

CHAPTER 6

LINGUISTIC IMPLICATIONS¹

1. The Syntax of 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel

In his 1989 monograph, *Syntax Criticism of Johannine Literature, the Catholic Epistles, and the Gospel Passion Accounts*, Martin analyzes the Greek style of the parallel narratives of the passion and resurrection in the four Gospels. He defines the accounts of the passion and resurrection as Mark 11:1-16:8, Matt 21:1-28:20, Luke 19:28-24:53, and John 12:1-21:25, respectively.²

Figure 11. Net Frequencies in Original Greek Documents of More Than 50 Lines

	No. of Lines	Original Greek							Translation Greek		
		17	16	15	11	10	9	4	-3	-4	-7
Plutarch – Selections	325		X								
Polybius – Bks I, II	192			X							
Epictetus – Bks III, IV	138	X									
Bks I, II	349						X				
Bks I, II, III, IV	487				X						

¹ Most of all, as for the linguistic evidence for the thesis of this study, same words that only occur in 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel might well be regarded as stronger proof. However, unfortunately, there remain few or no same words that are only used in them. Nevertheless, the syntactic correlation, the characteristic features of terminology, and the significant and frequent use of $\omega\acute{\iota}\eta$ for a simile (rhetoric) between them might also be viewed as possible linguistic evidence.

² Raymond A. Martin, *Syntax Criticism of Johannine Literature, the Catholic Epistles, and the Gospel Passion Accounts*, Studies in Bible and Early Christianity, vol. 18 (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1989), 43.

Josephus – Selections	215		X									
Papyri – Selections	630	X										
II Maccabees 2:13-6:31	495	X										
Philo – On Creation I-VIII	251						X					
Mark 11:1-16:8	447							X				
Matt 21:1-28:20	718									X		
Luke 19:28-24:53	524											X
John 12-21	732									X		

(Source: Martin, *Syntax Criticism of Johannine Literature, the Catholic Epistles, and the Gospel Passion Accounts*, 44 with modifications)

On the grounds of his syntactical analysis, Martin indicates that “somewhat surprising is the fact that the net frequencies of both Matthew’s and Luke’s accounts are much more Semitic, falling into clearly translation Greek area!”³ Martin’s observation naturally leads one to believe that the Greek style of the passion and resurrection account in Mark’s Gospel is closer to original Greek than those in the other Gospels.⁴ Subsequently, although the quality of 1 Peter’s Greek has been treated as a good Greek, nevertheless, as argued by Jobes, the author of 1 Peter is unlikely to have been a native speaker of Greek. In this light, it may well be said that there remains a notable correlation between the quality of Greek of the passion and resurrection account in Mark’s Gospel and that of 1 Peter as “a kind of passion document.”⁵

2. The Characteristic Features of Terminology

1 Peter seems to prefer the words of “sun(m)-composites” and “u`po(e)-composites” as its distinctive linguistic characteristic, considering that this vocabulary

³ *Ibid.*, 45. Donald H. Juel, *The Gospel of Mark*, Interpreting Biblical Texts (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), 35, notes that the Gospel of Mark “is written in simple Greek – not translation Greek.”

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ J. Ramsey Michaels, “St. Peter’s Passion: The Passion Narrative in 1 Peter,” *Word & World* 24 (2004): 388.

is uncommon in the NT.⁶ Some of these terms are *suntreco, ntw*n (1 Pet 4:4), *sumbai, nontoj* (1 Pet 4:12) (*u`perhfa, noij* (1 Pet 5:5), *u`pokri, seij* (1 Pet 2:1), and *u`pomenei/te* (1 Pet 2:20).⁷ Notably, these five words are also used in Mark 6:33, 10:32, 7:22, 12:15, and 13:13, respectively.

1 Peter uses the verb *pa, scw* and the noun *pa, qhma* with the most frequency among the NT. The word *pa, scw* is used forty times in the NT, twelve times in 1 Peter; while the term *pa, qhma* is used sixteen times, four times in 1 Peter.⁸ This characteristic of 1 Peter is significant in that it is a relatively brief writing among those of the NT. Michaels expresses a similar opinion when he comments that “the author is to some degree characterizing his epistle as a kind of passion document.”⁹

Likewise, the Gospel of Mark has been identified not only as the briefest Gospel, but possibly also as a “passion narrative with an extended introduction”¹⁰ according to Peter.¹¹ The wording of *pagei/n* in Mark 8:31 and that of *pa, qh|* in Mark 9:12 are used in describing the suffering of Christ. The suffering of Christ is repeatedly depicted in Mark 9:31 and 10:33-34 that are the vertical points in Mark’s account.

⁶ Elliott, *1 Peter*, 62.

⁷ See *Ibid.*, 57-58.

⁸ See *Ibid.*, 54, 61. *pa, scw* is used in 1 Pet 2:19, 20, 21, 23; 3:14, 17, 18; 4:1 (2 times), 15, 19; 5:10. *pa, qhma* is employed in 1:11; 4:13; 5:1, 9. See also Robert L. Webb, “The Petrine Epistles: Recent Developments and Trends,” in *The Face of New Testament Studies*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 382-83.

⁹ Michaels, “St. Peter’s Passion: The Passion Narrative in 1 Peter,” 388.

¹⁰ Martin Kähler, *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ*, trans. Carl E. Braaten (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), 80. For this issue, specifically see *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*, ed. Geert Van Oyen and Tom Shepherd, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 45 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006); *The Passion in Mark*, ed. Werner H. Kelber (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976). The latter was a landmark in the history of the research on the issue.

¹¹ Michaels, “St. Peter’s Passion: The Passion Narrative in 1 Peter,” 388. Michaels, *Ibid.*, 388, also insists that “while not narrative in the strict sense, 1 Peter could be thought of as Peter’s passion narrative in the sense that it purports to give Peter’s testimony to ‘the sufferings of the Christ’.”

In this light, there seems to remain a similarity of theology and thought, namely, the Christology of suffering, between 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel. Probably, however, this affinity might derive from Peter, not Mark, and Peter might have influenced Mark and have contributed to the theology and thought of Mark's Gospel (as Petrine Gospel). Peter was one of the pillar Apostles, and Mark was not only one of the co-workers of Peter, but also his son, albeit figuratively.

3. The Significant and Frequent Use of w^j

The comparative particle w^j occurs twenty seven times in 1 Peter. Considering its length, this is "the most frequent" employment in the New Testament.¹² In the case of Mark's Gospel, the particle w^j is used twenty two times. In view of rhetoric, the author of Mark's Gospel seems to favor a simile rather than a metaphor, by employing the comparative particle w^j . This characteristic use of the comparative particle w^j is also found in 1 Pet 1:19, 1:24, 2:5, and 3:6, by adding it to the citation of or the allusion to the OT (LXX).

3.1. The Characteristic Use of w^j in Mark's Gospel

The particle w^j is used *twice* in the parable of the seed growing section of Mark 4:26-29; *the account appears only in Mark's Gospel* among the four Gospels.

Mark 4:26-27

26 Kai. e;legen\ ou[twj
evsti.n h` basilei,a tou/
qeou/ w^j a;nqrwpoj ba,lh|
to.n spo,ron evpi. th/j
gh/j
27 kai. kaqeu,dh| kai.

26 And he said, "The kingdom of
God is as if a man should scatter
seed upon the ground,
27 and should sleep and rise night
and day, and the seed should sprout
and grow, he knows not how.

¹² See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 61-62.

evgei,rhtai nu,kta kai.
h`me,ran(kai. o` spo,roj
blasta/| kai. mhku,nhtai
w`j ouvki oi=den auvto,j

Even more surprising is the fact that the wording of h=san w`j pro,bata mh. e;conta poime,na (“they were like sheep without a shepherd”) in Mark 6:34 is *used only in Mark’s Gospel* among the parallel accounts of the miracle of the five loaves and the two fish in the four Gospels.¹³

Matt 14:14	Mark 6:34	Luke 9:11	John 6:2
kai. evxelqw.n ei=den polu.n o;clon kai. evsplugni,sqh evpV auvtoi/j kai. evqera,peusen tou.j avrrw,stouj auvtw/n	kai. evxelqw.n ei=den polu.n o;clon kai. evsplugni,sqh evpV auvtou,j(<u>o[ti</u> <u>h=san w`j</u> <u>pro,bata mh.</u> <u>e;conta</u> <u>poime,na</u> (kai. h;rxato dida,skein auvtou.j polla,Å	oi` de. o;cloi gno,ntej hvkolou,qhsan auvtw/ \ kai. avpodexa,menoj auvtou.j evla,lei auvtou/j peri. th/j basilei,aj tou/ qeou/(kai. tou.j crei,an e;contaj qerapei,aj iva/to	hvkolou,qei de. auvtw/ o;cloj polu,j(o[ti evqew,roun ta. shmei/a a] evpoi,ei evpi. tw/n avsqenou,ntwn

3.2. The Characteristic Use of w`j in 1 Peter

Quoting Isa 40:6 from the LXX, 1 Pet 1:24 inserts the comparative particle w`j to shift the metaphor into a simile.

¹³ Instead, the wording of w`sei. pro,bata mh. e;conta poime,na occurs in Matt 9:36.



Isa 40:6 (LXX)

6 fwnh. le,gontoj bo,hson
kai. ei=pa ti, boh,sw
pa/sa sa.rx co,rtoj kai.
pa/sa do,xa avnqrw,pou
w`j a;nqoj co,rtou

1 Pet 1:24

24 dio,ti pa/sa sa.rx w`j
co,rtoj kai. pa/sa do,xa
avvth/j w`j a;nqoj
co,rtou\ evxhra,nqh o`
co,rtoj kai. to. a;nqoj
evxe,pesen\

1 Pet 1:19 alludes to Exod 12:5, adding w`j to it.

Exod 12:5

5 pro,baton te,leion
a;rsen evniau,sion e;stai
u`mi/n avpo. tw/n avrnw/n
kai. tw/n evri,fwn
lh,myesqe

1 Pet 1:19

19 avlla. timi,w| ai[mati w`j
avmnou/ avmw,mou kai.
avspi,lou Cristou/(

Also, alluding to Ps 117:22 from the LXX, 1 Pet 2:5 appends w`j to change the metaphor into a simile.

Ps 117:22 (LXX)

22 li,qon o]n
avpedoki,masan oi`
oivkodomou/ntej ou-toj
evgenh,qh eivj kefalh.n
gwni,aj

1 Pet 2:5

5 kai. avvtoi. w`j li,qoi
zw/ntej oivkodomei/sqe
oi=koj pneumatiko.j eivj
i`era,teuma a[gion
avnene,gkai pneumatika.j
qusi,aj euvprosde,ktouj
îtw/|Ð qew/| dia. VIhsou/
Cristou/

1 Pet 3:6 alludes to Gen 18:12, affixing w`j to it.

Gen 18:12

12 evge,lasen de. Sarra evn
e`auth/| le,gousa ou;pw
me,n moi ge,gonen e[wj tou/
nu/n o` de. ku,rio,j mou

1 Pet 3:6

6 w`j Sa,rra u`ph,kousen
tw/| VAbraa,m ku,rion
avvto.n kalou/sa(h-j
evgenh,qhte te,kna

presbu,teroj

avgagopoiou/sai kai. mh.
fobou,menai mhdemi,an
pto,hsinÅ

Considering the fact that the word $\omega\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}$ is used twenty seven times in 1 Peter and is one of its stylistic features¹⁴, it does betray the close linguistic connection between 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel. In this light, it should be noted that this stylistic penchant might imply Mark's involvement in the writing of the epistle.

4. Conclusion

It seems few or no same words remain that are used only in 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel indicating a powerful linguistic similarity. It is probably, that 1 Peter is a comparatively concise letter and would result in this outcome. Nonetheless, there exist some linguistic similarities between them. These are the syntactic correlation, the distinctive features of terminology, and the significant and frequent use of $\omega\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}$ for a simile (rhetoric).

In view of syntax, while the quality of 1 Peter's Greek has been regarded as good, the author of 1 Peter is unlikely to have been a native speaker of Greek. Thus, considering that Mark's Greek is not translation Greek, there exists a remarkable syntactic correlation between 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel. They not only share some distinctive words which are rare in the NT, but also use similar terminology for the suffering of Christ. Also, the comparative particle $\omega\tilde{\nu}\tilde{\nu}$ is used in a characteristic way in them.

Considering the distinctive factors mentioned above, 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel disclose the close linguistic connection between them, which might well be

¹⁴ See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 61-62; Prasad, *Foundations of the Christian Way of Life according to 1 Peter 1, 13-25: An Exegetico-Theological Study*, 379.

possible evidence that Mark was the contributive amanuensis of 1 Peter.

CHAPTER 7

LITERARY IMPLICATIONS

1. The Use of the OT in 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel

With regard to the use of the OT, 1 Peter, as a somewhat concise letter, continually quotes and alludes to the OT as frequently as do Romans and Hebrews.¹ As Bauckham observes, the plentiful employment of citations from and allusions to the OT in the epistle can be classified according to two prime cases, namely, “prophetic interpretation and paraenetic application.”² Remarkably, the quotations of the OT in 1 Peter emphasize the suffering imagery of Christ, namely, Christ as the rejected stone of Ps 118³, which is one of the “key psalms” in 1 Pet 2:7, and Christ as the suffering servant of Isa 53, which is also one of “key chapters of Isaiah” in 1 Pet 2:22-25a.⁴

On the other hand, as pointed out by Sandmel, “Mark in many treatments is

¹ See Steve Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (London/New York: Continuum, 2005), 175; Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 3.

