mode" (though not the genre) of Mark as "tragic", however, the rules regarding tragedy established in the *Poetics* itself (XI), would seem to militate against such a connection since, "the change from prosperity to adversity should not be represented as happening to a virtuous character; for this raises disgust rather than terror or compassion" (Moxon 1934: 25). Moreover, Collins (2007: 91-93; 675) admits that Jesus' anguish in the final scene contrasts with what we would expect from Greek or Romans heroes, citing Plato's *Phaedo* where "death is the soul's great friend".
[291] E.g. Collins (2007: 800) suggests that some readers may have taken Mark 16.8 as epiphanic on account of ideas in Greek literature where fear is a common reaction to the divine epiphany, particularly since the appearance of an angel is analogous to the Greek divine epiphany. This observation opens up a new possibility, namely, that "fear" may be a motif linked with the manifestation of God in Mark. Not only Greek religion, but OT texts (e.g. Exod 3.5; Prov 1.7, 9.10; Ps 112.1) might be instructive background material.
[292] Collins (2007: 765) cites Chronis 1982: 110.
[293] Collins 2007: 765.

standing "over against" him.[294] Here, then, there is no indication that Jesus was the object of cultic worship in Mark.

With regard to (Q3), Collins provides some support for the hypothesis that attributes associated with Yahweh/God are switched to Jesus in Mark. For example, the "stronger one" (1.7) epithet is said to evoke connotations of God the DW.[295] However, Collins qualifies this stating that in the Markan context the term may connote the Davidic Messiah as God's eschatological agent – a role which on Collins' view Mark's Jesus did not carry out in his lifetime, but might be thought to fulfil in his return as Son of Man.[296] Again, the binding of Satan in the "strong man" pericope is said to be "analogous" to God's binding of Leviathan in Job.[297] In anticipation of Chapter 3 of this thesis, it is noteworthy that Collins' exegesis of the Markan sea-miracles (4.35-41/6.45-52) picks up on parallels from OT texts (e.g. Ps 105.9 in relation to 4.39; Job 9.8 in relation to 6.48) which form part of the Combat Myth.[298] With regard to the stilling of the storm, Collins suggests that the Markan Jesus is depicted less as a man dependent on God's salvific power and more as a "divine being".[299] That is not to say that Collins thinks that Mark's Jesus (much less the historical Jesus) is to be understood in creedal terms, i.e. as a second divine being.[300] Rather, in Mark's baptismal scene Jesus is instituted as an "agent of God" where the endowment of the Spirit has prophetic and messianic implications.[301]

ELIZABETH STRUTHERS MALBON

In *Mark's Jesus: Characterization as Narrative Christology*, Malbon builds on three decades of research in Markan studies.[302] Five chapters correspond to a five-part schematisation of Mark's "christology", hence, "Enacted", "Projected", "Deflected",

[294] Collins 2007: 765.
[295] Collins 2007: 64.
[296] Collins 2007: 64.
[297] Collins 2007: 233. Collins also likens this to Raphael's binding of Azazel in *1 En.* 10.8.
[298] Collins 2007: 262, 336. See Collins (2007: 256-263; 332-338) on the sea-miracles.
[299] Collins 2007: 260. Cf. Collins (2007: 333) where Jesus' walking on the sea in Mark 6.45-52 is similarly held to imply Jesus' divinity for Mark's audience.
[300] Collins (2007: 44) finds Mark's portrayal of Jesus "complex", "multifaceted and somewhat ambiguous". Collins (2007: 94) thinks of the historical Jesus in terms of an eschatological prophet, a wisdom teacher, an interpreter of Torah and "probably an exorcist", who may or may not have self-identified as the Messiah. Cf. Collins 2008: 171-173.
[301] Collins 2007: 39. Chronis 1982: 97-114.
[302] Malbon 2009.

"Refracted" and "Reflected" christology.[303] Malbon's introduction describes the narrative critical method with reference to the literary theory of Seymour Chatman.[304] The terminology is now standard e.g. "implied author"/ "implied audience", though Malbon draws some subtle distinctions e.g. "Markan narrator"/ "the Markan Jesus", "implied author"/ "Markan narrator".[305] The terms "implied author/implied audience" are theoretical constructions considered *internal* aspects of the narrative, designed to safeguard against the "intentional fallacy" (where the presumed motivation of the "real" author is overvalued) and the "affective fallacy" (where the response of the "real" audience is overvalued).[306] The Markan narrator communicates the Markan Jesus - a character - to the narratee, but is a literary aid to the implied author.[307] Malbon successfully demonstrates that the point of view of the Markan Jesus is not always aligned with that of the Markan narrator and that there *is* a distinction between the narrator and the implied author. Malbon's conclusion that the implied author has the narrator focus on Jesus as "near to God" and has the Markan Jesus *deflect* focus towards "God as sovereign" is representative of the work as a whole and its strongest conclusion.[308]

An example of the creative tension which Malbon finds between the Markan Jesus and the Markan narrator emerges in 5.19-20. For Malbon, the Markan Jesus references God "the Lord", whereas the Markan narrator has the healed demoniac proclaim *Jesus* in parallel with "the Lord".[309] Again, in relation to Mark 1.2-3 and (Q4), on the basis of the handling of the OT sources, Malbon suggests that the narratee might be encouraged to think of Jesus as "the Lord".[310] At the narrative level, then, in terms of (Q3), within the dynamics of the story, Mark 5.19-20 suggests the transfer of divine attributes/appellation to Jesus.[311] In terms of (Q5) the suggestion is that in Mark 1.2-3 and 5.20 the Markan narrator transfers to Jesus the divine title "the Lord".[312]

---

[303] Malbon (2009: 5) leaves "christology" uncapitalised to distinguish Mark's presentation of Jesus from patristic Christology.
[304] See Chatman 1978.
[305] Malbon 2009: 54, 66, 231.
[306] Malbon 2009: 7.
[307] Malbon 2009: 8.
[308] Malbon 2009: 237, cf. 144-146; 150.
[309] Malbon 2009: 136 -137.
[310] Malbon 2009: 71.
[311] Malbon (2009: 136) assumes that Jesus speaks of God as "the Lord" in 5.19, but the Markan Jesus might self-identify as "the Lord" here, especially since the demoniac prostrates himself before Jesus in 5.7. In both cases, for Mark "Jesus" is "the Lord".
[312] Malbon (2009: 71-75) finds that the appellation "Lord" in Mark is usually no more than a deferential term ("sir") but on occasion does recall Yahweh the Lord.

However, Malbon tends to downplay the significance of these, and similar observations which signal a very high Christology.[313] Indeed, Malbon suggests with regard to Jesus' healing of the paralytic that Mark 2.9 should be read "your sins are forgiven *by God*" but that is not what the text says, nor is this reading immediately obvious given the logic of 2.7.[314] Malbon eschews Markan high Christology because she flatly rejects the possibility that anyone other than God may be "divine" in Mark, and suggests that the gospel focuses not on essence (Jesus' nature) but on process (Jesus' relationships).[315] Her warnings concerning the back-projection of fourth century Christology onto Mark are well taken, but there are occasional hints that patristic dogmatics are being exchanged for modern, and post-modern scholarly presuppositions! Thus, when making some fairly categorical remarks about Mark's "first-century Gospel", Malbon might be read as advocating a return to Bousset.[316] *Uploading* the conclusions of others on the non-applicability to Jesus of categories such as "divinity" risks closing off avenues of Mark's narrative christology which on the grounds of Malbon's own findings might be more open than it first appears.[317]

(1.5) Summary of findings with responses

From this literature review, some partial, at times conflicting answers emerge in response to the five question matrix. In general, (Q1), ("Is there evidence in Mark that Jesus was venerated/worshipped as a transcendent or divine being?"), has been answered

[313] Malbon (2009: 71) notes the "potentially enormous significance" of the suggestion in Mark 1.3 that the narratee is to view Jesus as "Lord" but fails to draw out the implications of this *potential significance.* Similarly, on 1.24, Malbon (2009: 82) suggests that the title "Holy One of God" recalls "Holy One of Israel" used of Yahweh in the OT, but makes little of this.
[314] Malbon 2009: 152.
[315] Malbon 2009: 52, 202, 216.
[316] Malbon (2009: 62 n. 14) cites with approval R. H. Fuller "son of God" (in Achtemeier 1996: 1053), who opines that Nicean and Chalcedonian Christology "rests upon the Johannine development from a functional to a metaphysical Christology".
[317] Malbon (2009: 52 n. 77) depends on Boring who on the basis of the absoluteness of the one God (Mark 2.7; 10.18) and the citation of the Shema in 12.29-32 says that Mark "does not and cannot" have a "general category 'divine'" for God *and* beings such as Christ or angels. However, in 1 Cor 8.6, Jesus is, to borrow a Pauline metaphor, "grafted in" to the Shema or at least the central premise of the Shema on the absoluteness of God (on this see Hurtado 1988: 1-2; Wright 1991: 129). Since 1 Corinthians is usually believed to predate the final form gospel of Mark, regardless of whether Mark knew Paul, Boring's (and Malbon's) categorical exclusion of the *possibility* that "divine" may operate as a category in Mark for characters other than God seems unwarranted. Indeed Boring's first textual example works against his point, since Mark 2.7 suggests that the God/Jesus distinction in Mark can become blurry around the edges. While Mark's Jesus is "not God" (cf. Malbon 2009: 202) i.e. not identical with the one God of Israel, in places Jesus is so closely identified with God that the (Markan) question about Jesus' identity (cf. e.g. 4.41; 8.27-29; 14.61-64) inevitably raises questions about his essence, provenance and ultimately about his divinity.

negatively and in my view conclusively. Mark does not contain clear evidence of the cultic veneration/worship of Jesus as a transcendent or divine being. That is not to say that either the author or the audience did not venerate/worship Jesus, indeed a cultic setting may be presupposed.[318] Rather, in contrast to later Matthean statements which likely reflect the *de facto* veneration/worship of Jesus in early Christianity (e.g. Matt 2.2, 2.11; 14.33), Mark does not furnish the reader with such material.[319] Neither do we find anything akin to earlier liturgical passages (e.g. Phil 2.6-11; Col 1.15-20) which arguably attest early devotion, indeed worship of Jesus.[320]

On (Q2), ("Is there evidence in Mark that Jesus was regarded as preexistent?"), with the significant exception of Gathercole, the consensus view remains that Mark and the synoptic gospels do not lay claim to preexistence for Jesus. Nowhere in Mark is there any unambiguous statement of Jesus' preexistence. Nevertheless, three interrelated factors indicate that Mark *may* think of Jesus in terms of a preexistent heavenly being. First, overlooked by Gathercole, is the total Markan omission of Joseph, Jesus' father. Given the importance of genealogy in the other synoptics (Matt 1.1-17/ Luke 3.23-38) and allowing that Mark knew of Joseph's existence, this, surely, is a theologically significant omission.[321] Taken in connection with the portrayal of the Markan Jesus as intimately the "Son of God" at key narrative moments, such as the baptism, transfiguration and crucifixion, (e.g. 1.11, 9.7, 15.39 cf. 1.1(?)), this striking omission might hint at Jesus' otherworldly provenance by negation, just as Matthew and Luke affirm the same in a positive manner, by way of their birth narratives.[322] Second, it is widely observed that in Mark, the demons (like God) recognise Jesus as God's Son, whereas human characters are typically slow to perceive his true identity. Mark may mean that heavenly beings recognise "one of their own", in contrast to human family and acquaintances who are unable to grasp Jesus' true identity e.g. 3.21; 6.3-4. Third, if on a

[318] The irony concerning enemies falling before Jesus in Mark 15.19 (cf. 5.6), in mock veneration, may in some sense reflect community practice of early Jesus devotion, since, at least from Paul onwards, Jesus is referred to customarily, and in doxologies, as "Lord" (e.g. 1 Thess. 1.1, 3; 2 Cor 8.9; 1 Cor 8.6; Phil 2.10-11) .

[319] For this reading of the Matthean texts in parentheses see, e.g., Morris 1992: 37; Barbaglio, Fabris & Maggioni 1990: 84; France 1985: 82.

[320] On these texts see e.g. Wright 1991: 56-119.

[321] Similarly, Hurtado 2003: 321. While theoretically possible that Mark new nothing of Joseph, since he shows awareness of Jesus' family (3.31-35) and even Peter's (1.30), it is hard to believe that the omission of Joseph signals a lacuna in the tradition.

[322] On the title "Son of God" in Mark and its narrative and strategic importance see e.g. Marcus 1999: 266; Broadhead 1999: 116-123.

natural reading Mark identifies Jesus "Son of God" with the "Son of Man" (8.38), then Jesus' sonship could be implicitly preexistent by association, insofar as the Danielic (and also Enochic) "Son of Man" is a heavenly being.[323] Though the subject of debate, Jewish developments of the Danielic "Son of Man" figure (e.g. *1En.* 48.2-3; *4 Ezra* 13.26) suggest that this figure was understood to be a *preexistent* heavenly being.[324] Overall, therefore, the possibility that Mark viewed Jesus as preexistent must be held open, even though an outright statement of preexistence (cf. Col 1.15-17; John 1.1) is lacking.

In connection with (Q3), ("Is there evidence in Mark that divine operations and attributes were transferred to Jesus and if so, what might this imply?"), several commentators find evidence in Mark of the transfer of divine operations/attributes to Jesus. One possible example is the Markan Jesus' forgiving of sins (2.5-11).[325] Moreover, in common with more general studies on primitive "high" Christology, Collins, Gathercole, Marcus, Watts, and, more cautiously, Henderson, all find that in the Markan sea miracles (4.35-41/6.45-52) divine operations are transferred to Jesus.[326] Again, Malbon suggests a reading of Mark 5.19-20 wherein the healed demoniac becomes the mouthpiece of the Markan narrator proclaiming Jesus as "the Lord" i.e. equivalent to God.[327] Evidently, Mark does transfer to Jesus divine operations/attributes, however, the implications of this are interpreted variously.

In respect to (Q4), ("Is there evidence in Mark that particular OT texts are reprogrammed in such a way that Jesus becomes the referent in place of God?"), some commentators hold that the composite citation in the Markan prologue (1.2-3) involves the reprogramming of OT texts in such a way as to substitute Jesus as the new referent

---

[323] It is generally accepted that Dan 7.13 has influenced Mark 13.26 (see e.g. Nineham 1963: 357; Angel 2006: 127), and the Danielic "one like a Son of Man" has to some extent influenced 8.38, so Marcus 2009: 620, 629; Collins 2007: 410; Casey 1991: 150; Hooker 1991: 210-211.

[324] For Marcus (2009: 619-620), both Danielic and Enochic "Son of Man" figures may have influenced Mark 8.38. With regard to preexistence, there is no clear affirmation of preexistence in the Danielic conception (cf. Dan 7.13). However, the development of the Danielic tradition in *1 Enoch* probably claims preexistence for the "Son of Man"/ "one like a Son of Man", so Boyarin 2011: 51-76; Collins 2008: 88-89; Bousset 1913: 44-46; Gathercole 2006: 254-258; Broadhead 1999: 127. While Rowland (1982: 185), and Collins (1998a: 188-189) caution that only the *name* of the "Son of Man" in *1 En.* 48.2f. (cf. 62.7) antedates creation, Hengel (1976: 69-70) plays down the distinction between "ideal" and "real" preexistence. It should also be observed that preexistence seemingly attaches to the "Son of Man" figure in *4 Ezra* 13.26, as recognised by Collins 1998a: 209.

[325] Thus, Gathercole 2006: 57-61. Marcus (1999: 222-223) provides a nuanced discussion here, where Jesus as God's agent is attributed this function/authority.

[326] Collins 2007: 260, 333; Gathercole 2006: 62-64 ; Marcus 1999: 432 cf. 1992: 144-145 ; Watts 1997: 161-162; Henderson 2006: 11, 230.

[327] Malbon 2009: 136-137.

(i.e. the subject of "Lord") of a statement originally about God/Yahweh. While this is not the only plausible reading of this text, it is in my view the most probable.[328] Though direct scriptural citations with an introductory formula are relatively rare in Mark, scriptural allusions and partial citations without any introductory formula are more common. One example to be explored in greater depth in Chapter 3 is that of the apparent partial citation of Job 9.8 LXX at Mark 6.48. If Mark 6.48 does allude to/cite Job 9.8 LXX, then it would comprise a further example of the Markan reprogramming of an OT text where Jesus becomes the referent instead of Yahweh. As in (Q3), the implications of such a move may be interpreted variously.

Finally, on (Q5), ("Is there evidence in Mark that particular titles and/or the combination of titles attributed to Jesus in Mark imply Jesus' divinity?"), the literature review exposed flaws and limitations in treatments which have assessed christological titles in a broadly systematic manner. Therefore, it remains an open question whether particular titles or the combination of titles attributed to Jesus in Mark imply a heavenly provenance/the possible preexistence of Jesus. In one sense (Q5) presents particular methodological difficulties, since to understand a Markan title it is necessary to take into account its prehistory (often complex and multivalent), (e.g. "Son of Man", "Son of David"), while recognising that it might be reworked in its narrative context and in relation to other titles, and that it might also suffer external influence (e.g. "Son of God" and possible links with the imperial cult). Similarly, there needs to be an awareness of the dangers of back projecting later Christian conceptualisations of christological titles while simultaneously inquiring how such conceptualisations might arise.

Overall then, in the light of the above, (Q1) is largely a non-starter and requires no further exploration at this stage. Already, a provisional answer to (Q2) has been ventured questioning the negative consensus. Thus, (Q2) need no longer be pursued directly, but in the ensuing chapters, should corroborative or contrary evidence emerge in connection with the answer provided above, this will be noted. Both (Q3), and to a lesser extent (Q4), have been answered positively in works on primitive Christology and in specific Markan studies. This then is a fruitful line of enquiry, especially in regard to the Markan sea-miracles (4.35-41/6.45-52) which are sometimes mentioned in this

[328] Cf. The discussion above in relation to Joel Marcus' commentary. This reading gains external support insofar as Jesus is known as "the Lord" or "Lord" in early NT literature e.g. 1 Cor 8.5-6; Rom 1.4; Gal 1.3.

connection, but are seldom studied in detail.[329] Finally, (Q5) remains "open", that is to say, while a thorough treatment of titular Christology cannot be attempted here, since the Markan texts selected for more detailed study contain one or more christological titles, some clues may surface, though it is probably unrealistic to hope for anything more substantial.

(1.6) Proposal

(a) Aim

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms (in connection primarily with (Q3) and (Q4) of the question matrix established in this chapter), testing the hypothesis that Mark draws on the HDWT as part of his "high" Christology. Thus, it is expected that a contribution be made to perennial discussions on Markan Christology and primitive Christology. On the basis of the findings of this study, it is also hoped that an answer may be given to the broad question of whether Mark's Jesus should be regarded as divine, i.e. that Mark understands and portrays Jesus as a second divine being alongside God, or as a being that somehow *participates* in the "divine identity". Since only excerpts of Mark will be studied in depth, the answer to this governing question will be partial and preliminary, rather than complete and definitive.

(b) Approach

The approach taken in this study is broadly speaking *literary* and exegetical, as opposed to historical-critical.[330] That is, the concern is to work with the final form of the Markan text, delimited in the standard way: Mark 1.1 – 16.8.[331] The adoption of a final

[329]See, e.g. n. 298 above, and Hurtado (2003: 285), who touches briefly on the Markan sea-miracles. See also McCurley 1983: 58-61, and Batto 1992: 179-180, which treatments exhibit certain difficulties as will be discussed in Chapter 2. More detailed studies are Heil (1981: 7-74; 118-141), offering a fuller discussion of Mark 6.45-52, and a limited treatment of 4.35-41. Madden (1997: 91-103), provides some detailed discussion of 6.45-52 in response to Heil. Cf. Nicholls (2008: 91-94), who offers some comment on 6.45-52 in a recent study of the Matthean parallel passage (Matt 14.22-33). Brower (2009: 294-296, 304-305) treats 4.35-41 in relation to Bauckham's notion of "divine identity". These works will be considered in Chapter 3.

[330] In common with Wright (1992: 25), the term "literary" is used with caution since "literary criticism" is ambiguous insofar as some scholars take it generically to refer to older historical-critical approaches (Form, Source and Redaction Criticism), whereas in recent years the term and associated nomenclature can mean something quite different. Thus Chatman (1978: 18), whose method is presupposed in studies on Mark by Danove (2005: 2 n. 3), and Malbon (2009: 7), describes "literary theory" as "the study of the nature of literature" and cites Aristotle's *Poetics* in this connection; this clearly has little to do with historical criticism.

[331] On the ending(s) of Mark see e.g. Marcus 2009: 1088-1096; Wright 2003: 617-624.

form approach is not intended to invalidate more historical approaches, indeed, where the concern is to trace the nature of early Jesus devotion, redaction critical analysis of tradition history might yield interesting results.[332] However, given the uncertainty which sometimes surrounds the findings of traditional historical-critical analysis, it is more secure, methodologically, to approach the Markan text as a finished product, drawing in the course of the exegesis on the insights of narrative criticism.[333]

(c) Working assumptions

1. Following scholarly convention, both the Gospel and its author (where "author" is synonymous with the redactor of the final form of the text) are referred to simply as "Mark". While a traditional view of authorship is assumed, the proposed investigation would function equally well were nothing implied regarding the historical identity of the author. Again, while this study accepts the consensus view that Mark is the earliest written gospel (c.65 - 70 CE), debated questions regarding the provenance and intended readership will not be tackled here.[334]
2. The present study is a final form rather than an historical enquiry, working with the final form of the Markan text. Therefore, historical-critical issues pertaining to the hypothetical pre-history of particular pericopes will generally fall outside the remit of this work, though should such issues prove necessary to the advancement of the discussion, these will be given coverage. It is anticipated that

[332] Cf. The studies of Achtemeier 1970: 266-274, and Kelber 1979: 7-55, which provide possible clues as to the shape of the prehistory of Markan traditions.

[333] Attempts to determine which sections of Mark stem from the historical Jesus, which belong to oral tradition and which to Mark himself produce widely divergent results. Different readings of a text such as Mark 4.11-12 are illustrative. Thus, Wrede (1901: 68) could refer to Mark's view on Jesus' teaching in parables (as embodied in 4.11-12) as "completely unhistorical", in what ensues he ties these verses into his "messianic secret" concept (cf. Wrede 1901: 71-71). Weeden (1971: 148-150) also finds a Markan reconstruction here, but on his view the disciples act as "surrogates" for the evangelist's *theioi andres* opponents. Weeden (1971: 149 n. 17) further claims that these verses belong within the pre-Markan tradition but were relocated in the course of Markan redaction. Reasoning from the premise that there are "tensions" between 4.11-12 and the rest of the gospel, Collins (2007: 240) arrives at the conclusion that the evangelist made use of *two* sources in composing Jesus' speech in parables. On the other hand Taylor (1933: 80) sees "no reason" why Jesus himself should not have used the words of Isa 6.10 as recorded in Mark 4.10. Again, Lane (1974: 157-158) disputes the possibility that these verses are inauthentic and suggests that "a greater appreciation" of the historical situation in which Jesus spoke the parables will demonstrate the appropriateness of the logion in its context.

[334] For a range of possible views regarding the controversial matter of provenance and readership see e.g. Collins 2007: 7-10.

certain contemporary methods typically utilised within final form analyses, such as narrative criticism, will also be used within this inquiry. It is recognised that this form of critical analysis presupposes complex and nuanced theories, but given the limitations of space, only a "working" definition can be offered here, with references to more theoretical treatments. Thus, "narrative criticism" applied to Mark's Gospel is broadly understood as that mode of analysis which explores the literariness and narrativity of the gospel as *story* with an implied author and implied audience, where settings, character, plot and narrative rhetoric are focal.[335] As Elizabeth Malbon has shown, narrative criticism can be an effective tool in drawing out some of the subtleties of Markan Christology.[336]

3. Further to point 2, since this study addresses the Markan literary presentation, issues surrounding the historical factuality of particular events described by Mark are not central to this investigation. For instance, modern debates pitting naturalistic explanations for the sea-miracles and exorcism accounts (especially 9.14-29) against supernatural readings are unlikely to receive attention here, though should contemporary scholarly theories revive older naturalistic explanations, then these will be addressed in dialogue. Working with a majority scholarly perspective, it is held that for Mark both the sea-miracles and exorcisms are real historical events (not parables), in accordance with a first century worldview.[337]
4. Again, the special concern here is to investigate the extent to which *Mark* draws on the HDWT - which nomenclature and category will be explained in Chapter 2 - principally in his presentation of Jesus in the sea-miracles and exorcism accounts.[338] Thus, unless there are compelling reasons to revise the approach of this study, no attempt will be made to trace the influence of this tradition to the historical Jesus, although such a task might comprise a challenge for future study.
5. As already signalled, a systematic survey of Mark's Christology is beyond the scope of the present study. Thus, unless research opens up these possibilities, the reader should not expect to find expositions of the broader themes in Markan

[335] Malbon 2009: 6-7. On "narrative theory," see Chatman 1978. On "narrative theory" applied to Mark and/or gospel studies see, for example, Davidsen 1993: 25-53; Danove 2005: 1-27; Malbon 1992: 23-49; 2009: 1-19.
[336] E.g. Malbon 2009: 70-72.
[337] For reconstructions of the first century (Palestinian) worldview see e.g. Wright 1992; Crossan & Reed 2001: 98 - 135.
[338] For the nomenclature, see Chapter 2, n. 24.

scholarship e.g. the "messianic secret", "divine man"' Christology, discipleship in relation to Christology, though such themes may be touched upon in places and referenced in footnotes. In general, this study will be restricted to the investigation of Mark's possible use of the HDWT in the crafting of the sea-miracle and exorcism stories, with implications for a "high" Christology in the terms particularly of (Q3) and (Q4) above.

(1.7) Method

This study proposes the exegetical examination of particular Markan texts (the sea-miracles and exorcisms), in order to ascertain whether, and to what extent Mark draws on the HDWT in his portrayal of Jesus, and what the implications of this might be for Christology in terms of the set of questions presented above. The following measures will be carried out in order to work towards this goal:

1. In Chapter 2, following a brief consideration of background ANE divine warrior mythology, I will outline my understanding of the HDWT, establishing criteria for how texts might be classified as belonging within these traditions. An overview of the OT/Second Temple HDWT will be supplied with an introduction to imagery and a definition of terms and concepts with examples. A basic list of OT/Second Temple texts judged to belong to these traditions will be presented in tabular form according to the type of imagery/terminology present. In a final section of Chapter 2, scholarly works which have located the HDWT in Markan texts will be discussed and evaluated.
2. In Chapter 3, the Markan sea-miracles (4.35-41/6.45-52) will be translated and briefly set within their context in the gospel.
3. Each sea-miracle will be examined in the light of the HDWT where the concern will be to explore/demonstrate potential Markan links with these traditions. Thus, the imagery and terminology used by Mark will be compared to imagery and vocabulary from these traditions (as set out in Chapter 2), in order to establish whether and how far the evangelist draws on stock images and vocabulary from these traditions. More specifically,

it will be inquired whether there are particular Markan allusions and echoes to OT/Second Temple texts which belong to these traditions.

4. "Allusion" may be defined as an authorially intended reference to a preceding text, involving verbal and conceptual similarity.[339] Five key criteria for establishing what may be legitimately said to comprise a Markan "allusion" to the HDWT may be identified:[340] (a) Verbal parallels and conceptual coherence with a text identified in the list (provided in Chapter 2) or *in loco* as belonging to the HDWT are marked. That is, very similar or identical words appear in a primary and a potential source text, where the likelihood that such parallels are merely coincidental may be assessed on the following grounds: (i). volume, i.e. how extensive is the allusion. The repetition of a single word - depending on which word (cf. (b) below) - might be put down to mere coincidence more easily than the repetition of two or more words or an entire phrase; (ii). syntactical arrangement, i.e. a similar grammatical/syntactical arrangement might increase the possibility that an allusion is intended; (iii). semantic range, i.e. factors pertaining to different word meanings in the case of an individual term might increase or decrease the likelihood of an allusion. For instance, if a particular term is capable of a range of meanings but has a particular meaning in a given set of circumstances, then if similar circumstances obtain where a term is used in a primary text, the particular meaning in question becomes more likely and an allusion is more probable.[341] (b). Additional weight may be given to the verbal parallel which has as its object a recognised technical term or a strong established image of the traditions such as "Leviathan", "Rahab", God's "rebuke" of the chaos waters, see further below, Chapter 2; (c) The parallels identified

[339] This definition is an adaptation of Köstenberger & Patterson 2011: 713, where allusion is defined as "an authorially intended reference to a preceding text of Scripture involving verbal, or at a minimum, conceptual similarity."

[340] Cf. Hays 1989: 20-24, 29-30; Köstenberger & Patterson 2011: 705-706. While other works list further criteria, e.g. Beale (2007: 24) following Hays (1989: 29-33) cites the criterion of "historical plausibility," that is whether the historical situation allows for the possibility that the author could have intended the Old Testament reference and for the audience to grasp it, this might be regarded as more a *sine qua non* than a test of the validity of a proposed allusion.

[341] For examples of how factors relating to semantic range influence the understanding of terms and allusions see the discussion on the term "rebuke" in Chapter 2, pp. 91-92, and also the discussion of κοπάζω in Chapter 3, p. 126.

are unique to the proposed source text or tend towards exclusivity. (d) The allusion informs, enhances or explains the perceived authorial intent.[342] (e) The allusion gains support on the basis of the history of interpretation, i.e. other interpreters have discerned the same or similar allusions in this and/or related texts.[343] Evidently, these criteria are weighted differently, where criterion (e) might be deemed less important than, say, criterion (a). Where a potential allusion satisfies most or all of the criteria, then cumulatively, the validity of the allusion becomes more secure. For the purposes of clarification, consider the following example which will be fully discussed in Chapter 3: the allusion to Job 9.8 LXX in Mark 6.48b. With regard to criterion (a), in several studies Job 9.8 is identified as a text belonging to the HDWT.[344] Verbal parallels between Mark 6.48b ("walking on the sea") and Job 9.8 LXX ("walking on the sea as on firm ground") are marked: in terms of (i) above, three words are identical, where, in terms of (ii). above, identical syntactical elements obtain: participle + preposition + noun, (though the sequence is interrupted in Job 9.8 LXX by the comparison to dry land). Again, there is conceptual coherence (in Job 9.8 God walks on the sea, in Mark 6.48 Jesus, likewise, walks on the sea). Since very few other biblical texts have a similar wording, and since Job 9.8 LXX is the closest parallel to Mark 6.48b, criterion (c) is satisfied. Criterion (d) is also satisfied in that the allusion to Job 9.8 LXX would inform and enhance a Markan concern found elsewhere in the Gospel (not least in the related passage 4.35-41), namely, to cast Jesus in terms of Q3 above, in the role of Yahweh the DW. Finally, criterion (e) is satisfied, since other interpreters (e.g. Heil, Guelich, Lane) have similarly seen an allusion here.[345]

5. Following Köstenberger & Patterson's definition, "echo" may be defined as "an authorially intended reference to a preceding text, which exhibits a

[342] Cf. Beale 2007: 24, (following Hays 1989: 29-33), who refers to the criterion of "Satisfaction" in a similar vein. For Beale, this criterion concerns whether the potential allusion "makes sense of the author's larger contextual argument."
[343] This criterion is taken over from Hays 1989: 31; 2005: 43-44, (cf. Beale 2007: 24).
[344] E.g. Angel 2011: 307; Day 1985: 42; Heil 1981: 40; Collins 2007: 336-337; McCurley 1983: 61; Batto 1992: 179.
[345] Lane 1974: 236; Heil 1981: 40; Guelich 1989: 351.

proportionally lesser degree of verbal similarity than an allusion."[346] The verbal criteria for establishing an "echo" is thus less rigid than in the case of the "allusion." In order to establish the presence of an echo there must be (a) similarity of theme(s), where the level of thematic proximity necessarily strengthens or weakens the case. (b) Verbal parallels might not be essential to establish the presence of an echo, since in some instances the latter might merely be regarded as the subtle restatement of a concept or theme. Nevertheless, where there is evidence of some verbal correspondence, (e.g. the use of terms roughly equivalent in meaning though not identical words, or the use of similar verbal forms or syntax) the probability of a possible echo might be strengthened, where in individual instances relevant argumentation from context must be supplied.

6. The findings pertinent to the Markan sea-miracles will be examined within the framework of the question matrix discussed above where implications for Mark's "high" Christology will be noted.
7. In Chapter 4 the Markan exorcism stories will be translated and briefly set within their context. Specific verbal parallels between the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms will be demonstrated in order to show that the sea-miracles and exorcisms enjoy a conceptual relationship within Mark's overarching christological scheme.
8. The Markan exorcism stories will be investigated against the background of the HDWT to explore potential Markan links with these traditions, using the criteria presented in (4) above.
9. The findings pertinent to the exorcisms will be examined within the question matrix discussed above where implications for Mark's "high" Christology will be noted.
10. Chapter 5 will draw the findings of this study together; a penultimate step will be to consider the evidence for the Markan use of the HDWT within the context of wider debates on primitive Christology, in dialogue with other commentators. Some comment will be offered on the type(s) of Christology which emerge(s) in Mark e.g. "angel Christology"/ "Wisdom

[346] Köstenberger & Patterson 2011: 713.

Christology" or possibly some other form of Christology, and whether Mark's Christology may be understood in terms of "binitarian" monotheism, or "participation in the divine identity" or if indeed, other categories must be sought.

11. In a final step, the overall conclusion to this study will be given, complete with possible avenues for further study which may emerge in the course of this investigation.

1.8 Conclusion to Chapter 1

Chapter 1 has introduced debates on primitive Christology as the mainframe within which the present work seeks to take its place in dialogue. A question matrix (Q1 – Q5) has been identified as relevant to these debates, which questions become tools in this study's investigation of Mark's Christology. In a literature review, works on Mark were assessed; particular attention was given where answers were provided to questions in the question matrix. A summary of findings with responses ensued. From this it emerged that (Q1) had effectively been answered and required no further study. (Q2) had been largely answered (but might be further illumined during the course of research). (Q3) and (Q4) together were identified as a fruitful line of enquiry to be further explored in relation to the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms. (Q5) was maintained "open", with the proviso that systematic analysis of christological titles is beyond the scope of this project.

The "Proposal" section sketched the aim, approach, working assumptions, and method adopted by this study. In short, this thesis adopts a "final form" approach in order to test the hypothesis that Mark draws on the HDWT in the sea-miracles/exorcisms as part of his "high" Christology. Once tested, this hypothesis will feed into debates on primitive Christology, wherein some preliminary judgments regarding the nature of Markan Christology may be ventured.

CHAPTER 2

THE HEBREW DIVINE WARRIOR TRADITIONS AND THEIR POSSIBLE INFLUENCE ON THE GOSPEL OF MARK

2.1 Chapter Introduction

The preceding discussion outlined contemporary debates on primitive Christology, and evaluated treatments of Mark's Christology in relation to those debates. This thesis seeks to establish the hypothesis that Mark draws to some extent on DW traditions in order to make a christological statement about Jesus' divine identity. In connection mainly with (Q3) and (Q4) of the question matrix presented in the previous chapter, chapters 3 and 4 will endeavour to establish the degree and manner in which Mark uses these traditions in his sea-miracles and exorcism stories. If it can be demonstrated that Mark employs these traditions in conjunction with a high Christology, this will engender discussion of how the evangelist might have conceived of Jesus' identity (Chapter 5), where contemporary debates on primitive Christology come into focus once more. In anticipation of these sequential aims, the current chapter seeks to present and explain the HDWT, covering foundational assumptions concerning my reading of these traditions.[1]

After a brief outline of the ANE background, the HDWT will be introduced in terms of its nomenclature, nature, referent and form.[2] The HDWT will be located and described with reference to OT examples and scholarship tracing DW traditions to Hebrew texts. Attention will then focus briefly on the nature and function of these traditions in Second Temple literature (515 BCE – 200 CE), since this is the historical period to which the Gospel of Mark belongs. Since the study of DW traditions in this period is a relatively unexplored field, under a separate subheading there will be a discussion of the criteria used in this work to ascribe texts to the HDWT. A summary enumerates foundational assumptions regarding the HDWT, and presents the findings of this chapter in tabular form for ease of consultation. The final section will evaluate works which treat the possible influence of the HDWT on Mark.

---

[1] The nomenclature Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions (HDWT) is explained below (n. 24), and capitalised throughout for clarity. General references to warrior gods in ANE or other traditions appear uncapitalised, thus "divine warrior", rather than DW (Divine Warrior = Yahweh/God).

[2] The term "referent" concerns the thematic matrix to which a particular text belongs, i.e. HDWT texts may have a primarily *creational* or *historical* referent (see below, pp. 97-99, on "referent").

2.2 General introduction to the Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions

(a) Ancient Near Eastern Divine Warrior mythology

Since Hermann Gunkel's religio-historical study in 1895, scholars have detected in biblical and pseudepigraphical texts a Hebrew version of ANE mythologies which recount the battle of a warrior god with chaos forces.[3] The latter reach clear expression in the Babylonian Marduk-Tiamat conflict (*Enuma Elish*), and in the Canaanite Baal-Yamm/Baal-Mot conflicts (Ugaritic Baal cycle).[4] These traditions are frequently cited as possible source texts in conjunction with several biblical, mainly OT texts.[5] In terms of referent, the Babylonian Marduk-Tiamat myth is associated with cosmogony and kingship and may have been a euhemeristic outworking of a Babylonian monarchic agenda.[6] The Canaanite Baal divine warrior myths – principally the successive contests against Yamm and Mot - similarly concern kingship, but lack an explicit reference to creation.[7]

In these and comparable ANE myths, the predominant leitmotif has a hero storm god (e.g. Marduk; Baal) engage and overcome enemy deities personified as "sea" and/or chaos monsters (e.g. Tiamat; Yamm; Lotan/Litanu (Leviathan); the Dragon; the crooked

[3] Gunkel 1895 suggested biblical authors were dependent on Babylonian *Enuma Elish*, in particular the aetiological cosmogonic myth wherein storm god Marduk defeats sea-goddess Tiamat and forms the universe from the two halves of her carcass. However, most scholars (e.g. Cross 1973; Collins 1975: 596; Day 1985: 4; Angel 2006: 3-5) now favour a predominantly Canaanite background to the HDWT, allowing the possibility of some borrowing from Babylonian and other ANE mythologies. Several features of the HDWT find parallels in the Ugaritic Baal cycle, for example, there are similarities with the account in which Baal overcomes sea god Yamm and is proclaimed king (*KTU* 1.2 IV 8-31; 32-37). Tsumura (2005) and Watson (2006) have challenged Gunkel's findings and subsequent scholarly works which develop his thesis. There will be some engagement with these authors below.

[4] Green (2003: 186) sees these mythologies as parallel, but cautions that they must be viewed independently, each within its own distinctive cultural milieu. Again, in reference to the "Baal Cycle", Green (2003: 178, with references) explains that scholars debate whether the texts belonging to the Ugaritic Baal Myth should be regarded as separate sequential components of a single extensive myth, or whether separate episodes comprise independent units; his own opinion is that inconsistencies among some texts and fragments may indicate that particular episodes were drawn from diverse mythical cycles.

[5] *Enuma Elish* dates to 1,100 BCE, (e.g. Graf 1987: 90; Batto 1992: 36). The Ugaritic Baal cycles can be dated to 1,400 BCE, (e.g. Cohn 1993: 121; Ballard 1999: 13; Day 2000: 14 n.3). Extant accounts may preserve more ancient traditions, thus, Green (2003: 173-175) finds that "Baal" was originally an appellation for the great Syrian Storm-god Hadad/Adad known as early as the third millennium BCE ("Baal" subsequently became the proper name).

[6] Cf. Jacobsen 1976: 163 – 191; Wyatt 2008: 340.

[7] In extant Ugaritic texts e.g. *KTU* 1.2, Baal traditions have no cosmogonic referent. Nevertheless, Cross (1973: 40-43, 116-120) and Day (1985: 7-18) consider these cosmogonic and ultimately "creation myths", but this remains unproven, cf. Tsumura (2005: 144).

serpent).[8] The victorious warrior deity is subsequently enthroned king of the gods in a newly built palace.[9] It emerges that Babylonian and Ugaritic divine warrior myths exhibit certain common elements: (1). Threat from a hostile deity; (2). Theomachic combat/victory; (3). New temple built; (4). Banquet of the gods; (5) Manifestation of universal kingship of the warrior deity; (6) Theophany of the DW.[10] However, each myth has distinctive characteristics and the order in which these events occur varies from myth to myth.[11]

There is a range of imagery inherent to the ANE divine warrior myths. Since there is evidence that Hebrew writers drew on aspects of this imagery (see (b) below), it will be instructive to identify the principal, i.e. recurrent or stock images which pertain to these myths. The major ANE divine warrior figures are generally depicted as storm gods, whose might is conveyed in terms of the storm theophany, where meteorological phenomena describe the warlike manifestation of the storm god.[12] Thus, Baal, whose chief epithet is "cloud rider" confronts his enemies and is said to "open rifts in the clouds", his "voice" causes the mountains to fear and the earth to quake.[13] The voice of Baal is apparently envisaged in terms of the thunder storm, elsewhere Baal's voice comes forth from the clouds, as lightning flashes down on the earth.[14] Similarly, in his conflict with Tiamat, Marduk rides into battle on the storm-chariot armed with lightning and storm winds.[15]

Further to the meteorological arsenal, divine warriors use weaponry modelled on conventional human arms. Thus, Baal armed with clubs, Yagrush ("chaser") and Ayamur ("driver"), defeats the usurper sea-deity Yamm, clubbing him between the eyes.[16] Anath,

[8] Other ANE divine warrior myths featuring a hero storm god are found in Hittite (Teshub and Hebat), Sumerian (Ninurta), and ancient Egyptian (Seth) sources.
[9] For Baal's battle with Litanu/Lotan (= Leviathan) and Yam respectively see *KTU* 1.5.I.1-3 and *KTU* 1.3.III.37-IV.3.
[10] Hanson 1975: 302-303.
[11] Hanson (1975: 302-303) offers three basic ANE patterns where the essential elements are similar but the order variable.
[12] For a recent study of the ANE storm god, see Green 2003, examining archaeological evidence associated with religious art, iconography, and written evidence.
[13] *KTU* 1.4.VII.28-35. See further Green 2003: 195. Other epithets include, "Powerful Baal", "Prince Baal" and "Powerful Hero/Mighty Warrior".
[14] *KTU* 1.4.V.9-8. On Baal as primarily a warrior storm god who ensures the land's fertility (by sending rain), see e.g. Green 2003: 177; 186-187, especially 195-196, regarding Baal's lightning "spear" held in his right hand.
[15] For the "storm-chariot" see (*ANET*), *Enuma Elish* IV.49 cf. II.117; for the "lightning" see IV.39.
[16] *KTU* 1.2.IV.24-25.

seeking to avenge the death of Baal, slays Mot with a blade.[17] Marduk confronts Tiamat armed with bow, quiver, mace and net.[18] In combat, enemy deities and chaos monsters are sometimes captured and bound. Thus, in Akkadian mythology, Ea fetters and slays Apsu, while binding and incarcerating Mummu. Similarly, Marduk captures and binds Tiamat's demon army and her consort Kingu.[19] Serpentine monsters are occasionally bound or restrained in other ANE myths thus, Anath boasts of having "muzzled" the Dragon, and Apophis or "the serpent" is bound in some Egyptian texts.[20]

Frequently, the ANE mythic cycles produce graphic descriptions of the slaying of vanquished deities. Thus, Marduk "crushed", "trod upon", and "split open" Tiamat.[21] Again, Baal "rends", "smashes" and "annihilates" Yamm/Judge Nahar, and Anath boasts that she "crushed" the seven-headed serpent Shalyat.[22] In these brutal scenes of deicide there is sometimes a correlation with acts of creation and fertility. Aside from the cosmogonic Marduk-Tiamat drama, one example is Anath's destruction of Mot, whose corpse is "winnowed", "burned", "ground" and then "sown" upon the field.[23] Thus, in ANE divine warrior myths, conflict imagery provides a flexible idiom which can address matters of kingship, creation and even agriculture.

(b). The Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions in the Old Testament (nomenclature, nature, form and referent)

That which this work refers to as the Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions (HDWT) encompasses an ample body of texts, treated elsewhere under a variety of nomenclature, e.g. Divine Warrior motif, the *Chaoskampf*, the Combat Myth.[24] The HDWT comprises

[17] *KTU* 1.6.II.32.
[18] *Enuma Elish* IV.30-50. The combat commences immediately after the pantheon proclaims Marduk king (IV.28), contextually, conventional weaponry apparently symbolises the meteorological.
[19] *Enuma Elish* I.69-70; IV.110-120.
[20] *KTU* 1.3.III.40 cf. (*ANET*) VAB.D.37. Wyatt (1998: 79) contests the translation "muzzled", suggesting instead "lifted up". On Egyptian texts which speak of the binding on a dragon see, e.g. (*ANET*) *The Dragon of the West*; *The Repulsing of the Dragon and the Creation*.
[21] *Enuma Elish* IV.101; 130.
[22] See respectively, *KTU* 1.2.IV.24-25; *KTU* 1.3.III.37-42.
[23] *KTU* 1.6.II.32-35.
[24] While the term *Chaoskampf* on Whitney's testimony is absent from Gunkel's original, since Gunkel, it came to be used particularly in reference to the Babylonian Marduk-Tiamat cosmogonic conflict (Gunkel 2006: xxvii). For scholars who think the divine conflict myth has an *a priori* creation-kingship referent (e.g. Day 1985) *Chaoskampf* is a somewhat exclusive category for mythological texts which have an explicit or an ultimate connection with cosmogony. Some who object that the myth's primary referent is

texts written in Hebrew but also *culturally* Hebrew texts, i.e. texts written from a Hebrew/Jewish perspective, but in Greek, Latin or another language.[25]

In common with ANE precedents, in the HDWT, God is presented as warrior, often in connection with storm theophany imagery (e.g. Exod 15.3-18; Judg 5.4-5; Ps 18.12-15). Divine warrior imagery frequently occurs in the context of appeals to Yahweh/God that he rise up as in former times (e.g. Pss 68.1, 28; 74.10-14; 22; Isa 51.9). Thus, in historical reminiscences or flashbacks to former victories, God as DW can be described battling and rebuking the chaos sea/waters, and/or chaos monsters such as Leviathan and Rahab (not to be confused with the prostitute of the same name cf. Josh 2.1ff.) which are personifications of forces inimical to God and his people (e.g. Job 26.12-13; Pss 74.12-14; 89.9-10; Isa 51.9-11). God's defeat of enemies guarantees the permanence of divine sovereignty, which is often related to the deliverance/establishment of Israel (e.g. Zech 14.5, 9-11; Ps 68.20-23 with 34-35).

Although some studies apprehend the HDWT primarily in terms of form, usually with attempts to demonstrate ANE influence on Hebrew texts on form critical grounds, such approaches have had only limited success, since no single underlying literary pattern has been detected.[26] Enlarging on the work of F.M. Cross, Paul Hanson classifies numerous Hebrew psalms and some Isaianic texts as "Divine Warrior Hymns" on the basis of alleged correspondences with a putative Mesopotamian and Canaanite ritual

historical (e.g. Clifford 1984, 1992; Angel 2006), use the term *Chaoskampf* more broadly to include texts which lack a creation referent, where it is roughly synonymous with the "Divine Warrior" motif. However, other, predominantly North American scholars who read the myth in a similar way appear to omit the term *Chaoskampf* from their discussions (e.g. Cross 1973; Hanson 1975; Ballard 1999) and prefer to speak in terms of the Divine Warrior motif. On the premise that the Ugaritic Baal myth does not concern creation whereas the Enuma Elish Marduk-Tiamat conflict does, Tsumura (2005: 145) distinguishes between "*Chaoskampf* myths with a creation motif" and "*Chaoskampf* myths without a creation motif". This distinction shows that the term *Chaoskampf* is ambiguous and potentially misleading; in the present study, therefore, the term will only be used in relation to commentators who employ it in their discussions. Again, some scholars refer to the "Combat Myth" but since this designation can be applied widely to ancient mythologies of sundry cultural provenance (cf. Collins 1976) once more, this term will only be utilised when citing particular authors who use it in their work. Since the present study understands the Hebrew version of the myth in the light of Cross 1973, who prefers neither the term *Chaoskampf* nor Combat Myth, the nomenclature Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions (HDWT) will be used throughout to refer to the myth as it manifests itself in Hebrew texts.

[25] Many Second Temple Jewish and/or Jewish Christian texts were written in Greek, or translated Hebrew originals into Greek (e.g. Sirach; the LXX; Josephus' literary corpus; the NT canon). Other extant texts appear in Latin but are usually thought to derive from Greek renditions of a Hebrew original (e.g. *Pseudo-Philo*; *Testament of Moses*). Some texts preserved in other languages, (e.g. *1 Enoch* preserved in full only in Ethiopic (though there are fragments in Aramaic, Greek and Latin) may presuppose an original Hebrew version cf. Charlesworth 1983a: 6-7).

[26] The classic study which proceeds principally along form critical lines is that of Hanson 1975.

pattern of the "conflict myth".[27] However, the ANE myths themselves are variegated, allowing '*n*' number of structural permutations, making it something of an artificial construct to speak in terms of "the ritual pattern".[28] Moreover, some examples put forward by Hanson seem questionable. For instance, Ps 48 is said to conform to the pattern, Threat: Kings assemble vs. Zion / Combat-victory over enemy/ Salvation of Zion/ Victory shout/ Procession around the city/ Yahweh's universal reign; however, strictly speaking there is no "combat" insofar as the hostile kings flee at the sight of God in Zion (Ps 48.4-7), nor should the concluding verses of the psalm be construed as a "procession" since Ps 48.12-14 clearly concerns an inspection of the city walls rather than a liturgical set piece.[29] Occasionally, Hanson's handling of the texts suffers from a lack of clarification and/or justification. Thus, we are not told why in Ps 2.4-5 Yahweh's speaking to enemy kings and terrifying them in his fury is classified as "combat".[30] Again, it is unclear how Ps 2.11c, "Happy are all who take refuge in him", constitutes a "Victory shout", similarly doubtful in this respect is Hanson's treatment of Ps 97.8-9.[31]

At most, in agreement with F.M. Cross and H.W. Ballard, some Hebrew texts (e.g. Exod 15.3-17; Ps 68; Zech 14.3-9) arguably presuppose a more rudimentary Canaanite ideal of the divine warrior myth, anchored around what may be thought of as three thematic "movements": the battle march, the battle proper, the return to kingship.[32] In Hebrew versions of the myth, the actual battle with chaos waters/monsters can be in the foreground (e.g. Job 26.11-12; Pss 74.12-14; 89.9-10), or arguably, it may be presupposed in texts which refer to the enthronement of Yahweh/God over the seas/chaos/flood waters (e.g. Pss 29; 93).[33]

It emerges, then, that with rare exceptions (e.g. Ps 18.7-18 (= 2 Sam 22.7-18)), in Hebrew texts there is ostensibly no attempt to take over and reproduce a more

[27] Hanson 1975: 305-306 cf. Cross 1968.
[28] Contra Hanson 1975: 308.
[29] Hanson 1975: 305.
[30] Hanson 1975: 305.
[31] Hanson 1975: 305-306.
[32] Ballard 1999: 29, cf. Cross 1973: 94. Even here though, Hebrew authors tend not to rehearse the tripartite schema in full, and the examples provided in parentheses do not conform perfectly to the pattern. Cf. Cross (1973: 142) offers a different three-part pattern: Advance of the divine warrior + combat; Building of a sanctuary; confirmation of eternal kingship.
[33] Cross 1973: 156; Day 1985: 35-37; 57-60. Watson (2005: 48-64, 135) questions the connection with chaos imagery.

comprehensive plot structure such as one might encounter in ANE mythic cycles.[34] Moreover, notwithstanding references to God's conflict with mythical monsters, in Hebrew texts there is little if any suggestion that God fights rival *deities* in order to secure his position within a hierarchical pantheon. Rather, Hebrew authors tap into ANE traditions selectively, adapting given aspects of traditional divine warrior imagery in accordance with their particular theological agendas.[35] Thus, divine warrior and particularly storm theophany imagery may overlay an account of an historical event or battle, where the writer's concern is to emphasise that Yahweh himself fought for and delivered Israel (Exod 15.1-18; Judg 5.4-5; Deut 33.2-3). Again, classic imagery of the divine warrior slaying a chaos monster becomes a climactic flashpoint in psalmodic or prophetic texts (e.g. Isa 51.9-11; Pss 74.13-14; 89.10-11) giving mythic depth to heartfelt appeals calling on Yahweh to act on behalf of his people as in former times.

The latter raises the issue of referent. It was observed above that ANE divine warrior myths were frequently tied to a kingship theme, sometimes in association with a creation motif. Similarly, concerning Hebrew texts, the "myth and ritual" school posited a connection with creation and divine kingship (e.g. Pss 93.3-4; 104) in a cultic *Sitz im Leben*.[36] Accordingly, the HDWT is traced to a (hypothetical) pre-exilic Autumnal Enthronement Festival, which allegedly included the ritual re-enactment of Yahweh's victory over chaos at creation.[37] It is further argued that in a second phase of development the myth was historicised, where chaos symbols came to denote Israel's physical enemies (e.g. Isa 17.12-14 where chaos waters represent the Assyrians, and Jer 51.34 where Nebuchadnezzar is equated with the chaos monster).[38] In a noteworthy development, Levenson claims that certain exilic texts (i.e. Isa 51.9-11; Pss 74, 89) apply *Chaoskampf* to historical events in "dialectical counterstatement" where God is "reproached" for his

[34] The text of Hab 3.3-15 might be a further exception insofar as it draws heavily on divine warrior imagery in a sustained portion of poetry, however, the imagery concerns various events in Israel's history from the wider Exodus-Conquest narrative, where the connection with the older ANE materials stands further in the background (cf. the categorisation of this text in Cross 1973: 157).
[35] Similarly, Fishbane 2003: 63-64; Angel 2012: 85.
[36] The "myth and ritual" school flourished in the first half of the twentieth century. Chief exponents Sigmund Mowinckel and S.H. Hooke understood "myth" not merely as ancient story around which rituals grew up, but as the narrative expression of ritual, making sense in the present of that which is acted out. See e.g. Hooke 1933; Mowinckel 1962: 106-192.
[37] Day 1985: 19, 20, 26, 35. Cf. Mowinckel 1962: 136 – 169. Perennial debates concerning the existence or otherwise of this festival need not concern us here since this liturgical background is neither prescriptive nor essential for the NT use of HDWT imagery. For an argument in favour of its existence the reader is referred to Day 1992: 66-84; for a counter argument, to Peterson 1998.
[38] Day 1985: 101-104.

inaction in the face of national catastrophe, and urged to arise again as DW.[39] Finally, on this reading, a third developmental phase is dated to the post-exilic era, when the myth was allegedly eschatologised with the reestablishment of the nation effectively postponed to a future epoch (e.g. Dan 7.9-14; *1 En.* 60.7-9).[40]

An alternative scholarly position retains the cultic *Sitz im Leben* of the myth, but against the view outlined above, argues that it belonged originally to the Exodus-Conquest holy war ideology.[41] On this view, advocated by F.M. Cross, Israelite festivals went beyond the inherently agricultural mould of Canaanite religion insofar as they commemorated the divine liberation and establishment of the nation.[42] Therefore, without excluding the creation/kingship dimension, the primary referent of the myth is held to be *historical*, where the DW motif describes the powerful acts of God within history and particularly the establishment of Israel and her national institutions (e.g. Exod 15.1-18; Isa 17.12-13, 27.1, 51.9-11; Pss 74.13-15, 77.17-21). It is understood that from the outset of Israelite religion Yahweh was exalted as both Lord of creation and Lord of history.[43] Prior to the Second Temple period the myth's dual cosmogonic and historical referents stood in tension, such that one or other aspect could receive particular emphasis at any given time, lending the myth a "chameleon like quality".[44] Once more, during the Second Temple era the myth is judged to have become fully eschatologised.[45]

Since some applications of HDWT imagery in the Second Temple period are overtly or at least *covertly* historical (e.g. *Pss. Sol* 2.25-27; Dan 7.2-14) the degree of "eschatologisation" of these traditions must be determined on a case by case basis rather than simply assumed.[46] With this caveat, the present study reads the HDWT in the light of the work of F.M. Cross.[47] Pointedly original to the HDWT, then, is the reworking or reorientation of imagery which in its ANE context is ostensibly restricted to the

[39] Levenson 1988: 23-24.
[40] Day 1985: 186, 188.
[41] Cross 1973: 99-111.
[42] E.g. Cross 1968; 1973.
[43] Cross 1973: 112-44. Cross (1973: 82) makes an initial epistemological assault on older German scholarship accused of short-sightedly applying Hegelian categories to the interpretation of cult development, where the tacit assumption of a progression from the "natural" to the "historical" makes for a "unilinear, diachronic development: the historicizing of myth". Cf. Levenson 1988: 11; Lind 1980: 57; Batto 1992: 117-118.
[44] Stevens 1987: 101.
[45] Cross 1968. However, Cross (1973: 144) advances a more nuanced position, thinking in terms of the fusion of historical and mythological elements in apocalyptic.
[46] On these texts in relation to the HDWT, see Angel 2006: 83-86; 99-110.
[47] E.g. Cross 1968; 1973.

cosmological other-worldly sphere of the gods.[48] In the HDWT, divine warrior imagery takes on an historical application becoming a vehicle to explain the operation of the one God of Israel who fights for and/or with his people (e.g. Exod 15.1-18; Deut 33.2-3; Judg 5.4-5; Ps 144.5-7).

The foregoing discussion provides an overview of the HDWT with reference to major scholarly studies on these traditions in the OT. Since the primary referent of the traditions is debated, at times, texts judged by one scholar to belong to the HDWT might be declassified by another scholar working with a different primary referent.[49] Nevertheless, there is a near consensus that a body of OT texts (e.g. Exod 15.1-18; Isa 27.1; 50.2; 51.9-11; Pss 18; 74.13-14; 89.9-10; Job 26.11-13) has in fact been influenced by ANE divine warrior mythology. It should be noted, however, that David Tsumura and Rebecca Watson have questioned the extent of ANE influence on the Hebrew Bible, challenging the conclusions of Gunkel and Day.

Tsumura critiques Gunkel's foundational study which tried to establish too firm a connection between the Genesis creation narratives and the Babylonian Marduk-Tiamat creation myth.[50] For Tsumura, Gunkel's suggestion that Hebrew תְּהוֹם (deep) was taken over from Akkadian "Tiamat" and demythologised breaks down under a careful examination of phonetics.[51] Tsumura also disqualifies Day's attempt to tie Gen 1.2 to a putative Canaanite dragon myth, since in the extant texts, the Baal myth is nowhere linked to creation.[52] In the light of these critiques, Tsumura casts doubt over the alleged influence of *Chaoskampf* on the Genesis creation narratives.

However, Tsumura is less successful in his attempt to disqualify references to the traditions found in poetic literature.[53] First, at the conclusion of his book, Tsumura admits the influence of the Baal myth on certain OT texts.[54] While Tsumura rightly sees that divine warrior traditions are preserved fragmentarily in Hebrew texts, the concern to minimise the importance of mythological elements appears to have coloured his judgment

[48] Similarly, Miller 1973: 120; Albertz 1992: 52.
[49] E.g. Day 1985:3-4 in relation to McCarthy 1967.
[50] Tsumura 2005: 36-53.
[51] Tsumura 2005: 36-38.
[52] Tsumura 2005: 53-57, 144. Cf. Day 1985: 17.
[53] Similarly Clifford 2007: 345.
[54] Tsumura 2005: 194-195.

in places.[55] Thus, as Angel observes, Tsumura disallows a creation theme in Ps 74.13-14 and Ps 89.9-10, but overlooks the creation motif in Ps 74.15-17 and Ps 89.11-12 which does suggest the presence of a *Chaoskampf* theme in both psalms.[56] Again, Tsumura admits Ps 18 uses "storm language", but argues, curiously, that since the language is *metaphorical* it suggests that Yahweh was not in fact thought of as a storm-god.[57] This line of reasoning makes poor sense of the *de facto* portrayal, metaphorical or otherwise, of Yahweh as a storm-god, both here and in other texts (e.g. Judg 5.4-5; Zech 9.14; Ps 144.5-6; Job 36.24-33; Nah 1.3), since, if Yahweh could not be envisaged as a storm-god, he surely wouldn't be represented as such.

Rebecca Watson contends that scholars have too readily categorised Hebrew texts as "*Chaoskampf*", unjustifiably reading in notions of divine combat and creation.[58] Watson attempts to show that not all "watery" imagery in the Psalms has a *necessary* connection with *Chaoskampf* (e.g. Pss 29; 69).[59] However, several methodological difficulties substantially weaken the argument. For instance, Watson's rejection of a comparative religions approach seems unwise, since a consensus view recognises (e.g. on the basis of extant texts) that a similar myth was known in several ANE cultures, thus necessitating a comparative or partly comparative approach.[60] Moreover, while operating on the premise that biblical literature ought to be understood independently of ANE parallels, on occasion Watson adduces such parallels to support her case.[61] Equally, the explanation of theophany language as solely the manifestation of God's awesomeness (e.g. in relation to Ps 77) lacks cogency.[62] Watson's attempt to debunk the notion that such language depicts God as DW (in parallel with the older Baal traditions) sweeps aside the textual/archaeological evidence concerning ANE storm gods,[63] and overlooks internal biblical evidence (e.g. Ps 18.14; 144.6 where "lightning" is explicitly God's weapon).

---

[55] Similarly Angel 2007: 379.
[56] Angel 2007: 379. cf. Tsumura 2005: 190-194. Day (2007: 207) makes a similar criticism in relation to Watson's treatment of the same texts in the Psalter.
[57] Tsumura 2005: 151.
[58] Watson 2005: 1-2.
[59] Watson 2005: 48-64, 88-90.
[60] See e.g. Cross 1973; Miller 1973: 1-63; Hanson 1975: 292-324; Day 1985: 2-7; Collins 1998a: 100-102; Ballard 1999: 1-30; Fishbane 2003: 45-46; Green 2003: 258-264; Angel 2006: 1-6; Smith 2008.
[61] Watson criticizes Wakeman for a comparative religions approach (2005: 27). Watson (2005: 259) states her own approach proceeds "without recourse to extra-biblical parallels," but includes reference to the "Prayer for Uplifted Hands" for Nanna (2005: 238); and the appeal to the Egyptian "Teaching of Khety" (Watson 2005: 345).
[62] Watson 2005: 150-152.
[63] A stele from Ras Shamra dating to the 14th-13th centuries BCE portrays Baal with a lance representing lightning, see e.g. Craigie 1983b: 64-65.

Similarly, the notion that biblical dragon myths (e.g. Pss 74; 89) arose from folk religion when the Israelite elite was exiled in Babylon is ill-founded.[64] This reconstruction fails to explain how such myths were transmitted and received i.e. it is difficult to see how the common folk could have understood the tongue of the foreign invader and how, if the scribal class were part of the exiled "elite", the allegedly appropriated Babylonian myths came to be written down and included in the Psalmist. Again, this view fails to take into consideration that in later texts such as Isa 27.1, imagery originating in ancient Ugarit is preferred to Babylonian.

