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Module 13 Final Assignment

Segment Survey (Mark 12:1-12)

\*\*\*Primary Source was a non-study Bible (NIV)

**I. Major Divisions**

1. Introduction to the Parable *[12:1]*

-- Mark explains the scene external to the parable; Jesus is speaking/teaching

-- Jesus explains the scene inside of the parable; introducing venue and actors

* Area of Interest: Vineyard
* Actors:
  + Unnamed Man (Owner of the Vineyard)
  + Farmers (Tenants)

-- Time not specified within the parable; simple introductory statement

Notable events:

* Man plants, equips, and fortifies a vineyard
* Man rents out the vineyard and leaves it to the care of others—

2. Sending of the Servant *[12:2 –5]*

-- Jesus continues the parable in the temple courts

-- Jesus indicates that within the parable, time has passed; it is now harvest

-- The man sends many servants to collect the debt of the farmers

-- Notable events and themes:

* Servant 1 sent: Beaten and released (v.2,3)
* Servant 2 sent: Beaten and humiliate (“struck/treated shamefully”) (v.4)
* Servant 3 sent: Killed (v.5)
* An unspecified number of servants are sent to collect the debt of the tenants, each meeting the same fate – some combination of brutalization, humiliation, and killing (v.5)

3. Sending of the Son *[12:6–8]*

-- External to the parable, Jesus is continuing to speak

-- Jesus implies that within the parable, more time has passed as the owner has continued to send servants until the point that he has none left, but a son

-- Notable events and themes:

* The son is set apart from the servant, given the additional title of “whom he loves” (v.6)
* The man declares the authority of his son in stating “they will respect my son.” (v.6)
* Farmers continue their pattern of killing all those sent to collect on the debt (v.8)
* Farmers indicate special motivation for this act of violence, believing that if the son is to die, they will (for some reason) inherit the vineyard to themselves (v.7)

4. Conclusion of Parable; Opposition’s Response *[12:9 – 12]*

-- Jesus concludes the parable with a hypothetical question and answer, followed by a scriptural reference/teaching

-- Mark concludes the scene external to the parable by presenting the reader with the response of the chief priest and others.

-- Notable events and themes:

* Jesus poses the question about what the owner of the vineyard’s next action would be, and follows promptly with an answer (v.9)
* Jesus then recites a Scriptural passage, challenging the listeners as to whether they understand or not (worded as “Haven’t you read this…”) (v.10,11)
* Chief priests and co. choose not the rebut and leave the scene, even though they feel as though Jesus has spoken against them (v.12)
* Mark elaborates that the chief priest and co. are not acting for fear of the crowd around them, not fear of Jesus’ authority (v.12)

**II. Primary Structures and Interpretive Questions**

Primary Structure 1: Recurrence with Comparison and Contrast

*Recurring Theme: Persons sent to collect the debt of the Tenants*

*Contrast (Red): The perception of the vineyard owner*

*Comparison (Blue): Fate at the hands of the Tenants/Farmers*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Person(s) Sent*** | ***Vineyard Owner’s Perception*** | ***Farmer’s Reaction; Eventual Fate*** |
| *Servant 1* | Unspecified | *Beaten and sent back (3)* |
| *Servant 2* | Unspecified | *Struck and treated “shamefully”/belittled (4)* |
| *Servant 3* | Unspecified | *Killed by farmers (5a)* |
| *“Many” Servants* | Unspecified | *Beaten and/or killed (5b)* |
| *The son* | Distinguished as: “loved”  Given authority as:  “They will respect…” (6) | *Killed by farmers (8)* |

What are each of the elements of comparison recurring in this segment? (Identification)

What do each of them mean? (Definition)

Is any comparison stronger or weaker than the others? More significant? (Definition)

What are each of the elements of contrast recurring in this segment? (Identification)

What do each of them mean? (Definition)

How do these comparisons/contrasts interact? How do they enlighten or illumine one another throughout the segment as a whole? (Mode)

Why has the Jesus chosen to use these comparisons/contrast in his parable? Why has Mark presented this parable with the structure present? Are each of the comparisons/contrasts for the same purpose? (Reason)

