William Rossell

NT(IBS)511 Mark

Module 4 Assignment

Segment Survey (Mark 2:1-3:6)

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

**I. Major Divisions**

1. Forgiving, Healing, Challenging Tradition *[2:1-2:12]*

-- Specifies Capernaum as setting (in the home)

-- Two main events creating subdivisions

a. 2:1-2:5; Healing in the Home

b. 2:6-2:12; Contesting the Teachers

2. Calling Sinners; Inquiry on Fasting *[2.13-2:22]*

-- Change of setting (out by the lake/at Levi’s house)

--Again two notable occurrences, leading one to believe that this occurred during the single meal.

a. 2:13-2:17; Eating with Levi and Others

b. 2:18-2:22; Challenged on Fasting

3. Sabbath in the Grain Field *[2:23-2:28]*

--Change in time indicated by “one Sabbath”

--Setting changes to a grain field

--One notable interaction takes place before the next change of setting

4. Sabbath Healing in the Synagogue *[3:1-3:6]*

--Time changes though only specified “another time” indicating that this event place on a different Sabbath

--Setting is now placed in the synagogue

--Two events take place, but these events are concurrent rather than consecutive as seen in the similar situation of 2:1-2:12. Jesus heals while challenging the tradition of the Pharisees

**II. Primary Structures and Interpretive Questions**

Primary Structure 1: Recurrence

*Repetition of elements wherein there is a pattern of Christ in action, Christ being challenged, Christ responding to the challenge/challenger*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Christ Does** | **Christ Challenged** | **Christ Responds** |
| 2:5 “…sins are forgiven.” | 2:6-7 “Who can forgive…” | 2:8-11 “he said to them…” |
| 2:15 “having dinner at Levi’s” | 2:16 “Why does he…with sinners” | 2:17 “Jesus said to them…” |
| 2:15 “having dinner at Levi’s” | 2:18 “How is it…but you are not” | 2:19-22 “Jesus answered…” |
| 2:23 “…picked some heads…” | 2:24 “Why are they doing…” | 2:25-27 “He answered…” |

What are the elements or ideas that are recurring in this segment? (Identification)

What message are these recurrences conveying? Are they always the same? (Definition)

Are any recurrences more/less significant than others? (Definition)

Why does the author choose to use these ideas/events in succession? (Reason)

What disparity is evident between the occurrences? What might these differences be highlighting? (Mode)

What does this series of repetitions imply for the meaning of the segment as a whole? (Implication)

Primary Structure 2: Comparison

**Comparison 1:**

*The healthy and the sick The righteous and the sinners*

2:17a 2:17b

**Comparison 2:**

*Christ reaping grain of the Sabbath David taking bread from the house of God*

2:23 2:25-26

What are the elements being compared in each occurrence? (Identification)

In what ways are the corresponding elements similar? In what ways do they differ? (Definition)

Is one comparison more/less significant to the meaning of the segment as a whole? (Definition)

Why does the author employ this structure? What features or meanings are highlighted by these comparisons? (Reason)

How do these corresponding elements interact? (Mode)

What is the full array of implication introduced by the presence of these comparisons? (Implication)

Primary Structure 3: Interrogation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Question | Answer/Solution |
| **Interrogation 1** | 2:8-9; Why…Which” | 2:10-11; “But I want…take your mat and go home” |
| **Interrogation 2** | 3:4; “Which is…” | 3:5; “his hand was … healed” |

What inquiries are being made for each interrogation? (Identification)

What do they mean? (Definition)

What answers/responses are delivered for each interrogation? (Identification)

What do they mean? (Definition)

Is any set of interrogations more/less significant to the segment as a whole? (Definition)

How do the questions and the answers/responses interact with one another? (Mode)

What information is highlighted by the use of this structure? (Reason)

What are the full range of implications made by these pairs of inquiries and responses? (Implication)

Primary Structure 4: Substantiation

*Effect:*

2:10 Christ reveals to those in attendance his true authority.

*Cause:*

2:11-12 Christ heals the paralytic to show that he has ability and authority far beyond that of this world.

What are the elements of effect present in the segment? (Identification)

What does each of these mean? (Definition)

What are the elements of causality present in this segment? (Identification)

What does each of these mean? (Definition)

How do these elements of effect and elements of cause interact? How does one transition to the other? (Mode)

What information is highlighted or reveal through the use of this relationship? (Reason)

What implications are made for the meaning of the segment as a whole by the presence of this structure? (Implication)

**III. Strategic Areas**

2:8-12 Displays key elements of *interrogation* and *substantiation.*

1:42-45 Displays an example of the recurring pattern of interaction between Jesus and other, as well as key elements of the *comparisons* structure.

