

uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

FACULTÉ DES ÉTUDES SUPÉRIEURES ET POSTOCTORALES



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND POSDOCTORAL STUDIES

Steven Scott
AUTEUR DE LA THÈSE / AUTHOR OF THESIS

Ph.D. (Religious Studies)
GRADE / DEGREE

Department of Classics and Religious Studies
FACULTÉ, ÉCOLE, DÉPARTEMENT / FACULTY, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT

Raising the Dead:
Finding History in the Gospel Accounts of Jesus' Resurrection Miracles

TITRE DE LA THÈSE / TITLE OF THESIS

Theodore De Bruyn
DIRECTEUR (DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS SUPERVISOR

CO-DIRECTEUR (CO-DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS CO-SUPERVISOR

Emma Anderson

Ian Henderson (McGill University)

Jean Paul-Michaud
Université St-Paul

John Welch
Brigham Young University

Gary W. Slater
Le Doyen de la Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales / Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

Raising the Dead:
Finding History in the Gospel Accounts of Jesus's Resurrection Miracles.

Part One: The Synoptic Tradition

Steven Richard Scott

Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the PhD degree in Religious Studies

Department of Classics and Religious Studies
Faculty of Arts
University of Ottawa

© Steven Richard Scott, Ottawa, Canada

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-74246-4
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-74246-4

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

Raising the Dead: Finding History In the Gospel Accounts of Jesus's Resurrection Miracles. Part One: The Synoptic Tradition

This thesis is an historical analysis of Jesus's resurrection miracles in the synoptic tradition, namely, the stories of the raising of Jairus's daughter (Mark 5:21–43 and par.) and the widow of Nain's son (Luke 7:11–17), and the story of the exorcism of a possessed boy (Mark 9:14–29 and par.), which can be considered a raising-of-the-dead story only in the Gospel of Mark.

The analysis done in this thesis differs from other analyses in that it takes seriously both the oral and written nature of the gospels and the traditions behind them. The analysis also differs in that it uses a different historical framework: it works from a position of a very high Christology, frequent communication between Christian centres, and a definite authority structure within the early Christian community from its beginning. These items all affect how one will view the control of the oral tradition, which in turn will affect how one will analyse the differences between the synoptic versions of the stories of Jairus's daughter and the possessed boy, and how one will judge the fact that the story of the widow of Nain's son is found only in Luke.

In regards to the written nature of the gospels, it is argued that the primary structuring device used by the gospel authors is chiastic (concentric) in nature. To demonstrate this a new statistical method for judging chiasms has been developed. A large section of Mark (1:12–6:46) is divided into both longer and shorter units, and then the parallels—both word and conceptual— between each unit and all the other units are noted. This data is then not only used to judge the level of parallelism between units, but also to perform probability calculations on found chiastic structures. The demonstration of chiastic structures is useful in analysing possible redactional changes the gospel authors may have made to the Jesus tradition in order to create their chiasms. Also, because chiastic structures can impart meaning, elements that may have been added for theological reasons are also highlighted.

The result of both the oral and chiastic analyses is a completely new methodology for judging the historicity of the Jesus tradition.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations vi
Abbreviations Peculiar to this Thesis ix
Reference Table for the Unit Division for Mark 1:12–6:46. x
Introduction 1
The Historical Critical Method 4
"Resurrection" or "Raising the Dead" 6
Outline of the Thesis 7
Chapter One: The Historical Framework 9
Models of Oral Transmission 9
The Form Critics Model 9
The Scandinavian (Gerhardsson) Model 11
Bailey's Model 13
Control in Earliest Christianity 17
Leadership and Oversight in the Gospels, Acts, and Paul 17
Control, Unity, and Communication 24
The Effect of Control, Unity, and Communication on Oral Transmission 26
The Importance of the Jesus Traditions 32
Jesus as LORD 32
The Importance of Miracles Showing Jesus as Raiser of the Dead 35
Opposition to Jesus as LORD and its Effect on the Oral Tradition 37
Remembrance and Schematization 41
Eyewitness and Oral Tradition 41
Schematization and Oral Tradition 44
Orality and Methodology 45
Oral Analysis 45
Oral Tradition versus Written Tradition 47
Oral and Written Traditions and Historical Reliability 48
Summary 49
Chapter Two: Chiastic Analysis 53
Introduction 53
On the Lack of Evidence of Chiasm in Greco-Roman Times 53
Methodology for Judging Chiastic Structures 58
Introduction 58
Previous Criteria Developed 59

Probability and Chiasm 62
The Selection of the Chiastic Units 67
The Selection of Parallels 74
An Initial Survey of the Results 77
A Probability Analysis of Some Chiastic Structures in Mark 1:12–6:46 82
Initial Analysis of Some Chiastic Structures 82
Chiastic Patterns Are Rare 97
The Effect of Joining Units on Probability 103
Refining the Found Chiastic Structures 104
Meaning, Purpose, and Implications 125
Chiasms and Meaning 125
The Purpose of Chiasms 137
The Implications of the Analysis of Mark 1:12–6:46 for the Analysis of Other Chiasms in the Synoptic Gospels 139
Luke's and Matthew's Adaption of Mark's Chiastic Structures 144
Luke's Adaptation of Mark's First Power and Wisdom Chiasm 144
Luke's Adaptation of Mark's Second Power and Wisdom Chiasm 148
Matthew's Adaptation of Mark's Power Sections 154
Conclusion 162
Chapter Three: Jairus's Daughter 164
Introduction 164
Chiastic Analysis: Mark's Multiple Chiasms 165
Chiasm after John Dart 165
JD, HW, and Teaching in Nazareth Chiasm 169
Expansion of the Primary Chiasm 172
The Expansion of the Triple Chiasm 174
Chiastic Analysis: Luke's Triple Chiasm 182
Chiastic Analysis: Matthew's Chiasms 188
Matthew's Changes 192
Oral Analysis 197
Historical Plausibility 210
Conclusion 218
Chapter Four: The Possessed Boy 222
Introduction 222
Chiastic Analysis 222
Mark's Transfiguration Chiasm 222
Matthew's Transfiguration Chiasm 226

Luke's Transfiguration Chiasm 227
The Possessed Boy in Mark 229
Luke's Possessed Boy Chiasm 236
Matthew's Possessed Boy Chiasm 237
Oral Analysis 239
Initial Oral Analysis 239
Lukan and Matthean Omissions or Markan Additions? 246
Mark's and Matthew's Endings 251
The Probable Shape of the Oral Tradition 253
Historical Analysis 260
Conclusion 265
Chapter Five: Widow of Nain's Son 268
Introduction 268
Chiastic Analysis 269
Jesus-Is-the-One-to-Come Chiasm 271
The WNS Chiasm 276
WNS in Luke from a Linear Perspective 279
Elijah and Apollonius as Problems for Luke's Argument 281
Elijah Raises a Widow's Son 282
Apollonius of Tyana 284
Philostratus's Sources 285
The Similarities between Philostratus's and Luke's Stories and the Question of Dependency 292
Historical Analysis 295
Ancient Truth versus Modern Truth 301
How Luke Could Have Inserted the Story of the WNS into the Tradition 304
Conclusion 308
Thesis Conclusion 311
Appendix A: Parallel List 322
Word Parallels 322
Conceptual Parallels 346
Appendix B: Parallel Result Charts 370
Shorter Unit Parallel Chart 370
Shorter Unit Result Chart 390
Result Charts for All Possible Three-, Four-, and Five-level Chiasms 392
Three-level Chiasms 392
Four-level Chiasms 393

Five-level Chiasms 394
Five-level Chiasms with First Unit Doubled 395
Longer Unit Parallel Chart 396
Longer Unit Result Chart 402
Bibliography 404

Abbreviations[1]

AB	The Anchor Bible
ABD	*The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday. 1992.
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ACNT	Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament
AGRL	Aspects of Greek and Roman Life
AJT	*Asia Journal of Theology*
AnBib	Analecta biblica
AnLex	Friberg, Timothy, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller, *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament.* Victoria, B.C.: Trafford, 2005.
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kulture Roms im Spiegel der neureren Forschung.* Part 2, *Principat.* Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
ARA	*Annual Review of Anthropology*
ATR	*American Theological Review*
BAGD	Bauer, Walter, William Arndt, Frederick W. Danker, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
Bib	*Biblica*
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BTS	Biblisch-Theologische Studien
ch.	chapter
CBQ	*Catholic Bible Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CGTC	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary
CHL	Commentationes humanarum litterarum
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CTR	*Criswell Theological Review*
DJBP	*Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period: 450 B.C.E. to 600 C. E.* Edited by William Scott Green and Jacob Neusner. 2 vols. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1996.
DMAHA	Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology
EAII	Explorations (American Interfaith Institute)
ECC	Early Christianity in Context
EEC	*Encyclopedia of Early Christianity.* Edited by Everett Ferguson. 2d ed. New York: Garland. 1999.
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EP	*Expository Times*
EQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
ESCO	European Studies on Christian Origins
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments

[1] Abbreviations where possible follow Patrick H. Alexander, *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), ch. 8.