² Richard J. Bauckham, “James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude,” in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of B. Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 309.

³ See Hyukjung Kwon, “The Reception of Psalm 118 in the New Testament: Application of a “New Exodus Motif?”” (Ph.D. diss., University of Pretoria, 2007), 260-64; Lauri Thurén, *Argument and Theology in 1 Peter: The Origins of Christian Paraenesis*, JSNTSup 114 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 127-28.

⁴ See Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 116; Andreas J. Köstenberger, “The Use of Scripture in the Pastoral and General Epistles and the Book of Revelation,” in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 243-45. Also, S. Voorwinde, “Old Testament Quotations in Peter's Epistles,” *Vox Reformata* 49 (1987): 8-13, contends that the OT citations in 1 Peter are categorized according to two thematic cases, that is, “the righteous sufferer” and “the new Israel.”

explained incorrectly because Matthew and Luke (and John) are read with him.”⁵ Sandmel's indication relates to the use of the OT in Mark's Gospel.⁶ In comparison with the other synoptic Gospels, Mark's Gospel ostensibly shows trivial concern for the OT. However, this aspect seems deceptive.⁷ Thus, Evans comments: “how would we view Mark if Mark was the only Gospel we had? What if we had no Gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John with which to compare it? In this case would anyone read Mark and conclude that the evangelist had little interest in the Old Testament? To what extent and in what ways does the Old Testament appear in Mark?”⁸ The author of Mark's Gospel does cite or allude to the OT “at key points in his narrative.”⁹ Mark's Gospel begins with the citation of Isa 40:3 and alludes to the OT “at Jesus' baptism, at his transfiguration, and in his passion.”¹⁰ Specifically, the suffering imagery of Christ as the rejected stone of Ps 118 is also quoted in Mark 12:10.¹¹ As well, the allusion to the suffering imagery of Christ as the suffering servant of Isa 53 is shown by Mark 10:45. The metaphor of Christ as the messianic shepherd and that of Israel as sheep without a shepherd in Ezek 34 is explicitly alluded to in 1 Pet 2:25b and Mark 6:34.

Furthermore, a characteristic pattern of a quotation of and allusion to the OT exists in both 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel. In the case of Mark's Gospel, as

⁵ Samuel Sandmel, “Prolegomena to a Commentary on Mark,” in *New Testament Issues*, ed. R. Batey (London: SCM, 1970), 52.

⁶ See Craig A. Evans, “The Beginning of the Good News and the Fulfillment of Scripture in the Gospel of Mark,” in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 83; Andreas J. Köstenberger, “Hearing the Old Testament in the New: A Response,” in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2006), 269-70.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 84.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*, 85. See also *Idem*, “The Old Testament in the New,” in *The Face of New Testament Studies*, ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 137-38.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ See Kwon, “The Reception of Psalm 118 in the New Testament: Application of a “New Exodus Motif”?”, 131-37.

typically shown by the composite quotation of the prologue in Mark 1:2-3, a conflated quotation and a broad combination of allusions is Mark's characteristic manner of use of the OT.¹² Actually, the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in Mark 12:10 is observed in this way since the quotation is a part of the parable of the wicked tenants in Mark 12:1-12, which is also composed of the synthesis of the allusion to Isa 5:1-7 with the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22-23. The same pattern is also disclosed in 1 Pet 2:4-8, which also consists of the combination of the allusion to Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 with the composite quotation of Isa 28:16, Ps 118 (LXX 117):22, and Isa 8:14. Both 1 Pet 2:22-25, which includes the combination of the quotation of Isa 53 with the allusion to Ezek 34, and Mark 10:45, which comprises the conflated allusion to Isa 53 and Dan 7, also reveal that the synthetic use of the OT is significant.

In light of the fact that both 1 Pet 2:6-8 and 2:22-25 are key OT quotations regarding the suffering imagery of Christ, this characteristic use of the OT shown by 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel, not only sheds light on the literary connection between them, but also deserves much more careful consideration than it has typically received.

2. The Quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22

Several NT literatures explicitly quote Ps 118 (LXX 117):22, namely, Mark 12:10, Matt 21:42, Luke 20:17, Acts 4:11, and 1 Pet 2:7. Thus, Best notes that "in the light of such a widespread use of the psalm it is difficult to argue for a direct

¹² See Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 49, 141; Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," 319-21; Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," 175-78; *Idem*, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel*, 46-47; Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*, 15; Watts, "Jesus' Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited," 126, 128; Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 21.

connection between 1 Peter and any of the Synoptic Gospels.”¹³ However, as far as the popular assumption of the Markan priority among the synoptic Gospels and the fact that Acts 4:11 is actually a part of the Petrine speech are concerned, there seems subsequently to be little reason to resist the conclusion that the quotation of Ps 118:22 (LXX 117):22 in the NT is exclusively shared by 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark.¹⁴ In this light, the correlation between 1 Peter and Mark’s Gospel seems to be much more persuasive. On the contrary, although one does not allow for the Markan priority, it can still be said that this correlation between them, even if not unique, is valid. Furthermore, the fact that Rom 9:33 quotes both Isa 28:16 and 8:14, except for Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 unlike 1 Pet 2:6-8¹⁵, surely makes the case strong. Therefore, to investigate the literary connections between 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark, one must consider this correlation.

Ps 117:22 (LXX)	Mark 12:10	Matt 21:42	Luke 20:17	Acts 4:11	1 Pet 2:7
			o` de.		
		e,gei	evmble,ya		
	ouvde.	auvtoi/j	j		u`mi/n
	th.n	o`	auvtoi/j		ou=n h`
	grafh.n	Vihsou/j\	ei=pen\ t		timh.
	tau,thn	ouvde,pot	i, ou=n	<u>ou-to,j</u>	toi/j
<u>li,qon</u>	avne,gnwt	e	evstin	<u>evstin</u>	pisteu,ou
<u>oln</u>	e\	avne,gnwt	to.	<u>o`</u>	si(
<u>avpedoki,</u>	<u>li,qon</u>	e evn	gegramme,	<u>li,qoj(</u>	avpistou/

¹³ Ernst Best, “1 Peter and the Gospel Tradition,” *New Testament Studies* 16 (1970): 101. See also Rainer Metzner, *Die Rezeption des Matthäusevangeliums im 1. Petrusbrief*, WUNT II, 74 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995).

¹⁴ Nevertheless, this study does not argue the priority of Mark among the synoptic Gospels, but simply mentions it just as a possibility – in that case, the priority of Mark seems to be based on the oral tradition, possibly from Peter. For the earlier date of Mark’s Gospel, specifically see James G. Crossley, *The Date of Mark’s Gospel*, JSNTSup 266 (London/New York: T&T Clark International, 2004). Crossley dates Mark’s Gospel around the mid-40s.

¹⁵ See Douglas A. Oss, “The Interpretation of the ‘Stone’ Passages by Peter and Paul: A Comparative Study,” *JETS* 32 (1989): 181-200.



<u>masan oi`</u>	<u>o]n</u>	<u>tai/j</u>	<u>non</u>	<u>o`</u>	<u>sin de.</u>
<u>oivkodom</u>	<u>avpedoki,</u>	<u>grafai/j\</u>	<u>tou/to\</u>	<u>evxougen</u>	<u>li,qoj</u>
<u>u/ntej</u>	<u>masan oi`</u>	<u>li,qon</u>	<u>li,qon</u>	<u>hgei.j</u>	<u>o]n</u>
<u>ou-toj</u>	<u>oivkodom</u>	<u>o]n</u>	<u>o]n</u>	<u>u`fV</u>	<u>avpedoki,</u>
<u>evgenh,qh</u>	<u>u/ntej</u>	<u>avpedoki,</u>	<u>avpedoki,</u>	<u>u`mw/n</u>	<u>masan oi`</u>
<u>eivj</u>	<u>(ou-toj</u>	<u>masan oi`</u>	<u>masan oi`</u>	<u>tw/n</u>	<u>oivkodom</u>
<u>kefalh.n</u>	<u>evgenh,qh</u>	<u>oivkodom</u>	<u>oivkodom</u>	<u>oivkodo,</u>	<u>u/ntej(o</u>
<u>gwni,aj</u>	<u>eivj</u>	<u>u/ntej(o</u>	<u>u/ntej(o</u>	<u>mwn(</u>	<u>u-toj</u>
	<u>kefalh.n</u>	<u>u-toj</u>	<u>u-toj</u>	<u>o`</u>	<u>evgenh,qh</u>
	<u>gwni,aj\</u>	<u>evgenh,qh</u>	<u>evgenh,qh</u>	<u>geno,men</u>	<u>eivj</u>
		<u>eivj</u>	<u>eivj</u>	<u>oj eivj</u>	<u>kefalh.n</u>
		<u>kefalh.n</u>	<u>kefalh.n</u>	<u>kefalh.n</u>	<u>gwni,aj</u>
		<u>gwni,aj\</u>	<u>gwni,ajÈ</u>	<u>gwni,ajÅ</u>	

In the case of 1 Peter, the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 is a part of a synthetic citation which is inserted between the two Isaianic citations, namely, Isa 28:16 and 8:14. This pattern of OT use in 1 Peter reveals a notable parallel to that of OT use in Mark's Gospel. The authors of the synoptic Gospels quote Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 syllable by syllable, but reinterpret and apply it to its new context of early Christianity in view of Christology. The quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in Mark 12:10 not only shows the fact that with his passion and vindication, Christ is construed as the suffering servant of Isa 53 who renders the New Exodus to Israel, but also manifests the fact that with that Christ is identified as the cornerstone (capstone) that will establish the "new temple" of Isa 56:7.¹⁶

2.1. The Quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in 1 Pet 2:7

¹⁶ Morna D. Hooker, "Isaiah in Mark's Gospel," in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (London/New York: Continuum, 2005), 43. See also Kwon, "The Reception of Psalm 118 in the New Testament: Application of a "New Exodus Motif"?", 134-37; Andrew C. Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John*, WUNT II, 158 (Tübingen: Mohr, 2003), 102-12; Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*, WUNT II, 88 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1997), 345-46; *Idem*, "The Psalms in Mark's Gospel," in *The Psalms in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (London/New York: Continuum, 2004), 35.

The quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in 1 Pet 2:7 might well be observed in the context of the Living Stone and God's people in 1 Pet 2:4-10.¹⁷ This stone passage of 1 Pet 2:4-10 consists of six lavish citations from or allusions to LXX texts and is identified as "the final unit of the body opening" of the epistle.¹⁸ These are Isa 28:16, Ps 117:22, Isa 8:14, Isa 43:20-21, Exod 19:5-6, and Hos 2:23.¹⁹ Consequently, as Snodgrass points out, this stone section in 1 Peter is distinctive in view of the fact that "no other passage has such a complete grouping of stone citations or such a varied use of their implications."²⁰ According to Bauckham this stone section can be identified as "a key foundational and transitional role" in the entire epistle²¹, and its structure might be outlined as the following:

"4-5	Introductory statement of theme
4	A Jesus the elect stone
5	B The church the elect people of God
6-10	Midrash
6a	Introductory formula
6-8	A ¹ The elect stone
6b + 7a	Text 1 (Isa. 28:16) + interpretation
7b + 7c	Interpretation + Text 2 (Ps. 118:22)
8a + 8b	Text 3 (Isa. 8:14)+ interpretation
9-10	B ¹ The elect people
9	Text 4 (Isa. 43:20-21) + Text 5 (Exod. 19:5-6) conflated, the expansion of Text 4
10	Text 6 (Hos. 2:23) paraphrased (cf. Hos. 1:6, 9; 2:1)." ²²

¹⁷ See Troy W. Martin, *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*, SBL Dissertation Series 131 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 175-85.

¹⁸ Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 149. See also Jobes, *1 Peter*, 142.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ Klyne R. Snodgrass, "1 Peter II. 1-10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities," *NTS* 24 (1977): 97.

²¹ Bauckham, "James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude," 312.

²² *Ibid.*, 310.

In this outline of the structure of 1 Pet 2:4-10 a chiasm is also found in 1 Pet 2:4-8 in that the verb *avpodokima, zw* occurs both in 1 Pet 2:4 (*avpodedokimasme, non*) and in 2:7 (*avpedoki, masan*), leading Davids to comment:

He [the author of 1 Peter] cites the texts in the reverse order of the topics in v. 4. There he alluded to Ps. 118:112 (rejection) before mentioning God's election of "the stone" (Isa. 28:18). Now he produces a chiasm (in this case an A B C B A pattern, with C being Christians as stones) by referring to Isa. 28 first and then extending the Ps. 118 passage by means of Isa. 8. The result shows conscious homiletic artistry.²³

As for the provenance of the stone section in 1 Peter 2:4-8, some scholars have argued that a compilation of the OT texts would exist in early Christianity on the basis that not only are the stone passages intimately correlated with Christological and apologetic use, but also occur in several NT texts.²⁴ This would imply that the stone testimonia might be "a pre-Christian Jewish collection" that was acknowledged by the early church.²⁵

2.1.1. The Relation between Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 and the Two Texts of Isaiah

As Lindars indicates, 1 Pet 2:6-8 as a conflated quotation of the OT is "one of the clearest examples of catchword technique in the New Testament."²⁶ However,

²³ Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 89.