Tsumura and Watson question the influence of ANE divine warrior traditions on the OT, but ultimately concede that there is some, albeit limited influence of these traditions on the OT.[65] Thus, in regard to Pss 74.13-14; 89.9-10; Isa 27.1; 51.9; Job 9.13, Tsumura disallows any connection with creation, but recognises that these texts properly belong within wider ANE *Chaoskampf* traditions and recall an ancient battle between the warrior deity and his/her mythological adversary.[66] Watson similarly accepts Pss 74 and 89 as texts in which the battle motif appears, and in a nuanced statement explains that the "sea" or a "dragon" may on occasion appear as an "enemy" of God.[67]

Tsumura and Watson flag up the dangers inherent in merely presupposing the existence of particular traditions in OT texts.[68] Despite their cautions, however, they recognise the influence of divine warrior traditions in Hebrew texts such as Pss 74.13-14; 89.9-10. Since both scholars accept the *de facto* influence of divine warrior traditions on some Hebrew texts, their arguments to disallow it elsewhere (i.e. in texts judged to lack an explicit description of combat) seem open to challenge.[69] For instance, against Tsumura, Yahweh *is* depicted as a warrior storm deity in Ps 18 in terms which recall Ugaritic divine warrior mythology, and this text clearly belongs within these traditions.[70] Contrary to Watson's claim, the waters/sea *are* sometimes personified as a force inimical to God, being found in parallel with chaos monsters (e.g. Job 26.12; Pss 74.13; 89.9-10)

[64] Watson 2005: 262.
[65] E.g. Tsumura 2005: 194-195; Watson 2005: 22.
[66] Tsumura 2005: 191-194.
[67] Watson 2005: 22, 26.
[68] See for example, the judicious comments in Watson (2005: 259) on the tendency of the "comparative method" to overemphasise putative similarities between diverse religious systems and cultures.
[69] Cf. Day 2007: 7; Wyatt 2008: 339-340.
[70] Cf. Tsumura 2005: 151.

or with hostile nations, (e.g. Isa 17.12-13; Ps 69.14).[71] Therefore, the HDWT motif of God acting to suppress and overcome inimical waters is distributed rather more widely in the OT than Watson allows.

It emerges from the above discussion, that the HDWT in which, typically, God is presented as DW, victor of the inimical chaos sea/waters and/or chaos monsters is attested in various books of the OT. While the influence of ANE DW myths on biblical materials is widely recognised, it should be noted that the HDWT does not fully reproduce any mythic "cycle", nor in general does it appear to replicate ANE formal structures, rather particular imagery ultimately derived from the ANE is harnessed at given moments. Characteristically, the use of HDWT terminology and imagery draws attention to the might of God (often in dramatic appeal for him to aid Israel), though equally dragon imagery can be used independently to represent Israel's historical enemies. Thus, the referent of the HDWT is most often associated with the historical circumstances of Israel, though it is sometimes connected with creation and kingship.

(c) The Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions in Second Temple (515BCE – 200CE) literature

In Gunkel's ground-breaking research, samples of texts from the Second Temple period were found to contain the divine conflict motif.[72] Since Gunkel, certain texts are nearly always accepted as belonging to the HDWT on account of the imagery and philology which they exhibit. These texts include Dan 7.2-14, Rev 13.1-8, *1 En* 60.7-9, 24-25, *4 Ezra* 6.49-52, *Pss. Sol.* 2.25-26.[73] In these texts the chaos waters/monsters are emblems of forces inimical to God and his people, although on occasion (e.g. *1 En.* 60.7-9, 24-25), as in some OT HDWT texts (e.g. Exod 15.1-15; Isa 8.7) they become instruments of divine justice.

[71] E.g. Watson 2005: 4, 375. Wyatt (2008: 339) notes that Watson (2005: 4, 18) contradicts herself, first denying the possibility of the personification of water imagery, then allowing it.
[72] Gunkel (1895) surveys only a limited number of Second Temple texts since his work pre-dates the Dead Sea Scrolls' discovery.
[73] A case in point is Dan 7.2-14, where among others, Collins 1977: 96-99; 1993: 294-295; Casey 1980: 18; Goldingay 1989: 160; Angel 2006: 100-101, all identify the "sea" in Dan 7.2 with the chaos sea of ANE mythology, and agree that the motif of the beasts emerging from the sea is derived from divine warrior traditions.

Taking his cue from Gunkel, Andrew Angel analyses forty-six Second Temple texts in order to demonstrate the existence of this tradition in Hebrew writings of this period.[74] A broad spectrum of material is treated, from Qumranic texts to passages in Pseudo-Philo and Josephus. Angel's thesis has been favourably received, but has met with criticism on methodological grounds.[75] This is because it operates with a rather broad understanding of what might constitute the Hebrew *Chaoskampf* Tradition, ascribing certain texts to the tradition which purportedly draw on *Chaoskampf* imagery but lack an explicit conflict motif.[76]

Not every example produced by Angel provides clear support for his thesis. For instance, the influence of *Chaoskampf* is detected in *4Q504* 1-2.3.3, which text, drawing on Isa 40.17, describes the peoples as "chaos and nothing" before God.[77] However, it is questionable whether the occurrence of a single term sometimes associated with *Chaoskampf* (תֹּהוּ) warrants the inclusion of this text within the "Hebrew *Chaoskampf* Tradition".[78] There is no necessary connection with chaos imagery where the term occurs in the Isaianic source text, and on a natural reading, תֹּהוּ in *4Q504* 1-2.3.3 indicates "worthlessness" or "valueless", which is its sense in Isa 40.17, and its usual sense elsewhere in Isaianic contexts (e.g. Isa 29.21; 40.23; 41.29; 44.9; 49.4; 59.4).[79] Angel observes that the verb בָּרָא "to create" occurs in *4Q504* 1-2.3.4 in relation to Israel, which, in association with תֹּהוּ might hint at creation from chaos. However, where תֹּהוּ and בָּרָא are connected in possible relation to *Chaoskampf* (i.e. Gen 1.1-2 cf. Isa 45.18) it is the creation of the *cosmos*, not Israel which is in view. Thus, the alleged "creative use" of Isa 40.17 as part of a gentiles/chaos – Israel/creation contrast could instead be a case of over-reading. Even if the alleged contrast were demonstrated, with no context of

[74] Angel 2006.
[75] Amos 2007: 225; Miller 2007: 122-123; Brooke 2007: 595; Kvanvig 2008: 374-375. Notably, Collins (J.J) (2007: 338-339) questions Angel's methodology (see, n. 421), but remains generally favourable.
[76] Collins (2007: 338) in regard to Angel's *modus operandi* states, "Any reference to a Divine Warrior will do, even if there is no representation of chaos, and equally chaotic waters will suffice, even if there is no reference to the Divine Warrior".
[77] Angel 2006: 67-68, following the translation of Martínez & Tigchelaar 1998: 1015.
[78] Notably, in Gunkel's discussion of Gen 1, the term appears only twice, *en passant* (1892: 81, 94). Tsumura (2005: 9-35) discusses the term and questions the appropriateness of rendering it "chaos" in Gen 1.2.
[79] Angel (2006: 68) allows that Isa 40.17 may not use chaos imagery recognisably.

battle in this text, and in the absence of keywords and/or stock images belonging to the tradition, doubts would linger concerning the concreteness of the influence of *Chaoskampf* on this text.

Angel's reading of certain texts remains, therefore, open to question. Nevertheless, he has demonstrated the existence of the "Hebrew *Chaoskampf* Tradition" in this period.[80] On the evidence of Angel's survey, it emerges that the characteristic images and themes found in earlier biblical HDWT texts are generally retained in Second Temple writings. For example, God is depicted as the DW who comes in combat, in familiar storm imagery (e.g. *1QM* 12.9-10; *1QH* 11.34; *4Q370* 1.3-4; Sir 43.8-26; Wis 5.17-23; *L.A.B.* 11.5; *Ant.* 2.343-4; 6.27).[81] In common with earlier HDWT texts such as Judg 5.20, celestial hosts fight alongside God as DW (e.g. *1QM* 12.8; *1QH* 11.35; *L.A.B.* 11.5; 15.2; 31.1-2; Pr Man 4; Mark 13.24-7).[82] As in earlier HDWT texts such as Ps 46.4 and Isa 17.12, the hostile seas "roar" (e.g. *1QH* 10.12, 27; *1QH* 11.15; *11Q5* 26.10) and the chaos waters are described as "turbulent waters" (e.g. *1QH 10.16*; 10.27 cf. Isa 17.12; Jer 51.55).[83] Though less frequently than in earlier texts belonging to the traditions, God the DW rebukes the chaos waters, or stills them by his word of command (e.g. *L.A.B.* 10.5; Pr Man 3-4). On occasion the waters show fear or flee at the manifestation of the DW (*4Q416* 1.11-12; *T. Mos.* 10.1-10 cf. Ps 104.7; 114.3).[84] The chaos serpent/dragon and chaos monsters Leviathan and Behemoth also feature (e.g. *1 En.* 60.7-9; 24-5; Rev 13.1-8; *4 Ezra* 6.49-52).[85] Finally, as in earlier examples from the tradition, God's victory over chaos forces is well attested (e.g. *1QH* 11.6-18; 11.27-36; *Pss. Sol.* 2.25-6; Dan 7.2-14; *T. Ash.* 7.2-3).[86]

In terms of the range of meanings of this mythology, in Second Temple literature the imagery and philology of the HDWT is typically used in texts which concern the struggle of God's people against adversaries. Accordingly, the advent of God as DW is pictured as a salvific act where God rescues and/or establishes his people (e.g. *T. Mos.*

[80] Cf. Kvanvig 2008: 375.
[81] Angel 2006: 193. Cf. on *1QM* 12.9-10, Collins 2007: 64; on *1QH* 11.34, Adams 2007: 69-71. For a catalogue of Second Temple texts which draw on various images belonging to the tradition, see Angel 2006: 193-194.
[82] Angel 2006: 193. For a recent discussion of the Markan text mentioned here (13.4-7), see Adams 2007: 134-256.
[83] Angel 2006: 193; 41-42.
[84] Angel 2006: 194. Cf. on *T. Mos.* 10.1-10, Adams 2007: 72-74.
[85] Angel 2006: 71. Cf. respectively on these texts, Gunkel (2006): 40, 215-218, 40-42.
[86] Angel 2006: 194.

10.1-10; *1QM* 12.8-10).[87] Consonantly, the image of chaos waters may be used in symbolic representation of human enemies (e.g. *1QH* 10.12-16; 10.27-28; 14.22-5), alternatively, enemies may be portrayed as chaos serpent/dragon/monsters (*1QH* 10.27-8; *1QM* 11.17; *4QCD-A* 8.9-12a; *Jos. Asen.* 12.11; *4 Ezra* 6.49-52). At times this occurs with a pointed political referent, where particular human figureheads or empires are implicitly identified with chaos monsters (e.g. *Pss. Sol.* 2.25-6; Dan 7.2-14; Rev 13.1-18 cf. Ezek 29.3-5; Ezek 32.2-8).[88] In Rev 12.1-17, Satan is identified with the chaos dragon.[89]

In the light of these considerations, therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that if Mark has been influenced by the HDWT, elements of the imagery and terminology of the tradition discussed above might be used in the Gospel with a similar meaning. For example, we might expect to see God depicted as warrior and enemy forces described with chaos imagery. If the HDWT has influenced the evangelist's presentation then the ancient motif of God's victory over chaos waters/monsters ought to be present. Moreover, given the tendency in some Second Temple texts to connect chaos imagery with Satan and demons (e.g. Rev 12.1-17; *1QH* 11.27-36[90]; *1QH* 11.17-18[91]), if Mark has been influenced by the tradition then a similar identification could be present in the Gospel.

It should be observed, however, that Hebrew authors sometimes use mythological imagery somewhat freely. Already in OT texts, authors innovate within these traditions, thus in Exod 15, chaos waters (usually enemies of the divine warrior) become instrumental, a power at Yahweh's disposal. Again, chaos monster Leviathan, traditionally a fearsome enemy, becomes in Ps 104.26 a domesticated creature. In Second Temple texts, Angel cites numerous instances of creative developments within the traditions, where the imagery and terminology is employed in fresh ways.[92] Indeed, three

[87] Angel 2006: 195.
[88] On the identification of the dragon/conqueror in *Pss. Sol.* 2.25-26 as Pompey see R.B. Wright in Charlesworth 1983a: 640-641; Angel 2006: 85-86. On Dan 7.2-14 and the identification of the beasts with human empires i.e. the Babylonian, Median, Persian and Greek, see e.g. Collins 1993: 297-299; Angel 2006: 107-108. For a discussion of the historical referent of the two beasts in Rev 13.1-18 see Angel 2006: 146-148. Day (1985: 94) notes the identification of the dragon in Ezek 29/32 with Pharaoh Hophra (589-570 BCE).
[89] Angel 2006: 195.
[90] Angel (2006: 52) following Holm-Nielsen (1960: 72) identifies the "schemers of the deep" in this text with demons.
[91] The word "spirits" in *1QH* 11.18 suggests that the "creatures of the serpent" cf. Job 9.13, mentioned in parallel in the previous verse, are demons, where chaos imagery and demonology converge.
[92] E.g. Angel 2006: 89, 114, 144, 179, 182.

Second Temple texts (*1QH* 10.27; *1QH* 14.23; *T. Jud.* 21.9) use DW imagery/terminology in a manner which contradicts earlier usage, since in these texts the hurricane/whirlwind traditionally part of the DW's arsenal (e.g. Isa 30.30) now become part of the chaos imagery.[93] Since, contextually, the texts in question draw on other imagery/terminology from the traditions (e.g. *T. Jud.* 21.7 refers to "sea-monsters") there is, arguably, warrant for placing them within the HDWT. Where there are mitigating contextual factors, then, a text which uses a particular image from the traditions in an unorthodox manner, need not be automatically declassified from the HDWT. However, where an image is applied atypically, questions may arise over the extent to which the author draws on and/or comprehends traditional materials.

(d) Criteria for identifying texts belonging to the Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions

This study investigates the possible influence of the HDWT on Mark's Gospel, working with the hypothesis that Mark draws on OT/Second Temple texts which are part of these traditions. In order to proceed, criteria must be established to determine which OT/Second Temple texts may be classified as belonging to the HDWT. Since form critical analysis has been unable to establish a clear standard pattern peculiar to either ANE or Hebrew versions of divine warrior mythology, the HDWT will not be apprehended primarily in form critical terms, though considerations pertaining to form may have limited relevance in particular cases, as will be explained in due course.[94] Instead, for the purposes of identifying the HDWT, this study will focus primarily on divine warrior imagery and terminology ultimately traceable to ANE sources, but adopted and adapted in Hebrew texts.[95]

Criterion 1: Traditional Imagery

This study understands "DW imagery" in the light of the foregoing sketch of ANE mythology. The criterion of traditional imagery is invoked where God is depicted as a warrior in connection with storm theophany language, and/or where chaos waters or monsters are personified, typically as enemies of God, and/or where there is a description

[93] Angel (2006: 43, 55, 114) notes this discrepancy.
[94] See below pp. 96-98, on criterion 5.
[95] Day 1985; Ballard 1999; and Angel 2006, similarly work with the category of imagery.

of the battle between God and such hostile forces, and/or where there is description of God's assumption of kingship as the consequence of victory in battle. Methodologically, if a Hebrew text can be shown to draw on DW imagery inherent to one or more of these basic thematic categories, unless there are strong reasons to the contrary, that text will be classified as belonging to the HDWT. Thus, the positive classification of a text such as Ps 144.5-7 is straightforward since it both describes Yahweh's advent as warrior in the storm theophany and depicts inimical "mighty waters" (in parallel with "the hand of foreigners").[96]

The issue of classification may be more complex where a text contains imagery belonging to just one of the thematic categories mentioned above. In some cases, where descriptive language clearly derives (ultimately) from ANE divine warrior myths, it may be clear that the text belongs within the traditions. This holds where there is a description of God's advent as a warrior in storm theophany (e.g. Judg 5.4-5; Zech 9.14), or a description of God's battle with a chaos monster (e.g. Isa 27.1; Ps 74.13-14). However, in other cases the correspondence with divine warrior traditions may be less marked. Thus, while both Ps 144.5-7 and Ps 69.1-2, 14-15 contain the image of the "waters" (מַיִם) as a threatening force, Ps 144.5-7 contains further imagery/terminology which confirms the classification of the text to the HDWT, whereas, apparently, Ps 69.1-2, 14-15 does not. In the case of Ps 69.1-2, 14-15, the psalmist employs aquatic imagery where drowning is a metaphor for the threat of defeat at the hand of enemies. Evidently, such a metaphor might be arrived at independently of the HDWT. As it stands, Ps 69.1-2, 14-15 could belong to the HDWT, but this is less certain than in the case of Ps 144.5-7.[97]

Therefore, within the discussion of criterion 2 below on terminology, necessary qualifications and controls must be stated. Nevertheless, the classificatory *modus operandi* adopted here remains fairly broad insofar as a text need not necessarily describe the advent and/or battle of God as warrior for it to be placed within the HDWT. Since the traditions are generally used in a piecemeal manner, a given text might, for instance, merely contain an isolated image or reference to the inimical chaos sea/monster in a

[96] On this text see e.g. Day 1985: 123-125; Ballard 1999: 74-77.
[97] Angel (2006: 66) following Tate (1990: 196), thinks "waters" in Ps 69.15-16 refer to the chaos waters. Watson (2006: 90) argues against an allusion to chaos, finding that the prime sphere of reference is to the underworld.

flashback to the divine warrior myth.[98] In the interests of methodological precision, such texts might be designated "allusive" texts, as opposed to "descriptive" texts.[99] Allusive texts presuppose DW traditions insofar as they employ imagery/terminology proper to them, but without *necessarily* supplying descriptions of the combat or all the players in the drama. It is reasonable to expect that such allusions will be conceptually compatible with the myth they presuppose, though allowance must be made for the creative use of DW imagery and terminology in Hebrew texts. In the case of allusive texts, context will usually inform the classificatory process as will become clear in the examples set out in the other criteria below.

Criterion 2: Characteristic Terminology

A Hebrew text may be classified to the HDWT if it can be demonstrated that it draws on specific *terminology* familiar to the traditions, for the most part ultimately derived from ANE divine warrior myths. For example, as an "allusive" text, Ps 104.26 contains no description of divine conflict, but has an explicit allusion to "Leviathan", not now as a menacing enemy, but as the Creator's plaything in the sea.[100] Biblical Leviathan is thought to derive terminologically and conceptually from the Ugaritic *Lôtan* (*KTU* 1.3 iii. 38-42) a seven-headed monster defeated by the divine warrior.[101] Elsewhere in the OT, Leviathan is portrayed as a hostile fire-breathing, sea-dwelling many-headed draconic monster (e.g. Job 41.18-21; Ps 74.14) and is clearly a mythological creature.[102]

---

[98] Cf. Fishbane 2003: 63-64. Already, Cross (1973: 155-156) recognised two broad shapes or "patterns"/ "genres" to the use of the imagery in Hebrew texts. The first involving descriptions of Yahweh's battle march in the storm theophany and its devastating effects in the natural world has the cosmogonic struggle with chaos monsters in the "foreground". The second depicts the victorious DW coming from battle to his mountain/new Temple, where the defeat of the sea/chaos monster is in the "background".

[99] Since in this regard the present study reads the tradition in a similar way to Angel 2006, this methodological assumption is underlined in the light of criticisms of Angel's methodology in Kvanvig (2008: 375) and Collins J.J. (2007: 338-339).

[100] Day (1985: 72-73) makes a convincing case for translating Ps. 104.26b "Leviathan whom you formed to play with", as opposed to "Leviathan whom you formed to play in it" (i.e. the sea), but recognises that both readings are possible.

[101] Day 1985: 4-5, cf. 65-72. Cf. Angel 2011: 87.

[102] Angel 2011: 86-87. Though Leviathan is not to be identified straightforwardly with the crocodile, aspects of the description in Job, e.g. Job 41.13-14, may be broadly speaking "crocodilian" cf. Watson 2005: 345-353. In mythopoesis creatures from the natural world influence the fantastical (e.g. Dan 7.2-8; Ezek 1.5-14), however, Watson's assertion (2005: 333) that ancient Israelites would struggle to distinguish "real" and "mythological" creatures seems unfounded since they do implicitly make such distinctions, e.g. in interpreting dreams in Daniel, where Dan 2.38 speaks of the "real" "wild animals of the field, and the birds of the air" thus grounding these beings in terms of their natural habitats, which description may be compared with the "hybrid" mythological beasts in Dan 7 which are said merely to "look like" real beasts, cf. Gen 41.1-38, where the correlation (but not confusion) between the mythological/allegorical sphere and that of real historical events is clear.

Since *Lôtan* /Leviathan is consistently depicted as an inimical sea monster in ANE and Hebrew literature, the creature Leviathan in Ps 104.26 is to be identified with the same monster.[103] In Ps 104.26, however, with some originality, in order to emphasise God's power as Creator, the psalmist develops the tradition, focusing not on Leviathan's defeat *per se*, but on his subsequent condition as a domesticated creature dependent on God for sustenance (Ps 104.27).[104]

Contextual factors confirm that the classification is justified, since, already, in Ps 104.6-9, the conflict motif appears. Thus, Ps 104.7 depicts God rebuking hostile chaos waters. In the HDWT, God's defeat of the sea and his defeat of Leviathan are somewhat equivalent, occurring in parallel at Ps 74.13-14.[105] The suggestion then, is that the reference to Leviathan in Ps 104.26 necessarily presupposes the myth, referred to previously in the wider context of the psalm i.e. Ps 104.6-9.

A second example, *mutatis mutandis* is Sir 43.8-26. Although Sir 43.8-26 contains no description of divine conflict *per se*, the presence of traditional imagery and characteristic HDWT terminology suggests this text properly belongs within the traditions as an allusive text, though this is contested.[106] Angel notes that the imagery and philology of Sir 43.13-17 draws on God's advent in storm theophany imagery, where military allusions recall the heavenly army of the DW (Sir 43.8b, 10).[107] Again, Sir 43.13 mentions God's "rebuke" (גְּעָר). This term will be discussed below, for now suffice it to note that this is a word characteristic of the HDWT, often considered a technical term pertaining to God's rebuke of chaos.[108]

However, notwithstanding the presence of characteristic terminology, Collins disputes the classification of Sir 43.8-26, complaining that Angel's classificatory scheme lacks precision.[109] The divisive issue here is methodology, since Collins discusses Sir 43 with Ps 18.7-15 and Job 41.1-11, where the term *Chaoskampf* and related language is conspicuously absent (compare Day, where Ps 18.7-15 and Job 41.1-11 are included in

[103] Day 1985: 74.
[104] On Ps 104.26, see Day 1985: 30, 187.
[105] Tsumura (2005: 192) commenting on Job 3.8, says the word pair "Sea"/ "Leviathan" had become "almost a literary cliché in Hebrew."
[106] Collins 2007: 338, see further the discussion below.
[107] Angel 2006: 76-77.
[108] Gunkel 1895 (2006): 43; Kee 1968: 235-8; Day 1985: 29 n. 82; Angel 2006: 20-21, 76; Kennedy 1987: 47 – 64.
[109] Angel 2006: 74-80. Collins (J.J) 2007: 338.

his standard categorisation of *Chaoskampf* texts).[110] Thus, Collins prescribes a particularly rigorous definition of *Chaoskampf* where a description of divine conflict becomes a pre-requisite.[111] However, Gunkel includes Sir 43.25 and further texts such as Jer 31.35 where the conflict is more "presupposed" than explicit, and Day's treatment of texts such as Jer 31.35 is similar.[112] Therefore, Collins' mode of categorisation is neither *standard* nor does it operate in his own earlier work, where, within a strong thesis, on Dan 7, Collins speaks of "confrontation" between the forces of chaos and the heavenly beings, but as he points out the scene is of *judgment*, not battle.[113] Similarly, Collins rightly insists that the "roaring waters" of Isa 17.12-14 are a manifestation of the primordial chaos waters, however, the conflict motif is more implied than explicit in this text.[114] Therefore, as a methodological assumption, Collins' exclusory categorisation becomes problematic when forced on others unduly.

A further consideration relating to characteristic terminology seemingly confirms that Sir 43.8-26 belongs within the HDWT, namely, the expression "the monsters of Rahab" (Sir 43.25). In the OT, the proper noun "Rahab" almost always features as a mythological chaos monster in connection with the HDWT (e.g. Job 9.13; 26.12; Isa 51.9; Ps 89.11).[115] Excluding references to the prostitute Rahab in the book of Joshua (where the MT has different pointing), the only other two occurrences of "Rahab" in the OT are in Isa 30.7 and Ps 87.4. In the former "Rahab" is explicitly identified with Egypt and the same connection is probably intended in the latter.[116] Contrary to Watson's assertion that in these texts "Rahab" is merely a "nation-name", Wyatt insists that the terminology retains symbolic and mythological connotations in all its instances.[117] Indeed, it should be recalled that elsewhere, dragons/chaos monsters are identified with human powers or nations (e.g. Jer 51.34; Ezek 29.3; 32.1; Dan 7.1-8). On this evidence, therefore, the term "Rahab" seems intrinsically mythological and a characteristic term of the HDWT. Thus, the term "Rahab" in Sir 43.25 (where mythological overtones are explicit i.e. the

[110] Collins 1998: 87-88. Cf. Day 1985: 187.
[111] Collins 1998: 87-88.
[112] Gunkel 1895: 62-63. Cf. Day 1985: 187.
[113] Collins 1977: 105-106.
[114] Collins 1977: 97.
[115] On these texts see e.g. Day 1985: 25-28; 38-42; 91-93.
[116] Kidner 1975: 315; Day 1985: 90.
[117] Watson (2005: 273, 289-324) considers "Rahab," Wyatt (2007: 340) objects to her attempts to downplay the mythological aspect of the name.

"*monsters* of Rahab") provides further justification for placing this text within the HDWT.

(i) Further exploration of characteristic terminology

The issue of which particular items of vocabulary might be said to comprise terminology characteristic of the HDWT is complex, and involves factors such as the semantic domain and range of a given term. Building on previous scholarship, Harold Ballard catalogued a range of Hebrew terms allegedly associated with the OT DW motif.[118] However, since Ballard's catalogue is not wholly satisfactory, it will not be reproduced here.[119] For one thing, some terminology catalogued seems too generic to be of real classificatory value. Thus, following Fredriksson, Ballard lists the verbs יסד (he established) and כון (to establish) as vocabulary indicative of the establishment of the DW as king.[120] However, while יסד occasionally appears in connection with HDWT texts (e.g. Pss 89.12; 104.5, 8, cf. Isa 51.13 in relation to Isa 51.9-11), the verb כון is extremely common (a word search reveals 213 occurrences in the OT) and is not typically found where the DW is established as king, unless the category "Divine Warrior" may admit of a human figure (e.g. David), which is not the case in Ballard's work.[121] Again, statistical analysis can be misleading, thus, Ballard notes that the Hebrew word translated "mighty hero" occurs 11 times in the Psalms, but omits to mention that in only three (twice in Ps 24.8, once in Ps 78.65) is the referent God/Yahweh![122] A further difficulty, by all accounts difficult to explain, is the omission of the verb גָּעַר and particularly its cognates, commonly held to be a technical term in these traditions as mentioned above in relation to Sir 43.8-26 (and see further below), found in the psalms at Pss 18.16; 76.7; 80.17; 104.7.

[118] Ballard 1999: 35-42.
[119] Ballard's compendium of terms associated with the DW motif in the psalms offers a broad guide to terminology but must be reviewed in places.
[120] Ballard 1999: 128 n.4, following Fredriksson 1945: 186.
[121] Ballard (1999: 1) makes it clear enough that in his investigation the DW is Yahweh.
[122] Ballard 1999: 39. On the other hand, Ballard (1999:37, 40) following Korpel (1990: 506-508) notes that Ugaritic *gzr* ('Hero') as applied to the divine warrior, has an Hebrew equivalent in גבור which correlation, in my view, supports the location of this term within the HDWT where it is applied to God/Yahweh.

It emerges that a more discerning approach to terminology is exigent in order to ground and establish our second criterion. Such an approach might commence with the general proposition illustrated in the examples of Ps 104.26 and Sir 43.8-26 above: if an OT/Second Temple text employs particular terminology judged to belong characteristically to the HDWT, the likelihood increases that the text under consideration properly belongs to the HDWT. However, since some terms might be *characteristic* of the HDWT, but have a wider application and possibly a wider semantic range, hermeneutical sensitivity is essential. Thus, the need arises to establish some degree of control regarding the extent to which a particular term may be said to *belong* "characteristically" to the HDWT, as opposed to being *used* within the traditions, but also featuring beyond them and without an exclusive tie to them.

On examination, it appears that a limited number of terms occur exclusively within the HDWT, or tend towards exclusivity and so might be said to "belong" to the HDWT. This is judged to be true of the definite chaos monsters לִוְיָתָן "Leviathan", (e.g. Pss 74.14; 104.26; Job 41.1; cf. *4 Ezra* 6.49, 52), and רַהַב "Rahab", (e.g. Job 9.13; 26.12; Ps 89.11; Isa 51.9; Sir 43.25), and is true also of the definite בְּהֵמוֹת "Behemoth" (e.g. Job 40.15; *4 Ezra* 6.49, 51), a mythical beast always found in connection with Leviathan. The more generic "dragon(s)" (תַּנִּין), is often associated with Leviathan and Rahab or the ocean "deeps" (e.g. Isa 27.1; 51.9; Pss 74.13; 148.7; Job 7.12), but also functions as a cipher for a human adversary of God/God's people (e.g. Ezek 29.3; 32.2; cf. *Pss. Sol.* 2.25; *T. Ash.* 7.3 [*δράκων*]).[123] Thus, the word "dragon" should also be placed in this category, with the caveat that the same Hebrew word can be translated "serpent" in contexts where mythological connotations may not obtain (e.g. Exod 7.9, 10, 12; Ps 91.13).

To this inventory of words denoting mythological opponents of God should be added the uncommon and generic Greek term κῆτος, used in the Septuagint to translate

[123] On *Pss. Sol*. 2.25-26, and *T. Ash.* 7.2-3 in relation to the HDWT, see Angel 2006: 83 - 86; 114-116. For a general introduction to *Pss. Sol.* see R.B. Wright in Charlesworth (1983a: 639-650) where the work is dated to first century BCE. On *T. Ash.* see H.C. Kee in Charlesworth (1983: 775-781), who dates the testaments to second century CE.

תַּנִּין (“dragon,” Gen 1.21), לִוְיָתָן (“Leviathan,” Job 3.8) and רַהַב (“Rahab” e.g. Job 9.13, 26.12; Sir 43.25). Accordingly, the term κῆτος is normally rendered “sea monster,” (Job 26.12 LXX cf. *T. Jud.* 21.7; *T. Sol.* 2.8; *Jos. Asen.* 12.11).[124] In Jonah 2.1, 2, 11 LXX (cf. 3 Macc. 6.8) the term κῆτος translates the MT’s “great fish.” However, as Angel observes, on twenty-two occasions the LXX renders Hebrew דָּג (“fish”) with the word ἰχθύς (“fish”), and in one (Num 11.22), ὄψος “fish” translates the Hebrew.[125] Thus, as Angel demonstrates, the choice of κῆτος in Jonah 2 is atypical and strongly suggests that the Septuagint translators intended a reference to the chaos monster; that is, they apparently interpret the sea drama of the Jonah story in terms of a divine warrior motif.[126]

Further examples of characteristic terms of the HDWT, this time verbal, are חָלָל and רָכַב. Whereas חָלָל is an extremely common Hebrew radical with a range of possible meanings (e.g. “pierce”, “wound”, “profane”, “violate”), this verb occurs in the poel with the meaning “pierced”, only in the HDWT in relation to the slaying of chaos monsters (i.e. Job 26.13; Isa 51.9 cf. Ps 89.11), and as such, may be included here.[127] The verb רָכַב “to ride” and its substantive form (רֶכֶב) are very common and widely distributed in the OT. These words occur frequently (though not exclusively) in military contexts, and typically refer to human warriors/armies (e.g. Ezek 23.23-24; Jer 51.21; Amos 2.15; Nah 2.4-5; Hag 2.22). However, on just nine occasions, in descriptions reminiscent of ANE divine warrior myths, Yahweh/God is depicted as warrior riding through or on the heavens/cloud(s).[128] In these texts the advent of God/Yahweh as DW is more or less explicit (Ps 18.11/2 Sam 22.11; Ps 68.18; Hab 3.8), or implicit in doxology, where the context clearly draws on divine warrior imagery (e.g. Ps 104.3[129] cf. 6-7; Ps 68.5, 34 in

[124] BDAG 544 renders κῆτος “sea-monster” and gives as examples the texts cited in brackets above. Angel (2006: 87-88) following Martínez Fernandez (1982: 221) cited in Angel 2006: 87 n. 72.
[125] Angel 2006: 212.
[126] Angel 2006: 211-212. Cf. Day (1985: 111) who thinks the MT’s “great fish”, derives from the sea monster of Baal mythology.
[127] Cf. Davidson 1970: 260.
[128] It is frequently pointed out that the Ugaritic verb “to ride” is the exact equal of the Hebrew, Day 1985: 30; Ballard 1999: 37 following Korpel 1990: 506-508.
[129] In Ps 104.3 the word for Yahweh’s chariot is רְכוּב a hapax legomenon in the OT, which meaning is equivalent to רֶכֶב cf. Davidson 1970: 683.

relation to Ps 68.18; Deut 33.26 cf. 27, 29). Where Yahweh rides a cloud in Isa 19.1 this is presumably also as DW, but in this judgment oracle against Egypt further divine warrior imagery is lacking. On this evidence, where God/Yahweh is the subject/referent, the רָכַב word group must also be included as *belonging* exclusively or almost exclusively to the HDWT.

Where a text contains a reference to a named chaos monster or a specific verb used exclusively or almost exclusively within the traditions, it will be judged highly probable that the text in question belongs within the HDWT, and the burden of proof would lie with those intent on disallowing a connection with divine warrior traditions. However, other terms are used in a technical or semi-technical way in the HDWT occurring frequently or even most frequently within them, but have other usages in texts which have limited or no relation to divine warrior traditions. The verb הָמַם for example, occurs fifteen times in the OT. In Esth 9.24 and Isa 28.28 it may be rendered "crush", where there is no connection with divine warrior traditions. However, eleven occurrences have a divine referent where the verb always refers to the warlike action of God. In four occurrences it describes God the DW "routing" mythical chaos forces (i.e. Pss 18.15 (2 Sam 22.15, twice), 144.6). In the remainder of passages it refers to the "routing" of a human enemy of Israel (e.g. Exod 14.24; 1 Sam 7.10; Judg 4.15). The verb also appears (twice) in Jer 51.34, where Nebuchadnezzar is compared to a chaos monster.

Perhaps the clearest example of terms used frequently within the HDWT but not exclusively so, is the word group related to the verb גָּעַר "rebuke", (Greek ἐπιτιμάω), which, as mentioned above, is often used in the MT as a technical term to denote God's defeat of hostile and chaos forces (e.g. Job 26.11; Isa 50.2; Pss 18.16; 104.7. Cf. *L.A.B.* 10.5; Pr Man 3-4, where God is said to have "shackled" the deep by his word of command).[130]

Eleven of the fourteen occurrences of the verb גָּעַר in the OT have Yahweh as subject, of these, three refer clearly to the divine rebuke of chaos waters/sea (Isa 17.13; Nah 1.4; Ps 106.9), whereas Isa 54.9 has the verb in parallel with the flood waters, the

[130] On these Second Temple texts, see Angel 2006: 164-166; 81-83.

latter depicted as an instrument of divine destruction. Two refer to a rebuke of Satan (Zech 3.2 *bis*), one is a rebuke of hostile nations (Ps 9.6), and another an ostensibly obscure reference to the rebuke of "beasts in reeds" (Ps 68.31).[131] Three references (Ps 119:21; Mal 2.3; 3.11) have no apparent connection with the HDWT.

Where גְּעַר appears in nominal form, five references are to the rebuke of the chaos sea/waters (Job 26.11; Isa 50.2; Pss 18.16 (2 Sam 22:16); 104.7), and in Isa 66.15 the word appears in connection with the advent of God as warrior in storm theophany language. Two references from the psalms (Pss 76.7; 80.17) associate God's rebuke with the destruction of foreign human enemies. Isa 51.20 describes the "fainting" of Jerusalem's sons who are judged and rebuked by God. The term occurs twice in Isa 30.17 with a military nuance, but it is not specifically the divine rebuke which is in view. The final four uses of the noun occur in wisdom literature (Prov 13.1, 8; 17.10; Ecc 7.5) with a different meaning pertaining to a verbal warning or word of correction, where the *divine* rebuke of mythological or human enemies is not involved. It emerges, therefore, that taken together, verbal and nominal references to *God's* "rebuke" in the OT most often belong within the HDWT, though this is not absolutely the case. Where a term from this word group features in relation to the divine rebuke (over against a human rebuke) there is a strong likelihood that divine warrior associations are present.

Finally, in contrast with terms judged to belong exclusively to the HDWT and those used typically and technically within these traditions, several words such as "waters" (מַיִם), "sea" (יָם), or "river" (נָהָר) and Greek or Latin equivalents (e.g. θάλασσα, mare) occur in divine warrior texts, but feature hundreds of times in OT/Second Temple literature in a variety of contexts. In regard to this group of terms, there is no *a priori* connection with the HDWT, nor can an association with these traditions be considered probable on the basis of the occurrence of a given term *per se*. However, a cluster of such terms/images in relation to one or more of the thematic categories given in criterion 1, could strengthen the probability that a given author is drawing on the HDWT.[132]

[131] Day (1985: 119-120) argues that here "beasts" represent hostile human warrior-leaders, not chaos monsters.

[132] Angel (2006: 32) states that while the word "sea" is found within these traditions, *per se* it does not denote the *chaos* sea, thus where the word "sea" occurs, "further evidence is needed to prove that this text

Further to the latter, considerations from context and arguments from analogy may clarify the classification process. Thus, where the waters (מַיִם), appear in connection with the verb "to roar" (הָמָה), (LXX translates ἠχέω) the "roaring of the waters" has been recognised as an "established image" of the divine warrior traditions, indicating the inimical personification of the chaos waters (e.g. Jer 5.22; Isa 51.15; and in parallel with the "roaring" of the nations, Pss 46.4, 7; 65.8; Isa 17.12; cf. Jer 31.35).[133] Thus, in texts where the waters are described specifically as "roaring" in parallel with the wicked (e.g. *1QH* 10.12, 27), a technical usage may be discerned which strengthens the classification of the texts to the HDWT.[134] Again, regarding our earlier example of "waters" in Ps 69.1-2, 14-15, since elsewhere in the HDWT hostile chaos waters are found in parallel with human enemies (e.g. Isa 17.12-13; Ps 46.2-3, 6; 65.7) and since in Ps 69.14 the waters are parallel to human enemies, on analogy, the case for reading the "waters" in Ps 69.1-2, 14-15 as *chaos* waters is strengthened.[135]

Further terms which occur in divine warrior texts but appear in a variety of contexts with different meanings are those which may be broadly grouped as meteorological phenomena. In OT/Second Temple literature, weather language might be used in a literal descriptive sense (Exod 9.18-19; Job 24.8;), or in a metaphorical sense (Isa 28.17) where there is no necessary connection with divine warrior traditions. However, in connection with the storm theophany and the advent of Yahweh as DW in mythically coloured texts, meteorological phenomena take on something of a technical sense as figurative representations of the manifestation of God's might and/or the divine armoury. This is true of elements such as רַעַם "thunder" and/or בָּרָק "lightning" as employed in the following texts, Pss 18.14-15/2 Sam 22.14; 77.19; 104.7; Isa 29.6; Sir 43.17a; Jer 51.16; Hab 3.11; cf. Wis 5.21a [βολίδες ἀστραπῶν]; *L.A.B.* 11.5.[136] Again, wind (רוּחַ) and סְעָרָה "storm wind/ whirlwind" takes on this sense in Exod 15.8, 10;

refers to the chaos sea". For Angel, a counter example is "Leviathan" the chaos monster, where a reference to Leviathan is necessarily a reference to the Hebrew *Chaoskampf* Tradition (Angel's nomenclature).

[133] See Angel 2006: 41.

[134] See Angel 2006: 40-43.

[135] Cf. Angel 2006: 66-67.

[136] On the classification of *L.A.B.* 11.5 as belonging to these traditions, see Angel 2006: 166-169. For an introduction to *L.A.B.* see D.J. Harrington in Charlesworth (1983a: 297-303), where a first century C.E. date is given.

Job 26.13; Zech 9.14; Isa 29.6; cf. Job 38.1-2; cf. Wis 5.23 [πνεῦμα δυνάμεως καὶ ὡς λαῖλαψ]. Further examples are (בָּרָד) "hail", often in reference to the violent action of Yahweh the DW (e.g. Ps 18.13, 14 in tandem with "coals of fire"; Job 38.22; Isa 30.30; Sir 43.13); (רָעַשׁ) "earthquake", sometimes referring to the shaking of the mountains (e.g. Judg 5.4; Pss 18.18/2 Sam 22.8; 46.4; 68.8; 77.19; Isa 29.6; Nah 1.5; Zech 14.5; cf. *T. Mos.* 10.4).[137]

Where terminology operates as a criterion for ascertaining the influence of divine warrior traditions, frequency may be another decisive classificatory factor. It follows, for example, that where several meteorological terms sometimes associated with divine warrior mythology occur in a cluster e.g. in Ps 18 (בָּרַק/רַעַם/רָעַשׁ/גָּעַר/בָּרָד), the probability increases that the text be understood in terms of the HDWT.[138] On the other hand, if a text contains merely one or two terms which may be used within these traditions (e.g. "waters" in Ps 69.1-2, 14-15 or δράκων in *Pss. Sol.* 2.25 LXX), then that text would necessitate argumentation from other quarters to justify classification within the HDWT.

Psalm 69 has been discussed, but a further illustration *Pss. Sol.* 2.25-26 may be considered. Though, strictly speaking, there is only one key item of HDWT vocabulary in *Pss. Sol* 2.25-26 (i.e. δράκων in *Pss. Sol* 2.25), this term is judged to belong within the traditions, and on the basis of criterion 1 (and also criterion 3, see below) this text can be ascribed to the HDWT. Angel notes that the dragon imagery in *Pss. Sol.* 2.25 is reminiscent of imagery found in Ps 74.14, Ezek 29.3, 32.2 and Jer 51.34. He observes that Ps 74.13-14 refers to Leviathan's plural "heads" and suggests a connection with κεφαλάς in *Pss. Sol.* 2.25.[139] Again, Angel observes that the image of the dragon lying pierced on the mountains (ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων) of Egypt (*Pss. Sol.* 2.26) finds a parallel in Ezek 32.5 (32.6 LXX) which refers to the flesh of Pharaoh being strewn on the mountains (ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων), thus the death of Pompey in *Psalms of Solomon* is seen through the prism of Ezek 32.2-6.[140]

[137] On *T. Mos.* see J. Priest in Charlesworth (1983: 919-926) who dates the work first century C.E.
[138] Ballard (1999: 41) finds that Ps 18, with fourteen other psalms, has ten or more occurrences of DW language.
[139] Angel 2006: 84.
[140] Angel 2006: 85.

Further to Angel's observations, it is also significant that in *Pss. Sol.* 2.26 the dragon is described as being "pierced" (ἐκκεκεντημένον). Though a verbal parallel is lacking in the LXX, this is parallel in thought to Job 26.13 and Isa 51.9 MT, which refer to the piercing of a chaos monster. Again, Angel lists various commentators' explanations of the seemingly erroneous τοῦ εἰπεῖν in the phrase τοῦ εἰπεῖν τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν τοῦ δράκοντος (*Pss. Sol.* 2.25) rendered "*to destroy* the arrogance of the dragon" on account of the fact that "to say" makes little sense in context.[141] Over against other suggested allusions, given the correspondence ὑπερηφανίαν/ὑπερήφανον it is possible that ἐταπείνωσας ὡς τραυματίαν ὑπερήφανον ("You have humbled the proud as one who is slain") in Ps 89.11(Ps 88.11 LXX) may stand behind the phrase in *Psalms of Solomon,* where τοῦ εἰπεῖν would be emended to ταπεινοῦν in conjunction with ἐταπείνωσας in Ps 88.11 LXX. If this solution is adopted, this would be a further instance in which the author of *Pss. Sol.* 2.25-26 draws on images and specific texts belonging to the HDWT. Be that as it may, the verbal allusions to texts belonging within the HDWT, the conceptual coherence with these traditions and the occurrence of a *strong* term (δράκων) belonging characteristically to these traditions provides sufficient warrant to classify *Pss. Sol.* 2.25-26 to the HDWT, despite the low frequency of specific divine warrior terminology.

By way of summary, then, criterion 2 concerns the identification in a text of characteristic terminology associated with the HDWT. A select group of terms belongs exclusively or almost exclusively to these traditions, and where such terms occur in a given text (with necessary qualifications and caveats concerning referent and/or lexical form), it is extremely probable that the text in question belongs within the HDWT. The presence in a text of terms or particular groups of vocabulary (i.e. meteorological phenomena) where there is no *a priori* link to the traditions, may nevertheless support classification to the HDWT, especially where a cluster of relevant words appears in relation to one or more of the thematic categories outlined in criterion 1. Some items of terminology are judged "stronger" than others in terms of possible ties to the HDWT, and individual cases must be evaluated contextually in order to safeguard classificatory rigour.

Criterion 3: Parallel Texts

[141] Angel (2006: 83) follows the translation of Wright 1985: 653 (with emendation).

A third, related criterion, involves allusions to a specific HDWT text or texts, such as appears to occur in *4 Ezra* 6.49-52, which refers to Behemoth and Leviathan.[142] According to *4 Ezra* 6.49-51, these mythological creatures will be feasted on at an unspecified future date. The text makes no mention of God's advent as a warrior, or of divine conflict. Nevertheless, it is judged here to belong to the HDWT as an "allusive" text for various reasons. Prominent among these is the fact that an earlier text, Ps 74.14, also part of the HDWT, contains a similar theme of Leviathan becoming food. Since in *4 Ezra* 6.49-52 Behemoth is now listed alongside Leviathan, and given the eschatological tenor of the text, the author appears to have creatively reworked and reapplied imagery belonging to the earlier tradition, which suggests that he/she is working within it.[143] Thus, where an author appears to draw on a parallel text belonging to the traditions and containing a very similar idea, the case for the classification of the secondary text within the HDWT may be strengthened.[144]

In the case of *4 Ezra* 6.49-52, in view of criterion 2 above, the very mention of chaos monsters is sufficient to classify it within the HDWT insofar as Leviathan as a mythological enemy of God is unquestionably part of the tradition, originating in Canaanite divine warrior myth.[145] For reasons which will be explained below, Behemoth is similarly part of the tradition in connection with Job 40; indeed Job 40.15, 20 may be a further source text here.[146] Thus, the borrowing and creative use of a specific underlying text or texts belonging to the HDWT, coupled with the presence of particular terminology characteristic of the traditions secures the classification of a text to the HDWT.

Criterion 4: Appropriate Referent

In addition to those discussed so far, a fourth criterion, albeit of limited purchase, pertains to *referent*. It was shown above that ANE divine warrior mythology usually concerns a god's sovereign creation and/or kingship. Since scholars detect this and a

[142] On *4 Ezra* see Metzger in Charlesworth (1983: 517-524), who dates the book to the late first century C.E.
[143] Similarly, Angel (2006: 33, cf. 150) and his "criterion of creativity".
[144]Since *1 En.* 60.7, 24 also describes feasting on Leviathan and Behemoth as part of the messianic banquet at the eschaton, *4 Ezra* 6.49-52 could be dependent on this text, but given uncertainties surrounding the dates of these works the reverse is also possible. Theodotion *Ps.* 74.14 is a further contemporary text which refers to the eating of Leviathan.
[145] On the Canaanite origin of Leviathan see e.g. Day 1985: 4-5.
[146] Angel (2006: 149) notices that *4 Ezra* 6.51 has Behemoth dwelling in mountainous terrain, and concludes that the author draws on Job 40.15, 20, where Behemoth is pictured grazing on mountains. Cf. Stone 1990: 186.

further "historical" referent for divine warrior imagery in the HDWT, it is reasonable to expect OT texts associated with these traditions to relate to these topics. For instance, since Gunkel and in view of John Day's treatment of *Chaoskampf* in Job, Job 40.15-24 (which refers to Behemoth), may be said to belong to the traditions, though the element of divine conflict is presupposed rather than described or enacted (cf. Job 40.19; 24).[147] Alongside other reasons for reading the text in this way (e.g. the appearance of a bovine Behemoth-like companion for Leviathan in Ugaritic texts such as to parallel Job 40-41), Day finds a creation theme, and specific links to the motif of divine victory over chaos at creation.[148] Certainly, a creation theme does dominate these chapters, where in rhetorical one-upmanship with Job, God demonstrates his sovereignty as Creator. Clearly, since "creation" themes (like "historical" themes) occur in Hebrew texts without necessarily having a connection with the HDWT, arguments involving referent may be adduced as supporting evidence that a text be classified within the HDWT *only* alongside other more decisive factors.

Criterion 5: Similar Form

A fifth criterion, again of limited utility, is that of *form*. While it was cautioned above that some approaches have, on occasion, overreached themselves when attempting to systematise on the grounds of form, in some instances, in conjunction with other factors, considerations of a formal nature may advance the case for the inclusion of a text in the HDWT. This criterion may be invoked where particular psalms or portions of them are thought not only to draw on divine warrior imagery but to share a similar prosodic structure to ANE hymns, such as to imply a degree of dependence.

In this connection Ps 24 may be cited. Though no divine battle with chaos is described, some scholars argue that the motif is presupposed in Ps 24.1-2, which text refers to Yahweh's creation "on the seas" and "on the rivers".[149] Again, Ps 24.7-10

[147] Gunkel 1895: 39; Day 1985: 75-86.
[148] Day 1985: 80 - 83. Among Ugaritic texts cited by Day (1985: 81) in this connection, are *KTU* 1.3 III.43-44; *KTU* 1.6. VI. 51-53.
[149] Again, see Cross 1973: 93-94; Hanson 1975: 305; Day 1985: 37-38. Watson (2005: 128) denies any mythological connections here. Moreover, in an attempt to divorce Ps 24.1-2 (with its mention of the sea) from verses 7-10, she states (2005: 129), it is a "common feature of Hebrew poetry for a logical linear progression to pass through various stages, where the connection between each element may sometimes be as insubstantial as a mere linguistic affiliation, and the thematic or logical overlap between separated units may be non-existent." Watson, however, fails to provide a single example of this "common feature", yet recognises that the themes of creation and kingship do cohere. Clearly, Watson's analysis begs the question of the referent of the "battle" references in Ps 24.7-10.

depicts Yahweh as a victorious warrior returning from battle to take up kingship. Cross demonstrates that the phrase "Raise, o gates, your heads!" is probably adapted from a Ugaritic text (*KTU* 1.2.I.27), when Baal cries "Lift up, O gods, your heads!"[150] Thus, since Ps. 24.7-10 appears to draw on the wording and form of an extant Canaanite text from a divine warrior myth, the case for the inclusion of the psalm within the HDWT gains support.[151] A reception critical consideration seems to confirm the latter, namely, the fact that the epithets "King of glory" (Ps 24.7, 8, 9, 10) and "war hero" (Ps 24.8) are cited in a text from the War Scroll (*1QM* 12.8-10) where Yahweh is depicted as the DW doing battle with enemies and accompanied by the heavenly hosts.[152]

In addition to Ps 24, Ps 29 provides a further, this time *negative* example, where arguments made on the basis of form are unconvincing. This text is significant insofar as its classification within divine warrior traditions is sometimes contested.[153] Formal considerations (among others) have led some scholars to posit that Ps 29 was originally a Canaanite hymn extolling the victory of the divine warrior, appropriated and adapted by the psalmist.[154] Theoretically the demonstration of formal similarities could favour the classification of Ps 29 within the HDWT, but the arguments from form are purely hypothetical. Poignantly, there is no extant Canaanite hymn to which Ps 29 can be traced.[155] As a parallel to Ps 29.10 which portrays Yahweh enthroned as king over the flood, Ginsberg offered *CTA* 4.VII. 42-44 (= *KTU* 1.4.VII.42-44) "Thus Baal is enthroned in his house. Neither king nor no-king shall establish the earth as a dominion".[156] Since the *parallel* is clearly very loose, there is little to warrant the notion that Ps 29.10 reproduces an Ugaritic "formula".[157]

It emerges, therefore, that in regard to Ps 29, the case made on the grounds of form is insufficient to carry the argument. Rather, a more nuanced position, such as that of Craigie, sees Canaanite influence on particular aspects of Ps 29, i.e. the thundering of

[150] Cross 1973: 97-99.
[151] Cross 1973: 97-99.
[152] See Angel 2006: 38.
[153] Cross 1973: 151-152; Hanson 1975: 307; Cragie 1983: 245; Day 1985: 57-60, place Ps 29 within the divine warrior traditions, cf. Miller 1973:10, 36 , 69. Tsumura (2005: 152-155) and Watson (2005: 48-64) contest this connection.
[154] E.g. Ginsberg (1935) saw Ps 29.10 as an adaptation of the "formula" of Baal's triumph. Ginsberg's view is rehearsed in Green 2003: 261-264. Green 2003: 262 asserts that in the appropriated Baal hymn, the name "Yahweh" replaces "Baal" 18 times.
[155] Cragie 1983: 244.
[156] Translation from Miller (1973: 36), following Ginsberg (1935).
[157] Cf. Tsumura 2005: 155

the Lord, without suggesting the wholesale appropriation of a putative Canaanite "hymn".[158] In the event, Ps 29 may be judged to belong within the HDWT as an "allusive" text, since other criteria, i.e. those of imagery, terminology and referent are fulfilled.[159]

In the light of this discussion, the following keywords summarise the criteria which are used to identify a text as belonging to the HDWT: *imagery, terminology, parallels, referent, form.* It has emerged that the first three criteria are more significant than the latter two for classificatory purposes. Clearly, where a text may be shown to fulfil several criteria the cumulative effect strengthens the case for inclusion within the HDWT. In less clear-cut cases, additional factors may aid the classificatory decision process, e.g. arguments from context, or, as in the example of Ps 24 above, arguments from reception criticism. Where the classification of a text is uncertain, this will be stated.

(e) Summary of the Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions

In the light of this presentation, some foundational assumptions and methodological statements may now be made with regard to the present study and its understanding of the HDWT:

1. The present study builds on scholarship which finds a version of the ANE divine warrior myth in OT and Second Temple texts. These texts may or may not presuppose a complete archetypal pattern, but no biblical passage reproduces such a pattern exactly, nor is the myth narrated in full in the HDWT. Rather, it is preserved piecemeal in vivid snapshots of imagery and terminology which ultimately derive from the ANE divine warrior myth. Thus, this work will study the Hebrew version of the myth primarily as it manifests itself in terms of imagery and terminology, being concerned only in a secondary sense with issues of form.
2. It is understood that in the HDWT the myth refers in the first place to the establishment of Israel in history, but also has a creation/kingship referent. As indicated above (n. 24), the myth as it appears in ancient/Second Temple Israel will be referred to as the Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions (HDWT), which

[158] Cragie 1983: 243-246.
[159] See further Day 1985: 58-60. Watson (2005: 64) complains there is no resistance to Yahweh and therefore no conflict motif in Ps 29, thus disqualifying it from the *Chaoskampf* category. However, storm theophany language (with Canaanite divine warrior parallels) depicts Yahweh's destructive might, and his enthronement in Ps 29.10 is consistent with the creation/kingship schema. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, Ps 29 is judged to belong within the HDWT.

nomenclature implicitly aligns this study with the scholarly reading of these traditions associated with the work of F.M. Cross.

3. On the evidence provided first by Gunkel and now more extensively by Angel's systematic survey of Second Temple literature, it is assumed throughout that the HDWT existed as live traditions in the centuries leading up to and during the NT period, indeed the HDWT is used unequivocally in Rev 12.1-17; 13.1-18. While the location/audience of the gospel may be taken to be gentile (Rome), Mark clearly roots his gospel in Jewish (OT) traditions (see Mark 1.2-3). Thus, there is clear rationale for the attempt to demonstrate DW influence on the Gospel of Mark, where it will be argued that the evangelist draws on what were live traditions.
4. Since the present study will examine the possible influence of the HDWT on Mark, it will investigate the extent to which the evangelist draws on OT/Second Temple HDWT texts such as those enumerated above, (see the criteria in chapter 1, regarding how a Markan allusion to a source text will be identified). However, should doubts arise concerning the legitimacy of a source text's classification within the HDWT i.e. the texts' alleged connections with these traditions is queried or the text is not normally associated with these traditions in scholarly work, the criteria set out in this chapter will be utilised for clarification. Where there is uncertainty regarding the source text's classification within the HDWT this will be stated. As emerged in the comparison of Ps 69.1-2, 14-15 and Ps 144.5-7 above, and also in the brief consideration of Pss 24 and 29 at the close of the preceding section, some texts are easier to classify to the HDWT than others. In the less clear-cut cases, following the application of the criteria set out above, if ambiguity remains regarding the legitimacy of a text's classification within the HDWT a judgment call will be made, and, whether ultimately negative or positive, the judgment call will be properly identified as such.
5. As discussed above, it is anticipated that if Mark has drawn on the HDWT there will be a degree of contiguous usage of these traditions (i.e. imagery/terminology will be used in a way broadly consistent with prior examples belonging to these traditions). Again, however, allowance must be made for the possibility of the creative development and application of the HDWT in Mark. It is acknowledged that doubts may arise concerning the parameters of the creative development of traditions. Specifically, where an image from the tradition is employed in an

unorthodox, and perhaps especially in an unprecedented manner, a judgment call becomes exigent in order to decide whether the unorthodox/unprecedented usage of the image signals a "creative" development of the traditions, or a departure from them. The decision process will weigh contextual factors, thus if a text exhibits other imagery and terminology from the traditions the case for "creative development" will be bolstered. Conversely, a paucity of such imagery and terminology might be understood to damage the case for inclusion within the HDWT.

The spectrum of stock images/terminology belonging to the HDWT may now be grouped thematically. The following is a representative rather than an exhaustive list of imagery/vocabulary and textual examples belonging to the tradition:

THEME	IMAGERY/VOCABULARY	BIBLICAL/SECOND TEMPLE EXAMPLES
God's advent as warrior	(a) Storm theophany i.e. smoke, fire, clouds, hailstones, thunder, lightning, the shaking of the earth (b) God as DW accompanied by heavenly armies (c) God as riding on a war chariot/clouds	(a) Ps 18.8-16/2 Sam 22; Pss 77.17-19; 144.7-9; Judg 5.4; Zech 9.14; *1QM* 12.9-10; *4Q370* 1.3-5 (b) Judg 5.20; Deut 33.2; Zech 14.5; 1 *QM* 12.9-10; *L.A.B.* 11.5 (c) Ps 18.10; Hab 3.15
God's enemies	Personified as (a) the chaos waters, i.e. "sea", "many waters" (which sometimes "roar"), "the river", "the deep/deeps" (b) chaos monsters: Leviathan, Rahab, the Dragon, Behemoth.	(a) Nah 1.4; Hab 3.15; Isa 17.12-13; Ps 46.4; 65.7; Jer 5.22; Ps 93.3; Hab 3.8; Exod 15.5, 8; Ps 77.17; 4*Q370* 1.4; (b) Isa 27.1; Pss 74.12; 89.10; Job 3.8; 9.13; 26.12; 40.15-41.34; Dan 7.2-8; Rev 12.7
God's combative action against inimical chaos forces	(a) God's "rebuke" and/or calming/subjugation/trampling on chaos waters (or human enemies depicted in these terms), which can be dried up, occasionally 'bound', and sometimes "flee" in fear (b) God's smiting and slaying/subjugating of chaos monsters	(a) Isa 50.2; Pss 65.6-7; 104.6-9; Job 9.8; 26.12; Ps 18.16; Isa 17.12-14; 44.27; Hab 3.15; *L.A.B.* 10.5; Ps 104.7; 106.9; 114.3; Pr Man 3; Sir 43.23 (b) Pss 74.13-14; 89.10; Job 26.12-13; Isa 27.1; 51.9; Ezek 32.2-8; *Pss. Sol.* 2.25-26
God's victory and resulting supremacy	(a) God's victory procession and taking up kingship in Zion (b) God's enthronement over the (subjugated) chaos waters, boundaries set for waters (c) Chaos waters/monsters subjugated under God's rule and/or at his mercy	(a) Exod 15.17-18; Ps 24.7-10; Isa 35.1-10; Zech 14.9-11 (b) Ps 29.10; Ps 93; Job 38.8-11; *11Q5* 26.9-10a. (c) Job 7.12; 9.13 cf. Sir 43.25; Ps 104.26; *4 Ezra* 6.49-52; *1 En.* 60.7-9. 24-25

2.3 General introduction to the influence of the Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions on the Gospel of Mark: scholarly precedents

Since some scholars have already detected the influence of divine warrior traditions on Markan texts, their work must be briefly considered. Notably, H. C. Kee argued for the influence of the traditions on the synoptic exorcism stories. Kee identifies the verb ἐπιτιμάω "rebuke" in the exorcisms, with the Hebrew (גָּעַר) "rebuke" which he associates with God's sovereign rule. In the OT the latter is used principally in texts where God "rebukes" the chaos waters.[160] Kee supports this alleged philological correspondence with appeals to exorcistic passages in Qumranic literature, for instance, *1Q* (*1QapGen ar*) 20.28-29, where the term גָּעַר is said to denote the subjugation of evil spirits to God's rule.[161] In *1QM* 14.9ff power is wrested from the forces of Belial (demonic protagonists identified with the forces of chaos).[162] Analogously, in the Markan exorcisms, Jesus' "rebuke" (1.25; 9.25) reveals that he is involved in a cosmic eschatological struggle with Satan and his demonic hordes in order to usher in the Kingdom of God.[163]

On the evidence of Aramaic/Hebrew incantation texts, Joel Marcus argues that גָּעַר can have a more restricted meaning than Kee allows, being a near synonym of "to exorcise".[164] Nevertheless, Marcus recognises that in texts such as *1QM* 14.10 (we may add Jude 9), as in the Markan exorcisms themselves, the term signals God's dominion over evil spirits/Belial/Satan and not exorcisms *per se*.[165] This point is confirmed on the basis of the close association of Mark 3.22-30 (concerning the dominion of God and the dominion of Beelzebub) and the Markan exorcism accounts where the term "rebuke" occurs.[166] Moreover, Marcus acknowledges that Kee is correct to emphasise the mythic DW background of the term.[167] For the purposes of this study, Kee has demonstrated the

[160] Kee 1968: 232 – 236.
[161] Kee 1968: 235.
[162] Kee 1968: 243-244.
[163] Kee 1968: 242-243.
[164] Marcus 2000: 193.
[165] Marcus 2000: 193-194. On *1QM* 14.9 see Martínez & Tigchelaar 1997: 136-137, cf. Kee 1968: 234-235.
[166] See below, Chapter 4, section 4.2 (b) (ii), pp. 163-164.
[167] Marcus 2000: 194.

equivalence of the Greek and Hebrew terms ἐπιτιμάω /גָּעַר and established a philological connection between the Markan exorcisms and the HDWT.[168]

John Paul Heil studied the stilling of the storm and Jesus' walking on the sea in the synoptics against the background of the HDWT.[169] He concludes that these stories exhibit the influence of the HDWT. Regarding Mark 4.35-41, Heil argues that Jesus is identified with God, since like God in OT texts, he subdues the elements by his rebuke (4.39).[170] Heil also draws attention to similarities between the first Markan exorcism story (1.21-28) and 4.35-41.[171] With regard to Mark 6.45-52, in a detailed textual analysis, Heil claims that the evangelist presents Jesus' actions in such a way as to deliberately recall OT texts in which God the DW marches or tramples on the sea (especially Job 9.8, but also Hab 3.15; Ps 77.20; Isa 43.16), thus equating Jesus with God the DW.[172]

Heil's work has gained general approval, but has not gone unchallenged.[173] For Patrick Madden, the parallels between Job 9.8 LXX and the synoptic sea-walking stories are weak because the synoptic accounts lack the phrase ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐδάφους (as on dry land), and since Job 9.8 LXX θαλάσσης is anarthrous whereas the synoptics include the definite article.[174] However, Angel notes that the string περιπατεῖν + ἐπὶ + θάλασσα occurs only in Job 9.8 LXX and Mark 6.48-49 + par. making it highly probable that the synoptic authors do in fact draw on Job 9.8 LXX.[175] Therefore, Heil's arguments on the correspondence between Job 9.8 LXX and Mark 6.48 (+ par.) stand.