GNC	Good News Commentaries
GNS	Good News Studies
GP	Gospel Perspectives
HB	Hebrew Bible
HC	Householder Commentaries
Her	*Hermes*
Her	Hermenia
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HSCL	Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IRT	Issues in Religion and Theology
IVPNTCS	Inter Varsity Press New Testament Commentary Series
JAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JD	JD
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JEH	*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSP	*Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha*
JSNTSS	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LB	*Linguistica Biblica*
LD	Lectio divina
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
LZ	Lazarus (story of)
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NPP	New Perspectives on the Past
NRT	*La nouvelle revue théologique*
NT	*Novum Testamentum*
NTM	New Testament Monographs
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OBI	Orientalia et biblica lovaniensia
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OT	*Oral Tradition*
PB	Possessed boy
PrTMS	Princeton Theological Monograph Series
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
RThom	*Revue thomiste*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SCJ	Studies in Christianity and Judaism
SGM	Spiritual/Secret Gospel of Mark
SETU	*Studia evangelica: Texte und Untersuchungen*

SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and Its World
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies: Monograph Series
ST	*Studia Theologica*
SCHNT	Studia ad corpus hellenisticum Novi Testamenti
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTQ	*St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.* Edited by G. J. Botterwick and H. Ringgren. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley, and D. E. Green. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–
THNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
TInq	Theological Inquiries
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
WBC	World Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WNS	Widow of Nain's son
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

Abbreviations Peculiar to this Thesis

HW	(the story of the) Haemorrhaging Woman
JD	(the story of) Jairus's Daughter
PB	(the story of the) Possessed Boy
WNS	(the story of the) Widow of Nain's Son
LUD	Longer Unit Division
MLUD	Modified Longer Unit Division
SUD	Shorter Unit Division
MSUD	Modified Shorter Unit Division
DS	Disciple Story
GPS	General Public Story
PC	Power Chiasm
PS	Power Story
PSn	Power Section
PWC	Power or Wisdom Chiasm
PWS	Power or Wisdom Story
PWSn	Power or Wisdom Section
WC	Wisdom Chiasm
WS	Wisdom Story
WSn	Wisdom Section

Reference Table for the Unit Division for Mark 1:12–6:46.

The following table gives the original longer and shorter unit divisions along with the resulting modifications to these divisions. The table gives both the long title for each the unit, a shortened title, which will be used in the chiasm diagrams, and an abbreviated title, which will be used in tables and charts.

Unit no.	**Longer Unit Division (LUD) and *Modified Longer Unit Division (MLUD)***	**Unit no.**	**Shorter Unit Division (SUD) and *Modified Shorter Unit Division (MSUD)***
1	The temptation in the wilderness (1:12–13); the temptation; temp	1	The temptation in the wilderness (1:12–13); the temptation; temp
2	Proclaiming in Galilee (1:14–15); proclaiming in Galilee; pro Gal	2	Proclaiming in Galilee (1:14–15); proclaiming in Galilee; pro Gal
3	The call of the four (1:16–20); four called; 4 called	3	The call of the four (1:16–20); four called; 4 called
4	The healing of the Capernaum demoniac (1:21–28); Capernaum demoniac; C dem	4.1	Jesus teaches in the Capernaum synagogue (1:21–22); teaching in Capernaum; t in C
		4.2	The healing of the Capernaum demoniac (1:23–27); Capernaum demoniac; C dem
		4.3	The news spreads in Galilee (1:28); news spreads in Galilee; N in G
		4.2–3	*MSUD: Capernaum demoniac healed and news spreads (1:23–28); Capernaum demoniac; C dem*
5	The healing of Simon's mother-in-law (1:29–31); Simon's mother-in-law; S's m-i-l	5	The healing of Simon's mother-in-law (1:29–31); Simon's mother-in-law; S's m-i-l
6	A general healing at Simon's house (1:32–34); healing at Simon's; h at S's	6	A general healing at Simon's house (1:32–34); healing at Simon's; h at S's
5–6	*MLUD: The healing of Simon's mother-in-law and a crowd (1:29–34); at Simon's; at S's*		
7	Jesus with the four in the desert and proclaiming around Galilee (1:35–39); Jesus and the four in desert and proclaiming; J4 in d	7.1	Jesus and the four in the desert (1:35–38); Jesus and the four in desert; J4 in d
		7.2	Jesus and the four proclaim (1:39); Jesus and the four proclaim; J4 pro
8	The healing of a leper (1:40–45); leper healed; lep h	8.1	The healing of a leper (1:40–44); leper healed; lep h
		8.2	The leper proclaims (1:45); leper proclaims; lep pro
		8	*MSUD 8: same as LUD 8*
9	The healing of a paralytic (2:1–12); paralytic healed; para h	9.1	Jesus teaches at home (2:1–2); teaching at home; t at home
		9.2	The healing of a paralytic (2:3–12); paralytic healed; para h
		9	*MSUD: same as LUD 9*
10	The call of Levi (2:13–14); Levi called; L called	10.1	Jesus teaches by the sea (2:13); teaching by sea; t by sea
		10.2	The call of Levi (2:14); Levi called; L called
11	The controversy over eating with sinners (2:15–17); sinners controversy; sinners	11.1	Jesus eats with many (2:15); many eat with Jesus; many eat
12	The controversy over the disciples not fasting (2:18–22); fasting controversy; fasting		

Unit no.	Longer Unit Division (LUD) and *Modified Longer Unit Division (MLUD)*	Unit no.	Shorter Unit Division (SUD) and *Modified Shorter Unit Division (MSUD)*
12.1	*MLUD: The controversy over the disciples not fasting (2:18–20); fasting controversy; fasting*	12.1	The controversy over the disciples not fasting (2:18–20); fasting controversy; fasting
12.2–3	*MLUD: Two parables on new and old (2:21–22); new and old; new*	12.2	The parable of new cloth (2:21); new cloth; cloth
		12.3	Parable of new wine (2:22); new wine; wine
13	The controversy over plucking grain on the Sabbath (2:23–28); plucking controversy; plucking	13	The controversy over plucking grain on the Sabbath (2:23–28); plucking controversy; plucking
		13.1	*MSUD: The controversy over plucking grain (2:23–26); plucking controversy; pluck*
		13.2	*MSUD: The pronouncement on the Sabbath (2:27–28); Sabbath pronouncement; Sabath*
14	The controversy over healing on the Sabbath (3:1–6); healing controversy; h con	14	The controversy over healing on the Sabbath (3:1–6); healing controversy; h con
15	A general healing by a boat (3:7–12); healing by boat; h by bo	15	A general healing by a boat (3:7–12); healing by boat; h by bo
16	The appointment of the twelve (3:13–19a); twelve appointed; 12 app	16	The appointment of the twelve (3:13–19a); twelve appointed; 12 app
17	The Beelzebul controversy (3:19b–30); Beelzebul controversy; Beelz	17.1	Jesus's family part one (3:19b-21); Jesus's family part one; Jf 1
		17.2	The Beelzebul controversy (3:22–30); Beelzebul controversy; Beelz
18	Jesus declares his followers family (3:31–35); disciples declared family; D fam	18.1	Jesus's family part two (3:31–33); Jesus's family part two; Jf 2
		18.2	Jesus declares his followers family (3:34–35); disciples declared family; D fam
17–18	*MLUD: Beelzebul controversy and on family (3:19b–35); Beelzebul and family; Beelz fam*		
19	Jesus teaches from a boat (4:1–2); teaching from boat; t from bo	19	Jesus teaches from a boat (4:1–2); teaching from boat; t from bo
20	The parable of seed on different ground (4:3–9); seed on ground; s on gr	20	The parable of seed on different ground (4:3–9); seed on ground; s on gr
21	Jesus explains why he teaches in parables (4:10–12); Why teaching in parables; why par	21	Jesus explains why he teaches in parables (4:10–12); Why teaching in parables; why par
22	The explanation of the parable of the seed on the ground (4:14–20); parable explained; par exp	22	The explanation of the parable of the seed on the ground (4:14–20); parable explained; par exp
21–22	*MLUD: Explanation of parables (4:10–20); explanation of parables; exp par*		
23	The parable of the lamp (4:21–23); lamp; lamp	23	The parable of the lamp (4:21–23); lamp; lamp
24	The parable of measure for measure (4:24–25); measure; measure	24	The parable of measure for measure (4:24–25); measure; measure
23–24	*MLUD: Parables of lamp and measure for measure (4:21–25); lamp and measure; lamp and meas*		

Unit no.	**Longer Unit Division (LUD) and *Modified Longer Unit Division (MLUD)***	Unit no.	**Shorter Unit Division (SUD) and *Modified Shorter Unit Division (MSUD)***
26	The parable comparing the kingdom to a mustard seed (4:30–32); mustard seed; mustard	26	The parable comparing the kingdom to a mustard seed (4:30–32); mustard seed; mustard
27	Conclusion to the parable section (4:33–34); parable section conclusion; par con	27.1	Jesus teaches public only in parables (4:33); public taught in parables; pub par
		27.2	Jesus teaches everything to the disciples (4:34); disciples taught everything; d all
28	The miracle of the stilling of the storm (4:35–41); storm stilled; storm	28.1	Jesus leaves crowd in a boat (4:35): Jesus leaves in boat; J leaves
		28.2	The miracle of the stilling of the storm (4:36–41); storm stilled; storm
29	The healing of the Gerasene demoniac (5:1–20); Gerasene healed; Ge dem		
29.1–2	*MLUD: Gerasene healed and news spreads (5:1–17); Gerasene healed; Ger h*	29.1	The healing of the Gerasene demoniac (5:1–13); Gerasene healed; Ge dem
		29.2	The news spreads in Gerasa (5:14–17); news spreads in Gerasa; n in Ge
		29.1–2	*MSUD: same as MLUD 29.1/2*
29.3–4	*MLUD: Gerasene not accepted as disciple, but sent to proclaim (5:18–20); Gerasene not accepted; Ge not*	29.3	The Gerasene is not accepted as a disciple (5:18–19); Gerasene not accepted; Ge not
		29.4	The Gerasene proclaims (5:20); Gerasene proclaims; Ge pro
30	Jairus makes a request (5:21–24); Jairus's request; Ja req	30.1	Jesus returns in a boat (5:21); Jesus returns in boat; J ret
		30.2	Jairus makes a request (5:22–24); Jairus's request; Ja req
			***GPS and PS**: MSUD 30: same as LUD 30*
31	The healing of the HW (5:25–34); the HW; HW	31	The healing of the HW (5:25–34); the HW; HW
30–31	*MLUD: Jairus's request and the HW (5:21–34); Ja req + HW*		
32	The raising of JD (5:35–43); JD; JD	32.1	Messengers arrive for Jairus (5:35–37); Jairus's messengers; Ja mes
		32.2	The mourning crowd at Jairus's house (5:38–40a); Jairus's mourners; Ja mo
		32.3	JD is raised (5:40b–43); JD raised; JD
		32	*MSUD: same as LUD 32*
33	Jesus teaches in Nazareth (6:1–6a); teaching in Nazareth; t in Naz	33	Jesus teaches in Nazareth (6:1–6a); teaching in Nazareth; t in Naz
33–34.1	*MLUD: Jesus teaches in Nazareth and surrounding villages (6:1–6); t in Naz*	*33–34.1*	*MSUD: same as MLUD 33–34.1*
34	The twelve are instructed (6:6b–13); twelve instructed; 12 ins	34.1	Jesus teaches in villages (6:6b); teaching in villages; t in vil
		34.2	The twelve are instructed (6:7–11); twelve instructed; 12 ins
		34.3	The twelve proclaim and heal (6:12–13); twelve proclaim; 12 pro
35	The story of Herod and John the Baptist (6:14–29); Herod and John; He and Jo	35.1	Herod hears the news concerning Jesus (6:14–16); Herod hears the news; Herod
		35.2	The death of John (6:17–29); death of John; John
34–36.1a	*MLUD: Twelve instructed, on Herod and John, and twelve return (6:7–30); twelve proclaim and on Herod; 12 and He*	*34–36.1*	*MSUD: same as MLUD 34–36.1a*