**IV. Additional Observations**

1. v. 10 introduces the title “Son of Man” to Christ, which is repeated in v. 28. I considered citing this as a instance of the inclusio structure, but decided against it due to it not bookending the segment.

2. v. 19-22 Jesus uses parable language to address the challenges of the people on his disciples’ practices. This language suggests that Christ was aware of what was to come, and also hints at allowing the old tradition to be replaced with a new one. Interesting as he seems to have paid homage to the old tradition in the earlier text, i.e. 1:44.

3. v. 8 Upon being challenged by the Pharisees about his forgiving of the paralyzed man, Christ alludes to the notion that it is easier for him to forgive sins than to heal infirmities. Could this have been used simply as a jab at the Pharisees and to show the onlookers that he did have authority to do these things, or is there more literal connotations to this?

4. 2:1 indicates that Jesus had “come home” when returning to Capernaum. Does this meaning that he had invested in property, or was staying with John and James, or Simon, or Andrew? This also may indicate that he was welcomed in by the people as the people were seemingly the ones making the case that Capernaum had become Christ’s home, indicating a community welcoming and belonging of Christ.

5. The chiasm structure was consider in view of v. 10-12, but was instead replaced with substantiation. The original observation was that v. 10 and v. 11 present a pattern of effect—cause, followed by a pattern of cause—effect in v. 12. The reversal of order led me to believe chiasm was appropriate, however the ultimate determination was that the desired effect was define, followed by the cause being deliver, indicating the substantiation structure, and all that follow was simply for the purpose of verification.

**V. Interaction With Secondary Sources**

Donahue, J. R. (2002). *The Gospel of Mark*. (D. J. Harrington, Ed.) (Vol. 2). Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press. p. 92-118

* Donahue finds that the segment is best divided into 5 main sections, these being 2:1-12, 2:13-17, 2:18-22, 2:23-28, and 3:1-6.
  + I can see the reasoning behind his decision, as his addition main division is exactly in line with that of my subdivisions in Major Division 2.
* p. 93, Donahue brings notice to the recurring pattern of opposition that is cited in Primary Structure 1.
* p. 98, Donahue revisits this pattern stating that it is the standard pattern of a “controversy story.”
  + I find that our consensus brings legitimacy to this present pattern and bodes well for my confidence in selecting it to be a primary structure.
* p. 99, Donahue notes the “Son of Man” sayings as “crucial for interpretation.”
  + Perhaps, I may have been too quick to look past these as a potential primary structure.
* p. 105, Donahue states that the geographical location of the account in 2:18-22 is unclear, but still asserts that it is a separate “controversy story” altogether.
  + I, again, see why Donahue feels this way, but my take is that the situation is better considered as a larger chunk of text, with interrelating features such as the potential of this happening of a single meal.
* p. 112, Donahue brings attention to the point of comparison between the action of Christ in the grain field and the actions of David in the “house of God”/shrine of Nob. He insinuates that the Markan Jesus’ interpretation of the events surrounding David and the comparison of these two things is fast and loose to say the least.
  + I find this to be a fair point, as one of the results that can be observed in instances like these, as even Donahue asserts, is confusion on the connection of the comparison to the purpose of Sabbath. This has been the experience of many Christians during study, and as such, if it is present here, then Donahue’s point may hold water.
* p. 113, Donahue does assert that the use of the “Son of Man” phrase is purposeful, as it “constitutes the theological apex of the periscope,” further stating that these “echo and carry forward the theme of authority.”
  + I am led to believe that I could have defended the use of the inclusion structure, as clearly I am not the only person to have ever seen it, but I will not in this survey as I did not come to the conclusion based solely on primary sources.

Stein, R. H. (2008). *Mark*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic. p. 113-157

* Stein also finds this segment to be best divided into 5 main sections exactly mirroring those of Donahue above.
  + Is this a traditional viewing of the scriptures, or have I missed a beat?
* p. 122, Stein likewise finds that the purpose of Mark’s passage is to reveal Christ as the Son of God and places great importance on the “Son of Man” title.
* p. 124, Stein addresses the second instance of comparison that I have cited and seeks to explain the reason Mark chose to use it.
  + I find that Stein is well justified in his confident assertion and explanation of the literary structure, as he points out the shift in terminology in order to support the parallelism used in the comparison language itself, that I had not previously noticed.
* p. 134, Stein justifies his division of the scripture by citing the same lack of geographical information as mentioned in this survey and by Donahue, but comes to the opposing position from myself.
  + I do not believe that this necessitates a definitive answer, as the location does not bare on the subject matter, so we can disagree and the purpose and message will remain the same.
* p. 142-151, Stein makes note of possible discrepancies in the Biblical text regarding the chronology of 2:23-28, but does not mention anything about the potential ‘inadequacy’ of the comparison as insinuated by Donahue.