²⁴ See Klyne R. Snodgrass, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 44-45; *Idem*, "1 Peter II. 1-10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities," 106; Bauckham, "James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude," 311-12; Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 110; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 150; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 89; Jobes, *1 Peter*, 151; Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 144; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 97; Best, *1 Peter*, 105; J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), 58; M. C. Albl, *'And Scripture Cannot Be Broken': The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, *Novum Testamentum Supplements* 96 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999).

²⁵ Snodgrass, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," 45. See also Thomas D. Lea, "How Peter Learned the Old Testament," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 22 (1979-80): 96-102; Matthew Black, "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *NTS* 18 (1971-72): 1-14; C. F. D. Moule, "Some Reflections on the 'Stone' Testimonia in Relation to the Name Peter," *NTS* 2 (1955-56): 56-58.

²⁶ Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1961), 169.

even though 1 Pet 2:6-8 is dependent on Isa 28:16, Ps 118 (LXX 177):22, and Isa 8:14, specifically in the case of the quotation of Isa 8:14, there remains a relatively different wording between 1 Peter and the LXX text.

1 Pet 2:6-8

LXX

6 dio,ti perie,cei evn grafh/|\ ivdou. ti,qhmi evn Siw.n li,qon avkrogwniai/on evklekto.n e;ntimon kai. o` pisteu,wn evpV auvtw/| ouv mh. kataiscunqh/|Å

Isa 28:16 dia. tou/to ou[twj le,gei ku,rioj ivdou. evgw. evmbalw/ eivj ta. qeme,lia Siwn li,qon polutelh/ evklekto.n avkrogwniai/on e;ntimon eivj ta. qeme,lia auvth/j kai. o` pisteu,wn evpV auvtw/| ouv mh. kataiscunqh/|

7 u`mi/n ou=n h` timh. toi/j pisteu,ousin(avpistou/sin de. li,qoj o]n avpedoki,masan oi` oivkodomou/ntej(ou-toj evgenh,qh eivj kefalh.n gwni,aj

Ps 177:22 li,qon o]n avpedoki,masan oi` oivkodomou/ntej ou-toj evgenh,qh eivj kefalh.n gwni,aj

8 kai. li,qoj prosko,mmatoj kai. pe,tra skanda,lou\ oi] prosko,ptousin tw/| lo,gw| avpeiqou/ntej eivj o] kai. evte,qhsanÅ

Isa 8:14 kai. eva.n evpV auvtw/| pepoiqw.j h=|j e;stai soi eivj a`gi,asma kai. ouvci w`j li,qou prosko,mmati sunanth,sesqe auvtw/| ouvde. w`j pe,traj ptw,mati o` de. oi=koj Iakwb evn pagi,di kai. evn koila,smati evgkaqh,menoi evn Ierousalhm

It can be said that despite the fact that the wording of evgw evmbalw/ eivj))) Siw,n in Isa 28:16 is shifted to the phrasing of ti,qhmi evn

siw,n in 1 Pet 2:6, the text itself in 1 Pet 2:6 is apparently an intrinsic citation of Isa 28:16.²⁷ Besides, there is no doubt that 1 Pet 2:7 is an explicit quotation of Ps 117:22 of the LXX due solely to the one minute shift of li,qoj from li,qon in the LXX text.²⁸ On the contrary, the quotation of Isa 8:14 in 1 Pet 2:8 differs considerably from the LXX, but similar wording is found in Rom 9:33, which also consists of the quotations of Isa 28:16 and 8:14. However, there remains no linguistic reliance of 1 Pet 2:8 upon Rom 9:33 or *vice versa*, since the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in 1 Pet 2:7 clearly divides the citation of Isa 28:16 from that of Isa 8:14.²⁹ As Michaels points out, the author of 1 Peter “adapts his texts with a certain freedom not exercised” in association with Ps 118 (LXX 117):22.³⁰

In these conflated quotations, the first quotation of Isaiah in 1 Pet 2:6 is explicitly connected with the second quotation of the Psalms in 1 Pet 2:7, not only by the reiteration of li,qoj but also by the linguistic affinity between avkrogwniai/on and kefalh.n gwni,aj.³¹ The terminology kefalh.n gwni,aj and hN")Pi varoal . signify “head of the corner” and might be

²⁷ See Sue Woan, “The Psalms in 1 Peter,” in *The Psalms in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (London/New York: Continuum, 2004), 216. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 89, notes that the terminology of the quotation of Isa 28:16 is drawn from the LXX text, “but unlike Ps. 118:22 it is not an exact quotation, nor does it agree with the Hebrew text.” See also Elliott, *1 Peter*, 424; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 159; Bauckham, “James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude,” 311; Jobes, *1 Peter*, 147; Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 144; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 103; Best, *1 Peter*, 105.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 217.

²⁹ See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 431; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 162; Snodgrass, “I Peter II. 1-10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities,” 103-04; Jobes, *1 Peter*, 153, also comments that the author of 1 Peter “follows not Isa. 8:14 LXX but a reading found also in the later Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, as does Paul in Rom. 9:33.” Likewise, Michaels, *1 Peter*, 106, notes that “it is likely, therefore, that Peter is simply following a different Greek text at this point.”

³⁰ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 106. Similarly, Snodgrass, “I Peter II. 1-10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities,” 106, contends that “the practice of the author of I Peter was typical for many in the early Church. Like Paul, he had a personal acquaintance with the OT text and wrestled to adapt its message to Christian understanding and existence. Also like Paul he drew on a repository of important OT verses from which the central teaching of the Church could be communicated afresh.” See also Woan, “The Psalms in 1 Peter,” 219.

³¹ See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 429; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 105; Bauckham, “James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude,” 311.

employed to portray “a foundation stone” or “a keystone.”³² Yet, on the basis of the employment of *avkrogwniai/on* in the first Isaiah citation in 1 Pet 2:6, a plausible suggestion seems to be that the writer of the epistle “had a foundation stone in mind and reinterpreted Ps. 118:22.”³³ The third quotation of Isaiah in 1 Pet 2:8 is also closely linked with the second quotation of the Psalms in 1 Pet 2:7 by the catchword *li, qon*.³⁴ The employment of the word *avpistou/sin* prior to the citation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 renders itself chiefly a prologue to that of Isa 8:4 in 1 Pet 2:8.³⁵ It seems that the author of 1 Peter associates the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 with that of Isa 8:14 in order to maintain “the positive statement that Christ is the precious corner stone and the negative statement that they ‘stumble because they disobey the word, as they were destined to do.’”³⁶ By this connection the author broadens “the theme of nonbelievers’ rejection of the stone and the consequences of rejecting”.³⁷ Schutter expresses an opinion similar to this when he says that the principal intention of citing Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 was essentially to remind “the builders’ shame over their mistake” and additionally to mention “Christ’s exaltation.”³⁸ In this light, Bauckham’s observation that “the author I Peter was by no means content to relay isolated scriptural texts which came to him in the tradition, but studied whole passages of Scripture . . . in a way which combined christological-prophetic interpretation and paraenetic application” is much more persuasive.³⁹

2.1.2. The Function of the Quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in 1 Pet 2:7

³² Woan, “The Psalms in 1 Peter,” 217.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ Bauckham, “James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude,” 311.

³⁵ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 105.

³⁶ Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 110. See also *Idem*, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 180.

³⁷ Elliott, *1 Peter*, 430. See also Michaels, *1 Peter*, 106.

³⁸ Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 136. See also Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 181.

³⁹ Bauckham, “James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude,” 313.

Psalm 118 (LXX 117) has been generally identified as “a royal song of thanksgiving for military victory, set in the context of a processional liturgy.”⁴⁰ Prior to the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in 1 Pet 2:7, 1 Pet 2:4 also alludes to it. Bauckham declares that 1 Pet 2:4-10 could be construed “a particularly complex and studied piece of exegesis,” reminiscent of “the thematic pesharim of Qumran,” thus basically regarding it as a midrash.⁴¹ Not only is the metaphor of Christ as the living stone depicted in 1 Pet 2:4, but it is also subsequently maintained and enlarged by the hermeneutic and the composite quotation of the OT in 1 Pet 2:6-8.⁴² Nevertheless, in contrast to a real midrash of rabbis, the purpose of the author of 1 Peter seems to be “not primarily to provide further illumination for any particular text, but to show how the election of Christ leads to the election of those who believe in him as the holy people of God.”⁴³

Lindars contends that the purpose of the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 was to apply the text itself to Christ’s death and Resurrection. According to Lindars, the rejected stone was construed as the passion of Christ and the head of the corner was also identified as the Resurrection.⁴⁴ From his point of view, the two texts of Isaiah, namely Isa 28:16 and 8:14, were employed as supplementary texts that might reinforce the terminological connection between them and offer annotation on Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 on the basis of the observation that the key word between them in a real sense is *avkrogwniai/on*, not *li, qoj* and that the word *avkrogwniai/on* not only renders an abundant portrayal to the stone of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22, but also

⁴⁰ Woan, “The Psalms in 1 Peter,” 217. See also Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101-150*, rev. ed., WBC, vol. 21 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 163-68.

⁴¹ Bauckham, “James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude,” 310. See also Woan, “The Psalms in 1 Peter,” 218-19; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 90; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 95; Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 138.

⁴² Woan, “The Psalms in 1 Peter,” 219.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*, 179-80.

ultimately comes to kefalh.n gwni,aj (the head of the corner).⁴⁵ Although Schutter criticizes Lindars' argument, pointing out that the key point of the conflated quotation in 1 Pet 2:6-8 is "stone" itself and the interpretation and application of the stone testimonia does commence with Isa 28:16, he does accept "the importance of the application to the Passion and Resurrection" from the view of the author of 1 Peter.⁴⁶ Therefore, in this light, the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in 1 Pet 2:7 apparently plays "a supportive and collective role" among the two texts of Isaiah.⁴⁷ It might well be said that the author of 1 Peter identified Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 as disclosing not only Christ's passion and death, but also his exaltation and quoted it to explicitly elucidate "the theme of reversal in God's activity" and the distinction between Christians and non-Christians.⁴⁸

2.2. The Quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in Mark 12:10

As Watts points out, "Mark's interest in the Psalms is second only to Isaiah"; Ps 118 (LXX 117) acts a chief function in Mark's Gospel.⁴⁹ Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 is quoted in the context of the parable of the wicked tenants in Mark 12:1-12, which might be recognized as an abridgement not only of Mark's Gospel, but also of the entire Scriptures.⁵⁰ However, it should be noted that prior to the explicit quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in Mark 12:10, it is first alluded to in Mark 8:31.⁵¹

Mark 8:31

Ps117:22 (LXX)

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 180.

⁴⁶ Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 133.

⁴⁷ Woan, "The Psalms in 1 Peter," 219.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.* See also Elliott, *1 Peter*, 430.

⁴⁹ Watts, "The Psalms in Mark's Gospel," 25.

⁵⁰ Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, 341.

⁵¹ See C. Breytenbach, "Das Markusevangelium, Psalm 110,1 und 118,22f.: Folgetext und Prätext," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. C. M. Tuckett (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 215; Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John*, 102.



Kai. h;rxato dida,skein li,qon o]n avpedoki,masan
 auvtou.j o[ti dei/ to.n oi` oivkodomou/ntej ou-toj
 ui`o.n tou/ avnqrw,pou evgenh,qh eivj kefalh.n
 polla. paqei/n kai. gwni,aj
avpodokimasqh/nai u`po.
 tw/n presbute,rwn kai. tw/n
 avrciere,wn kai. tw/n
 grammate,wn kai.
 avpoktanqh/nai kai. meta.
 trei/j h`me,raj
 avnasth/nai\

The explicit allusion to Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 in Mark 8:31 occurs in the context of the first passion prediction narrative. As Watts and Marcus have observed, Mark 8:31 might well also be interpreted in view of the Way to a New Exodus. It is most likely that Mark's Way section (Mark 8:22/27-10:45/52) is dependent upon the New Exodus backdrop of Isa 40-55.⁵² Brunson also comments that the allusion to Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 is identified as "a turning point in the Gospel that focuses attention on the suffering that characterizes Jesus' mission."⁵³ Concerning the function of the allusion to Ps 118 (LXX 117):22, Brunson goes on to say:

First, Mark sought to explain the scandal of the cross by showing that the rejection of Jesus was necessary and according to God's will as revealed in Scripture. . . . Second, the context of the psalm serves to affirm Jesus' identity as Messiah, while at the same time underlining the suffering he must undergo. Third, if there is a sense of scriptural inevitability attached to the prediction of rejection, the allusion carries an implicit – and equally inevitable – expectation that vindication must follow, as it does in the psalm. Fourth, it is possible . . . that with its rejection-exaltation theme Ps 118.22 'may be the basic form of the passion prediction.' Its use with the Son of Man sayings suggests the possibility that the rejected stone of Ps 118 may have contributed to the association of suffering with that figure.⁵⁴

On the other hand, as noted above, Mark 12:1-9 not only appears to allude clearly to

⁵² See Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus and Mark*, 221-91; Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*, 31-41.

⁵³ Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John*, 102-03.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 103-04.

the imagery of the vineyard song of Isa 5:1-7, but also is combined with the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22-23 in Mark 12:10-11.⁵⁵ This practice reveals the Gospel of Mark's (Mark's Jesus) characteristic way of using OT.