Unit no.	**Longer Unit Division (LUD) and *Modified Longer Unit Division (MLUD)***	**Unit no.**	**Shorter Unit Division (SUD) and *Modified Shorter Unit Division (MSUD)***
36.1b–4	*MLUD: The feeding of the five thousand (6:31–46); feeding of the 5000; 5000*	36.1	The twelve return (6:30–32); twelve return; 12 ret
		36.2	Jesus teaches the crowd that follows (6:33–34); teaching following crowd; t foll
		36.3	The feeding of the five thousand (6:35–44); feeding of the 5000; 5000
		36.4	The twelve are sent ahead (6:45–46); twelve sent ahead; 12 sent
		36.1b–4	*MSUD: Same as MLUD 36.1b–4*

Introduction

The miracles of Jesus raising people from the dead are perhaps the most astounding miracles in the gospels; they are certainly the most astounding healings. They immediately cause one to wonder whether they could have taken place. However, as others have pointed out, it is beyond the scope of the historical critical method to determine whether Jesus actually raised anyone from the dead; rather, the best one can do is to try and determine if the accounts of the raising-of-the-dead miracles found in the gospels reflect incidents in Jesus's life where the witnesses thought Jesus raised someone from the dead.[2] This thesis is consequently a historical-critical analysis to determine whether, and to what degree, the raising-of-the-dead miracles found in the synoptic gospels reflect incidents in Jesus's life. A proper historical analysis requires an analysis of what some have termed the three levels of history to be found in the gospels: the level of the finished gospel (often referred to as the redactional level), the level of the traditions employed by the gospel writers, and finally the level of the historical events that gave rise to the gospel accounts.[3] A thorough analysis of each of these levels will be performed to see what history, if any, can be found concerning the original events and the historical effects that led to the gospel accounts of these astounding miracles.

There have been three substantial historical critical analyses of Jesus's miracles of revivification, namely, by Rochais, Harris, and Meier.[4] These analyses are all good analyses in their own right. Only an overview of the prominent methodologies used by each author will be given here, and the specific points made by them and others on different aspects of the stories will be dealt with in the analysis of the miracles. The methodology used by Rochais and Meier are quite similar; both focus on form criticism and redaction criticism. Meier's analysis is more rounded because he uses many types of argument based on the criteria developed in the first volume of his series.[5] Harris's

---

[2] Anything beyond this, as others have pointed out, goes beyond the scope of the historical critical method; see John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (3 vols.; ABRL New York: Doubleday, 1991–2001), 2: 517–21, 773–75.

[3] I am here following Paul J. Achtemeier, "Miracles and the Historical Jesus: A Study of Mark 9:14–29," in *Jesus and the Miracle Tradition* (Eugene, Ore.: Cascade, 2008), 117–18; Repr. from Catholic Bible Quarterly 37 (1975): 471–91.

[4] Murray J. Harris, "'The Dead Are Restored to Life': Miracles of Revivification in the Gospels," in *The Miracles of Jesus* (GP 6; Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1986); Meier, *Marginal*, 2: 773–873; Gérard Rochais, *Les récits de résurrection des morts dans le Nouveau Testament* (SNTSMS 40; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

[5] Meier, *Marginal*, 1: 167–95. The primary criteria he refers to are the criterion of embarrassment (168, items that are embarrassing to the early church are unlikely to have been invented), the criterion of discontinuity or dissimilarity (171, items that are dissimilar to either first century Judaism or Christianity are likely to be original to Jesus), the criterion of multiple attestation (174, the more an item is attested in independent historical records the more likely it is historically accurate), and the criterion of coherence (176, that which coheres with what has already been established as historically likely has a greater likelihood of being historical). Meier then lists the following as secondary or dubious criteria: the criterion of traces of Aramaic (178, Greek that has vocabulary or sentence structure more similar to Aramaic than Greek is more likely to have originated in Palestine), the criterion of Palestinian environment (180, that which reflects a Jewish Palestinian environment is more likely to reflect that environment than that which does not), the criterion of the vividness of narration (181, concrete details that do not seem to serve any polemical value are not likely to have been invented), the criterion of the tendencies of the development of the synoptic tradition (182, that which tends to conform to the way the synoptic tradition developed is more likely to have originated in said development), and the criterion of historical presumption (183, this involves the question of historical proof and will depend on how one understands the larger historical framework of the transmission of the Jesus traditions). Many of these criteria have been strongly criticized,

analysis focuses on showing how the miracles as presented are historically possible, and his study is thus apologetic in nature. It has been over fifteen years since these three studies, and since then some new developments have taken place that have a direct impact on the study of the historical Jesus.

One advance is the realisation that form criticism was laid on mostly false foundations. The insight that the Jesus tradition was made up of individual units (stories about Jesus or sayings of Jesus) that were passed on orally before being written down remains intact.[6] However, the nature of the manner of the oral transmission proposed by the form critics has been severely challenged, primarily in the work of Birger Gerhardsson and Kenneth Bailey.[7] The form critics' understanding of oral transmission as mostly uncontrolled transmission allowed for the view that the tradition would be changed and added to as the *Sitz im Leben* changed. The goal of the historian became that of removing these changes in order to get back to the original perfect form.[8] This led to erroneous conclusions such as the belief that the shorter form of tradition was more likely to be the more original. More recent studies have shown, however, that oral transmission can lead to both shortening and lengthening of tradition. This is even seen in the gospels, where at times Luke and Matthew expand on Mark and at other times they shorten Mark.[9]

Another defect of form criticism is that though it was based on a model of oral tradition it still tended to view the transmission of traditions in terms of written tradition. It tended to view the tradition as static; the tradition would only change when the *Sitz im Leben* changed. However, as will be shown below, each performance of an oral tradition can change even when the *Sitz im Leben* remains substantially the same. There is also evidence that though the gospels are written texts the authors used their material in an

---

but it is not within the scope of this thesis to do a thorough analysis of each criterion. For example, the flaws of the criterion of dissimilarity are the main focus of Gerd Theissen and Dagmar Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria* (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 1–171. This heavily used criterion leads to a very narrow amount of material and tends to produce a picture that is anti-Semitic, and one that views most of the material as being produced by the early church. It would be like taking as historically accurate in the works of Luther only that which was dissimilar to both Catholicism and Lutheranism: one would not be left with much. Rather, that which fits with Palestinian Judaism and can been seen to develop into early Christianity through Jesus is a better indicator of what is likely to be historical. Hence Theissen and Winter argue for the criterion of historical plausibility, which is a variation of Meier's criterion of coherence. Theissen and Winter, *Quest*, 188–91, speak of "comprehensive historical plausibility," the combination of the plausibility of historical context and plausibility of historical effects in combination with the distinctiveness of the historical figure of Jesus. Theissen and Winter are again using the language of Gadamer and his concept of *Wirkungsgeschichte*, "history of effect"; see Hans Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Historicity* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1972), 300–307.

[6] This is actually the insight of Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesus-überlieferung* (1919; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969). Schmidt is not actually a form critic, but is considered a founding father, since this insight was foundational to form criticism.

[7] K. E. Bailey, "Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels," *AJT* 5 (1991): 34–54; K. E. Bailey, "Middle Eastern Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels," *ExpTim* 106 (1995): 563–67; Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961); Birger Gerhardsson, *The Reliability of the Gospel Tradition* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001). The various models of oral transmission are discussed below on page 9.

[8] For a short overview on form criticism see John Barton, "Form Criticism: Old Testament," *ABD* 2:838–41; Vernon K. Robbins, "Form Criticism: New Testament," *ABD* 2:841–44. On form criticism in relationship to oral tradition see Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006), 241–49. Form criticism and its defects in regards to oral transmission are discussed in detail below on page 9.