What is the full list of implications made by the presence of this structure within the segment? What is the additional meaning has been added by the use of the structure? (Implication)

Primary Structure 2: Bracketing Causation

*Cause: Jesus speaks against the chief priests and co. through the use of a parable*

*12:1a “Jesus…began to speak…in parables”*

*Effect: Tensions rise further between Jesus and his opposition*

*12:12 “The…priests…looked for a way to arrest him because…he had spoke the parable against them.”*

What is the element of cause present in this segment? (Identification)

What does it mean? (Definition)

What is the resulting effect of the cause in this segment? (Identification)

What does it mean? (Definition)

How does the cause lead to the effect in this segment; what are the connecting links? How does the causation interact with the rest of the segment? (Mode)

Why has Mark chosen to use this structure? Why does Mark present the structure in the form that it is presented? (Reason)

What is highlighted by the presence of the cause and effect pattern present? (Reason)

What implications are made by this use of the structure? (Implication)

Primary Structure 3: Interrogation

*Question: Jesus asks his listeners a final rhetorical question about what the owner of the vineyard’s reaction would be?*

*12:9a “What then will the owner… do?”*

*Answer: Jesus informs the listener immediately as to what the owner of the vineyard’s response would be.*

*12:9b “He will come…kill…and give the vineyard to others.”*

What is the questioning element of the interrogation? (Identification)

What does it mean? What prompted the question, and where does it lead? (Definition)

How does the question reflect on the information leading to it? How does it interact with the segment as a whole? (Mode)

Why does the author choose to present this question? Does it highlight specific information within the text? If so, what information? (Reason)

What is the answering element of the interrogation? (Identification)

What does it mean? (Definition)

How does the answer interact with the question? What information brought to the forefront through it? (Mode)

How does the connected interrogation interact with the segment as a whole? (Mode)

Why has the author chosen to use the structure as it is present? What meaning is added to or illuminate within text because of this structure’s presence?

What does the presence of the interrogation imply for the meaning of the segment as a whole? (Implication)

**III. Strategic Areas**

12:8 Shows an instance of the *Recurrence* of fate meeting those sent to collect

the debt.

12:9 Present the whole of the *Interrogation* the concludes the parable

12:12 Present the key element of effect within the *Causation*, showing the

priests response to the parable and tension between them and

Jesus.

*~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~*

**IV. Additional Observations**

1. The term “vineyard” appears 6 times throughout the 12 verses (v. 1*(2)*, 2, 8, 9 *(2)*).

* Is there a distinct purpose for Jesus using this term for the setting?
* What about “vineyard” was important or substantial to the culture of the day?
* Does this lean on other scriptural imagery?

**V. Interaction with Secondary Sources**

Donahue, J. R. (2002). *The Gospel of Mark*. (D. J. Harrington, Ed.) (Vol. 2). Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press. p. 383-453 (p. 384-423)