In his 2002 article, "Egyptian Viticultural Practices and the Citation of Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9," Kloppenborg Verbin indicates that a main issue in the understanding of the parable of the wicked tenants of Mark's Gospel is surely the doubtful probability that Isa 5:1-7 is essential to the formation of the parable.⁵⁶ Kloppenborg Verbin comments that provided the Isaianic allusion is indispensable for the organization of the parable, "it is natural – virtually inevitable – to read the parable's characters intertextually in relation to Isaiah's vineyard."⁵⁷ If so, as pointed out by Watts, the connection between Mark 12:1-9 and 12:10-11 explicitly shows Mark's intention of interpreting the parable of the wicked tenants: "The fenced vineyard with vat and tower is Zion with its Temple and altar, the owner is Yahweh, the vine his people, the tenants Israel's leadership, the servants the prophets, and the owner's 'beloved' son Jesus."⁵⁸ Marcus also notes that "the wicked tenants are the rejecters of the stone, the stone itself is the son, and the 'lord of the vineyard' is God."⁵⁹

Kloppenborg Verbin contends that on the grounds of the observation of "the

⁵⁵ See Craig A. Evans, "How Septuagintal Is Isa. 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9?," *NovT* 45 (2003): 105-10; *Idem*, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, WBC, vol. 34B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001), 224-28; John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, "Egyptian Viticultural Practices and the Citation of Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9," *NovT* 44 (2002): 134-59; Klyne Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants*, WUNT 27 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 72-112; Watts, "The Psalms in Mark's Gospel," 33; Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*, 111-14; Hooker, "Isaiah in Mark's Gospel," 42-43.

⁵⁶ Kloppenborg Verbin, "Egyptian Viticultural Practices and the Citation of Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9," 134.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Watts, "The Psalms in Mark's Gospel," 33. See also Kloppenborg Verbin, "Egyptian Viticultural Practices and the Citation of Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9," 134.

⁵⁹ Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*, 111.

legal and horticultural aspects of ancient viticulture” the Isaiah allusion in Mark 12:1, 9 was secondary and Septuagintal, pointing out that “the scenario presented by Mark is economically and legally incoherent and that this incoherence is principally a function of the Isaian elements in Mark 12:1.”⁶⁰ The main points of Kloppenborg Verbin’s argument are predominantly derived from “the LXX’s reconceptualization” of the vineyard song of Isa 5:1-7 and “the influence that Egyptian viticultural practices have exerted on the LXX’s rendering.”⁶¹

Mark 12:1, 9

1 Kai. h;rxato auvtou/i/j evn
parabolai/j
lalei/n\ avmpelw/na
a;nqrwpoj evfu,teusen

kai. perie,qhken fragmo.n

kai. w;ruxen u`polh,nion
kai. wv|kodo,mhsen pu,rgon
kai. evxe,deto auvto.n
gewrgoi/j kai.
avpedh,mhsenÅ

9 ti, ou=n poih,sei o`
ku,rioj tou/ avmpelw/nojÈ

Isa 5:1-5 (LXX)⁶²

1 a;|sw dh. tw/|
hvgaphme,nw| a=|sma tou/
avgaphtou/ tw/| avmpelw/ni,
mou avmpelw.n evgenh,qh
tw/| hvgaphme,nw| evn
ke,rati evn to,pw| pi,oni

2 kai. fragmo.n perie,qhka
kai. evcara,kwsa kai.
evfu,teusa a;mpelon swrhc
kai. wv|kodo,mhsa pu,rgon
evn me,sw| auvtou/ kai.
prolh,nion w;ruxa evn
auvtw/| kai. e;meina tou/
poih/sai stafulh,n
evpoi,hsen de. avka,nqaj

3 kai. nu/n a;nqrwpoj tou/
Iouda kai. oi`
evnoikou/ntej evn
Ierousalhm kri,nate evn
evmoi. kai. avna. me,son

⁶⁰ Kloppenborg Verbin, “Egyptian Viticultural Practices and the Citation of Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9,” 136. See also *Idem*, “Isaiah 5:1-7, the Parable of the Tenants, and Vineyard Leases on Papyrus,” in *Text and Artefact: Religion in Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honor of Peter Richardson*, ed. S. G. Wilson and M. Desjardin (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000), 111-34.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 137.

⁶² See *Ibid.*, 153-54.

evleu, setai kai. avpole, sei
 tou.j gewrgou.j kai. dw, sei
 to.n avmpelw/na a;lloijÅ

tou/ avmpelw/no,j mou
 4 ti, poih,sw e;ti tw/|
avmpelw/ni, mou kai. ouvkv
 evpoi,hsa auvtw/| dio,ti
 e;meina tou/ poih/sai
 stafulh,n evpoi,hsen de.
 avka,nqaj
 5 nu/n de. avnaggelw/
 u`mi/n ti, poih,sw tw/|
avmpelw/ni, mou avfelw/
 to.n fragmo.n auvtou/ kai.
 e;stai eivj diarpagh,n kai.
 kaqelw/ to.n toi/con
 auvtou/ kai. e;stai eivj
 katapa,thma

Kloppenborg Verbin's conclusion that the allusions to Isa 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9 "are purely Septuagintal"⁶³ seems to be rather excessive, and has been criticized by Evans who argues that there still remains a "Semitic flavor of the parable as a whole and the Semitic coherence of the Markan context and framework throughout"⁶⁴ in Mark 12:1-9. However, as even Evans agrees, Kloppenborg Verbin's inquiry has significant merit for the continuing examination of Mark's Gospel.⁶⁵

From the point of view of the context of Mark's Gospel, the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22-23 in Mark 12:10-11 appears to be an ornament to the parable of the wicked tenants. The connection between the allusion to Isa 5:1-7 and the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22-23 in Mark 12:1-11, is enhanced by the linguistic and thematic similarity.⁶⁶ With regard to this parallel, Marcus observes:

The rejection of the stone corresponds to the rejection of the servants and the

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 159.

⁶⁴ Evans, "How Septuagintal Is Isa. 5:1-7 in Mark 12:1-9?," 110.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*, 111.

son in the parable, its vindication by the Lord corresponds generally to the action of ‘the lord of the vineyard’ in 12:9, and the words ‘builders’ (oivkodomou/ntej) and ‘head’ (kefalh.n) are reminiscent of the building (wv|kodo,mhsen) of the tower (12:1) and the wounding of one of the servants in the head (evkefali,wsan, 12:4).⁶⁷

Similarly, according to Snodgrass, the link between the parable of the wicked tenants and the psalm quotation is consolidated not only by the wordplay between !b (son) and !ba (stone), but also by the rational “equation of the rejected son and the rejected stone.”⁶⁸ This is also reinforced by “the equation of tenants and the builders.”⁶⁹

The psalm quotation in Mark 12:10-11 is clearly identical to the LXX syllable by syllable.

Mark 12:10-11	Ps 117:22-23 (LXX)
10 ouvde. th.n grafh.n tau,thn avne,gnwte\ li,qon o]n avpedoki,masan oi` oivkodomou/ntej(ou-toj evgenh,qh eivj kefalh.n gwni,aj\ 11 para. kuri,ou evqe,neto au[th kai. e;stin qaumasth. Evn ovfgalmoi/j h`mw/nE	22 li,qon o]n avpedoki,masan oi` oivkodomou/ntej ou-toj evgenh,qh eivj kefalh.n gwni,aj 23 para. kuri,ou evqe,neto au[th kai. e;stin qaumasth. evn ovfgalmoi/j h`mw/n

The structure of the quotation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22-23 in Mark 12:9-10 also exhibits its chiastic pattern.

12:10a	ouvde. th.n grafh.n tau,thn avne,gnwte\ li,qon o]n avpedoki,masan oi` oivkodomou/ntej(A
--------	--

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants*, 96. See also Watts, “The Psalms in Mark’s Gospel,” 34; Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, 340.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

Even though the psalm quotation is literally identical to the LXX, the Gospel of Mark explicitly attempts to apply it to the distinct context and reinterpret it from the view of Christology – messianic interpretation.⁷⁶ The wording of *kefalh.n gwni,aj* which seems to have been a favorable and frequent Christian employment for the rejection and demise of Jesus prior to his vindication, necessarily results in attention to the imagery of Christ.⁷⁷ Kim argues that the weight of the psalm quotation does not lie on the rejected stone image, but lies on that of “its vindication or exaltation”.⁷⁸ Thus the key intention in the psalm quotation of Mark’s Jesus is to confirm “the divine will for his vindication or exaltation after his rejection and death.”⁷⁹ In this light, it is not unlikely that the phrasing of *kefalh.n gwni,aj* is connected with the Temple. As pointed out by Kim, quoting Ps 118 (LXX 117):22-23, Jesus portrayed himself as “the foundation stone of a new temple”⁸⁰, which will be established by his passion – the rejection and death.⁸¹ This also relates to the New Exodus imagery of Mark’s Gospel.⁸² As a result, it may well be said that the main focus of both the parable of the wicked tenants and the psalm quotation is the identification of Jesus who fulfills the OT prophecies.⁸³

3. The Quotation of and Allusion to the Suffering Servant of Isa 53

⁷⁶ See Jocelyn McWhirter, “Messianic Exegesis in Mark’s Passion Narrative,” in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*, ed. Geert Van Oyen and Tom Shepherd, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 45 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 84-85.

⁷⁷ See France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 462; Hooker, “Isaiah in Mark’s Gospel,” 43; Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John*, 110-11.

⁷⁸ Seyoon Kim, “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 *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987), 135.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 137.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 142. See also Hooker, “Isaiah in Mark’s Gospel,” 43.

⁸² Watts, “The Psalms in Mark’s Gospel,” 35.

⁸³ See McWhirter, “Messianic Exegesis in Mark’s Passion Narrative,” 77-85; Kim, “Jesus – The Son of God, the Stone, the Son of Man, and the Servant: The Role of Zechariah in the Self-Identification of Jesus,” 135-38; Hooker, “Isaiah in Mark’s Gospel,” 43.

Along with the imagery of Christ as the rejected stone, that of Christ as the suffering servant of Isa 53 also plays a significant role in depicting the passion of Christ in both 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark. In this regard, it is crucial to note that there exists a noteworthy quotation of, or allusion to, the imagery of Christ as the suffering Servant in Isa 53 between 1 Pet 2:22-25b and Mark 10:45.⁸⁴

3.1. The Suffering Servant in 1 Pet 2:22-25a

The expression of *Cristou/ paqh,masin (paqhma,twn)* is used twice in 1 Peter among the NT.⁸⁵ 1 Pet 4:13 reads:

avlla. kaqo. koinwnei/te
toi/j tou/ Cristou/
paqh,masin cai,rete(i[na
kai. evn th/| avpokalu,yei
th/j do,xhj auvtou/ carh/te
avgalliw,menoiÅ

But rejoice in so far as you share Christ's sufferings, that you may also rejoice and be glad when his glory is revealed.

Also 1 Pet 5:1 reads:

Presbute,rouj ou=n evn
u`mi/n parakalw/ o`
sumpresbu,teroj kai.
ma,rtuj tw/n tou/ Cristou/
paqhma,twn(o` kai. th/j
mellou,shj avpokalu,ptesqai
do,xhj koinwno,j\

So I exhort the elders among you, as a fellow elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ as well as a partaker in the glory that is to be revealed.

The similar wording of *promarturo,menon ta. eivj Cristo.n paqh,mata* (the sufferings destined for Christ) occurs in 1 Pet 1:11. This suffering imagery of Christ seems to be "Peter's characteristic way of referring both to Christ's redemptive

⁸⁴ Michaels, "St. Peter's Passion: The Passion Narrative in 1 Peter," 393, notes that "whatever remote similarity Peter's language may have to Mark's (see Mark 10:45, 14:24) is best explained here by a common dependence on Isaiah."

⁸⁵ See Michaels, "St. Peter's Passion: The Passion Narrative in 1 Peter," 387.

death on the cross and to the events leading up to it.”⁸⁶ In fact, 1 Pet 1:18 construes the death of Jesus as “ransom.”⁸⁷

Most of all, the suffering imagery of Christ is noticeably manifested by 1 Pet 2:22-25. Schutter notes that these passages exhibit “the most elaborate reorganization or rewriting of Is.53.”⁸⁸ In addition, Elliott comments that 1 Pet 2:21-25 shows an inventive and unique intermingling of a diversity of “Israelite, Hellenistic, and primitive Christian traditions.”⁸⁹ This means that Christ’s imagery symbolizes a merger of the “Hellenistic concept of a moral model with the primitive Christian tradition of the disciple.”⁹⁰ As a matter of fact, 1 Pet 2:21-25 depicts the sufferings of Christ as that of the Servant of Isa 53. The author of 1 Peter selectively quotes and alludes to the LXX,. Thus, Schutter says that he is liable for the “development.”⁹¹

1 Pet 2:22 o]j a`marti,an ouvkv
evpoi,hsen ouvde. eu`re,qh
do,loj evn tw/| sto,mati
aevtou/

Isa 53:9 o[ti avnomi,an ouvkv
evpoi,hsen ouvde. eu`re,qh
do,loj evn tw/| sto,mati
aevtou/

2:24d ou- tw/| mw,lwpi
iva,qhte

53:5d evpV auvtou,n tw/|
mw,lwpi auvtou/ h`mei/j
iva,qhmen

2:25a h=te ga.r w`j pro,bata
planw,menoi

53:6a pa,ntej w`j pro,bata
evplanh,qhmen a;nqrwpoj
th/| o`dw/| auvtou/
evplanh,qh

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁷ Mark 10:45 also attempts to interpret the death of Jesus as ransom.

⁸⁸ Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 143. See also J. de Waal Dryden, *Theology and Ethics in 1 Peter*, WUNT II, 209 (Tübingen: Mohr, 2006), 178-85.

⁸⁹ Elliott, *1 Peter*, 543.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 543-44.