[9] On this and other so called laws of transmission see E. P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1969), esp. 272–75.

oral manner; in other words, since they lived in a primarily oral society they tended to write in an oral manner.[10] Thus, though the gospels are written documents, they reflect the sensibility of oral tradition. The form critic, on the other hand, though working from a model of oral tradition, treated oral tradition from the perspective of written tradition. By viewing oral traditions as written traditions the form critic essentially became a redaction critic: the goal was to remove the various levels of redaction that accumulated as the *Sitz im Leben* changed. This is a major flaw of the analyses of Rochais and Meier. Both authors treat the gospel authors as if they were working primarily from static or written sources.[11] However, if the gospel authors were working primarily from oral tradition, then the goal is not to remove various levels of redaction to establish what was in the original source, but rather to establish what the essential core of the oral tradition was, and what sort of variation was allowed in each performance of the tradition.

This is not to say that redaction criticism is not an important tool in historical critical analysis. Much of this thesis will be devoted to trying to understand what the raising-of-the-dead miracles meant to the gospel authors and how they might have adapted the oral tradition to achieve their goals as authors. In this respect, the analysis is similar to that of scholars practicing traditional form and redaction criticism. There is, however, a subtle difference: whereas traditional criticism used redaction criticism to peel away redactional levels to get to an isolated core, much as one peels away and removes the layers of an onion, the analysis here is more to determine in what way the gospel authors were working within the variation allowed in the Christian community for recounting valued tradition. For example, it will be argued that variation was allowed in the details of a tradition, but not to the basic storyline or point of the tradition. It is in these details that an oral performer can make the story his own and add her or his own slant, or other levels of meaning. Other performers may or may not use similar details. Consequently, by removing the redactional details used by the gospel author one is not necessarily closer to the author's source.

One similarity between the two methodologies is the goal of finding an essential core: in the case of traditional redaction criticism, it is the original story before the additional elements were added from each change in the *Sitz im Leben*, and in the case of the methodology proposed here, it is the core story that cannot be changed. Often the results will be the same or very similar: the redactional elements more often occur in the details, and it is in the details where variation is allowed. One then may ask, what use is a different method if the results will often be similar and in some cases the same? The situation is analogous to court trial, where a person was convicted on evidence that was discovered to be false. If a new trial is ordered based on true evidence, and this trial also leads to a conviction, it does not make the first trial any less invalid, and the consequent retrial any less worthwhile or necessary. This is because a conclusion is only as valid as the method used to reach it. As such this thesis is as much about how the final conclusions are reached as it is about the final conclusions.

In addition to a better understanding of how oral societies transmit and control traditions, the understanding of how early Christianity developed in the first century is changing. For example, as will be discussed below, the standard view of Christianity moving from a low Christology to a high Christology over time has been challenged.

---

[10] See below on page 45.

[11] For example, in speaking of the story of JD, Rochais says, "Les trois additions que Marc fait au texte de sa source . . ." (Rochais, *Récits*, 73). Meier, though he often speaks of the oral tradition the authors may have used, uses phrases such as "The exact wording of the earliest form of the Jairus tradition . . ." (Meier, *Marginal*, 2:780). As will be discussed, such phrasing as "exact wording" is generally inappropriate when speaking of oral tradition; see below on pages 9–17.

Also the view of largely independent Christian communities developing primarily in isolation from each other has been challenged.[12] This means that the understanding of the *Sitz im Leben* of the early church has changed. Since this thesis will be working from the perspective of this different historical framework, the conclusions as to what is plausible will be different.

There is also growing evidence that the gospel authors used a structuring device known as chiasm.[13] The study of chiastic structures is slowly gaining acceptance in the academy; however, there are still many sceptics. This thesis addresses this scepticism by developing a rigorous and systematic methodology for analysing potential chiastic structures. If it can be demonstrated that an author uses chiasm in a text, then one has a potentially useful tool in determining the intent of an author, because chiastic structuring is also a rhetorical device. Furthermore, a chiastic analysis will highlight items the author may have added to the tradition in order to create the chiastic structures. This thesis will be using both chiastic and oral analysis: chiastic analysis to determine not only the structural arrangement brought to the oral tradition by the gospel writer, but also the theological meaning of the tradition for the author, and oral analysis to determine where possible the probable shape of the oral story. Both of these analyses can be used as a type of redaction criticism: the determination of a chiastic structure will highlight material that was perhaps changed to create the chiasm, and in the determination of the likely shape of the oral story, each author's changes to the tradition become clearer.

In light of these new developments in the study of early Christianity and the New Testament, a new historical critical analysis is needed. Before moving on, a few words are needed in regards to the historical critical method.

The Historical Critical Method

The goal of this thesis is a historical-critical analysis, in light of the above developments, of the accounts in the gospels of Jesus's miracles of bringing people back from the dead. Some may object to the phrase "finding history" in the title, and may read into it a positivist understanding of history on my part. This could not be farther from the truth. I am not claiming to have found history in a definitive sense; rather the title refers to the art of practising history. The modern practice of history, referred to as the historical-critical method, is about the critical analysis of sources to determine what can be said about what happened in the past. Theses are proposed and arguments are made based on the evidence and how we understand the functioning of the world around us. The theses and arguments are then assessed by others for their degree of plausibility. Whether or not this process is positivist depends on the assessor. For some, the level of plausibility will never reach absolute certainty, and consequently there is no danger of positivism, but for others the threshold of plausibility becoming absolute certainty may be extremely low. Most people hold a position somewhere between the extremes of absolute scepticism and absolute positivism.

On a theoretical level I am an absolute sceptic: for me there is always the possibility, no matter how small, of new evidence turning up that will destroy my understanding of the world, as in the movie *The Matrix*.[14] Or to use the example of Descartes, the source of modern scepticism, it could be that all I perceive is due to work

---

[12] On Christology see below on page 32. On the Christian community see below on page 17.

[13] The methodology of chiasm is the topic of chapter two.

[14] Andy Wachowski and Larry Wachowski, "The Matrix" (United States and Australia: Warner Brothers Pictures, 1999). In this movie the main character at one point wakes up to discover that he has been in a life-support pod and all his experiences had been fed to him via huge interactive computer.

of a malignant demon [15] Even if I do not think this is likely, I accept that the picture of the world formed in my brain is due to a biological process that processes a limited amount of effects from the world through my senses (sense-data), and that what I perceive does not represent things-in-themselves, but is only a partial reflection of a shadow at best [16] In addition my thought processes are conditioned by my language, upbringing, and culture, and to a degree I cannot escape the theoretical structures they impose [17] However, on a practical level, I accept that my understanding of the world does on some level have a direct correspondence with the world For example, I am certain that if a ten-thousand ton weight were to drop on me or anyone else, the result would be one dead human I am likewise certain, for example, that there was a Roman emperor Augustus who ruled an empire two thousand years ago [18]

There is not the time or space here to go into the theoretical underpinnings, or lack there-of, of the historical critical method [19] Instead I refer the reader to a several recent discussions of this subject by historical Jesus scholars that closely represent my views on

---

[15] Rene Descartes, *The Essential Descartes* (ed Margaret Dauler Wilson, New York New American Library, 1969), 169–170 This comes at the end of meditation one which supplies reasons for doubting what we experience On this meditation see Gary C Hatfield, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Descartes and the Meditations* (RPG London Routledge, 2003), 71–97 To counter this scepticism Descartes produced his proofs of God in meditation 3, Descartes, *Essential Descartes*, 179–93 However, these proofs were soon dismantled, and a satisfactory proof for what we experience as being "real" has not been discovered The best attempt is probably G E Moore's "Proof of an External World," in his G E Moore, *Philosophical Papers* (London Allen & Unwin, 1959), ch 7 The best rumination on the philosophical tension between certainty and scepticism can be found in Ludwig Wittgenstein, et al , *On Certainty* (New York Harper, 1972)

[16] There is a distance between the phenomena presented in our minds via sense data and the actual things-in-themselves that cause the data to be presented This area of philosophical enquiry is referred to as phenomenology On things-in-themselves or noumena see Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* (trans Marcus Weigelt and F Max Muller, London Penguin, 2007) On sense data see J L Austin and G J Warnock, *Sense and Sensibilia* (Oxford Clarendon, 1962), A J Ayer, *The Foundations of Empirical Knowledge* (London Macmillan, 1940), A J Ayer, "Has Austin Refuted Sense-Data?," in *Symposium on J L Austin* (New York Humanities, 1969) Phenomenology began with Edmund Husserl whose work was expanded by Martin Heidegger The most recent prominent thinkers are Paul Ricoeur and Hans-Georg Gadamer

[17] This is the insight of the linguistic turn that began with the work of the structuralist Saussure, and continued with post-structuralism and postmodernism, see Ferdinand de Saussure, *Writings in General Linguistics* (Oxford Oxford University Press, 2006) On post-structuralism and postmodernism and related theories, see Peter Barry, *Beginning Theory An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory* (Manchester Manchester University Press, 1995)

[18] On balancing scepticism and "common sense" see Wittgenstein, et al , *On Certainty* My own position is very close to that presented by N T Wright, *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (3 vols , Minneapolis Fortress Press, 1992–2003), 1 31–46 He argues for a balance between positivism and scepticism from the phenomenologist perspective (see above n 16 on page 5) for which he uses the term critical realism critical in the sense of being aware of the arguments for being sceptical about our observations of the world, but realist in that these observations do represent the world In addition he accepts that our observations are understood via our worldviews and "stories," and hence takes into account the insights of the linguistic turn For similar positions see James D G Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Cambridge Eerdmans, 2003), 110–11, Paul R Eddy and Gregory A Boyd, *The Jesus Legend A Case for the Historical Reliability of the Synoptic Jesus Tradition* (Grand Rapids, Mich Baker Academic, 2007), 80–81, Ben F Meyer, *Critical Realism and the New Testament* (PrTMS 17, Allison Park, Pa Pickwick, 1989) In regards to the practice of history, Eddy and Boyd use the term "open historical-critical method" (Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, 81)