Paul Brooks Duff posits that the Markan entry narrative (Mark 11) is largely modelled on Zech 14, but with a twist.[176] The latter text describes the appearance of Yahweh the DW on the Mount of Olives and the march into Jerusalem with "his holy ones" (Zech 14.4-5) to take the city/Temple, establish his reign (Zech 14.9-11) and

[168] Cf. Marcus 2000: 194.
[169] Heil 1981.
[170] Heil 1981: 65-66; 97-103.
[171] Heil 1981: 125-126.
[172] Heil 1981: 37-55.
[173] Favourable assessments include Kee 1984; Batto 1992: 174-184; Angel 2006: 21. Madden (1997: 3) is broadly dismissive of Heil's work. Nicholls (2008: 49-51) contests Heil's contention that there is a theme of God's dominance over the sea in the synoptic sea-walking stories, since she says this is missing from the LXX rendering of the verse on which the evangelists allegedly rely. For Nicholls (2008: 50), Heil's argument regarding the NT sea-walking story, *in casu* Matt 14.25, cannot stand on "half a verse in Job".
[174] Madden 1997: 65.
[175] Angel 2011: 307. This point also works against Nicholls' comment on the "half verse in Job", cf. above, n. 173.
[176] Duff 1992: 56-66.

vindicate his people by destroying their enemies (Zech 14.12-15). The Markan Jesus is identified with the Zecharian DW figure since Jesus enters Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives in procession accompanied by his followers (11.1, 7-11). However, Duff notes that in Mark the procession ends "comically" since unlike God in the Zecharian text (and historical Greco-Roman warrior-kings) Jesus does not storm the city and establish his reign, but simply looks around and exits.[177] On the following day, rather than appropriating the Temple, in an "ironic twist" where there is a further allusion to Zech 14, Jesus "disqualifies" and "condemns" it in anticipation of its eventual destruction.[178] Duff's article has had limited influence.[179] Nevertheless, the suggestion that the divine warrior pattern is inverted in Mark is fascinating, and in keeping with studies which find parody and irony as pivotal for understanding the Markan crucifixion narrative.[180]

Bernard Batto reads Mark 4.35-41/6.45-52 as "epiphanies," detecting the influence of the Combat Myth on these texts.[181] Following Heil, Batto observes that in the Hebrew Bible only God stills/tramples the back of the sea. He notes that Jesus' rebuke of the demon in Mark 1.25 is parallel to his rebuke of the sea and concludes that 4.35-41 should be understood in the light of texts such as Job 26.11-13. Batto insists it is no coincidence that in the ensuing "Legion" story (5.1-20), the demons end up in the sea, which he styles as the abode of the "anti-god".[182]

Batto finds confirmation of the influence of the divine conflict myth in Mark in the picture of Jesus sleeping in the boat (4.38), which detail is said to recall the repose of the warrior deity after his defeat of the chaos monster, allegedly a "standard motif" of ANE mythology.[183] However, the *standard* notion of the sleep/leisure of the gods is a variegated feature of ANE myths, not necessarily associated with the defeat of chaos.[184] The notion that Mark knew of and drew on particular ANE myths (i.e. Ea's defeat of Apsu, and/or Marduk's defeat of Tiamat in *Enuma Elish*) is speculative and without

[177] Duff 1992: 67.
[178] Duff 1992: 67-69. Duff (1992: 65) argues that Mark 11.15 echoes Zech 14.21.
[179] Duff's study is not mentioned by Marcus 2000/2009. However, it is discussed in Watts 1997: 308-309; Angel 2006: 23. Collins (2007: 517 n. 41) accepts that Zech 14 forms the background to the Markan entry scene, but disagrees with some elements of Duff's interpretation.
[180] See e.g. Camery-Hoggatt 1992; Marcus 2006: 73-87; Kelber 1979: 81-82.
[181] Batto 1992: 179-180.
[182] Batto 1992: 180.
[183] Batto 1992: 180 Cf. Batto 1987: 153-177. Batto (1987: 158-159) references texts such as *Atrahasis I.* 78 - 83, (for which see Lambert & Millard 1999: 47) in which, warrior god Enlil is awakened by his servant Nusku who announces that the lesser gods are about to attack his house.
[184] Batto 1987: 153-177; cf. Mrozek & Votto 1999: 415-419.

evidence. In any case, for the parallel to function at a conceptual level Mark's Jesus would have to sleep *after* not before the stilling of the storm. The issue of typology and interpretation in relation to Jesus' sleep in Mark 4.38, will be taken up more extensively in the following chapter.

For Foster McCurley, Mark draws on the divine conflict motif in 4.35-41/6.45-52 in order to demonstrate that the eschatological victory of God takes place in Jesus' ministry. McCurley notes that the phrase "on that day" (4.35) recalls the "Day of the Lord" in Isa 27.1, and thus sets the eschatological tone to a story in which Jesus is likened to Yahweh in his victory over chaos.[185] While the Markan phrase reproduces the precise wording of several OT prophetic texts referring to the "Day of the Lord" (e.g. Dan 12.1; Amos 2.16; 8.3, 9, 13; Mic 5.9; Zeph 1.9, 10, 12; Jer 4.9), McCurley is mistaken in his claim that the respective Greek phrases translated "on that day" in Mark 4.35 and Isa 27.1 are identical.[186] Thus, while the possibility of an allusion to Isa 27.1 in 4.35 might not be excluded, it is difficult to demonstrate that this is in fact the case.

More perceptive is McCurley's inference that the conflict imagery represents a "confessional statement"; since Jesus has been identified as the Son of God (1.1, 11, 3.11), the question concerning his identity in 4.41 already has its answer.[187] In common with Heil, McCurley mentions the parallel at Mark 1.25/4.39.[188] Like Batto, he also finds cosmological associations in 5.1-20 on account of the literary context and the destructive role of the sea at the conclusion of the story.[189] McCurley also points to a parallel with Exod 14-15 here. For McCurley, in the sea-miracles and exorcisms, Mark draws on themes and imagery from the HDWT in such a way as to demonstrate that Jesus confronts cosmic and not human (Roman) powers.[190] However, it should be noted that the imagery of the HDWT is frequently used as polemic against particular historical oppressors (Ezek 29.3-5 32.2-8; *Pss. Sol.* 2.25-26).[191] Since the "Legion" story (5.1-20) is often interpreted

[185] McCurley 1983: 60.
[186] McCurley 1983: 60. Granted, the same words appear, but the ordering of the phrase is different in Isa 27.1 LXX.
[187] McCurley 1983: 59.
[188] McCurley 1983: 59, 62. Cf. Heil 1981: 125-126.
[189] McCurley 1983: 63. Cf. Batto 1992: 180.
[190] McCurley 1983: 63-67.
[191] Similarly, Angel 2006: 22.

as anti-Roman polemic, McCurley assumes too readily that the "chaos imagery" has a cosmic referent, when this inference necessitates demonstration from the text.[192]

In a popular work Longman and Reid take an intertextual approach which seeks to reconcile the OT image of God as DW and the presentation of Jesus as "warrior" in the NT.[193] The Markan portrayal of John the Baptist and Jesus is said to display DW influence, and the reader is informed that Jesus' baptism and wilderness testing should be understood respectively as "the warrior anointed" and "the warrior tested".[194] Jesus' battles with demons and the "strong man" saying of Mark 3.27 are read in the light of the DW motif,[195] as is the appointing of the twelve in 3.13 – 19.[196] Similarly, the storm-stilling in 4.35-41 is understood via an appeal to Isa 51.9-11, while the ensuing "Legion" exorcism is interpreted in the light of God's warrior-like intervention at the Exodus deliverance.[197] The Markan accounts of Jesus' transfiguration,[198] triumphal entry,[199] crucifixion,[200] and the Son of Man's coming in the clouds,[201] are also thought to have been influenced by the DW motif.

Longman and Reid's work is interesting, though in places their conclusions fail to convince.[202] For instance, the claim that Jesus' baptism represents the anointing of the DW lacks clear textual evidence since a rather generic appeal to the hymn in Isa 42.10 – 13 (on the basis of the putative allusion to Isa 42.1 in Mark 1.11) will not do. Again, the styling of the Markan temptation scene as "the warrior tested" requires further justification.[203] Finally, while there is truth in the assertion that Jesus' appointing of the twelve has been overlooked within the context of the Exodus/Conquest motif of the Twelve tribes as twelve military divisions, a fuller proposal needs to be worked out on

[192] For anti-Roman undertones in Mark 5.1-20 see, Myers 1988: 190-194; Marcus 1999: 351-352; Horsley 2003: 100-103, and Chapter 4, pp. 179-181, below.
[193] Longman III and Reid 1995: 27.
[194] Longman III and Reid 1995: 92 – 97.
[195] Longman III and Reid 1995: 98 – 100; 110 – 112.
[196] Longman III and Reid 1995: 103.
[197] Longman III and Reid 1995: 114, 116.
[198] Longman III and Reid 1995: 119 – 120.
[199] Longman III and Reid 1995: 121 – 124.
[200] Longman III and Reid 1995: 129 – 135.
[201] Longman III and Reid 1995: 125 – 128.
[202] Angel (2006: 28-29) finds it "suggestive" but lacking demonstration.
[203] Longman III and Reid (1995: 97) appeal to the warrior-nature of angels in OT and Second Temple texts, and correctly infer that in Mark 1.13 the angels are more than "emissaries of heavenly hospitality". However, in the light of the tendency to view this pericope as reflective of an Isaianic *Urzeit wird Endzeit* new creation theme, further argument is necessary to establish the conflictive nature of the scene as Mark presents it.

the basis of a possible allusion to the census in Numbers 1 and related passages in order to establish the influence of the DW motif here.[204]

In Andrew Angel's survey of the Hebrew *Chaoskampf* Tradition a key text is Mark 13.24-27.[205] Here the evangelist purportedly draws on DW imagery by loosely quoting Isa 13.10, 34.4, both of which are lifted from DW hymns.[206] Enlarging on the consensus that Mark 13.26 quotes Dan 7.13, Angel's exegesis considers the redactional μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς. Since in its LXX usage (e.g. Isa 36.2; 1 Macc 7.10, 11, 9.60, 11.63, 12.24, 42, 13.12) this phrase always means "a great force" or "a large army", Angel takes it as a reference to the heavenly host.[207] Given that the Son of Man leads the heavenly host and since the leader of the heavenly host in the OT is God the DW, Mark identifies the Danielic Son of Man with the DW and God himself. In 13.27, therefore, the Son of Man (as DW) sends out the angels to gather the elect.[208] Thus, for Angel, in 13.24-27 three verses from the Hebrew *Chaoskampf* Tradition are combined which with the Markan reference to the heavenly host recall the traditional image of God as warrior, marching with the heavenly army heralded by celestial portents.[209]

There are, however, some difficulties with Angel's syllogistic solution. Central to the argument is the understanding that the phrase μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς ("with a large force/army") denotes the heavenly host. However, Angel acknowledges in response to Fletcher-Louis that this phrase always occurs in the LXX in reference to a *human* army, thus it is not obvious why the phrase should now be read in terms of the heavenly host.[210] If a heavenly army is not meant, this rather changes the complexion of the Markan pericope, and the suggestion is that it probably refers to the Roman army which sacked Jerusalem in 70 CE.[211] While certain OT texts might imply the notion that God as DW can advance with the Israelite army (e.g. Judg 5.4-5 with 5.13 cf. 5.23; Ps 110.3-5),[212] notwithstanding examples supplied by Angel to show that occasionally Jewish authorities may be identified with chaos forces (*1QH* 10.12-16, 27-28, 14.22-25; *T. Jud.* 21.6-9), the

[204] Longman III and Reid 1995: 103.
[205] Angel 2006: 125 – 134.
[206] Angel 2006: 127.
[207] Angel 2006: 127 – 128.
[208] Angel 2006: 131.
[209] Angel 2006: 129.
[210] Angel 2006: 127 n. 160.
[211] Angel 2006: 127 n. 160, 132-134.
[212] On this and holy warfare as "synergism" see Miller 1973: 156.

idea that the *DW* should march against Jerusalem with a *foreign* army is unprecedented in the traditions.[213]

Dominic Rudman argues that the synoptic accounts of the crucifixion (*in casu* Mark 15.33-39) have been influenced by OT *Chaoskampf* typology.[214] For Rudman, Jesus' crucifixion is expressed literally as *Chaoskampf* though here the powers of chaos are victorious. He associates the darkness with chaos, reads the rending of the Temple veil as symbolic of the rending of creation, and interprets Jesus' death as the death of a creator figure (4.35-41 is read in terms of creation's triumph over chaos).[215]

While Rudman's suggestion is interesting, his conclusions are unconvincing. Rudman provides no compelling reason for associating the darkness in the synoptic crucifixion scenes with the *Chaoskampf*. That Jesus' death represents the death of a creator figure seems speculative, and Mark 4.35-41 need not necessarily be interpreted in terms of "creation's triumph over chaos". The idea that the rending of the Temple veil is suggestive of the rending of creation might be nearer the mark, but if so, this is no longer *Chaoskampf*. A more fruitful line of enquiry might be to investigate the possible association of the Markan crucifixion scene with Jesus' battle against demonic forces, where the divine conflict myth is in the background (see chapter 4 of this work).

Finally, following Richard Bauckham, Kent Brower has offered an article examining the question of Jesus' "divine identity" in Mark, paying particular attention to 4.35-41; 5.1-20, within a wider consideration of 4.35-5.43.[216] Brower suggests that 4.35-41 has parallels in Ps 44.23 (Ps 43.24 LXX), Ps 107.23-29 (Ps. 106.23-29 LXX); and Ps. 89.8-10, 18 (Ps. 88.9-11, 19 LXX), but fails to spell out in more detail the probable or *de facto* verbal links from the respective Greek texts.[217] In relation to Jesus' rebuke (ἐπετίμησεν) of the wind in Mark 4.39, Brower points out pertinent OT parallels (i.e. Ps 106. 9 (105.9 LXX) Isa 27.1; 51.9; Job 9.13, 26.12; Ps 89.9-10; 74.13). However, these OT texts belonging to the HDWT refer to God's rebuke of the sea or chaos monsters, whereas strictly speaking Jesus *rebukes* the wind. Brower fails to explain this

[213] Angel (2006: 134) recognises this.
[214] Rudman 2003: 102 – 107.
[215] Rudman 2003: 107.
[216] Brower 2009: 291-305. Brower (2009: 291 n. 4) mentions a lecture given by Bauckham in Cambridge on December 11, 2008, entitled "Divine Identity in Mark" where, among other texts, Mark 4.35-41 was discussed as part of an unpublished paper.
[217] Brower 2009: 295.

discrepancy, which potentially diminishes the purchase of the suggested parallels, particularly since the wind/storm wind is part of the armoury of God as DW in these very traditions (Exod 15.8, 10; Job 26.13; Zech 9.14; Isa 29.6; Wis 5.23).

On occasion, Brower makes some unsubstantiated claims. Thus, it is asserted that in Mark 4.35-41 Jesus displays "a certain self-awareness" by insisting on the night-crossing and that he seemingly "expects conflict", but neither statement gains support from the text.[218] Overall, though Brower's reflections on 4.35-41; 5.1-20 are highly relevant to this thesis a more detailed exegesis is desirable, particularly since Brower's conclusion, that Jesus shares the unique identity of God but is not God's agent, is more asserted than properly demonstrated.[219]

2.4. Conclusion to Chapter 2

Chapter 2 has introduced the HDWT against their ANE background. Criteria have been set out, against which OT/Second Temple texts may be weighed, in order to establish whether or not they belong within these traditions. Examples of OT texts belonging to the HDWT were presented and discussed, and Second Temple texts were briefly considered in the light of Angel's comprehensive study on the traditions in the period 515 BCE – 200 CE. Since divine warrior imagery/terminology appears in late Second Temple works (e.g. Rev 13.1-8, *4 Ezra* 6.49-52) it is clear that these traditions were live at the time when Mark was written. Studies propounding arguments for the influence of these traditions in Markan texts were considered above, paving the way for the next chapters of this thesis which will examine the possible influence of the HDWT on the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms with recourse to the same criteria established in this chapter.

Whereas scholars such as P.B. Duff have traced divine warrior traditions to the Gospel of Mark on the basis, primarily, of formal traditions, the enquiry in the ensuing chapters will proceed along the lines set out in this and the previous chapter. Thus, the extent to which Mark has drawn on divine warrior traditions in his portrayal of the sea-miracles and exorcisms will be evaluated with reference to the five criteria delineated

[218] Brower 2009: 295.
[219] Brower 2009: 305.

above: (1) Traditional imagery (2) Characteristic terminology (3) Parallel texts (4) Appropriate referent (5) Similar form, where the use of imagery and terminology belonging to the HDWT are judged to be the key criterions. If it can be demonstrated that Mark draws on divine warrior imagery and terminology such as is found in OT/Second Temple texts belonging to the traditions, and especially if he cites or alludes to particular DW texts (cf. the definition of "allusion" and "echo" in Chapter 1, pp. 64-66), then the hypothesis that Mark draws on divine warrior traditions in his portrayal of Jesus will stand.

If then, it can be shown that Mark draws on these traditions in his portrayal of Jesus, this again raises the question of how exactly Jesus' identity should be understood. If Mark intends to depict Jesus in the role of God the DW attributing to Jesus the status and operations of the DW, then assuming the line and idiom of Brower and Bauckham, there could be indications that Mark's Jesus is to be understood to *share* the "divine identity".[220] An alternative route would be to think in terms of Hurtado's category of "binitarian". Thus if it can be clearly shown that Mark's Jesus takes on the role and status of God the DW but also insists on a monotheistic agenda, then, Hurtado's category - where Jewish monotheism is modified but not to the point that it entails apotheosis (i.e. the worship of a separate second divine being) – might provide the most appropriate form for comprehending Markan Christology.[221]

However, the same evidence might be interpreted in different ways. If Mark's Jesus is granted the operations and authority that are the prerogative of God in his role as the DW, then as A.Y. Collins and Joel Marcus seem to suggest, Jesus might also be thought of as a divine agent, i.e. an essentially human figure endowed with a mediator's role and a special status as the chosen go-between of God, occasionally seeming "divine" on account of his *proximity* to God.[222] Again, given the prevalence and prominence of principal agent figures in Second Temple Jewish literature, and since (as discussed above) divine attributes are sometimes said to be transferred to such figures there remains the possibility that Mark views Jesus as the incarnation of God's "Wisdom" or "Word" or as

[220] On this see Brower 2009: 291-305.
[221] See, e.g., Hurtado 2004: 100.
[222] See, e.g., Collins 2007: 44-48, 94; Marcus 1999: 148, 222-223.

some form of principal angel figure.[223] The latter possibility perhaps gains support insofar as Michael, chief of angels according to *1 En.* 9.1, can appear as a great warrior angel fighting on behalf of God and God's people, commissioned by God (e.g. *1QM* 17.6-8; *1 En.* 10.11-13, 24.6 cf. Dan 12.1). Thus, however strange it may seem to those nurtured within mainstream Christian traditions, the possibility that Mark has come to his christological understanding of Jesus on these analogies is real. The further, more extreme possibility that Mark actually views Jesus as a principal angel figure, must be kept open at this stage.[224]

[223] On "Wisdom" in this connection, see, e.g. Ben Witherington 2001: 221; on "Logos" in connection with Pauline and Johannine statements about Jesus see, e.g. Thyssen 2006: 167-168; on principal angels/angel Christology in this connection see, e.g. Sullivan 2004: 116; Carrell 1997: 63.
[224] See, however, Chapter 1, p. 10, n. 32 concerning the Markan Jesus' humanity.

CHAPTER 3

THE INFLUENCE OF DIVINE WARRIOR TRADITIONS ON THE MARKAN SEA MIRACLES (4.35-41/6.45-52) WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR CHRISTOLOGY

(3.1) Introduction

In this chapter I will study the two well-known Markan sea miracles (4.35-41; 6.45-52) sometimes termed "sea-epiphanies",[1] in order to establish the extent to which Mark draws on the HDWT in his presentation of these texts. Each story will be briefly set in context. Following the methodological procedures outlined in chapters 1 and 2, the Markan stories will be scrutinised in order to establish whether and to what extent the evangelist draws on imagery and terminology belonging to the HDWT. I will endeavour to demonstrate that in Mark 4.35-41 and 6.45-52, the evangelist likens Jesus to God/Yahweh the DW, a figure familiar to OT and Second Temple texts. Once both sea-miracles have been examined, the findings of the enquiry will be checked against the question matrix outlined in chapter 1, in order to determine whether answers to christological questions are forthcoming.

(3.2). Mark 4.35-41

(a). Text

> *35* And he said to them on that day as it became evening, 'Let's cross over to the other side.' *36* And leaving the crowd, the disciples took him in the boat, just as he was, and other boats were with him. *37* And there came a great storm of wind and the waves came over into the boat, so that it was already starting to fill. *38* But he was in the stern, his head upon a cushion, sleeping. And they roused him and said to him 'Teacher, do you not care that we are being destroyed?' *39* And Jesus awoke, rebuked the wind and said to the sea 'Silence! Be muzzled!' And the wind ceased and there came a great calm. *40* And he said to them 'Why are you so cowardly? Do you not yet have faith?' *41* And they feared with a great fear and said to one another, 'Who is this therefore, that even the wind and the sea obey him?'[2]

[1] Heil (1981: 8) defines the "epiphany genre" as "a sudden and unexpected manifestation of a divine or heavenly being experienced by certain selected persons, in which the divine being reveals a divine attribute, action or message". Subsequently, Heil (1981: 17) asserts the "epiphanic" character of Mark 4.35-41 and 6.45-52. Several commentators read both as epiphanies, e.g. Dibelius 1933: 71, 93-94; Collins 2007: 258-259; 334-335; Guelich 1987: 270, 346. However, some take 6.45-52 as an epiphany (e.g. Boring 2006: 189; Marcus 1999: 429), but apparently not 4.35-41.

[2] Similar to RSV and NRSV the opening καὶ in v.38 is taken as an adversative conjunction ("but"); and the closing καὶ in v.41 as an intensive ("even"), contra Collins 2007: 257.

(b). 4.35-41 within the wider Markan context

In Mark 1, the evangelist supplies the reader with information regarding the identity of Jesus. Thus, the baptismal scene presents Jesus as God's "beloved son" (1.11), whom, in the temptation, is served by angels (1.13). In keeping with John's statement (1.7), as herald of the Kingdom of God (1.15), Jesus is an extraordinarily powerful preacher (1.22) with incomparable authority (1.27). Indeed, the teaching and exorcism in the synagogue at Capernaum raise the Markan question concerning Jesus' identity. Whereas demons appear knowledgeable concerning Jesus (1.24), the bewildered villagers question, τί ἐστιν τοῦτο; (1.27). The subsequent report of miscellaneous healings and exorcisms (1.34) further confirms Jesus' extraordinary prowess as the charismatic "Son".

In Mark 2, the identity question is again taken up explicitly. Central to the healing of the paralytic (2.1-12) is the questioning of the scribes who judge that Jesus commits blasphemy by making himself equal to God (2.7). Further questions (2.16, 18) pertain to the nature of Jesus' activities, implicitly raising the issue of his identity. Again, the sabbath controversy in Mark 2.23-28 concerns Jesus' identity insofar as Jesus ostensibly compares himself to David, announcing in self-reference, (ὥστε) κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου (2.28).

In Mark 3, human opposition to Jesus intensifies. After a sabbath healing (3.1-6) the Pharisees and Herodians conspire to kill Jesus (3.6). The local or regional opposition evident here and in Mark 2 gains a "national" hue when *Jerusalem* scribes accuse Jesus of being in league with Beelzebul (3.22). Again, with manifest irony, the issue of Jesus' identity is focal, for the unclean spirits acknowledge, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (3.11), and Jesus commissions the twelve to exorcise demons (3.14-15), whereas Jesus' enemies claim, πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει (3.30). Again, Jesus' family seem troubled by his actions and their symbolic import (3.21).[3] Mark's Jesus in turn makes a subversive statement

[3] Seldom pointed out, the allegation reported in Mark 3.21 that Jesus was ἐξέστη "out of his mind" has as its probable referent Jesus' appointment of the twelve on the mountaintop (3.13-19). This detail suggests that for Mark, those who witnessed Jesus' action realised its symbolic import, on which see e.g. Marcus 1999: 266-267. What precisely triggers the crowd's negative reaction is debatable, since in 3.13-19 Jesus

about family (3.35) which seemingly points back to his special identity as God's "Son" (1.11).

The "parable section" (4.1-34) which provides the immediate background to the first sea-miracle, is sometimes treated as a self-contained narrative unit.[4] Whether or not 4.1-34 and 4.35-41 were originally juxtaposed in Mark's tradition (both views are possible), in its final Markan form, the parable section is linked both to the foregoing and subsequent narrative plot.[5] Thus, the "insiders"/"outsiders" contrast (4.10-12; 34) is thematically related to events described in the preceding chapter with the "appointment" and commissioning of the twelve ("insiders"), scribal opposition and the controversy involving Jesus' family ("outsiders").[6] Equally, the double temporal clause in Mark 4.35 ("On that day, when evening had come") establishes continuity between Jesus' teaching (4.1-34) and his overcoming a powerful threatening force (4.35-41). This sequential arrangement is foreshadowed to some extent by events in the Capernaum synagogue, where Jesus first teaches then overcomes a demon (1.21-27). Again, the disciples' lack of faith exposed by Jesus' question in Mark 4.40 (οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν;) complements their lack of understanding, exposed by Jesus' question in 4.13 (οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε;). These questions occur in adjacent passages with a similar theme. In both cases Jesus exposes the disciples' lack of understanding.

The parable section, therefore, takes up and develops the Markan portrait of Jesus as herald of the Kingdom of God (1.15) and authoritative teacher (1.27). It does so in response to growing controversy surrounding Jesus' true identity (especially 3.22-27), and to some extent answers critics who are "outsiders" and afflicted with spiritual blindness.[7] The parable of the sower and the disciples' sluggish perception of the nature of the Kingdom of God (and indeed of the parable genre in 4.13), properly introduces the theme of non-comprehension/comprehension and of spiritual blindness/sight, developed

might be understood to be setting himself up as a new Moses, or possibly as acting like God himself, constituting a new Israel (cf. Henderson 2006: 79-80). Either way, the Markan identity motif dominates the narrative.

[4] Collins 2007: 239-242.

[5] See Achtemeier 1970: 275.

[6] See Watts 1997: 199-205.

[7] Watts 1997: 208-210.

in coming chapters (e.g. 8.22-26 cf. 27-30; 10.46-52), which is intimately connected with the perception of Jesus' true identity and mission.[8]

Notably, Mark 4.35-41 is also closely linked to the exorcism of the Gerasene demoniac (5.1-20).[9] In Mark 5.1 the topographical ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, picks up the thread of 4.35 (διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν). Whereas in 4.36 Jesus enters the boat, in 5.2 he alights.[10] At a deeper rhetorical level, the Markan identity motif which reappears in the poignant question of the disciples τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν (4.41), receives an answer from a supernatural source when the demoniac identifies Jesus as "Son of God" declaring, υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (5.7).

Mark 4.35-41, then, is located within a series of events which, without excluding other related themes (e.g. discipleship; Kingdom of God), acquire a Markan shape that repeatedly raises the underlying issue of Jesus' identity. In the following analysis, 4.35-41 will be examined as a component of the larger narrative discourse unit, where the latter, on a standard division may be taken to mean the first half of the Gospel, i.e. 1.1-8.26.[11] Further to the working hypothesis outlined in Chapter 1, the question of Jesus' identity in Mark 4.35-41 will be considered in specific regard to the possible influence of DW traditions on this text. As explained in Chapter 1, the nature of this enquiry is "final form," drawing on the tools of narrative criticism. The aim, then, is to discern the Markan meaning of the events described in 4.35-41, where issues concerning historicity and prehistory in the tradition are not an immediate concern.

An exhaustive treatment of the text and all the attendant critical issues is beyond the current remit.[12] Rather, the discussion will be limited to the examination of particular words, phrases and images which might comprise evidence either for or against the influence of the HDWT on Mark 4.35-41. As such, it will be necessary to evaluate possible citations or allusions to OT/Second Temple texts, whether belonging particularly to the HDWT or otherwise. The evaluative procedure corresponds to that outlined in

[8] See e.g. Watts 1997: 239-247; Malbon 2009: 37.
[9] See further Chapter 4, section 4.4 (b), pp. 176-177.
[10] Collins 2007: 265.
[11] Though there is no consensus regarding the structure of Mark, at its most basic level the gospel may be divided bipartitely (1.1-8.26: Jesus' ministry in Galilee; 8.27-16.8: the road to and events in Jerusalem), though a further "way" section is often identified (8.27-10.52). Beyond this, commentators find further subsections, see, e.g. Guelich 1989: xxxvi (with references); Marcus 1999: 62-64. Cf. Matera 1982: 2; Kingsbury 1983: 50-51; Bayer 2012: 21.
[12] For a spectrum of critical issues, see e.g. Guelich 1989: 259-271; Collins 2007: 257-263.

chapters 1 and 2, thus, it will gauge factors such as the strength of verbal parallels, conceptual coherence, syntactical arrangement, and factors pertaining to the semantic range of a specific term.

For methodological ease, attention will focus initially on details relating to the staging of the story, then, under separate subheadings, the story proper and its denouement. In order to delineate the present approach from previous treatments, where pertinent, the following discussion will assess the hypothetical possibility and plausibility of alleged connections with the HDWT suggested in other treatments, with recourse to the procedure outlined in Chapter 1. With regard to the five criteria established in Chapter 2, if it can be demonstrated that Mark uses imagery and terminology from the HDWT in 4.35-41, then a further step will be required to draw out the possible implications for the focal issue of Jesus' identity with reference to the question matrix supplied in Chapter 1.

(c). Analysis of 4.35-41 investigating the possible influence of the Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions

(i) The setting of the story in relation to the HDWT

The physical setting of the first Markan sea-miracle is anticipated in the report in 4.1 that Jesus "sat on the sea" (καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ). It has been alleged in relation to Mark 4.1 that "biblically literate readers" might recall the image in Ps 29.3, 10 of God enthroned over chaos waters.[13] Psalm 29 is generally thought to be a DW hymn somewhat influenced by Canaanite Baal hymnody.[14] Therefore, if Mark intends an allusion to Ps 29, the backdrop to 4.35-41 might be understood as an allusive text in terms of this mythology. However, the correspondence between the Markan phraseology and the wording of the relevant Septuagint passages is minimal, (Ps 28.3, κύριος ἐπὶ ὑδάτω; Ps 28.10, κύριος τὸν κατακλυσμὸν κατοικιεῖ καὶ καθίεται κύριος βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, as opposed to Mark 4.1 καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ). Furthermore, since Ps 29 has neither a sea stilling nor a rescue element, it seems unlikely that Mark intends a specific allusion

[13] Marcus 1999: 291. Conversely, Mark 4.1 might equally recall Ezek 28.2 MT, where the king of Tyre is rebuked for conceitedly setting himself up as a god sitting "in the heart of the seas".
[14] Cross 1973: 151-157; Day 1985: 57-60. Cf. the nuanced discussion in Chapter 2, pp. 98-99.

to Ps 29 here, and in the absence of other connections with this psalm (here or elsewhere in Mark) the presence even of an *echo* seems improbable.

More generally, it has been argued that in Mark, ἡ θάλασσα (three occurrences in 4.1 and one in 4.39) has inherent mythological connotations, where chaos associations surrounding "sea" are allegedly presupposed.[15] This view fails to reckon with Markan texts in which the word "sea" does not have obvious mythological connotations, i.e. where it is employed straightforwardly as a locale (1.16; 2.13; 3.7; 5.21; 7.31). However, at points in Mark, there is a *de facto* association of ἡ θάλασσα with the demonic/supernatural and death/destruction (e.g. 5.13; 6.49; 9.42; 11.23). In such texts it is probable that for Mark's readers the term would have evoked mythological traditions.[16] Since, as will be discussed below, the sea is personified in Mark 4.39, insofar as Jesus commands the sea, πεφίμωσο "be muzzled!" as if it were a monstrous and/or demonic creature (1.25, cf. Luke 4.35), it is probable that a mythological HDWT meaning for "sea" obtains in 4.35-41.[17]

Moving from topography to chronology, Mark 4.35-41 is introduced in 4.35 by the double temporal marker (ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὀψίας γενομένης). While the phrase ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ has been taken eschatologically in connection with *Chaoskampf* against the background of Isa 27.1 LXX, this reading is unlikely for the reasons given previously.[18] Rather, the temporal statement supplies a natural link between 4.1-34 and 4.35-41, providing the reader with a sense of basic chronological sequence.

On the other hand, there may be deeper significance in the rare phrase ὀψίας γενομένης, ("as it became evening/late"), which suggests the approach or setting in of darkness.[19] In biblical literature, with the exception of Matt 16.2 where the text is uncertain,[20] the phrase occurs only in Mark (4.35; 6.47; 14.17; 15.42).[21] The first two

[15] Malbon 1984: 375-376, cf. Boring 2006 : 143.
[16] Nineham 1968: 146; cf. Mauser 1963: 127; Boring 2006: 58.
[17] Similarly, Marcus 1999: 337.
[18] McCurley 1983: 60, see Chapter 2, p. 106.
[19] BDAG 746, designates the phrase "in the evening," but notes that it can refer to the period immediately prior to or subsequent to sundown.
[20] NA[27] gives the words in brackets and only a (D) rating. Cf. Madden 1997: 99 n. 62.
[21] The similar phrase ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης (BDAG 746: "when evening came") is slightly less rare, occurring only in the NT in Matt 8.16; 14.15; 14.23; 20.8; 26.20; 27.57; Mark 1.32. On the whole, these Matthean references parallel Mark's use of ὀψίας γενομένης, and for Matthew also the phrase may have symbolic connotations. Thus, the following texts may be matched, Matt 14.23/Mark 6.47; Matt 26.20/Mark 14.17; Matt 27.57/Mark 15.42. In Matt 8.16 ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης is somewhat parallel to the same phrase in Mark 1.32, since both are summary statements reporting Jesus' healing of the sick/demon possessed; however,

occurrences set the scene in the respective sea-miracles (4.35; 6.47), the latter two bracket Jesus' death, for Mark 14.17 prefaces Jesus' revelation that one among the disciples will betray him, and 15.42 prefaces the confirmation of Jesus' death and the ensuing burial (15.42-46). Both sea miracles contain an element of threat (explicit in 4.35-41, implicit in 6.45-52),[22] and both 14.17 and 15.42 directly concern the death of Jesus. Therefore, it is reasonable to infer that for Mark, approaching night/darkness is to some extent symbolic of evil/death.[23]

In terms of criteria 1 and 2 (Traditional imagery and Characteristic terminology) since "evening"/"darkness" do not rank among the characteristically prominent terms/images of the HDWT catalogued in Chapter 2 of this thesis, the straightforward equation of "darkness" and *Chaoskampf* seems unwarranted.[24] Nevertheless, as mentioned above, in their respective contexts, three Markan texts which contain the phrase ὀψίας γενομένης concern a threat to life, and the fourth directly concerns the death of Jesus (cf. "darkness" reigning in Luke 22.53). Thus, insofar as the phrase ὀψίας

---

the expression in Matt 8.16 also sets the chronological frame for the first sea-miracle (Matt 8.23-27) and is thus equivalent to Mark 4.35 ὀψίας γενομένης. In Matt 14.15, ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης prefaces the feeding miracle (cf. the Markan phrase καὶ ἤδη ὥρα πολλή (6.35) and the similar notion ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρῆλθεν (Matt 14.15). Here the Matthean ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης might signal a mere temporal marker, with no deeper significance intended. On the other hand the topography is described ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος (Matt 14.15), in the light of the biblical understanding of "desert" as a place of danger (see e.g., Mauser 1963: 21-23) the phrase could have a symbolic nuance heightening the sense of the multitude's vulnerability, in anticipation of God's timely provision through Jesus. In Matt 20.8, ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης is ostensibly a mere temporal marker, so while the phrase may have symbolic overtones in Matthew this is not exclusively the case.

[22] That Mark 6.45-52 should be read (in part) as a "rescue" story, containing an element of threat see, e.g., Lane 1974:237; Heil 1981: 17; Guelich 1989: 346-347; Hooker 1991: 170; Collins 2007: 328 (though the "storm rescue" connection is played down in 333-334).

[23] Contra Gundry (1993: 244) who misses the strategic placement of this phrase in Mark. For a similar symbolic notion see, Luke 22.53, cf. n. 25.

[24] Contra Rudman (2003: 105) who associates Chaos with the dark realm of Sheol, appealing to texts such as Jonah 2.3-6, Ps 69.2-3. On the other hand, Watson (e.g. 2006: 90) argues these very texts refer to Sheol as opposed to Chaos! Gunkel (1895: 69) notes how in Ps 18.6-18 two *distinct* conceptual fields combine, namely, the descent of an individual into subterranean waters as an "image of extreme peril of death" (e.g. Jonah 2; Ps 59 [an error – Ps 69 is meant]), and the theophany of the DW. Again, in *1QH* 11.9-18 there is specific mention of "Sheol" (v. 9 cf. v. 16) in direct relation to the HDWT images of the watery abyss and the roaring chaos waters (on which see Angel 2006: 44-50), but "darkness/night" does not feature. That the HDWT can occasionally incorporate the notion of "darkness/night" is suggested by Job 3.8 where, in the context of that chapter, Leviathan is associated with the dark/night, cf. Ps 91.5. Again, "sons of darkness" is a standard epithet for the demonic army of Satan in the War Scroll (e.g. *1QM* 1.1; 13.16; 14.17), and Satan's domain is said to be "in dark[ness]" (*1QM* 13.11). In *1En* 10.4 the Lord commands Raphael bind Azaz'el and cast him into "the darkness". Again, Eph 6.11-17 does combine images from the HDWT with the notion of "darkness" (v. 12) associated with supernatural evil powers.

γενομένης suggests the setting in of darkness introducing a note of foreboding in Mark 4.35, it is conducive to a chaos motif.[25]

(ii) The development of the story in relation to the HDWT

In the preceding section, it was suggested that the Markan scene of a personified stormy threatening "sea" most probably evokes the mythological image of the hostile sea/waters which are the enemy of God and his people in the HDWT (e.g. Ps 65.8; 89.10; 104.7; Nah 1.4; Job 7.12, 9.8; cf. Rev 21.1). The main evidence for the influence of the HDWT on Mark 4.35-41 emerges as the story develops in 4.37-41. Mark apparently "bookends" 4.37-39 with initial and final boundary markers καὶ γίνεται λαῖλαψ μεγάλη (4.37a)/ καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη (4.39b), where a similar syntactical pattern/wording (καὶ + verb γίνομαι + nominative, feminine noun + μεγάλη) with opposite meaning form an inclusio around these verses such that Jesus' miraculous stilling of the storm becomes the centrepiece of the story.[26]

The term λαῖλαψ in Mark 4.37 has been linked to Job 38.1 LXX, where God appears in the whirlwind in a manner broadly reminiscent of the theophany of the DW (Isa 29.6; Zech 9.14; cf. Wis 5.23 and 5.14).[27] However, *prima facie* the proposed parallel appears unsound, since in Mark 4.39 Jesus rebukes the "wind", such that it is hardly a positive element of a divine theophany.[28] A closer parallel, at least verbally, is Jer 32.32 LXX (Jer 25.32). Besides Mark 4.37, Jer 32.32 LXX is the only biblical text which contains the couplet λαῖλαψ μεγάλη. This degree of *exclusivity* in terms of the verbal parallel makes it a distinct possibility that Mark may be quoting or alluding to the Jeremiah text. Admitting, then, the possibility of a *de facto* parallel, Jer 32.32 LXX must now be examined more closely.

Jeremiah 25.30-31, a war oracle referring to the advent of God, contains characteristic imagery of the DW "roaring" and overcoming enemies.[29] In Jer 25.32-33 MT, (Jer 32.32-33 LXX) the divine pronouncement continues the thought of the

[25] More nuanced than the view of Rudman (2003: 102-107), who too readily subsumes darkness within a *Chaoskampf* motif, is that of Guelich (1989: 264), who finds that contextually the "topos of nightfall" taken with the stormy sea functions as "an intensification of the chaos motif".
[26] Similarly, on these literary patterns, see Gundry 1993: 239-241.
[27] Collins 2007: 259. On the connection of Job 38.1 with the theophany of the DW, see, Cross 1973: 169-170.
[28] Contra Collins 2007: 259.
[29] Cross 1973: 170 n. 99; Lundbom 2004: 272.

preceding oracle. In line with the sense of the Hebrew, the phrase λαῖλαψ μεγάλη is often taken with the ensuing description of the destruction of the nations in Jer 32.33 LXX, wherein the storm wind represents the instrument of God's wrath against the nations.[30] However, a different reading is possible. In Jer 32.32b LXX, the λαῖλαψ μεγάλη which goes forth (ἐκπορεύεται – present middle 3rd. singular) from the ends of the earth (ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς) could parallel the preceding clause, where evil is said to "come from nation to nation" ἔρχεται (present middle 3rd. singular) ἀπὸ ἔθνους ἐπὶ ἔθνος. In this case, λαῖλαψ μεγάλη would refer figuratively to the hostile nations (or their wicked activity),[31] in a manner congruous with the use of the image of the wind in *1QH* 10.27; *1QH* 14.23; cf. *T. Jud.* 21.9.[32]

While the latter reading perhaps misapprehends the original sense of the text in terms of authorial intention (i.e. the verse originally envisaged God's judgment of the nations rather than the cause of that judgement), it is, nevertheless, a viable reading of the Greek. If the going forth of "evil" is taken to refer to the wicked activity of the nations then, especially given the corresponding verb forms ἔρχεται and ἐκπορεύεται, the λαῖλαψ μεγάλη would stand in parallel relation with the term κακὰ. There is no doubt that in the Markan context the λαῖλαψ μεγάλη is a life-threatening inimical force which Jesus subdues. Thus, if 4.37 does contain an allusion to Jer 32.32 LXX, it seems likely that the evangelist has taken the phrase λαῖλαψ μεγάλη as a hostile force, which, in the LXX is parallel with the evil nations. Since other Second Temple texts (e.g. *1QH* 10.27; *1QH* 14.23; cf. *T. Jud.* 21.9) rework HDWT imagery such that the elements become part of the inimical manifestation of chaos, it is comprehensible that Mark might read the imagery this way. Thus, in terms of our criterion 2 which concerns characteristic terminology, the use of Jer 32.32 LXX λαῖλαψ μεγάλη in Mark 4.37 is one possible instance in which the evangelist probably draws on the vocabulary and imagery of the HDWT in the crafting of his story.

Turning to Mark 4.38-39, here the use of language appears to establish a contrast between Jesus and the disciples. In 4.38 the evangelist deploys verbs in the historic

[30] On the Hebrew, see Holladay 1986: 681; Stulman 2005: 228-229; Allen 2008: 291; Lalleman 2013: 205-206.
[31] Lundbom (2004: 274) notes that Duhm concluded the verse referred to one nation attacking another, an interpretation previously rejected by Calvin (and rejected by Lundbom).
[32] While this imagery is seemingly rare, in the HDWT inimical foreign nations are frequently likened to chaos waters (e.g. Pss 46.2-3 with 6; 65.7; Isa 17.12-13; *1QH* 10.12-16; *1QH* 10.27-28) and *mutatis mutandis* a similar meaning is apparently intended here.

present (καθεύδων; ἐγείρουσιν; λέγουσιν; μέλει; ἀπολλύμεθα) apparently to convey a sense of dramatic urgency. In 4.39, with the exception of the present active and perfect passive imperatives (σιώπα, πεφίμωσο), the aorist tense governs the verbal sequence (διεγερθεὶς; ἐπετίμησεν; εἶπεν; ἐκόπασεν; ἐγένετο).[33] This verbal shift in 4.38-39 signals the transition from the disciples' perspective to that of Jesus, and marks out Jesus from them.

Certainly, the desperate plea of the storm tossed panic-stricken disciples contrasts with the image of the sleeping Jesus. It has even been suggested that Mark's depiction of Jesus in 4.38 hints at the dormant deity figure familiar to ANE divine warrior myths.[34] This hypothesis, as discussed previously, is distinctly improbable and may be dispensed with.[35] Nevertheless, since Mark 4.38 + par. is the only instance in the NT where Jesus is described as actually sleeping, it is possible that at a rhetorical level some other form of underlying typological motif may be operative.[36]

In this vein, it has been observed that the general narrative shape of Mark 4.35-41 recalls Jonah 1, with its departure by boat, storm, sleeping protagonist, terrified sailors, miraculous stilling and awestruck sailors.[37] Moreover, Mark may draw on the actual vocabulary of Jonah 1.5-6 LXX, (compare Jonah 1.5-6, ἐφοβήθησαν/ἐκάθευδεν/ ἀπολώμεθα with 4.41 ἐφοβήθησαν; 4.38 ἀπολλύμεθα/ καθεύδων).[38] Again, 4.41 "they feared a great fear" (ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν) uses the same idiom as Jonah 1.16 LXX (ἐφοβήθησαν οἱ ἄνδρες φόβῳ μεγάλῳ).[39] Finally, in Mark 4.39 the subsiding of the wind (ἐκόπασεν) uses the same verb applied to the calming of the sea in Jonah 1.11-12 LXX (on which term see further below).[40] Thus, there is a strong possibility that Mark 4.35-41 draws on the language of the Septuagint version of the Jonah story, which, as discussed in Chapter 2, has associations with the HDWT.[41]

---

[33] On the nuances of the Greek verbal system see, e.g., Köstenberger & Patterson 2011: 582.
[34] Batto 1987; 1992: 180. Collins 2007: 259; Marcus 1999: 338. Cf. Mrozek & Votto (1999: 415 – 419) for a more nuanced treatment of the sleeping divine figure in ancient Mesopotamian, Babylonian and Sumerian mythology in relation to OT texts. Horsley (2001: 105) rejects the view that Mark 4.35-41 appeals to such ANE myths.
[35] Cf. Chapter 2, p. 105-106.
[36] Ben Witherington 2001: 175. Guelich (1989: 266) briefly surveys major scholars' conjectures regarding the possible nuances of Jesus' sleeping.
[37] Marcus 1999: 337 following Cope 1976: 96 – 97.
[38] Collins 2007: 259; Ben Witherington 2001: 175-6; Boring 2006: 143.
[39] Marcus 1999: 334, cf. 336.
[40] Marcus 1999: 334.
[41] See Chapter 2, p. 90.

This, however, is not to suggest that 4.35-41 operates straightforwardly in terms of a Jesus-Jonah typology.[42] Whereas Jonah is non-compliant, (Jonah 1.3), Mark's Jesus is God's beloved and favoured son (1.11). In Jonah 1.4 God sends the tempest, but in Mark, the wording of Jesus' rebuke (4.39, compare 1.25) suggests a demonic origin for the storm, (see the discussion below). Whereas recalcitrant Jonah sleeps away from view in the ships' "bowels" (τὴν κοίλην), Jesus sleeps "in the stern" (ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ), (Jonah 1.5 compare 4.38).[43] Unlike Jonah (Jonah 1.6), Mark's Jesus is no would-be mediator and offers no prayer to God here. In marked dissonance, the passive Jonah is hurled into the sea (Jonah 1.15), whereas Jesus actively overcomes the wind and waves by his word of command. In Jonah 2.1 LXX, the hapless prophet is swallowed by the chaos monster (κῆτος), in poignant contrast, Jesus commands the personified creature-like sea to be "muzzled" (Mark 4.39).[44]

It emerges, then, that Mark 4.35-41 does not provide a straightforward parallel to the Jonah story. If anything, Jesus is an *antitype* of Jonah, though unlike the other synoptic authors, Mark supplies no explicit statement that "something greater than Jonah is here" (Matt 12.39-41; Luke 11.29-32).[45] In Mark, the vocabulary of Jonah LXX provides some raw materials from which the evangelist casts his version of Jesus' first sea-miracle, wherein the Jesus-Jonah antithesis is implicit, peaking with the potent image of Jesus stilling and "muzzling" the personified sea by his spoken word (4.39). This action radically distinguishes him from Jonah, being something of an epiphany insofar as the action likens him to God himself (see below).[46] Thus, for Mark, Jonah serves as a literary foil for Jesus: whereas the former is swallowed by the chaos monster, Jesus subdues and muzzles the threatening chaos sea.

With regard to the stilling of the storm itself, there is a near consensus that Jesus' rebuke of the wind and silencing of the sea (Mark 4.39) recall OT texts in which God

[42] Similarly, Marcus 1999: 338; Collins 2007: 260.
[43] Guelich (1989: 266) also notes the contrast between Jesus and Jonah's sleep.
[44] On "κῆτος" see the discussion in Chapter 2, p. 90 and n. 124 therein.
[45] Contra Guelich 1989: 267, and Boring (2006: 147 n. 97), who says Mark here "taps into the Q tradition" to demonstrate that one greater than Jonah has arrived - whose mastery of the storm, in the light of Job 38.8-11 points in the direction of divine provenance - there is no evidence that Mark uses the hypothetical Q tradition here.
[46] Similarly, van Iersel (1998 : 195), Guelich (1989: 266-267) and Boring (2006: 147 cf. n. 97) notice the Jesus-Jonah contrast, citing Matt 12.39-41; Luke 11.29-32. Collins (2007: 260), similarly, notes that in early Christian tradition Jonah was an antitype of Jesus. Gundry (1993: 246) accepts possible limited influence of the Jonah story here, but stressing the discrepancies between Mark 4.35-41 and the proposed Jonah parallel fails to consider the possibility of an antithetical relation between the stories.

rebukes or stills the stormy chaos sea.[47] In Mark, as noted above, the sea is personified since Jesus orders it as one would a person, σιώπα "silence!" (cf. 10.48), or a demon, πεφίμωσο "be muzzled!" (cf. 1.25; Luke 4.35). In point of fact, there are particularly clear verbal links between the first exorcism story in Mark 1.21-28 and 4.35-41: thus, ἐπετίμησεν in 1,25; 4,39. Moreover, in Mark the verb φιμόω "to muzzle," occurs only in 1.25 and 4.39 (φιμώθητι/πεφίμωσο).[48] In Mark 1.27 the demons "obey him [Jesus]" (ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ), and again in 4.41 the wind and the sea "obey him [Jesus]" (ὑπακούει αὐτῷ), another significant parallelism since again, the verb (ὑπακούειν) "obey" occurs nowhere else in Mark. This literary relationship suggests that the two episodes are to be read together, where the personified sea is symbolic of evil or, possibly, though less likely, a *de facto* demonic power.[49] Both stories demonstrate Jesus' victory and dominion over supernatural inimical chaos forces.

While the wind or whirlwind is a traditional feature in the theophany/action of the DW (e.g. Exod 14.21 LXX; Ps 17.11 LXX; 103.3 LXX), as discussed above in relation to the phrase λαῖλαψ μεγάλη in Jer 32.32 LXX, in Second Temple texts it can sometimes be aligned instead with the inimical chaos forces themselves (*1QH* 10.29; *1QH* 14.23; *T. Jud.* 21.9, cf. Dan 7.2).[50] This association emerges in Mark 4.35-41, where the wind (ὁ ἄνεμος) and waves (τὰ κύματα)/sea (ἡ θάλασσα) operate as parallel inimical elements (4.37) and are conjointly subdued by Jesus (4.39, 41). On the basis of the parallels with the first exorcism story outlined above, and given that Jesus' rebuke (ἐπετίμησεν) is directed specifically against the wind (Mark 4.39), commentators are probably right to draw attention to mythical demonic associations which the wind has in certain Second Temple texts (e.g. *Jub.* 2.2; 1 *En*. 60.16; 69.22; 2 *En*. 40.9; *4 Ezra* 6.41-42).[51]

Thus, where the wind/sea are taken together, in terms of criterion 1 on traditional imagery, Mark 4.39 is similar in thought to OT texts such as Ps 107.29 and specific

[47] Nineham 1968: 146; Guelich 1989: 267; Marcus 1999: 338; Boring 2006: 143; Collins 2007: 260-262.
[48] The verb φιμόω is rare in biblical literature, it occurs twice in regard to animals (Deut 25.4 cf. 1 Tim 5.18) once in Matt 22.12 figuratively as "speechless" (RSV), and twice in regard to the silencing of human opponents (Matt 22.34; 1 Pet 2.15). Beyond Mark 4.39, the imperatival form is used only in 1.25/Luke 4.35 as a command given to demons.
[49] Gundry (1993: 240-241) rejects the notion that Jesus exorcises a particular storm-demon, in favour of the conclusion that "he [Jesus] is portrayed as quelling the powers of chaos in general." The numerous parallels (see main text) with Yahweh/God stilling the sea as a personified hostile chaos force suggest this is correct.
[50] The word ἄνεμος occurs in Dan 7.2, the other texts have similar Hebrew/Greek words for wind/whirlwind.
[51] Guelich 1989: 267; Collins 2007: 261.

HDWT texts such as Ps 89.10 MT, in which God stills the waves of the sea.[52] More pointedly, the language and imagery of 4.39 is strongly reminiscent of particular HDWT texts in which God himself specifically "rebukes" or "commands" the personified sea or waters/monsters of chaos (e.g. Pss 18.15; 104.7; 106.9; Isa 50.2; 51.9-10; Job 26.11-12; Nah 1.4 cf. *L.A.B. 10.5*; Pr Man 3; Sir 43.13).[53] Again, the Markan Jesus' "muzzling" command suggests a vivid image of the DW whose powerful word is sufficient to subdue the forces of chaos.

In Job 26.11-13, for example, the divine rebuke and stilling of the waters are complementary elements in the description of God's cosmic battle with the chaos monster Rahab.[54] Again, in the LXX translation of Pss 18.15 (Ps 17.16 LXX); 104.7 (103.7 LXX), the chaos waters are vanquished by God's "rebuke" (ἐπιτιμήσεώς). Moreover, in Ps 106.9 the Red Sea is personified and assimilated to the DW mythic pattern where God battles Sea or chaos monsters; notably, in the Septuagint (105.9 LXX), the word "rebuke" occurs in the exact same (aorist) form as in Mark 4.39: "He rebuked (ἐπετίμησεν) the Red Sea and it dried up".[55]

The verb ἐπιτιμάω is the Greek equivalent of Hebrew גָּעַר. As explained previously, where God is the referent of this verb in the MT, it nearly always denotes the divine defeat of hostile and/or chaos forces.[56] Though the term appears in the context of exorcisms (Mark 1.25; 3.12; 9.25) it is true that the verb ἐπιτιμάω and substantives are used variously in Mark (i.e. 8.30, 32-33 on Jesus' charge to the disciples to keep silence and the rebuke of Peter, though in the latter case Satan is the ultimate target of Jesus' rebuke; 10.13 the disciples' rebuke of people bringing children; 10.48 the people's rebuke of Bartimaeus). In the present context, however, the description of Jesus' "rebuking" of the wind so as to calm the sea in 4.39 strongly recalls the action of God the DW in the

[52] For Collins (2007: 258), Ps 107 exercises some programmatic influence on Mark 4.35-41, however, the *de facto* verbal parallels are considerably fewer compared with the biblical Jonah story (LXX), and significantly God sends the storm in Ps 107, which is not the case in Mark 4.35-41. Again, regarding the explanation that the curious detail of ἄλλα πλοῖα in 4.36 comprises an allusion to Ps 107.23, (e.g. Nineham 1963: 148) while not impossible, at the level of narrative discourse it is difficult to see what might be gained by the proposed allusion. The ostensibly redundant phrase in Mark 4.36 is likely an eyewitness detail, that is, a residual feature of historical reminiscence.

[53] Several scholars cite various of these texts as possible background to Mark 4.35-41, e.g. Marcus 1999: 338; Collins 2007: 262; Boring 2006: 143.

[54] McCurley 1983: 59.

[55] Collins 2007: 262.

[56] See the discussion in Chapter 2, and Gunkel 1895: 43; Kee 1968: 235-8; Day 1985: 29 n. 82; Angel 2006: 20-21, 76; Kennedy 1987: 47 – 64.

texts mentioned above. Given these simultaneously linguistic and conceptual parallels, the weight of evidence suggests that by his rebuke of the wind and silencing/stilling of the sea in 4.39, the Markan Jesus is likened to the figure of God as warrior, familiar to OT and some Second Temple texts. This comparison is particularly poignant, since only God stills the sea in OT/Second Temple literature.

Once more, in Mark 4.39 after Jesus rebukes the wind it abates (ἐκόπασεν), a description analogous to OT and Second Temple HDWT texts which use the same verb in reference to God's silencing of the chaos waters.[57] The verb κοπάζω "to cease/abate" has a fairly wide semantic range in the OT (e.g. Num 11.2; Num 17.13; Josh 14.15; Ruth 1.18; Esth 2.1, 7.10 LXX). However, more often than it refers to other actions or events, κοπάζω refers to the abating of threatening waters/sea (7/27 occurrences). It occurs twice in Jonah 1.11-12 LXX (κοπάσει ἡ θάλασσα), where it refers to God's stilling of the sea. Similarly in Gen 8.1, (cf. 8.7, 8, 11) as in Mark 4.39, the verb appears in the aorist (ἐκόπασεν) where it describes God's calming of the flood, which represented "a kind of re-emergence of the chaos waters".[58] Again, in Sir 43.23, God "calms the great deep" (ἐκόπασεν), an expression which in context suggests the conquest of chaos.[59] That this connotation obtains in the use of the verb in Mark 4.39 is all the more likely since in the entire NT, κοπάζω appears exclusively in Jesus' sea-miracles in connection with the abating of the storm (4.39; 6.51 cf. Matt 14.32), strengthening the possibility that Mark draws the term from Jonah 1.11-12 LXX, or perhaps from Gen 8 or even Sir 43.23 LXX. Given that the silencing/calming the chaos waters/sea is exclusively God's prerogative (cf. 2 Macc 9.8), when read against the background of the HDWT, the Markan Jesus' authoritative command and the wind's prompt submission ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος (4.39) point to the epiphanic nature of our passage, wherein Mark likens Jesus to God himself.[60]

(iii) The denouement of the story in relation to the HDWT

Finally, with regard to the denouement of the story, we consider the disciples' question in Mark 4.41, "Who is this therefore that even the wind and the sea obey him?" It should be noted that the disciples' question in 4.41 "Who is this therefore..." (τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν), which on a narrative level has rhetorical force, loosely parallels the

[57] Gunkel 1895: 97; cf. Angel 2006: 79.
[58] Day 1985: 53.
[59] See Angel 2006: 74-81.
[60] Heil 1981: 65-6; 97 – 103.

distinctly rhetorical question cum refrain of Psalm 24, "Who is this king of glory?". While the Markan question τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν has no exact parallel in the Septuagint, the wording of the psalmist's question in Ps 23.8, 10 LXX, τίς ἐστιν οὗτος (ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης) is approximate. This three word string sequence occurs only twice more in the LXX outside of Ps 23 (in Job 17.3 and Jer 37.21). While contextually and conceptually there are no grounds for seeing either Job 17.3 or Jer 37.21 as possible background to Mark 4.41, conceptually, an echo of Ps 24.8 and 24.10 would provide an appropriate conclusion to Mark's presentation of Jesus as a sea-conquering divine figure in 4.35-41, since in this psalm Yahweh is heralded as the victorious and mighty warrior king who founded the world upon the seas and the waters (Ps 24.1-2).

As discussed in chapter 2, the influence of the cosmogonic Canaanite divine warrior pattern has been traced to Psalm 24.7-10, its odd features explained as residual mythical elements.[61] God is described as "mighty in battle" (Ps 24.8) and the divine conflict with chaos at creation is likely implied here.[62] The epithet "king of glory" is unique to this psalm, but is taken up in the War Scroll in texts which describe God the DW going out to battle (*1QM* 12.8; *1QM* 19.1), demonstrating that this psalm was read as depicting God the DW by at least some Jewish contemporaries of Jesus.[63]

Psalm 24 is routinely taken as an antiphonal liturgy used in the autumnal Israelite festival.[64] Therefore, just as the Psalmist's question "Who is this king of glory?" invites the chiming collective response "Yahweh!", it could be that Mark's similarly worded question on the lips of the disciples (as narrative characters) evokes from the Markan audience (as readers/hearers) the same response given in Ps 23.8, 10 LXX, thus completing Mark's analogy, where Jesus is likened to Yahweh the victorious warrior and glorious king over chaos. If so, this crowning reference to the manifestation of God's kingship in Jesus would tie in broadly with the Kingdom theme introduced in a prominent way in the earlier parable section.

[61] Cross 1973: 93, cf. Chapter 2, p.97-98.
[62] Day 1985: 37-38.
[63] Martínez & Tigchelaar 1997: 133, 143.
[64] Cross 1973: 90 – 93; Craigie 1983: 212; Weiser 1962: 232; cf. Goldingay 2006: 356; Kidner 1973: 115. Cf. Chapter 2, p. 74 n. 36.

(d) Summary of findings

In summary, then, I have advocated the following points, arranged here in descending order relative to their strength and importance for this argument:

(1). Attention was called to Mark 4.39 wherein the Markan Jesus orders the sea to silence. That Jesus "muzzles" the sea, strongly suggests that the latter is personified as an inimical force, very reminiscent of the sea as a hostile entity in the HDWT. In fact, with reference to criterion 1 on traditional imagery, Jesus' actions as presented by Mark are parallel in thought to numerous OT texts in which God as DW subjugates the personified chaos sea. This is especially poignant since in OT/Second Temple texts, only God is portrayed as subjugating the sea.