⁹¹ Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 143. Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 211-12, underlines that 1 Pet 2:23 exhibits “fundamental aspect of the Passion narrative without representing particular parts of the narrative” in the Gospel of Mark. See also Jobes, *1 Peter*, 194.

This section comprises the most widely continued quotation of and allusion to Isa 53 among the whole NT, except for Acts 8:32. The thought of Christ's vicarious sacrifice in 1 Pet 2:21-25 is most likely a distinctive merit of this letter, since it does not occur in different NT literatures that cite or allude to Isa 53.⁹² Therefore, 1 Pet 2:21-25 has been presented as the core account of Christology of 1 Peter, and Christ's sufferings have also played a chief Christological role in the letter.⁹³ In this regard, Matera's observation deserves mention:

The Christology of 1 Peter is a Christology of suffering. It affirms that the sufferings of Christ were uniquely redemptive and the necessary prelude to his glory. . . . by focusing on the sufferings of Christ, 1 Peter shows the intimate relationship between Christology and the Christian life: the *past* suffering of Christ is the *present* condition of believers, while the *present* glory of Christ is the *future* glory of those who follow in the steps of the suffering Christ.⁹⁴

Some scholars have contended that 1 Pet 2:22-25 is a citation from a preexisting Christian hymn. After Windisch (1911) this view is held by Boismard, Bultmann, and Goppelt.⁹⁵ The main points of the argument, as outlined by Goppelt, are as follows: (1) the transition from second person to first person to second person; (2) the transition of the audience from Christian slaves (servants) to all believers; and

⁹² See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 541, 548. Although Acts 8:32, Luke 22:37, and Matt 8:17 quote or allude to Isa 53, however, the concept of vicarious sacrifice of Christ does not clearly occur in these verses. See also Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 210.

⁹³ Jobes, *1 Peter*, 192. See also J. Ramsey Michaels, "Catholic Christologies in the Catholic Epistles," in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: William. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 274-79. Thus, S. Pearson, *The Christological and Rhetorical Properties of 1 Peter*, Studies in Bible and Early Christianity 45 (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001), 39, sees Isa 52-53 as the "controlling source behind 1 Peter." See also Earl Richard, "The Functional Christology of First Peter," in *Perspective on First Peter*, ed. Charles H. Talbert, NABPR Special Studies Series 9 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986), 133-39.

⁹⁴ Frank J. Matera, *New Testament Christology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 184. (Italics Matera's)

⁹⁵ See H. Windisch, *Die katholischen Briefe*, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 15 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1911), 62-63; M.-E. Boismard, *Quatre hymnes baptismales dans la première épître de Pierre* (Paris: Cerf, 1961), 111-32; R. Bultmann, "Bekenntnis- und Liedfragmente im ersten Petrusbrief," in *Exegetica*, ed. E. Dinkler (Tübingen: Mohr, 1967), 294-95; Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 207-10.

(3) the frequent use of the relative pronoun ω [j].⁹⁶ This position, however, has been criticized by Best, Osborne, Michaels, Achtemeier, and Elliott.⁹⁷ Elliott argues that (1) the switch in the personal pronoun might well occur through the employment of any material, as well as the immediate use in Isa 53; (2) the shift in the audience is the author's tactic; and (3) the relative pronoun ω [j] is often employed throughout 1 Peter, including the sections which are not hymnic.⁹⁸ In this respect, it is more plausible to see that the author of 1 Peter not only quoted Isa 53 LXX, but also interpreted and applied it to the addressees.⁹⁹

Although 1 Pet 2:22-25 seems to use the terminology of Isa 53, these verses follow the order of incidents in Christ's passion.¹⁰⁰ Hooker, thus, mentions that although the author of 1 Peter does not use Isa 53 as a 'proof text,' his employment of this source has "moved here beyond simple appeal to 'what is written' to the exploration of its *significance*."¹⁰¹ This means that the author of 1 Peter clearly renders "new sense of Isa 53."¹⁰² Jobes observes:

Because Jesus suffered a death reserved for slaves under Roman law, his identity as Isaiah's Suffering Servant (slave) is corroborated. Furthermore, this mode of death, which the Romans reserved for slaves and others lacking Roman citizenship, strengthens the identification between the plight of the "servant" Peter addresses in 2:18 and the Suffering Servant.¹⁰³

Also, provided that the addressees of 1 Peter are mainly Gentiles, the author of the

⁹⁶ Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 207-08.

⁹⁷ See Best, *1 Peter*, 120; T. P. Osborne, "Guide Lines for Christian Suffering: A Source-Critical and Theological Study of 1 Peter 2,21-25," *Biblica* 64 (1983): 381-408; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 136-37; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 192-93; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 549-50.

⁹⁸ Elliott, *1 Peter*, 549-50.

⁹⁹ Jobes, *1 Peter*, 195.

¹⁰⁰ Paul J. Achtemeier, "Suffering Servant and Suffering Christ in 1 Peter," in *The Future of Christology: Essay in Honor of Leander E. Keck*, ed. Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 180. Also Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 143, comments that "a variety of elements which appear in his [the author's] handling of Is. 53 indicate the presence of a pesher-like hermeneutic."

¹⁰¹ Morna D. Hooker, "Did the Use of Isaiah 53 to Interpret His Mission Begin with Jesus?," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origin*, ed. William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 93. (Italics Hooker's)

¹⁰² Jobes, *1 Peter*, 195.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

letter seems to be drawing attention to the position that they had held among God's people.¹⁰⁴

3.2. The Suffering Servant in Mark 10:45

Mark 10:45 reads, *kai. ga.r o` ui`o.j tou/ avnqrw,pou ouvkh=lqen diakonhqh/nai avlla. diakonh/sai kai. dou/nai th.n yuch.n avtou/ lu,tron avnti. pollw/nÅ* ("For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life as a ransom for many.") This verse has widely been construed as Christ's perception of his suffering based on the suffering Servant in Isa 53.¹⁰⁵ In 1959 Hooker and Barrett independently produced works that argued against the consensus.¹⁰⁶ In her work, *Jesus and the Servant*, Hooker contends that even though Gospels disclose "a considerable number of possible references" to Isa 53, "no sure reference to any of the Servant Songs exists in those passages where Jesus speaks of the *meaning* of his death: there is no evidence that either he or the evangelists had the suffering of the Servant in mind."¹⁰⁷ Instead, Hooker argues the possibility that the imagery of suffering originated from echoes on the Son of Man in Dan 7.¹⁰⁸ In his article, "The Background of Mark 10:45," Barrett expresses a similar argument to Hooker's when he says that the imagery of suffering comes from the Maccabean backdrop to the Son of Man in Dan 7, and the correlation between Isa 53 and Mark 10:45 is "much less definite and

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 198.

¹⁰⁵ As respects a distinctive study for this issue, specifically see Sharyn Dowd and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience," in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*, ed. Geert Van Oyen and Tom Shepherd, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 45 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 10-16. Dowd and Malbon, *Ibid.*, 16, argue that the death of Jesus in Mark's Gospel is construed as release from both demonic powers and tyrannical powers.

¹⁰⁶ See Morna D. Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant* (London: SPCK, 1959); C. K. Barrett, "The Background of Mark 10:45," in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959), 1-18.

¹⁰⁷ Hooker, *Jesus and the Servant*, 148-50.

¹⁰⁸ See *Idem*, *The Son of Man in Mark* (London: SPCK, 1967), 103-47.

more tenuous than is often supposed.”¹⁰⁹

But Hooker and Barrett’s argument has been criticized by Jeremias, France, and Kruse in that they not only treated the logion in a fragmentary method, but also dealt with the terminological affinities separately.¹¹⁰ In his 1983 work, *“The ‘Son of Man’ as the Son of God*, Kim also underlined that the wordings of *dou/nai th.n yuch.n auvtou/ lu,tron avnti. pollw/n* in Mark 10:45 should be understood in light of Isa 43:3 and 53:10-12.¹¹¹ Kim’s observation deserves mention:

Since *polloi*, and *dou/nai th.n yuch.n auvtou* thus make us think that in Mk 10.45 Jesus has Isa 53 as well as Isa 43 in view, is it not probable that he also sees a material correspondence between *rp̄k* in Isa 43.3f. and *~Xa* in Isa 53? . . . For in the latter it is the Ebed’s vicarious suffering of the penalty for the sins of “many” (so that they may be accounted righteous) which is designated as *~Xa*. It may well be that Jesus sees his death as the *rp̄k* of Isa 43.3f. because as the *~Xa* of the Ebed in Isa 53.10-12 it is actually the substitutionary suffering of the penalty for the sins of Israel and the nations which redeems or frees them from the penalty at the last judgement. . . . Thus, when Mk 10.45 is seen through Isa 43 because of the decisive correspondence *lu,tron avnti.=txt rp̄k*, the connection of the former with Isa 53 is more clearly visible. . . . When Isa 43 and 53 together provide all the elements of the logion so clearly and harmoniously, there is no reason to appeal to the texts like 2Macc 7.37ff.; 4Macc 6.26ff.; 17.21f. which provide only a partial parallel to the logion, or suspect that the logion was built by the Hellenistic Jewish church reflecting this martyrological tradition.¹¹²

More recently, in his 1998 article, Watts also indicates that “even when a saying is regarded in its totality, it must also be located within the broader context of the evangelist’s presentation of Jesus’ ministry.”¹¹³ He goes on to say:

. . . insufficient attention has been paid either to the hermeneutical framework provided by Mark’s Gospel as a literary whole or to those indications which the

¹⁰⁹ Barrett, “The Background of Mark 10:45,” 13-15. See also C. S. Rodd, *The Gospel of Mark*, Epworth Commentaries (London: Epworth Press, 2005), 131. Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark*, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1976), 257.

¹¹⁰ See J. Jeremias, review of *Jesus and the Servant*, by M. D. Hooker, *JTS* 11 (1960): 142; R. T. France, “The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus,” *TynBul* 19 (1968): 28; C. G. Kruse, *New Testament Foundations for Ministry: Jesus and Paul* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1983), 44.

¹¹¹ See Seyoon Kim, *“The ‘Son of Man’ as the Son of God*, *WUNT* 30 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1983), 50-58.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 55-58.

¹¹³ Rikki E. Watts, “Jesus’ Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited,” 126.

Markan Jesus offers as to the provenance of linguistic parallels has often neglected the mixed nature of Markan citations of and therefore perhaps allusions to the OT, the highly allusive fashion in which Mark's Jesus often appeals to OT texts, the often idiosyncratic or less common translational choices evident in Isaiah LXX, and the phenomenon of semantic change which raises questions about the validity of relying solely on the LXX to determine linguistic parallels. When all of these factors are considered, the case for an allusion to Isaiah 53 in the passion prediction and Mark 10:45 is rather stronger than Hooker or Barrett suggests.¹¹⁴

Moreover, there seems to remain a significant literary characteristic of the Gospel of Mark which should be considered. As Moyise points out, while the other Gospels manifest "a set of quotations as a sort of running commentary on the narrative", on the contrary, citations in the Gospel of Mark are "on the lips of characters in the story (mainly Jesus)," except for its opening (Mark 1:2-3), which clearly cites "scripture as editorial comment."¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, this observation does not suggest that Mark's Gospel betrays "no scriptural commentary" on the occurrences which he reports, but does mean that there exists a somewhat broad combination of "allusions and echoes that fill out Mark's narrative and engage the reader in a variety of ways."¹¹⁶ In this light, Moyise's argument that "Mark has told the story of Jesus' passion in such a way that it evokes the righteous sufferer of the psalms and probably also the suffering servant of Isaiah and the smitten shepherd of Zechariah" is certainly persuasive.¹¹⁷ A number of quotations and allusions in the Gospel of Mark are merged and associated in an integrated way.¹¹⁸

Simultaneously, the composite quotation in the prologue of Mark's Gospel (Mark 1:2-3) must be considered. Although Mark 1:2a reads, *Kaqw. j ge,graptai*

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ See Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 21; Hooker, "Isaiah in Mark's Gospel," 35; W. S. Vorster, "The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark," *Neotestamentica* 14 (1981): 70.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 32.

¹¹⁸ See Watts, "Jesus' Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited," 128; Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," 175; Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," 319-21.

evn tw/| VHsai<a| tw/| profh,th| (“As it is written in Isaiah the prophet”)¹¹⁹, the quotation in the prologue consists of a combination of Exod 23:20, Mal 3:1, and Isa 40:3. In this regard, Marcus’ indication that “the fusion of two or more scriptural passages into one conflated citation is a characteristic Markan method of biblical usage” is remarkable.¹²⁰ As mentioned above, since the conflated quotation in Mark 1:2-3 is the solitary “editorial” one in his Gospel and is ascribed to Isaiah, it seems likely that Isaiah was the most crucial document in the Old Testament for Mark the evangelist.¹²¹ Based on this fact, Marcus and Watts regard this prologue citation as the key vertical of understanding Mark’s Gospel.¹²²

In a related vein, Mark 9:12 might well be investigated as the Old Testament

¹¹⁹ Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 21-22, notes that “ancient copyists dealt with the discrepancy by omitting the word ‘Isaiah’ and turning ‘prophet’ into a plural. Thus most of our surviving manuscripts read, ‘As it is written in the prophets’ (hence KJV).” Concerning the ascription of the combined citation to Isaiah, Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the New Testament*, 62, indicates that “the earliest representative witnesses of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text” support a reading of “in Isaiah the prophet.” Thus, Moyise, *Ibid.*, 22, also suggests that “the most common is that Mark is using a testimony source where the texts had already been combined. Mark ascribes it to Isaiah either because he was unaware of its composite nature or because ‘Isaiah’ stands for ‘prophets’ in the same way that ‘Psalms’ can stand for ‘writings’ (see Luke 24.44).” Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*, 17-22, proposes that since he desires his community to know that “gospel” is “as it is written in Isaiah the prophet,” Mark’s ascription of 1:2-3 to Isaiah was intended, thus citing as a fulfillment of the promise of the retrieval in Isaiah. See also Hooker, “Isaiah in Mark’s Gospel,” 49; *Idem*, “Who Can This Be?: The Christology of Mark’s Gospel,” in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: William. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 82.