* In addressing the division of the text into major and minor blocks, there is good agreement between Donahue’s perception and my own. However, there are some notable discrepancies. For instance, take verse 15:20: I find the verse is best included with the text that follows as it is the first event that is directly related to the action of the crucifixion; Donahue however finds that the verse is best included with the text that precedes it as it contain information about the final act relating to his torment and public humiliation.
  + I do not see there being a clearly define right or wrong, best or worst, here. Certain the verse contains information making both patterns of division justifiably valid.
  + Other discrepancies between our divisions reflect similar features.
* p. 384-385 (Note 1 and 2), Donahue does diligent work here to expand on the characters and motivations for action in 14:1-2 that Mark only touches on.
  + In response to Additional Observation 1, I find that Donahue providing this information is a valuable asset for understanding the events to come, and even events prior. The priestly aristocracy is a confusing dynamic and is often hard to follow throughout the gospel narrative as the same titles will be given to character that actually serve in essentially differing roles.
  + By being given this further information, readers are better able to understand why events occurred in such a rushed fashion and why the priests feared public outcry and revolt.
* p. 385 (Note 3), Donahue notes the same feature of intercalation that I remarked on above in Additional Observation 1. For me, this confirms the presence of the structure.
  + Donahue further develops the role that Bethany plays in the final days of Jesus’ life, acting as his proverbial ‘home-base’ with its close proximity to Jerusalem.
  + Donahue also goes into great detail when observing the act of anointing and the many associated themes, however never presents evidence that this information is imperative to the interpretation of the segment as a whole, though it is certainly locally important.
  + This reinforces the notion that while the literary structure of *intercalation* is present, it is not used here as a primary structure within the segment.
* p. 389 (Note 11), Donahue connects the first and last components of the *intercalation* stating that the priests’ reactions (v. 11, *they were delighted*) and Judas’ search for a good opportunity (v. 11, *watched for an opportunity*) address the comments regarding the priests’ desires and hesitancy in v. 1-2.
* p. 393 (Note 16 and 17), p. 401-403 (Note 27 and 30), Donahue address each of the predictions that I have above cited as a *Recurring theme* in Primary Structure 3.
  + Donahue details that while each of these four events fall well under the label of prediction, they do not all serve the same purpose.
  + Donahue makes the claim that Prediction 1 above (14:13-16) is a further showing of Christ’s messianic authority before the disciples during his final days.
  + Donahue states that Prediction 2 above (14:27,50) is a prediction of fulfillment of prior prophecy, and not a statement made through Christ’s inherent authority. It is alleged that this would be more for informing the disciples that the prophecy of old is coming to fruition.
  + Prediction 3 above (14:30,68-71) is a response of Christ to Peter’s own oblivious nature. Donahue details the Greek used in indicated that through the use of a certain term (*eg­ō*), Peter is again adamant that Christ is incorrect in his assertion and is going so far as to take personal offense to such a claim. Christ then response using language that indicates not only that Peter would, but that ESPECIALLY Peter would. Donahue even then bring attention to the fact that while Christ is others would “fall away,” Peter crime is much greater in that he would “deny” Christ.
  + As for Prediction 4 above (14:17,44-46), Donahue’s response to this is that it falls more in line with the purposes of Prediction 2 in that it serves to remind and make the disciples aware that the old prophecy is being completed.
  + My only response to these is that I firmly believe the input would be valuable when review one’s own interpretation of the text. I have not yet done so, so to speak to the accuracy of or my agreement to Donahue’s statements can only be conjecture. However, I would say he make a very strong case.
* p. 416-417 (Note 51 and 52), Donahue address the young man in 14:51-52, reminding the reader that many scholars debate the identity or significance of this character to this day. Donahue offers his own various postulations for the purpose of the young mans presence.
  + Donahue claims that potentially the young man was a nearby neighbor noticing the ruckus stirred by the crowd, potentially he was representative of one of the disciples that had come with Jesus into the garden, maybe he was fully representative of the 8 disciples that may or may not remain at the entrance to Gethsemane, or perhaps he may have been representative of an angel. Donahue never offers strong argument to any one of these many possibilities, but remains objective on the question.
  + Donahue does, however, bring attention the state of dress and nakedness prescribed to the young man in fleeing the scene. Donahue makes these following assertions:
    - Nakedness in the Bible = shame
    - Nakedness in literature = bareness
    - The linen cloth is potential symbolic of the burial cloth used to cover Jesus
    - By the young man fleeing naked after being described as one who “was following Jesus,” Mark enlightens the reader to the fact that this was someone that had left all they had to follow Jesus, and again, lost all they had in deserting him, further stating that the naked state in which he fled symbolizes the shame on all those who depart from Jesus in this tumultuous time.
  + Though I cannot speak to the accuracy of Donahue’s postulations, as apparently neither can many scholars much more experienced than me, I do find that his response is valuable “food for thought” when examining this passage. Though his presumptions may not speak accurately to Mark’s original intentions, they are certainly useful in a modern sense of teaching, as they serve as a possible answer to the questions posed above in Additional Observation 5.
* p. 423 (Note 62), Donahue poses a point that I unfortunately did not catch. During his trial before the Sanhedrin, when asked if he is “the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One,” (14:61), Jesus’ response affirming his identity is the first occasion of the revealing of the so-called ‘Messianic secret.’ This is Christ’s first time to blatantly state that he is indeed the Christ, Donahue states this as the “suffering Messiah,” and Jesus here confirms all the allusions to his identity earlier and throughout Mark.