[19] On theory and history see Gabrielle M Spiegel, *Practicing History New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn* (New York, N Y Routledge, 2005), Willie Thompson, *Postmodernism and History* (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire Palgrave Macmillan, 2004)

the subject.[20] On one level a review of these is unnecessary, because the degree to which the conclusions can be found to be plausible is dependent on the reader's understanding of the world and how the human mind operates.[21] In other words, whether and to what degree the methodologies applied in this thesis are successful in raising the dead and finding history is in the hands of my peers and their worldview. Hopefully there will be a positive fusion of horizons.[22]

"Resurrection" or "Raising the Dead"

Some may object to the use of the term "resurrection" in regards to Jesus's miracles of raising people from the dead, because they think that the term "resurrection" should be reserved for *the* resurrection. For these scholars, resurrection means the resurrection to eternal life.[23] I disagree because resurrection only refers to the act of raising someone from the dead. One is to assume that the person raised by Jesus was understood to have been raised to perfect health. This is the same as Christians believe will happen at *the* resurrection. Whether this act was done by Jesus during his ministry, or at *the* resurrection, the person raised is raised to perfect health. The difference is that those resurrected on the day of the LORD, will be resurrected to a world, where, in the language of Revelation and the Hebrew Bible, the dragon in the sea has been defeated once and for all. In other words, they will be resurrected to a world without death and decay in any form. It is not the resurrection that brings eternal life, but the absence of all evil, including death, in the world. Furthermore, as will be shown in the analysis of the

---

[20] See Dunn, *Jesus*, 67–136; Theissen and Winter, *Quest*, 201–204, 226–60; Wright, *Christian Origins*, 1:31–46 Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, 39–90.

[21] As Theissen and Winter, *Quest*, 202, point out the root of *plaus*ibility and ap*plaus*e are the same. They argue for that which the individual scholar considers to be true to be imparted intersubjectively, it must be considered plausible by her or his audience: "By describing our criterion as the 'criterion of plausibility,' we thus are including the subjectivity of the scholar and the intersubjectivity of the scholarly community (and that means what can be accepted there) in our methodology" (Theissen and Winter, *Quest*, 202). On the problem of historical plausibility Theissen and Winter say: "We will never know 'how it really was' (Ranke), nor can we ever be able to slip into the role of eyewitness of that time, whether or not this would seem to be a desirable or meaningful possibility. An accurate and comprehensive picture is an ideal, a horizon that can be approached only as a matter of plausibility. Plausible judgements are relative judgements. Their relativity is indicated by three signs: they are intersubjective; they are a matter of probability, and they are unrepeatable" (Theissen and Winter, *Quest*, 201). By "unrepeatable" they mean that what is plausible is dependent on the understanding of the individual scholar and her or his audience at a specific time; "the judgement about plausibility is open and can be changed" (Theissen and Winter, *Quest*, 203). In using the term "horizon" Theissen and Winter are referring to the thought of Hans-Georg Gadamer and his concept of the fusion or meeting of horizons: "the horizon in which the person seeking to understand lives and the historical horizon within which he places himself . . . the horizon of the present is continually in the process of being formed ... (and) cannot be formed without the past . . . understanding is always the fusion of these horizons supposedly existing by themselves" (Gadamer, *Truth*, 302–7). On these quotes see Dunn, *Jesus*, 122–23.
Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (*Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation* [New York: Continuum, 2000], 51–55), in particular, has a problem with the criterion of plausibility, because what is "plausible in a culture depends on the hegemonic ideological understandings of 'how the world is.'" This is true, but it is true for everything we consider to be true, that is, plausible. It is part of the condition of humanity. Such arguments lead to the ultimate conclusion that every conclusion drawn on the nature of the world and what we experience is completely arbitrary, and one perspective is just as valid as another. This may be theoretically true; however, it is not practical: at some point we have to make a leap of faith. The first leap is accepting that the phenomena presented to our minds do represent an external world. This sort of extreme postmodern argumentation also leads to for what for many people are completely unpalatable conclusions such as the conclusion that arguments both for and against the holocaust are equally valid. On a theoretical level plausibility is all we have and we cannot escape it.

[22] See previous note for the background of this term.

[23] For example, this is the position of Meier, *Marginal*, 2:775–77.

gospel stories, Jesus raising the dead person was seen as an example of the power he will use on the Day.

Outline of the Thesis

There are three raising the dead miracles to be found in the synoptic gospels: Jairus's daughter,[24] the possessed boy,[25] and the widow of Nain's son.[26] Since the titles of these stories will be used repeatedly, abbreviations will be used when discussing them: JD, PB, and WNS. The story of the possessed boy is not generally considered a raising-of-the-dead story, in view of how it is presented in Luke and Matthew. However, it can be demonstrated that it is a raising-of-the-dead story in Mark by the reaction of the audience, certain verbal parallels with JD, and chiastic parallels with Jesus's previous speech on taking up the cross and losing life in order to gain life (Mark 8:34-38).[27] The central hypothesis of this thesis is that JD and the PB are based on historical events during Jesus's ministry, and furthermore were used to argue that Jesus was the Messiah. However, these two stories are not very good raising-of-the-dead stories, and consequently Luke created the WNS to show that Jesus was more than a prophet-miracle worker like Elijah or Elisha, and more than a pagan miracle worker like Apollonius.

Since the framework for the historical analysis that leads to these conclusions is somewhat new, and not yet accepted by the majority of the academy, some explanation and justification is required for using this framework. This is the purpose of the first chapter. The chapter begins with a review of the various models of oral tradition, and argues that the model proposed by Bailey is the most appropriate. However, there is a question as to whether a model based on observations in contemporary Mediterranean culture is applicable or appropriate for an urban Diaspora network. Would the village life and the various types of control observed by Bailey be similar to the village life of the Galilean founders of Christianity? Would these founders think the traditions about Jesus were important? Would they exert control over the tradition? Is there evidence that early Christianity was controlling in nature? Is there evidence of control in early Christianity's urban Diaspora network? The first chapter will argue that indeed it is likely that the village life in Galilee was likely similar to that to contemporary pre-industrial Egyptian village life, that the traditions about Jesus would have been of the utmost importance to the early Christians, and that there is plenty of evidence of control in early Christianity's urban Diaspora network. The chapter will conclude with a brief outline of the methodology of oral analysis. Issues of memory and schematization will also be discussed.

The second chapter will present a new methodology for judging chiastic structures. One of the main criticisms of chiastic analysis is the belief that one can find valid parallelism between any two units of text if one wants to. The second chapter will address this issue by doing a statistical analysis of the parallels between the textual units in a large section of Mark, which will enable one to quantitatively evaluate the parallelism between any one unit and any other unit. This analysis will also provide a set of figures with which one will be able to conduct a probability analysis on the parallels found in a chiastic structure. Furthermore, the analysis will show that valid parallelism cannot be found between any two units of text, and that valid chiastic patterns are actually quite rare. In addition the following items will be discussed: the origins of chiastic structuring as a literary device, how chiasms generate meaning, and the purpose of structuring text

---

[24] Mark 5:21-43; Luke 8:40-56; Matt. 9:18-26.
[25] Mark 9:14-29; Luke 9:37-42; Matt. 17:14-21.
[26] Luke 7:11-17.
[27] See below on page 222.

using chiasm. The new methodology will then be applied to Luke's and Matthew's use of Mark's miracle tradition. It will be argued that Luke and Matthew were aware of the structural and rhetorical aims of Mark. In the process the meaning for the synoptic gospel writers of the miracle tradition, and in particular the raising-of-the-dead miracles, will be demonstrated. This chapter will also demonstrate the importance of the miracle tradition for early Christianity in its claim that Jesus is the Messiah, and the special significance of the raising-of-the-dead miracles in regards to this will also be shown. The chiastic analysis will also highlight items within the sections analysed that were possibly added by the gospel writers for either theological or chiastic reasons. From this perspective, chiastic analysis can be seen as a type of redaction criticism.

The next three chapters will each focus on one of the raising-of-the-dead miracles. Chapter three will analyse the story of JD. First a chiastic analysis will be performed on all three gospel accounts to highlight items that may have been added by the authors for theological or chiastic reasons. Then the possible reasons for Matthew's different version of the story will be discussed and whether his changes were made for theological reasons. Then an oral analysis will be performed to determine the likely shape of the oral tradition, that is, which items were essential to the tradition, which items were allowable variations, and which items were not likely to be found in the tradition. The chiastic analysis will help determine items in the last category. Finally, a historical analysis will be performed to determine if the oral tradition reflects an incident in Jesus's life. The same process will then be performed on the stories of the PB and the WNS. The latter, however, precludes an oral analysis, because we only have one version of the story. Instead an analysis of the story's parallelism with two other raising-of-the-dead stories, namely, Elijah raising a widow's son and Apollonius raising a young bride, will be carried out to determine the relationship between these stories and the story of the WNS will be determined.

It will be argued that the the stories of JD and the PB are likely based on historical incidents in Jesus's life, and that both were raising-of-the-dead stories in the oral tradition. It will be argued, however, that the story of the WNS was the invention of Luke, who based the story on a combination of the Elijah and Apollonius stories to show Jesus to be a superior miracle worker. The possible means by which Luke could have this story accepted by the early Christian community will then be discussed.

Chapter One: The Historical Framework

This chapter outlines the historical framework that this thesis works from. It will begin with a short study of the various models of oral tradition, and describe the model used for the thesis. The question of whether this model is appropriate for the early church will then be addressed.