(2). In parallel to Jesus' "muzzling" of the sea, in Mark 4.39 the evangelist's use of the verb ἐπιτιμάω in Jesus' rebuke of the wind reproduces the use of the same verb (or its Hebrew equivalent) in OT texts in which God as DW rebukes the sea/chaos monsters. In relation to criterion 2 concerning characteristic terminology, by means of this simultaneously verbal and conceptual parallel, in all probability Mark intends to liken Jesus to God the DW.

(3) It was pointed out that both the terminology/phraseology of Mark 4.35-41 and the unique image of Jesus sleeping and being woken (4.38) recall the initial portion of Jonah (LXX), the septuagintal form of which belongs within the HDWT. An element of antithesis obtains, whereby the Markan Jesus, depicted in a way recalling the sea-conquering DW, emerges as the antitype of the prophet Jonah. In the LXX, Jonah is swallowed by the chaos monster, in contrast, Jesus rises from sleep and "muzzles" the threatening personified sea in an epiphanic moment pointing to his true divine identity. In terms of criterion 1 which concerns traditional imagery, the Markan Jesus' "muzzling" of the sea by his verbal command does not have a direct precedent, however, it is congruous with texts which portray God restraining the sea by his powerful word (e.g. Pr Man 3; Job 26.11-12; Nah 1.4).

(4) It was suggested that the disciples' concluding question in Mark 4.41, which for Mark has rhetorical force, is likely a deliberate nuanced echo of Ps 24.8, 10 (23.8, 10 LXX) a psalm belonging to the HDWT tradition in which Yahweh is

exalted as a mighty warrior king, his victory over chaos presupposed. If, as seems probable, there is a *de facto* echo of this psalm, the suggestion again, in relation to criterion 2 on characteristic terminology, is that Mark likens Jesus to God the DW.

(5). It was shown that in Mark 4.37, the phrase λαῖλαψ μεγάλη absent elsewhere from the NT and a *hapax legomenon* in the OT (Jer 32.32 LXX), was likely appropriated from Jer 32.32 LXX, where it occurs in connection with hostile nations and the manifestation of God the DW against them. If, as judged probable here, the Markan phrase λαῖλαψ μεγάλη is an allusion to Jer 32.32 LXX, the evangelist again draws on the language of the HDWT (cf. criterion 2).

(6) Consonant with the more major HDWT connections cited above, a further detail is that the verb κοπάζω used to describe the abating of the storm wind in Mark 4.39 is familiar to the HDWT tradition in the OT and in at least one extant Second Temple text, where the "sea"/ "waters"/ "deep" are stilled by God. This fits in with the tenor of the passage as described in (1) and (2) above, and further indicates that to some extent Mark draws consciously on HDWT vocabulary and imagery (cf. criterions 1 and 2). Mark harnesses the HDWT in such a way that Jesus' actions and the consequent reactions of nature recall OT/Second Temple scenarios in which God demonstrates his sovereignty over the chaos waters/sea.

(e) Conclusion: Mark 4.35-41

Admittedly, then, there is no place in Mark 4.35-41 for the more fantastical features of the HDWT, e.g. thunder and lightning as weapons in the DW's arsenal or named inimical sea monsters such as Rahab and Leviathan. Again, given the instant and total success of the Markan Jesus' verbal rebuke, technically the *kampf* or conflict element is kept to a minimum in the Markan story.[65]

On the other hand, on the strength of points (1) and (2) above, and given the clear verbal links between the first Markan exorcism story (1.21-28) and 4.35-41, at the level of symbol, it emerges that the stormy sea represents a hostile evil force to be confronted

[65] I am grateful to Professor Roland Deines of the University of Nottingham whose critique of an earlier essay brought this to my attention.

and vanquished, which is precisely what Jesus does when, in 4.39 he "muzzles" the chaos sea. Granted that Mark is drawing on the mythological imagery selectively and in accordance with his own purposes, in context, a number of images, terms and phrases in 4.35-41 (e.g. λαῖλαψ μεγάλη; κοπάζω; ἐπιτιμάω; τίς ἐστιν οὗτος) appear to have been drawn from the HDWT. On the strength of the verbal and conceptual parallels Mark has Jesus act and speak in a very similar way to God the DW who stills the chaos waters/sea in the HDWT.

Since Mark appears to have taken over vocabulary from the Septuagint story of Jonah, it may be that to some extent the prophet Jonah functions as a literary foil for the sea-conquering Jesus. However, the central focus is the implicit comparison between Jesus and God the DW. Just as God is called upon to arise and rescue his people by overcoming chaos (represented by the chaos monsters/waters) in the HDWT, the disciples call on Jesus who overcomes the chaotic, hostile sea in a manner entirely reminiscent of the former. Since only God stills the sea in OT literature, the marvelling of the disciples' in 4.41 becomes as much a Markan statement as it is a genuine question: Jesus' identity is divine identity.

(3.3) MARK 6.45-52

(a). Text

> *45* And immediately he made his disciples get into the boat and to go ahead to the other side to Bethsaida while he dismissed the crowd. *46* And after saying goodbye to them he went on the mountain to pray. *47* And when evening came, the boat was in the middle of the sea, and he was alone on the land. *48* And when he saw them straining at the oars, for the wind was against them, about the fourth watch of the night he went to them, walking on the sea, and he wanted to pass by them. *49* But when they saw him walking on the sea they thought he was a ghost and cried out *50* for they all saw him and were terrified. But immediately he spoke with them and said to them, "Have courage, it is I, do not be afraid". *51* And he went up to them in the boat and the wind abated and they were greatly astonished, *52* for they had not understood about the loaves, but their hearts were hardened.

(b). 6.45-52 within the wider Markan context

In a seminal article, Paul Achtemeier identified two cycles of miracle catenae in Mark, namely, 4.35-6.44 and 6.45-8.26.[66] In both proposed catenae, three "healing miracles" and a "feeding miracle" follow each initial sea-miracle, though other material

[66] Achtemeier 1970: 265-291.

is interspersed.[67] Achtemeier's redaction critical considerations regarding the pre-history of these materials are not at issue here, but the rough narrative pattern he identified provides a general picture of the surrounding context of 6.45-52.[68] In this section of Mark, recurring themes include the manifestation of Jesus' extraordinary power over demons, illness and death (5.1-43; 6.53-56; 7.24-30; 7.32-37; 8.22-26); faith responses (adequate or inadequate) to Jesus (5.20; 5.34; 6.1-6; 6.56; 8.21), and events of typological significance (6.30-44; 8.1-10).

Various christological interpretations attach to the miraculous events described in these chapters (e.g. some find that Jesus acts as a prophet, a messianic figure, or as a divine agent in the mould of a *theios aner*).[69] The Markan identity motif, that is, the underlying Markan concern with the revelation and perception of Jesus' identity, is intrinsic to this narrative section. Thus, at times Mark reports explicit questions or speculation as to Jesus' identity (e.g. 4.41; 6.1-6; 6.14-16); such inquiries to some extent punctuate the entire gospel (e.g. 1.27; 2.7; 3.22-27; 4.41; 6.1-6; 6.14-16; 8.27-30; 12.35-37; 14.60-62). In 6.45-52 itself, the evangelist presents a mistaken/true identity contrast (6.49-50 cf. 3.22-27), wherein the disciples imagine that Jesus is a ghost, but Jesus reveals his identity, reassuring them, "It is I, do not be afraid."

Reading Mark 6.45-52 within its immediate context, the denouement, "for they had not understood about the loaves, but their hearts were hardened," (6.52) forges a clear connection with the preceding narrative unit, namely the feeding of the 5,000 (6.30-44).[70] The meaning and nuances of this phrase and its interpretative significance will be considered in the discussion of the denouement below. After the transitional summary in 6.53-56, the next major narrative unit is 7.1-24. Though Mark 6.45-52 may share some general thematic similarities with 7.1-24, (e.g. the disciples' difficulty of perception, 7.18

[67] Achtemeier 1970: 291.
[68] For reactions to Achtemeier's reconstruction of the Markan pre-history, see e.g. Perrin 1974: 113 n. 20; Kingsbury 1983: 30, 32, 37.
[69] For Mark's Jesus as (i) "prophet" see, e.g., Wright 1996:191-196; Broadhead 1999: 55-57; (ii). "messianic figure" see Lane 1974: 28, 288-289; (iii). "*theios aner*" see e.g., Keck 1965: 348-350; Achtemeier 1972: 198; Perrin 1974: 112. Clearly, as a general point, christological categories may overlap, that is, whereas scholars sometimes read the gospel through one particular christological lens to the detriment of others (e.g. "Messiah" or "Son of God") christological roles/titles actually converge in Mark (e.g. 8.38; 14.61), see Morrison 2008: 292-308 and his critique of Kingsbury in this connection.
[70] On redactional critical issues surrounding the possible linking of 6.45-52 with 6.30-44 in the Markan pre-history, see e.g. Madden 1997: 95-96.

with 6.49; the motif of hidden and revealed identity, 7.24 with 6.49-50) verbal links are lacking and the possible connections are quite subtle.

Conversely, within the wider Markan context, it emerges that there exists a particular, pronounced literary relationship between 6.45-52 and the previous sea-miracle described in 4.35-41. In similarly staged scenarios, thematically both texts concern the miraculous revelation of Jesus' true identity at sea, and may be formally classified as "epiphanies" or "sea-epiphanies".[71] More pointedly, these texts share numerous linguistic, conceptual and formal features. For example, Jesus takes the initiative at the outset (4.35; 6.45); leaving/dismissing "the crowd" (τὸν ὄχλον in 4.36; 6.45), and stilling the threatening wind (4.39; 6.51) before the awestruck disciples (4.41; 6.51).[72] Both texts employ the same words to describe the traverse "to the other side" (εἰς τὸ πέραν 4.35; 6.45). An identical temporal marker appears (ὀψίας γενομένης 4.35; 6.47).[73] Also, the phrase "and the wind abated" in Mark 6.51 exactly replicates the Greek of 4.39 (καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος), which, confirming the literary relationship between these stories, occurs in biblical literature only in these two verses.[74]

To be sure, each text presents its own distinct episode and the events are clearly different within the Markan scheme.[75] In 4.35-41, Jesus is likened to God the DW acting to save his people, but the storm-rescue theme (if such it may be called) is more subtle in 6.45-52.[76] Again, in Mark 4.35-41, the wind personified as an inimical force is rebuked

[71] Dibelius 1919: 71; Heil 1981: 17; Collins 2007: 259, 327. Collins (2007: 332) further classifies Mark 6.45-52 as an act of early Christian *mythopoesis* – the construction of an incident in the life of Jesus intended to honour him and win adherents to his cause, adding that some in Mark's audience took it literally and others symbolically or allegorically. Marcus (1999: 432-433) acknowledges that the evangelist draws on the first sea-story as he crafts the second, but also sees a link to baptism in 6.45-52 where Jesus' walking on the sea symbolises his conquest of death, an idea which he says is present in the retelling of the story in *Odes Sol.* 39. Marcus even suggests that in terms of its pre-history, 6.45-52 may have been a resurrection narrative. Boring (2006: 191) cautions that the story should not be thought of as a "misplaced resurrection story" in chronological or linear terms, but admits that it is permeated with resurrection imagery and language. For the popular view propounded at least since Bultmann that in the tradition a rescue story has been combined with an epiphany, see the discussions in Guelich 1989: 346; Collins 2007: 327.

[72] Marcus 1999: 428; Heil 1981: 128.

[73] Heil 1981: 127.

[74] Heil 1981: 127-128; France 2002: 269.

[75] Contra Bultmann (1963: 216), nothing necessitates that the two literary accounts be construed as developing traditionally from a single historical event, even though literarily the episodes are presented in parallel.

[76] There is some debate as to whether a storm motif/rescue obtains in Mark 6.45-52. Commentators who see a storm motif in 6.45-52 include Nineham 1968: 180-181; Marcus 1999: 430; Cole 1989: 179-180; Boring 2006: 189-190; Guelich 1989: 347, 350; Heil 1981: 19-30, 73. Marcus (1999: 430) notes that in Jewish apocalyptic texts a stormy sea became something of a standard image of the climactic stress of the end time (1*QH* 3.6, 12-18; 6.22-25; 7.45) thus positing a Markan eschatological perspective in 6.45-52. Hooker (1991: 169-170) rejects the presence of the storm motif in 6.45-52, and while she recognises that

by Jesus in 4.39. In 6.48 the phrase ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς indicates that the disciples struggle against an adverse wind.[77] However, there is no rebuke and therefore no overt personification of the wind here. Rather, the wind subsides when Jesus enters the boat (6.51). Since the wind is clearly personified as a hostile force in Mark 4.35-41 (and is not mentioned outside the sea-miracles), the same notion could be implied in 6.45-52, but is not explicit.

Notwithstanding the differences in nuance, the shared vocabulary and common motifs make it very certain that the evangelist presents traditional material in order to invite the sea-miracles to be read together.[78] It appears, then, in the light of the deliberate Markan echoes of the first sea miracle, 6.45-52 is properly the sequel to 4.35-41.[79] In view of the literary linkup of these sea-miracles, if as argued above, Mark 4.35-41 draws on the HDWT and points to the epiphanic revelation of Jesus' divine identity, ending on a question "who is this?" (4.41), it follows that 6.45-52 may provide part of the "answer" to the question left hanging in 4.41, particularly if the same DW Christology emphases are evident therein.[80] Thus, the possible influence of the HDWT on Mark 6.45-52 now necessitates investigation and demonstration from the text of 6.45-52. Following the same arrangement as previously, 6.45-52 will be approached first in terms of its setting, and secondly in terms of its development.

(c). Analysis of 6.45-52 investigating the possible influence of the HDWT

(i) The setting of the story in relation to the HDWT

In Mark 6.45-47, a series of statements introduce the second sea-miracle. Initially, in 6.45 the reader learns that Jesus "orders" or "urges" (ἠνάγκασεν) his disciples to board

---

there are affinities with the storm motif in 4.35-41, Collins (2007: 333-334) thinks it an "overstatement" to describe the events of 6.45-52 as taking place in a "storm".

[77] Since the word ἐναντίος occurs in Acts 27.4 in relation to a contrary wind at sea, it may not be assumed that the Markan expression ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς comprises evidence of the personification of the wind in this story.

[78] Marcus (2000: 424-425, cf. 428) reads the stories together, setting out the common features of the two stories side by side along with the Johannine version of Jesus' walking on the sea (John 6.16-21), and speculates that the two Markan sea-stories were probably already linked in the pre-Markan tradition. Guelich (1989: 346), in his discussion of the form of the passage, conjectures that an earlier epiphany story has taken on aspects of a rescue story possibly influenced by Mark 4.35-41. Contra Madden 1997: 72-73 who plays down the similarities.

[79] Guelich 1989: 347. Cf. Achtemeier (1970: 265-266, 291). who finds that 4.35-41 and 6.45-52 respectively introduce two cycles of miracle catenae in Mark, (4.35-6.44) and (6.45-8.26), where rough similarity in the order of events is taken as evidence of Mark's reworking of his tradition.

[80] See the section in Chapter 4 on Mark 5.1-20 for another part of the "answer".

a boat and cross over to Bethsaida while he dismisses the crowd.[81] Mark then reports that Jesus went away to "the mountain" (τὸ ὄρος) to pray (6.46). Commentators suggest that the unnamed but definite mountain is a symbolic reference to Sinai and the exodus, where an attendant Jesus-Moses typology is sometimes thought to operate.[82] On the premise of Markan priority, it may be that Matthew aims to make explicit that which he perceives to be an implicit reference to the exodus in his Markan source. Instead of the Markan ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος (6.46), Matt 14.23 has ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος ("he went up the mountain"), a phrase used just three times in the LXX, in exclusive reference to Moses' ascent of Sinai (Exod 19.3; 24.18; 34.4).[83]

Further to the latter, in Mark 6.47, after the probably symbolic phrase ὀψίας γενομένης (see above 3.2 (c) (i)), Mark states that the boat was "in the middle of the sea" (ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης). Though it has gone largely unnoticed in Mark studies, this exact phrase occurs elsewhere in biblical literature, and always in reference to the exodus Red Sea crossing (Exod 14.29; 15.8, 19; Neh 9.11). Slightly different phrasing (εἰς μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης) occurs three times in Exod 14.16, 22, 23, and once in Ezek 26.12, where there is no exodus connection.[84] In the light of the criteria in chapter 1 regarding the identification of allusions and echoes, it is noteworthy that the phrase ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης is an exact verbal/syntactical parallel to four OT texts narrating the Red Sea crossing, and closely parallel to a further three of four texts which concern the same event. Given the parallel's precision and exclusivity, i.e. the unique connection of this specific phrase to plural texts regarding the exodus sea crossing, it is highly probable that Mark draws this expression from the exodus narrative, in order to deliberately recall the exodus crossing.[85]

---

[81] The Markan selection of the verb ἀναγκάζω seems strange here (a Markan *hapax legomenon*), elsewhere in the NT it conveys compulsion (e.g. Acts 26.11; 28.19; 2 Cor 12.11; Gal 2.3, 14), though BDAG 60 distinguishes two levels of meaning, namely *compulsion*, cf. the texts given here in parentheses, and *strongly urge* where Mark 6.45 is cited. For Gundry (1989: 348) there are no explicit clues as to the reason for the sense of urgency expressed by ἀναγκάζω here; Madden (1997: 97) explains it in terms of a residual element from tradition. The term is retained in the Matthaean version of the story (Matt 14.22).

[82] Hooker 1991: 169-170; Broadhead 1992: 122; Marcus 1999: 422-423; Henderson 2006: 210. However, Gundry (1989: 349) emphasises the epiphanic nature of Mark 6.45-52 and points out that God appeared to Israel from the mountain (Deut 33.2; Hab 3.3), citing Jesus' self-manifestation to the disciples in 6.45-52 in such a way as to compare Jesus more to God himself than to Moses.

[83] Similarly Madden 1997: 104 (Matt 14.46 is erroneous and should read Matt 14.23).

[84] Malbon (1984: 375 n. 34) cites the connection between the phrase in Mark 6.47 and the similar phrase in Exod 14.16, 22.

[85] Matthew lacks this phrase, reporting the location of the boat in terms of the measurement of stades, (Matt 14.24).

It emerges, then, that Mark very probably stages the second sea-miracle such as to intentionally recall the exodus sea crossing narrated in Exod 14-15. Exodus 15 is the keystone of the HDWT, wherein Yahweh "the man of war" (Exod 15.3) fights as DW and liberator of Israel (e.g. Exod 15.3, 8, 19).[86] The conceptualisation of Exod 15 in terms of DW mythology undergoes intertextual development in later OT passages such as Isa 51.9-11 and Ps 77.16-20.[87] In *Jos. Ant.* 2.343-344a, a text roughly contemporaneous with Mark, mythological glosses (e.g. the hurling of thunderbolts in *Ant.* 2. 343) show that the exodus event/Song of the Sea continued to be read in terms of DW traditions.[88] Similarly, in another contemporary text, *L.A.B.* 10.5, the retelling of the exodus event involves the conflation of mythological texts belonging to the HDWT (i.e. Pss. 18.16; 106.9) with Exod 15.8.[89] That is, like Josephus, Pseudo-Philo interprets the exodus sea crossing through the prism of DW mythology.

As both Josephus and Pseudo-Philo are broadly contemporaneous with Mark, it is certainly possible, even probable, that Mark understood the exodus in a way similar to these authors. In this case, alongside Josephus and Pseudo-Philo, Mark likely understands the salvific action of God in the exodus in terms of the HDWT, where this understanding underlies the Markan description of Jesus' sea-walking. On the other hand, the Markan exodus allusions/imagery might simply be at the service of a Jesus-Moses typology. In this case, the evangelist might have no particular concern to evoke DW traditions. Therefore, it remains to consider the development of the Markan story itself in order to establish if, and to what extent Mark draws consciously on the HDWT in his representation of Jesus' sea-walking miracle, and what this might mean.

(ii) The development of the story in relation to the HDWT

Once the evangelist has set the scene, the main drama of the second sea-miracle occurs in Mark 6.48. The verse begins with Jesus observing/perceiving (ἰδὼν) the difficulty experienced by the disciples, who are described as "straining" (βασανιζομένους) since the "wind was against them" (ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς). Occasionally, it is suggested that this Markan vocabulary contains a nuance of

[86] On Exod 15.1-18 in relation to divine warrior mythology, see Cross 1973: 121-144, with coverage of the influence of the Song of the Sea on later Hebrew texts. Cf. Miller 1973: 113-118. Cf. Watts 1997: 160, who describes Exod 15 as "perhaps the finest early example" of a DW Hymn.
[87] Cf. Cross 1973: 136-137.
[88] For DW traditions in *Jos. Ant.* 2.343-344, see Angel 2006: 179-181.
[89] Angel 2006: 164-166.

eschatological persecution, but this is uncertain.[90] More clearly, the detail that the wind subsides as Jesus enters the boat (6.51), suggests, in parallel with 4.39 (where the same phrase denotes the wind's response to Jesus' rebuke), that the adverse, threatening elements are under Jesus' control. If, as suggested above, on the narrative level 6.45-52 provides part of the answer to the question in 4.41, the parallelism here reminds the reader that like God himself, Jesus controls the elements.

There is a chiastic arrangement to the story, which plays on similar themes and operates with opposites/contrasts. This may be illustrated as follows:

6.44: The mention of "loaves" (or loaves are implied)[91]
6.45: Jesus has his disciples board a boat (ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον)
6.47: Jesus is alone on the land
6.48a: Jesus sees the disciples
6.48b: Jesus walks on the water
6.49a: The disciples see Jesus
6.49: Jesus is on the sea (within range of the disciples)
6.51: Jesus himself boards a boat (ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον)
6.52: The mention of "loaves"

The chiasm has as its midpoint Mark 6.48b, which suggests that the narrative crux is Jesus' walking on the sea.[92] A plethora of hermeneutical approaches have been applied to this text, both historical and ahistorical.[93] Since this thesis works with the final form of the Markan text, historical and/or rationalistic approaches to this pericope will not be examined here.[94] Rather, Jesus' walking on the sea will be tackled at a literary level in

[90] Marcus (1999: 423) and Boring (2006: 188), suggest an eschatological nuance for βασανιζομένους, since the verb sometimes denotes end-time tribulation (Rev 9.5; 11.10; 12.2). Gundry (2000: 390) objects that where βασανίζειν has this connotation the persecution is carried out by the subject of the verb, which in this case would make the disciples' the persecutors. Mark's verb selection, followed in Matt 14.28, may be purely literal in intent (so BDAG 168), as could be the case with the expression "the wind was against them" (cf. Acts 27.4).

[91] In Mark 6.44 the Greek [τοὺς ἄρτους] appears in square brackets with a C-rating, meaning that it is not completely certain whether these words belong within the original text. While the phrase is found in manuscripts such as A, B, and L, it is omitted from e.g. P 45, א D W Θ. Whether or not the words are deemed original, 6.52 ostensibly picks up on the thought expressed in 6.43-44.

[92] Cf. Marcus (1999: 429), who makes the same point, though with a representation of the chiasm seemingly more simplistic than the literary pattern found in the original text.

[93] For a survey of several approaches, see Madden 1997: 1-14; and (especially on the Matthean parallel) Nicholls 2008: 29-72; 73-97.

[94] For the general contours of older rationalistic views (e.g. Paulus) and responses from those such as D.F. Strauss, see e.g. Nicholls 2008: 99-126 esp. 105-106; Madden 1997:24 ; cf. Marcus 1999: 423.

order to establish the probable narrative meaning of the miracle in terms of authorial intention.

With regard to Jesus' walking on the water, three main sources have been posited as background material: the Old Testament, Hellenism and Buddhism. The third option advocated by W. B. Brown may be dismissed, since any historical evidence that might establish a link between NT and Buddhist traditions is entirely lacking.[95] However, in the light of the Hellenisation of the ANE (since Alexander), it might be significant that Hellenistic traditions portray gods walking, running and charioting across the water.[96] Thus, Poseidon rides through the waves without wetting even the bronze axle of his chariot (Homer *Il.* 13.23-31). Euphemus his son by Europa is said to skim across the sea on tiptoe without wetting his feet (e.g. Apollonius Rhodius *Argonautica* 1.182-84).[97] Since sea-walking is restricted to divine beings, in certain Hellenistic/Hellenistic-Jewish texts (e.g. Menander frg. 924K; 2 Macc. 5.21 LXX; Dio Chrysostom 3.30-31), this feat seems to have become proverbial for the humanly impossible.[98]

While no non-Septuagintal Hellenistic text offers strong verbal parallels to the Markan text, ruling out the possibility of literary dependence, the evangelist may have been aware of stories portraying gods traversing the surface of the sea. On the assumption that some of Mark's readers had a Greco-Roman background, in connection with Mark 6.48 it is reasonable to infer they may have recalled such myths.[99] If so, against this background, the Markan account would be understood as a statement about Jesus' divinity, and, as has been conjectured, this might not have been lost on Mark.[100]

The final option is that of an OT background to Jesus' walking on the sea. In Mark, frequent appeals are made to OT texts, directly in citation, (e.g. 1.2-3; 4.12; 7.6-7, 10; 10.6-8, 19; 11.17; 12.10-11, 26; 14.62; 15.34), and by explicit allusion (e.g. 1.44 with

[95] Brown 1928. For a rejection of this view see Madden 1997: 49-54. Again, Nicholls (2008: 55-56) observes that in the relevant texts Buddha flies over rather than walks on the water. While such traditions appear to be early, the text in which Buddha is said to fly over the water (Jataka 190), is late (fifth century CE).
[96] On Hellenism's influence in the region see, e.g., Schürer 1979: 29-80; Grabbe 1992: 147-170.
[97] Collins (2007: 328-329), among other examples, cites these episodes.
[98] Collins 2007: 331.
[99] Similarly, Collins 2007: 72-73; Nicholls 2008: 57. Interestingly, the Poseidon myth is commonly thought to derive, ultimately, from ANE divine warrior traditions (indeed the idea of subjugation of κήτε, is one possible way to read Poseidon's action in *Il.* 13, cf. below n. 143).
[100] Collins 2007: 333; Cf. Nicholls 2008: 58-59, 62.

Lev 14.2-32; 2.25-26 with 1 Sam 21.1-6; 9.13 in relation to Elijah).[101] Therefore, it is inherently possible that a particular OT text(s) could have influenced Mark's description of Jesus' sea-walking. Indeed, as noted above, the staging of Mark 6.45-52 was almost certainly influenced by exodus language and motifs.

Several OT texts have been suggested as possible background to 6.45-52 (+par.)/Mark 6.48b.[102] In Ps 77.16-20, in DW hymnody celebrating the exodus victory, God makes his way through/on the sea, his footprints "unseen" (Ps 77.19 = Ps 76.20 LXX).[103] Isaiah 43.15-16; 51.9-11, similarly recalls the exodus victory in terms of God making a path in or through the sea, though primarily in reference to the people's passage through the Red Sea.[104] *Mutatis mutandis*, Sir 24.5 depicts Wisdom "walking" in the abyss, (cf. Job 38.16 LXX).[105] Following a description of the DW's conflict with the chaos waters (Hab 3.8-10), in Hab 3.15 Yahweh is said to "trample" (albeit with horses) the waters as he rides in his chariot (cf. Hab 3.9).[106] Finally, Job 9.8 describes Yahweh walking on the sea, which text is sometimes taken as the literary precursor to Mark 6.48b.[107]

While the exodus theme of Ps 77.16-20; Isa 43.15-16/51.9-11 coheres with the exodus allusions identified in Mark 6.46-47, in relation to criterion 1 on traditional imagery, since walking through parted waters/sea is not the same as walking *on* the sea, these texts stand some distance from 6.48b.[108] Somewhat similar to Mark 6.48b, Sir 24.5 employs the verb περιπατέω (περιεπάτησα) to describe Wisdom "walking" in the abyss. Again, however, walking in the abyss is not identical with walking on the sea. In Job 38.16 LXX, God asks if Job has ἦλθες δὲ ἐπὶ πηγὴν θαλάσσης, ("come into/upon the springs of the sea,") or if he has "walked" (περιεπάτησας) in the abyss, with the implication that God has in fact done so. Parallel with Mark 6.48b, Job 38.16 LXX uses the verb περιπατέω, the preposition ἐπὶ and the genitive noun θαλάσσης. However, in

[101] On the citation of OT texts in Mark, see Rikk E. Watts, in Carson & Beale 2007: 111-249.
[102] See, e.g., Heil 1981: 47-55. Heil's example of Wis 14.1-4 need not concern us, since it involves the safe passage of a ship (rather than a person).
[103] Cross 1973: 136, 157; Hanson 1975: 306.
[104] Cross 1973: 136 n. 88. Note, however, that Isa 43.2 speaks of Yahweh "being with" his people when they pass through waters, a notion which could be figurative, but might have a literal sense.
[105] Skehan and Di Lella (1987: 327), translate "through the deep abyss I [Wisdom] took my course," cf. 332-333.
[106] Heil 1981: 44-46.
[107] E.g., Lane 1974: 236; Heil 1981: 40; Guelich 1989: 351.
[108] Madden 1997: 62.

contrast with Mark 6.45-52, Job 38.16 LXX conceives rhetorically of a theoretical act, not a *de facto* action of sea-walking. Similarly, Hab 3.15 does not portray a literal "sea-*walking*." Given the absence of concrete verbal parallels, Hab 3.15 is unlikely to have exercised direct influence on Mark.[109]

In contradistinction from the texts considered above, Job 9.8 LXX actually describes God walking on the water in a way that directly prefigures the event described in Mark 6.48b.[110] In terms of a traditional image (criterion 1), Job 9.8 is the only biblical text which explicitly and unambiguously describes Yahweh walking on the water.[111] Commentators have drawn attention to the very similar wording of Mark 6.48b, "walking on the sea" (περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης) and Job 9.8 LXX, "walking on the sea as on firm ground" (περιπατῶν ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐδάφους ἐπὶ θαλάσσης).[112] In view of the conceptual congruence and verbal similarity of the respective Greek phrases, it is very likely that Job 9.8 LXX has influenced the Markan representation of Jesus' sea-walking. Moreover, in terms of transitivity, that is, the ability of an audience to comprehend an allusion and its source text, the Markan Jesus' one-off sea-walking action likely points readers back to the one-off sea-walking action in the OT, namely, the event described in Job 9.8.[113]

Nevertheless, the connection between the NT sea-walking stories and Job 9.8 LXX is rejected by Patrick Madden and Rachel Nicholls. Madden notes the absence of the definite article in Job 9.8 LXX (present in Mark 6.48b) and observes that the phrase ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐδάφους in Job 9.8 LXX, does not occur in the gospels, finding that these dissimilarities weaken the case for dependence.[114] Thus, while Madden acknowledges the evangelists may be literarily dependent on Job 9.8 LXX, he thinks this unlikely. Similarly, Nicholls finds a Hellenistic background more probable than a particular Jewish/OT source text.[115] She rejects the notion that there was an OT *motif* of YHWH

[109] Similarly Madden 1997: 63.
[110] Madden (1997: 65) observes that the Hebrew verb דרך translated "trampled" RSV/NRSV at Job 9.8 MT does not necessarily refer to walking by foot, observing that the same verb is used of Yahweh's chariot in Hab 3.15. On the other hand, there is no mention of a chariot in Job 9.8.
[111] Job 38.16 speaks of walking, though this is upon the abyss rather than the sea, and on the basis of ellipsis (rather than direct statement) God is understood to have thus walked.
[112] Heil 1981: 40; Collins 2007: 336.
[113] On "transitivity" see, Köstenberger & Patterson 2011: 849.
[114] Madden 1997: 65.
[115] Nicholls 2008: 50.

walking on the water, and (in relation to Matthew) dismisses the possibility that the NT consciously drew on such a motif.[116]

Angel has challenged the negative findings of Madden, demonstrating outstanding similarities between Matt 14.25-26 (and par.) and Job 9.8 LXX.[117] Angel notes that the string περιπατέω + ἐπὶ + θαλάσσης occurs solely in Job 9.8 LXX and in the NT sea-walking stories (Matt 14.25-26; Mark 6.48; John 6.19). This level of verbal and semantic congruence between the NT sea-walking stories and Job 9.8 LXX somewhat eclipses the dissimilarities highlighted by Madden. On the latter, contextually the lack/presence of the article is a minor dissimilarity. The Markan (+ par.) omission of the comparative clause ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐδάφους found in Job 9.8 LXX seems more noteworthy. However, the omission of this phrase is readily explained since it was probably judged extraneous. It is more difficult to account for the evidence presented by Angel as mere coincidence.

Nicholls' claim that the evidence for a Hellenistic background to this story is "much stronger" than a direct OT source seems incongruous.[118] With one exception, the Hellenistic examples adduced by Nicholls are not actual descriptions of sea-walking.[119] The single exception, that of Euphemus mentioned above, bears no verbal relation to the NT accounts, thus, unsurprisingly, no attempt has been made to view it as the literary precursor to the evangelists' sea-walking stories. No putative Hellenistic background text contains the level of conceptual congruence and concrete verbal similarities shared by the evangelists' accounts of Jesus' sea-walking and Yahweh's sea-walking in Job 9.8 LXX.[120]

To this point, several biblical and non-biblical texts have been mentioned in connection with Mark 6.48b. However, on the basis of the criteria outlined in chapter 1 regarding the identification and evaluation of allusions, only Job 9.8 LXX qualifies as an allusion. While a minority of commentators doubt Job 9.8 LXX has influenced the NT

[116] Nicholls 2008: 50.
[117] Angel 2011: 307.
[118] Nicholls 2008: 68.
[119] Nicholls 2008: 57-58. Xerxes' feat (in Isocrates, *Panegyricus* §89) is bridge-building, so his troops' "sea-walking" is merely metaphorical, though, interestingly, the sea is whipped and thus treated as an inimical power (cf. Herodotus VII chapter 36). Other examples (i.e. the dialogue involving Socrates in Dio Chrysostom 3.30-31), merely pertain to the theoretical possibility that a human might walk on water.
[120] YHWH's sea-walking in Job 9.8 LXX may have mythological overtones but is depicted as an actual event, not a hypothetical possibility as, for example, in the discussion involving Socrates (Dio Chrysostom 3:30-31), see Cohoon 1932.

sea-walking stories, for the most part these commentators are unable to rule out this possibility completely.[121] Since the identification of allusions operates on the evaluation of probabilities, the possible connection between Mark 6.48b and Job 9.8 LXX will now be further investigated, in order to establish if any additional factors make the link more or less certain.

It has been observed that the phrase καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς ("he [Jesus] wanted to pass by them") (Mark 6.48), can be interpreted in the light of Job 9.11 LXX, ἐὰν ὑπερβῇ με οὐ μὴ ἴδω καὶ ἐὰν παρέλθῃ με οὐδ᾽ ὧς ἔγνων ("if he should go beyond me I would not see him, if he were to pass me by, I wouldn't even know").[122] There is a plausible verbal link between παρελθεῖν in Mark 6.48, and the aorist subjunctive παρέλθῃ in Job 9.11 LXX, which refers to God's *passing by.*[123] In the LXX, the verb παρέρχομαι ("pass by") is standard terminology used in the divine epiphany (Exod 34.6; 1 Kgs 19.11; Gen 32.31-32 LXX).[124] Job 9.11 LXX in particular would provide an especially pertinent backdrop to the Markan scenario since its negative tone regarding human inability to comprehend divine mystery is congenial to Mark's theme of the lack of insight on the part of the disciples (cf. 6.49, 52), who are unable to perceive Jesus' true identity.[125] The Markan notion that Jesus "wanted (ἤθελεν) to pass by (παρελθεῖν) them" is suggestive of Jesus' revelatory intent.[126] In the event, the disciples mistake Jesus for a φάντασμά (ghost) (6.49), necessitating a change of plan i.e. instead of passing by, Jesus approaches them and boards the boat (6.50-51).

The argument that Mark 6.48b draws on Job 9.8 LXX neither necessitates nor rests on the further possible link with Job 9.11 LXX. Nevertheless, if as judged likely here, 6.48 echoes Job 9.11 LXX, then this further strengthens the Mark/Job parallel.[127] On the evidence and arguments presented to this point, it will be regarded as established

[121] Nicholls (2008: 50), though, appears quite absolute in denying this connection.
[122] Commentators puzzle over this sub clause in Mark 6.48. Collins (2007: 334) following Dibelius, understands Jesus' desire to pass by the disciples as indicative of his intention to be manifested to them in revelatory fashion. Marcus (2000:426) following Heil (1981: 69-71) cites the divine epiphany in Exod 33.17-34.8, noting that the story is reworked in 1Kgs 19.11-13 and concludes that "pass by" in the OT is technical epiphany language.
[123] Lane (1974: 236), suggests Mark may have intended his readers to see an allusion to Job 9.8, 11.
[124] Heil 1981: 69-72.
[125] Collins 2007: 337; Lane 1974: 236-238. Interestingly, Collins (2007: 336 cf. Heil 1981: 71 n. 98) asserts that technically Job 9.11 is not an epiphany, and insofar as it emphasises the incognisable nature of God, might even be described as an "anti-epiphany".
[126] The same verb occurs in Mark 13.30, 31-32; 14.35, but only in 6.48 does it signal physical motion (in the other instances it transmits metaphorically the idea of "passing on" i.e. ceasing). Thus, the only possible epiphanic use of the verb in Mark comes in 6.48.
[127] Similarly, Guelich (1989: 351) comments that Job 9.8, 11 LXX is the "closest parallel" to Mark 6.48.

that Mark 6.48b alludes directly to Job 9.8 LXX. Therefore, by Markan design, the event of Jesus' sea-walking is described in such a way as to recall the similar event of Yahweh's sea-walking described in Job 9.8.

The direct use of Job 9.8 in the Markan presentation of Jesus walking on the sea comprises a clear instance wherein the evangelist draws on the HDWT. As part of a hymnic description of God's power as creator, Job 9.8 MT uses mythological language to describe Yahweh's triumph over the chaos sea.[128] Elsewhere in Job, the chaos monster Rahab personifies the sea and is found in synonymous parallelism with the sea, i.e. Job 26.12. Therefore, Yahweh's walking on or trampling of the sea in Job 9.8 with his defeat of Rahab's helpers in the contextually proximate Job 9.13 almost certainly refer to the same event, namely, God the DW's primeval conflict with the powers of chaos.[129]

John Paul Heil reads Job 9.8 MT in this way, and finds the influence of a victory/dominance motif on the NT sea-walking stories. Heil reads בָּמָתֵי יָם in Job 9.8 MT in connection with Ugaritic *bmt* (back). Thus, the phrase "back of the sea" is interpreted against a mythological background in which Yahweh treads upon the back of the defeated sea monster (cf. the Baal myth), where *yām* is taken as a proper noun (Yam).[130] Alternatively, the phrase may be rendered "heights (i.e. waves) of the sea" which reading is reminiscent of the raising high of the sea elsewhere in the context of Yahweh's conflict with the chaos sea (cf. Ps 93.3f).[131] As it stands, some ambiguity surrounds the Hebrew phrase, but on either reading the point is essentially the same: Yahweh the DW triumphs over the personified inimical sea.[132]

In this connection, since Mark 6.48b alludes to the wording of Job 9.8 LXX, it should be pointed out that the Septuagint of Job 9.8 differs from the MT. For Heil, the verb choice in Job 9.8 LXX and the addition of ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐδάφους ("as on firm ground") demythologises the original Hebrew, obscuring the notion that Yahweh is victor over the sea.[133] In seven instances, the LXX renders MT דּוֹרֵךְ עַל "he trod/trampled on" with the construction ἐπιβαίνω ἐπὶ (e.g. Mic 1.3; Am 4.13; Deut 33.29; Ps 91.13). Since Job 9.8

[128] Heil 1981: 40; Collins 2007: 336-337.
[129] Day 1985: 40.
[130] Heil 1981: 40 following Albright 1938: 227; cf. Collins 2007: 336.
[131] Day 1985: 42.
[132] Watson (2005: 281 n. 57) accepts that the Hebrew evokes the idea of a "ribcage" (which clearly implies a creaturely description of the sea) but, against this, tries to deny any mythological connection.
[133] Heil 1981: 41.

LXX is the only instance in the Septuagint in which Hebrew *derek* is translated with περιπατέω, Heil cites this as evidence of demythologisation.[134]

As further support for his demythologisation argument, Heil notices that Mic 1.3 LXX and Amos 4.13 LXX translate בָּמֳתֵי "the heights" (τά ὕψη), which has a mythological nuance (cf. "the height of the strength of the sea" in *Tg* Job 9.8b). Job 9.8 LXX, however, lacks this correspondence inserting in its place the comparative phrase "as on firm ground" (ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐδάφους).[135] Accordingly, Heil concludes that in Job 9.8 LXX the sea is depicted as a locale rather than a defeated enemy.[136]

For the present purposes, again assuming that Mark 6.48b draws on Job 9.8 LXX *de facto*, were Job 9.8 LXX proved to lack DW connections, this might discredit the conclusion that Mark consciously drew on these traditions at this point. Interestingly, Heil maintains that the NT sea-walking accounts should be read mythologically, despite his conclusions concerning Job 9.8 LXX. That is, for Heil, the Markan account ought to be understood against the background of that which we have termed the HDWT. This is because Heil detects a mythological milieu in the gospel stories tied in with the storm-motif: the waves are raised by the wind, where the sea manifests itself as an opposing power "at the height of its strength".[137] In other words, for Heil, while the evangelists use wording similar to the LXX, the rationale employed is more reminiscent of Job 9.8 MT.

In response to Heil's argument that Job 9.8 LXX demythologises the Hebrew text, it should be noted that the changes in terminology from the MT need not amount to "demythologisation." The Septuagintal description of Yahweh walking on the sea "as on dry land," is out of the ordinary *per se*, and hardly removes the episode from the mythological sphere. As Heil observes, *Tg.* Job 9.8 has the combination of the verb "walk" and the meaning of the sea as an opposing power which is walked upon. On analogy, therefore, this later text suggests that the use of the verb περιπατέω is not incompatible with the motif of Yahweh's domination of the sea.[138] It could be that the LXX presupposes the motif, expressing it in slightly different terms. If "demythologisation" were a chief concern of the Septuagint translator, it becomes difficult to explain the reference to Yahweh's power over chaos sea-monsters (κήτη) in

[134] Heil 1981: 41.
[135] Heil 1981: 41 - 43.
[136] Heil 1981: 41-42.
[137] Heil 1981: 43.
[138] Heil 1981: 43.

Job 9.13 LXX (cf. the mention of the δράκοντα "dragon" in Job 40.25).[139] Thus, it is unlikely that Job 9.8 LXX actually "demythologises" the underlying Hebrew text.

Nicholls acknowledges the presence of a domination motif in Job 9.8 MT, but similar to Heil argues that the nuance of domination ("trampling" or "treading" on the sea) is not conveyed in the purported NT source text, Job 9.8 LXX.[140] However, going beyond and against Heil, she finds that Matthew (and presumably the other evangelists) lacks the nuance of victory and domination found in the Hebrew, since, if anything, the point of contact is with the Greek not the Hebrew text.[141] Against Heil, Nicholls denies the existence of an OT motif of Yahweh walking on the water. She concludes from this that one is precluded from demonstrating that Matthew was consciously drawing on such a tradition.[142]

On closer scrutiny, aspects of Nicholls' syllogistic reasoning appear unsound. First, Nicholls takes ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἐδάφους ("as on firm ground") in Job 9.8 LXX, as evidence of a change in theme from the MT. However, in the next stage of her argument Nicholls fails to note that the NT sea-walking stories omit precisely this element. This fact might connote a concern on the part of the evangelists to *retain* the mythological nuances she acknowledges are present in the original Hebrew text.

Again, it is odd that Nicholls admits a "Hellenistic motif" of sea-walking, but disallows an OT one. The example of Poseidon's sea-going chariot is claimed to be a component of "a more general cultural resource of ideas" which include a sea-walking theme.[143] If that is the case, the same rationale ought to operate for texts such as Hab 3.15, (where chariot horses of Yahweh the DW "tread" on the sea).[144] Likewise, it is difficult to see why Greek bridge-building stories constitute evidence for a Hellenistic sea-walking motif, when OT passages describing God's walking in or making a path

[139] On κῆτος see the discussion in Chapter 2, p. 90, with references.
[140] Nicholls 2008: 50.
[141] Nicholls 2008: 47-51.
[142] Nicholls 2008: 50.
[143] Nicholls 2008: 57. Interestingly, Day (1985: 107-108) links the tale of Zeus' battle with Typhon in Apollodorus (*The Library* I.6.3) to Hab 3, and both the relevant sections of Hab 3 and Apollodorus are traced to a common Ugaritic background. In the light of indications of Greek appropriations of ANE mythology (cf. Graf 1987: 86-96) the Poseidon traditions cited here might provide a parallel to Hab 3, and they may similarly reflect older eastern divine warrior mythology. In this case, the "general cultural resource of ideas" mentioned by Nicholls, would ultimately be traced back to the ANE divine warrior traditions.
[144] Hab 3.15 is cited by Heil as general cultural background to the NT sea-walking stories.

through the sea (e.g. Ps 77.19; Isa 43.16) or walking in the abyss (Job 38.16; cf. Sir 24.5) are disallowed as evidence of an OT sea-walking motif.[145]

In the light of texts such as Job 9.8, Hab 3.15, Isa 51.9-11, it is necessary to restate and reinstate Heil's conclusion regarding the existence of an OT dominance motif where Yahweh subdues the inimical chaos sea. This motif is none other than a particular expression of traditional DW mythology, in which Yahweh the DW conquers the personified and inimical sea/chaos monsters.[146] Yahweh's walking or trampling on the sea emblematic of domination is a less common feature of the HDWT than his rebuking or attacking of the sea/chaos sea monsters, nevertheless it is found within the traditions and in conjunction with more common aspects of DW mythology (Hab 3.15; Job 9.8). Thus, it is striking that in two closely related pericopes, which, as suggested above, form a bipartite narrative question-answer formula, Mark portrays Jesus speaking and acting as Yahweh/God the DW.

By way of summary and conclusion regarding the Markan sea-walking, on the strength of the conceptual/verbal correspondences it emerges that Mark 6.48b draws directly on the description of God's sea-walking in Job 9.8 LXX. It seems certain that Job 9.8 MT belongs within the HDWT. In view of the changes from the MT, the legitimacy of ascribing Job 9.8 LXX to the HDWT is a matter of debate. Some claim Job 9.8 LXX seeks to "demythologise" the underlying Hebrew text, but this is uncertain and no explanation for this hypothetical manoeuvre is forthcoming. On the contrary, particularly in view of the mention of chaos monsters in Job 9.13 LXX and elsewhere in Job, it is reasonable to conclude that the DW motif is likely presupposed in Job 9.8 LXX. Even if Job 9.8 LXX were understood to demythologise the MT, this would not necessitate the hypothesis that the evangelists knew nothing of the original mythological nuances in the Hebrew of Job 9.8, or that they read Job 9.8 LXX in a none mythological way.[147] Thus, Jesus' sea-walking in Mark 6.48b is to be understood against the

[145] Again, as evidence of a Hellenistic sea-walking "motif," Nicholls (2008: 58) cites Josephus' condemnation of Caligula's hubris (Jos. *Ant.* 19.I). If Josephus can be used in this way, then it is unclear why 2 Macc 5.21 LXX is excluded from Nicholls' discussion of a possible OT background, given that the NT authors routinely drew on the Septuagint.

[146] Cf. Marcus 1999: 432-433, who describes Jesus' walking on the sea as "symbolic of his conquest of death" (433) in relation to the resurrection (entertaining the possibility that Mark 6.45-52 is a displaced resurrection narrative). Marcus (1999: 432) mentions Rev. 15.2 as a further example of the notion of God's victory over death, since here martyrs who have triumphed over death stand on the crystal sea.

[147] The fact that Mark 6.45-52 contains mythological features, (i.e. the ghost) confirm this.

background of the HDWT, where Jesus is likened to Yahweh the DW as represented in Job 9.8.

Moving beyond 6.48, in 6.45 – 52 there are further indications that the evangelist may have shaped his narrative drawing on DW traditions contained in other OT texts. Within the orbit of criterion 2 on characteristic terminology, in Mark 6.50 the verb ταράσσω describes the disciples' perturbation at Jesus' approach, (ἐταράχθησαν) "they were terrified". While not uncommon in the OT, this verb is prominent in Ps 45 LXX, which psalm (Ps 46) has been identified as belonging to the *Chaoskampf/* DW traditions.[148] The same aorist passive form used in Mark 6.50 occurs three times in Ps 45 LXX.[149] It occurs twice in parallelism at Ps 45.4 LXX, where it is applied to the "waters" and the "mountains" which are "troubled" by the manifestation of the might of God. Again, it occurs in Ps 45.7 LXX, where this time the nations are "troubled" by God's coming in power.[150] The parallelism between waters/nations as inimical to God the DW is attested within the HDWT (cf. Ps 65.7; Isa 17.12; *1QH* 10.12, 27).[151]

Other OT passages in which this identical form occurs (e.g. Pss. 76.17; 106.27 LXX) are similarly texts belonging within the HDWT. Since ἐταράχθησαν is a Markan hapax legomenon, the evangelist's unusual word choice merits further study in order to discern the presence of any possible deeper significance.[152] Shifting the focus from the possible influence of a single source text (Ps 45 LXX) to a wider survey of the term ἐταράχθησαν yields interesting results. Already in chapter 2 it was observed that the Hebrew verb הָמָה "to roar" used in connection with the chaos sea/waters is an "established image" of the HDWT, indicating the inimical personification of the chaos waters (e.g. Jer. 5.22; Isa. 51.15; and in parallel with the "roaring" of the nations, Pss.

[148] Gunkel (1895: 67) considers the psalm a late adaptation of the myth where it is applied eschatologically to the final judgment. Day (1985: 187) includes Ps 46.2-3 MT as a *Chaoskampf* text, categorising it as pre-exilic.
[149] Marcus (1999: 426) notices several apparent points of contact between 6.45-52 and Ps 46.
[150] Marcus 1999: 426.
[151] Cf. Chapter 2, p. 92. Marcus (1999: 431) citing Davies & Allison 2.505 further observes that the Targum of Ps 76.17 LXX (ἐταράχθησαν ἄβυσσοι "the depths were troubled") transfers the disturbance of the waters to "the peoples." It is possible that in describing the reaction of the disciples to Jesus' manifestation, Mark makes a similar move.
[152] Outside Mark, the verb ταράσσω is used in a general sense "troubled" in several NT passages e.g. Matt 2.3; John 11.33, 12.27, 13.21, 14.1; Acts 15.24, 17.8; Gal 1.7, 5.10; 1 Pet 3.14. Interestingly, it used only twice in Luke, both times in broadly epiphanic circumstances: in Luke 1.12 it describes Zechariah's reaction to the visitation of the angel of the Lord, and in Luke 24.38 the risen Jesus asks the Emmaus road travellers why they are "troubled," in fact, they think they have seen a πνεῦμα ("spirit") (Luke 24.37), cf. Tob 12.16.

46.4, 7; 65.8; Isa. 17.12).[153] In the LXX translations of the texts in parentheses (i.e. Pss. 45.4, 7; 64.8; Isa. 17.12; 51.15; Jer 5.22) the verb ἠχέω translates the Hebrew "roar," but in every case the verb ταράσσω occurs in parallel with the chaotic roaring of the sea.

Furthermore, in the psalms, the exact verbal form found in Mark 6.50 (ἐταράχθησαν), is always used to describe the effect wrought by God's advent as warrior (Ps 17.8; 45.4 *bis* 45.7; 47.6; 63.9; 75.6; 76.17; 106.27 LXX). The sole exception is Ps 30.11 LXX, where ἐταράχθησαν does not refer to God or God's advent. Also, it is perhaps pertinent that Jdt 4.2; 7.4; 16.10 employ the same form in association with the approach of a human warrior(s). Of the remainder of occurrences of ἐταράχθησαν in the Septuagint (Gen 19.16; 42.28; 45.3; Tob 12.16; cf. Wis 16.6) the Genesis texts concern human reactions to adverse circumstances (also Wis 16.6), whereas Tob 12.16 describes the reaction of Tobit and Tobias to an angelophany.[154] It emerges, therefore, that wherever the term is associated with the approach of God, ἐταράχθησαν occurs in the context of DW mythology/hymnody. In Pss. 17.8; 45.4 *bis* 45.7; 47.6; 63.9; 75.6; 76.17; 106.27 LXX, ἐταράχθησαν denotes the unsettling effect which God's advent has on enemies, e.g. literally, "the nations" (Ps 45.7 LXX) and figuratively "the waters" (Ps 76.17 LXX).[155]

In regard to the Markan verb choice of ἐταράχθησαν in 6.50, this semantic survey raises interesting possibilities. If, as argued above, Mark 6.48b cites Job 9.8 LXX, then the implication is that Mark depicts Jesus in the same way as the OT depicts Yahweh. In the LXX, as demonstrated above, ἐταράχθησαν is consistently used in a particular way, most frequently in relation to the manifestation of God. Therefore, since Mark 6.50 concerns the manifestation of Jesus, the unique verb selection in this text is unlikely to be coincidental, and is probably a further indication that the evangelist strives to compare Jesus with Yahweh himself. The exact meaning of such a comparison and its interpretative possibilities must now be briefly explored.

---

[153] See Angel 2006: 41.

[154] The verb form is exceedingly rare in literature roughly contemporaneous to Mark. It is absent from Philo and occurs once only in Josephus (*Ant* 7.359). In the Pseudepigrapha it occurs only in *Jos Asen* 24.12.

[155] On the basis of the translations of the related texts and on the strength of the passive voice of ἐταράχθησαν, Ps 45.7 LXX should be understood to express the perturbation of the nations at God's advent as warrior (RSV translates actively "the nations rage," since the Hebrew הָמְּוּ גוֹיִם (Ps 46.7) has this active meaning).

Notwithstanding the perennial difficulties concerning the extent of transfer of meaning from source to allusive texts, some interpretative judgments may be made.[156] Since specific DW connotations always attach to the verb form ἐταράχθησαν as used in the psalms (excepting Ps 30.11 LXX), and since Mark has already appealed to the HDWT by alluding to Job 9.8 LXX, it is likely that Mark's use of ἐταράχθησαν is designed to evoke the scenario of the manifestation of Yahweh as DW. In this case, the disciples are troubled at Jesus' manifestation as a ghost, just as the waters/nations are said to be troubled at Yahweh's awesome manifestation in OT texts (e.g. Ps 45.7; 76.17; 106.27 LXX).[157] The scene is laden with irony insofar as Jesus manifests himself in a fashion similar to Yahweh yet the disciples mistake him for a ghost. The Markan Jesus comes to the aid of his disciples, but similar to God's *enemies* who become "troubled" in the LXX psalm texts cited above, the disciples fail to comprehend that the awesome manifestation of Jesus signals deliverance rather than destruction.

On balance, since Jesus is clearly likened to Yahweh the DW in the parallel and literarily related sea-miracle (Mark 4.35-41), the possibility that a similar strategy obtains in 6.45-52 increases, especially within a question-answer framework suggested above. More importantly, in the sea-walking act *per se* (Mark 6.48b) Jesus is likened to God the DW, by way of an allusion to a text belonging within the HDWT. Again, as mentioned above, the form ἐταράχθησαν consistently describes reactions to the manifestation of God as DW in texts which are often understood as possible background to Mark 6.45-52, such as Ps. 76.17 LXX.[158] Thus, it is judged probable that the use of the term ἐταράχθησαν in 6.50 is part of a wider Markan strategy to present Jesus in a way reminiscent of Yahweh the DW. Ultimately, the LXX psalms which have the term ἐταράχθησαν in relation to God, all concern a motif of divine deliverance wherein Yahweh saves his people (particularly evident, e.g. in Ps 106.23-30 LXX). This seems relevant since Jesus' entry into the boat averts a real or potential danger, by causing the cessation of the contrary wind, which is also described in terms drawn from the HDWT (καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος in Mark 6.51 cf. 4.39 and attendant discussion).

[156]On this methodological issue, see Beale 2007: 27-31.

[157] Ps 106.27 LXX has as its referent a rather generic reference to "those that go down to the sea in ships" (Ps 106.23 LXX). Since these sea-farers call to the Lord (v. 28) these are probably Israelites (though they could be gentiles cf. Jonah 1.14-16 LXX). In context, God manifests his might in the sea-storm but also delivers them when they call to him.

[158] For the possible influence of Ps 77 (76 LXX) on Mark 6.45-52, see, e.g., Marcus 1999: 431-432; Nineham 1968: 180; Hooker 1991: 169.

One final point tends to confirm the inferences made thus far. In Mark 6.50, Jesus identifies himself to the disciples, saying ἐγώ εἰμι ("It is I" or "I am"). At the level of Markan narrative, Jesus' self-identification in 6.50 is often understood in terms of Jesus laying claim to the divine name used of (and by) God in OT texts, beginning with Exod 3.14 LXX: καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Μωυσῆν ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν καὶ εἶπεν οὕτως ἐρεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ισραηλ ὁ ὢν ἀπέσταλκέν με πρὸς ὑμᾶς .[159] If the Markan statement in 6.50 is designed to recall the divine name, then the Markan association, even identification of Jesus with Yahweh in this episode would be complete.

In the Matthean version of this event (Matt 14.22-33), it is very probably the case that the ἐγώ εἰμι saying does carry this connotation. This is because Matthew orders his account such that the "I am" (Matt 14.27) pronouncement becomes the emphatic narrative centre-point, of a complex chiastic arrangement.[160] Thus, attention focuses rhetorically on this saying suggesting that for Matthew, Jesus makes a striking statement (concerning his divine identity), a suggestion apparently confirmed by the report of the disciples' reaction in Matt 14.33.[161] On the assumption of Markan priority, as Mark's first interpreter, Matthew, then, appears to understand the ἐγώ εἰμι in his Markan source as Jesus' self-identification with Yahweh.

While this synoptic insight is suggestive, since the ἐγώ εἰμι in Mark 6.50 is not the literary highpoint of the Markan drama (cf. above on 6.48b), it cannot be assumed that what is true for Matthew holds also for Mark. Nevertheless, in the light of Mark's comparison of Jesus and Yahweh through the allusion to Job 9.8 in Mark 6.48b, and given the previous argument relating to the verb form ἐταράχθησαν, which also occurs in 6.50, the interpretation of the Markan ἐγώ εἰμι in terms of a reference to the divine name seems fitting. It remains to examine other occurrences of the expression in Mark to see if this reading is possible and/or plausible.

[159] On the "I am" formula as the divine name here see, e.g., Lane 1974: 237; Heil 1981: 12; Guelich 1989: 351; Marcus 1999: 427; Ben Witherington 2001: 221-222; Hurtado 2003: 285; cf. 370 – 374, and, more cautiously, Collins 2007: 333, cf. Hooker (1991: 170). On the other hand, France (2002: 273 n. 71) recognises the "numinous character" here, but disallows the connection. France's logic breaks down since the disciples' misapprehension of Jesus' divine identity does not imply that Jesus has not revealed himself as a divine being, in fact, the disciples' consistent failure to recognise who Jesus *truly* is comprises a key Markan Christological motif.
[160] Angel 2011: 309-310.
[161] Angel 2011: 310.

The phrase appears on Jesus' lips in Mark 13.6, the sense of which is captured by the RSV, "many will come in my name, saying 'I am he' (ἐγώ εἰμι)". No identification with the Greek rendering of the Tetragrammaton is obvious here. The only other occurrence is in Mark 14.62, where in response to the High Priest's question if he is "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed" (14.61), Jesus replies ἐγώ εἰμι ("I am"), adding that the High Priest will see the "Son of Man seated at the right hand of Power, coming with the clouds of heaven". The High Priest responds in fury, tearing his clothes and decrying Jesus' words as blasphemy (14.63-64). While there is some question as to which particular element of Jesus' response causes the High Priest to take such grave offense, it is at least possible, and perhaps probable that within the context of Jesus' response as a whole, the ἐγώ εἰμι is taken as a rather unsubtle reference to the divine name.[162] Thus Jesus' announcement in Mark 14.62 likely suggests, somehow, self-equation with God himself.

If the Markan ἐγώ εἰμι is understood in this way in Mark 14.62, the probability that it could have this nuance in 6.50 increases. Since only God walks on the sea in the OT, Jesus' self-identification in Mark 6.50 ἐγώ εἰμι ("I am" albeit with the sense "It is I") appears somewhat conspicuous. Again, it was observed above that given the epiphanic features of the Markan story, revelatory significance probably attaches to the Markan verb παρελθεῖν in 6.48. Since this verb is used in poignant moments of divine revelation (e.g. Exod 34.6; 1 Kgs 19.11; Gen 32.31-32 LXX) the suggestion is that for Mark, Jesus intends to manifest himself just as Yahweh did in the OT. Therefore, though it is not *definitely* the case that Mark's Jesus pronounces the divine name in self-reference, on the cumulative strength of the arguments presented to this point, and in view of the implications of the same phrase in Mark 14.62, this seems distinctly possible.

In terms of intertextuality, it is notable that ἐγώ εἰμι in Mark 6.50 occurs in connection with the Markan hapax legomenon ἐταράχθησαν (6.50) and Jesus' negative injunction to the disciples, μὴ φοβεῖσθε (6.50). As demonstrated above, the verb form ἐταράχθησαν is particularly prominent in Ps 45 LXX. It is interesting, therefore, that the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι also occurs in Psalm 45 LXX, where, after Yahweh manifests himself as DW, he pronounces the ἐγώ εἰμι formula in self-reference: ("Be still and know that *I am*

[162] For a nuanced treatment with references to relevant literature on the topic of Jesus' pronouncement within the context of Mark 14.53-65, see Bock: 2000. Bock views the combination of Jesus' use of Ps 110.1 and Dan 7.13 as the interpretative key to the Markan "blasphemy" charge, see e.g. Bock 2000: 25, 28.

God" Ps 45.10 LXX).[163] It has been further suggested that Jesus' negative injunction to the disciples, μὴ φοβεῖσθε (6.50), is reminiscent of the affirmation "we shall not fear" in Ps 45.3 LXX (οὐ φοβηθησόμεθα).[164]

It is true that the Markan representation of this event could be patterned on various OT texts (e.g. Jer 26.28; 49.11, combining the divine identification formula with a negative command not to fear; cf. Exod 3.6; Isa 41.4-5; Isa 51.12-13). Again, though prominent in Ps 45 LXX, the verb form ἐταράχθησαν need not *necessarily* have been drawn from Ps 45 LXX. Nevertheless, on the cumulative force of the arguments made above, there remains a strong possibility that Ps 45 LXX has directly influenced the Markan description of Jesus' sea-walking miracle.