Stein, R. H. (2008). *Mark*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic. p. - (p.689-)

* p. 689, Stein makes clear that he believes the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin is ‘sandwiched’ between two references to Peter, rather than Peter’s denials being ‘sandwiched’ between two instances of trial.
  + Stein refers to Evans (1982) and Evans (2001) stating that this author makes argument against this being considered a ‘Markan sandwich’.
  + I find myself agreeing with Evans on this note, as I do **not** believe that Mark has intended the text to be read this way. Leaving my claim of a potential *inclusio* to the side for now, I feel that Mark taking the (assumed) backward step in time between 14:65 and 14:66 indicates the following text (14:66-72) to have good purpose to its own rite and is not allocated to the purpose of drawing attention to the passage regarding the trial before the Sanhedrin.
* p. 693, Stein draws attention to the Christological implications made by the recounting of Peter’s denial. Stein also uses this framework to draw contrast between Christ and Peter, the former standing courageously and well composed before the high Jewish authorities and the latter becoming unsettled and angry before a single, female servant.
  + I feel Stein draws good parallels here, and may go further in developing the idea of how one is to emulate the spirit of Christ.
  + I also think this is a good use of conclusion, and a valuable extrapolation. As Stein is using this passage not only to describe the events for historical purposes, nor even just to reaffirm Christ authority and wisdom, but that by comparing the two characters, Christ becomes the character model that all should aspire to be: brave, courageous, stoic, unafraid, faithful, etc.
* p. 702, Though Stein does not outright say that he believes any particular structure is here, he makes mention of the undeniable parallels between the trial of Jesus before the Sanhedrin and the trial of Jesus before Pilate. Stein points out the following:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Topic** | **Sanhedrin** | **Pilate** |
| *Silence* | 14:61a | 15:5 |
| *Question* | 14:61b | 15:2a |
| *Affirmation* | 14:62 | 15:2b |

* + This supports the belief that Mark may have intended for the two accounts to be mutually interpretive, speaking insight into one another. If this is the case, I feel that it only further cements my own assertions in Additional Observation 7.
* p. 696,703, Stein goes into depth on the historicity and historical accuracy of the character of Pontius Pilate, stating that the historical Pilate much like the Biblical Pilate was often swayed by political pressures stemming from the Jewish people and their opposition to the Roman occupation.
  + Being clear in making the statement that Pontius Pilate gave Jesus over to be crucified even after acknowledging Jesus’ own innocence, Stein explicitly provides his own interpretative insight by stating that “Jesus goes to his death not because of his being found guilty [of any crimes] but due to the “envy” of his enemies.
  + I agree with Stein in stating that these points are critically important for Mark reader’s to grasp, because though it may be an obvious assertion made through tradition, this is the indication given by Mark that Jesus is utterly innocent even while dying a sinner’s death.
* p. 705, Stein states the following: “It is true that the mocking of Jesus by the soldiers (15:16-20b) could be omitted and would not be missed, for 15:20b follows 15:15 smoothly…”
  + **I absolutely disagree with this assertion,** and my reasoning is that 15:16-20a are the records of fulfillment to the third Passion prediction delivered by Christ in 10:33-34. Without this piece of information, this prediction would be left “up in the air.”
  + I feel it is absolutely necessary that Mark speak to these points in order to ensure that any good and true information regarding the predictions from Jesus are always fulfilled as these serve as testaments to his authority and provide tokens of reality and authenticity to his Messiahship.
* p. 721, Stein notes that upon his death on the cross, Jesus’ identity has now been signified to all within creation. Through his ministry Christ’s identity was proclaimed time after time through various mean, such as: the Father bearing witness at the Baptism and Transfiguration, various demons in various accounts, Christ himself speaking to the Jewish authorities and disciples, but it is only here, when the Roman centurion speak of Jesus identity as the “Son of God,” that this true has ultimately been revealed also to a ‘large’ group of gentiles.
  + As a final note, I am glad to have read this piece. I had not previously noted that, but after having it brought to my attention, I find it difficult to discount in any way. It speaks even more weight on the act of completion through the means of the cross that at the moment of his death, Christ reveals himself to all.