Models of Oral Transmission

The Form Critics Model

The form critics presented the first model of oral transmission for the Jesus traditions. Karl Lugwig Schmidt noticed that the Jesus traditions in the synoptic gospels were made up of individual units or pericopes.[28] He proposed the oral traditions about Jesus were transmitted via these units, and that these pericopes were in particular forms. This concept was expanded by Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann, and *Formgeschichte* (the study of form history) was born.[29] The form critics proposed that these units were folk literature and studied them in light of the folk literature studies of the time. They argued that in folk literature there are definite forms that oral traditions conform to, and that when traditions are created they are molded into one of these forms. The type of form used was determined by the *Sitz im Leben* within the community, that is, how the traditions were used within the community. Furthermore, they argued that if the use were changed, then the original form would be changed.[30]

The form critics also claimed to know how particular forms were used within the early Christian community. They then argued that when the tradition was put to a different use a new layer of tradition was added. Consequently, the goal became to remove the different layers and return to the original form, that is, the form of the pericope closest to Jesus. By studying how the traditions from Mark were changed by Luke and Matthew, and how forms in folk literature changed, various laws were developed as to how the changes took place.

The form critics argued that these changes to the tradition were possible because the early Christians were not concerned with the historical Jesus, but only with the risen Jesus, who spoke to the communities through prophecy. They also held to a sharp separation between the Palestinian and Hellenistic communities,[31] and maintained that the forty odd years between the death of Jesus and the writing of the first gospels was a very long time, allowed for Jesus traditions to be freely modified and created. In other words, there was no control, formal or otherwise, over the traditions. This lack of control corresponded with another view of the oral traditions: the oral traditions, like folk traditions, were passed on anonymously without reference to any possible eyewitnesses.

---

[28] Schmidt, *Rahmen*.

[29] Rudolf Karl Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. John Marsh; New York: Harper & Row, 1963) Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1933).

[30] For short summaries of form criticism see n. 8 above on page 2. See also, Martin J. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context* (OTSS 274; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Burton Scott Easton, *The Gospel before the Gospels* (New York: Scribner, 1928); S. H. Travis, "From Criticism," in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977).

[31] Against this view see Craig C. Hill, *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).

This model has been challenged on many fronts. The following list of objections is adapted from the one presented by Richard Bauckham:[32]

1. The concept of pure forms is dubious: there is no reason why traditions could not from the beginning existed in mixed forms. Also, very few pericopes in gospel tradition conform to the pure forms proposed.[33]
2. There is no correlation between form and *Sitz im Leben*: studies have shown that the same traditions can perform different functions in different contexts, and a variety of forms can be used in the same context.[34]
3. There is no basis for the concept of homeostasis, the correspondence between tradition and use. Jan Vansina, in his study on the relation between oral traditions and history, concludes there is some congruence, but not total congruence, and that the presence of archaisms gives homeostasis the lie. Also, homeostasis theories cannot explain why history is valued in some societies more than others, and why more specific cultural features come into play.[35]
4. E. P. Sanders' work has shown there are no laws of tradition operating consistently throughout the gospel traditions: traditions develop in opposite directions. That being said, there is a tendency towards some of the laws developed.[36]
5. The comparison with folklore is not valid: the time-span between Jesus and the gospels is shorter and the nature of traditions is different than those studied by folklorists.[37] One needs to distinguish between different types of traditions and the different ways they are treated.
6. Folklorists have abandoned the idea of the folk as collectively the creator of folk traditions. Rather, a role is played by authoritative individuals in interaction with the community.[38]

---

[32] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 246–49. See also the ten critical points for classical form criticism by Gerhardsson, *Reliability*, 82–86.

[33] Travis, "From Criticism," 158–59. Reiner Blank, *Analyse und Kritik der formgeschichtlichen Arbeiten von Martin Dibelius und Rudolf Bultmann* (Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1981), 201. In regards to this thesis, pure forms have been proposed for healing stories. However, only a few such miracles conform to the forms proposed by scholars. Rather than viewing the common elements found in healing stories as a prescriptive ideal form the storytellers were trying achieve, a more useful approach is to see these elements as descriptive. This type of structuralist form criticism is the approach of Gerd Theissen, *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition* (trans. Francis McDonagh; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 1–42. Any healing story requires certain elements: a healer, a person with a health problem, a means by which healer and healed person meet (usually the sick person or representative making a request), and the actual healing which would include confirmation of the healing. Unless every miracle story conforms exactly to a certain form one cannot propose an ideal pure form with any certainty.

[34] Rainer Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer: eine Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung* (WUNT 7; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [P. Siebeck], 1981), 12–13; G. N. Stanton, "Form Criticism Revisited," in *What about the New Testament?: Essays in Honour of Christopher Evans* (London: SCM, 1975), 23; G. N. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (SNTSMS 27; London: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 181. This is the case for oral traditions in general; see Jan Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 101.

[35] Vansina, *Oral tradition*, 121–22. Cf. Samuel Byrskog, "A New Perspective on the Jesus Tradition: Reflections on James D. G. Dunn's *Jesus Remembered*," *JSNT* 26 (2004): 459–71.

[36] Sanders, *Tendencies*, 272.

[37] E. Earle Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays* (WUNT 18; Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans, 1978), 244; E. Earle Ellis, "The Synoptic Gospels and History," in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus* (NTTS 28.2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 54–55.

[38] Blank, *Analyse*, 200–201.

7. Form critics worked from pre-conceived notions of the development of early Christianity. For example, they saw a sharp distinction between Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity.[39]
8. Form critics assumed traditions were passed orally for several decades. However, written texts, in the form of small collections and note books, are possible at a very early stage. For example, Q may have been written in the forties of the first century CE.[40] There was likely interaction between written and oral traditions.[41]
9. Form critics use a literary model for understanding oral transmission.[42] Dunn points out that the layers to be stripped away are like the process of editing, and not appropriate for oral transmission.[43] Also, the study of oral performance shows that each performance of oral tradition differs from others, but does not build on the earlier performances.[44]

As Bauckham points out, despite these criticisms, and the fact that very few scholars still practice form criticism, the basic oral framework proposed by the form critics still holds sway.[45]

The Scandinavian (Gerhardsson) Model[46]

Birger Gerhardsson proposed a different model based on the insights of his teacher Harald Riesenfeld.[47] Gerhardsson used the way in which rabbinic traditions were passed on as the basis for his model. In rabbinic tradition, a focus was placed on the memorization of traditions, with the use of mnemonic techniques.[48] Thus, very little change is allowed to the traditions passed on, except by the authorized controllers of the tradition. In contrast to the form critics' model, the tradition is passed on independent of use: there is a separate

---

[39] Hill, *Hellenists*; Wright, *Christian Origins*, 1: 420–21.

[40] Gerd Theissen, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 203–34; Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 28–29. Theissen sees clear allusions to Caligula crisis (39/40 CE) in the temptation story and argues that the image of the Pharisees as persicutors is to be located in the forties and fifties CE. Others date Q later; for example, Dieter Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle: Anhang: Zur weiteren überlieferung der Logienquelle* (WMANT 33; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 88; James McConkey Robinson, et al., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Her; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2000), lv.

[41] Ellis, "Synoptic," 53; Travis, "From Criticism," 159.

[42] James D. G. Dunn, "Altering the Default Setting: Re-Envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition," *NTS* 49 (2003): 144–45; Dunn, *Jesus*, 194–95, 248–49; Werner H. Kelber, "The Case of the Gospels: Memory's Desire and the Limits of Historical Criticism," *OT* 17 (2002): 64; Robbins, "Form,"2: 842.

[43] Dunn, *Jesus*, 194–95.

[44] Dunn, "Altering," 172.

[45] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 249. The arguments against form criticism presented here are not intended to imply that *all* of form criticism is in error. Rather, the focus here is on how the form critics viewed the Jesus traditions as being kept and passed on. There is still much usefulness to be found in analysing the form of a tradition and how such forms were used in the ancient world. Also, the role of *Sitz im Leben* is also important in regards to the traditions. However, the *Sitz im Leben* presented by the form critics and Bauckham, for example, are very different.

[46] For a longer summary see Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 249–52.

[47] Gerhardsson, *Memory*; Gerhardsson, *Reliability*; Harald Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings: A Study in the Limits of "Formgeschichte."* (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1961); Harald Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition: Essays* (trans. E. Margaret Rowley and Robert A. Kraft; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970).

[48] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 249; Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 148–56; Gerhardsson, *Reliability*, 9–14.

mechanism for the passing of tradition where there are identified teachers and controllers of the tradition, who pass the tradition on to identified students.[49] This model can thus be seen as the opposite to the uncontrolled model of the form critics. However, it should be pointed out that Gerhardsson does allow for change in the traditions and notes that variation is found in rabbinic literature.[50]

Gerhardsson's model was not accepted by scholars for a variety of reasons. First, despite his caveats, it was seen as being too rigid: it did not account for the variation found in the gospels.[51] Furthermore, he was accused of anachronism: he was applying techniques of the second century and beyond to first-century Palestine; that is, he was accused of equating the rabbis with the Pharisees, and viewing the Pharisees as the dominant religious force in Palestine.[52] This model was also a radical departure from the previous reigning model, that of the form critics. Though the first two criticisms are valid, they are perhaps overstated. True, Gerhardsson did focus on exact memorization, but he did acknowledge that variation was allowed.[53] A full study on the degree of variation found in rabbinic traditions in contrast to the variation found in the gospel traditions would help determine the relationship.

In regards to anachronism, though this is a valid claim, it is true that the rabbis as a Jewish group were forming at the same time that Christianity, also a Jewish sect, was forming.[54] Also, the techniques of memorization were common to the Hellenistic Roman world of the time: students learnt through the memorizing of not only what their teachers taught them, but also the teachings of past teachers in their tradition.[55] True, this memorization was also augmented with written traditions. However, it is now generally acknowledged that the pharisaic and rabbinic traditions were not necessarily passed on completely orally:[56] for example, it is likely the rabbis used notebooks to aid memory.[57] This would supply a further parallel with early Christianity, where it is believed that the sayings tradition Q may have begun as an aid to memory in notebook form.[58]

---

[49] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 250.