One further text which could possibly form part of the literary background to Mark 6.45-52 in specific connection with 6.50, is Isa 43.1-11; 15-16. This prophetic text draws poetically on the deliverance at the Red Sea as part of the Isaianic "new exodus" motif.[165] While not as marked as the parallel with Job 9.8 LXX, consonant with the idea expressed in Mark 6.48b, in Isa 43.16 the Lord is depicted making a way in the sea and a path in the mighty waters. As discussed above, Mark 6.50 contains the self-identification formula "It is I" (ἐγώ εἰμι), and it is noteworthy that Isa 43 contains several "I am/I will be" statements (Isa 43.1, 3, 5, 11, 13, 15; cf. Isa 41.4; 43.25; 44.6; 45.18; 46.4; 48.12; 51.12; 52.6). Similarly, the negative command "Do not be afraid" (μὴ φοβεῖσθε) in 6.50 is sometimes thought to parallel the exhortation "Do not fear" (μὴ φοβοῦ in Isa 43.1, 5), which occurs in connection with passage through the waters (cf. Isa 43.2).[166]

Once more, however, the possible intertextual links with Isa 43.1-11; 15-16 are not wholly certain. Since "I am"/ "Do not fear" formulas are frequent in this section of Isaiah and since such a connection occurs elsewhere in the OT (e.g. Jer 26.28; 49.11), it would be difficult to establish an exclusive, direct connection between Mark 6.50 and Isa 43.1-11/ 15-16. Nevertheless, some of the conceptual notions and vocabulary found in

[163] In Ps 45.8-9 LXX, as in other texts, Yahweh's warlike intervention effects peace on earth. On this see Ballard 1999: 87-88.
[164] Marcus 1999: 426-427.
[165] For this theme specifically in relation to the use of Isaiah in Mark, see Watts 1997: 161.
[166] Boring 2006: 190. Heil (1981: 59-60) points this out in relation to Mt 14.22-33; Watts (1997: 161-162) following Heil, makes the same link but with Mark 6.45-52. Cf. Bowman and Komoszewski 2007: 205-206.

6.45-52 are also present in Isa 43.1-11; 15-16 and the influence of this passage on Mark cannot be ruled out.

On balance, therefore, in connection specifically with Mark 6.50, the possibility that 6.45-52 may have been influenced to some degree by Ps 45 LXX and perhaps also Isa 43.1-11, 15-16 cannot be ruled out. If so, this could again suggest that Mark consciously draws on the HDWT, since Ps 46 belongs within these traditions, and since, within the "new exodus" motif, Deutero-Isaiah consistently portrays Yahweh as DW, where there are links with the *Chaoskampf* and the exodus crossing, reaching clear mythological expression in Isa 51.9-11.[167]

(iii) The denouement of the story in relation to the HDWT

The denouement of the second Markan sea-miracle is something of an interpretative conundrum. In the light of the miraculous events narrated in the immediately preceding verses, it is perhaps unsurprising that as Jesus steps into the boat, the disciples are described as (λίαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο) "greatly astonished." However, the epexegetical assertion in 6.52, οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις ἀλλ᾽ ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη (for they didn't understand about the loaves, but their heart was hardened) is somewhat unexpected, and its meaning is not immediately apparent. Taken together, the rhetorical force of Mark 6.51-52 implies that had the disciples made the pertinent connections concerning "the loaves," they would not have been "greatly astonished" (6.51) at Jesus' sea-walking feat. Thus, the story closes on a note of censure.

Since Mark furnishes us with no further explanation, any explicit statement of what exactly the disciples failed to understand about "the loaves" is lacking. Clearly, the remark concerning "the loaves" points back to the preceding narrative unit (6.30-44). There is a near consensus that the first Markan feeding miracle (6.30-44) flagged up in 6.52, contains echoes of Exod 16, or alludes to the events described in the Exodus.[168]

[167] Watts (1997) offers the fullest study on the portrayal of Yahweh as DW in Isa 40-55. Thus, Watts (1997: 160 n. 118) states: "Yahweh-Warrior language is found in [Isa] 40.26; 42.13-15; 43.17; 44.27; 45.2; 49.24ff; 50.2 and 51.9f", for the links between the warrior language and *Chaoskampf* he refers the reader to Stuhlmueller (1970: 86).

[168] E.g. Nineham 1963: 178; Lane 1974: 228-229; Cole 1989: 178; Broadhead 1992: 122; Watts 1997:19, 232-233; Guelich 1989: 336; Hooker 1991: 164-165, 167; Marcus 1999: 410-411; Collins 2007: 322-323. Carrington (1960: 139) views 2 Kgs 4.42-44 as the sole OT antecedent for the "Feeding of the Five Thousand," notwithstanding, Carrington (1960: 135) still understands the story against a predominantly

This holds even where critics detect the presence of additional layers of meaning, such as an Elijah-Elisha typology or an implicit Markan interest in the Eucharist.[169] Thus, in Mark 6.41-42, Jesus, like Moses, and Elisha (cf. 2 Kgs 4.42-44), but possibly even as God himself, miraculously provided bread for the masses.[170] At a basic level, therefore, "the loaves" episode is to be understood in terms of Jesus' capacity to make miraculous provision in adverse circumstances in a way parallel to the events surrounding Israel's exodus delivery.[171]

Further to this, it seems very probable that the "connections" with "the loaves" which the disciples had failed to make, relate to the apprehension of Jesus' true identity. First, it is to be recalled that Mark chapter 6 begins with explicit questions concerning the identity of Jesus (6.1-6, 14-16). Secondly, in ostensibly epiphanic fashion, the context which immediately precedes the denouement (6.49/50) raises again the question of Jesus' identity within a striking mistaken/true identity concept. Thirdly, on formal grounds, it is to be observed that Mark 6.45-52 shares the same basic structure as 4.35-41, namely, a sea-crossing, a miraculous action at sea, and the wonderment of the disciples. Since the denouement of the first sea-miracle involves an explicit question regarding Jesus' identity

---

Mosaic backdrop. Interestingly, Bultmann (1963: 229) rejects the idea that the NT feeding miracles arose from the stories of manna in the desert in Exod 16, but accepts that in such stories the OT makes its "own contributions" in the "details."

[169] Collins (2007: 319-320) first cites parallels with 1 Kgs 17 and 2 Kgs 4.42, though she also sees similarities with (among other themes) the Exodus wilderness/manna motif, similarly Guelich 1989: 344-345. For Marcus (1999: 410-411), Exodus and Eucharist associations, and indeed further sets of associations coexist in Mark 6.30-44. That the Markan portrayal of the eucharistic act recalls the feeding miracles is clear on the basis of the verbal parallels between 14.22 and 6.41, 8.6 (cf. Marcus 1999: 410). Nevertheless, contra Marcus (1999: 434-435), it is not immediately clear why the allusion to "loaves" in 6.52 is necessarily a *eucharistic* one. As observed in n. 171, below, in Mark "loaves/bread" is a polyvalent concept used in different ways with different implications. While 6.41 (and 8.6) seemingly foreshadows 14.22, it is not obvious that 6.52 constitutes a link in the eucharistic chain. Given the tell-tale exodus phrase ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης cited in 6.47 just before Jesus' sea-walking (see above), and the further likely links to the exodus story proposed in the present argument, it seems most natural to read the "loaves" in 6.52 in the light of the exodus connections which obtain in 6.30-44.

[170] Hooker (1991: 169) sees that strictly speaking, in the feeding miracle, Jesus has revealed himself as one greater than Moses, since Jesus himself provides the people with bread whereas Moses had only *received* it. *Mutatis mutandis* in 2 Kgs 4.42-44 Elisha is depicted in the role of miraculous provider, but he specifically invokes the name of the "Lord" (v. 43) as the narrator confirms (v. 44). The Markan Jesus' heavenward glance (Mark 6.41) might have a similar meaning, nevertheless, the scale of the Markan miracle and the lack of any verbal invocation or petition suggests that Jesus is the greater cf. Guelich 1989: 344.

[171] "Loaves/bread" again occurs in Mark 7.2, 5 within the context of Jesus' discussion with the Pharisees on human traditions, and in 7.27, where its use is metaphorical and relates to God's provision/action on behalf of his people. The term is prominent in the second feeding miracle (Mark 8.1-9) and in 8.14-21, where the "bread" motif and the disciples' lack of understanding appears once more in close connection. Here, though, there is a new development in relation to a polemic against the Pharisees (8.15). The one remaining occurrence of the term "bread" in Mark's Gospel is that of 14.22, in the context of the Last Supper.

(4.41), and since 6.45-52 parallels 4.35-41 in other respects (see discussion above), the probability that the denouement in 6.52 concerns the mystery of the true identity of Jesus is likely increased. If this interpretation is correct, as part of a recurrent Markan identity motif, the disciples' failure to "understand about the loaves" (6.52) is tantamount to the failure to acknowledge Jesus' true identity as bound up with the power and being of God himself.[172]

Thus, it may be concluded that 6.52 and the two Markan events to which it implicitly and explicitly refers (6.48-50/6.30-44) raise again the question of Jesus' identity. An important interpretative issue, particularly in view of Q3 of chapter 1 of this thesis, (concerning the transfer of divine operations and attributes to Jesus), concerns the authorial and christological intent regarding the exodus allusions which obtain in this section of the gospel. It may be asked if the exodus connections evident in Mark 6.45-52 (cf. 6.30-44) are designed, at least in part, to frame Jesus as a neo-Mosaic figure. On the other hand, in Mark 6.48b Jesus' sea-walking recalls Yahweh the DW walking on the sea (cf. Job 9.8). Since in the exodus drama proper (Exod 15.3) and in Second Temple retellings of it (*Jos Ant.* 2.343-344a/ *L.A.B.* 10.5), God is portrayed as DW and liberator, the connections may tie into the Markan statement that Jesus acts as DW and liberator in a way parallel to God himself.

In favour of the notion that Mark represents Jesus as a new Moses, it might be argued that Jesus' presence on "the mountain" in 6.46 is reminiscent of Moses (e.g. Exod 24.15, 18). Moreover, in Mark 6.50, Jesus' exhortation to the disciples, Θαρσεῖτε, ("Have courage!"), could be seen to reproduce intentionally, Moses' rallying call to the Israelites (θαρσεῖτε in Exod 14.13 LXX), which immediately precedes the miraculous crossing of the Red Sea.[173] However, whereas Moses goes from the sea to the mountain (Exod 15, 19), the Markan Jesus is said to go from the mountain to the sea, which sequence corresponds to the going forth of God as DW (Hab 3.3-15).

Therefore, on the evidence presented in this chapter, it seems that the Markan Jesus is likened less to a divinely appointed agent (Moses), than he is to God himself. To

[172] Similarly, Nineham 1963: 180.

[173] Bowman and Komoszewski 2007: 205; Cf. Marcus 1999: 434. The imperative form Θαρσεῖτε occurs again in Exod 20.20 LXX, but is otherwise rare in the OT, since it is not found elsewhere in the Torah and in the prophets it occurs only in Zech 8.13, 15 (where the Lord addresses Israel using this term), and again only in Hag 2.5 and Joel 2.22.

restate an earlier point, Mark 6.45-52 reads primarily as an "epiphany", or at least has an epiphanic thrust, since the salient points in the narrative show Jesus fulfilling roles ordinarily assigned to God.[174] For example, Mark 6.48b, the central element of the story and mid-point of Mark's chiastic structure, presents Jesus walking on the sea. This is an allusion to Job 9.8, and has the effect of comparing Jesus not to Moses, but to God. In 6.50 the "troubled" reaction of the disciples to Jesus' manifestation is characteristic of reactions to the manifestation of Yahweh as DW in the OT. Again, as Jesus enters the boat, the wind dies (6.50: καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος), which phrase reproduces exactly Mark 4.39, recalling Jesus' power over the elements in the first sea-miracle where the comparison is with God himself. As discussed above, the theophanic motif of "passing by" together with Jesus' self-identification, ἐγώ εἰμι in 6.50, at least for Mark, probably suggests that Jesus lays claim to the divine name, such that Jesus is again identified not with Moses (who witnesses the revelation of God) but somehow with Yahweh.[175]

(d) Summary of findings

The following points summarise findings relating to this section on Mark 6.45-52. These are arranged in descending order relative to their strength and importance.

> (1). The chiastic high-point of 6.45-52 was shown to be Jesus' sea-walking in 6.48b. Invoking criterion 2 on characteristic terminology, it was argued that Mark 6.48b contains an allusion to the similarly worded and semantically ordered Job 9.8 LXX. The intertextual implication is that Mark likens Jesus to Yahweh who walks on the sea in Job 9.8. This is relevant to the current thesis since, in relation to criterion 1 on traditional imagery, Job 9.8 is a HDWT text which uses imagery to describe God as creator, depicting the dominance of God the DW over the sea. The notion that Job 9.8 LXX demythologises Job 9.8 MT was considered, but ultimately rejected.

[174] Boring 2006: 190. Hooker (1991: 169) stresses that the Markan Jesus is here (and elsewhere) shown to be superior to Moses. Nineham (1968: 180-181) posits that the story in its original form climaxed in the epiphanic revelation of Jesus in his godlike mastery over the waves, but that in the redactional process additions were made (for Nineham these possibly originated in a separate story) which had to do with the rescue of the stranded disciples.

[175] Cf. Collins (2007: 333), who affirms that "theophanic elements" in the story suggest that members of Mark's audience would understand that the passage implies the divinity of Jesus.

(2). Further to (1) above, and in relation to criterion 2, it was argued that the Markan hapax legomenon ἐταράχθησαν (6.50), is a verb form used characteristically in the HDWT, where in relation to God, it always describes the reaction of those who behold the manifestation of Yahweh as DW. If, as argued in (1), Mark likens the sea-walking of Jesus to Yahweh the DW by allusion to Job 9.8, then this description of the reaction of the disciples would befit that association. The suggestion, then, is that complementing the allusion to Job 9.8 in Mark 6.48b, in 6.50 the evangelist draws strategically on a term from the HDWT in such a way as to liken the disciples' reaction to the manifestation of Jesus to that of the reactions of those who behold the manifestation of Yahweh the DW in the OT.

(3) Again in relation to (1), the presence of a further verbal/conceptual link between Mark 6.48 and Job 9.11 LXX involving the verb (παρέρχομαι) was judged to strengthen the conclusion that Mark likens Jesus to Yahweh himself as presented in Job 9. The use of the verb παρέρχομαι in this context also recalls particular revelatory moments (e.g. Exod 34.6; 1 Kgs 19.11; Gen 32.31-32 LXX) of the divine epiphany.

(4) Since, as demonstrated in this section, the sea-miracles Mark 4.35/6.45-52 exist in a parallel literary relationship, they likely form a narrative question-answer formula, since the strategic question concerning Jesus' identity, raised in 4.41, may be seen (in part) to be illuminated by 6.45-52. Both stories draw on HDWT texts and imagery to describe an epiphanic revelation of Jesus' identity in such a way as to liken Jesus to God the DW, making a claim regarding Jesus divine identity.

(5) In relation to criterions 1 and 2 on imagery and terminology, it was argued that Mark 6.45-52 contains several conceptual and verbal links with the exodus story, including the Red Sea traverse, as indicated, particularly, by the phrase familiar to the exodus drama, ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης in 6.47. In Exod 15, a fundamental text within the HDWT, God is depicted as a warrior-like liberator. In Second Temple renditions of the Red Sea crossing, authors roughly contemporaneous with Mark (i.e. *Jos Ant.* 2.343-344a/ *L.A.B.* 10.5) draw on texts from the HDWT to enhance their portrayal of God as DW. Similarly, Mark 6.45-

52 echoes the Red Sea traverse, and in his description, Mark (like Josephus and Pseudo-Philo) draws on HDWT texts and terminology, most notably Job 9.8, where Yahweh is depicted as DW (6.48b). This would suggest that Mark frames the sea-walking story so as to recall the exodus event, wherein Jesus is likened to the God who manifested himself as DW and liberator of the people in the exodus story.

(6) Further to the previous points, it was argued that the use of the phrase (ἐγώ εἰμι) in Mark 6.50, just after Jesus (like Yahweh) has walked on the sea, suggests that for Mark, Jesus appropriates the divine name in self-reference (cf. 14.62 with vv. 63-64) in what is effectively a revelatory event, which point tends to support the notion of a Markan strategy to liken Jesus to God himself in 6.45-52.

(7) Given the various verbal correspondences between Mark 6.45-52 and Ps 46 (45 LXX), it was argued that this HDWT psalm could have exercised particular influence on the Markan story. In view of verbal and conceptual parallels, it was similarly suggested that Isa 43.1-11, 15-16, the latter of which is also within the HDWT, may to a lesser extent, lie in the background of 6.45-52.

(e) Conclusion: Mark 6.45-52

It emerges then, that similar to Mark 4.35-41, in 6.45-52, Jesus is portrayed acting in a striking way which recalls the exclusive action of God in an OT text belonging within the HDWT (cf. criterion 1 on traditional imagery). The sea-walking in Mark may be understood as symbolic of Jesus' power over the forces of evil and death in a way which somewhat parallels 4.35-41. In Mark 4.35-41 the focus is on Jesus' verbal rebuke of the chaos forces symbolised in the elements. In 6.45-52, the narrative peak is the sea-walking event and the near identification of Jesus with Yahweh the DW, victor over chaos. Indeed, the evangelists' choice of terminology draws at times on the HDWT (for example, in the allusion to Job 9.8 LXX in Mark 6.48b, and the use of the verb form ἐταράχθησαν in 6.50), apparently in order to liken the epiphanic manifestation of Jesus to his disciples to the manifestation of God as DW in OT texts. The use of the ἐγώ εἰμι formula in Mark 6.50 would further confirm this comparison between Jesus and God himself, and, as argued above, it is clear that Matthew read it this way.[176]

[176] See argument on pages 149-150.

The clear allusions to the exodus drama may be seen to some extent to present Jesus as a neo-Mosaic figure. However, it is clear that Mark represents Jesus as much more than a new Moses, since Jesus' own actions are directly parallel to those of God himself in the OT. It is fascinating that similar to Josephus and Philo in their retellings of the Red Sea crossing, Mark enriches his account which echoes the Red Sea crossing, with imagery and vocabulary drawn from the HDWT. Furthermore, the Markan strategy which draws together allusions to the exodus sea crossing (e.g. 6.47) and allusions to God's victory over the sea at creation (e.g. 6.48b) has a precedent in the OT, since the HDWT text Isa 51.9-11 explicitly combines the exodus event with the creation *Chaoskampf* myth in its depiction of Yahweh as DW. Thus, in 6.45-52, Mark would appear to appeal to texts in such a way as to liken Jesus to Yahweh the DW, whose might was demonstrated at the creation, and whose salvific power was established in the event of liberation from Egypt at the Red Sea as recorded in the book of Exodus.

(3.4). *Conclusion and closing reflections on the Markan sea-miracles*

The sea-epiphanies in Mark 4.35-41/6.45-52 are highpoints in the Gospel's consistent rhetorical inquiry concerning Jesus' identity. For Mark, Jesus' divine identity comes to light in these stories, so commentators correctly read them as "epiphanies".[177] As argued above, in both the stilling of the storm and Jesus' sea-walking, Mark draws on imagery and language belonging to the HDWT. In a narrative strategy, Mark 6.45-52 provides part of the answer to the question concerning Jesus' true identity which appears in 4.41. Together, the Markan portrayal of Jesus' rebuking the sea and walking on it are designed to recall God's action against chaos and evil in OT texts. Thus, in what are essentially two poignant, parallel Christological statements, Mark identifies Jesus with God the DW.

In regard to the question matrix outlined in chapter 1, these findings do not directly illuminate Q1 (regarding the possible worship of Jesus), Q2 (on the issue of preexistence), nor Q5 (on Christological titles).[178] Nevertheless, with respect to Q3 (the transfer of divine operations/attributes to Jesus), Mark's intertextually charged

[177] Heil 1981: 17, 72-73, 118; cf. Collins 2007: 258 – 259.
[178] Note, however, the relevance of the Matthean parallel to Mark 6.45-52 (i.e. Matt 14.33) in relation to (Q1) and (Q5).

descriptions of Jesus' sea-stilling and sea-walking in 4.35-41 and 6.45-52 are very striking, insofar as Jesus acts and speaks as only God himself acts and speaks in OT texts.

Similarly, these findings are relevant to Q4 (on the reprogramming of OT texts wherein Jesus becomes the referent in lieu of God/Yahweh). For instance, it was argued in relation to 4.35-41 that Mark frames the disciples' question in 4.41 such that it becomes a deliberate nuanced echo of Ps 24.8, 10 (23.8, 10 LXX). Consequently, this OT HDWT text is reworked such that *Jesus* is understood to be the "King of glory" in place of Yahweh. Again, in regard to 6.45-52, it was demonstrated that Mark 6.48b contains an allusion to Job 9.8 LXX, thus Mark has *Jesus* walk on the sea, whereas in the original source text it is Yahweh who does so.

Though the implications of these findings certainly point in the direction of Mark's high Christology, as narrative critics observe, there is no absolute identification of Jesus and God in the gospel of Mark, since the "Son" and the "Father" are separate Markan characters (Jesus prays to the Father and distinguishes himself from the Father, see, for example, the "ignorance logion" in 13.32). In the light of the wider context of the gospel, it is not the case, therefore, that Mark's Christology amounts to some form of proto-sabellianism. Nevertheless, the strong identification of Jesus with God as DW would seem to suggest that Mark is making a statement about Jesus which cannot be made about any other human figure. The very close identification of Jesus and God the Father in Mark, probably implies that in some way, Mark considers Jesus to be divine.

CHAPTER 4

THE INFLUENCE OF HEBREW DIVINE WARRIOR TRADITIONS ON THE MARKAN EXORCISMS (1.21-28; 5.1-20; 7.24-30; 9.14-29 cf. 1.32-34, 39; 3.11-12) WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR CHRISTOLOGY

(4.1) Introduction

While commentators treating subjects such as Christology, discipleship or "miracles" typically mention the Markan exorcisms, few studies have as their object Mark's exorcisms.[1] Generally, studies on exorcisms address historical questions and historical critical concerns rather than narrative critical ones.[2] It is not the aim of this thesis to investigate the historicity of the Markan exorcisms. It will be assumed that the worldview of Mark (and Jesus) conceived of Satan as a real spiritual being and of demon possession as the *de facto* incorporation of a person by a supernatural being(s).[3] This assumption is unlike that of some modern scholars, whose tendency is to rationalise demon possession in terms of the manifestation of a psychological condition.[4] Analysis of the spectrum of contemporary studies treating the psychological, socio-psychological or supernatural nature of demon possession is beyond the remit of this study. [5] The present chapter focuses on how the Markan exorcisms may contribute to our understanding of Markan Christology.

From a narrative perspective, the Markan exorcisms will be studied in relation to the sea-miracles in 4.35-41/6.45-52, (see below 4.2b(iii); 4.4b). The primary justification for this is that there are striking connections between two major Markan exorcisms and the first sea-miracle, as will be demonstrated below.[6] This link is important for the reading of the exorcisms proposed here, since, as shown in Chapter 3, the Markan sea-miracles draw strongly on the HDWT in order to present Jesus in such a way as to recall God the DW. Here, it will be argued that congruously, in the exorcisms and related pericopes, Mark reveals the nature of the divine battle and Jesus' role therein. Each Markan

[1] See, however, Pero 2013, and, Shively 2012, on Mark 3.22-30. Specific studies on exorcisms include, Kee 1968; Hiers 1974; Twelftree 1993; Kirschner 1994; Klutz 2004.
[2] E.g. Hiers 1974; Twelftree 1993; Sterling 1993; Klutz (2004) espouses a more synthetic "sociostylistic" approach.
[3] Similarly, Hiers 1974: 35; van Iersel 1998: 135; Twelftree 1993: 13.
[4] Thus, Nineham (1963: 77) remarks that a "widely accepted suggestion" is that demon possession is in reality *hysteria* on the part of the human protagonist.
[5] E.g. Van der Loos 1965: 3-116; cf. Casey (2007: 144-167) on Mark 2.1-12 and in connection with healing stories and modern interpretations; Eve 2002: 350-376; Goodman 1988.
[6] See below on Mark 1.21-28 and 5.1-20.

exorcism (1.21-28; 5.1-20; 7.24-30; 9.14-29) will be considered individually in order to determine if HDWT influence obtains. Similarly, there will be analysis of the Markan summary statements (1.32-34, 39; 3.11-12) which refer to exorcisms, and two related pericopes, the centurion's cry in 15.39, and Jesus' authorisation of others to exorcise in his name in 9.38-41. The final part of the discussion and the conclusion to this chapter will tie into the question matrix established in chapter 1.

(4.2) Mark 1.21-28

(a). Text[7]

> *21* And they entered Capernaum and immediately on the Sabbath he went into the synagogue and taught. *22* And they were astonished at his teaching for he was teaching them as one who had authority and not as the scribes. *23* And immediately there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit and he cried out, *24* saying, 'What do you have to do with us Jesus Nazarene, Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are - the holy one of God'. *25* But Jesus rebuked him saying, 'Be muzzled and get out of him!' *26* And the unclean spirit shook him and crying out in a loud voice came out of him. *27* And they were all amazed so that they queried among themselves 'What is this? A new teaching with authority: he commands even the unclean spirits and they obey him!' *28* And the news of him went out immediately into the whole region of Galilee.

(b) *1.21-28 within the wider Markan context*

(i). 1.21-28 in the light of the prologue

As will be argued in (c) below, Mark 1.21-28 has strategic, programmatic importance for understanding Jesus' mission and identity as conqueror of demonic forces. In this sense it builds on the prologue.[8] In the prologue, Jesus is formally introduced as "Jesus Christ" (1.1).[9] Further clues surrounding his identity emerge in the composite citation (1.2-3) attributed to the "prophet Isaiah" (1.2).[10] Key here is the phrase τὴν ὁδὸν

[7] Since "teaching" and "exorcism" are parallel in Mark 1.27, the pericope is better delineated 1.21-28 than 1.23-28.

[8] Scholars demarcate the Markan prologue variously, e.g. Watts (1997: 95) delineates 1.1-13 with a "hinge" on verses 14-15; Moloney (2002: 30) suggests 1.1-13; Boring (2006: 5-6) suggests 1.1-15.

[9] The epithet "Son of God" in 1.1, omitted from several manuscripts, is attested in the Western tradition, for example, in א[1] B D L W 2427. NA[27]awards the variant a "C" rating; in favour of its inclusion are e.g. Guelich 1989: 6; Donahue & Harrington 2002 :60. Those who take the expression to be a scribal addition include Marcus 1999: 141; Collins & Collins 2008: 126. Since questions remain over the authenticity of the phrase in Mark 1.1 it will be suspended from the discussion of the title "Son of God" in the last section of this chapter.

[10] Mark 1.2-3 combines elements from Exod 23.20, Mal 3.1 and Isa 40.3 but the citation is attributed to Isaiah, seemingly because of the importance of this prophet for Mark, thus, Marcus 1999:147.

κυρίου in 1.3. Whether this phrase is taken as an objective genitive, (i.e. tantamount to the ethical *pathway* of God), or as a subjective genitive, (i.e. as God's *physical way* through the desert), is a hermeneutical decision of some christological significance.[11] If the former, then implicitly, John the Baptist and, *a fortiori* Jesus, are introduced primarily as heralds, whose remit, broadly conceived, is to summon people to adopt God's "way." However, the phrase is best taken as a subjective genitive, whereby, at least implicitly, the itinerant Markan Jesus becomes identified from the outset with Yahweh.[12]

Contextually, the latter reading is preferable since, whereas in the original Isaianic text κυρίου has as its referent *Yahweh* in enunciation of the coming of God, in the Markan context, John the Baptist as ἄγγελόν heralds *Jesus'* coming (1.4-8).[13] Subtle changes to the wording of the Isaianic source text lend further support to this view. Thus, in Mark 1.3 the substitution of "his" in the place of "for our God" (Isa 40.3 LXX) means that κυρίου is no longer inevitably linked to God himself, but can refer instead to Jesus.[14] This probable identification of Jesus with Yahweh in Mark 1.3 has further significance for this thesis insofar as Yahweh is depicted in the Deutero-Isaianic source text as the DW, who makes a new, physical way in the desert as the mighty deliverer of his people.[15]

In this vein, it is significant that Mark has John the Baptist describe Jesus as ὁ ἰσχυρότερός - the "stronger one" (1.7).[16] Mark's language selection suggests the

[11] For the "subjective" reading see e.g. Marcus 1992:29; Gundry 1993: 35-36; Boring 2006: 37. Marcus (1999: 148) however, gives some room to the objective explanation, finding that Mark seeks not simply to identify Jesus with God, rather, "where Jesus is acting there God is acting."

[12] Cranfield 1959: 39-40; Hooker 1991: 35-36. For Marcus (1992: 38-39), the "attentive Markan reader" would probably make this connection, though he cautions from the use of κυρίος in 12.36-37 that Mark makes no absolute identification of Jesus and Yahweh. Again, Marcus (1992: 149) makes this connection in Mark 1.3, commenting on the "triumphal entry": "For Mark, Jesus is a warrior, and his entrance into Jerusalem is a decisive campaign in God's holy war of eschatological liberation, a war that Mark 1.1-3 already established as the theme of the Gospel. Jesus' way *is* the way of the Lord; in his entrance into the holy city the Lord returns to Zion to redeem it from an alien rule." Marcus (1999: 143) suggests the NT usage of *kyrios* as applied to Jesus implies some form of divinity, though "Mark … never unambiguously calls Jesus *kyrios* in this sense." Similarly, Watts 1997: 87, cf. 80, 140, where Watts identifies Jesus as the "Yahweh-Warrior" known to Isaiah. On the Markan "desert" background as a throwback to the Isaianic desert motif see e.g. Marcus 1992: 23.

[13] Johansson 2010: 102; Focant 2009: 3; Donahue & Harrington 2002: 61. Cf. Marcus (1992: 42) who comments that ultimately, John *prepares the way* for Jesus by dying a martyr's death.

[14] Cranfield 1959: 39-40; Gundry 1993: 36.

[15] On Isa 40.3-6 in terms of the theophany of the DW, see Cross 1973: 106, cf. on the battle connotations here, Baltzer 2001: 55-56; Knight 1965: 24-25. In Deutero-Isaiah, the strongest images of Yahweh the DW are found in Isa 50.2; 51.9-11.

[16] Collins (2007: 146) asserts that Mark 1.7 evokes connotations of the divine warrior/ his royal messiah or "other agent in battle" but cites no textual evidence for this connection. Notably, the comparative form ἰσχυρότερός is most often used of military might in the LXX, e.g. Num 13.18, 31; Deut 4.38, 7.1, 9.1, 11.23; Judg 5.13; 14.18; 18.26.

background influence of a Deutero-Isaianic DW motif (cf. 1.2). The "ἴσχ" root occurs frequently in Isa 40-55 LXX in reference to Yahweh the DW, who is "strong" and strengthens his people.[17] In the gospel, however, with the occasional exception (e.g. 2.17 οἱ ἰσχύοντες), the "ἴσχ" root occurs in relation to *Jesus'* confrontation and conquest of Satan and demons as ὁ ἰσχυρότερός i.e. 3.27 (ὁ ἰσχυρός), 5.4, (ἴσχυεν) and 9.18 (ἴσχυσαν), (cf. below on Mark 3.22-30).[18]

The Markan identification of Jesus and Yahweh outlined above is nuanced in the baptism scene (1.9-11). In 1.10, heavenly and earthly spheres intersect through the σχιζομένός τούς οὐρανοὺς "rending" of the heavens (contrast Matt 3.16/Luke 3.21 which prefer ἀνοιγω "to open") which, together with the descent of the Spirit as a dove connotes a miraculous portent, laden with apocalyptic significance.[19] In 1.11, the Markan audience receive insider information that Jesus is "son" (explicitly), and God is "Father" (implicitly). That the Spirit descends "into" (εἰς) Jesus, rather than merely rests on him (ἐπι) (contrast Matt 3.16/Luke 3.22), suggests Jesus is "possessed" by the Spirit of God.[20] This idea is developed in relation to Jesus' exorcisms, albeit in a case of mistaken identity in 3.22-30.[21]

Following his baptism, thrust into the desert by the Spirit, Jesus is tempted by Satan (1.12-13). Despite attempts to interpret this pericope as Jesus' definitive "binding of Satan" (cf. 3.26-27), in Mark, Jesus' confrontation with demonic forces is ongoing (cf. 1.21-28), and the text offers no statement that Jesus triumphs over Satan here.[22] Nevertheless, notwithstanding its brevity, the encounter is rightly interpreted as an eschatological conflict wherein Satan and the wild animals confront Jesus who is

[17] E.g. Isa 40.10, 26, 29, 31; 41.1, 10; 42.6, 13; 50.2 cf. 45.1, 5; 49.5, 26. Similarly, Boring 2006: 42, and Watts (1997: 101-102, 150-151) who enlarges on the Isaianic Yahweh-Warrior connection, opining that taken together, 1.7 and 1.10 constitute a response to the prayer for deliverance in Isa 63.7 – 64.12, where Jesus comes "in strength" as the DW to deliver Israel. Shively (2012: 72-73) makes a very similar point, stating that Mark recasts Jesus as "the Strong One of Jacob" of Isa 49.26.

[18] Similarly Hooker 1991: 142; Shively 2012: 73.

[19] Lane (1974: 55) and Ben Witherington 2001: 71 stress that the rending of the heavens – often accompanied by a voice – is a common feature in apocalyptic thought, wherein the fixed separation of heaven and earth is broken. (cf. *Apoc. Bar.* 22.1; *T. Levi* 2.6; 5.1; 18.6; *T. Jud.* 24.2; Rev 4.1; 11.19; 19.11). Lane (1974: 55) and also Boring (2006: 45) cite the theophany of the DW in Isa 64.1 = 63.19 LXX, as a possible precedent to the Markan description of the "rending of the heavens," (cf. Watts 1997: 162). Alternatively, Van Iersel (1998 :100) finds the influence of Ezek 1.1-2.7.

[20] On the Holy Spirit in Mark, see Shively 2012: 163-166.

[21] Driggers 2007: 229-231; Shively 2012: 56. Conversely, Eve (2002: 328) infers that the charge in 3.22 might not amount to Jesus being *possessed* by Beelzebul: it could mean that Jesus as sorcerer has the spirit Beelzebul under his control.

[22] With, e.g. Hiers 1974: 43; Twelftree 1993: 116; Stein 2008: 185; contra Ben Witherington 2001: 77.

supported by angels.[23] Heil advocates this view, finding a chiastic structure in Mark 1.12-13 wherein grammatical parallelism indicates that Jesus' relation to the animals is antithetical to the angels' relation to him.[24] Heil also cites Isa 13.21-22 LXX and Isa 34.13-14 where wild animals occur in close association with demons.[25] Again, Lev 17.7 and 2 Chron 11.15 mention "hairy goat-like demons" said to inhabit desert places.[26] Strikingly, possibly influenced by Ps 91.11-13 and akin to Mark 1.13, *T. Naph.* 8.4, (cf. 8.6) refers to "the devil" "wild animals" and "the angels" in sequence, where the first two are hostile and the latter group allies of God's people.[27] These parallels suggest the Markan temptation scene is best read in terms of an eschatological conflict.

Following the "temptation scene," Mark 1.14-15 comprises a "hinge", transitional unit.[28] Readers learn of John's arrest which prefaces Jesus' preaching the "Gospel of God", with its Kingdom emphases of repentance and belief. Temporally, therefore, these verses signal the close of John's ministry and the beginning of Jesus' Kingdom ministry. As becomes clear in 1.21-28 and in the Kingdom language used in 3.22-30, one dimension of the gospel and the inbreaking of the Kingdom of God involves Jesus' overturning of demonic forces belonging to the Satanic kingdom.[29]

To summarise this subsection, Mark 1.21-28 develops and confirms the portrayal of Jesus in the prologue. Thus, implicitly identified with Yahweh the DW ("Lord" 1.3) and explicitly the "stronger one" (1.7), Jesus the Spirit possessed Son who faces Satan (1.12-13) and announces the Kingdom of God (1.15) now demonstrates his unparalleled power over evil (1.21-28).

(ii). 1.21-28 in relation to 3.22-30

While Mark 1.21-28 builds on the prologue, it also prefigures the so called "Beelzebul controversy" (3.22-30).[30] The remark of the bystanders in 1.27 to the effect

[23] Boring 2006: 47-48; Lane 1976: 61; Longman III and Reid 1995: 95 – 97; Heil 2006.
[24] Heil 2006 :65-66.
[25] Heil 2006: 74.
[26] Anderson 1967: 151. Cf. *Testament of Solomon* where, in the context of exorcism, in unholy natural-supernatural alliance animal-like demons confront and even mock a hero (*T. Sol.* 10; 11).
[27] Gibson 1994: 21; Marcus 1999: 170.
[28] Similarly, Collins 2008: 91.
[29] Though Hiers (1974: 43-44, 47) notes it is nowhere *stated* that the exorcisms are Kingdom "signs" or evidence of the "breaking in" of the Kingdom of God, in Mark this notion seems implicit.
[30] For a comprehensive treatment of 3.22-30 see Shively 2012.

that Jesus has control over demons becomes the premise of 3.22-30.[31] Whereas the Jerusalem scribes accuse Jesus of being possessed by Beelzebul (3.22), in his "parables" of the divided "Kingdom" and "House" Jesus demonstrates the flaws in their logic.[32] The latter symbols should be understood primarily as metaphors for Satan's kingdom, the antithesis of the Kingdom of God.[33] Thus, 3.24-25 cohere with and develop the notion introduced in 1.24, that Jesus' conflict with demons is a major far-reaching Markan theme on a grand (cosmic) scale, not merely a localised issue or a Markan subtopic.

Mark 3.22-30, then, is a hermeneutical key for understanding the overall significance of Jesus' exorcisms. On the logic of Mark 3.23b-26, Satan's "kingdom" and "house" stands united around Satan the "strong man" (ὁ ἰσχυρός = Beelzebul/Satan in 3.27/23 cf. 5.4). Jesus' exorcism ministry is characterised, in turn, as the assault of the "stronger one" (ἰσχυρότερός in 1.7) on the Satanic dynasty.[34] That is, through his "binding" action Jesus the DW is able to free people from Satan's dominion over them, as witnessed initially in 1.21-28.[35]

Further to the latter, thematically, it is possible that Isa 49.24-25 has influenced Mark 3.27.[36] If so, whereas in Deutero-Isaiah, Yahweh the DW is depicted as deliverer, rescuing his people from oppressive human powers, in Mark, Jesus is cast as the DW and liberator of those led captive by Satan.[37] The rhetoric in Mark 3.22-30, therefore, clarifies the nature of Jesus' exorcisms as particular confrontations in an overarching clash of kingdoms (God's and Satan's) where Jesus, implicitly "the stronger one" appears in the role of the DW.

---

[31] Shively (2012: 48-49) links 1.21-28 to the "Beelzebul discourse" (3.22-30), for her, the latter, rather than the former is "programmatic" for Mark. It is my view that coming first and at the outset of Jesus' public ministry, 1.21-28 is programmatic (see further (c) below), whereas 3.22-30 is the hermeneutical key to Jesus' exorcism ministry.

[32] Shively 2012: 63-64.

[33] On "kingdom" and "house" see Shively 2012: 64-65.

[34] Watts (1997: 150) following Mauser 1963: 30, notes that the Markan prologue is intentionally linked to the Beelzebul controversy in Mark 3, since "Satan," "Spirit" and "strong man" terminology occur together only here in Mark.

[35] The "binding" of the demon prince or demons is a motif which occurs in Second Temple texts e.g. *1 En.* 10.4-5; 54.4-5; *T. Sol.* 3.6; 11.2; 15.7-8.

[36] See e.g. Nineham 1968: 120; Watts 1997: 147-150; Marcus 1999: 283; Shively 2012: 73.

[37] Shively (2012: 74-75) discusses the recontextualisation of Isaianic themes in Mark around apocalyptic *topoi.*

(iii). 1.21-28 in relation to 4.35-41

A current objective is to demonstrate that the exorcism in Mark 1.21–28 is closely linked to the sea-miracles, where 4.35-41/6.45-52 are to be read together, as argued in the previous chapter. Though commentators note verbal parallels in 1.21-28 and 4.35-41, the full force of these parallels is seldom recognised. Mark's design in connecting the Capernaum exorcism with the sea-epiphanies is christological and, without excluding other christological emphases, part of a strategy to present Jesus in the initial chapters of the gospel against the background of DW mythology. Thus, in 1.21-28 and 4.35-41/6.45-52 the evangelist poses the question as to Jesus' identity, but in each case and progressively he also provides an answer. In these texts, Jesus is identified with God the DW, familiar to OT and Second Temple literature, so that for Mark, Jesus is the DW who delivers people from the domain of Satan.

Scholars frequently cite parallels between Mark 1.21-28 and Jesus' stilling of the storm in 4.35-41.[38] For instance, Jesus rebukes (ἐπετίμησεν) the demoniac (1.25), "Be muzzled and get out of him!" (φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ) and similarly rebukes the wind and sea (4.39), where the relevant verb form corresponds exactly to 1.25 (ἐπετίμησεν). In 4.39, Jesus demands the elements be silent (σιώπα) and repeats the command given to the demoniac in 1.25 "Be muzzled!" (πεφίμωσο).[39] The similarities extend to the respective conclusions since in both 1.27 and 4.41 a rhetorical question concerning Jesus' authority/identity prefaces a statement regarding the obedience of hostile powers to Jesus. In 1.27, demons are said to "obey him" (ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ), and again in 4.41 the wind and the sea "obey him" (ὑπακούει αὐτῷ), a striking parallelism, since the verb (ὑπακούειν) "obey" occurs nowhere else in Mark.[40] The conceptual correspondences may be pressed yet further if the penultimate "καὶ" in 4.41 is taken as an intensive ("even"), as in 1.27.[41]

Given the verbal parallels outlined above which occur exclusively in Mark 1.21-28 and 4.35-41, these texts seem intentionally worded such as to complement each other.

[38] E.g. Marcus 1999: 339-340; Gundry 1993: 240; Collins 2007: 261.
[39] Marcus 1999: 339; Collins 2007: 261; Hooker 1991: 139-140; Boring 2006: 146; Lane 1974: 177 n. 99; Heil 1981: 125; Watts 1997: 161. France (2002: 224) rejects interpretations of 4.35-41 as "exorcistic" and downplays links with 1.21-28. However, France's exegesis misses some relevant connections.
[40] Heil (1981: 125) makes this point, but probably over-reads when he finds *Ubereitung* in 4.41, that is, that Jesus in his powerful stilling of the storm "outdoes" his previous powerful act in 1.21-28.
[41] Marcus (1999: 332) and Heil (1981: 125) translate thus, while Collins (2007: 257) renders "kai" in 4.41 "both". RSV and NRSV also favour the intensive "kai".

In 1.21-28 Jesus silences and "muzzles" the demonic enemy in the very same way that in 4.35-41, portrayed as DW, he silences and "muzzles" the stormy sea, emblematic of forces hostile to God. In both accounts Jesus is presented as an incomparably powerful figure (cf. the force of the rhetorical questions in 1.27; 4.41 respectively), whose unique authority vanquishes inimical forces to the amazement of onlookers. Thus, the deliberate "twinning" of the first Markan exorcism (1.21-28) and the first sea-miracle (4.35-41) binds together the exorcisms and sea-miracles.

(c) Analysis of 1.21-28 investigating the possible influence of Divine Warrior traditions

The exorcism in 1.21-28 comprises the first miraculous act of Jesus' ministry narrated by Mark. As such, commentators judge this story has programmatic significance for Mark's portrayal of Jesus as exorcist/miracle worker.[42] The *collective* emphasis of the (singular) unclean spirit's exclamation, "Have you come to destroy us?" further underlines the programmatic character of the exorcism, since it points beyond the immediate localised circumstances to a grand-scale conflict between Jesus and inimical supernatural forces (cf. 1.12-13; 3.22-30). Programmatically, the bystanders' remark in 1.27, "he commands even the unclean spirits and they obey him!" becomes a rubric for Jesus' later encounters with demons. Thus, subsequent references to Jesus' conflict with Satan/demons should be read in the light of 1.21-28, which, as suggested above and as will be argued below, ought in turn be understood against the background of the HDWT.

The influence of DW traditions has already been traced to the Markan exorcisms by a number of scholars on the premise of thematic similarities i.e. God's overcoming of evil and verbal parallels.[43] Aside from connections with the Markan sea-epiphanies presented above, independent evidence suggests that in 1.21-28 the evangelist presents Jesus the exorcist as reminiscent of the DW. H.C. Kee demonstrated the correspondence of the term ἐπιτιμάω as it appears in the LXX and in the NT exorcisms with the Hebrew גָּעַר used in the MT most frequently as a technical or quasi-technical term referring to God the DW's rebuke/defeat of hostile and chaos forces.[44] The verb ἐπιτιμάω appears in

[42] E.g. Twelftree 1993: 57; Guelich 1989: 55; Donahue & Harrington 2002: 82-83.
[43] Kee 1968: 232-245; Cohn 1993: 195-200; Watts 1997: 140; 144-156; Longman III and Reid 1995: 91.
[44] Kee 1968: 235-8; cf. Gunkel 1895 (2006): 43; Day 1985: 29 n. 82; Angel 2006: 20-21, 76; Kennedy 1987: 47 – 64. For a fuller discussion of this term see Chapter 2, pp. 91-92.

Mark 1.25 but is absent from Hellenistic exorcistic stories. Thus, with reference to our criterion 2 on characteristic terminology, Mark apparently harnesses a term used characteristically in reference to the subjugation of evil forces by God the DW, to describe Jesus' wresting of a demon.[45]

In a nuanced challenge to Kee's thesis, some scholars infer that by the first century CE, ἐπιτιμάω had accrued a generic usage in exorcisms.[46] This claim is made on the grounds of evidence in the Greek magical papyri deemed to reflect older (first century) traditions, where the term appears in incantations used to control demons and gods (e.g. PGM I: 253, 324; II: 43-55; IV: 3080; VII: 331; XII: 171). In point of fact, since Mark 1.25 is the earliest documentary use of the term in a particular exorcism, it is impossible to say whether ἐπιτιμάω had this general application before the gospel, or if such a use was rather a Markan or early Christian innovation. In any case, in Mark 4.39 the term refers to the silencing of the sea and clearly recollects its characteristic use in the HDWT where God rebukes the chaos waters/sea, so that even if it is allowed that ἐπιτιμάω had a more generic sense of control over demons in the first century (which remains uncertain), it seems clear that the evangelist is aware of its underlying mythical connotations.[47]

Further to Jesus' rebuke in 1.25, here as in the other exorcisms (5.1-20; 7.24-30; 9.14-29), Mark's Jesus is distinct from contemporary exorcists in that he neither prays, invokes a power source, nor uses sacred objects to exorcise demons.[48] This is at odds, for example, with Josephus' description of Eleazar's exorcism which relies on Solomonic ritual and incantatory formulas.[49] Similarly, it is a far cry from the kind of procedure recommended by Raphael in Tobit.[50] Indeed, on the internal Markan evidence which attests the *novelty* and efficacy of Jesus' exorcistic activity (cf. 1.27),[51] attempts to straightjacket Jesus as a "man of his time" seem incongruous.[52] It is wrong to imagine,

[45] Similarly, Boring 2006: 65.
[46] Marcus 1999: 193-194; Dunn and Twelftree 1980: 212.
[47] Marcus 1999: 193 – 194; France 2002: 104.
[48] France 2002: 100-101, 104. Collins (2007: 165-170; 173) stresses Jesus' unique exorcistic technique and provides a sample of exorcisms in contemporaneous literature.
[49] *Ant* 8.47-49.
[50] E.g. Tob 8.1-2
[51] Granted it is Jesus' "teaching" which is "new", but a natural reading of the text finds no dichotomy between the exorcism and the teaching since both attest his "authority".
[52] Contra e.g. Twelftree 1993: 153, following Aune (1980: 1507-57); Vermes 1973: 79; Sterling 1993: 491; Donahue & Harrington 2002: 83-84. Van der Loos (1965: 128, 134), rightly highlights the distinctiveness of Jesus' exorcism ministry. For Eve (2002: 349), the assumption in scholarly literature that Jewish exorcists were very common is "apparently not supported by the literary evidence".

for example, that Jesus "fits the mould" of a "Jewish exorcist" or charismatic *Hasid* type, since the evidence for the existence of such a "type", not least in regard specifically to the performance of *exorcisms*, is neither substantial nor compelling.[53]

Furthermore, sometimes neglected or played down by recent commentators, the Markan Jesus' straightforwardly verbal exorcistic technique is seemingly *unprecedented* in the Hellenistic Jewish milieu of the first century CE.[54] Beyond the synoptic exorcism accounts, there are few (if any) exorcistic texts datable to the first century CE with a Jewish provenance.[55] The only report of an exorcism comparable to that described in Mark 1.21-28, i.e. one performed by the exclusive means of a verbal imperative, is Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 4.20 (*VA* 4.20), a work published at the earliest in 217 CE.[56] In this text Apollonius reportedly orders a demon to leave a young man (described in reported rather than direct speech), providing a sign as proof of exit. Accordingly, the demon is said to topple a statue and the boy is restored to health. However, recent commentators find that in *VA* 4.20 and other exorcisms ascribed to Apollonius, Philostratus likely depends on the synoptic stories of Jesus' exorcisms.[57] Interestingly, *Acts of Peter* 2.4.11 also has a statue topple over as proof of exorcism, which raises a question regarding the further possible influence on *VA* 4.20 of post-biblical Christian traditions.[58] Thus, the legitimacy of *VA* 4.20 as an independent

[53] Contra e.g. Vermes 1973: 79, 206-209, whose thesis is rejected by Jaffé (2009: 225), "La catégorie socio-religieuse du hasid galiléen charismatique développée par Vermes, ne semble donc pas pertinente dans la désignation de Jésus le Nazaréen." Vermes (1973: 206-209) cites Honi the Circle Drawer and Hanina ben Dosa as charismatic figures similar to Jesus, but neither of these figures were portrayed as exorcists *per se.*

[54] Keener (2011: 769-787) provides a useful overview of synoptic exorcisms/demonology in relation to the wider Hellenistic Jewish background, but fails to notice the remarkable nature of Jesus' exorcisms. France (2002: 100-101) cites an unpublished PhD dissertation by E.F. Kirschner stressing the more unique aspects of Jesus as exorcist, these findings also appear in Kirschner 1994: 9-24.

[55] For Keener (2011: 781) most exorcism texts post-date the first and even second century CE. The "significant exceptions" he mentions are actually fairly insignificant for our understanding of Jesus' exorcisms since (as his n. 144 recognises), these are Egyptian models from antiquity, temporally and geographically distant from Jesus and primitive Christianity.

[56] Conybeare (1960: viii) states Philostratus' work was not published before 217 CE, therefore, the historical reliability of its Apollonius traditions is ultimately uncertain. Conybeare (1960: xv) attacks scholars who assume Philostratus' *Apollonius* was an intentional "counterblast to the Christian gospel," but nevertheless recognises that towards the end of the 3rd. century CE, Apollonius *was* set up by pagans as a rival to Christ. Quite independently of whether Philostratus' work can be classified as an anti-Christian polemic, the significant time gap between the life of the historical Apollonius and Philostratus' work, together with the possibility of Christian influence on Philostratus ought to tell against unqualified comparisons between Jesus and Apollonius.

[57] Klutz 2004: 125; Keener 2011: 782.

[58] Thomas (2003: 106) finds in the *Actus Vercellenses* (3rd – 4th. Century), the earliest extant representation of a second century original to be identified with the *Acts of Peter.* Baldwin (2005 :302) denies the very existence of a second century *Acts of Peter*, though accepts that during that time "certain Petrine fabulae probably circulated and were employed in the discourse of Christians for various purposes." Ultimately, the uncertainty surrounding the date of *Acts of Peter* makes it unclear whether this text or "fabulae"

"parallel" to Jesus' verbal exorcistic *modus operandi* is in doubt, since it was likely influenced by the Markan and synoptic exorcism stories. Therefore, strikingly original in Mark, it is by Jesus' mere word of command, his straightforward "rebuke" that demonic and evil forces are overcome.[59]

Interestingly, other exorcistic activity recorded in the NT itself seemingly confirms the uniqueness of Jesus' self-confident, ostensibly independent approach as witnessed in the first Markan exorcism. In Jude 9, archangel Michael is said to "rebuke Satan" *in the name of God* – rather than on his own authority. Remarkably, in Acts 16.18 (cf. 19.13) Paul commands a spirit to leave a girl "in the name of Jesus Christ."[60] Equally striking, as will be discussed in (4.9) below, in Mark 9.38-39 exorcisms are reportedly conducted in Jesus' name by outsiders (cf. Luke 10.17).[61] The practice of exorcising demons in the name of Jesus Christ is attested in the first centuries of the Christian era.[62]

Therefore, on the combined basis of these considerations, the Markan use of the term ἐπιτιμάω in 1.25 likens Jesus not to putative contemporary Jewish exorcists concerning whom we know very little, nor to Greco-Roman sages, but principally to God the DW who "rebukes" evil forces represented by the chaos sea or chaos monsters in biblical/Second Temple texts (e.g. Job 26.11; Isa 50.2; Pss 18.15; 104.7; *L.A.B.* 10.5; Pr Man 3-4). Also noteworthy, in a single OT text, Satan himself is rebuked in these terms (Zech 3.2 *bis*), where the Angel of the Lord issues the rebuke.[63] While the latter might

contained within it influenced Philostratus, or whether the inverse occurred (if indeed there is any relation between the texts).

[59] Twelftree (1993: 158) cites Philostratus *VA* 4.20 and the exorcism performed by fourth generation tannaitic Rabbi Simeon ben Yose (*b. Me`il* 17b, cf. Twelftree 1993: 23), to suggest that Jesus' exorcism by verbal command is not necessarily unique, though he concedes that it is "distinctive" of Jesus' exorcisms. My own view, argued here, is that Jesus' exorcistic *modus operandi* is unprecedented, at least, it was perceived and/or represented as such by the early church.

[60] On this, see Klutz 2004: 207-264.

[61] Van der Loos (1965: 140) similarly notes 9.38-39, referencing scholars' who read this is an interpolation.

[62] Kelhoffer (2000: 317) highlights e.g., *Dial.* 30.3 (cf. *Dial.* 76.6a; 85), particularly relevant here is Justin's statement "Even today they [the demons] are cast out in the name of Jesus Christ." Similarly, Kelhoffer (2000: 326) cites Tertullian *Apol.* 23, an excerpt of which affirms: "all the authority and power we have over them [the demons] is from our naming the name of Christ…" Origen *CC* 1.6 (cf. 3.24) is also considered (Kelhoffer 2000: 333-334) where again, the "name of Jesus" is connected with exorcisms.

[63] In Zech 3.2 the Angel of the Lord appears to be involved in the rebuke of Satan (cf. Jude 9). In agreement with Carrell (1997: 28) and Gieschen (1998:65-68), in some texts like Zech 3.2 the Angel of the Lord is a figure distinguishable from Yahweh himself, whereas on other occasions (e.g. Gen 16.7-14), the Angel of the Lord is indistinct from the Lord, whereby the former is as Carrell (1997: 28) puts it, "a form of Yahweh's self-manifestation which expressly safeguards his transcendent nature." Fossum (1985: 86) can describe the Angel of the Lord as an "extension of Yahweh's personality," since the Angel of the Lord bears the divine name. The scholars cited here in loc. thus recognise the ambiguity which surrounds the identity of the Angel of the Lord.

form part of the background to Mark's exorcisms, there is no clear evidence that Mark draws on Angel of the Lord traditions, nor that he develops Christology in terms of "angel Christology."[64]

While in 1.21-28 Jesus acts on his own authority, as the Spirit empowered "Son" (cf. 1.9-11), some argue that his authority to teach and exorcise is at once God's authority.[65] At the narrative level, the Markan exorcisms tie into the theme of the hiddenness and disclosure of Jesus' true identity, since other than God (1.11; 9.7) and, exceptionally, the centurion in 15.39 (see 4.8 below), only demons "know" who Jesus is in terms of his divine sonship (cf. 1.34; 3.11-12; 5.7). In 1.24, the demon recognises Jesus but somewhat atypically, identifies him as "Jesus of Nazareth" and ὁ ἁγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ, rather than "son" (cf. 3.11; 5.7).[66] The "holy one of God" title is variously explained and OT precedents include the warrior figure Samson (Judg 13.7, 16.17 LXX),[67] the priestly Aaron, (Ps 106.16),[68] and the prophet Elisha (2 Kgs 4.9).[69] The wording of the epithet in Mark 1.24 is closest to Judg 16.17 LXX cf. Judg 13.7 (though the phrase in the latter is anarthrous),[70] and if an echo of the Spirit-filled warrior Samson was intended, this might be conducive to the portrayal of Jesus as the Spirit-driven DW.

However the epithet "holy one of God" is understood, the demon's claim to knowledge about Jesus and the actual naming itself is often read in terms of a supernatural power struggle, similar to exorcisms described in magical texts.[71] In view of the patent

[64] Dunn (1980: 158) denies any NT writer thought of Jesus as an angel. On the other hand, proponents of "angel Christology" suggest an "angelomorphic" interpretation for Mark 9.2-8, see, e.g. Rowland 1985: 100; Sullivan 2004: 114-116, but since radiance is associated with those who come into the presence of God (e.g. Moses in Exod 34.29-30) or with the wise (e.g. Dan 12.3) this is just one of various explanations. Hägerland (2012: 171-178) proposes an "angelomorphic" background to Mark 2.10 on the basis of an echo of Dan 4.14 and the use of the title "Son of Man" here.
[65] Cf. Boring (1999: 466).
[66] Twelftree (1999: 59) claims that in its Markan context this title is "of the same order" as the title "Son of God."
[67] Marcus 1999: 188, 189.
[68] Twelftree (1993: 68) against Guelich (1989: 57), who says the designation indicates a special (though unspecified) relationship of Jesus with God.
[69] Similarly, Donahue & Harrington (2002: 80) mention all three references cited here. Schweizer (1970: 52) notes that the only exact precedent of the title is that used of Samson, but points to 1 Kgs 17.18 which uses a comparable title and also has the same question formula used in Mark 1.24.
[70] 2 Kgs 4.9 is also similar ἀνΘρωπος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἁγιος.
[71] Lane 1974: 74; Gundry 1993: 76; Marcus 1999: 187-188. Twelftree (1993: 66) cites the fourth or fifth century text PGM VIII.13 "I know you Hermes, who you are and whence you come and which is your city" in connection with Mark 1.24, cf. Twelftree 1993: 67 n. 57 citing PGM IV.1500, 2984ff; V.103ff.; VIII.13. While later comparable texts do not provide proof that demonic outbursts or "naming" in Mark are indicative of some form of struggle, the overall Markan context does imply antagonism (cf. the demons' question in 1.24).

element of confrontation and the reference to the destruction of the demons (plural) in Mark 1.24, commentators are justified to take 1.21-28 as related to notions of eschatological divine warfare, broadly comparable to apocalyptic texts which describe conflicts and war with demons (e.g. *1QH* 11.6-18; *1QH* 11.27-36).[72] The demon's instant recognition of Jesus coupled with the notion that his advent signals their destruction, testifies to Jesus' extraordinary ineluctable power over evil as the "stronger one".

The demons' initial question, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί (1.24) is probably a kind of verbal parry in a power struggle. This formula of "disassociation," [73] occurs variously in the LXX (e.g. Judg 11.12; 1 Kgs 17.18; 2 Sam 16.10, 19.22; 2 Chron 35.2).[74] Notably, in every case there is an explicit threat to life involved, where a prophet (1 Kgs 17.18) or a king (Judg 11.12; 2 Sam 16.10, 19.22; 2 Chron 35.21) is understood to have power over life and death.[75] Thus, in the light of its OT background it seems improbable that the expression has a "magic" meaning.[76] Rather, the intertextual connections point to the demons' realisation that Jesus represents a very real threat, an idea made explicit in the "have you come to destroy us(?)"[77] The Markan emphasis is thus implicitly christological, attesting the extraordinary status, power and authority of Jesus to which the powerful demon must ultimately submit (cf. the marvelling reaction of the witnesses in 1.27).

(d) Summary of findings

In summary, in relation to the first Markan exorcism (1.21-28) the following points have been made:

(1) In a seemingly unprecedented move, in relation to criterion 2 on characteristic terminology, in 1.25, Mark appropriates the term ἐπιτιμάω, frequently associated

[72] E.g. Marcus 1999: 186; Donahue & Harrington 2002: 83-84.
[73] France 2002: 103.
[74] In this vein the list of texts cited by Lane (1974: 73) is misleading, since it includes OT variations on the actual question formula used in Mark 1.24/5.7 and in some OT texts.
[75] Stein (2008: 87) against Guelich (1987: 67), shows that it is incorrect to say that this question formula is always posed by an inferior in the light of John 2.4; 2 Sam 16.10; 19.23 LXX. However, against Collins (2007: 169) since it always occurs where there is an implicit superior-inferior dynamic, regardless of which party actually uses the expression, in Mark 1.24 it signals the inevitability of the demon's submission to Jesus.
[76] Contra e.g. Bauernfeind 1927: 28; Van der Loos 1965: 379.
[77] Most commentators read this as a question, though for Lane (1974: 73) and Hooker (1991: 64) it is a statement, for a rejection of the latter see Marcus 1999: 188. Either way, the sense of the phrase is practically the same.

with God the DW's conquest of evil forces/Satan, applying it in the context of Jesus' inaugural, programmatic exorcism. Jesus' authoritative verbal wresting of the demons – only occasionally paralleled in later sources – is reminiscent of God the DW in OT/Second Temple texts which emphasise the irresistible power of God who similarly rebukes his enemies.

(2) Verbal parallels between Mark 1.21-28 and 4.35-41 (e.g. ἐπετίμησεν and φιμώθητι/πεφίμωσο in 1.25/4.39; ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ/ὑπακούει αὐτῷ in 1.27/4.41) establish that Mark intends these stories as a combined witness to Jesus' power and authority over evil. Since 4.35-41 exhibits influence of the divine battle motif of the HDWT, the linking of the *programmatic* exorcism in 1.21-28 to this story implies that Jesus' entire exorcism ministry is to be read through the lens of the HDWT. Ultimately, the Markan identity question underlies both the exorcisms and the sea-miracles since the "what?" in the concluding question of 1.27 is developed in 4.41, becoming a "who?": in both, as argued here, Jesus is likened to God the DW which comparison is part of the answer to the question Mark sets up.

(3) In terms of Mark's high Christology it was argued that Jesus' mode of exorcism is unparalleled. Whereas broadly contemporaneous accounts (e.g. *Ant.* 8.47-49; Tob 8.1-2) depict exorcists relying on magic objects and/or invoking the name of God/gods (cf. Jude 9), here the straightforward verbal command of the Markan Jesus effects the exorcism. No appeal is made to the name of God, but both as an image and a term belonging within the HDWT (cf. criterions 1 and 2) Jesus' verbal "rebuke" is reminiscent of God the DW. It was also observed that in Acts 16.18 (cf. 19.13) Paul exorcises in "the name of Jesus Christ".