¹²⁰ Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*, 15. See also Morna D. Hooker, “Mark,” in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of B. Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 220; Kee, “The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16,” 175-78.

¹²¹ See Hooker, “Isaiah in Mark’s Gospel,” 35, 49; Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 30. In the case of 1 Peter, Isaiah seems to be the most significant book for its author in view of the fact that he heavily quotes or alludes to Isaiah. This may also imply the close literary relation between 1 Peter and Mark. See Woan, “The Psalms in 1 Peter,” 213.

¹²² See Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*, 12-47; *Idem*, “Mark and Isaiah,” in *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. A. B. Beck, A. H. Bartelt, P. R. Raabe, and C. A. Franke (Grand Rapids: William. B. Eerdmans, 1995), 449-66; Watts, *Isaiah’s New Exodus and Mark*; Beavis, *Mark’s Audience: The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11-12*, 110; Steve Moyise, “Is Mark’s Opening Quotation the Key to his Use of Scripture?,” *Irish Biblical Studies* 20 (1998): 146-58.

context of Mark 10:45. As a matter of fact, Barrett has argued that the suffering of Jesus came from the Maccabean backdrop to the Son of Man in Dan 7¹²³, however, his argument has been criticized by Watts for ignoring “the one indication that the Markan Jesus himself gives as to his understanding of his suffering, namely, Mark 9:12.”¹²⁴ According to Watts, it might seem that Jesus’ use of Son of Man as a self-identification ostensibly points out a backdrop of Dan 7. However, considering not only the fact that there exists no immediate “OT prophecy of a suffering Son of Man” and “a suffering Son of Man”, it is scarcely the key of Dan 7. Further, the fact that the Markan Jesus is not opposed to connecting “otherwise ‘unrelated’ OT texts or motifs,” does not make the case for Dan 7.¹²⁵ Therefore, in light of Mark’s Isaianic horizon, “that Mark’s Jesus should join two previously unconnected ideas – Son of Man and Isaianic ‘servant’ imagery – is not surprising.” It can also be argued that the notional and terminological backdrops to Mark 9:12 might well have originated from Isa 53.¹²⁶

In this light, the three passion predictions in Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34 also play a significant role in the context of Mark 10:45. The wording of *polla. pa, scw* in Mark 8:31 and *paradi, dwmi* in Mark 9:31; 10:33 are very likely an allusion to Isa 53. The word *paradi, dwmi*, specifically, is also much more outstanding in Isa 53.¹²⁷ On this point, Watts has testified that “the Markan Jesus’ understanding of his death” is profoundly and notionally dependent on Isa 53.¹²⁸ Even though one accepts that the Markan Jesus was “among the first to see a suffering Son of Man” in Dan 7, the notional and terminological affinities indicate that he drew the bulk of the depictive

¹²³ Barrett, “The Background of Mark 10:45,” 13-15.

¹²⁴ Watts, “Jesus’ Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Cruc Revisited,” 131.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 133-34. This argument is also supported by Otto Betz, “Jesus and Isaiah 53,” in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*, ed. William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998), 83-87.

¹²⁷ See *Ibid.*, 134-35.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 136

particulars of the suffering from Isa 53.¹²⁹ In light of this observation, it is reasonable to conclude that the noted intention of the death of Jesus in Mark 10:45 is more probably associated with the overt suffering servant in Isa 53 rather than with that of the implicit Son of Man.¹³⁰ At the same time, this also shows the Gospel of Mark's characteristic use of the OT, namely, the synthetic allusion to the OT.¹³¹

4. The Allusion to Ezek 34: the Messianic Shepherd / Sheep without a Shepherd

1 Pet 2:25 exhibits its synthetic use of the OT, namely, a blend of the quotation of Isa 53:6a and the extensive allusion to Ezek 34. This pattern of OT use is also distinctive of Mark's Gospel. Also, in view of the metaphorical relation between Christ as "the messianic" shepherd of Israel and Israel as sheep without a shepherd¹³², Jesus' compassion for the huge crowd of Israel and the expression of *h=san w`j pro,bata mh. e;conta poime,na* ("they were like sheep without a shepherd") in Mark 6:34 are most likely a clear and extensive allusion to Ezek 34.¹³³

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 137. For details of the discussion, especially see *Ibid.*, 136-51. See also D. J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 360; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 420-21; Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 120; Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, 315; Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 288-90; Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*, 591-93; Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 383-85; Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 218-19; Kee, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel*, 47; Lamar Williamson Jr, *Mark, Interpretation* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1983), 109-91.

¹³¹ Alberto de Mingo Kaminouchi, *'But It Is Not So Among You': Echoes of Power in Mark 10.32-45*, JSNTSup 249 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2003), 145.

¹³² See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 538. Osborne, "Guidelines for Christian Suffering," 403; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 113; Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 124; I. J. du Plessis, "The Relation between the Old and New Testament from Perspective of Kingship/Kingdom – including the Messianic motif," *Neotestamentica* 14 (1981): 50; Ben J. de Klerk and Fika J. van Rensburg, *Making a Sermon: A Guide for Reformed Exegesis and Preaching Applied to 1 Peter 2:11-12, 18-25* (Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom Theological Publications, 2005), 61.

¹³³ Of course, the phrasing of *w`sei. pro,bata oi-j ouvk e;stin poimh,n* is used in Num 27:17, and the expression of *w`j poi,mnion w-| ouvk e;stin poimh,n* (*w`j pro,bata oi-j ouvk e;stin poimh,n*) is employed in 1 Kings 22:17 (2 Chr 18:16). Similar imagery is also found in Jer 23:1-4. However, as mentioned above, in terms of the symbolical relationship between Christ as the messianic shepherd of

4.1. The Combination of Isa 53 with Ezek 34 in 1 Pet 2:25

The phrasing of *h=te ga.r w`j pro,bata planw,menoi* in 1 Pet 2:25a comes from Isa 53:6a. However, the author of 1 Peter shifts the first plural pronoun to second plural.¹³⁴

Isa 53:6a (LXX)	1 Pet 2:25a
<i>pa,ntej w`j pro,bata</i>	<i><u>h=te</u> ga.r w`j pro,bata</i>
<i><u>evplanh,qhmen</u> a;nqrwpoj</i>	<i><u>planw,menoi</u></i>
<i>th/ o`dw/ auvtou/</i>	
<i>evplanh,qh</i>	

In this vein, as Elliott observes, based on the fact that the word *evpestra, fhte* and the metaphor of “the return of straying sheep” are not used in Isa 53¹³⁵, the author extensively alludes to Ezek 34 in 1 Pet 2:25b.¹³⁶

Ezek 34	1 Pet 2:25b
4 <i><u>evpestre,yate</u></i>	
6 <i><u>avpostre,fwn</u></i>	<i><u>evpestra, fhte</u></i>
10 <i><u>avpostre,yw</u></i>	
16 <i><u>evpistre,yw</u></i>	
23 <i>kai. avnasth,sw evpV</i>	<i><u>poime,na</u></i>
<i>auvtou.j <u>poime,na</u> e[na kai.</i>	
<i>poimanei/ auvtou,j <u>to.n</u></i>	
<i><u>dou/lo,n mou David</u> kai.</i>	

Israel and Israel as sheep without a shepherd (Ezek 34:5-24; 37:24), these verses do not seem overtly to reflect a correlation as much as does Ezek 34. See also Elliott, *1 Peter*, 538.

¹³⁴ See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 537; Jobes, *1 Peter*, 198; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 150; Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 146; Osborne, “Guidelines for Christian Suffering,” 401-02.

¹³⁵ Elliott, *1 Peter*, 537.

¹³⁶ See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 537-38; Jobes, *1 Peter*, 198-99; Senior, *1 Peter*, 80; Osborne, “Guidelines for Christian Suffering,” 403; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 150; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 113-14; Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 215; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 204; Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 124-25.

e;stai auvtw/n poimh,n

evpi,skopon

11 evpiske,yomai

Ezek 34 intensively and prominently shows the relation between God as the shepherd of Israel and Israel as sheep without a shepherd more than any other OT passage. In particular, poimh,n in Ezek 34:23-24 remarkably exhibits a messianic imagery, which is repeated in Ezek 37:34. This significantly sheds light on the NT's identification of Jesus with the messianic shepherd, since the NT does not portray God as shepherd, but manifestly does depict only Christ as shepherd.¹³⁷ In view of the fact that the phrasing of to.n poime,na kai. evpi,skopon tw/n yucw/n u`mw/n is clearly construed as Christ, 1 Pet 2:25 also evidently shows the same relation between Christ as shepherd and Christians.¹³⁸ The identification of Christ with a shepherd is also explicitly disclosed by the expression of avrcipoi,menoj in 1 Pet 5:4.¹³⁹

4.2. The Allusion to Ezek 34 in Mark 6:34

Mark 6:34 reads, kai. evxelqw.n ei=den polu.n o;clon kai. evsplagcni,sqh evpV auvtou,j(o[ti h=san w`j probata mh. e;conta poime,na(kai. h;rxato dida,skein auvtou.j polla,Å (“And as he landed he saw a great crowd, and he had compassion on them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd; and he began to teach them many things.”) This verse is apparently associated with “wilderness motifs” in view of the

¹³⁷ See Osborne, “Guidelines for Christian Suffering,” 403; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 538; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 113-14; Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 124-25.

¹³⁸ See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 538; Jobes, *1 Peter*, 198-99; Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 147; Senior, *1 Peter*, 77; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 151; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 113-14; Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, 215-16; Kelly, *The Epistles of Peter and of Jude*, 124-25.

¹³⁹ See Elliott, *1 Peter*, 539; Jobes, *1 Peter*, 199; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 114.

background of the place. As a matter of fact, the word *ε;rhmon to,pon* as the backdrop of the place is repeated in Mark 6:32-33.¹⁴⁰ Lane notes that a great crowd who follow Jesus and the apostles “are representative of Israel once more in the wilderness.”¹⁴¹ In this light, this verse plays a significant role in the account of the miracle of Jesus feeding five thousand people with the five loaves and the two fish. Distinctively, while this account occurs in the four Gospels, the wording of *ο[ti h=san w`j pro,bata mh. e;conta poime,na* is only employed in Mark 6:34.

In light of this sequence, comparing Mark 6:34 with Ezek 34 (37:24), there remains a conspicuous parallel between them.

Ezek 34 (37:24)

Mark 6:34

5a kai. diespa,rh ta.
pro,bata, mou dia. to. mh.
ei=nai poime,na j

kai. evxelqw.n ei=den
polu.n o;clon kai.
evsplugcni, sqh evpV
aevtou, j(

8c para. to. mh. ei=nai
poime,na j

23 kai. avnasth,sw evpV
aevtou.j poime,na e[na kai.
poimanei/ aevtou, j to.n
dou/lo,n mou David kai.
e;stai avtw/n poimh,n

ο[ti h=san w`j pro,bata mh.
e;conta poime,na(

24 kai. evgw. ku,rioj
e;somai avtoi/j eivj qeo,n
kai. David evn me,sw|
avtw/n a;rcwn evgw.

kai. h;rxato dida,skein
aevtou.j polla, Å

¹⁴⁰ See Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 225; Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 217

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 226. See also Bernhard Citron, “The Multitude in the Synoptic Gospels,” *SJT* 7 (1954): 416.

ku,rioj evla,lhsa

37:24 kai. o` dou/lo,j mou
 Daid a;rcwn evn me,sw|
 auvtw/n kai. poimh.n ei-j
 e;stai pa,ntwn o[ti evn
 toi/j prostagmasi,n mou
 poreu,sontai kai. ta.
 kri,mata, mou fula,xontai
 kai. poih,sousin auvta,

Ezek 34:5, 8 repeatedly indicates that there is no true shepherd for Israel. Thus, God promises that he will place over Israel a messianic shepherd, his servant David in Ezek 34:23-24; 37:24. The shepherd metaphor in Ezek 34 is clearly connected with “the wilderness.”¹⁴² Since there is no whole chapter which not only intensively and outstandingly manifests the relation between God as shepherd of Israel and Israel as sheep without a shepherd, but also shows God’s promise of establishing a messianic shepherd other than Ezek 34, Mark 6:34 might well be observed against the background of Ezek 34.¹⁴³ Certainly, the shepherd delineations of Ezek 34 are crucial for the depiction of Jesus as “the shepherd fulfilling God’s purpose in seeking out the lost, the weak, the abandoned.”¹⁴⁴ As the messianic shepherd, Jesus’ feeding function may clearly be recognized as a key to the Gospel of Mark’s feeding

¹⁴² *Ibid.* See also Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 217

¹⁴³ See Timothy Wiarda, “Story-Sensitive Exegesis and Old Testament Allusions in Mark,” *JETS* 49 (2006): 502; Eugene LaVerdiere, *The Beginning of the Gospel*, vol. 1 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 172-73; Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 226; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 265; Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, 205; Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 217; van Iersel, *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary*, 225; Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*, 323; Hooker, *The Gospel according to ST Mark*, 165; Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, 340; Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark*, 155; Wilfred Tooley, “The Shepherd and Sheep Image in the Teaching of Jesus,” *Novum Testamentum* 7 (1964): 15-19.