[50] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*; Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 77–78, 97–98, 111, 136–39, 146–48, 180–81, 334–35; Gerhardsson, *Reliability*, 54.

[51] Dunn, *Jesus*, 198; Ellis, "Synoptic," 56; Jens Schröter, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte: Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas* (WMANT 76; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1997), 136.

[52] P. Davids, "The Gospels and Jewish Traditions: Twenty Years after Gerhardsson," in *Gospel Perspectives* (GP 1; Sheffield: JSOT, 1980), 76–81; S. Talmon, "Oral Transmission and Written Transmission, or the Heard and the Seen Word in Judaism and the Second Temple Periods," in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (JSNTSup 64; Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 132–33. Neusner was originally of this opinion but changed his mind, apologized, and wrote the introduction to the reprint of Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity; With, Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* (trans. Eric J. Sharpe; BRS 1961, 1964; repr., Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998).

[53] For references see above n. 50 on page 12.

[54] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 250.

[55] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 251; Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer*, ch. 3.

[56] See the discussion in Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 251–52; Gerhardsson, *Reliability*, 11–13 Gerhardsson here adapts his view found in Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 201–202.

[57] Gerhardsson, *Reliability*, 12–13 Gerhardsson argues that though there were no official texts of the oral tradition, it is likely that written aids were used as this was common practice in the Hellenistic world. See also Martin S. Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE-400 CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), ch. 3.

[58] For example, see Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM, 2000), 120. The reasons for writing down oral tradition can be reduced to the desire to aid memory or to prevent the tradition

Bailey's Model

More recently, the model proposed by Kenneth Bailey is slowly gaining ground.[59] Bailey based his model on his experiences of Middle Eastern village life.[60] The model is thus based on anecdotal experiences; however, they do provide a concrete example of how the passing on of oral traditions works in a real-life situation.[61] Bailey develops a threefold typology in order to categorize the oral transmission observed.[62] This typology is based on whether the transmission is controlled or uncontrolled, and formal or informal.

The first category is informal uncontrolled transmission. This was reserved for rumour and news of the day which had no value to the village. In this category stories could quickly change with each telling. The model of the form critics falls into this category. The second category is informal controlled transmission which Bailey sees as a likely parallel to the transmission of the Jesus traditions. The final category is formal controlled transmission. This is formal memorization as found with the Quran and other works of Islamic learning. Here there are clearly identified teachers and students who learn and pass on the tradition. Bailey says "the passing on of memorized tradition provided opportunity for explanation and discussion as to its meaning, while the cold lifeless book did not." He notes that a similar approach is found in Plato,[63] and that this sort of learning was not only practiced and revered by Muslims, but also by Christians in the Middle East.[64] The rabbinic model of Gerhardsson fits into this category of formal controlled transmission.

The middle category, informal controlled transmission, was observed in a situation called the *haflat samar*.[65] Here the community gathered to tell and listen to poetry, proverbs, riddle stories, parable stories, and stories of important events and figures in the village history. Though these were informal events, usually gathered around the fire in the evening, there was a sense of preservation of the culture of the village: *samar* comes from the root to

---

from being tampered with. In the early stage when there were many students of Jesus around, the main reason would be as an aid to memory. The codex was essentially a notebook, and the Christians seem to be one of the first groups to use this notebook format for books proper. On this see Loveday Alexander, "Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 73–74; Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 116–27.

[59] Bailey, "Informal," 34–54; Bailey, "Middle," 563–67. Among the scholars who have adopted this model are Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 252–63; Dunn, *Jesus*, 205–210; Wright, *Christian Origins*, 2: 133–37. These works also give useful summary and discussion of Bailey's observations and proposals.

[60] Bailey worked for more than thirty years in the Middle East; his observances come primarily from time spent in rural Egypt.

[61] The main doubt expressed about using Bailey as a model is whether twentieth century observances of Middle Eastern village life reflect the situation of early Christianity; see, for example, Dean B. Deppe, "Jesus Remembered," *CTJ* 40 (2005): 336. However, there are several reasons that Bailey's observances are applicable to the ancient world. On a general level it can be argued that until recent times there has been very little change in village life in the Middle East. Also, the study of this life and society around the Mediterranean basin has proved useful in other areas. For example, the study of honour and shame in the Mediterranean has made clearer attitudes and responses found in ancient texts. On honour and shame see Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, "Honour and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediteraranean World," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 25–65. It will also be shown that similar types of control mechanisms were in place in early Christianity as in the situations observed by Bailey; see below on page 17.

[62] Bailey, "Informal," 5–6; see also 42–45.

[63] Bailey, "Informal," 6; *Phaedra*, 274c–275a.

[64] Bailey, "Informal," 6.

[65] Bailey, "Informal," 6.

preserve. These events were informal in that there were no specific students or tellers of the tradition. That being said, only people who had lived all their lives in the village could participate in the telling, and then most often elders: a man who had moved to the village thirty-six years previously was not allowed to participate. The material was controlled by the community as a whole, especially the elders.

There were different levels of control over the different types of material.[66] Some types of material, poetry and proverbs, had to be reproduced verbatim, or the teller would be immediately corrected by their listeners.[67] With other types material there was no control: jokes, casual news, and rumour. This material was irrelevant to the identity of the community. With the remaining material, the various types of stories, some variation was allowed. However, the story had to be recognisably the same story: the sequence of events could change, dialogue and certain descriptive details could be expanded or contracted, but the punch line or point of the story could not change.[68] In other words, the story could not change into another story. In regards to this Dunn notes that each performance of a story was not the editing of a previous performance, but a new performance in its own right, which is quite a different process from that proposed by the form critics and their layering on of new tradition.[69]

Bailey argues that this informal controlled type of transmission would best reflect early Christianity in the villages of Palestine. Dunn follows up on this and shows with numerous examples that the synoptic gospels follow the same control over the different types of material found within them as observed by Bailey.[70] However, the question remains as to whether this model is appropriate to the situation beyond Palestinian village life, that is, to the church as it expands to the city of Jerusalem and throughout the Roman empire.

Bauckham in his analysis points out other problems with this model.[71] To begin with, it does not allow for the role of eyewitnesses, because the historical events took place before the lifetimes of those present.[72] Also, Bailey only makes a division in regards to whether the material is controlled or uncontrolled, or passed on in a formal or informal situation. Bauckham argues that there should be a third category of stability and flexibility in regards to the type of tradition.[73] Bauckham is right that detailed study of the Jesus traditions in regards to flexibility and type of material is needed.[74] Bauckham is also right in saying that there is no reason why there cannot be some flexibility in formal controlled material, and that the rabbinic material gives an example where variation, and consequently a certain flexibility, is found in this type of material.[75] At the same time, it is only fair to note that stability and flexibility are discussed by Bailey: total flexibility is allowed with jokes, casual news, and rumour, but none with proverbs and poetry. In regards to stories the basic plot line

---

[66] Bailey, "Informal," 6–7, 42–45.
[67] This is also observed by Vansina, *Oral tradition*, 48–49.
[68] On the mixture of essential and non-essential elements see also Werner H. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: the Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 27–33; Albert Bates Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (HSCL 24; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960), 120.
[69] Dunn, *Jesus*, 209.
[70] Dunn, *Jesus*, 210–54.
[71] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 257–63.
[72] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 260.
[73] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 258–60.
[74] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 259.
[75] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 258.

and point of the story had to be maintained, but there was flexibility in regards to details. But this still does not account for a large amount of material where the flexibility may vary widely. Thus, though Bailey's threefold typology is useful, it should not be seen as denoting an absolute division of oral tradition.

In regards to eyewitnesses, Bailey gives an account of an oral tradition that came into being during his stay in Egypt.[76] This story concerned an accident at a wedding where someone was shot due to the custom of firing rifles into the air. Bailey, who was away at the time, heard the story a week after it happened from several people (a boy on the far bank, the boatman who took him across the Nile, various villagers, and the village mayor). Each telling had different details about the wedding, but the climax of the story (several sentences) was told by each person virtually word for word. In the climax, one is told that the bridegroom's friend fired the gun, but it did not go off. He then lowered the gun, and the gun fired. This last was always in the passive form; that is, it was stressed the firing of the gun was an accident. The bullet passed through the bridegroom, who died instantly. When the police came, the villagers told them a camel had stepped on him. Thus, in only a week the story had crystallized, been given definitive shape, and entered into the oral tradition of the village. Bailey also reports that when he was preaching he would introduce a new story to the community to make a point.[77] After the service, an elder from the front row would shout across to a friend in a loud voice saying, "Did you hear what the preacher said?," and then continue to repeat the story with the punch-line. People all across the church would then repeat the story to their neighbours, and would repeat the central thrust of the story two or three times. This way the whole congregation learnt the story and would pass it along through the village in the coming week.

In both cases, we have tradition passed on by eyewitnesses. However, it is not passed on as personal memory, but what is termed collective memory, i.e., shared memory or information from the past.[78] This is not to say that a tradition cannot be a combination of the two types of memory:[79] in the first story, eyewitnesses could add personal details they remembered from the wedding, but the final climax that showed the shooter's innocence becomes collective memory. Also, the story becomes schematized to stress a certain interpretation of the event. Schematization occurs all the time in memory: it allows one to retain information.[80] Moreover, a schematization can change without affecting the memories

---

[76] Bailey, "Informal," 48–50. Dunn also discusses this story: Dunn, *Jesus*, 207–8.

[77] Bailey, "Informal," 50.