(4) Finally, contextual considerations strengthen the notion that Mark draws on the HDWT in his depiction of Jesus in 1.21-28. Read in conjunction with the immediately following verses, Mark 1.3 refashions Isa 40.3 LXX, so as to apply the title "Lord" in reference to Jesus. That is, in the Markan narrative which forms part of the background to 1.21-28, the way of the Isaianic Yahweh DW now becomes the way of Jesus. Consonantly, Mark's Jesus is the "stronger one" (1.7) which designation on a natural reading has probable warrior associations and is emphatically legitimised by the Markan Jesus' overturning of demonic forces by his mere word of command in 1.25. This in turn foreshadows the parabolic

Beelzebul text (3.22-30 esp. 27) which confirms the nature of the divine battle in Mark.

(e) Conclusion Mark 1.21-28

Whereas scholarly treatments routinely compare Jesus to other "exorcists," this investigation has found that beyond the NT, little is known about exorcists/exorcisms in the first century CE. That which *is* known underlines the uniqueness of Jesus' self-oriented exorcistic approach. By performing exorcisms on his own authority the Markan Jesus is unique: whereas, as evidenced in the magical papyri, magicians evoked myriad powers, *so needy were they of divine power* – by contrast, Jesus conquers demons and chaos *by his word.* The authoritative verbal rebuke of God the DW in OT/Second Temple texts provides the closest intertextual background to Jesus' programmatic exorcism in Mark 1.21-28. Thus, Mark's presentation of Jesus the exorcist in a way reminiscent of God the DW is significant for Q3 of the question matrix (cf. Chapter 1), concerning the ascription of divine attributes to Jesus.

In regard to Q4 of the question matrix (cf. Chapter 1), on the reprogramming of OT texts to make Jesus the referent in place of God, it was noted that in 1.3 the evangelist reorients Isa 40.3 LXX in order to identify Jesus with Yahweh the DW i.e. "Lord." Even before he receives God's Spirit, Mark identifies Jesus with Yahweh the DW (1.3 cf. 1.7). However, the Markan baptism pericope nuances this identification: God is "Father", Jesus is "Son." In the Markan narrative world, then, Jesus' unparalleled power and authority has to do with his very close identification with God the DW. As the one in whom God's Spirit resides (1.10, cf. 1.12, 3.29-30), Jesus is uniquely capable of overturning Satan's kingdom (3.22-30). Thus, in the exorcisms and related texts, Mark implies that the man Jesus is categorically distinct from all others on account of his unique standing (as "Son") with the Father. The Markan portrait of Jesus as exorcist contrasts with Jude 9 where Michael rebukes Satan in God's name, thus, it should not be classified as "angel Christology." Rather, Mark's consistent identification of Jesus with God the DW hints that Jesus is the manifestation of Yahweh in human form.

(4.3) Recapitulation: Jesus' exorcism ministry in the light of Mark 1.21-28

Before proceeding with the investigation of the other Markan exorcisms and related texts, it will be helpful to briefly restate a foundational point made above. That

Mark 1.21-28 draws on a key term of the HDWT (ἐπιτιμάω in 1.25) in relation to Jesus' confrontation with evil forces suggests that it is to be read against the background of the HDWT. Since, as established above (see (d).2), 1.21-28 is very deliberately linked to the sea-miracle in 4.35-41, which is also clearly to be read in the light of the HDWT, this confirms that for Mark, Jesus' inaugural exorcism is to be read against the mythological background of the HDWT. Moreover, on the premise that the exorcism in 1.21-28 is programmatic (see 4.2 (c) above), setting the agenda for the subsequent exorcisms and related pericopes, it emerges that collectively, the Markan exorcisms are to be understood in the light of 1.21-28, and thus, are to be read in terms of the battle motif of the HDWT. Therefore, the ensuing examination of the other Markan exorcisms assumes they develop the battle motif which runs through the gospel. It will also note further possible connections with the HDWT. Equally, though, the particular nuances and individual emphases of each exorcism will be investigated and discussed in order to establish the ways in which Mark develops the portrait of Jesus as exorcist.

(4.4). Mark 5.1-20

(a) Text

> *1* And they came to the other side of the sea into the country of the Gerasenes.[78] *2* And after he had come out of the boat, immediately there went to meet him from the tombs a man with an unclean spirit *3* who had his dwelling in the tombs, and no-one was able to bind him any longer, not even with a chain *4* because he had often been bound with shackles and chains, but the chains had been torn apart by him and the shackles had been smashed, and no-one was strong enough to subdue him. *5* Continuously, night and day he was in the tombs and in the mountains, crying out and cutting himself with stones. *6* And when he saw Jesus from a distance, he ran and threw himself down before him. *7* And crying out in a loud voice he said, 'What do you have to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, Don't torment me!' *8* For Jesus was saying to

[78] The reading "Gerasenes" is best attested e.g. ℵ* B D 2427, but as commentators such as Marcus (1999: 341-342) observe, this presents a geographical problem since Gerasa (today Jerash in Jordan), one of the Decapolis cities, was situated 37 miles south east of the Sea of Galilee making the drowning of the pigs incongruous. The Matthean version (8.28ff), apparently relocates events to Gadara, whose position five miles south east of the Sea of Galilee with territory reaching up to it fits the geography better. Commentators generally judge Markan manuscripts reading "Gadarenes" e.g. A C f^{13} 157, to be assimilations to this Matthean redactional move. "Gergasenes", if identified with Kursi, is situated on the east bank of Galilee, making it the most geographically plausible locale for the story, but it is poorly attested e.g. ℵ^2 L Δ Θ f^1 157, and probably a scribal alteration. For Marcus (1999: 342), "Gerasa" is appropriate "symbolically" since the Hebrew root *grs* means "to banish" and was a common term for exorcism. Similarly, Guelich (1989: 288) suggests geography should be interpreted in the light of thematic considerations. Mauser (1963: 81-82) cites the evangelist's unspecific references to "the desert" in the prologue and affirms that Mark's thematic agenda takes precedence over geographical exactitude, where again Matthew and Luke, dissatisfied with Markan generality or imprecision, seek greater geographical precision in their presentations.

him 'Come out from the man, the unclean spirit'. *9* And Jesus asked him 'What is your name?' And he said to him, 'My name is Legion for we are many'. *10* And he begged him earnestly not to send them out of the country. *11* But there, towards the mountain, was a large herd of pigs feeding. *12* And the demons begged him 'Send us into the pigs so that we may enter them'. *13* And he permitted them, and the unclean spirits came out and entered the pigs and the herd of about two thousand rushed down the cliff and were choked in the sea. *14* And the herdsmen fled and announced it in the city and the fields. And people came to see what had occurred. *15* And they came to Jesus and saw the man who had been demonised, sitting, clothed and being of sound mind – the one who had had the legion! – and they were afraid. *16* And those who saw what happened to the demonised man and to the pigs fully recounted it to them. *17* And they began to beg Jesus to leave their region. *18* And he was getting into the boat the one who had been demonised begged him that he might be with him. *19* And he did not permit him, but said to him 'Go into your house, to your people and announce to them the great things the Lord has done for you, and how he has had mercy on you. *20* And he went away and began to proclaim in the Decapolis what great things Jesus had done for him, and all were amazed.

(b) 5.1-20 within the wider Markan context

On Paul Achtemeier's proposed miracle catenae scheme, Mark 5.1-20 can be located within an initial miracle cycle (i.e. 4.35-6.44), as the first of three "healing miracles" preceding a "feeding miracle."[79] More particularly, there is a near consensus that 4.35-41 and 5.1-20 are deliberately juxtaposed and thematically related.[80] Some even find the stories form a pair.[81] The synoptic parallels suggest as much, since following Mark, Matthew and Luke retain the juxtaposition of the stories (Matt 8.23-27/28-34; Luke 8.22-25/26-39). Within Mark, syntactically, in common with 4.35 (cf. 6.45), 5.1 introduces a sea crossing with the phrase εἰς τὸ πέραν.[82] This phrase in Mark 5.1 appears to refer back to 4.35.[83] Consonantly, in Mark 4.36 Jesus is portrayed boarding the boat; in 5.2 he alights.[84]

Both stories emphasise Jesus' extraordinarily authoritative verbal command. At sea, Jesus verbally overpowers the raging storm in a manner reminiscent of God the DW (4.35-41). On land, in 5.1-20, Jesus verbally overpowers the potent "Legion" of demons.[85] Clearly, since chapter divisions are a subsequent, artificial device, there is

[79] Achtemeier 1970: 265-291.
[80] Nineham 1968: 152; Bligh 1968: 387; Watts 1997: 160-161; Collins 2007: 265; Achtemeier 1970: 275-276; Hooker 1991: 141; Guelich 1989: 287-288; McCurley 1983: 63; Mauser 1963: 126. However, Ben Witherington (2001: 178) states misleadingly "it is not at all clear if we are to see this tale as the immediate sequel to the storm at sea" and doubts the temporal reference in 4.35, arguing that the sea-crossing would not have taken the entire night. However, at the narrative level there is a direct sequence.
[81] Hooker 1991: 141; Watts 1997: 219.
[82] In Mark, the phrase occurs twice more, (5.12; 8.13).
[83] Collins 2007: 265; Achtemeier 1970: 275 – 276.
[84] Collins 2007: 265.
[85] France (2002: 226) similarly compares the events.

every reason to read the stories together as the respective elements of a bipartite narrative subsection. Whereas redaction critics debate whether and at which point these stories may have been juxtaposed in the tradition,[86] for the purposes of this study suffice it to note that in the final Markan order they are contextually and thematically united. Thus, just as in 4.35-41 Jesus is depicted in a manner strikingly reminiscent of God the DW who wrests the chaotic sea, in 5.1-20, this portrayal continues insofar as Jesus demonstrates his power over inimical demonic forces in a superlatively authoritative vein.

Some commentators supply arguments which might potentially support the notion that Mark presents Jesus as a DW figure in 5.1-20, but which break down on closer examination. In this vein, Ps 65.7-8 has been suggested as background for Mark 4.35-41/5.1-20.[87] In the MT, Ps 65.7 describes God the DW stilling the noise/tumult of the sea and the noise/tumult of the peoples.[88] However, as observed in chapter 2, the linking of the sea(s)/nations is found variously in HDWT texts (e.g. Isa 17.12-13; Ps 46.2-3 cf. *1QH* 10.12, 27), and in Ps 65.7-8, it is probably to be taken as synonymous parallelism not as separate events.[89] Moreover, since in common with other NT authors, Mark's Scripture quotations tend broadly to follow the Septuagint,[90] the possibility of some degree of literary dependence on Ps 65.7-8 is significantly reduced since the LXX (Ps 64.7-8) has the DW *trouble* i.e. "stir up" the sea and the nations, rather than still them.

Alternatively, Rikki Watts reads Mark 4.35-5.20 in terms of an Isaianic new exodus motif.[91] For Watts, Mark's Jesus emerges as the "Creator-Warrior" in 4.35-41, who delivers Israel in 5.1-20 by drowning the demon army.[92] Following Hanson and Cross, Watts thinks the "ancient Divine-Warrior Exodus tradition" is reflected in Isa 63.19b – 64.2, finding various thematic parallels between Isa 63.7 – 65.7 and Mark 4.35-

[86] Achtemeier 1970: 275-276; cf. Guelich (1989: 274) states it is "most likely" the stories were combined in the pre-Markan phase without explaining why.
[87] Marcus 1999: 348; Cf. Nineham 1968: 152.
[88] Day 1985: 35.
[89] Although, if Mark is in some way reliant on Ps 65.7-8 it might be argued that he doesn't recognise the synonymous parallelism, or that according to his individual purposes he crafts 4.35-41/5.1-20 as two stages of what is represented in microcosm in Ps 65.7-8. The intrinsic likelihood of this however, seems questionable.
[90] For illustrations, see the comments of Hooker (1991: 35-36) on the use of the LXX in the programmatic composite citation in Mark 1.2-3, and Donahue & Harrington (2002: 359) on the use of Ps 110.1 in 12.16. Both examples also suggest that Mark sometimes reworks the syntax of the Greek text to make it fit his own purposes.
[91] Watts 1997: 160-162.
[92] Watts 1997: 161.

5.20.[93] Watts cites thematic similarities between Isa 65.1-7 and Mark 5.1-20, i.e. in the former text demons are mentioned in connection with tombs (Isa 65.4 LXX ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι compare 5.3) and the eating of swine flesh.[94]

However, the grounds for Watts' linking Mark 4.35-41/5.1-20 to a specifically *Isaianic* DW theme are only partly justified. As demonstrated in chapter 3 of this thesis, the intertextual allusions in 4.35-41 bring the Markan story into contact with numerous HDWT texts.[95] Secondly, it is unclear that possible Markan allusions to Isa 65.1-7 may be straightforwardly subsumed under the DW rubric on the basis of the theophany of the DW in Isa 63.19b – 64.2.[96] Thirdly, the suggestion that Jesus as DW executes a new exodus on the basis of a comparison of the disciples' reaction in Mark 4.41 with Isa 64.2 concerning the one "who did awesome things we did not expect" must be rejected given the absence of clear verbal parallels.[97] The same holds for Watts' sweeping suggestion that the entire section 4.35 – 5.43 may have been redacted around the final lament of the people in Isaiah.[98] Overall, Watts' maximalist approach relies on over general correspondences between Mark 4.35-41/5.1-20 and Isaianic texts, lacking more detailed textual support in the form of clear verbal parallels.

Joel Marcus proposes Exod 14.1 – 15.22 LXX as the main textual background to Mark 5.1-20.[99] Of Marcus' suggested parallels (original transliterations retained) numbers 1-3 are illustrative: (1). Mark 5.1 "They came to the other side of the sea" (*thalassa*) with Exod 14.22 "Israelites pass through the sea (*thalassa* in Exod 14.22 cf. Exod 15.16); (2). Mark 5.3-4 "No one had been able (*edynato*) to tie him up; no one had the power (*ischyen*) to subdue him" with Exod 14.28; 15.4; 15.6, 13: "The power (*dynamis*) of Pharaoh is destroyed; the power (*ischys*) of God is glorified"; (3). Mark 5.7 "Son of the Most High God" (*tou theou tou hypsistou*) read against Exod 15.2 "This is ... my father's God, and I will exalt (*hypsōsōs*) him." *Prima facie*, these suggested correspondences hardly attest a literary relation, since the words cited in (1) and (2) are commonplace and the alleged correspondence in (3) is inexact. Marcus' fourth

[93] Watts 1997: 162; cf. Hanson 1975: 87-89 and Cross 1973: 170.
[94] Commentators routinely see the literary influence of Isa 65.1-4 (or 1-7) on Mark 5.1-20, thus, Nineham 1968: 153; Boring 2006: 150; Ben Witherington 2001 : 178.
[95] Moloney (2002: 99), also sees the calming of the storm in Mark 4.35-41 as evidence that Jesus is "Lord of creation."
[96] Watts 1997: 162.
[97] Watts 1997: 162. On Mark 4.41 and the probable allusion to Ps 24.8, 10 see Chapter 3, pp. 126-127.
[98] Watts 1997: 176 n. 203.
[99] Marcus 1999: 348 – 349, following Derrett (1979: 6-8).

comparison, Mark 5.13 "The pigs... choked to death in the sea" with Exod 14.28-30; 15.19 "The Egyptians are drowned," comprises a better conceptual and verbal parallel, (compare 5.13 εἰς τὴν θαλάσσαν with the same phrase in Exod 14.28). Nevertheless, the suggestion that Mark consciously draws on Exod 14.1-15.22 LXX in his crafting of the "Legion" story ultimately goes beyond the evidence and must be rejected.

There is, therefore, uncertainty surrounding alleged OT source texts for Mark 5.1-20. Much clearer is the synchronic reading of 4.35-41 with 5.1-20, which attests a sustained Markan focus on the incomparable power and authority of Jesus as DW. The emphasis on the verbally exercised and absolute authority of Jesus as witnessed in Mark 4.35-41/5.1-20 carries over into the subsequent healing stories, not least the climactic raising of Jairus' daughter (5.35-43), proving that ultimately even death itself must yield to Jesus.

(c). ***Analysis of 5.1-20 investigating the possible influence of Divine Warrior traditions***

In the preceding sections (4.2; 4.3) it was established from the clear connections between the programmatic exorcism in Mark 1.21-28 and 4.35-41, that collectively the Markan exorcisms are best read against the background of the HDWT. Therefore, this subsection will investigate further possible developments and influence of DW themes in Mark 5.1-20. As outlined above, 5.1-20 is to be read in conjunction with 4.35-41, which in terms of Christology, sets forth a Markan portrait likening Jesus to God the DW. For Mark, while Jesus' conflict with Satan and demons (e.g. 1.24; 3.27; 5.1-20) takes place on the earthly stage, it is, by nature an apocalyptic, otherworldly, supernatural reality.[100]

The latter point must be underscored since there have been attempts to rationalise Mark 5.1-20, viewing it as alleged anti-Roman polemic. Myers reads 5.1-20 in this vein against the background of the parable of the mustard seed, which supposedly symbolises the triumph of the Kingdom of God over the "tree of Rome," but nothing in the text warrants either this reading of the parable or the linking of the two texts.[101] Garroway brings a post-colonial perspective to 5.1-20, finding in the transformation and

[100] On "apocalyptic" see (J.J.) Collins 1998: 1-42. While Mark is not an "apocalypse", to adopt Collins' idiom (1998: 41), it has an underlying "apocalyptic perspective" insofar as it is framed spatially by the supernatural world and temporally by eschatological judgment (13.1-31 cf. 1.14-15).
[101] Myers 1988: 192-194.

commission of the demoniac the *mimesis* and fulfilment of the parable of the sower, but the Markan text itself does not appear to link the two.[102] Incigneri reads 5.1-20 (particularly the "Legion" reference) in connection with Mark 1.13.[103] For Incigneri, Rome is identified with Satan in the Markan temptation scene, but this conclusion is highly speculative.[104]

There is insufficient evidence to claim that the ultimate significance of the Markan exorcisms consists in the adumbration of the defeat of Rome.[105] While texts such as *1QM* envision a *de facto* physical (and spiritual) battle involving human and supernatural combatants (e.g. *1QM* 1.10-11; 7.6; 9.15-16), Mark's Jesus embodies a non-violent stance at his arrest (14.43-49) with no attempt to confront Roman Imperial forces. Far from predicting the downfall of Rome, Mark has Jesus predict the destruction of the Temple (13.2), i.e. Jesus predicts a great (Roman) victory over the very Jewish establishment which opposes him (cf. 3.22; 14.55-65).[106]

Therefore, contrary to the sophisticated hypotheses propounded by contemporary commentators, there is little evidence of an anti-Roman polemic in Mark. Though frequently the linchpin in the argument that Mark has a preponderantly anti-Roman agenda, the Latin loanword "legion" in 5.9 primarily focuses on the numerical aspect of this instance of demon possession (cf. Matt 26.53 "twelve legions of angels").[107] Moreover, the first *de facto* mention of a Roman individual potentially hostile to Jesus is Pilate (15.1).[108] Notwithstanding the part which Roman authorities and soldiers play in

---

[102] Garroway 2009: 73. This erudite sounding interpretation is extrapolated from the text, rather than explicit within it.
[103] Incigneri 2003: 190.
[104] Incigneri (2003: 108-109) links the "beasts" in 1.13 to the Neronian persecutions in Rome (cf. Tacitus *Annals* 15.44). However, this link is not immediately obvious, and the idea that Satan represents "Rome" here, is extrapolation (Incigneri 2003: 112-114). Similarly, working from his reading of 1.13, Incigneri (2003: 185-188) insists that the "divided house" in 3.24-25 refers to the Flavian house, wherein Vespasian is the "Strong Man." However, Incigneri (2003: 186-187) recognises that biblically the term "house" is widely used of the Davidic dynasty, but fails to note that the accusations brought against Jesus are made by *Jerusalem* scribes (thus identified, and with no mention of Rome). Contextually, there is no immediate reason why the "house" in 3.24-25 should constitute a reference to the Roman Empire, though in a secondary sense, it might be a play on the Jerusalem connection of Jesus' opponents.
[105] Contra Horsley 2001: 102.
[106] Space limitations prevent an exploration of Mark 13 here. See, however, Adams 2007: 134-256; Angel 2006: 125-134; Shively 2012: 184-219.
[107] Cf. Schweizer 1970: 112; Twelftree 1993: 85; Boring 2006: 151. Stein (2008: 255) notes that in *T. Sol* 11.3-7, "legion" signals the demons' numerousness, not a supposed Roman connection.
[108] The dialogue in 12.13-17 which involves Caesar in name, seemingly detracts from the notion of a Markan anti-Roman agenda. Even on the assumption that the logion is ambivalent and potentially subversive (see Wright 1996: 502-507) this is not immediately obvious from the text, and were it primarily an anti-Roman gospel, one would expect multiple polemical indications.

the Markan Jesus' death, it is unlikely that an author engaged in an anti-Roman polemic would hold up a centurion as a paradigm of conversion (cf. below 4.8 on 15.39).[109]

The dramatic confrontation of Jesus and "Legion", then, is to be read in terms of the conflict of heavenly powers, foregrounded earlier in Mark 1.24. Consonant with the wider Markan context, the description of the demoniac in 5.3-4 with its "binding" and "strength" language consciously harks back to the linguistically and thematically proximate "strong man" saying in 3.27, (compare 5.3 δῆσαι with 3.27 δήσῃ; 3.27 ὁ ἰσχυρός with 5.4 ἴσχυεν) which has to do first and foremost with Jesus' conflict with Satan not Rome.[110] Whereas others are incapable of restraining the demoniac (5.4 cf. 9.18), the mere sight of Jesus the DW forces a submissive act of prostration (5.6).[111] The parabolic Beelzebul discourse (3.22-30) is thus enacted and borne out in Mark 5.1-20.

Again, on intratextual connections, the drama of the initial confrontation between Jesus and the demonic "Legion" recalls the brief exchange in Mark 1.24-25. Once more, the same question formula τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί (5.7) is a precursor to the demons' "naming" of Jesus. Here, though, Jesus is identified as "the Son of the Most High God," a particular example of the general tendency of the demons to witness to Jesus' sonship (3.11).[112] Again, the plea "don't torment me" may be compared with the demon's question in 1.24 "Have you come to destroy us?" The dialogue in 5.1-20 is more prolonged, however, and the imperfect (ἔλεγεν) in the epexegetical 5.8, suggests a lengthier confrontation, as does the statement in 5.10, "And he begged him earnestly not to send them out of the country."[113] Moreover, though not specifically stated in 5.1-20 that Jesus "rebukes" the demons, he orders them to leave (5.8) and "permits" (5.13) them to enter the pigs

[109] On the nature of the Centurion's "confession" see, e.g. Cranfield 1959: 460; Donahue & Harrington 2002: 449, 452.
[110] Marcus 1999: 343; Guelich 1989: 289. Collins (2007: 233) argues that Jesus' binding of Satan in 3.27 is analogous to God's binding of Leviathan in Job 40.26, 29 LXX, but the connection is perhaps over-subtle.
[111] The possible christological implications regarding the use of προσκυνέω in 5.6 will be discussed in connection with similar statements (see below, section 4.7, p. 208).
[112] Collins (2000: 90) suggests readers with a Greco-Roman background would see in this title a reference to Zeus. Incigneri (2003: 190 n. 126) affirms that a Roman audience would hear a reference to Jupiter. Such issues of transitivity are probably relevant, especially on the assumption that Mark wrote for an audience which included gentiles. Nevertheless, given the Scriptural allusions in 1.11 (i.e. Ps 2.7 and probably Gen 22.2) the Markan "sonship" theme is presented primarily against a Jewish, OT background.
[113] Stein (2008: 254) rejects the contention of Twelftree (1993: 84) that there is a suggestion of "battle" or "war" with demons in these verses, stating that the scene envisions the surrender and judgement of vanquished enemies. A mid-position between these two views seems to do justice to the text, that is, while there is some suggestion of the demons struggling and stalling their inevitable exit via outbursts of speech, this is *inevitable* precisely because it is Jesus who is in control.

(5.13).[114] Christologically, it is striking that Jesus has authority to grant demons "permission," reinforcing the Markan emphasis on Jesus' lordship over demons.

Thus, it emerges that while some proposed intertextual connections are in doubt (see section b above), intratextual connections within Mark attest a constellation of allusions which present Jesus in a way reminiscent of God the DW. Mark's Jesus comes as "Lord" (1.3), the "stronger one" (1.7) capable of binding the "strong man" (3.27 cf. 5.4) and expelling the demonic Legion (5.13). As discussed previously, consonant with the identification of Jesus as "Lord" in 1.3, now in 5.19-20 the former demoniac identifies "the Lord" with "Jesus".[115] Mark's Jesus' statement in 5.19 seems to imply that Jesus acts as God's agent, or, to put it another way, God himself is the underlying "power source" in Jesus' exorcistic activity.[116] On the other hand, the emphasis on *Jesus* in 5.20 (in connection with "the Lord" in 5.19) subtly confirms the point which the evangelist has been making in 4.35-41/5.1-20, i.e. Jesus' powerful speech and actions identify him closely with Yahweh ("the Lord") the DW himself.

(d) Summary of findings

With regard to the second Markan exorcism in 5.1-20 the following points have been made:

(1) In view of the programmatic linkup of Mark 1.21-28 with 4.35-41, as an exorcism account, 5.1-20 belongs within Mark's divine battle scheme.

(2) It is clear that 4.35-41 and 5.1-20 are literarily and thematically linked and designed to be read together. In 4.35-41, Jesus is represented in a manner reminiscent of God the DW in HDWT texts, this portrait carries over into 5.1-20. In both accounts Jesus overcomes a hostile non-human force.

(3) In relation to criterion 2 on characteristic imagery, Markan vocabulary links 5.1-20 to the "strong man" pericope (compare 5.3 δῆσαι with 3.27 δήσῃ; 3.27

[114] Bauernfeind (1927: 43) suggests, remarkably, that the demons deceive Jesus, since, after requesting permission to enter the pigs they drive the herd into the sea in order to make trouble for Jesus with the locals!. Clearly, the evangelist is unlikely to present Jesus as beguiled by the demonic horde and it is much more probable, that the relocation of the demons to the sea brings appropriate closure to the story.
[115] Cf. the comments in the review of Malbon 2009, in Chapter 1, pp. 54-56.
[116] Unless, that is, Jesus here refers to *himself* as "the Lord" and "he". This seems an unnatural way of speaking about oneself, but the prostration of the "Legion" before Jesus in 5.6 implies the lordship of the latter, so the possibility of a statement in self-reference remains.

ὁ ἰσχυρός with 5.4 ἴσχυεν cf. 1.7), and also recalls the programmatic exorcism in 1.21-28 (e.g. τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί in 5.7, with τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί in 1.24). Mark applies this terminology, especially the "ἰσχ" word group, in order to present Jesus in a manner reminiscent of God the DW, particularly against a Deutero-Isaianic DW background.

(4) Though the technical HDWT term "rebuke" does not appear (contrast 1.25; 3.12; 9.25), the story nevertheless attests the extraordinary verbal power which Jesus exercises over demons. This power and authority is linked to Jesus' identity as "Son" (5.7) and "the Lord" (5.19-20), which title, in the prologue, is bound up with the association of Jesus with Yahweh the DW (1.3 cf. 1.7).

(5) Mark 5.1-20 should not be interpreted as the central pillar of an alleged anti-Roman polemic. Rather, consistent with previous pericopes (1.21-28; 3.22-30) Jesus is presented as the DW who overturns Satanic forces.

(e) Conclusion Mark 5.1-20

Insofar as 5.1-20 is juxtaposed with and thematically similar to 4.35-41, it is to be read with that Markan sea-miracle. Thus, the first Markan exorcism story (1.21-28) prefigures the first sea-miracle (4.35-41), which in turn is complemented by the second exorcism story (5.1-20). The inter-relatedness of the two initial Markan exorcisms and the first sea-miracle (parallel to the second sea-miracle in 6.45-52 – cf. Chapter 3) confirms the interconnection of the sea-miracles and the exorcism stories. This interconnection in turn betrays a Markan theological concern to depict Jesus in a manner reminiscent of God the DW, whose power and authority over evil is supreme, bringing salvation to Satan's captives.

As in 1.21-28, in 5.1-20 demonic speech has christological significance since Jesus is identified as "Son of the Most High God" (5.7). Here though, in the denouement of the story, at the level of Markan narratology the identification of Jesus with "the Lord" (5.19-20) is significant in terms of Q5 of the question matrix, and also points back to 1.3 where the same title is applied to Jesus, likening him to Yahweh the DW.

Attempts to read Mark 5.1-20 against the background of various OT, and especially HDWT texts have been somewhat speculative and too wide in scope. While Isa 65.1-7 may have exercised a degree of thematic influence on the presentation in 5.1-20, this is not clearly the case with regard to the exodus story as recounted in Exod 14-15.22 LXX. Therefore, while clear-cut allusions to texts belonging within the HDWT do not emerge, the portrayal of Jesus in a manner reminiscent of Yahweh the DW carries forward from 4.35-41. Moreover, in 5.1-20 the warrior motif is sufficiently explicit *per se*. That is, Jesus confronts and overcomes a "Legion" of demons, sending them to the sea, which, according to Second Temple texts (e.g. *1QH 11.16-18; T. Sol.* 5.11; *Apoc. El.* 5.35), is the "holding place" for such supernatural creatures.

(4.5). Mark 7.24-30

(a) Text

> *24* From there, he arose and went forth to the region of Tyre.[117] And he entered a house and didn't want anyone to know, but was not able to be hidden. *25* But immediately a woman who heard about him, whose little daughter had an unclean spirit, approached and fell down before his feet. *26* Now the woman was a Greek, of Syrophoenician race. And she asked him in order that he cast out the demon from her daughter. *27* And he said to her, 'First allow the children to be fed, for it is not right to take the bread of the children and throw it to the little dogs.' *28* But she answered and said to him 'Lord,[118] even the little dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs.' *29* And he said to her, 'Because of this word, depart, the demon has come out of your daughter.' *30* And she went away into her house, found the little child lying upon the bed and the demon gone.

(b) 7.24-30 within the wider Markan context

On Achtemeier's model, within the first Markan miracle cycle the exorcism in 5.1-20 follows the first sea-miracle (4.35-41), correspondingly, in the second cycle (6.45-8.26), the exorcism in 7.24-30 follows the second sea-miracle (6.45-52).[119] The sequence is broken in the second cycle though, since between sea-miracle and exorcism the evangelist interposes both a summary statement of Jesus' activities (6.53-56) and an entire section of teaching (7.1-23).

---

[117] Here, ℵ A B and several f^1 and f^{13} manuscripts read "Tyre and Sidon," the variant does not alter the sense of the Markan text in any significant way for the present purposes.
[118] Here ℵ A B Δ 0274^{vid} several f^1 manuscripts and various other sources prefix the word ναί ("yes"), which possibly lends a more assertive tone to the phrase and might require the adversative rendering of the καὶ.
[119] Achtemeier 1970: 265-291.

Mark 7.24-30 is thematically pertinent to the discussion in the immediately preceding episode.[120] While the details of 7.1-23 need not concern us here, it is noted that Jesus' dispute with the Pharisees on dietary regulations and ritual purity culminates in the editorial comment that "Jesus declared all foods clean" (7.19). In the ensuing exorcism story, using "bread" in a figurative sense, Mark's Jesus touches on Jewish-Gentile relations and the actual notion of Jew and Gentile eating together. While the characterisation hardly espouses equality - Jews are characterised as "children," Gentiles "little dogs" - ultimately the principle which emerges is seemingly akin to the Pauline "first the Jew, (and on the Syrophoenician woman's insistence) then the Greek."

In terms of the collective Markan exorcisms, 7.24-30 differs from the first accounts (see below), but complements and balances the final exorcism in 9.14-29. In 7.24-30, Jesus is importuned by a *gentile woman* whose infant *daughter* is possessed. Then, in 9.14-29, a *Jewish man* whose *son* is possessed begs Jesus to exorcise the demon. Since, *prima facie*, Mark knew of multiple exorcisms (e.g. 1.34; 3.11-12), the choice to retell these stories in full may be partly due to their relative symmetry and complementarity, where both 7.24-30 and 9.14-29 emphasise the need to respond to Jesus with a word of faith.

(c) Analysis of 7.24-30 investigating the possible influence of Divine Warrior traditions

In the light of the programmatic exorcism in 1.21-28, the exorcism in 7.24-30 should be read within the Markan divine battle scheme. However, the story in 7.24-30 exhibits distinct emphases. Whereas Mark generally portrays the confrontation of Jesus and a demon(s), in 7.24-30 Jesus has no contact with either demon or demoniac.[121] Rather, the mother of the afflicted girl approaches Jesus. In the former exorcisms (cf. the Markan summary statements) the demons recognise Jesus, naming him with christological epithets, i.e. "holy one of God"; "Son of the Most High God". Here, the recognition of Jesus' authority and the christological "naming" is that of the Syrophoenician herself. While the title κύριε ("Lord") in 7.28 might merely be a form of respectful address, at the level of the Markan narrative it recalls the identification of Jesus

[120] Gundry 1993: 376.
[121] Contra Twelftree (1993: 145) who argues from silence and against the natural reading of the conclusion of the text, that the girl may have accompanied her mother on a stretcher.

with Yahweh in 1.3; 5.19-20.[122] Conceptually similar to "Legion" in 5.6, the woman is said to fall (προσέπεσεν) at Jesus' feet (7.25).

In terms of Jesus' actions, in Mark 7.29, in response to the woman's speech, Jesus merely announces "the demon has come out…" At one level, as a variation on the battle motif, the Markan Jesus' *modus operandi* here further testifies to his incomparable authority as conqueror of evil, capable of exorcising demons from afar, with no need even to issue a verbal rebuke.[123] Equally though, Mark stresses that the attitude of the Syrophoenician woman is an important factor in this exorcism (i.e. Jesus' explanation in 7.29, "Because of *this word*"), whether her reply be understood in terms of persistence, faith or insight.[124]

(d) Summary of findings

With regard to the third Markan exorcism recorded in 7.24-30, the following points have been made:

1. As an exorcism, 7.24-30 should be read within the Markan battle theme established in the programmatic exorcism account in 1.21-28.
2. Nevertheless, 7.24-30 is atypical since there is no direct confrontation between Jesus and the demon(s), (contrast 1.21-28; 5.1-20; 9.14-29). The exorcism is performed from afar with no report of the demon recognising or naming Jesus. Instead of verbally rebuking the demon, in response to the woman's word concerning the "crumbs" the Markan Jesus simply announces that the demon has left her daughter.
3. In terms of the criteria set out in Chapter 2, there is no indication that terminology or themes derived from the HDWT is employed here, nor does the pericope

[122] Gundry (1993: 374) adduces linguistic and semantic arguments to support his point that there is special emphasis on the title "Lord" here. For example, he posits that ordinarily verbs of answering occur in a participial form and verbs of saying in the indicative mood (or vice versa), whereas here the verbs ("she was asking" (v.25) "he was saying" (v.26)) are the only instance in Mark where these verbs occur together in the indicative mood, thus calling attention to the designation "Lord" .

[123] Against Twelftree (1993: 146), who cites an exorcism at a distance by Apollonius of Tyana in *VA* 338, aside from issues concerning the reliability of Philostratus' writings and their possible dependence on Christian sources (see above), Apollonius has recourse to a letter which allegedly commands the demon to leave, whereas Jesus requires no such device in Mark 7.24-30. It is inaccurate to claim that Jesus could heal from a distance "like other exorcists of his period," since we know so little about *any* other exorcists from the first century C.E.

[124] Smith (2012: 475-476) suggests that Jesus presents the woman with a riddle to solve.

appear to draw directly on any OT text.[125] Rather, Mark 7.24-30 comprises a variation on the battle theme with its own distinct purpose, which purpose has to do with the issue of faith in Jesus.

(e) Conclusion Mark 7.24-30

In terms of the collective Markan exorcisms 7.24-30 is atypical, but important. From a christological perspective, 7.24-30 underlines Jesus' absolute authority over demonic forces i.e. Jesus can exorcise from afar, even without a verbal "rebuke". Jesus' extraordinary power over evil is bound up with his unique identity. For Mark, the title "Lord" identifies Jesus with Yahweh (1.3; 5.19-20). Thus, in relation to Q5 of the question matrix, "Lord" as applied to Jesus in 7.28 with the detail that the woman fell at Jesus' feet (cf. 5.6; 5.19-20) may suggest a deeper christological nuance concerning Jesus' divine identity, going beyond a merely formal title and gesture, though this is rather subtle and probably not the surface meaning here.

Again, in 7.24-30, there is a shift in emphasis insofar as the "word" of the woman (7.29) is a contributing factor in the exorcism. Thus, in a variation on the battle theme, Mark implies that by a faith response to Jesus, human characters play an active role in the defeat of Satanic forces.

(4.6). Mark 9.14-29

(a) Text

> *14* And when they came to the disciples they saw a great crowd around them and scribes disputing with them. *15* And immediately when all the crowd saw him they were amazed and ran forth greeting him. *16* And he asked them, 'Why do you argue with them?' *17* And someone from the crowd answered him, 'Teacher, I brought my son to you, he has a mute spirit *18* and wherever it takes hold of him it knocks him down, and he foams and grinds his teeth and becomes withered, and I said to your disciples that they might cast it out, but they were not able. *19* And he answered them saying, 'O faithless generation, until when must I be with you? Until when shall I put up with you? Carry him to me.' *20* And they brought him to him, and seeing him the spirit immediately convulsed him, and he fell on the ground, rolling and foaming at the mouth. *21* And he asked his father, 'How long has this been happening to him? And he replied, 'From childhood. *22* And many times it has thrown him into the fire and into the water in order to destroy him, but if you are able, help us and be compassionate to us. *23* But Jesus said to him, 'If you can, all things are possible for the believer' *24* Immediately the father of the little child cried out, 'I believe. Help my faithlessness.' *25* When Jesus saw that a crowd came running

[125] Gundry (1993: 376) disallows the suggestion that the Markan pericope has been modelled on 1 Kgs 17.8-24 on account of the clear differences between the two accounts.

> together he rebuked the unclean spirit, saying to it, 'Mute and deaf spirit, I command you, get out from him and you shall come into him no longer. *26* And he shook and convulsed him a lot and left, and he became like a dead person, so that the majority said 'He has died.' *27* But Jesus took his hand, raised him and he stood up. *28* And once he had entered into the house, his disciples privately asked him, 'Why were we not able to cast it out?' *29* And he said to them, 'This type in no way is able to come out, except through prayer.'

(b) 9.14-29 within the wider Markan context

The final exorcism occurs in Mark's "way section" (8.22-10.52). In this section, by juxtaposing Peter's confession and the first "passion prediction" (8.27-30; 31-33), Mark has Jesus effectively redefine messiahship over against popular conceptions and expectations.[126] Though the disciples are unable to comprehend (e.g. 8.32-33; 10.35-39), it emerges from the "passion predictions" (8.31; 9.31-32; 10.33-34) that Jesus' messianic mission will entail suffering and death. The issue of faith, i.e. adequate and inadequate responses to Jesus, becomes pivotal in this section, where it is revealed that Jesus, "Son of Man" (8.31; 9.31; 10.33) *must* (8.31) undergo suffering and death.[127] The issue of believing in Jesus is integral also to 9.14-29, as discussed below.

Mark 9.14-30 is placed after the Transfiguration (9.1-8) and the "aside" with Peter, James and John in 9.9-13. The Transfiguration contains a recapitulation of the baptism scene (9.7) with Jesus identified once more as the "Son of God." Again, similar to the baptism scene, otherworldly descriptors (9.2-3) obtain. This time, however, Peter, James and John witness the event, though they seem unable to comprehend its meaning (9.6). In Mark 9.11-13, the question about Elijah is presumably raised in the wake of the appearance of the prophet on the mountain with Jesus. On a standard reading, Jesus' answer (9.13) is taken as a reference to John the Baptist.[128]

As the narrative ensues beyond Mark 9.14-29, the seeming suggestion that the possessed boy has effectively returned from the dead (9.27-28) subtly foreshadows the resurrection motif regarding the "Son of Man" in 9.31 (cf. 9.9-10). As will be explored below, the thematic contrast between the believing father in the story (cf. 7.24-30) and the failing disciples prefigures the adequate responses of "outsiders" (e.g. 10.46-52) and

[126] France 2002: 326; Kingsbury 1983: 97-98; Collins 2007: 400-401. Cf. Marcus 1992: 36.
[127] See Marcus 2009: 589-592, on the "blindness" motif in this section of Mark.
[128] See, e.g. Donahue & Harrington 2002: 274-275.

inadequate responses from "insiders" (e.g. 10.13; 35-40) to Jesus, whom, in this section, makes clear that his mission will involve his own suffering and death.

(c) Analysis of 9.14-29 investigating the possible influence of Divine Warrior traditions

In the light of the programmatic 1.21-28, as with the other exorcisms, 9.14-29 should be read within Mark's battle scheme. Since 9.13 - a veiled reference to John the Baptist - immediately precedes 9.14-29, probably, the wording of 9.18 καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν deliberately recalls John's identification of Jesus as ὁ ἰσχυρότερός (cf. 1.7). Both Matthew and Luke substitute ἠδυνήθησαν (Matt 17.16; Luke 9.40 *vs*. Mark 9.18), which may further suggest that the Markan employment of this term is intentional and strategic, designed to recall the previous statements involving the ἴσχ word group in the context of exorcisms.[129] Here, the disciples (commissioned by Jesus as exorcists in 3.15; 6.7), fail, since they are not "able," i.e. implicitly, not *strong* or powerful enough to exorcise this demon. As "the stronger one," reminiscent of God the DW in the sea-miracles and as in the other exorcisms, Jesus is able to exorcise the demon (9.25-27) by way of his verbal command.

In Mark 9.14-29 (cf. 7.24-30), unsurprisingly there is no report of the boy/demon addressing Jesus, since the demon is described as a πνεῦμα ἄλαλον (9.17, 25).[130] Nevertheless, Jesus "rebukes" the demon (9.25), where the technical HDWT term ἐπιτιμάω again appears on Jesus' lips. The importance of this term and its mythic undercurrents was discussed above (cf. 4.1.c) in relation to 1.21-28. Once more in 9.25, in the light of the earlier use of the term and in the context of Jesus' subduing a powerful demon the occurrence of ἐπιτιμάω again recalls God the DW's defeat and subjugation of evil. Here Mark would appear to employ a framing device or A B B^1 A^1 pattern, since, in the first and final exorcisms, but not in the middle two, Jesus' authoritative verbal "rebuke" (1.25; 9.25 cf. 3.12) is salient.[131] Thus, this inclusio linking the first and last

[129] Sterling (1993: 475) observes the difference in terminology but explains it by suggesting that Matthew and Luke use an alternative source. It might simply be the case, however, that they are *polishing* what to them appears to be a less adequate verb to describe the inability of the disciples.
[130] Though the spirit is described "crying out" in Mark 9.26 this is presumably a scream, since inability to speak is not synonymous with total inability to produce sound.
[131] The *de facto* presence of a Markan inclusio here is seemingly confirmed by the "shaking" action in the exorcism (i.e. 1.26, σπαράξαν with σπαράξας in 9.26; the verb is found nowhere else in Mark); in both verses the exit of the demon is described identically ἐξῆλθεν, and both register a crying out.

exorcisms serves to frame the collective exorcisms, characterising them with the language of the HDWT (cf. 4.39).

Notwithstanding the connections with the HDWT, similar to 7.24-30, the final Markan exorcism also represents a variation on the battle theme. Just as the response of the Syrophoenician woman replaces the christological "confession" of the demon (cf. 1.24; 3.11; 5.7), so in 9.14-29 it is the boy's father who "cries out" (9.24) in faith, albeit a self-confessedly inadequate faith. Apparently, there is a shift of emphasis from the first two Markan exorcism accounts to the final two. In 1.21-28 and 5.1-20, in direct speech the demons themselves witness to the power and authority of Jesus. However, in 7.24-30 and 9.14-29 the human parents of children afflicted with demons appeal to Jesus and secure his help by way of their verbal response to him.

On the one hand, the first two Markan exorcisms (both tied literarily to 4.35-41) combine to emphasise the authority and power of Jesus over demons, where his activity is reminiscent of God the DW. Though the representation of Jesus as a powerful figure reminiscent of God the DW remains relevant in 7.24-30 and 9.14-29, the primary Markan focus has shifted. Central now is the response of people to Jesus, whom as the reader learns on the basis of the passion predictions, despite coming as the mighty DW, will nevertheless suffer and die.

(d) Summary of findings

With regard to the final Markan exorcism account recorded in 9.14-29, the following points seem relevant:

(1) In the light of the programmatic exorcism in 1.21-28, the final exorcism story is to be read within a Markan battle scheme.
(2) In terms of criterion 2 on characteristic terminology, Jesus is depicted "rebuking" a demon using terminology derived from the HDWT (9.25), where there seems to be an implicit semblance to God the DW, a link which is even more explicit in the first Markan sea-miracle. Again, in a Markan framing device, this terminology in 1.25 and 9.25 (cf. 1.26 with 9.26) matches the first and last exorcisms, demarcating Jesus' exorcism ministry and characterising it in HDWT terms.

(3) On the contextual evidence involving the veiled reference to John the Baptist in 9.13, and the changes made by the synoptic authors to Mark's terminology, it appears that the word ἴσχυσαν in 9.18 is used strategically, where it recalls the Markan prologue (1.7) in which Jesus is presented in a manner reminiscent of God the DW. The implication is that as one who is comparable to God the DW, Jesus the "stronger one" is able to exorcise the demon that defeats the disciples.

(4) Whereas the first two Markan exorcisms (1.21-28; 5.1-20) focus entirely on Jesus' extraordinary power over demons, 9.14-29 and 7.24-30 have to do with the faith response of people to Jesus. It was suggested that this shift in emphasis coheres with the context of the Markan "way" section where the central theme is Jesus' redefinition of messiahship and the necessity of putting one's faith in him.

(e) Conclusion Mark 9.14-29

It emerges, then, that items of vocabulary employed in Mark 9.14-29 derive from the HDWT. Both the tone and outcome cohere with the portrait of Jesus as a powerful figure akin to the DW developed in the previous sea-miracles and exorcism stories. As in 7.24-30 – a story with which 9.14-29 has certain thematic and rhetorical affinities – there appears to be a shift in emphasis from the initial exorcism stories. That is, without detracting from the representation of Jesus as a powerful warrior figure, there is now a more developed focus on the importance of a faith response to Jesus the exorcist whose mission, paradoxically, will involve suffering and death.

(4.7) *The Markan Summary Statements (1.32-34, 39; 3.11-12)*

It was argued above that in the Markan exorcisms, Jesus' words and actions recall those of God the DW. Insofar as the Markan "summary statements" (1.32-34, 39, 3.11-12 cf. 6.12-13) report multiple healings and exorcisms performed by Jesus,[132] these quantitative statements complement the qualitative full episodic healings/exorcisms, heightening the impression of Jesus' extraordinary authority. Furthermore, Mark utilises the summaries in connection with the issue of exorcisms and Jesus' core identity as "son

[132] "Healings" and "exorcisms" are separate categories in Mark, similarly Eve 2002: 373-374.

of God", which in view of (Q5) of the question matrix (concerning Christological titles) must now be explored.

In the initial exorcism accounts it emerges that demons have knowledge of Jesus' identity (1.24; 5.7). In Mark 1.32-34, this point is made in a general way, "they [the demons] knew him." In 3.11, the latter is clarified, since it is stated that at the sight of Jesus, the unclean spirits fall before him crying out, "You are the Son of God" (καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ). That which is reported as a general trend in 3.11 is particularised in 5.6-7, where "Legion" prostrates himself before Jesus, declaring him to be the "Son of the Most High God."[133] Again, in a generalised way, drawing on the vocabulary of the HDWT, in 3.12 Jesus is said to rebuke unclean spirits (ἐπιτίμα), a detail which is parallel to particular rebukes elsewhere in Mark (1.25; 9.25).

From this it emerges that Jesus' exorcism ministry is intimately linked to his identity as divine son. It is specifically as "Son of God" that Mark's Jesus overcomes demons, implying that there is an intrinsically *functional* dimension to this title.[134] At the lowest end of the christological spectrum, in view of the allusion to Ps 2.7 in Mark 1.11, the title "Son of God" might be understood as a human i.e. messianic title.[135] On this reading, God *adopts* Jesus in a way recalling the ideal of Davidic kingship (and at a distance, other ANE kingship models, principally the Egyptian).[136] Rather than a "divine" being (i.e. a preexistent, ontologically divine being), Jesus is a specially appointed human being who bears the authority and communicates the kingly presence of God.[137] On this

[133] Twelftree (1993: 81) observes that Mark 5.6 refers to this event using a verb which corresponds to early Christian worship. In relation to the statement that the demons threw themselves down before Jesus in 3.11, Marcus (1999: 259) opines that Mark operates with a concept not unlike Phil 2.10-11. While Bultmann (1963: 358) appears to accept Mark 5.6 as evidence that men *worship* Jesus, it is unlikely that the demon in 5.6 should be understood to offer Jesus "worship," rather, this is a deferential attitude of one conscious of his/her inferiority, or (and less likely) mock deference.

[134] The meaning of the title is much debated, recent treatments espousing distinct approaches include, Rowe 2002; Collins & Collins 2008; Peppard 2011, 2012.

[135] In this connection Johansson (2010a: 364-393) cites Juel 1977: 78-82; 108-114; Matera 1987: 37; Collins 2008: 127-128. However, Dillon (2014: 10) notes the adoptive part of the phrase from Ps 2.7 is omitted in Mark 1.11 and infers that the scene is not one of messianic investiture, but rather indicative of an identity and role which Jesus *already* has, i.e. "Son of God".

[136] On the ANE models see Collins & Collins 2008: 2-23. While there may be some notion of "divine" kingship in royal psalms, Collins & Collins (2008: 23) cite the lack of cultic veneration as evidence that the Israelite king was not considered "divine" in a strict sense.

[137] Collins & Collins (2008: 132) recognise this in terms of Jesus' baptism in Mark, but this is mitigated by the statement on the previous page that in the Markan Transfiguration scene Jesus appears like a deity who is visiting earth. Rowe (2002: 1 cf. 38-52) as background to the "Son of God" title in Mark, speaks of a

type of reading, as the *bearer* of God's presence and authority, Jesus' success as exorcist, "Son" and DW also issues from the fact that God's Spirit *possesses* him (1.10).[138]

A little "higher" on the Christological scale are explanations citing Greco-Roman parallels.[139] Greco-Roman heroes and emperors such as Augustus, were heralded as "sons" of a god and "divine".[140] Assuming that Mark wrote for an audience which included those of a Greco-Roman background, in terms of transitivity, it is plausible that he intended such people to view Jesus as to some extent parallel and/or rival to this type of heroic ideal "divine" figure.[141] On the other hand, in view of the predominant Jewish and OT background to Mark, there would be limits to this parallelism. Indeed, it may be partly for this reason that Mark omits an infancy narrative, since the notion of male gods producing semi-divine heirs by the rape of human women would be thoroughly abominable to the Jewish mind-set.[142]

At the highest end of the christological spectrum, though it would be anachronistic to procure creedal formulas in Mark, the gospel's concept of divine sonship might prefigure later statements of belief in Jesus as the "second person" of the Trinity. It was previously suggested that the absence of any mention of Joseph coupled with the supernatural, demonic knowledge of Jesus' true identity as "Son of God" might signal a heavenly or divine identity for Jesus.[143] That Mark twice links "divine sonship" with the title "Son of Man" lends support to this interpretation. The linkage occurs in Mark 8.38 ("his father/ Son of Man"), and, by implication in 14.61-62, where in answer to the High Priest's question "Are you the Christ, the Son of the blessed?" Mark has Jesus reply "I am" and then cite Dan 7.13 with explicit mention of the "Son of Man." Notwithstanding the complexities surrounding this title, it is generally accepted that where the "Son of

"two-tier" Davidic kingship model evident in Ps 2 and other royal psalms, wherein the Davidic king is subordinate to God as king, and remains a human figure.

[138] Driggers 2007: 230 cf. 235. In a sense, this makes Jesus as "Son of God" comparable to Israel, also called "Son" by God in certain OT texts (e.g. Hos 11.1). However, the typological notion that as "Son of God" the individual Jesus takes up the role of collective Israel, seemingly developed in the gospel of Matthew e.g. Matt 2.15 in relation to Hos 11.1, (for a recent treatment with references to scholarly readings of Matt 2.15, see Beale 2012: 697-715), is not developed in an explicit manner in Mark.

[139] See e.g. Collins 2000; Peppard 2010: 431-451; 2011a: 86-131.

[140] For example, coins described Octavian as "divi filius," from 40 BCE. On his deathbed, Vespasian allegedly claimed he was "turning into a god" Suetonius *Vespasian* 23.4 see, e.g. Collins & Collins 2008: 53.

[141] See n. 112 above, cf. Peppard 2011a: 86.

[142] This observation concerning the lack of an infancy narrative in Mark was made by Prof. Roland Deines (personal communication, May, 2013).

[143] See Chapter 1, p. 57.

Man" epithet occurs with a Danielic/Enochic sense (as in Mark 8.38/14.61-62), it refers to a heavenly, probably (but not certainly) preexistent figure.[144] Thus, by aligning the concept of divine sonship with the title "Son of Man" Mark likely hints at Jesus' divinity, or at least his heavenly provenance.[145]

In terms of Q5 of the question matrix, in Mark, the title "Son of God" is apparently multi-layered. On the evidence of the allusion to Ps 2.7 in Mark 1.11, it emerges that the divine sonship concept has royal messianic connotations. It may be that the Markan presentation of Jesus as "Son of God" resonates somewhat with Greco-Roman traditions, in which case a form of divine identity for Jesus is being claimed. At a deeper level, the convergence of the divine sonship concept with the nexus of the Danielic/Enochic Son of Man ideas likely indicates that Mark presupposes some form of underlying divine identity for Jesus.

In the light of the discussion above, for the purposes of this enquiry, it emerges that the Markan summary statements are Christologically significant for two principal reasons. First, as statements of Jesus' far-reaching success as exorcist, they heighten the reader's appreciation of Jesus' power as a DW figure. Secondly, they reinforce the Markan emphasis that supernatural beings (i.e. demons) recognise Jesus in this role as "Son of God". The fact that the Markan divine sonship concept is bound up with the exorcisms suggests there is a functional dimension to the title/notion. Nevertheless, as discussed immediately above, there are strong hints in Mark that divine sonship implies some form of divine identity for Jesus. Since the "Son of God" title also occurs in Mark 15.39, it will now be necessary to briefly consider this text.

(4.8) Mark 15.39

At the cross, as Jesus breathes his last, the centurion declares ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν (surely this man was the/a son of God/a god).[146] Previously in

[144] For references to literature regarding the Enochic "Son of Man", see Chapter 1, p. 58, n. 323, and, of especial interest here is Boyarin 2011: 51-76. On the "Son of Man" generally, see e.g. Casey 2007.
[145] If Angel (2006: 125-134) is correct, then, the presentation of the "Son of Man" in Mark 13.26 draws on texts from the HDWT in such a way as to portray Jesus in a manner reminiscent of Yahweh the DW.
[146] It is debated whether the centurion identifies Jesus as *the* Son of God, or merely as *a* son of a god in relation to Greco-Roman heroes since Mark 15.39 has anarthrous (υἱὸς Θεοῦ), see e.g. Kim 1998: 224-241. Both translations are possible, as suggested above, for Mark, the identification is probably a positive confession.

Mark, only *supernatural beings* i.e. God (1.11; 9.7) and demons (3.12; 5.7) perceived Jesus' true identity as "Son of God."[147] To this point in the gospel, the title has had a particular association with divine battle, wherein, as exorcist, Jesus likened to God the DW overcomes inimical forces. The question, therefore, is why Mark includes this statement at this point, and what it might mean.

Structurally, on the premise that the divine sonship concept is deliberately located near the beginning, middle and end of Mark (1.11; 9.7; 15.39), since the first two references are pronouncements made by God himself, the centurion's statement is aligned with the infallible point of view of God.[148] One implication of this is that even if historically the centurion's exclamation were an ironic taunt, for Mark, any irony converts into a positive confession. That is, as the only human being to correctly identify Jesus as "Son" – and this at the foot of the cross - the centurion has especial emblematic significance. Therefore, the Markan notion of the centurion responding to Jesus in faith would serve a paradigmatic hortatory function.

Nevertheless, the centurion's remark that Jesus is "son of God" is also reminiscent of the demonic outbursts in the exorcisms (3.12; 5.7). Therefore, the crucifixion scene recalls the divine battle motif. Joel Marcus has noted the "exorcistic" character of the Markan crucifixion scene.[149] Thus, Jesus "cries out" in a loud voice φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (15.34, cf. 37) which exact combination occurs only twice more in Mark, in exorcisms (1.26; 5.7).[150]

Clearly though, the latter represents an unexpected inversion, since Jesus would seem to be depicted as *exorcised* rather than exorcist. Indeed, Jesus' citation of Ps 22.1 in 15.34 concerning God *abandoning* him is congenial to the probably implicit notion that God's Spirit is being driven out from Jesus in death. In relation to this, it has been pointed out that Mark 1.9-11 and 15.37-39 form an inclusio with matching elements (i.e.

[147] It is conceded that the notion of divine sonship is raised in 14.61, "Are you […] the Son of the Blessed?" but from his reaction in 14.63-64, it is clear that the High Priest rejects rather than acknowledges this.
[148] On this see e.g. Kingsbury 1983: 68; Marcus 2009: 1059. Contra Kim 1998: 239.
[149] Marcus 2009: 1030-1031, 1054, 1058. In a personal communication dated 10th. June, 2010, Marcus states that Mark 13 "relates the end to a cosmic 'exorcism'" and "since, for Mark, Jesus' death is already an eschatological event, it makes sense to think of it as exorcistic."
[150] Similarly Marcus 2009: 1058. Watts (2007a: 322) argues that since the phrase φωνῇ μεγάλῃ signals Jesus' or God's power elsewhere in the NT (e.g. John 11.43; Rev 1.10; 5.12; 7.2) the Markan reference similarly attests Jesus' power, but this is uncertain since elsewhere in Mark, the phrase only refers to the defeat of the demons.

the tearing of the heavens and the tearing of the veil, the phrase "Son of God").[151] Since, in 1.10, Jesus receives the πνεῦμα it is probably no coincidence that Mark's description of Jesus' death ἐξέπνευσεν (15.37, 39) is, by etymological similitude, the rhetorical counterpart to Jesus' reception of God's Spirit at baptism. This suggestion gains support in that both Matthew and Luke make it explicit that Jesus gives up his *spirit* at death (Matt 27.50; Luke 23.46).

Such an inverted schema would cohere with a pattern of inversion traceable at least to the "way" section, where Jesus the Messiah comes to Jerusalem not to triumph over human enemies in a conventional holy war, but to suffer and die and, somehow, in *surrendering* his life, save many (cf. 10.45).[152] The scenes leading up to the crucifixion are heavily ironic, i.e. Jesus is mocked as a king, when the readers know that he is in fact God's royal messiah.[153] It could be that the Markan irony continues in the exorcistic crucifixion scene insofar as Jesus appears defeated, God's Spirit driven from him, when in reality his death represents a victory over evil as the portent of the torn veil and the centurion's declaration imply.

Though space limitations foreclose the possibility of further exploration, the following ideas might be pursued elsewhere. First, the centurion's cry and Jesus' cries hint that the crucifixion scene is a form of exorcism or a battle with demonic forces. Since, for Mark, Jesus' exorcisms achieve the defeat of Satan (e.g. 1.24; cf. 3.22-30), the suggestion is that paradoxically, in a chapter replete with parody and irony, Jesus' death defeats Satanic forces.[154] Other NT texts might support the notion that Jesus defeating demonic forces is an early soteriological tradition, e.g. Col 2.15 which speaks of the defeat of the "rulers" and "authorities" at the cross. Ultimately, however, a fuller proposal must be worked out as to *how* Mark understands Jesus' death as the defeat of Satan, especially given the apparently dissonant element of Jesus crying out, announcing that God has *forsaken* him in 15.34.[155]

[151] See e.g. Ulansey 1991: 123-125
[152] See Marcus 1992: 36.
[153] See e.g. Marcus 2006: 73-87.
[154] See Marcus 2006: 73-87.
[155] On Ps 22 here, see Watts 2007: 236; Ahearne-Kroll 2007: 205-210

(4.9) Mark 9.38-41 (cf. 6.7)

A final text related to Jesus' exorcism ministry is the brief pericope in 9.38-41, where Jesus effectively *authorises* non disciples, i.e. those outside the Twelve (cf. 3.15; 6.7; 6.13), to exorcise in his name. Christologically, the significance of this authorisation is hard to overestimate. Since in later exorcistic magic texts the invocation of a god's name and even the name of Yahweh is commonplace, and since angels rebuke Satan in the name of God (Zech 3.2; Jude 9), the fact that for Mark, Jesus' *name* may be invoked in this way likely implies a divine identity.

While some texts do link exorcisms with the names of particular human personages understood to be prodigious exorcists, (e.g. Solomon), such texts are almost always later than the first century CE. [156] Again, there are very few if any clear-cut examples of exorcisms being performed in the name of a human being. A possible exception is *Jos Ant 8.45-49*, where Eleazar could be depicted as invoking the name of Solomon.[157] In *Ant* 8.47, the participle μεμνημένος (Σολόμωνός τε μεμνημένος), could mean "making mention" i.e. Eleazar actually speaks the name "Solomon", perhaps as part of an exorcistic formula.[158] However, μεμνημένος could equally mean "remembering" (cf. *J.W.* 7.18), or "calling to mind" (cf. *Ant.* 8.209), in which case, Eleazar proceeds *calling to mind* or *remembering* Solomon.[159] The latter rendering fits naturally enough with the next half of the phrase where Eleazar recites Solomonic incantations – presumably from memory. Even on the former rendering some ambiguity remains, since it is not explicitly stated that the exorcism occurs in "Solomon's name". Moreover, *Ant* 8.45 specifically states that *God* had granted Solomon knowledge of the exorcistic art, so, contextually there is no question that the ultimate "power-authority" is God himself.[160] Finally, since Eleazar partly depends on what is purportedly an Solomonic exorcistic ritual aid (a ring containing a root under the seal), and since Jesus has no need of such apotropaic aids, this further distances Josephus' story from the Markan pericope.

---

[156] For an earlier text see, *1QapGen* 20.16-29 where Abraham exorcises Pharaoh through prayer and laying on of hands.
[157] See e.g. the translation of Eve 2002: 339.
[158] For this and the following sentence see BAGD 652.
[159] Contra the translation of Eve 2002: 339, and also Whiston and Thackeray. In the cross-referenced texts Whiston translates the participle respectively, "remembered" and "called to mind".
[160] The same notion is clearly attested in *T. Sol.* 1.5-7.

In conclusion, it is striking that for Mark, exorcisms may be performed in the name of Jesus, and that Jesus authorises such practice. There is no concrete evidence antedating the NT that exorcisms were performed in the name of a particular individual, even if some Jewish texts celebrate particular individuals as accomplished exorcists. Thus, in the light of biblical parallels such as Zech 3.2 and Jude 9, in which Satan is rebuked in *God's* name, Mark 9.38-41 is apparently further evidence that in his depiction of Jesus as mighty exorcist, the evangelist claims some form of divine identity for Jesus.

