

Segment Survey: Mark 2:1–3:6

1. Main Units and Subunits 2.17

2:1	2:12	2:13	2:17	2:18	2:22	2:23	2:27	3:1	3:6
Paralytic forgiven; Teachers grumble within		Sinful eating: Pharisee questions disciples		No fasting; People question Jesus		Disciples eat: Pharisees confront Jesus		Jesus heals; Pharisees plot murder	

- I made my divisions based upon readily identifiable separate events within the narrative.

2. Primary Structures

A. *RECURRENCE of CAUSATION with INTERROGATION*

Cause	→	Effect / Question	→	Answer
2:1-5 J. forgives	2:6-7	scribes grumble / Why?	2:8-12	J. heals
2:13-15 J eats w/sinners	2:16	teachers question disciples / Why?	2:17	J responds
2:18a J's disciples fast	2:18b	people question Jesus? / Why?	2:19-22	J responds
2:23 Disciples eat grain	2:24	Pharisees confront J / Why?	2:25-28	J responds
3:1-4 accusers present	3:5	J responds to their hard heart by healing	3:6	Phar/Herods plot murder

Evidence for Interrogation (see Structure B below for more on Interrogation)

In each primary case except the last, the Effect involves a Question to which J responds

- 2:6 Why does he blaspheme by claiming God's prerogative to forgive sins?
- 2:16 Why does he eat with, of all people, *tax collectors* and other such sinners?
- 2:18 Why don't your disciples behave appropriately and fast?
- 2:24 Why are your disciples doing what is not allowed on Sabbath?
- 3:4 *J questions Pharisees as part of the Cause. He responds to their response (which reveals hardened hearts). This differs from earlier pattern, though it still involves a question as part of the Effect*

Investigative questions Recurring Causation

What are the main elements of each cause? (ID) Each effect? (ID)

What does each of these elements mean? (Def)

Are these causations related to one another in any way? If so, how are they related? (Def)

How do these particular effects flow from the causes? (means)

How do the causes lead to the effects? (means)

Why does Mark use causation? (reasons)

Why does he use it repeatedly? (reasons)

What are the full implications of these repeated causations? (implications)

(Note that in this set of questions, I develop a more detailed set than the basic ones, but all questions are still focused on the structure itself)

Investigative Questions for Recurring Interrogation

What are the key questions in each episode? (ID)

What does each question mean? (Def)

What are the key elements in the answer/response to each question (ID)?

What does each element of the answers/responses mean? (Def)

Who asks the question in each episode and to whom is the question addressed? (Def)

Are the recurring questions related in any way? If so, what is the meaning of this/these relationships? (ID/Def)

What is the significance of the varied pattern of interrogation in the last episode, 3:1-6, in relation to the other episodes? (Def)

How do the questions illuminate the answers/responses to them? (means)

How do the answers/responses illuminate the questions? (means)

Why does the author use these recurring interrogation? (reasons)

What are the full implications of the answers to these questions? (implications)

B. RECURRENCE of CONTRAST within RECURRING QUESTION/ANSWER

Each question asked of Jesus, as well as the question asked by Jesus (3:4), point to a misunderstanding of who Jesus is and what he represents. Jesus' response in each case, whether in the form of a question or not, reveals the truth about him. *Thus, this Question & Answer movement works within the Recurrence of Recurring Causation cited above.*

Mistaken perception by leaders of Jesus	vs.	truth about Jesus
Questions		Answers
2:6-7		2:8-11
2:16		2:17
2:18		2:19-22
2:24		2:25-28
3:4 (Jesus interrogates inquisitors)		3:5 (implied)

What are the elements of each questions? Of each answer? (ID)

What does each element mean? (Def)

What are the elements of the contrast in each case and what does each mean? (ID/Def)

Are these recurring questions and answers related? If so, how are they related? (Def)

Are the recurring contrasts related? If so, how are they related? (Def)

How do the answers flow from the questions? (means)

How do the questions lead to these answers? (means)

How do the differences between the contrasted elements illuminate one another? (means) Why does the author use question/answer with contrast in this section? Why repeatedly? (reasons)

What are the full implications of the answers to these questions? (implications)

C. CLIMAX OF OPPOSITION TO JESUS (THIS IS DISTINCTIVE; BUT IS IT IMPORTANT?)

2:6ff.	Questions of Jesus <i>unspoken</i>	considering going after Jesus
2:16	Disciples approached and questioned;	going after J actively, but indirectly
2:18	Jesus himself questioned;	going after J actively and directly, but mildly
2:24	Jesus rebuked	going after J actively and directly, but confrontationally
3:2	Malice present	going after J actively and directly, with evil intent
3:6	Opponents plot to kill Jesus	going after J actively and directly, with intent to kill

What are the element(s) of the climactic movement? (ID)

What does each element in the climactic movement mean? (Def)

How do these element(s) build from lesser to greater to greatest? (means)

Why does Mark use this climactic movement? (reasons)

What are the full implications of this climax? (implications)

D. CHIASM WITH CONTRAST

In this case the focal point of the chiasm concerns a contrast between old and new, a contrast that interprets the conflict present in each of the episodes of the segment. The steps of the chiasm form around healing (frame 2:1-12/3:1-6), eating (2:13-17/2:23-27), and the focal point of eating where the contrast between old and new is explicit.