¹⁴⁴ Joseph A. Grassi, *Loaves and Fishes: The Gospel Feeding Narratives*, *Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 21.

account.¹⁴⁵ Wiarda posits this view by noting that the feeding account mainly concentrates on Jesus as “the eschatological shepherd and provider.”¹⁴⁶ It is most likely that Mark 6:34 overtly shows that Jesus, who became the messianic shepherd for Israel without a shepherd, fulfills the promise of God in Ezek 34.¹⁴⁷

5. The Quotation of and Allusion to Isa 40: 8

Finally, there also remains the quotation of Isa 40:8 in 1 Pet 1:25 and the allusion to it in Mark 13:31b. It is most likely that Isaiah is the key prophet to the author of 1 Peter based on the fact that the book of Isaiah is the most frequently quoted and alluded to in it, and the statement *profh/tai oi` peri. th/j eivj u`ma/j ca,ritoj profhteu,santej* in 1 Pet 1:10.¹⁴⁸ Specifically, in the case of Mark 13:31, it consists of a conflated allusion, namely, a combination of the allusion to Isa 51:6 (Ps 101:27a, LXX) with that to Isa 40:8, which also exhibits the Markan (Markan Jesus) characteristic use of the OT. More crucially, from the view of the Markan hermeneutical key, shown by the prologue in 1:1-3 – *vArch. tou/ euvaggeli,ou vIhsou/ Cristou/ iui`ou/ qeou/Ð* – the phrasing that *oi` de. lo,goi mou ouv mh. pareleu,sontai* in Mark 13:31b not only plays a

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁶ Wiarda, “Story-Sensitive Exegesis and Old Testament Allusions in Mark,” 502. Wiarda, *Ibid.*, 504, argues that “interpreters must take particular care to integrate allusion analysis with a more comprehensive process of narrative interpretation that includes tracing plots, sensing nuances of characterization, and seeing how small details function within larger scenes.” Thus, he, *Ibid.*, 489, draws attention to “story-sensitive exegesis,” and notes that it deals with “Gospel narratives as realistically depicted time-of-Jesus scenes and through the stories they tell about human actions and motivations. It treats places and objects as concrete entities, and seeks to be sensitive to unfolding plots and nuances of characterization.”

¹⁴⁷ LaVerdiere, *The Beginning of the Gospel*, 173.

¹⁴⁸ See Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 175; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 24. It seems likely that at least 1 Pet 1:10-2 may also be observed from the view of the Isaianic New Exodus, just as Watts did Mark’s Gospel from that view. See also Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 100-09. Schutter, *Ibid.*, 109, notes that “in more than one way it may be legitimate to call 1 Pet. 1.10-2 a hermeneutical key, since it not only gives unmatched insight into what by all appearances is at least a major aspect of the author’s hermeneutical stance, but also allows for convenient access to his use of the OT elsewhere in the letter.”

significant role in the integrated interpretation of Mark's Gospel, but also betrays the close literary relation between the Gospel itself and 1 Peter.¹⁴⁹

5.1. The Quotation of Isa 40: 8 in 1 Pet 1:25

As one of the explicit quotations, 1 Pet 1:24-25 cites Isa 40:6-8 and is compared with the LXX and the MT as follows.

1 Pet 1:24-25	Isa 40:6-8 (LXX)	Isa 40:6-8 (MT)
24 <u>dio,ti pa/sa</u> <u>sa.rx w`j co,rtou</u> <u>kai. pa/sa do,xa</u> <u>auvth/j w`j a;nqoj</u> <u>co,rtou\ evxhra,nqh</u> <u>o` co,rtou kai. to.</u> <u>a;nqoj evxe,pesen\</u>	6 fwnh. le,gontoj bo,hson kai. ei=pa ti, boh,sw <u>pa/sa</u> <u>sa.rx co,rtou</u> <u>kai. pa/sa</u> <u>do,xa</u>	lK' ar' q.a, hm'ä rm:ßa'w> ar'êq. rmEäao lAq..6 `hd, (F'h; #yciîK. ADßs.x;-lk'w> ryciêx' rf"âB'h;- yKi² #yciê lbe(n"â 'rycix' vbeÿ" 7
25 <u>to. de. r`h/ma</u> <u>kuri,ou me,nei eivj</u> <u>to.n aivw/na</u> tou/to de, evstin to. r`h/ma to. euvaggelisqe.n eivj u`ma/j)	<u>avnqrw,pou w`j</u> <u>a;nqoj co,rtou</u> 7 <u>evxhra,nqh o`</u> <u>co,rtou kai.</u> <u>to. a;nqoj</u> <u>evxe,pesen</u> 8 <u>to. de.</u> <u>r`h/ma tou/</u> <u>geou/ h`mw/n</u> <u>me,nei eivj</u> <u>to.n aivw/na</u>	ryciêx' !kEïa' AB+ hb'v.n"â hw"ßhy> x;Wri lbe(n"â ryciêx' vbeÿ" 8 s `~l'(A[l. ~Wqïy" WnyheDl{a/-rb;d>W #yci

A significant difference exists between the LXX and the MT; verse 7 in the MT is totally absent in the LXX. This difference between them demonstrates that the author

¹⁴⁹ Jobes, *1 Peter*, 127.

of 1 Peter follows the LXX and not the MT.¹⁵⁰ On the other hand, there are three differences between 1 Peter and the LXX. First, the particle $\omega\acute{\nu}\nu\eta$ in 1 Pet 1:24 was added to shift the metaphor into a simile. Next, the term $\alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega, \rho\omicron\upsilon$ was changed into a pronoun $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta/\eta$ which shows that 1 Peter is closer to the MT rather than to the LXX only at this point. Finally, the author of 1 Peter transformed the wording of $\tau\omicron\upsilon/ \gamma\epsilon\omicron\upsilon/ \eta\grave{\mu}\omega/\nu$ in the LXX into $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota, \omicron\upsilon$ in his epistle, consequently, this transformation is overtly deliberate and renders a much more essentially significant theological meaning – the Christological application.¹⁵¹

Specifically, there is debate about the interpretation of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota, \omicron\upsilon$. It is clear that $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon/ \gamma\epsilon\omicron\upsilon/ \eta\grave{\mu}\omega/\nu$ of Isa 40:8 in the LXX is taken as a subjective genitive. Nevertheless, on the basis of the substitution of $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota, \omicron\upsilon$ for $\tau\omicron\upsilon/ \gamma\epsilon\omicron\upsilon/ \eta\grave{\mu}\omega/\nu$, there seems to be a possibility of a shift from a subjective genitive to an objective genitive, although it is difficult to decide which. Achtemeier supports an objective genitive construction, pointing to “the tendency in Christian tradition to identify the message Jesus spoke and the message spoken about Jesus.”¹⁵² Achtemeier’s position is supported by Elliott and Schreiner. Elliott also argues that as far as verses 10-12 and 25b are concerned, “the word that endures forever is the word about Jesus Christ, his suffering, and glorification.”¹⁵³ Schreiner opines that $\rho\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota, \omicron\upsilon$ is “the word about the Lord Jesus,” by noting that “the historical

¹⁵⁰ See Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 176; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 141; Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 124; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 78-79; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 390; Goppelt, *A Commentary on I Peter*, 127; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 77; Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 96; Senior, *1 Peter*, 48; Prasad, *Foundations of the Christian Way of Life according to 1 Peter 1, 13-25: An Exegetico-Theological Study*, 377.

¹⁵¹ See Moyise, “Isaiah in 1 Peter,” 176-77; *Idem*, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 110; Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 141-42; Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 130; Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, 79; Elliott, *1 Peter*, 391; Michaels, *1 Peter*, 78-79; Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 96; Senior, *1 Peter*, 48.

¹⁵² Achtemeier, *1 Peter*, 141-42. See also Prasad, *Foundations of the Christian Way of Life according to 1 Peter 1, 13-25: An Exegetico-Theological Study*, 383.

¹⁵³ Elliott, *1 Peter*, 391.

Jesus did not proclaim the gospel to believers in Asia Minor.”¹⁵⁴ On the contrary, Michaels strongly contends that the interpretation *kuri,ou* should be taken as a subjective genitive by emphasizing that *kuri,ou* is being applied Christologically, which means “the message Jesus proclaimed, so that in Peter’s context the statement becomes a parallel to Jesus’ own pronouncement” that *o` ouvrano.j kai. h` gh/ pareleu,sontai(oi` de. lo,goi mou ouv mh. pareleu,sontai* in Mark 13:31.¹⁵⁵ Michaels’ argument, however, is somewhat weakened by his own reference that “to Peter, the message of Jesus and the message about Jesus are the same message, just as they are to Mark (1:1, 14-15) and to the author of Hebrews (2:3-4).”¹⁵⁶ To this end, prior to reaching a final decision, a cautious and balanced observation should be considered. Consequently, Schutter’s observation deserves mention. Schutter indicates that considering that 1 Pet 1:12 and 23 portray “the message as having its origin from God” and *qeou/* in Isa 40:8 is construed as a subjective genitive, the substitution of Lord for God may still follow the preponderant construction as a subjective genitive in Scripture.¹⁵⁷ He also points out that the author of 1 Peter consistently identifies Jesus with Lord in both 1:3 and 2:3, thus the use of *kuri,ou* in the citation might well maintain the construction as a subjective genitive – the word of the Lord.¹⁵⁸

In summary, Schutter suggests that the author of 1 Peter is developing a concealed “double-meaning”, which makes it difficult to decide whether the interpretation is an objective genitive or a subjective genitive.¹⁵⁹ Therefore, Schutter concludes that “in his [the author’s] hands it has been made to apply particularly to

¹⁵⁴ Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, 96-97.

¹⁵⁵ Michaels, *1 Peter*, 79.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁷ Schutter, *Hermeneutic and Composition in 1 Peter*, 126.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

the Christian experience, because ‘the message from the Lord (God)’ of Isaiah’s prophecy is none other than ‘the message about the Lord (Jesus)’ which imparted to the addressees a new experience.”¹⁶⁰ Schutter’s conclusion appears to be much more careful and persuasive.

5.2. The Conflated Allusion to Isa 51:6 (Ps 101:27a, LXX) and Isa 40: 8 in Mark 13:31

The Markan Jesus’ saying in 13:31 is most probably grounded on Isa 51:6 (Ps 101:27a, LXX) and Isa 40:8.¹⁶¹ The wordings between them are compared as follows.

Mark 13	LXX
<p>31a <u>o` ouvrano.j kai. h` gh/ pareleu, sontai</u> (</p> <p>31b <u>oi` de. lo,goi mou ouv mh. pareleu, sontai</u></p>	<p>Isa 51:6 <u>o` ouvrano.j w`j kapno.j evsterew,gh h` de. gh/ w`j i`ma,tion palaiwgh, setai</u> (Ps 101:27a <u>auvtoi. avpolou/ntai</u>)</p> <p>Isa 40:8 <u>to. de. r`h/ma tou/ geou/ h`mw/n me,nei eivj to.n aivw/na</u></p>

In terms of the allusion to Isa 40:8 in Mark 13:31b a point remains for clarification. This concerns the meaning of *lo,goi mou* (my words). Although “my words” ostensibly seems to refer to the preceding words in the present context, it should also be emphasized that “my words” requires an application to Jesus’ entire teaching.¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁶¹ See Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 480; France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 540; Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, 376; Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*, 792; Hooker, *The Gospel according to ST Mark*, 321; Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 335.

¹⁶² See C. S. Mann, *Mark*, AB, vol. 27 (New York: Doubleday, 1986), 538; van Iersel, *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary*, 409 ; Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the*

In this respect, Jesus' proclamation most probably reveals a Christological confirmation, which means that the steadfastness of Jesus' word is equivalent to that of God's word.¹⁶³ Subsequently, concerning the fact that Isa 40 is one of the "key chapters of Isaiah"¹⁶⁴ in Mark's Gospel as shown by its prologue, the explicit allusion to Isa 40:8 in Mark 13:31b would be viewed as a part of the hermeneutical key to the Gospel itself – My words [the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God] will never pass away.

6. Conclusion

1 Peter and Mark's Gospel prominently draw attention to the suffering of Christ and apply the imagery of the rejected stone of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 and that of the suffering servant of Isa 53 to it. Certainly, Isaiah and the Psalms seem to be the most crucial of the OT documents for the author of 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark considering that they quote and allude to them so intensively. On the other hand, the imagery of Christ as the messianic shepherd of Ezek 34 is also strongly emphasized by both 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel.

In view of this OT use between 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel, a conspicuous characteristic remains. In the case of Mark's Gospel, such as the merged quotation of the prologue in Mark 1:2-3, a composite citation and an extensive combination of allusions is Mark's distinctive method of use of the OT. The citation of Ps 118 (LXX

Cross, 792; Hooker, *The Gospel according to ST Mark*, 321-22; Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, 336; Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, 376. Specifically, van Iersel, *Ibid.*, 409, relevantly comments, "That Jesus' words will not pass away is of central importance to the reader, particularly in this context. It implies that all his predictions and promises remain, even when the last human being has disappeared from the face of the earth and the last bit of heaven and earth has ceased to exist."

¹⁶³ France, *The Gospel of Mark*, 540. Lane, *The Gospel according to Mark*, 480, also comments that "what is said of God in the OT may be equally affirmed of Jesus and his word." Furthermore, it is remarkable that Peter is one of the four disciples (Peter, James, John, and Andrew) who were listening to Jesus' teaching in Mark 13.