(4.10). *Conclusion and closing reflections on the Markan exorcisms*

It was demonstrated above that the exorcism in Mark 1.21-28 is programmatic for Jesus' exorcism ministry. Since 1.21-28 draws on the terminology of the HDWT and is unmistakably linked to 4.35-41 (as is 5.1-20), which story draws on the HDWT, it was argued that all the Markan exorcisms and related pericopes should be understood within the broad framework of a divine battle motif.

In connection with the latter, it is significant that Mark frequently presents Jesus "rebuking" demons in a way which recalls God the DW through the use of the technical verb closely associated with the HDWT ἐπιτιμάω (1.25; 3.12; 9.25 cf. 8.33).[161] Again, in terms of vocabulary, in the Markan exorcism stories (and the related "Beelzebul" pericope in 3.22-30), the evangelist consistently employs words from the "ἴσχ" word group, which as argued above, most probably draws on the imagery of God the DW as encountered in Deutero-Isaiah.

In terms of the Markan Christology which emerges from the exorcisms the following considerations seem important. First, as set out above, the *modus operandi* of Jesus the exorcist, i.e. exorcism by straightforward verbal rebuke with no appeal to a power-authority, is striking insofar as it differs from what is known about other exorcists from the first century CE (or later) on the basis of the sparse literary records available. It was proposed above that while the NT itself suggests that other exorcists did operate in Jesus' time, Jesus' exorcistic *modus operandi* was essentially unique. Thus, far from

[161] It was pointed out in the previous chapter that while in Mark ἐπιτιμάω doesn't always have as its object a hostile force or demons/Satan (see, e.g. 10.13), that is the most common use of the term. In Mark 8.33, while Peter is rebuked, the context strongly suggests that *Satan* is the ultimate target of Jesus' rebuke (contra Pero 2013: 4).

comparing Jesus to other putative or *de facto* Jewish exorcists, in terms of a parallel, Mark's depiction of Jesus as exorcist recalls the image of God the DW rebuking and defeating the powers of chaos on the basis of his supreme authority.

Secondly and relatedly, it seems significant that while NT texts bear witness to the success of those who exorcise demons in Jesus' name (e.g. Mark 9.38-39; Luke 10.17; Acts 19.13), beyond the NT corpus, exorcisms are normally recorded as being performed in the name of God (or in magic texts in the name of a god or plural gods, though preeminent humans might possibly be mentioned in a chain of references). It is striking that Jesus does not call on God in the exorcisms and the distinctly authoritative nature of Jesus' exorcisms is further underlined by Mark via the wonderment and "fear" of witnesses (e.g. 1.27; 5.15).[162] Just as the title "Lord" in Mark is seemingly ambiguous, capable of having either God or Jesus as its referent, so it is noteworthy that in Jude 9, the archangel Michael rebukes Satan in the name of the Lord.[163] Thus, in terms of Q3 of the question matrix proposed in chapter 1 of this thesis, cumulatively, the fact that Jesus exorcises on his own authority in a way reminiscent of God the DW's rebuke of evil, and the fact that exorcisms are performed by others in *his* name (cf. 9.38-39), suggests that a further divine prerogative has been appropriated by the Markan Jesus.

Thirdly, and recalling (Q5) of the question matrix (on Christological titles) it was observed that in the second exorcism (5.19-20), at the level of Markan narratology, the title "Lord" apparently refers to God *and* Jesus. Again, the mother in the third exorcism story addresses Jesus as "Lord" (7.28), and she, like "Legion", falls at Jesus' feet in acknowledgement of his lordship (7.25; cf. 5.6). Whereas, on the surface, the Syrophoenician woman's speech might comprise merely an appropriate formal address (the equivalent of "sir"), since in 1.3 and 5.19-20 the title "Lord" identifies Jesus with Yahweh, there are possible undercurrents of a divine identity for Jesus associated with this title.

Fourthly, again in relation to (Q5) of the question matrix, it was observed that the divine sonship concept and title "Son of God" is associated with the Markan exorcism stories, insofar as demons recognise Jesus as God's son, and are silenced by him (3.11-12 cf. 1.32-34; 5.7). This designation (explored in 4.7 above), therefore, has a clearly

[162] On the theme of "wonder" in Mark, and partly in relation to Jesus' exorcisms, see Dwyer 1996.
[163] On the "ambiguity" of the "Lord" title in Mark, see Johansson 2010: 101-124.

functional dimension, that is Jesus as "Son of God" defeats Satan. While for Mark, the title "Son of God" might have a purely Davidic emphasis with no implicit *ontological* claim, a different reading is possible. Here, on the basis of a cumulative case it was argued that for Mark, Jesus' divine sonship and the title "Son of God" at least suggest some form of heavenly provenance and divine identity for Jesus.

These findings on the Markan exorcisms bring the investigation of the sea-miracles and exorcisms to a close. In the following chapter, in addition to recapitulating the conclusions reached so far, the evidence collected on Mark's use of the HDWT will be considered with reference to wider debates on Christology. In particular, it is now time to make a reasoned judgment, albeit a preliminary one, given the necessarily limited nature of this investigation, as to whether Mark's Christology and specifically DW Christology is best framed in terms of "binitarian", "participation", "Wisdom", "angel" Christology or some other category.[164]

[164] On these categories, see Chapter 1, pp. 16-29.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION: THE INFLUENCE OF THE HEBREW DIVINE WARRIOR TRADITIONS ON THE MARKAN SEA-MIRACLES AND EXORCISMS (4.35-41/6.45-52; 1.23-28; 5.1-20; 7.24-30; 9.14-29) MARK'S JESUS, DIVINE

(5.1) Introduction

This study has examined aspects of Mark's Christology within wider debates on early high Christology, sketched in Chapter 1. The specific objective has been to evaluate the influence of the HDWT (outlined in Chapter 2) on the Markan sea-miracles (Chapter 3) and exorcisms (Chapter 4), exploring possible implications for the Christology of Mark.

In Chapter 1, from the overview of debates on early Christology, the following question matrix was identified: (Q1), "Is there evidence in Mark that Jesus was venerated/worshipped as a transcendent or divine being?"; (Q2), "Is there evidence in Mark that Jesus was regarded as preexistent?"; (Q3), "Is there evidence in Mark that divine operations and attributes were transferred to Jesus and if so, what might this imply?"; (Q4), "Is there evidence in Mark that particular OT texts are reprogrammed in such a way that Jesus becomes the referent in place of God?"; (Q5), "Is there evidence in Mark that particular titles or the combination of titles attributed to Jesus in Mark imply Jesus' divinity?".

In Chapter 1, (Q1), whether Mark's Gospel provides evidence of the cultic worship of Jesus in primitive Christianity was answered negatively and conclusively. (Q2), on preexistence was held open, but in the light of the foregoing investigation may now be answered conclusively. Though Mark supplies no outright statement of Jesus' preexistence there are indications that this is presupposed. It was argued that Mark's total omission of Joseph raises an underlying question concerning Jesus' ultimate provenance.[1] Consonantly, the fact that during his lifetime, Jesus is recognised as "Son of God" only by heavenly beings, i.e. God and demons, could imply an ultimately heavenly provenance for Jesus, i.e. angelic beings recognise him as one originating in the heavenly sphere. The latter becomes a very real possibility in view of the Markan combination of Jesus' divine sonship with sayings about the heavenly "Son of Man"

[1] For this and the subsequent arguments here, see Chapter 1 pp. 57-58, Chapter 4, p. 193.

figure (8.38; 14.61-62), which figure seems to have been regarded as preexistent in apocalyptic literature of the period (*1 En.* 48.2-3; *4 Ezra* 13.26). Therefore, on the cumulative force of these considerations, flat denials that Mark's Jesus is portrayed as preexistent require some qualification or nuancing, since it is seemingly implicit or presupposed in Mark that Jesus was ultimately a preexistent heavenly being.[2]

Again on the question matrix, (Q3) and (Q4) were identified as a fruitful avenue of inquiry to be explored in relation to the possible influence of the HDWT on the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms. It was also judged that limited answers might be found for (Q5) on christological titles. Responses to these questions will be considered below in relation to the sea-miracles and then the exorcisms in the respective subsections entitled "Implications for Markan Christology". In each case, there will be an initial restatement of the conclusions reached with regard to the principal objective of this study, namely, to determine the extent of the influence of the HDWT on the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms.

(5.2) Conclusions and final considerations on the Markan sea-miracles

(a) *Conclusions on the influence of the HDWT on the Markan sea-miracles*

Chapter 3 investigated the influence of the HDWT on Mark 4.35-41 and 6.45-52. The chief findings of this chapter will now be briefly restated in summary form.

(i) Mark 4.35-41

1. It was established that since in Mark 4.35-41, Jesus "muzzles" the sea (πεφίμωσο "be muzzled!" 4.39), the sea is personified as an inimical force. It was further demonstrated that the personification of the sea as an inimical force recalls OT/Second Temple HDWT texts, wherein God the DW subjugates the chaos sea/monsters. This lead to the conclusion that the apparently original Markan image is to be read in terms of the HDWT.

2. It was demonstrated that the term ἐπιτιμάω in Jesus' "rebuke" of the wind (4.39) recalls OT texts in which God as DW rebukes the sea/chaos monsters. It was

[2] Contra Collins & Collins 2008: 209. The reference is to all synoptic authors, though, in the immediately ensuing sentence Mark's concept of "Son of God" is treated.

observed that the wind itself is associated with chaos in Second Temple developments of the HDWT, (*1QH* 10.27; *1QH* 14.23; *T. Jud.* 21.9, cf. Dan 7.2) and Mark's representation is consistent with such texts. It was inferred from Jesus' words and actions in 4.39, that Mark likens Jesus to God the DW.

3. It was suggested that the presence of Jonah terminology/phraseology (LXX) indicates that for Mark, the prophet is a literary foil to Jesus: whereas Jonah is swallowed by the chaos monster, Jesus as DW "muzzles" the threatening sea.

4. It was argued that in Mark 4.41, the disciples' question is probably a nuanced echo of Ps 24.8, 10 (23.8, 10 LXX) a psalm belonging to the HDWT tradition in which Yahweh is exalted as a mighty warrior king, his victory over chaos presupposed.

5. It was demonstrated that the phrase λαῖλαψ μεγάλη in 4.37 was likely appropriated from the HDWT text Jer 32.32 LXX, where it occurs in connection with hostile nations and the manifestation of God the DW against them.

6. It was noted that the verb κοπάζω, used to describe the abating of the storm wind in Mark 4.39, is familiar to the HDWT tradition in the OT and in at least one extant Second Temple text, where the "sea"/ "waters"/ "deep" are stilled by God.

(ii). Mark 6.45-52

7. It was argued that the chiastic centre-point of Mark 6.45-52, 6.48b, contains an allusion to Job 9.8 LXX. The intertextual implication is that Mark likens Jesus to Yahweh the DW who walks on the sea in Job 9.8.

8. It was argued that there is a further verbal/conceptual link between Mark 6.48 and Job 9.11 LXX involving the verb (παρέρχομαι). Since the use of the verb παρέρχομαι recalls texts in which God reveals himself Exod 34.6; 1 Kgs 19.11; Gen 32.31-32 LXX, it was argued that the Markan scene is reminiscent of a divine epiphany.

9. It was demonstrated that the Markan *hapax legomenon* ἐταράχθησαν (6.50), is a verb form used characteristically in the HDWT, where in HDWT texts it always describes the reaction of those who behold the manifestation of Yahweh as DW.

Once more, this was taken as evidence that Mark presents Jesus in such a way as to recall Yahweh the DW.

10. It was further demonstrated that the sea-miracles (Mark 4.35-41; 6.45-52) exist in a parallel literary relationship, such that they likely form a narrative question-answer formula. Thus, the strategic question concerning Jesus' identity, raised in 4.41, may be seen (in part) to be answered by Mark 6.45-52, where Jesus acts as Yahweh the DW. In connection with the latter, it was judged that given the epiphanic context, for Mark, Jesus may be understood to pronounce the divine name (ἐγώ εἰμι in 6.50) in self-reference.

11. It was established that 6.45-52 contains several conceptual and verbal links with the exodus story, suggesting that Mark frames his sea-walking story so as to recall the exodus sea-crossing. Thus, Jesus is likened to God who manifested himself as DW and liberator of the people in the exodus story.

12. Since various verbal correspondences were identified between Mark 6.45-52 and Ps 46 (45 LXX), it was argued that this HDWT psalm could have exercised particular influence on the Markan story. Similarly, though to a lesser extent, it was suggested that Isa 43.1-11, 15-16, (v.15-16 belong within the HDWT), might lie in the background of Mark 6.45-52.

On the basis of the evidence and arguments presented in Chapter 3, summarised here, it emerges that the Markan sea-miracles do exhibit the influence of the HDWT. This influence is manifest variously: through the personification of the sea as an inimical force which Jesus "muzzles" (4.39), by the use of technical vocabulary belonging within the HDWT (e.g. ἐπιτιμάω in 4.39; cf. ἐταράχθησαν in 6.50) and by allusions and echoes of specific HDWT texts (e.g. Job 9.8 LXX in Mark 6.48b and Ps 24.8, 10 in Mark 4.41). Since the influence of the HDWT on the Markan sea-miracles may be regarded as established, it remains to examine the possible implications of these findings for Markan Christology.

(b) ***Implications for Markan Christology***

As summarised above, Mark draws on the terminology and imagery of the HDWT in his presentation of Jesus' sea-miracles (4.35-41; 6.45-52). In terms of the question

matrix in Chapter 1, this thesis has argued that both Mark 4.35-41 and 6.45-52 attest the transfer of divine operations/attributes to Jesus (Q3), and the reprogramming of OT texts such that Jesus becomes the referent in place of God/Yahweh (Q4). By his word, God alone subdues and "rebukes" the sea as a symbol of evil in OT and specifically HDWT texts (e.g. Job 26.11-13; Pss. 18.15; 104.7; 106.9). Thus, in terms of (Q3), insofar as the Markan Jesus rebukes the elements and silences the sea, he speaks and acts in a manner reminiscent of Yahweh the DW.

Similarly, in terms of (Q4), there is only one clear reference to walking on (as opposed to through) the sea in the OT, Job 9.8 LXX, which verse is adapted by Mark in 6.48 so that Jesus is identified with Yahweh the DW. While non-Hebrew and/or non-Jewish parallels are sometimes suggested as background influences for the Markan sea-miracles, none of these were found to exhibit clear links with Mark. Instead, the OT/Second Temple sources were found to correspond more closely to the Markan presentation. Insofar as Mark 6.48 casts Jesus in the role of Yahweh, it was inferred that the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι in 6.50, suggests that the Markan Jesus appropriates the divine name in self-reference (cf. 14.62 with vv. 63-64) consonant with the overall revelatory, epiphanic character of the event.

On the findings of Chapter 3, then, (Q3) and (Q4) have been answered positively, with Mark's Jesus being consistently identified with Yahweh the DW. Since the sea-miracles present an explicit question concerning Jesus' identity (4.41), the interpreter faces the difficult task of determining what precisely Mark intends the reader to understand about Jesus' person from the portrait he crafts. Clearly, since the core christological issue of Jesus' identity is developed throughout Mark, this question cannot be answered solely on the basis of the presentation of Jesus in the sea-miracles. Nevertheless, some more limited observations may now be made together with responses to scholarly perspectives on Markan and wider NT Christology.

First, regarding the issue of "divine agency" discussed in Chapter 1, it is noteworthy that no divine agent (e.g. Wisdom, exalted patriarchs, principal angels) ever subdues the sea by a verbal command, which action is an exclusively divine prerogative.[3] Again, though Wisdom is depicted "walking in the abyss" (Sir 24.5), strictly speaking, only God walks *on* the water in the OT – in the very text which Mark adopts and adapts

[3] On "divine agency" see Chapter 1, pp. 16-29.

(Job 9.8 LXX in Mark 6.48b) to describe Jesus' sea-walking. This fact seemingly disqualifies the suggestion of Ben Witherington that the Markan sea-walking story comprises an early move to identify Jesus with Wisdom.[4] Furthermore, though Mark's identification of Jesus with Yahweh the DW appears conceptually proximate to texts in which attributes and operations of God are transferred to divine agents (e.g. Sir 24.5; Wis 10.18), since Jesus is, *prima facie*, a human person rather than an attribute of God or a metaphor, Mark's direct, recurrent identification of Jesus with Yahweh the DW goes beyond such precedents in Jewish literature.[5]

It might be argued, following A.Y. Collins, that on account of Jesus' reception of the Spirit (1.9-11), as a human prophetic and messianic "divine agent", Mark's Jesus is uniquely placed to accomplish that which only God accomplishes in OT and Second Temple HDWT texts.[6] Without denying that Mark's Jesus is a Spirit-filled prophetic and messianic character, as demonstrated in this study, in Mark 4.35-41/6.45-52, the evangelist attributes to Jesus *exclusively* divine functions, hinting that Jesus claims the divine name in self-reference. Notwithstanding OT typological elements in other parts of the gospel (e.g. Davidic and/or Moses typology in the feeding miracles),[7] Mark's move in the sea-miracles to identify Jesus with God himself goes beyond any standard OT typological interpretation. Indeed, on the interpretation of the present work, in the sea-miracles and exorcisms, Mark's Jesus appears to be *categorically* distinct from other human beings.

This claim, that Mark understood Jesus to be *categorically* different from other humans is borne out by precedents belonging to "divine agency." This is because in broadly comparable Second Temple texts where "divine agents" assume the role (e.g. creator, judge), operations (e.g. salvation, the defeat of Satan) and even, in the case of the angel Yahoel (*Apoc. Ab.* 10.3), the name of God, such agents are either manifestations of God himself (e.g. Wisdom), or *heavenly* beings of some description (e.g. principal angels or exalted patriarchs such as Enoch).[8] This holds true also of certain LXX and Qumranic

[4] Ben Witherington 2001: 221 n. 67.
[5] The humanness of Mark's Jesus is explicit (see Chapter 1, p. 11, n. 32), but on every page, Mark makes it clear that Jesus is far from an ordinary human being.
[6] Collins 2007: 39. Conversely, Collins acknowledges that sometimes e.g. Mark 4.39, Jesus is portrayed more as a divine than a human being (see Collins 2007: 260).
[7] See e.g. Marcus 1999: 406, on Mark 6.30-44.
[8] In Second Temple texts celebrated patriarchs, particularly Enoch and Moses, are often recast with a heavenly identity. Enoch is identified with the heavenly, preexistent Son of Man figure (*1 En.* 71.14-17), Moses is compared to the angels (Sir 45.2) and in Ezekiel the Tragedian 79-80 the stars bow before Moses

texts which apportion divine attributes and operations to the future Davidic Messiah (e.g. *4Q174.13*, Pss 109 LXX; 71.17 LXX), in that these very texts picture the coming Messiah as more-than-human i.e. as a preexistent, somehow divine or angelic figure.[9]

On the basis of this study's positive answers to (Q3) and (Q4) in Chapter 3, two related conclusions may now be drawn. One is that the Markan identification of Jesus with God himself breaks with precedents from the category of "divine agency" insofar as Mark is making christological statements concerning the historical, human individual "Jesus of Nazareth" (16.6), which rival similar statements made elsewhere only about personified divine attributes, principal angels and exalted, apocalyptically reconceptualised celestial patriarchs or preexistent Messiah figures. The second conclusion, a corollary of the first, is that the manner and intensity with which Mark identifies Jesus with God himself suggests an ultimately heavenly, preexistent and divine identity for the man Jesus.

In terms of the sea-miracles, there is no indication that any particular precedent or precedents, i.e. divine attributes, principal angels, exalted patriarchs, Second Temple Jewish messianic speculation, stands behind the Markan identification of Jesus with God. Conceptually, it might be that the combination of such precedents has influenced Mark's Christology. It is noteworthy, though, that within the wider context of Mark, Jesus is explicitly presented as the Messiah (e.g. 1.1; 1.11; 8.29; 14.61-62). Moreover, Mark actually cites an LXX text associated with the preexistence of the Messiah (12.36) in the context of a question concerning the Messiah's origins (12.35, 37).[10] Thus, a more wide-ranging study on Mark's Christology would necessarily investigate Jewish ideas about a heavenly, preexistent Messiah.[11] That is not to say that other "divine agency" categories become irrelevant (especially since, messianic, angelic and similar categories seemingly coalesce in a roughly contemporaneous work such as *1 Enoch*), rather it is to recognise the relevance of messianic speculation alongside "divine agency" ideas when dealing with formative influences on Mark's Christology.

---

enthroned in heaven (see Chapter 1, p. 27). Similarly, as Collins & Collins (2008: 74) note, the LXX rendering of Psalm 110 (Ps 109) and 71.17 might hint at preexistence of the Messiah, in which case, the distinction is *categorical*, not merely one of degrees.

[9] Cf. Collins & Collins 2008: 74. The texts in brackets here are discussed in Collins & Collins 2008: 54-74.

[10] Cf n. 8 above; on Mark 12.35-37, see e.g. Watts 2007: 222.

[11] Cf. Collins & Collins (2008: xii) who complain that Hurtado fails to include "messiah" among his "principal agents".

In summary, it was found that (Q3) and (Q4) of the question matrix receive an affirmative answer in relation to the Markan sea-miracles where the evangelist consistently identifies Jesus with Yahweh the DW. This identification of a human person with God himself moves beyond Second Temple precedents pertaining to "divine agency." At the same time, since elsewhere the type of claims which Mark makes for Jesus are only made in relation to personified divine attributes or heavenly beings, the conclusion of the present study is that in the Markan sea-miracles, the evangelist claims some form of heavenly or "divine" identity for Jesus.

(5.3) Conclusions and final considerations on the Markan exorcisms

(a) ***Conclusions on the influence of the HDWT on the Markan exorcisms***

Chapter 4 investigated the influence of the HDWT on the Markan exorcisms (1.21-28; 5.1-20; 7. 24-30; 9.14-29) and related texts. The chief findings of this chapter will now be briefly restated in summary form.

1. It was established that the first exorcism story draws on a key term of the HDWT (ἐπιτιμάω in 1.25) suggesting that Jesus' exorcistic confrontations with evil forces ought to be read in terms of the HDWT.

2. On the strength of verbal parallels exclusive to 1.21-28 and 4.35-41 (i.e. φιμώθητι/πεφίμωσο in 1.25/4.39; ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ/ὑπακούει αὐτῷ in 1.27/4.41) it was demonstrated that Mark intends these stories to be read together. Since the sea-miracles were read in terms of the divine battle motif of the HDWT, and since Mark ties Jesus' exorcism ministry to the sea-miracles, it was argued that the same divine battle motif likely extends to the exorcisms.

3. It was argued (a) that the first Markan exorcism (1.21-28) is programmatic, setting the agenda for the other exorcism stories, which, (b) collectively, (see 2 above) are to be read in the light of the HDWT.

4. It was further explained that Mark 3.22-30 is the hermeneutical key to understanding the Markan divine battle motif as a clash between God/Jesus and Satan.

5. It was established with regard to the second exorcism (5.1-20) that literary links with the immediately preceding sea-miracle (4.35-41) demonstrate their inter-

relatedness, reinforcing the Markan connection of the sea-miracles with the exorcisms, where the portrait of Jesus as a figure reminiscent of God the DW in 4.35-41 carries over into 5.1-20.

6. It was demonstrated that Mark 5.1-20 is connected to the "strong man" pericope (compare 5.3 δῆσαι with 3.27 δήσῃ; 3.27 ὁ ἰσχυρός with 5.4 ἴσχυεν cf. 1.7), and also the programmatic exorcism in 1.21-28 (e.g. τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί in 5.7, with τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί in 1.24). It was argued that Mark applies this terminology, especially the "ἰσχ" word group, in order to present Jesus in a manner reminiscent of God the DW, particularly against a HDWT (Deutero-Isaianic) background.

7. It was further argued that the Markan Jesus' power and authority is linked to his identity as "Son" (5.7) and "the Lord" (5.19-20) where the latter is to be read against the background of a Deutero-Isaianic DW motif (cf. on 1.3, 1.7).

8. It was demonstrated that Mark 5.1-20 is unlikely to be an anti-Roman polemic, rather, it enacts the parabolic Beelzebul pericope (3.22-30) and is to be read in terms of the HDWT, i.e. identified with God the DW, the Markan Jesus confronts genuinely supernatural (Satanic) forces.

9. Granted the programmatic nature of Mark 1.21-28, it was claimed that the third exorcism account (7.24-30) should be read within the Markan battle schema, even though specific HDWT influence on 7.24-30 is lacking. While 7.24-30 is atypical insofar as no confrontation between Jesus and a demon(s) is reported, the fact that Jesus can exorcise even *without* a rebuke points to an unprecedented, insurmountable power.

10. It was established that in Mark 9.25, Jesus is once more depicted "rebuking" a demon using a key term of the HDWT (ἐπιτιμάω). It was further demonstrated that a Markan framing device employing this key HDWT term delineates Jesus' exorcism ministry (1.25 with 9.25), characterising it in terms of the HDWT and likely emphasising the underlying similarity between the words and actions of Jesus and Yahweh the DW.

11. Again, it was pointed out that the evangelist draws on "ἴσχ" terminology shown to be linked to a HDWT background (9.18). Whereas the disciples are "not

strong" enough to exorcise this demon, Jesus the "stronger one" (cf. 1.7) triumphs.

12. It was argued that in view of the programmatic exorcism in Mark 1.21-28, the latter two exorcisms (7.24-30; 9.14-29) are also to be read in terms of the HDWT. However, it was observed that in view of the importance of the reactions respectively of the mother and father in the penultimate and final exorcisms, these stories represent a development of the battle motif. In focus here are faith reactions to Jesus as exorcist as part of the redefinition of categories (i.e. messiahship) which is central to the "Way" section. This redefinition concerns trusting in Mark's Jesus as Messiah and "Son of Man", despite the fact that he will suffer and die (8.31; 9.31; 10.33-34) and rise again.

13. In relation to the Markan summary statements (1.32-34, 39; 3.11-12), mentioning Jesus' successful exorcism ministry, these were found to bolster the depiction of Jesus as a uniquely powerful exorcist where HDWT vocabulary again obtains (i.e. Mark 3.12).

14. In addition, it was established that the summary statements confirm the Markan notion that demons have knowledge of Jesus' identity as God's "Son" (1.32-34; 3.11). This was discussed in relation to the title "Son of God,"

15. The latter lead in turn to a preliminary consideration of the centurion's cry (15.39) in connection with the exorcisms and the divine battle motif of the HDWT. Jesus' death was judged to be exorcistic and a continuation of the theme of divine battle.

16. Finally, further to the arguments which suggest that the Markan presentation of Jesus as exorcist identifies Jesus with God the DW, it was argued in relation to 9.38-41 that Jesus' authorisation of others to exorcise in his own name is seemingly tantamount to a claim for some form of divine identity for Jesus.

(b) ***Implications for Markan Christology***

As summarised above, the Markan exorcisms are to be read in terms of the HDWT and the divine battle motif wherein Jesus confronts and destroys Satan's demons (e.g. 1.24; cf. 3.22-30). It was argued that since in the exorcisms Jesus never invokes the name of God (or god/gods) and uses no talisman or magic object, the Markan presentation

sets Jesus apart from legendary exorcists as described in roughly contemporaneous Jewish-Hellenistic texts. Moreover, in terms of (Q3) of the question matrix, it was argued that Mark portrays Jesus in a manner reminiscent of God himself, since, by his mere verbal rebuke, on his own authority, Jesus defeats inimical (demonic) forces (1.25; 9.25 cf. 3.12), recalling the action of God the DW against evil in OT/Second Temple texts.

Although Jewish apocalyptic texts from the Second Temple period depict chief angels confronting and/or "binding" demons (e.g. *1 En.* 10.4-8; 17.16; *Jub.* 5.6; *1QM* 13.9-12), warrior angels are always subordinate to God and act only in God's name and on his authority.[12] This is perhaps best demonstrated in the two instances in biblical literature where principal angels rebuke (ἐπιτιμάω) Satan in the name of God (i.e. the Angel of the Lord in Zech 3.2; Michael in Jude 9). It is christologically significant, therefore, that Jesus does *not* rebuke demons/Satan in God's name, rather he acts on his own authority. While some such as Sullivan claim a form of angel Christology underlies aspects of Mark, the fact that warrior angels are always identified as *angels* (even if, like Raphael in Tobit, they can disguise themselves in human form) demonstrates that such comparisons are limited, since Jesus is nowhere identified as an angel in Mark.[13] The latter conclusion coheres with Hurtado's more general verdict that principal angel analogies are "useful" but "limited" for understanding how early Christology evolved.[14]

Once more, as noted above, in Mark 9.38-41, Jesus authorises others to exorcise in his name (cf. Acts 16.18; 19.13, Mark 3.15; 6.7; 6.13). It was argued that this is especially relevant for Christology when it is appreciated that exorcisms were performed in the name of gods (cf. the magical papyri) and when read against Jude 9 where the archangel Michael is said to "rebuke" Satan in God's name. The implication, again, is that Mark likens Jesus to Yahweh and is claiming for Jesus some form of divine identity in his portrayal of Jesus as exorcist. These findings complement the similar claims of

[12] In *11QMelch*, Melchizedek comes in judgment and is called "Elohim" (*11QMelch* 10), but the wider context (i.e. *11QMelch* 13) makes it clear that his actions against Belial are executed, ultimately, on God's authority, see further Collins & Collins 2008: 79-86. Cf. Shively (2012: 122-123) on the subordination of warrior angels to God himself.

[13] Sullivan (2004: 116) claims that the Markan Transfiguration involves angelomorphic Christology; for a refutation of this view, see Chapter 1, p. 21, n. 84.

[14] Hurtado 1998: 4. Bauckham (2008: 10) doubts the utility of angel analogies, emphasising that angels *serve* whereas Jesus shares the sovereign rule of God.

Hurtado concerning the uniqueness of Jesus' exorcisms in relation particularly to Acts 16.18, 19.13.[15]

From a different angle, it is interesting that the Markan exorcisms are relevant to (Q5) on the possibility that Markan Christological titles might imply a divine identity for Jesus. It was demonstrated that at the level of Markan narratology, the title "Lord" as used in the second exorcism (5.19-20) refers to both God *and* Jesus. Similarly, the mother in the third exorcism addresses Jesus as "Lord" (7.28), and like "Legion", falls at Jesus' feet in acknowledgement of his lordship (7.25; cf. 5.6). If, as argued in 4.1.(b) (i) in terms of (Q4), the title "Lord" in Mark 1.3 applies to Jesus, rather than to Yahweh, then it would seem that for Mark, the title "Lord" strategically identifies Jesus with Yahweh. Moreover, since "Lord" is the LXX equivalent of Yahweh, for Mark, undercurrents of a divine identity for Jesus are probably associated with this title, even if superficially (and historically?) it is an appropriate formal address, i.e. "sir" in Mark 7.28.

Once more in relation to (Q5) of the question matrix, it was observed that the divine sonship concept and title "Son of God" is prominent in the Markan exorcism stories, insofar as demons recognise Jesus as God's son (3.11-12 cf. 1.32-34; 5.7). This designation (explored in 4.7 above), therefore, has a clearly functional dimension, that is Jesus as "Son of God" defeats Satan. In response to Collins & Collins, it is true that for Mark the title "Son of God" has a royal messianic sense (Ps 2.7 in 1.11; 8.29).[16] However, this work has proffered cumulative arguments which suggest that the Markan title presupposes a divine identity for Jesus. The lack of a birth narrative and the omission of Joseph together with the exclusive identification of Jesus as "Son of God" by demons and God himself i.e. heavenly beings, (excepting 15.39), was taken as suggestive of a heavenly provenance for Jesus. Most important, however, is the Markan identification of the divine sonship concept with the heavenly "Son of Man" (8.38; 14.61-62). Since, for Mark, the "Son of God" is also the "Son of Man," an equivalence which Collins and Collins accept, and since the "Son of Man" in Mark has a clearly heavenly, possibly preexistent status, the notion of Jesus' divine sonship necessarily transcends the purely human, "divine agent" messianic understanding.[17] Rather, the equivalence of "Son of

[15] Hurtado 2003: 204.
[16] Collins & Collins 2008: 209.
[17] Collins & Collins 2008: 209.

God" and "Son of Man" in Mark suggests an ultimately heavenly identity for Jesus as God's "Son" where his preexistence might be presupposed.

In summary, then, this study has found that in the Markan exorcisms, in terms of (Q3) Jesus is identified with God the DW. While principal angel figures confront and overcome demons in Second Temple texts, they do so on the authority of God and in his name (e.g. Zech 3.2; Jude 9; *1 En.* 10.4). In contrast, Jesus authorises people to exorcise in *his* name (Mark 9.38-41). This again aligns the Markan Jesus (who is not presented as an angel) with God himself and seemingly suggests some form of divine identity. Again, in terms of (Q5) it was argued that the title "Lord" as applied to Jesus in the Markan narratology further identifies Jesus with Yahweh. Once more, the title "Son of God" and the divine sonship concept was taken to have both functional and ontic associations for Mark. Thus, similar to the conclusion regarding the sea-miracles, the Markan presentation of Jesus as exorcist suggests that the evangelist claims an ultimately heavenly, divine identity for the man Jesus.

(5.4) Conclusions and final considerations regarding Divine Warrior Christology as a particular facet of Markan Christology

(a) *Conclusions on Divine Warrior Christology as a facet of Markan Christology*

As recognised in Chapter 1, the Christology of the Gospel of Mark is multifaceted. In Mark, christological titles and concepts converge harmoniously (e.g. 8.38; 14.61-62), indicating, against the spirit of older "corrective" Christology paradigms, that the Markan portrait of Jesus is mosaic-like, consisting of complementary rather than antagonistic elements. While particular titles and concepts such as "Son of God"/divine sonship appear to have especial importance for Mark, it is the combination of titles and concepts which provides the overall answer to the identity question which Mark poses concerning Jesus (e.g. 4.41, cf. 1.27; 6.14-16; 8.27-30; 14.61-62).

Since the scope of this study has been largely limited to the Markan sea-miracles, exorcisms and related pericopes, focusing on the influence of the HDWT therein, the results presented to this point provide part, but by no means all of the answer to the Markan identity question. On the basis of this investigation, it may be inferred that one important dimension of Mark's Christology is "Divine Warrior Christology," wherein

Jesus is identified with Yahweh the DW. This christological dimension is particularly evident in the Markan sea-miracles and the exorcisms, which, on the above conclusions, are to be read in terms of the divine battle motif of the HDWT.

It might be inquired how this Divine Warrior Christology is to be understood alongside other established christological categories such as "Royal Christology" and the suffering servant/Son of Man.[18] In brief, with regard to the former category, Divine Warrior Christology complements the royal messianic theme running through Mark. This is because Mark's Jesus overcomes demonic forces as "Son of God". The unprecedentedly close identification of Jesus with Yahweh the DW in Mark's Divine Warrior Christology nuances messianic notions and induces the reader to conceive of a heavenly, divine identity for Jesus.

With regard to the possible relation of Divine Warrior Christology and (for want of a better term) "Servant Christology", it was observed previously that there is a mismatch between the Markan presentation of Jesus as a mighty exorcist and healer in the first half of the gospel, and the later portrait of the suffering Son of Man who dies on a cross. An exploration of this well-known Markan tension cannot be attempted here, but some limited comments are made below in 5.5 (a) with a view to possibilities for further research.

(b) ***Implications for Markan Christology***

The Divine Warrior Christology identified in chapters 3 and 4 of this study forms part of the answer to its governing question: "Mark's Jesus, divine?" As demonstrated in Chapter 3, in terms of (Q3) and (Q4) of the question matrix, the Markan identification of Jesus with Yahweh the DW in the sea-miracles suggests that Jesus' identity is bound up with that of God himself. Similarly, as demonstrated in Chapter 4, Mark's portrayal of Jesus as exorcist also identifies him with Yahweh the DW, where, since exorcisms can be performed in Jesus' name, a divine identity for Jesus is seemingly being claimed. Again, christological titles (i.e. "Son of God", "Lord") associated with Jesus' exorcism ministry were judged to further suggest a divine identity for Jesus.

[18] For "Royal Christology" see e.g. Juel 1977; Matera 1982. On "Servant Christology" see e.g. Watts 1997: 257-287; Broadhead 1999: 101-108 For a christological interpretation which unites the two around a Davidic model see Ahearne-Kroll 2007.

Therefore, in a preliminary way, the question in the title of this study may be answered in the affirmative. However, the question itself must be sharpened: if it is accepted that in his Divine Warrior Christology, Mark presents Jesus as in some sense divine, in *what sense* is Jesus to be regarded as divine? Here, scholarly debates on early high Christology obtain once again. For example, Mark's Divine Warrior Christology might be judged to broadly cohere with Bauckham's notion of "participation" in the divine identity insofar as Jesus the DW assumes a role and functions exclusively associated with God himself. However, Collins and Collins have critiqued Bauckham's concept of Jesus' "participation" in God's divine identity, stating that it lacks "historical specificity".[19] Thus, while Mark's Jesus could be said to participate in the divine identity, on the evidence of the gospel's Father-Son distinction (e.g. 1.11; 13.32) which delineates two distinct identities, the participation in the activities of God would appear to be more *functional* than *ontic*, which would be the opposite of Bauckham's general conclusion on NT Christology.[20] Again though, if as argued in chapters 3 and 4 and also in this chapter with regard to "divine agency", Mark has Jesus claim divine attributes, titles (i.e. "Lord") and even the divine name in self-reference (6.50), then this, suggests an ontic, heavenly dimension to Jesus' divine identity.

If the present conclusions on Divine Warrior Christology are accepted, then the form of divine identity which Mark claims for Jesus might perhaps be expressed in Hurtado's terms as "binitarian." This would do justice to the gospel's distinction of "Father" and "Son" while recognising the Markan claims that Jesus' divine identity is intimately bound up with that of God himself. It is to be recalled though, that Hurtado's concept of "binitarian monotheism" was developed fundamentally, though not exclusively, in relation to NT evidence suggesting that Jesus may have received cultic worship from the earliest times. In the case of Mark, as *per* (Q1) of this study, it has been judged that the gospel contains no evidence for the cultic worship of Jesus, though neither does it contain or constitute evidence that such worship did not take place.

In summary, while Mark nowhere asserts that Jesus is a "second god," this study has found that in the sea-miracles and exorcisms, an ultimately heavenly provenance and more-than-human identity is claimed for Jesus. The most that can probably be said, given

[19] Collins & Collins 2008: 213.
[20] Admittedly, Bauckham (2008: 30-31) claims primitive Christology is "ontic" rather than "functional" in regard to the overall NT evidence, not the specifically Markan treatment.

the limitations of the present work, is that in his Divine Warrior Christology, Mark claims *some form* of divine identity for Jesus. How exactly Mark conceptualised the latter remains a matter of debate.

(5.5) Further considerations in relation to possible areas for future study and overall statement of conclusion in summary form

(a) *Considerations relating to possible areas for future study within Mark, Markan Christology and elsewhere.*

This work has concentrated on the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms and the Divine Warrior Christology identified within these stories. Notwithstanding efforts made to read these stories in their Markan contexts, inevitably, the present study is limited in scope. For future research within Mark, it would be interesting to examine other Markan texts, not least the healing stories often associated with the exorcisms (e.g. Mark 1.32-34; 3.10-12), in order to establish if these also have been influenced by the HDWT or are related to the Markan portrayal of Jesus as DW.

More generally, a wider-ranging study might consider the various facets of Markan Christology alongside the Divine Warrior Christology identified in this work. This could be undertaken in relation to soteriological dimensions concerning the death of Jesus, judged here to be "exorcistic," but necessitating further study and clarification. The well-known tension in Mark between the powerful presentation of Jesus in the first half of the gospel and his inglorious death by crucifixion might be explored in terms of Divine Warrior Christology and Servant Christology. Perhaps the former has an apologetic function designed to offset the apparent fact that Jesus died as a failed messiah, thus forcing a careful reading of Servant Christology in order that the reader perceive the true meaning of Jesus' death as a *necessary* (8.31) "ransom" (10.45).

Again, in terms of its high Christology, the Markan portrait of Jesus as DW might be further explored within debates on early NT Christology. In particular, it might be inquired if and to what extent the Markan portrayal of Jesus as the victor of evil/Satan tallies with other NT literature. Alternatively, the possibility that the historical Jesus claimed a divine identity for himself in terms of Divine Warrior Christology might be

investigated. It is, indeed, a fascinating question if Jesus thought of himself as somehow carrying out the role ascribed to Yahweh the DW in the OT.

(b) Overall statement of conclusion in summary form

This study has examined the Markan sea-miracles and exorcisms in order to test the hypothesis that Mark draws on the HDWT to bolster his "high" Christology. The general conclusion is that Mark does indeed draw on aspects of the HDWT in these stories and other related pericopes. It has been established that in these stories, Mark consistently identifies Jesus with Yahweh the DW, which identification points to a very "high" Christology. This Christology may be brought into contact with wider debates on early high Christology with reference to the question matrix outlined in Chapter 1. The questions set out there may now be answered, at least provisionally on the basis of the findings of this work:

(Q1), "Is there evidence in Mark that Jesus was venerated/worshipped as a transcendent or divine being?" was answered "no." (Q2), "Is there evidence in Mark that Jesus was regarded as preexistent?" was answered "probably." (Q3), "Is there evidence in Mark that divine operations and attributes were transferred to Jesus and if so, what might this imply?" was answered "yes," with implications of some form of divine identity for Jesus. (Q4), "Is there evidence in Mark that particular OT texts are reprogrammed in such a way that Jesus becomes the referent in place of God?" was answered "yes." (Q5), "Is there evidence in Mark that particular titles or the combination of titles attributed to Jesus in Mark imply Jesus' divinity?" was answered "yes."

In connection with these findings, this study understands the high Christology expressed in the sea-miracles and exorcisms as tantamount to a Markan claim about Jesus' identity. Since, in Mark, Jesus as "son" is clearly distinguished from God as "father," (e.g. 1.11; 9.7; 13.32), in terms of scholarly debates on early Christology, Hurtado's notion of "binitarian monotheism" might be one viable way of understanding Jesus' divine identity as expressed in his Divine Warrior Christology. While on the limited scope of this enquiry more comprehensive statements about Markan Christology cannot be ventured, it would appear, at least in his Divine Warrior Christology, that Mark claims some form of divine identity for Jesus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abott-Smith, G. (1981) *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Achtemeier, P. J. (1962) 'Person and Deed. Jesus and the Storm-Tossed Sea', *Int* 16: 169 – 176.

Achtemeier, P. J. (1970) 'Toward the Isolation of Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae', *JBL* 89: 266-274.

Achtemeier, P. J. (1980) ' "He Taught Them Many Things": Reflections on Marcan Christology', *CBQ* 42: 465 – 481.

Achtemeier, P. J. (ed.) (1996)*The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.

Adams, E. (2005) 'The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel', *TynBul* 56: 39 – 61.

Adams, E. (2007) *The Stars will Fall from Heaven*, London: T&T Clark.

Adler, W. (1993) 'Review of Margaret Barker *The Great Angel*', *CBQ* 55: 795.

Ahearne-Kroll, S. P. (2001) 'Who Are My Mother and Brothers? Family Relations and Family Language in the Gospel of Mark', *JR* 81: 1-25.

Ahearne-Kroll, S. P. (2007) *The Psalms of Lament in Mark's Passion: Jesus' Davidic Suffering*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ahearne-Kroll, S. P. (2010) 'Audience Inclusion and Exclusion as Rhetorical Technique in the Gospel of Mark', *JBL* 129: 717-735.

Aichele, G. (1994) 'Fantasy and Myth in the Death of Jesus', *Cross Currents* 44: 85-96.

Aichele, G. (1999) 'Jesus' Uncanny "Family Scene"', *JBL* 74: 29-49.

Aichele, G. (2006) 'The Possibility of Error: Minority Report and the Gospel of Mark', *BibInt* 14: 143-157.

Aichele, G., Miscall, P. and Walsh, R. (2009) 'An Elephant in the Room: Historical-Critical and Postmodern Interpretations of the Bible', *JBL* 128: 383-404.

Albertz, R. (1992) *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period (Vol. 1): From the Beginnings to the End of the Exile*, London: SCM Press.

Albright, W. F. (1938) 'Review of G. Hölscher *Das Buch Hiob*', *JBL* 57: 227-228.

Aleti, J. N. (1985) 'Mort de Jésus et Théorie du Récit', *RSR* 73: 147 – 160.

Allen, J. (2007) 'Ezekiel the Tragedian on the Despoliation of Egypt', *JSP* 17: 3-19.

Allen, L. C. (1976) *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Allen, L. C. (2008) *Jeremiah*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.

Amador, J. D. H. (1999) *Academic Constraints in Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction to a Rhetoric of Power*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Ambrozic, A. M. (1972) *The Hidden Kingdom: a Redaction-critical Study of the References to the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel*, Washington DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America

Amos, C. (2007) 'Review of Andrew R. Angel *Chaos and the Son of Man*', *JSOT* 31: 225.

Anderson, B.W. (1967) *Creation versus Chaos: the Reinterpretation of Mythical Symbolism in the Bible*, New York: Association Press.

Anderson, H. (1996) *The Gospel of Mark*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Angel, A. R. (2006) *Chaos and the Son of Man*, London: T&T Clark.

Angel, A. R. (2007) 'Review of David Tsumura *Creation and Destruction*', *JSS* 53: 379.

Angel, A. R. (2011) 'Crucifixus Vincens: the "Son of God" as Divine Warrior in Matthew', *CBQ* 73: 299-317.

Angel, A. R. (2012) *Angels: Ancient Whispers of Another World*, Eugene, Oregon: Cascade.

Argyle, A. W. (1968-69) 'The Meaning of *ἐξουσία* in Mark I:22, 27', *ExpTim* 80: 343.

Aune D. E. (1980) 'Magic in Early Christianity', *ANRW* II.23.3: 1507-57.

Baldwin, M. C. (2005) *Whose Acts of Peter? Text and Historical Context of the Actus Vercellenses*, WUNT II/ 196 Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Ballard, H. W. (1999) *The Divine Warrior Motif in the Psalms*, (BIBAL 6) North Richland Hills, Texas: Bibal Press.

Baltzer, K. (2001) *Deutero-Isaiah: a Commentary on Isaiah 40-55*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Barbaglio, G., Fabris, R. and Maggioni, B. (1990) *Os Evangelhos* (I), São Paulo: Loyola.

Barker, M. (1992) *The Great Angel: a Study of Israel's Second God*, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Barker, M. (2010) 'Review of J. J. Collins and A.Y. Collins *King and Messiah as Son of God*', *EQ* 82: 166-168.

Batto, B. F. (1987) 'The Sleeping God: an Ancient Near Eastern Motif of Divine Sovereignty', *Bib* 68: 153 – 77.

Batto, B. F. (1992) *Slaying the Dragon: Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Bauckham, R. (1980-81) 'The worship of Jesus in Apocalyptic Christianity', *NTS* 27: 322-341.

Bauckham, R. (1983) 'The Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum of Pseudo-Philo and the Gospels as "Midrash"', in France R. T. and D. Wenham (eds.), *Gospel Perspectives III: Studies in Midrash and Historiography*, Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press: 33-76.

Bauckham, R. (1998) *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New* Testament, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bauckham, R. (2006) *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bauckham, R. (2008) *Jesus and the God of Israel*, Milton Keynes: Paternoster.

Bauernfiend, O. (1927) *Die Worte der Damonen im Markus-Evangelium*, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Bayer, H. F. (2012) *A Theology of Mark: the Dynamic between Christology and Authentic Discipleship*, Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P & R Publishing Co.

Beale G. K. (2007) *We Become What We Worship*, Downers Grove, llinois: IVP.

Beale G. K. (2011) *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, Grand Rapids: Baker.

Beale G. K. (2012) 'The Use of Hosea 11.1 in Matthew 2.15: one more time', *JETS* 55: 697-715.

Beale, G. K., and Carson, D. A. (2007) *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. (1957) *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen*, London: Macmillan.

Becker E. M. (2010) 'Die markinischen Summarien—ein literarischer und theologischer Schlüssel zu Mark 1–6', *NTS* 56: 452-474.

Begg, C. (1990) 'Josephus' Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah and Moses: Some Observations', *JBL* 109: 691-693.

Belo, F. (1981) *A Materialist Reading of the Gospel of Mark*, Maryknoll: Orbis.

Best, E. (1983) *Mark: The Gospel as Story*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Best, E. (1990) *The Temptation and the Passion: the Markan Soteriology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Betz, H. D. (1992) *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation including the Demotic Spells*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

BIELER (1935-1936) *Theios Aner*

Bird, C. H. (1953) 'Some *gar* Clauses in St. Mark's Gospel', *JTS* 4: 171-178.

Black, C. C. (1993) 'Was Mark a Roman Gospel?', *ExpTim* 105: 36-40.

Blenkinsopp, J. (1961) 'The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry', *JBL* 80: 55 – 64.

Bligh, J. (1969) 'The Gerasene Demoniac and the Resurrection of Christ', *CBQ* 31: 383-390.

Bock, D. L. (2000) *Blasphemy and Exaltation in Judaism: the Charge Against Jesus in Mark 14.53-65*, Grand Rapids: Baker.

Bock, D. L. (2006) *The Missing Gospels: Unearthing the Truth Behind Alternative Christianities*, Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

Bohak, G. (2008) 'Review of Kimberley B. Stratton *Naming the Witch: Magic, Ideology, and Stereotype in the Ancient World*', *JSJ* 39: 445-446.

Bolt, P. G. (2004) 'Review of Brian J. Incigneri *The Gospel to the Romans*', *JSNT* 27: 241-243.

Borg, M. J. (1984) *Jesus: Conflict, Holiness and Politics*. Lameter: Edwin Mellen

Boring, E. M. (1976) 'The Unforgivable Sin Logion Mark 3.28-29/ Matt 12.31-32/ Luke 12.10: Formal Analysis and History of the Tradition', *NovT* 17: 258-79.

Boring, E. M. (1985) 'Review of Jack Dean Kingsbury *The Christology of Mark's Gospel*', *JBL* 104: 732 – 735.

Boring, E. M. (1990) 'Mark 1.1-15 and the Beginning of the Gospel', *Semeia* 52: 43-81.

Boring, E. M. (1999) 'Markan Christology: God-language for Jesus?', *NTS* 45: 451 – 471.

Boring, E. M. (2006) *Mark A Commentary*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Boring, E. M. (2011) 'Review of Elizabeth Struthers Malbon *Mark's Jesus*', *RBL* 13: 381-385.

Bornkamm, G. (1960) *Jesus of Nazareth*, New York: Harper & Row.

Bornkamm G., Barth G. and Held, H. J. (1963) *Tradition and Interpretation in* Matthew, London: SCM.

Bousset, W. (1970) *Kyrios Christos*, Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Bowman R. M., and Komoszewski, J. E.

2007 *Putting Jesus in His Place*, Grand Rapids: Kregel.

Boyarin, D. (2004) *Border Lines: the Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Boyarin, D. (2010) 'Beyond Judaisms: Metatron and the Divine Polymorphy of Ancient Judaism', *JSJ* 41: 323-365.

Boyarin, D. (2011) 'How Enoch can Teach us About Jesus', *Early Christianity* 2: 51-76.

Boyarin, D. (2012a) 'Daniel 7, Intertextuality, and the History of Israel's Cult', *HTR* 105: 139-162.

Boyarin, D. (2012b) *The Jewish Gospels: the Story of the Jewish Christ*, New York: The New Press.

Boyd, G. A. (1997) *God at War: the Bible and Spiritual Conflict*, Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press.

Branscomb, B. H. (1937) *The Gospel of Mark*, London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Bremmer, J. N., and Veenstra, J. R. (eds.) (2002) *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*, Leuven: Peeters.

Brett, M. G. (1991) 'Motives and Intentions in Genesis 1', *JTS* 42: 1- 16.

Briggs, R. S. (2001) 'The Uses of Speech-Act Theory in Biblical Interpretation', *CurBS* 9: 229-276.

Broadhead, E. K. (1992) *Teaching with Authority: Miracles and Christology in the Gospel of Mark*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Broadhead, E. K. (1994) *Prophet, Son, Messiah: Narrative Form and Function in Mark 14-16*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Broadhead, E. K. (1999) *Naming Jesus: Titular Christology in the Gospel of Mark*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Brooke, G. (2006) 'Review of David Tsumura *Creation and Destruction*', *JSOT* 30: 124.

Brooke, G. (2007) 'Review of Andrew R. Angel *Chaos and the Son of Man*', *ExpTim* 118.12: 595.

Brower, K. (2009) 'Who Then Is This? – Christological Questions in Mark 4.35-5.43', *EQ* 81: 291-305.

Brown, W. N. (1928) *The Indian and Christian Miracles of Walking on the Water*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.

Buckley, J. J. (2012) 'Review of John G. Cook *Roman Attitudes Towards the Christians: From Claudius to Hadrian'*, *JR* 92: 552-554.

Budd, P. J. (1984) *Numbers*, Waco, Texas: Word Books.

Bultmann, R. (1952) *Theology of the New Testament (2 Vols)*, London: SCM

Bultmann, R. (1963) *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.

Burdon, C. (2004) ' "To the Other Side": Construction of Evil and Fear of Liberation in Mark 5.1-20', *JSNT* 27: 149-167.

Busch, A. (2006) 'Questioning and Conviction: Double-voiced Discourse in Mark 3:22-30', *JBL* 125: 477-505.

Byrskog, S. (2000) *Story as History – History as Story*, WUNT 123; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Cadwallader, A. H. (2006) 'In Go(l)d We Trust: Literary and Economic Currency Exchange in the Debate over Caesar's Coin (Mark 12.13-17)', *BibInt* 14: 486-507.

Caird, G. B. (1956) *Principalities and Powers: a Study in Pauline Theology*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Caird, G. B. (1960-70) 'Shake Off the Dust from Your Feet (Mk 6.11)', *ExpTim* 81: 40-43.

Caird, G. B. (1980) *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, London: Gerald Duckworth.

Camery-Hoggatt, J. (1992) *Irony in Mark's Gospel: Text and Subtext*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carmignac, J. 'Le Document de Qumran sur Melkisédeq', *RevQ* 7: 343-378.

Carrell, P. R. (1997) *Jesus and the Angels: Angelology and the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carrington, P. (1960) *According to Mark: a Running Commentary on the Oldest Gospel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, J. (1987) *Dio Cassio: The Roman History, the Reign of Augustus*, London: Penguin Books.

Casey, P. M. (1991) *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*, Cambridge: James Clarke.

Casey, P. M. (1996) *Is John's Gospel True?*, London: Routledge.

Casey, P. M. (2007) *The Solution to the Son of Man Problem*, London: T & T Clark.

Chance, J. B. (2007) 'The Cursing of the Temple and the Tearing of the Veil in the Gospel of Mark', *BibInt* 15: 268-291.

Charles, R. H. (1908) *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, London: Adam and Charles Black.

Charlesworth, J. H. (1980) 'The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel' in Collins J. J. and Nickelsburg G. W. E. (eds.) *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*, SBLSCS 12; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980: 135-51.

Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.) (1983) *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: volume 1*, New York: Doubleday & Co.

Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.) (1985) *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: volume 2*, New York: Doubleday & Co.

Charlesworth, J. H. (1986) 'The Jewish Roots of Christology: the Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice', *SJT* 39: 19-41.

Charlesworth, J. H. (2002) 'Can one Recover Aramaic Sources behind Mark's Gospel?', *RRJ* 5: 249-258.

Chatman, S. (1978) *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, New York: Cornell University.

Chester, A. (1991) 'Jewish Messianic Expectations and Mediatorial Figures and Pauline Christology', in Hengel M. and Heckel U. (eds.) *Paulus und das antike Judentum*, WUNT, 58 Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]: 17-89.

Chronis, H. L. (1982) 'The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15.37-39', *JBL* 101: 97-114.

Clayton, C. N. (2001) 'Where the Gospel Text Begins: a Non-Theological Interpretation of Mark 1:1', *NovT* 43: 105-127.

Clifford, R. J. (1972) *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*, Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, R. J. (2007) 'Review of David Tsumura *Creation and Destruction*', *CBQ* 69: 344 – 345.

Cohn, N. (1993) *Cosmos, Chaos and the World to Come: the Ancient Roots of Apocalyptic Faith*, London: Yale University Press.

Cohon, S. S. (1955) 'The Unity of God: a Study in Hellenistic and Rabbinic Theology', *HUCA* 26: 428-438.

Cole, A. R. (1989) *Mark*, Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Cole, A. R. (1989) *Galatians*, Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Collins, A. Y. (1976) *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*, Missoula, Montana: The Scholars Press.

Collins, A. Y. (1992) *The Beginning of the Gospel: Probings of Mark in Context*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.

Collins, A. Y. (1992a) 'The "Son of Man" Tradition and the Book of Revelation', in Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.) *The Messiah: developments in earliest Judaism and Christianity*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press: 536 – 568.

Collins, A. Y. (1996) 'The Apocalyptic Rhetoric of Mark 13 in Historical Context', *BR* 41: 5-36.

Collins, A. Y. (1998) 'Finding Meaning in the Death of Jesus', *JR* 78: 175 – 196.

Collins, A. Y. (1999) 'Mark and His Readers: The Son of God among Jews', *HTR* 92: 393 – 408.

Collins, A. Y. (2000) 'Mark and His Readers: The Son of God among Greeks and Romans', *HTR* 93: 85 – 100.

Collins, A. Y. (2004) 'The Charge of Blasphemy in Mark 14.64', *JSNT* 26: 379-401.

Collins, A. Y. (2007) *Mark*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Collins, A. Y. (2009) 'Mark's Interpretation of the Death of Jesus', *JBL* 128: 545 – 554.

Collins, A.Y., and Collins, J. J.

2008 *Son of God: Divine, Human and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature,* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Collins, J. J. (1975) 'The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: a Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic', *VT* 25: 596 – 612.

Collins, J. J. (1977) *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.

Collins, J. J. (1985) 'The Testament (Assumption) of Moses', in de Jonge M. (ed.) *Outside the Old Testament*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 145 – 58.

Collins, J. J. (1992) 'The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism', *NTS* 38: 448-466.

Collins, J. J. (1993) *A Commentary on Daniel*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Collins, J. J. (1998) *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Collins, J. J. (1998a) *The Apocalyptic Imagination: an Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Collins, J. J. (2007) 'Review of Andrew R. Angel *Chaos and the Son of Man*', *JJS* 58: 338 – 339.

Collins, J. J. (2007a) 'Mowinckel's He That Cometh Revisited', *ST* 61: 3-20.

Collins, J. J. (2010) *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Collins, J. J. (2012) 'The Transformation of the Torah in in Second Temple Judaism', *JSJ* 43: 455-474.

Combs, J. R. (2008) 'A Ghost on the Water? Understanding an Absurdity in Mark 6.49-50', *JBL* 127: 345-358.

Conzelmann, H. (1975) *1 Corinthians*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Conybeare, F. C. (1960) *Philostratus The Life of Apollonius of Tyana (2 vols)*, London: William Heinemann

Cook, J. G. (1997) 'In Defence of Ambiguity: is there a Hidden Demon in Mark 1.29-31?', *NTS* 43: 184-208

Cope, O.L. (1976) *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*, CBQMS 5. Washington DC: Catholic Bible Association.

Cragie, P. C. (1972) 'Psalm XXIX in the Hebrew Poetic Tradition', *VT* 22: 143-51.

Cragie, P. C. (1983) *Psalms 1-50*, Waco, Texas: Word.

Cragie, P. C. (1983a) 'The Tablets from Ugarit and their Importance for Biblical Studies', *BAR* 9: 62-73.

Cranfield, C. E. B. (1959) *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crellin, R. (2012) 'Basics of Verbal Aspect in Greek', *JSNT* 35: 196-202.

Crenshaw, J. L. (1998) *Old Testament Wisdom: an Introduction*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Cross, F. M. (1966) 'The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult', in Altmann, A. (ed.) *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Cross, F. M. (1968) 'The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth', *JTC* 5: 1-25.

Cross, F. M. (1969) 'New Directions in the Study of Apocalyptic', *JTC* 6: 157-65.

Cross, F. M. (1973) *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Cross, F. M. (1998) *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Crossan J. D., and Reed J. L. (2001) *Excavating Jesus: Beneath the Stones, Behind the Texts*, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Crossley, J. G. (2003) 'Halakah and Mark 7.4: "…and Beds"', *JSNT* 25: 433-447.

Crossley, J. G. (2004) *The Date of Mark's Gospel: Insight from the Law in Earliest Christianity*, London: T&T Clark.

Cullmann, O. (1963) *The Christology of the New Testament*, London: SCM.

Danker, F. W. (1970) 'The Demonic Secret in Mark: A Reexamination of the Cry of Dereliction (15.34)', *ZNW* 61: 48-69.

Danker, F. W. (1996) 'Review of Erkki Koskenniemi *Apollonius von Tyana in der neutestamentlichen Exegese*', *CBQ* 58: 757.

Danker, F. W. (2000) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature:* 3rd. edition, *(BGAD)*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Danove, P. (1998) 'The Narrative Rhetoric of Mark's Ambiguous Characterization of the Disciples', *JSNT* 70: 21-38.

Danove, P. (2001) 'The Narrative Function of Mark's Characterization of God', *NovT* 43: 12-30.

Danove, P. (2005) *The Rhetoric of the Characterization of God, Jesus and Jesus' Disciples in the Gospel of Mark*, JSNTSup 290; New York: T&T Clark.

Davidsen, O. (1993) *The Narrative Jesus: A Semiotic Reading of Mark's Gospel*, Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press.

Davidson, B. (1970) *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Davies, W. D., and Allison, D. C. (1991) *Matthew.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Davis, P. G. (1989) 'Mark's Christological Paradox,' *JSNT* 35: 3-18.

Davis, P. G. (1994) 'Divine Agents, Mediators, and New Testament Christology', *JTS* 45: 479-503.

Day, J. (1985) *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite myth in the Old Testament*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Day, J. (1992) *Psalms*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Day, J. (2000) *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Day, J. (2007) 'Review of Rebecca S. Watson *Chaos Uncreated*', *JSOT* 31: 206-207.

Deines, R. (2009) 'Review of Rachel Nicholls *Walking on the Water*', *ExpTim* 120: 408-409.

Deines, R. (2012) 'Christology between Pre-existence, Incarnation and Messianic Self-understanding of Jesus in the work of Martin Hengel' in Bird, M. F. and Maston, J. (eds.), "Earliest Christian History: History, Literature and Theology, Essays from the Tyndale Fellowship in Honor of Martin Hengel", (WUNT 2.320) Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck: 75-116.

Deines, R. (2013) 'Did Matthew Know he was Writing Scripture? Part 1', *EJT* 22: 101-109.

DeMaris, R. E. (2002) 'Possession, Good and Bad – Ritual, Effects and Side-Effects: the Baptism of Jesus and Mark 1.9-11 from a Cross-Cultural Perspective', *JSNT* 80: 3-29.

Derrett, J. D. M. (1981) 'Why and How Jesus Walked on the Sea', *NovT* 23: 330-348.