A 2:1-12 *healing* /forgiveness of sins of paralytic

B 2:13-17 **eating** with sinners/call of Levi

C 2:18-22 CONTRAST of old and new wineskins

B¹ 2:23-27 **eating** on Sabbath

A¹ 3:1-6 *healing* of man with withered hand on Sabbath

What are the elements of the chiastic movement (ID) and what does each mean (Def)?

Are there differences between the formal parallel elements of the chiasm (ID) and, if so, what does each of these differences mean (Def)?

Are there similarities between the formal parallel elements of the chiasm (ID) and, if so, what does each of these similarities mean (Def)?

How does the central element (2:18-22) illuminate the other elements of the chiasm (2:1-12, 3:1-6; 2:13-17, 23-27)? (means)

How do the framing elements (2:1-12, 3:1-6; 2:13-17, 23-27) illuminate the central element (2:18-22) of the chiasm? (means)

Why does Mark use this particular chiastic structure? (reasons)

What are the full implications of this chiasm? (implications)

3. Strategic Areas

- a. 2:7 an initial clear statement of misperception of Jesus at the heart of the *contrast* in this segment
- b. 3:4-6 Key statement *contrasting* understandings of Jesus, the reason for that misunderstanding exposed through J's *question* posed to the Pharisees, and the *climactic response* of opposition to Jesus.

4. Additional (selected only) observations

- This segment is marked by a growing tension (unlike the atmosphere in the episodes of 1:21-45) between Jesus and scribes (2:6), Pharisees (2:16, 18, 24; 3:6) and (secondarily) Herodians (3:6).
- This tension/conflict is foreshadowed with earlier conflict in 1:13 (the earliest statement of opposition) and 1:22 where J's teaching is contrasted with that of the scribes.
- issue of authority central to this section (cf. 1:22, 27); *explicit* examples only include:
 - 2:7-12 center on who has the authority to forgive sin
 - 2:14 J tells L to follow; L follows
 - 2:27 culminating controversy over Sabbath; Son of Man is Lord of Sabbath
- 3rd story of J calling disciples in 2:14 (cf. 1:16-18, 1:19-20)
 - Levi's occupation different than previous called ones, a tax collector
 - calling a tax collector different than calling fishermen; could put J in danger with fellow Jews
 - Levi's also called while in the process of work
 - Levi's response like that of Simon and Andrew, James and John: L simply gets up and follows
 - "following" repeated again, in connection with sinners/tax collectors in v. 15,
 - the couplet, sinners/tax collectors, also repeated (15, 16 [2x], 17 [sinners only])
- the "heart" mentioned 3x here
 - 2:6, 9 scribes seem to be doubting J, asking questions "in their hearts" (διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν)
 - 3:5 J grieved at the Pharisees (3:6) hardness of heart (συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν)

5. Interaction with Secondary Sources

Marcus, Joel. *Mark 1-8*. AB 27. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

1. Marcus notes the repeated questions in 2:7, 16, 18, 24; in 3:1-6 he says a question is implied but not stated 212
2. J silences he opponents with questions or miracles each time (212 up to this point).
3. J's response to their questions constitutes the central point of each scene 213
4. I agree with Marcus as far as he goes. But I do not think he sees all the parallels here, parallels better understood in terms of the recurring cause-effect that I note above. He is right on target, however, about the role of the questions in highlighting central issues that allow Jesus to respond.
5. Marcus also sees *inclusio* (though he does not use that name) in 2:1-12 and 3:1-6. Each contains
 - a. A miracle
 - b. J perceives opponents unstated intentions
 - c. J interrupts his miracle to respond (213 so far)
 - d. J speaks to the sufferer in near identical terms (i.e. "Get up") 214
6. Marcus see somewhat of a chiasm with the same set of components that I do. But he doesn't think 2:13-17 and 2:23-28 truly correspond, thus make this segment a true chiasm. I present my evidence for a chiasm above, seeing enough parallels to warrant the seeing a true chiasm here. 214
7. Marcus does agree that 2:18-22 constitutes the unifying theme of the segment, the contrast between new and old 214
8. On the whole, Marcus and Miller see the segment in similar terms. I think my recurring cause-effect with interrogation better captures the movement of thought throughout. I also see a distinctive climactic movement in the opposition to Jesus, one Marcus does not identify.

Stein, Robert. *Mark*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

1. Stein doesn't deal with the dynamics of cause-effect apparent in the segment. He sees the recurring questions as significant since each leads to an important Christological statement. 112-113 This, Stein argues, contributes to the key theme for Mark's gospel 113
2. Stein also notes the presence of an *inclusio* involving 2:1-12 and 3:1-6. Like Marcus, he sees the following parallels
 - a. similar introductions 2:1; 3:1
 - b. J perceives unspoken objections 2:8; 3:2, 4
 - c. J tells the sick person to "rise" 2:9; 3:3
 - d. J heals a paralytic 2:10; 3:1, 3
 - e. J speaks to the paralytic 2:10; 3:3 all 113

3. But Stein makes no claims about how this feature functions other than to give the segment “unity.” I see a clear *inclusio*, I need to see more about how it illuminates the segment.
4. Stein right highlights that this section focuses more on J’s teaching rather than on J’s healing
4. In all, Stein notes some important features though he doesn’t explore their significance in any meaningful manner. Maybe this will come in his detailed comments on each individual episode. But its not in his introduction.