¹⁶⁴ Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, 116.

117):22 in Mark 12:10 is viewed from this aspect because the citation is a section of the parable of the wicked tenants in Mark 12:1-12, which comprises the synthesis of the allusion to Isa 5:1-7 with the citation of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22-23. The identical type is manifested in 1 Pet 2:4-8, which is composed of the compound of the allusion to Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 and the conflated citation of Isa 28:16, Ps 118 (LXX 117):22, and Isa 8:14. Both 1 Pet 2:22-25, which contains the compound of the citation of Isa 53 and the allusion to Ezek 34, and Mark 10:45, which holds the merged allusion to Isa 53 and Dan 7 display the merged and integrated way of using the OT.

Finally, considering the two key factors mentioned above, little reason remains to resist the conclusion that 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel reveal a close literary connection between them, which could certainly be evidence that Mark was the contributive amanuensis of 1 Peter.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this work is to explore Mark's possible involvement in the writing of 1 Peter in light of the practice of first century letter writing. Even though Peter was one of the pillar Apostles, his letter 1 Peter has been ignored by NT scholarship. However, after Elliott's reproach, a considerable number of scholarly works have made their appearance. Subsequently, as regards its authorship, there remain two major trends among modern scholars. While quite a number of scholars accept the authenticity of 1 Peter, a sizeable number favor pseudonymity.

There seem to remain several modern critical issues relevant to the authorship of 1 Peter. These relate to the linguistic problem, the historical problem, the doctrinal problem, and the practice of pseudonymity. These problems of 1 Peter lead modern scholarship to reject the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter and contend that 1 Peter is pseudonymous. However, the pseudonymous hypothesis overlooks the probability that Peter, as a contemporary of Paul, must have employed an amanuensis while writing his epistle, which was the outstanding practice of first century letter writers, including Paul himself. In contrast, although the amanuensis hypothesis appeals to Peter's reference in 1 Pet 5:12, *Dia. Silouanou/ u`mi/n tou/ pistou/ avdelfou/(w`j logi,zomai(diV ovli,gwn e;graya* ("By Silvanus, a faithful brother as I regard him, I have written briefly to you") and identifies Silvanus as its amanuensis, however, the Greco-Roman epistolary evidence shows that the formula *gra, fw dia, tinoj* identified *only* the letter-

carrier. In this regard, the current arguments for and against the authenticity of 1 Peter are not sufficient.

On the other hand, remarkably, Peter also refers to Mark as a greeter in 1 Pet 5:13. In this vein, it should also be mentioned that Tertius who was the amanuensis of Romans greets its recipients, *avspa,zomai u`ma/j evgw. Tertioj o` gra,yaj th.n evpistolh.n evn kuri,w|* (Rom 16:22). If Silvanus was the amanuensis for 1 Peter, he may well have greeted its addressees, but Peter did not mention it. In this light, Peter's reference in 1 Pet 5:13, *VAspa,zetai u`ma/j h` evn Babulw/ni suneklekth. kai. Ma/rkoj o` ui`o,j mou* (She who is in Babylon, chosen together with you, greets you, and so does Mark my son), supports the probability that Mark could have been the amanuensis of 1 Peter. Mark was clearly a very literate man, if, as is likely, he was Peter's *e`rmhneuth,j* and the author of the Gospel of Mark based on the references in the early church, including Papias' note, and Peter almost certainly used amanuenses while writing his epistle as Paul did. It should also be noted that Peter's reference in 1 Pet 5:13, *Ma/rkoj o` ui`o,j mou*, plays a crucial role as a historical reference implying the steady relationship between Peter and Mark.

The thesis of this study is that Mark was the contributive amanuensis for 1 Peter with Peter's allowance of a free hand in the composition. This work investigated Mark's involvement in the writing of 1 Peter from five angles by means of a historical and comparative approach. The five criteria are the dominant practice of using an amanuensis in first-century letter writing, the noteworthy employment of an amanuensis by Paul as a contemporary of Peter, historical connections, linguistic connections, and literary connections. Chapter two surveyed the two main proposals regarding authorship of 1 Peter including modern critical issues relevant to authorship. Since Cludius' criticism (1808), there seems to be a trend in modern

scholarship regarding the authorship of 1 Peter, namely, 1 Peter is not Petrine. A considerable number of scholars have queried the genuineness of 1 Peter based on the linguistic problem, the uses of excellent Greek and the Old Testament (LXX) in the letter. They contend that 1 Peter is a pseudonymous epistle. However, this hypothesis is not acceptable, since the early church rejected the practice of pseudonymity and since there remains no example of a pseudonymous epistle in the first century.

Since the question of the authenticity of 1 Peter on the grounds of linguistic and historical problems is a modern tendency, the conclusion that 1 Peter is not Petrine is hasty. A number of scholars have advocated the authenticity of 1 Peter by noting that Peter employed an amanuensis in writing epistles and allowed him to have considerable freedom based on the practice of first-century letter writing. In other words, the linguistic problem must be seen in light of the internal evidence of 1 Peter, the external evidence in the early church, and the practice of first-century letter writing. Therefore, considering Peter's use of amanuenses and his allowing a free hand in the process of writing, it is certainly rational to include the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter as a *bona fide* possibility.

In chapter three, first century letter writing was examined and presented as a practical and supportive background for this work. It is anachronistic to compare the concept of ancient literate with that of contemporary literate using the same criteria. Clearly, reading and writing were separate capabilities in Greco-Roman society. Writing was a rather professional skill, mainly associated with amanuenses due to the technical trouble of penning on papyrus and the difficult access to writing equipment. As revealed by quite a number of extant papyri, generally many people in the lower classes in Greco-Roman society did not acquire the ability to write in their own hands.

Although some of them were partially literate, they were, however, still functionally illiterate. Therefore, there exists the illiteracy formula in the extant papyri.

The role of an amanuensis in Greco-Roman antiquity was classified as a transcriber, contributor, and composer. An amanuensis' role as a contributor was the most common in Greco-Roman antiquity. Obviously, the use of an amanuensis, particularly in the writing of official (business) letters, was a prevalent tendency among people of all ranks and classes, regardless of whether the author was literate or illiterate. Even though, occasionally, both the lower and upper classes would write private letters personally, they still employed an amanuensis to write them. In particular, when an author was ill, then an amanuensis actually wrote an epistle on his behalf. Moreover, business and the laziness of the author were reasons for employing an amanuensis. Importantly, there exists a collegueship between the authors and their personal amanuenses. It must also be emphasized that no matter what the amanuensis' role was or whether a letter was an official or a private one, the writer assumed full accountability for the contents of the letter, because he was liable for checking the final draft of the amanuensis.

In chapter four, the process of Paul's letter writing was examined in light of first century letter writing, and the practice of using an amanuensis for Peter's employment of an amanuensis. Of the thirteen traditional Pauline epistles, Paul undoubtedly engaged an amanuensis in the writing of six at least. Five of Paul's letters manifestly disclose the appearance of an amanuensis by underlining a change in handwriting. Paul employs a formula, $\text{th/| evmh/| ceiri,}$, in 1 Cor 16:21, Gal 6:11, Col 4:18, 2 Th 3:17, and Phlm 19. In the case of Romans, Tertius is identified as its amanuensis. Namely, three of the *Hauptbriefe* were penned through an amanuensis, and this fact notably and evidently indicates Paul's preference and

practice of employing amanuenses while writing his epistles. A statement of the letter being written by an amanuensis and a change in handwriting are viewed as explicit evidence for employing one. The appearance of a postscript is treated as an implicit indicator for engaging an amanuensis. In light of Paul's uses of the autograph postscripts in 1 Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, and Philemon, the case for the use of an amanuensis for 1 Thessalonians and 2 Corinthians is stronger.

Identifying Paul's amanuensis is crucial for this issue, since the extent of the free hand given him may depend on whether a secretary was one of Paul's co-workers who was gifted and trusted or one contracted in the market. In light of the practice of letter writing in Greco-Roman antiquity, it seems very likely that Paul would probably allow an amanuensis to have a free hand when he was a gifted and a trusted colleague. This probability is surely established by the instances that Cicero, Atticus, Quintus, and Alexander the Great employed their amanuenses as contributors. Therefore, it is most likely that Paul's amanuensis probably acted as a contributor, a role which was the most common in Greco-Roman antiquity.

In this light, Peter, as a first century letter writer and a contemporary of Paul, almost undoubtedly engaged an amanuensis in the writing of his epistle allowing him to have a free hand, namely, employing him as a contributive amanuensis. On the other hand, 1 Pet 5:12 does not render Silvanus an amanuensis since the wording of *gr̄a, fw dia, tinoj* is solely used for identifying the letter bearer in the Greco-Roman epistolography. Even so, this fact does not eliminate the probability that Peter employed an amanuensis in the composition of his epistle. Therefore, there remains a real possibility that Mark may well be the amanuensis of 1 Peter based on 1 Pet 5:13 and Papias' fragment. If Mark in 1 Pet 5:13 is the same as the person who is the

author of the Gospel of Mark, this robustly implies that Peter gave Mark, a talented and trusted co-worker, extra freedom while writing 1 Peter in light of the practice of first-century letter writing.

In chapter five, the close relationship between Peter and Mark through their ministry based on 1 Pet 5:13 and the references to Mark in the early church including Papias' note reported by Eusebius was explored and presented as evidence of historical connections between two individuals. Acts exhibits not only that Mark was obviously associated with the Jerusalem church, which implies, at least, that he was also indirectly connected with Peter, but also that Mark as a co-worker of Paul and Barnabas took part in a missionary journey and had significant duties. In this vein, Mark in the Pauline letters has been described constantly as Paul's helpful co-worker. Colossians, Philemon, and 2 Timothy demonstrate that Mark is clearly associated with the Asia Minor churches, specifically, the Colossian church, and had been with Paul in Rome. It is probable that during the period of Paul's later ministry, Mark must have been working as his collaborator in the areas of Rome and Asia Minor.

In this vein, 1 Pet 5:13 also shows the close relationship between Peter and Mark in Rome. The early Christian writers indicate that Peter stayed some time in Rome and was martyred. This sheds light on the probability that Mark's eventual duty in Rome must have set him working alongside Peter.

While some dispute still exists regarding its interpretation of Papias' fragment, there is also a separate description of Mark by the *Anti-Marcion Prologue* to the Gospel of Mark and Hippolytus of Rome. The early Christian writers have coherently reported that Mark was Peter's *e`rmhneuth,j* and the Evangelist. Unless there is a decisive factor that rejects the early church tradition about Mark, in light of both the close relationship between Peter and Mark from 1 Pet 5:13 and the

practice of first-century letter writing, which surely perform as historical evidence to maintain the argument that Mark was the contributive amanuensis of 1 Peter.

In chapter six, the syntactic correlation, the distinctive features of terminology, and the significant and frequent use of $\omega\acute{\nu}\nu\sigma$ for a simile between 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel were explored and presented as possible evidence that implies linguistic connections between. Even though the quality of 1 Peter's Greek has been treated as a good, the author of 1 Peter is unlikely to have been a native speaker of Greek. Consequently, considering that Mark's Greek is not a translation Greek, there remains a significant syntactic correlation between 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel. Furthermore, they not only have common use of characteristic vocabulary, words which are infrequent in the NT, but also employ similar terms for the suffering of Christ. Besides, the comparative particle $\omega\acute{\nu}\nu\sigma$ is engaged in a distinctive manner in them.

In chapter seven, the common Old Testament quotations (allusions) in 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark and their conflated and integrated use of the OT were investigated and presented as possible evidence that implies surprising literary connections between them. 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel outstandingly emphasize the suffering of Christ and apply to it the imagery of the rejected stone of Ps 118 (LXX 117):22 and that of the suffering servant of Isa 53. Isaiah and the Psalms are probably the most crucial documents in the OT for the author of 1 Peter and the Gospel of Mark considering that they cite and allude to them so deeply. Also, the imagery of Christ as the messianic shepherd of Ezek 34 is powerfully underscored by both 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel.

From the pattern of the OT use between 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel, a prominent characteristic emerges. The author of Mark's Gospel quotes or alludes to

the OT through a merged and integrated method. Mark 12:1-11, 10:45, and 13:31 demonstrate this way. Similarly, the author of 1 Peter also cites or alludes to the OT by the same method and this feature is manifested by 1 Pet 2:6-8 and 2:22-25. Therefore, based on these two key features, there seems to be little reason to reject the conclusion that 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel disclose a close literary connection between them, which could be evidence that Mark was the contributive amanuensis of 1 Peter.

Although there remains the similarity of theology and thought between 1 Peter and Mark's Gospel, which may arise from the linguistic and literary similarity between them, however, this affinity of theology and thought might well originate from Peter, not Mark. Because Peter was one of the pillar Apostles and Mark was not only one of the co-workers of Peter, but also his son, albeit figuratively. It is most likely that Peter influenced Mark and contributed to the theology and thought of Mark's Gospel, namely, as Petrine Gospel.

The greeting of 1 Peter claims that its author is the Apostle Peter. There remains no instance of a pseudonymous letter in the first century and the early church rejected the practice of pseudonymity. In this regard, the problem of 1 Peter should be viewed in light of the internal evidence of 1 Peter and the external evidence in the early church. Thus, considering everything mentioned above, this work concludes that Mark was the contributive amanuensis for 1 Peter with Peter's allowance of greater freedom in the composition.