Dewey, J. (1973) 'The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2:1-3.6', *JBL* 92: 394-401.

Dewey, J. (1991) 'Mark as Interwoven Tapestry: Forecasts and Echoes for a Listening Audience', *CBQ* 51: 221-236.

Dewey, J. (2004) 'The Survival of Mark's Gospel: a Good Story?', *JBL* 123: 495-507.

Dibelius, M. (1919) *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; 2nd. edition, 1933); ET *From Tradition to Gospel* New York: Scribner's Sons, 1935.

Dillon, R. J. (2014) 'Mark 1:1-15: A "New Evangelization"?', *CBQ* 76: 1-18.

Dixon, E. P. (2009) 'Descending Spirit and Descending Gods: a "Greek" Interpretation of the Spirit's "Descent as a Dove" in Mark 1:10', *JBL* 128: 759-780.

Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W. (1999) 'Rethinking Historical Criticism', *BibInt* 7: 235-271.

Donahue, J. R. (1973) *Are you the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark*, SBLDS 10; Missoula, MT: Scholar's Press.

Dowd, S., and Malbon, E. S. (2006) 'The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience', *JBL* 125: 271 – 297.

Driggers, I. B. (2007) 'The Politics of Divine Presence: Temple as Locus of Conflict in the Gospel of Mark', *BibInt* 15: 227-247.

Duff, P. B. (1992) 'The March of the Divine Warrior and the Advent of the Greco-Roman King: Mark's Account of Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem', *JBL* 111: 55-71.

Dunn, J. D. G. (1980) *Christology in the Making: an Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, London: SCM.

Dunn, J. D. G. (1991) *The Parting of the Ways: between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, London: SCM.

Dunn, J. D. G. (2003) *Jesus Remembered*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Dunn, J. D. G. (2005) *A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed*, Grand Rapids: Baker.

Dunn, J. D. G. (2007) 'Review of Simon Gathercole *The Pre-existent Son*', *RBL 9*: 378-384.

Dunn, J. D. G. (2010) *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus? The New Testament Evidence*, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Dunn, J. D.G., and Twelftree, G. H. (1980) 'Demon-possession and Exorcism in the New Testament', *Churchman* 94: 210 – 25.

Dyer, C. (1986) 'The Purpose for the Gospel of Mark', in Toussaint, S. D. and Dyer, C. H. (eds.) *Essays in Honor of J. Dwight Pentecost*, Chicago: Moody Press: 49-62.

Edwards, C. (2008) *Suetonius Lives of the Caesars*, Oxford: Oxford World's Classics.

Elbert, P. (2000) 'The Devil Disease and Deliverance: Origins of Illness in New Testament Thought – an Appreciation and Critique', *AJPS* 3: 139-154.

Elliot, J. K. (1976) 'Is ὁ ἐξελθών a Title for Jesus in Mark 1.45?', *JTS* 27: 402-405.

Emerton, J. A. (1958) 'The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery', *JTS* 9: 225-242.

Esler, P. F. (2005) 'The Incident of the Withered Fig Tree in Mark 11: a New Source and Redactional Explanation', *JSNT* 28: 41-67.

Evans, C. A. (2000) 'Mark's Incipit and the Priene Calendar Inscription: From Jewish Gospel to Greco-Roman Gospel', *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 1:67 – 81.

Evans, C. A. (2003) 'How Septuagintal is Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9?', *NovT* 45: 105-110.

Eve, E. (2002) *The Jewish Context of Jesus' Miracles*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Eve, E. (2008) 'Spit in your Eye: the Blind Man of Bethsaida and the Blind Man of Alexandria', *NTS* 54:1-17.

Farrer, A. M. (1951) *A Study in Mark*, Westminster: Dacre.

Farrer, A. M. (1954) *St. Matthew and St. Mark*, Westminster: Dacre

Feuillet, A. (1958) ‘Le Symbolisme de la Colombe dans les Récits Évangeliques du Baptême’, *RSR* 46: 524 – 544.

Fiensy, D. (1999) ‘Leaders of Mass Movements and the Leader of the Jesus Movement’, *JSNT* 21 : 3-27.

Fishbane, M. (2003) *Biblical Myth & Rabbinical Mythmaking*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fitzmyer, J. A. (1974) ‘The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament’, *NTS* 20: 382-407.

Fitzmyer, J. A. (1979) *A Wandering Aramean*, SBLMS 25. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press.

Fitzmyer, J. A. (2000) ‘Melchizedek in the MT, LXX, and the NT’, *Bib* 81: 63-69.

Fitzmyer, J. A. (2003) *Tobit*, Berlin: Walter de Grutyer.

Fletcher-Louis, C. (1996) ‘4Q374: a Discourse on the Sinai Tradition: the Deification of Moses and Early Christology’, *DSD* 3: 236 – 252.

Fletcher-Louis, C. (1997) *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, WUNT, II/94; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Fletcher-Louis, C. (2006) ‘Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 1’, *JSHJ* 4: 155-175.

Fletcher-Louis, C. (2007) ‘Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 2’, *JSHJ* 5: 57-79.

Focant, C. (2009) ‘Une Christologie de Type “Mystique” (Marc 1.1-16.8)’, *NTS* 55: 1-21.

Forbes, C. (2001) ‘Paul’s Principalities and Powers: Demythologizing Apocalyptic?’, *JSNT* 82: 61-88.

Fossum, J. E. (1985) *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Foster, P. (2003) ‘Is it Possible to Dispense With Q?’, *NovT* 45: 313-337.

France, R. T. (1985) *Matthew*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

France, R. T. (2002) *The Gospel of Mark*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

France, R. T. (2003) *Divine Government: God’s Kingship in the Gospel of Mark*, Vancouver: Regent College Publishing.

Francis, F. O. (1962) ‘Humility and Angelic Worship in Col 2:18’, *ST* 16: 109-134.

Frankfurter, D. (2010) ‘Where the Spirits Dwell: Possession, Christianization, and Saints’ Shrines in Late Antiquity’, *HTR* 103.1: 27-46.

Fredriksen, P. (2012) ‘Jesus the Jewish Christ’, *ST* 66: 3-19.

Fredriksson, H. (1945) *Jahwe Als Krieger*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup.

Friesen, S. J. (2004) ‘Myth and Symbolic Resistance in Revelation 13’, *JBL* 123: 281-313.

Funk, R. W. (1961) *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature (F. Blass and A. Debrunner): A Translation and Revision of the Nineteenth German Edition Incorporating Supplementary Notes of A. Debrunner*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Funk, R. W. (1996) *Honest to Jesus: Jesus for a New Millennium*, New York: Harper Collins.

García Martínez, F. (2002) ‘Magic in the Dead Sea Scrolls’ in Bremmer, J. N., and Veenstra, J. R. (eds.) *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*, Leuven: Peeters: 13-33.

García Martínez, F., and Barrera, J. T. (1993) *Los Hombres de Qumrán: Literatura, Estructura Social y Concepciones Religiosas*, Madrid: Trotta.

García Martínez, F., and Tigchelaar, E. J. C. (1997-1998) *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (2 vols)*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Garroway, J. (2009) ‘The Invasion of a Mustard Seed: a Reading of Mark 5.1-20’, *JSNT* 32: 57 – 75.

Gathercole, S. J. (2005) ‘Pre-existence, and the Freedom of the Son in Creation and Redemption: an Exposition in Dialogue with Robert Jenson’, *IJST* 7: 38-51.

Gathercole, S. J (2006) *The Pre-existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark and Luke*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Georgi, D. (1964) *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Georgia, A. T. (2013) ‘Translating the Triumph: Reading Mark’s Crucifixion Narrative Against a Roman Ritual of Power’, *JSNT* 36: 17-38.

Gerhardsson, B. (2001) *The Reliability of the Gospel Tradition*, Peabody: Hendrickson.

Gibson, J. B. (1994) ‘Jesus’ Wilderness Temptation according to Mark’, *JSNT* 53: 3-34.

Gieschen, C. A. (1998) *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*, Leiden: Brill.

Ginsberg, H. L. (1935) ‘A Phoenician Hymn in the Psalter’, Rome: *XIX Congresso Internazionale degli Orientalisti.*

Ginzberg, L. (1909) *The Legends of the Jews, Volumes I and II* (2008), Forgotten Books.

Ginzberg, L. (1909) *The Legends of the Jews, Volumes III and IV* (2008), Forgotten Books.

Gleason, R. (2003) ‘Angels and the Eschatology of Heb 1-2’, *NTS* 49: 90-107.

Goldingay, J. E. (2003) *Israel’s Gospel (Vol.1)*, Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press.

Goldingay, J. E. (2006) *Psalms vol. 1: Psalms 1-41*, Grand Rapids: Baker.

Goodacre, M. (1999) 'Beyond the Q Impasse or down a Blind Alley?', *JSNT* 76: 33-52.

Gooder, P. (2008) *Searching for Meaning: an Introduction to Interpreting the New Testament*, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Goodman, F. D. (1988) *How about Demons? Possession and Exorcism in the Modern World*, Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press.

Gourgues, M. (1999) *Les Paraboles de Jésus chez Marc et Matthieu*, Montréal: Médiaspaul.

Grabbe, L. L. (1992) *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, London: SCM.

Graf, F. (1987) *Greek Mythology*: *an Introduction*, Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins University Press.

Grafius, B. (2012) 'Review of Anathea E. Portier-Young *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*', *BibInt* 20: 343-345.

Grant, M. (1996) *Tacitus: the Annals of Imperial Rome*, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Grant, R. (1986) *Gods and the One God: Christian Theology in the Graeco Roman World*, London: SPCK.

Green, A. R. W. (2003) *The Storm God in the Ancient Near East*, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Grogan, G. (1999) 'New Testament Christology or New Testament Christologies?', *Themelios* 25: 60-73.

Guelich, R. A. (1989) *Mark 1-8:26*, Dallas: Word.

Gundry, R. H. (1993) *Mark: a Commentary on his Apology for the Cross*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Gundry, R. H. (2000) 'Review of Joel Marcus *Mark 1-8*', *RBL:* 386-391.

Gundry, R. H. (2003) 'Richard A. Horsley's *Hearing the Whole Story:* A Critical Review of its Postcolonial Slant', *JSNT* 26: 131-149.

Gunkel, H. (1895) *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap. Jon 12*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht) tr. Whitney K. W. Jr. as *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton: A Religio-Historical Study of Genesis 1 and Revelation 12*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Gurtner, D. M. (2007) 'The Rending of the Veil and Markan Christology: "Unveiling" the 'ΥΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ', (Mark 15.38-39) *BibInt* 15: 292-306.

Hagedorn, A. C., and Neyrey, J. H. (1998) ' "It was Out of Envy that they Handed Jesus Over (Mark 15.10)": the Anatomy of Envy and the Gospel of Mark', *JSNT* 69: 15-56.

Hägerland, T. (2012) *Jesus and the Forgiveness of Sins*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hahn, F. (1963) *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: their History in Early Christology*, Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.

Hanson, P. D. (1979) *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: the Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Hard, R. (1997) *Apollodorus: The Library of Greek Mythology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hart, R. P. (1997) *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*, Needham Heights, Mass.: Allyn & Bacon.

Hatina, T. (2002) *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative*, JSNTSup, 232; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Hatina, T. (2006) *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels. Volume 1. The Gospel of Mark*, LNTS, 304; London: T&T Clark.

Hayman, P. (1991) 'Monotheism – a Misused Word in Jewish studies?', *JJS* 42: 1-15.

Hays, R. B. (1989) *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, New Haven: Yale University Press

Hays, R. B. (2005) *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Head, P. M.

1997 *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: an Argument for Markan priority*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hedrick, C. (2007) 'Realism in Western Narrative and the Gospel of Mark: a Prolegomenon', *JBL* 126: 345-359.

Heger, P. (2010) '1 Enoch – Complementary or Alternative to Mosaic Torah?', *JSJ* 41: 29-62.

Heil, J. P. (1981) *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt 14:22 – 33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b – 21*, Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

Heil, J. P. (1999) 'A Note on "Elijah with Moses" in Mark 9,4', *Bib* 80: 115.

Heil, J. P. (2006) 'Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13', *CBQ* 68: 63-78.

Helmer, C. (ed.) (2006) *The Multivalence of Biblical Texts and Theological Meanings*, Atlanta: SBL.

Henaut, B. W. (1993) *Oral Tradition and the Gospels: the Problem of Mark 4*, (JSNTS) London: T&T Clark.

Henderson, I. H. (2001) ' "Salted with Fire" (Mark 9.42-50): Style, Oracles and (Socio) Rhetorical Gospel Criticism', *JSNT* 80: 44-65.

Henderson, S. W. (2001) ' "Concerning the Loaves" Comprehending Markan Incomprehension in Mark 6.45-52', *JSNT* 83: 3-26.

Henderson, S. W. (2006) *Christology and Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hengel, M. (1976) *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, London: SCM.

Hengel, M. (1983) *Christology and New Testament Chronology: in Between Jesus and Paul*, London: SCM.

Hengel, M. (1985) *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, London: SCM.

Hernández, J. Jr. (2011) 'The Relevance of Andrew of Caesarea for New Testament Textual Criticism', *JBL* 130: 183-196.

Hiers, R. H. (1974) 'Satan, Demons and the Kingdom of God', *SJT* 27: 35-47.

Holladay, W. L. (1986) *Jeremiah* (vol. 1), Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Holm-Nielsen S. (1960) *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran.* Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus.

Hong, K. P. (2013) 'Synchrony and Diachrony in Contemporary Biblical Interpretation', *CBQ* 75: 521-539.

Hooke, S. H. (1933) *Myth and Ritual*, London: Oxford University Press.

Hooker, M. D. (1967) *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and its Use in St Mark's Gospel*, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Hooker, M. D. (1991) *The Gospel According to St. Mark*, London: A&C Black.

Horsley, R. A. (2001) *Hearing the Whole Story: the Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Horsley, R. A. (2003) *Jesus and Empire: the Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Horsley, R. A. (2003a) 'A Response to Robert Gundry's Review of Hearing the Whole Story', *JSNT* 26: 151-169.

Howell, D. N., and Luc, A. (2000) 'Review of Gregory Boyd *God at War*', *EMQ* 36: 192 – 196.

Hurtado, L. W. (1979) 'New Testament Christology: a Critique of Bousset's Influence', *TS* 40: 306-317.

Hurtado L. W. (1988) *One God, One Lord: early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism,* Philadephia: Fortress Press.

Hurtado, L. W. (1998) 'First-Century Jewish Monotheism', *JSNT* 71: 3-26.

Hurtado, L. W. (2000) 'Religious Experience and Religious Innovation in the New Testament', *JR* 80: 183-205.

Hurtado, L. W. (2001) 'Review of Charles A. Gieschen *Angelomorphic Christology*', *RBL* 3: 323-325.

Hurtado, L. W. (2003) *Lord Jesus Christ,* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Hurtado, L. W. (2004) 'Devotion to Jesus and Historical Investigation: A Grateful, Clarifying and Critical Response to Professor Casey', *JSNT* 27.1: 97-104.

Hurtado, L. W. (2005) *How on Earth did Jesus Become a God*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Iersel, B. M. F. van. (1996) 'Failed Followers in Mark: Mark 13:12 as a Key for the Identification of the Intended Readers', *CBQ* 58: 244-263.

Iersel, B. M. F. van. (1998) *Mark: a Reader-response Commentary,* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Incigneri, B. J. (2003) *The Gospel to the Romans: the Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel,* Leiden: Brill.

Iverson, K. R. (2007) 'Review of H. N. Roskam *The Purpose of the Gospel of Mark in its Historical and Social Context*', *NovT* 49: 200-202.

Iverson, K. R. (2011) 'A Centurion's "Confession": a Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15:39', *JBL* 130: 329-350.

Iverson, K. R. (2012) 'Jews, Gentiles and the Kingdom of God: The Parable of the Wicked Tennants in Narrative Perspective (Mark 12:1-12)', *BibInt* 20: 305-335.

Iverson, K. R. (2013) 'Incongruity, Humor and Mark: Performance and the Use of Laughter in the Second Gospel (Mark 8.14-21)', *NTS* 59: 2-19.

Jacobsen, T. (1976) *Treasures of Darkness: a History of Mesopotamian Religion,* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Jacobson, H. (1989) 'Biblical Quotation and Editorial Function in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*', *JSP* 5: 47 – 64.

Jacobson, H. (1996) *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Jaffé, D. (2009) 'L'Identification de Jésus ao Modèle du Hasid Charismatique Galiléen: Les Thèses de Geza Vermes et Shmuel Safrai Revisitées', *NTS* 55: 218-246.

Janes, R. (2006) 'Why the Daughter of Herodias Must Dance (Mark 6.14-29)', *JSNT* 28: 443-467.

Jassen, A. P. (2009) ‘The Dead Sea Scrolls and Violence: Sectarian Formation and Eschatological Imagination’, *BibInt* 17: 12-44.

Johansson, D. (2010) ‘Kyrios in the Gospel of Mark’, *JSNT* 33: 101-124.

Johansson, D. (2010a) ‘The Identity of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark: Proposals Past and Present’, *CBR* 9: 364-393.

Johansson, D. (2011) ‘ “Who Can Forgive Sins but God Alone?” Human and Angelic Agents and Divine Forgiveness in Early Judaism’, *JSNT* 33: 351-374.

Johnson, E. S. (1987) ‘Is Mark 15.39 the Key to Mark’s Christology?’, *JSNT* 31: 3-22.

Johnston, S. I. (2002) ‘The Testament of Solomon from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance’ in Bremmer, J. N., and Veenstra, J. R. (eds.) *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period*, Leuven: Peeters: 35-49.

Jones, S., and McKenzie, R. (1968) *A Greek-English Lexicon Complied by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Juel, D. H. (1977) *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS 31), Missoula: Scholars Press.

Juel, D. H. (1992) ‘The Origin of Mark’s Christology’, in Charlesworth J. H. (ed.) *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press: 449 – 460

Juel, D. H. (1994) *A Master of Surprise: Mark Interpreted*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Press.

Kähler, M. (1964) *The So-called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Kang, S. I. (2008) ‘The “Molten Sea”, or is it?’, *Bib* 89: 101-103.

Kazen, T. (2006) ‘Standing Helpless at the Roar and Surging of the Sea’, *ST* 60: 21-41.

Kazen, T. (2008) ‘The Christology of Early Christian Practice’, *JBL* 127: 591-614.

Kee, H. C. (1968) ‘The Terminology of Mark’s Exorcism Stories’, *NTS* 14: 232-246.

Kee, H. C. (1977) *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark’s Gospel*, London: SCM.

Kee, H. C. (1983) ‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’, in Charlesworth J. H. (ed.) *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: volume 1*, London: Darton, Longman and Todd: 775 – 828.

Kee, H. C. (1984) ‘Review of John Paul Heil *Jesus Walking on the Sea*’, *JBL* 103: 481-482.

Keener, C. S. (2011) *Miracles: The Credibility of the New Testament Accounts*, (Vol 2) Grand Rapids: Baker.

Kelber, W. H. (1976) *The Passion in Mark*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Kelber, W. H. (1979) *Mark's Story of Jesus*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Kelhoffer, J. A. (2000) *Miracle and Mission*, WUNT II 112, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Kennedy, J. M. (1987) 'The Root *G'R* in the light of Semantic Analysis', *JBL* 106: 47-64.

Kidner, D. (1973) *Psalms 1-72*, Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Kim, S. (1987) 'Jesus - The Son of God, the Stone, the Son of Man, and the Servant: The Role of Zechariah in the Self-Identification of Jesus' in Hawthorne G. F. and Betz, O. (eds.) *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids/Tubingen: Eerdmans/Mohr Siebeck: 134 – 148.

Kim, T. H. (1998) 'The Anarthrous Υιος Θεου in Mark 15,39 and the Roman Imperial Cult', *Bib* 79: 222-241.

Kingsbury, J. D. (1983) *The Christology of Mark's Gospel*, Philadelphia: Fortress.

Kingsbury, J. D. (1989) *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*, Minneapolis: Fortress.

Kirk, J. R. D. (2012) 'Time for Figs, Temple Destruction and Houses of Prayer in Mark 11: 12-25', *CBQ* 74: 509-527.

Kirschner, E. F. (1994) 'Jesus e os Exorcistas de Seu Tempo: Paralelos e Distinções', *VS* 4: 9-24.

Klauck, H. J. (2000) *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: A Guide to Graeco-Roman Religions*, London: T & T Clark.

Klint, S. (2000) 'After Story – a Return to History? Introducing Reception Criticism as an Exegetical Approach', *ST* 54: 87-106.

Klutz, T. (2004) *The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: a Sociostylistic Reading*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klutz, T. (2005) 'Review of Clinton Wahlen *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels*', *JSNT* 27: 44-46.

Kloppenborg, J. S. (2004) 'Isa 5.1 LXX and Mark 12:1, 9 Again', *NovT* 46: 12-19.

Kloppenborg, J. S. (2005) ' "Evocatio Deorum" and the Date of Mark', *JBL* 124: 419-450.

Korpel, M. C. A. (1990) *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine*, Munster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Koskenniemi, E. (2010) 'Philo and Greek Poets', *JSS* 41: 301-322.

Köstenberger, A. J., and Bouchoc, R. (2003) *The Book Study Concordance of the Greek New Testament*, Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman and Holden.

Köstenberger A. J., and Patterson, R. D. (2011) *Invitation to Biblical Interpretation: Exploring the Hermeneutical Triad of History, Literature and Theology*, Grand Rapids: Kregel.

Knight, G. A. (1965) *Deutero-Isaiah: a Theological Commentary on Isaiah 40-55*, New York: Abingdon.

Kvanvig, H. S. (2008) 'Review of Andrew R. Angel *Chaos and the Son of Man*', *JSJ* 39: 374-375.

Lagrange, M. J. (1947) *Évangile selon Saint Marc*, Paris: Études Bibliques.

Lalleman, H. (2013) *Jeremiah and Lamentations* (TOTC), Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Lambert, W. G., and Millard, A. R. (1999) *Atra-hasis: The Babylonian Story of the Flood*, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Lambrecht, J. (2002) 'A Note on Mark 8.38 and Q 12.8-9', *JSNT* 24: 117-125.

Lane, W. L. (1974) *The Gospel According to Mark*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lang, B. (1983) *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority*, Sheffield: The Almond Press.

Lawrence, Louise (2011) 'Exploring the Sense-scape of the Gospel of Mark', *JSNT* 33: 387-397.

Levenson, J. D. (1988) *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: the Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence*, San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Levin, Y. (2006) 'Jesus, "Son of God" and "Son of David": the "Adoption" of Jesus into the Davidic Line', *JSNT* 28: 415-442.

Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and Jones, H. S. (1996) *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th. edition with rev. supplement. Oxford.

Liew, T. B. (1999) 'Tyranny, Boundary and Might: Colonial Mimicry in Mark's Gospel', *JSNT* 73: 7-31.

Lightfoot, R. H. (1950) *The Gospel Message of Mark*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lind, M. C. (1980) *Yahweh is a Warrior: the Theology of Warfare in Ancient Israel*, Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press.

Longman, III, T. (1985) 'The Form and Message of Nahum: Preaching from a Prophet of Doom', *Reformed Theological Journal* 13-24.

Longman, III, T., and Reid, D. G. (1995) *God is a Warrior*, Carlisle: Paternoster.

Lopes, A. N. (2004) *A Bíblia e Seus Intérpretes: uma Breve História da Interpretação*, São Paulo: Cultura Cristã.

Lucas, A. J. (2014) 'Assessing Stanley E. Porter's Objections to Richard B. Hay's Notion of Metalepsis', *CBQ* 76: 93-111.

Lundbom, J. R. (2004) *Jeremiah 21-36*, New York: Doubleday.

MacDonald, D. R. (2010) *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*, Yale: Yale University Press.

Machiela, D. A., and Perrin, A. B. (2014) 'Tobit and the Genesis Apocryphon: Toward a Family Portrait', *JBL* 133: 111-132.

Mack, B. L. (1992) 'The Christ and Jewish Wisdom', in Charlesworth J. H. (ed.) *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press: 192 – 221

Madden, P. J. (1997) *Jesus' Walking on the Sea*, New York: Walter de Grutyer.

Malbon, E. S. (1983) 'Fallible Followers: Women and Men in the Gospel of Mark', *Semeia* 28: 29-48.

Malbon, E. S. (1984) 'The Jesus of Mark and the Sea of Galilee', *JBL* 103: 363 – 77.

Malbon, E. S. (1991) *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Malbon, E. S. (1986b) 'Disciples/Crowds/Whoever: Markan Characters and Readers', *NovT* 28: 104-130.

Malbon, E. S. (1989) 'The Jewish Leaders in the Gospel of Mark: A Literary Study of Marcan Characterization', *JBL* 108: 259-281.

Malbon, E. S. (1993) 'Echoes and Foreshadowings in Mark 4-8: Reading and Rereading', *JBL* 112: 213-232.

Malbon, E. S. (1993a) 'Texts and Contexts: Interpreting the Disciples in Mark', *Semeia* 62: 81-102.

Malbon, E. S. (2003) 'Narrative Christology and the Son of Man: What the Markan Jesus Says Instead', *BibInt* 11: 373-412.

Malbon, E. S. (2004) *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark's Gospel*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Malbon, E. S. (2009) *Mark's Jesus? Characterization as Narrative Christology*, Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press.

Malbon, E. S., and McKnight, E. V. (eds.) (1994) *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Mann, C. S. (1986) *Mark*, New York: Doubleday & Co.

Manzi, F. (1997) *Melchisedek e l'angelologia nell' Epistola agli Ebrei e a Qumran*, AnBib 136, Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institution.

Marcus, J. (1984) 'Mark 4.1-10 and Marcan Epistemology', *JBL* 103: 557 – 74.

Marcus, J. (1988) 'Entering into the Kingly Power of God', *JBL* 107: 663-675.

Marcus, J. (1989) 'Mark 14:61: Are you the Messiah-Son-of-God?', *NovT* 31: 125-141.

Marcus, J. (1992) *The way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Gospel of Mark in the Old Testament*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Marcus, J. (1992a) 'The Jewish War and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark', *JBL* 111: 441-462.

Marcus, J. (1995) 'Jesus' Baptismal Vision', *NTS* 41: 512 – 521.

Marcus, J. (1996) 'Modern and Ancient Jewish Apocalypticism', *JR* 76: 1-27.

Marcus, J. (1999) *Mark 1-8*, London: The Anchor Yale Bible, Doubleday & Co.

Marcus, J. (2000) 'Mark – Interpreter of Paul', *NTS* 46: 473-487

Marcus, J. (2006) 'Crucifixion as Parodic Exaltation', *JBL* 125 1: 73 - 87

Marcus, J. (2009) *Mark 8-16*, London: The Anchor Yale Bible.

Marcus, J. (2013) 'Passover and Last Supper Revisited', *NTS* 59: 303-324.

Marcus, J. (2013a) 'A Note on the History of Interpretation of Zechariah 14.21', *NovT* 55: 22-30.

Marcus, R. (1956) '*Mebaqqer* and *Rabbim* in the Manual of Discipline vi. 11 – 13' *JBL* 75: 298 – 302.

Marsh, C., and Moyise, S. (2005) *Jesus and the Gospels*, London: T&T Clark.

Martin, D. B. (2010) 'When Did Angels Become Demons?', *JBL* 129: 657-677.

Martin, T. W. (2001) 'Watch During the Watches (Mark 13:35)', *JBL* 120: 685-701.

Matera, F. J. (1982) *The Kingship of Jesus: Composition and Theology in Mark 15*, UTS, Richmond, Vi: SBL.

Matera, F. J. (1987) *What are they Saying About Mark?*, Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Matera, F. J. (1988) 'The Prologue as the Interpretative Key to Mark's Gospel', *JSNT* 34: 3-20.

Matera, F. J. (2007) 'Review of Simon Gathercole *The Pre-existent Son*', *RBL*

Mauser, U. W. (1963) *Christ in the Wilderness. The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and its Basis in the Biblical Tradition*, London: SCM Press.

McCurley, F. R. (1983) *Ancient Myths and Biblical Faith*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

McGinn, B. (1994) 'Ocean and Desert as Symbols of Mystical Absorption in the Christian Tradition', *JR* 74: 155-181.

McGrath A. E. (1987) *The Making of Modern German Christology 1750 – 1990*, Leicester: Apollos.

McKenzie, J. L. (1956) 'Mythological Allusions in Ezekiel 28.12-28', *JBL* 75: 322-327.

McLaren, J. S. (2005) 'Jews and the Imperial Cult: From Augustus to Domitian', *JSNT* 27: 257-278.

Meeks, W. (2004) ‘Inventing the Christ: Multicultural Process and Poetry Among the First Christians’, *ST* 58: 77-96.

Meier, J. P. (1994) *A Marginal Jew, volume II: Mentor, Message and Miracles*, New York: Doubleday.

Menahem, K. (2006) ‘Some Early Jewish and Christian Exegetical Problems and the Dynamics of Monotheism’, *JSJ* 37: 548-593.

Meyer P. W. (2004) *The Word in this World: Essays in New Testament Exegesis and Theology*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Michalak, A. R. (2012) *Angels as Warriors in Late Second Temple Jewish Literature*, WUNT II 330, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Miller, G. D. (2012) ‘An Intercalation Revisited: Christology, Discipleship and Dramatic Irony in Mark 6.6b-30’, *JSNT* 35: 176-195.

Miller, G. D. (2012a) ‘Raphael the Liar: Angelic Deceit and Testing in the Book of Tobit’, *CBQ* 74: 492-508.

Miller, P. D. (1973) *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Miller, R. C. (2010) ‘Mark’s Empty Tomb and Other Translation Fables in Classical Antiquity’, *JBL* 129: 759-776.

Miller, S. (2007) ‘Review of Andrew R. Angel *Chaos and the Son of Man*’, *JSNT* 29: 122-123.

Moloney, F. J. (2002) *The Gospel of Mark: a Commentary*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.

Moloney, F. J. (2010) ‘Review of Joel Marcus *Mark 8-16*’, *CBQ* 72: 382-383.

Moloney, F. J. (2013) ‘Constructing Jesus and the Son of Man’, *CBQ* 75: 719-738.

Moo, J. (2009) ‘The Sea that is No More: Rev 21.1 and the Function of Sea Imagery in the Apocalypse of John’, *NT 51:* 148-167.

Morris, L. (1992) *The Gospel According to Matthew.* Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Morrison, G. S. (2008) *The Turning Point in the Gospel of Mark: a Study of Markan Christology*, Washington: The Catholic University of America.

Moss, C. R. (2004) ‘The Transfiguration: An Exercise in Markan Accommodation’, *BibInt* 12: 69-89.

Moss, C. R. (2010) ‘The Man with the Flow of Power: Porous Bodies in Mark 5:25-34’, *JBL* 129: 507-519.

Motyer, S. (1987) ‘The Rending of the Veil: A Markan Pentecost’, *NTS* 33: 155-157.

Mowinckel, S. (1962) *The Psalms in Israel’s Worship: vol. 1*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Moxon, T. A. (1934) *Aristotle Poetics*, London: J. M. Dent and sons.

Moyise, S. (2008) *Evoking Scripture: Seeing the Old Testament in the New*, London: T&T Clark.

Mrozek, A., and Votto, S. (1999) 'The Motif of the Sleeping Divinity', *Bib* 80: 415-419.

Myers, C. (1988) *Binding the Strongman: a Political Reading of Mark's story of Jesus*, Maryknoll: Orbis.

Naluparayil, J. C. (2000) *The Identity of Jesus in Mark: An Essay on Narrative Christology*, Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 49; Jerusalem: Franciscan Painting Press.

Naluparayil, J. C. (2000a) 'Jesus of the Gospel of Mark: Present State of Research', *CurBS* 8: 191-226.

Neville, D. J. (2008) 'Moral Vision and Eschatology in Mark's Gospel: Coherence or Conflict?', *JBL* 127: 359-384.

Newman, C. C. (ed.) (1999) *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel: a Critical Assessment of N.T. Wright's Jesus and the Victory of God*, Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter Varsity Press.

Neyrey, J. H. (2005) 'God, Benefactor and Patron: The Major Cultural Model for Interpreting the Deity in Greco-Roman Antiquity', *JSNT* 28: 3-11.

Nicholls, R. (2008) *Walking on the Water: Reading Mt 14.22-33 in the light of its Wirkungsgeschichte*, Leiden: Brill.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E. (2001) *1 Enoch 1: a Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1-36; 81-108*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E., and VanderKam, J. C. (2012) *1 Enoch 2: a Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 37-82*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Nicklas, T. (2009) 'Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus', *JSJ* 40: 432-433.

Nineham, D. E. (1968) *The Gospel of Saint Mark*, London: A&C Black.

North, W. E. S. (2003) 'John for Readers of Mark? A Response to Richard Bauckham's Proposal', *JSNT* 25: 449-468.

Oden, T. C., and Hall, C. A. (1998) *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament II, Mark*, Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP.

Pascut, B. (2012) 'The So-Called Passivum Divinum in Mark's Gospel', *NovT* 54: 313-333.

Pataki, D. A. (2011) 'A Non-combat Myth in Revelation 12', *NTS* 57: 258-272.

Patella, M. (2006) *Lord of the Cosmos: Mithras, Paul and the Gospel of Mark.* London: T&T Clark.

Penney, D. L., and Wise, M. O. (1994) 'By the Power of Beelzebub: an Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q*560*)', *JBL* 113/114: 627 – 650.

Peppard, M. (2010) 'The Eagle and the Dove: Roman Imperial Sonship and the Baptism of Jesus (Mark 1.9-11)', *NTS* 56: 431-451.

Peppard, M. (2011) 'Adopted and Begotten Sons of God: Paul and John on Divine Sonship', *CBQ* 73: 92-110.

Peppard, M. (2011a) *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in its Social and Political Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pero, C. S. (2013) *Liberation from Empire: Demonic Possession and Exorcism in the Gospel of Mark*, New York: Peter Lang.

Perrin, N. (1965-66) 'Mark XIV.62: The End Product of a Christian Pesher Tradition?', *NTS* 12: 150-155.

Perrin, N. (1974) *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Perrin, N. (1974a) *The New Testament: an Introduction.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Pesch, R. (1971) "The Markan Version of the Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac" *Ecumenical Review* 21: 349-76.

Pesch, R. (1976) *Das Markusevangelium.* (2 vols), HTKNT 2. Freiburg: Herder.

Peterson, A. R. (1998) *The Royal God: Enthronement Festivals in Ancient Israel and Ugarit?*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Peterson, N. R. (1978) 'Point of View' in Mark's Narrative', *Semeia* 12: 97-121.

Peterson, N. R. (1980) 'The Composition of Mark 4:1-8.26', *HTR* 73: 185-217.

Pierce, M. N. (2013) 'War: Fighting the Enemies of God, not Man', *B*TB 43: 81-87.

Pilch, J. J. (1995) 'Death with Honor: the Mediterranean Style Death of Jesus in Mark', *BTB* 25: 65-70.

Pokorný, P. (1974) 'The Temptation Stories and their intentions', *NTS* 20: 115-127.

Pokorný, P. (1987) *The Genesis of Christology: Foundations for a Theology of the New Testament*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Poirier, J. C. (2005) 'The Ouranology of the Apocalypse of Abraham', *JSJ* 35: 391-408.

Porter, S. E. (ed). 2006 *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Powell, M. A. (1990) *What is Narrative Criticism?*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Priest, J. (1992) 'A Note on the Messianic Banquet', in Charlesworth J. H. (ed.) *The Messiah: developments in earliest Judaism and Christianity.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press: 222 – 238.

Pritchard, J. B. (1969) *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd. edition, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Queller, K. (2010) ' "Stretch Out Your Hand!" Echo and Metalepsis in Mark's Sabbath Healing Controversy', *JBL* 129: 737-758.

Rahlfs A., and Hanhart, R. (2006) *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes edidit Alfred Rahlfs, Editio altera quam recognovit et emendavit Robert Hanhart* 2 vols in 1, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Rainbow, P. A. (1991) 'Jewish Monotheism as the Matrix for New Testament Christology: a Review Article', *NovT* 33: 78-9.

Räisänen, H. (1976) *Das "Messiasgeheimnis" im Markusevangelium*, Schriften der Finnischen Exegetischen Gesellschaft 28. Helsinki: Länsi-Suomi.

Rhoads, D., and Michie, D. (1982) *Mark as Story: an Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Rhoads, D., and Kari, S. (eds.) (1999) *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Riches, J. K. (2000) *Conflicting Mythologies: Identity Formation in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew*, London: T&T Clark.

Riches, J. K. (2001) 'Conflicting Mythologies: Mythical Narrative in the Gospel of Mark', *JSNT* 84: 29-50.

Rindge, M. S. (2012) 'Reconfiguring the Akedah and Recasting God: Lament and Divine Abandonment in Mark', *JBL* 131: 755-774.

Robertson, A. T. (1919) *Studies in Mark's Gospel*, New York: The Macmillan Company.

Rogers, T. J. (2004) 'Shaking the Dust Off the Markan Mission Discourse', *JSNT* 27: 169-192.

Routledge, R. (2010) 'Did God Create Chaos? Unresolved Tension in Genesis 1.1-2', *TynBul* 61.1: 69 – 88.

Rowe, R. D. (2002) *God's Kingdom and God's Son: the Background to Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms*, Leiden: Brill.

Rowland, C. C. (1982) *The Open Heaven*, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Rowland, C. C. (1985) 'A Man Clothed in Linen: Daniel 10.16ff. and Jewish Angelology', *JSNT* 24: 99-110.

Rudman, D. (2003) 'The Crucifixion as Chaoskampf: a New Reading of the Passion Narrative in the Synoptic Gospels', *Bib* 84: 102-107.

Runge, S. E. (2012) 'Relative Saliency and Information Structure in Mark's Parable of the Sower', *BAGL*: 103-125.

Samuel, S. (2002) 'The Beginning of Mark: a Colonial/Postcolonial Conundrum', *BibInt* 10: 405-419.

Schaberg, J. (1989) "Mark 14.62: Early Christian Merkabah Imagery?" in Marcus J. and Soards M. (eds.) *Apocalyptic and the New Testament*, JSNTSup 24. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 69-94.

Schneck, R. (1994) *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I – VIII*, Berkeley: BIBAL Press.

Schökel, L. A. (1994) *Diccionario bíblico hebreo-español*, Madrid: Editorial Trotta.

Schürer, E. (1979) *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ vol. II*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Segal, A. (1977) *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Shiner, W. (2000) 'The Ambiguous Pronouncement of the Centurion and the Shrouding of Meaning in Mark', *JSNT* 78: 3-22.

Shiner, W. (2003) *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-century Performance of Mark*, Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Shively, E. E. (2012) *Apocalyptic Imagination in the Gospel of Mark: the Literary and Theological Role of Mark 3.22-30*, Boston: De Grutyer.

Shively, E. E. (2012a) 'Review of Michael Tait *Jesus, the Divine Bridegroom, in Mark 2:18-22'*, *CBQ* 74: 832-834.

Shreckhise, R. L. (2007) 'The Rhetoric of the Expressions in the Song by the Sea (Exodus 15,1-18)', *SJOT* 21: 201-217.

Schremer, A. (2008) 'Midrash, Theology and History: Two Powers in Heaven Revisited', *JSJ* 39: 230-254.

Silva, M. (1997) *Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Sim, D. C. (2011) 'Matthew's Use of Mark: Did Matthew Intend to Supplement or to Replace his Primary Source?', *NTS* 57: 176-192.

Siniscalchi, G. B. (2011) ' "Resurrecting Jesus" and Critical Historiography: William Lane Craig and Dale Allison in Dialogue', *HEYJ*: 362-373.

Skarsaune, O. (1982) *In the Shadow of the Temple*, Downers Grove, Illinois.: IVP.

Skehan, P.W., and Di Lella, A. A. (1987) *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, New York: Doubleday.

Skinner, C. W., and Iverson, K. R. (2012) *Unity and Diversity in the Gospels and Paul*, Atlanta: SBL.

Sleeman, M. (2007) 'Mark, the Temple and Space: a Geographer's Response', *BibInt* 15: 338-349.

Smith, A. (2006) ‘Tyranny Exposed: Mark’s Typological Characterization of Herod Antipas (Mark 6:14-29)’, *BibInt* 14: 259-293.

Smith, D. A. (2003) ‘Revisiting the Empty Tomb: the Post-Mortem Vindication of Jesus in Mark and Q’, *NovT* 45: 123-137.

Smith, J. C. H. (2012) ‘The Construction of Identity in Mark 7.24-30: The Syrophoenician Woman and the Problem of Ethnicity’, *BibInt* 20: 458 – 481.

Smith, M. S. (2008) *God in Translation: Deities in Cross-cultural Discourse in the Biblical World*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Smith, S. H. (1989) ‘The Literary Structure of Mark 11.1-12.40’, *NovT* 31: 104-124.

Soares, E. (2009) *Septuaginta: Guia Histórico e Literário*, São Paulo: Hagnos.

Steenburg, D. (1990) ‘The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God’, *JSNT* 39: 95-109.

Stein, R. H. (2008) *Mark*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Steinmann, A. E. (2009) ‘When Did Herod the Great Reign?’, *NovT* 51:1-29.

Sterling, G. E. (1993) ‘Jesus as Exorcist: an Analysis of Matthew 17.14-20; Mark 9.14-29; Luke 9.37-43a’, *CBQ* 55: 467-493.

Stevens, B. A. (1983) ‘Jesus as the Divine Warrior’, *ExpTim* 94: 326 – 9.

Stevens, B. A. (1987) ‘ “Why ‘Must’ the Son of Man Suffer” the Divine Warrior in the Gospel of Mark’, *BZ* 31: 101-110.

Stokes, R. E. (2009) ‘The Devil Made David Do It… Or “Did He”? The Nature, Identity and Literary Origins of the “Satan” in 1 Chronicles’, *JBL* 128: 91-106.

Stoldt, H. (1977) *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Stone, M. E. (1990) *A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Strack H. L., and Stemberger, G. (1992) *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Strawn, B. A. (2010) ‘Jonah’s Sailors and their Lot Casting: a Rhetorical-critical Observation’, *Bib* 91: 66-76.

Stuckenbruck, L. T. (1995) *Angel Veneration and Christology*, Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Stuckenbruck, L. T., and North, W. E. S. (eds.) (2004) *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, (JSNTS 263) T&T Clark: London.

Stuhlmueller, C. (1970) *Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah*, AnBib 43. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Stulman, L. (2005) *Jeremiah*, Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Sullivan, K. P. (2004) *Wrestling with Angels: a Study of the Relationship between Angels and Humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Tate, M. E. (1990) *Psalms 51-100*, Dallas: Word Books.

Taylor, V. (1933) *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, London: MacMillan and Co.

Telford, W. R. (1980) *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, JSNTSup 1 Sheffield: JSOT.

Telford, W. R. (1995) *Mark*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Thackeray, H. S. J. (1988) *Josephus: Jewish Antiquities Books I – III*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Theissen, G. (1991) *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Thomas, C. M. (2003) *The Acts of Peter, Gospel Literature and the Ancient Novel: Rewriting the Past*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Throup, M. O. (2010) 'Animals and Angels in Mark 1.13: Hints of the Divine Warrior in the Wilderness?', *Oracula* 6: 29-39.

Throup, M. O. (2013) 'Malbon's Jesus: a Review of E. S. Malbon's "Mark's Jesus" ', *Oracula* 14: 95-97.

Thurston, B. B. (2010) 'Review of A.Y. Collins *Mark*', *TS* 71: 210-211.

Thurston, B. B. (2013) *Maverick Mark: the Untamed First Gospel*, Collegeville, Min: Liturgical Press.

Thyssen, H.P. (2006) 'Philosophical Christology in the New Testament', *Numen* 53: 133-176.

Tolbert, M. A. (1989) *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-historical Perspective.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.

Tsumura, D. T. (1989) *The Earth and the Waters in Genesis 1 and 2*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Tsumura, D. T. (2005) *Creation and Destruction: a Reappraisal of the Chaoskampf Theory in the Old Testament*, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Tuckett, C. M. (2008) 'Review of Richard Bauckham *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*', *RBL* 10: 380-385.

Twelftree, G. H. (1993) *Jesus the Exorcist: a Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.

Twelftree, G. H. (1999) *Jesus the Miracle Worker: a Historical and Theological Study*, Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.

Twelftree, G. H. (2008) 'In the Name of Jesus: a Conversation with Critics', *JPT* 17: 157-169.

Twelftree, G. H. (2011) 'Exorcism and the Defeat of Beliar in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *Vigiliae Christianae* 65: 170-188.

Ulansey, D. (1991) 'The Heavenly Veil Torn: Mark's Cosmic "Inclusio"', *JBL* 110: 123-125.

Valantassis, R. (2001) 'Demons, Adversaries, Devils, Fisherman: the Asceticism of Authoritative Teaching (NHL, VI, 3) in the Context of Roman Asceticism', *JR* 81: 549-565.

Van de Water, R. (2006) 'Michael or Yhwh? Toward Identifying Melchizedek in 11Q13', *JSP* 16.1: 75-86.

Van der Horst, P. W., and Newman, J. H. (2008) *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek*, New York: Walter de Grutyer.

Van der Loos, H. (1965) *The Miracles of Jesus*, Leiden: Brill.

Vangemeren, W. A. (1990) *Interpreting the Prophetic Word: an Introduction to the Prophetic Literature of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Van Henten, J. W. (1999) 'The First Testing of Jesus: a Rereading of Mark 1.12-13', *NTS* 45: 349 – 366.

Vearncombe, E. (2013) 'Cloaks, Conflict and Mark 14:51-52', *CBQ* 75: 683-703.

Vermes, G. (1962) *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Middlesex: Penguin.

Vermes, G. (1973) *Jesus the Jew: a Historian's Reading of the Gospels*, London: Collins.

Verseput, D. J. (1987) 'The Role and Meaning of the 'Son of God' Title in Matthew's Gospel', *NTS* 33: 533-556.

Voelz, J. W. (2005) 'The Greek of Codex Vaticanus in the Second Gospel and Marcan Greek', *NovT* 47: 209-249.

Wahlen, C. (2007) 'The Temple in Mark and Contested Authority,' *BibInt* 15: 248-267.

Wakeman, M. K. (1969) 'The Biblical Earth Monster in the Cosmogonic Combat Myth', *JBL* 88: 313-320.

Wallace, D. B. (1996) *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Wansbrough, H. (1972) 'Mark 3.21: Was Jesus out of His Mind?', *NTS* 18: 233 – 35.

Watson, D. F. (2010) 'The "Life of Aesop" and the Gospel of Mark: Two Ancient Approaches to Elite Values', *JBL* 129: 699-716.

Watson, R. S. (2005) *Chaos Uncreated: a Reassessment of the Theme of "Chaos" in the Hebrew Bible*, Berlin: Walter de Grutyer.

Watts, R. E. (1997) *The Influence of the Isaianic New Exodus on the Gospel of Mark*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Watts, R. E. (2007) "Mark" in Beale, G. K. and Carson, D. A. (eds.) *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker: 111-249.

Watts, R. E. (2007a) 'The Lord's House and David's Lord: the Psalms and Mark's Perspective on Jesus and the Temple', *BibInt* 15: 307-322.

Weeden, T. J. (1968) 'The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel', *ZNW* 59: 145-158.

Weeden, T. J. (1971) *Mark – Traditions in Conflict*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Weeden, T. J. (2008) 'Polemics as a Case for Dissent: a Response to Richard Bauckham's *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*', *JSHJ* 6: 211-224.

Weiser, A. (1962) *The Psalms*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Wenell, K. J. (2007) 'Contested Temple Space and Visionary Kingdom Space in Mark 11-12', *BibInt* 15: 323-327.

Wenham, J. (1984) *Easter Enigma: Do the Resurrection Stories Contradict one another?*, Exeter: The Paternoster Press.

Whitaker, R. (2013) 'Rebuke or Recall? Rethinking the Role of Peter in Mark's Gospel', *CBQ* 75: 666-682.

Williams, G. J. (2013) 'Narrative Space, Angelic Revelation and the End of Mark's Gospel', *JSNT* 35: 263-284.

Williams, J. F. (2006) 'Does Mark's Gospel Have an Outline?', *JETS* 49: 505-525.

Williams, J. F. (2013) 'Foreshadowing, Echoes and the Blasphemy at the Cross (Mark 15:39)', *JBL* 132: 913-933.

Witherington, B. (2001) *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Wrede, W. (1971) *The Messianic Secret*, Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.

Wright, A. T. (2005) 'Some Observations of Philo's De Gigantibus and Evil Spirits in Second Temple Judaism', *JSJ* 36: 471-488.

Wright, N. T. (1991) *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Wright, N. T. (1992) *The New Testament and the People of God*, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Wright, N. T. (1996) *Jesus and the Victory of God*, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Wright, N. T. (1997) *What St Paul Really Said*, Oxford: Lion.

Wright, N. T. (2003) *The Resurrection of the Son of God*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Wyatt, N. (1998) *Religious Texts from Ugarit: the Words of Ilimilku and his Colleagues*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Wyatt, N. (2008) 'Review of Rebecca S. Watson *Chaos Uncreated*', *JSS* 53: 338-340.

Yoder Neufield, T. R. (1997) *Put on the Armour of God: The Divine Warrior from Isaiah to Ephesians*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Yonge, C. D. (2006) *The Works of Philo*, Peabody: Hendrickson

Zabatiero, J. (2007) *Manual de Exegese*, São Paulo: Hagnos.

Zeigler J. (1939) *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 'Isaias'*, Göttingen: Dandenhoed & Ruprecht.

ABBREVIATIONS

Unless otherwise stated, the following abbreviations follow Alexander, Patrick H. *The SBL Handbook of Style* (1999), Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.

HEBREW BIBLE/ "OLD TESTAMENT"

Gen	Genesis
Exod	Exodus
Lev	Leviticus
Num	Numbers
Deut	Deuteronomy
Josh	Joshua
Judg	Judges
Ruth	Ruth
1-2 Sam	1-2 Samuel
1-2 Kgdms	1-2 Kingdoms (LXX)
1-2 Kgs	1-2 Kings
3-4 Kgdms	3-4 Kingdoms (LXX)
1-2 Chr	1-2 Chronicles
Ezra	Ezra
Neh	Nehemiah
Esth	Esther
Job	Job
Ps/Pss	Psalms
Prov	Proverbs
Eccl	Ecclesiastes
Song	Song of Songs
Isa	Isaiah
Jer	Jeremiah
Lam	Lamentations
Ezek	Ezekiel
Dan	Daniel
Hos	Hosea
Joel	Joel
Amos	Amos
Obad	Obadiah
Jonah	Jonah
Mic	Micah
Nah	Nahum
Hab	Habakkuk
Zeph	Zephaniah
Hag	Haggai
Zech	Zechariah
Mal	Malachi

NEW TESTAMENT

Matt	Matthew

Mark	Mark
Luke	Luke
John	John
Acts	Acts
Rom	Romans
1-2 Cor	1-2 Corinthians
Gal	Galatians
Eph	Ephesians
Phil	Philippians
Col	Colossians
1-2 Thess	1-2 Thessalonians
1-2 Tim	1-2 Timothy
Titus	Titus
Phlm	Philemon
Heb	Hebrews
Jas	James
1-2 Pet	1-2 Peter
1-2-3 John	1-2-3 John
Jude	Jude
Rev	Revelation

APOCRYPHA AND SEPTUAGINT

Bar	Baruch
Add Dan	Additions to Daniel
Pr Azar	Prayer of Azariah
Bel	Bel and the Dragon
Sg Three	Song of the Three Young Men
Sus	Susanna
1-2 Esd	1-2 Esdras
Add Esth	Additions to Esther
Ep Jer	Epistle of Jeremiah
Jdt	Judith
1-2 Macc	1-2 Maccabees
3-4 Macc	3-4 Maccabees
Pr Man	Prayer of Manasseh
Ps 151	Psalm 151
Sir	Sirach/Ecclesiasticus
Tob	Tobit
Wis	Wisdom of Solomon

OLD TESTAMENT PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Ahiqar	*Ahiqar*
Apoc. Ab.	*Apocalypse of Abraham*
Apoc. Adam	*Apocalypse of Adam*
Apoc. Dan.	*Apocalypse of Daniel*
Apoc. El. (C)	Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah*
Apoc. El. (H)	Hebrew *Apocalypse of Elijah*
Apoc. Mos	*Apocalypse of Moses*

Apoc. Sedr.	*Apocalypse of Sedrach*
Apoc. Zeph.	*Apocalypse of Zephaniah*
Apocr. Ezek	*Apocryphon of Ezekiel*
Aris. Ex.	Aristeas the Exegete
Aristob.	Aristobulus
Artap.	Artapanus
As. Mos.	*Assumption of Moses*
Ascen. Isa.	*Mart. Ascen. Isa. 6-11*
2 Bar.	*2 Baruch (Syriac Apocalypse)*
3 Bar.	*3 Baruch (Greek Apocalypse)*
4 Bar.	*4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremiou)*
Bk. Noah	*Book of Noah*
Cav. Tr.	*Cave of Treasures*
Cl. Mal.	Cleodemus Malchus
Dem.	Demetrius (the Chronographer)
El. Mod.	*Eldad and Modad*
1 En.	*1 Enoch (Ethiopic Apocalypse)*
2 En.	*2 Enoch (Slavic Apocalypse)*
3 En.	*3 Enoch (Hebrew Apocalypse)*
Eup.	Eupolemus
Ezek. Trag.	Ezekiel the Tragedian
4 Ezra	*4 Ezra*
5 Apoc. Syr. Pss.	*Five Apocryphal Syriac Psalms*
Gk. Apoc. Ezra	*Greek Apocalypse of Ezra*
Hec. Ab.	Hecataeus of Abdera
Hel. Syn. Pr.	*Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers*
Hist. Jos.	*History of Joseph*
Hist. Rech.	*History of the Rechabites*
Jan. Jam.	*Jannes and Jambres*
Jos. Asen.	*Joseph and Aseneth*
Jub.	*Jubilees*
L.A.B.	*Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* (Pseudo-Philo)
L.A.E.	*Life of Adam and Eve*
Lad. Jac.	*Ladder of Jacob*
Let. Aris.	*Letter of Aristeas*
Liv. Pro.	*Lives of the Prophets*
Lost Tr.	*The Lost Tribes*
3 Macc.	*3 Maccabees*
4 Macc.	*4 Maccabees*
5 Macc.	*5 Maccabees*
Mart. Ascen. Isa.	*Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah*
Mart. Isa.	*Mart. Ascen. Isa. 1-5*
Odes Sol.	*Odes of Solomon*
Ph. E. Poet	*Philo the Epic Poet*
Pr. Jac.	*Prayer of Jacob*
Pr. Man.	*Prayer of Manasseh*
Pr. Mos.	*Prayer of Moses*
Ps.-Eup.	Pseudo-Eupolemus
Ps.-Hec.	Pseudo-Hecataeus
Ps.-Orph.	Pseudo-Orpheus

Ps.-Phoc.	Pseudo-Phocylides
Pss. Sol.	*Psalms of Solomon*
Ques. Ezra	*Questions of Ezra*
Rev. Ezra	*Revelation of Ezra*
Sib. Or.	*Sibylline Oracles*
Syr. Men.	*Sentences of the Syriac Menander*
T. 12 Patr.	*Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*
T.Ash	*Testament of Asher*
T. Benj.	*Testament of Benjamin*
T. Dan	*Testament of Dan*
T. Gad	*Testament of Gad*
T. Iss.	*Testament of Issachar*
T. Jos.	*Testament of Joseph*
T. Jud.	*Testament of Judah*
T. Levi	*Testament of Levi*
T. Naph.	*Testament of Naphtali*
T. Reu.	*Testament of Reuben*
T. Sim.	*Testament of Simeon*
T. Zeb.	*Testament of Zebulun*
T. 3 Pat.	*Testaments of the Three Patriarchs*
T. Ab.	*Testament of Abraham*
T. Isaac	*Testament of Isaac*
T. Jac.	*Testament of Jacob*
T. Adam	*Testament of Adam*
T. Hez.	*Testament of Hezekiah (Mart. Ascen. Isa.* 3.13-4.22)
T. Job	*Testament of Job*
T. Mos.	*Testament of Moses*
T. Sol.	*Testament of Solomon*
Theod.	Theodotus, *On the Jews*
Treat. Shem.	*Treatise of Shem*
Vis. Ezra	*Visions of Ezra*

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

1Qap Gen^{ar}	Genesis Apocryphon
1QH^{a}	*Hodayot*^{a} or *Thanksgiving Hymns*^{a}
1QIsa^{a}	Isaiah^{a}
1QIsa^{b}	Isaiah^{b}
1QM	*Milḥamah* or *War Scroll*
1QpHab	*Pesher Habakkuk*
1QS	*Serek Hayaḥad* or *Rule of the Community*
CD	Cairo Genizah copy of the *Damascus Document*
11QMelch	*Melchizedek*

Other scrolls referred to principally numerically (rather than by name) follow the sigla found in García, Martínez, F. and Tigchelaar, E. J. C. (1997-1998) *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (2 vols)*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.

PHILO

Abr.	*De Abrahamo*
Aet.	*De aeternitate mundi*
Agr.	*De agricultura*
Anim.	*De animalibus*
Cher.	*De cherubim*
Conf.	*De confusione linguarum*
Congr.	*De congress eruditionis gratia*
Contempl.	*De vita contemplative*
Decal.	*De decalogo*
Deo	*De Deo*
Det.	*Quod deterius potiori insidari soleat*
Deus	*Quod Deus sit immutabilis*
Ebr.	*De ebrietate*
Exsecr.	*De exsecrationibus*
Flacc.	*In Flaccum*
Fug.	*De fuga et inventione*
Gig.	*De gigantibus*
Her.	*Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*
Hypth.	*Hypothetica*
Ios.	*De Iosepho*
Leg.	*Legum allegorae*
Legat.	*Legatio ad Gaium*
Migr.	*De migratione Abrahami*
Mos. 1,2	*De vita Mosis* I, II
Mut.	*De mutatione nominum*
Opif.	*De opifício mundi*
Plant.	*De plantatione*
Post.	*De posteritate Caini*
Praem.	*De praemiis et poenis*
Prob.	*Quod omnis probus liber sit*
Prov. 1,2	*De providentia* I, II
QE 1,2	*Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum* I, II
QG 1,2,3,4	*Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin* I, II, III, IV
Sacr.	*De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*
Sobr.	*De sobrietate*
Somn. 1,2	*De somniis* I, II
Spec. 1,2,3,4	*De specialibus legibus* I, II, III, IV
Virt.	*De virtiutibus*

JOSEPHUS

Ant.	*Jewish Antiquities*
J.W.	*Jewish War*
Ag. Ap.	*Against Apion*
Life	*The Life*

ʿAbod. Zar.	*ʿAbodah Zarah*
ʾAbot	*ʾAbot*
ʿArak.	*ʿArakin*
B. Bat.	*Baba Batra*
B. Qam.	*Baba Qamma*
Bek	*Bekorot*
Ber.	*Berakot*
Beṣah	*Beṣah (= Yom Ṭob)*
Bik.	*Bikkurim*
ʿEd.	*ʿEduyyot*
ʿErub.	*ʿErubin*
Giṭ.	*Giṭṭin*
Ḥag.	*Ḥagigah*
Hor.	*Horayot*
Ḥul.	*Ḥullin*
Ker.	*Keritot*
Ketub.	*Ketubbot*
Maʿaś.	*Maʿaśerot*
Maʿaś. Š.	*Maʿaśer Šeni*
Mak.	*Makkot*
Meg.	*Megillah*
Meʿil.	*Meʿilah*
Menaḥ.	*Menaḥot*
Mid.	*Middot*
Moʿed	*Moʿed*
Moʿed Qaṭ.	*Moʿed Qaṭan*
Naš.	*Našir*
Ned.	*Nedarim*
Neg.	*Negaʿim*
Nid.	*Niddah*
ʾOhal.	*ʾOhalot*
Parah	*Parah*
Peʾah	*Peʾah*
Pesaḥ.	*Pesaḥim*
Qidd.	*Qiddušin*
Roš Haš.	*Roš Haššanah*
Šabb.	*Šabbat*
Sanh.	*Sanhedrin*
Šeb.	*Šebiʿit*
Šebu.	*Šebuʿot*
Šeqal.	*Šeqalim*
Soṭah	*Soṭah*
Sukkah	*Sukkah*
Taʿan.	*Taʿanit*
Tamid	*Tamid*
Ṭehar.	*Ṭeharot*
Ter.	*Terumot*
Yebam.	*Yebamot*

Yoma	*Yoma (= Kippurim)*
Zabim	*Zabim*
Zebaḥ.	*Zebaḥim*
Zera.	*Zeraʿim*

TARGUMIC TEXTS

Frg. Tg.	*Fragmentary Targum*
Sam. Tg.	*Samaritan Targum*
Tg. Esth. I, II	*First or Second Targum of Esther*
Tg. Isa.	*Targum Isaiah*
Tg. Job	*Targum Job*
Tg. Ket.	*Targum of the Writings*
Tg. Neb.	*Targum of the Prophets*
Tg. Neof.	*Targum Neofiti*
Tg. Onq.	*Targum Onqelos*
Tg. Ps.-J.	*Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*
Tg. Yer. I	*Targum Yerušalmi I*
Tg. Yer. II	*Targum Yerušalmi II*
Yem. Tg.	*Yemenite Targum*

OTHER RABBINIC WORKS CITED IN DISSERTATION

Pirqe R. El.	*Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer Rab.*
Tanḥ.	*Tanḥuma (on Leviticus)*

SECONDARY SOURCES: MAJOR REFERENCE WORKS, JOURNALS, BIBLE VERSIONS AND SERIES

ANET	Pritchard, J. B. (1969) *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd. edition, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
ANRW	Temporini, H. and Haase, W. (1972-) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neuren Forschung.*
BAGD	Danker, F. W. (2000) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature:* 3rd. edition, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
BAGL	*Biblical and Ancient Greek Linguistics*
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BDB	Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R. and Briggs, C. A. (1907) *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BibRes	*Biblical Research*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
CBQ	*Catholic Bible Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CurBS	*Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*

DDD	Van der Toorn, Karel, Becking, Bob and Van der Horst, P. W. (1999) *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
HeyJ	*Heythrop Journal*
HR	*History of Religions*
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testamentum
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
Int	*Interpretation*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theology Society*
JPT	*Journal of Pentecostal Theology*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods*
JSHJ	*Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTC	*Journal for Theology and the Church*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KTU	Dietrich, M, Loretz, O. and Sanmartín (1976) *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit. Teil 1: Transkription*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., Scott R. and Jones, H. S. (1996) *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th. edition with rev. supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
RB	*Revue biblique*
RBL	*Review of Biblical Literature*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RTR	*Reformed Theological Review*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertations Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SJR	*Scottish Journal of Religion*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
ST	*Studia Theologica*
TDNT	Kittel, G. and Friedrich G. (1964 – 1976) *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (10 vols.) Grand Rapids.
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries

TWOT	Harris, R. L., Archer, G. L. (2 vols) (1980) *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, Chicago.
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testamentum
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

ANE	Ancient Near East
BCE	Before the Common Era
CE	Common Era
DW	Divine Warrior
HDWT	Hebrew Divine Warrior Traditions