[78] The notion of collective memory was first coined by Maurice Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory* (trans. Francis J. Ditter and Vida Yazdi Ditter; New York: Harper & Row, 1980); Maurice Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1952); Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory* (trans. Lewis A. Coser; HSoc Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992). See also Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 310–318.

[79] Halbwachs argued that all memory was collective memory. This tendency has been quite influential in sociology, anthropology and related disciplines. On the other hand, the psychological study of memory stresses individual memory. A middle way is now emerging as shown in the work of James Fentress and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory* (NPP; Oxford: Blackwell, 1992); Barbara A. Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering* (TSoc; Maidenhead, Eng.: Open University Press, 2003) On this and more references see Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 310–12.

[80] On schematization see C. R. Barclay, "Schematization of Autobiographical Memory," in *Autobiographical Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 82–99. See also the discussion in Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 325–38.

of an event.[81] A common device in murder mystery movies is to replay an earlier scene, but from the perspective of new knowledge: the scene (memory) does not change, but the interpretation does. In the case of the climax of the bridegroom story, the schematization becomes a shared one. This is a natural process when several eyewitnesses to an event recount a story together. When eyewitnesses remember an event, they can bring forth memory of the event, relive the event, and can vouch for what happened. However, when the story is passed on it becomes information memory.[82] The shared schematization turns the memories into collective memory. For the eyewitnesses the memory becomes a combination of personal memory and information memory shared by the community. This movement from personal memory to collective memory was shown when Bailey preached: in the repetition the memory became schematized and could be passed on as collective information memory.

Eyewitnesses in this situation could play a role as those present could vouch that the account corresponded with what Bailey said. However, Bauckham in his criticism is right in that when the traditions were passed on, the names of the eyewitnesses were not included. This is because they were not required: the traditions were passed on within the village structure, and since several people in the village had witnessed the events, there was no need to justify or defend the traditions against accusations that they did not take place. However, this may be different when speaking to an outsider and a need is felt to justify the veracity of the story.

Bailey's model is useful, because it is based on concrete observations of an oral society at work. He observed not only how new traditions entered the community's collective tradition, but also how the traditions were preserved. Dunn's analysis of how the gospel tradition allows variation shows that the Jesus tradition is treated in a similar manner to that observed by Bailey. It indicates a strong likelihood that Jesus traditions were schematized into a set pattern at a very early stage to become part of the collective memory of the Jesus community.

However, there is a difference between traditions passed on in the stable environment of a village and traditions passed on by a community spread throughout the major urban centres of the Roman Empire. First, there is a difference in size: one cannot know everyone in a city, and people come and go. In other words, there is not the sense of community in a large city as there is in a village. That being said, a city is made up of inter-relating communities. Some communities can be quite small and close knit. Such communities would be like a village within a city.

An example would be the smaller Jewish communities found within many Greco-Roman cities. Jewish communities functioned to a degree as separate communities within the cities where they resided. They often had control over a separate water supply, a community hierarchy of elders and leaders, and a place for study, meeting, and making decisions pertaining to the community (the synagogue). They even had the right to administer

---

[81] On this see J. A. Robinson, "Perspective, Meaning, and Remembering," in *Remembering our Past: Studies in Autobiographical Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 200–203 See also Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 338–41.

[82] Bauckham makes the useful distinction between information memory, learnt information, and personal or recollective memory, which is the actual memory of an event: Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 312. The shared memories and schematization provide details of the event that may not have been part of each individual's personal memory.

punishments to members of the community who broke its laws.[83] Such a community, depending on its size, would function like a village within a city. As such there would be similar mechanisms of control available when conveying oral traditions.

The Christian community, however, was not recognized as a separate community, and its members, unlike the Jewish community, would not all live in the same area, though they would most likely be located in or around the Jewish quarter of a city. Could such a community function like a village in regards to control over its oral tradition? I think that it could and did. To function like a village within the larger community it would need to view itself as a distinct subculture within the larger community, have a strong sense of unity, and have recognized leaders. With these three elements in place there would then be the conditions for the control mechanisms observed by Bailey.

Even if the above three elements were present in the Christian community, there remains a larger methodological question: is it fitting to apply a model observed in modern Egypt to the ancient world? I would argue that the sort of life that Bailey observed was very much pre-industrial, or at most, transitional, and not "modern." The situation he observed had more in common with largely unchanging pastoral life of the previous centuries than with the modern world in which we live. Just as other aspects of observed "modern" life in the Mediterranean world, such as honour and shame, have proven very useful when studying the ancient world so too, I would suggest, does the model observed by Bailey. This, combined with the analysis of Dunn, makes it quite probable that this model closely reflects the situation in the ancient world.

Returning to the three necessary elements for control over the oral tradition, that the Christian community viewed itself as a distinct community within the larger community is without question. This leaves the elements of leadership and a strong sense of unity. We will begin with the subject of leadership and control within in the early Christian community, before turning to the subject of unity and communication.

Control in Earliest Christianity

Leadership and Oversight in the Gospels, Acts, and Paul

The picture of earliest Christianity presented by the form critics, and still adopted by many scholars today, is that of a movement with very little hierarchy or control; controlling structures are not seen as emerging until late into the first century.[84] In order to sustain such a picture, the evidence from the synoptic gospels and Acts is seen as projecting back the emerging structures of the latter part of the first century into the time of Jesus and the period

---

[83] For a good description of how the community was organized see James Tunstead Burtchaell, *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 201–27.

[84] In an extreme form, the picture presented is one of individual itinerant missionaries going off to preach the gospel. These people then founded separate communities that developed in isolation with there own theologies. It is only later in the first century that controlling structures were put into place with a central theology. The growth of Christianity from this perspective is seen as going from pluralistic to monolithic. An example of the extreme form is John Dominic Crossan, who holds that the earliest Christians focused on Jesus's teaching on how to live and were later taken over by controlling Christians who focused on Jesus's death (Pauline tradition). To come to this conclusion Crossan has to ignore or discount the Pauline evidence and that of Acts, and has to focus on Q, the *Gospel of Thomas*, and the *Didache*. See John Dominic Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately after the Execution of Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).

before the fall of Jerusalem. However, the evidence does not support this conclusion: the letters of Paul confirm the picture presented in the canonical gospels and Acts. Since this thesis disagrees with the majority position, the evidence will be looked at in some detail, and particular attention will be paid to differences between Paul and Acts.

Before we begin, a word is necessary on the type of leadership, hierarchy, and authority that is under consideration. The type of hierarchy argued for is not that of a modern army. In an army the commander-in-chief has absolute authority and below him are generals, and so forth. Each level of command has authority over the one below. This is an extremely rigid hierarchical type of leadership. This is quite different, than say, an ancient village, where there were elders and perhaps a chief elder who had leadership, respect, and authority. This type of leadership lacks the rigidity of an army. Larger communities are more organized, and have designated positions of authority. For example, larger Jewish communities had various positions to help run the synagogue and fulfil the needs of the community. James T. Burtchaell argues that when the church organization emerges it is based on that of the synagogue.[85] It is this type of hierarchy that is argued for here, where there were definite leaders with authority, but not absolute authority. Furthermore, these leaders were respected because of their proximity to the Messiah, which in the framework of an early high Christology would mean a very high level of respect.

The gospels are unanimous in saying that Jesus appointed disciples to help him carry out his work of proclaiming the good news.[86] The gospels also agree that he appointed a special group of twelve. [87] In the synoptic gospels there is also an inner group of three. [88] In addition, there was also a treasurer, Judas (John 13:29). According to Acts (1:20–26), this organisational structure continued after Jesus's death.[89] This is confirmed by Paul, who

---

[85] Burtchaell, *From synagogue.*

[86] Mark 1:16, Luke 5:1–11, Matt 4:18–22, John 1:35–42. Though the call stories may not have taken place as presented in the synoptic gospels (they seem to be inspired by the story of Elisha leaving his ploughing in 1 Kgs 19:19–21), there is no doubt that Jesus did call disciples. In this respect, the calling of disciples in John may be more historically accurate. On the parallels with Elisha see Roger David Aus, *The Stilling of the Storm: Studies in Early Palestinian Judaic Traditions* (Binghamton, N.Y.: Global Publications Binghamton University, 2000), 89–100; Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Beginning of the Gospel: Probings of Mark in Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 156–57; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 183.

[87] Mark 3:13, Luke 6:12–16, Matt 10:1–4, John 6:67–71, 20:24. On the historicity of the twelve see R. Alan Culpepper, *Mark* (SHBC 20; Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2007); John P. Meier, "The Circle of Twelve: Did it Exist During Jesus' Public Ministry?," *JBL* 116 (1997): 105–12.

[88] Peter, James, and John: Mark 5:37, 9:2, 14:33 and par. Cf. Gal 2:9. Though the three only appear in Mark and passages that parallel Mark, and the three fit the larger themes of the gospel, the similarity with the three in Galatians show that there is a historical basis for the organisational structure. So Culpepper, *Mark*, 108. It has been suggested that the three "pillars" (Gal 2:9) represent the three patriarchs: Roger David Aus, "Three *Pillars* and Three Patriarchs: A Proposal Concerning Gal 2:9," *ZNW* 70 (1979): 252–61. The Essenes also had a structure of twelve and three (1QS 8:1).

[89] The three are not specifically mentioned in Acts. However, in Acts 3–4 Peter and John are shown going to the temple every day to preach, and after James the brother of John dies (12:2), James the brother of Jesus is shown to be head of the church (12:17, 15:13, 21:18). It would appear that the brother of Jesus replaces the brother of John. The twelve continues as Matthias replaces Judas (Acts 1:20–26). On the historicity of 1:20–26 see Reginald Horace Fuller, "The choice of Matthias," *SETU* 6: 112 (1973); against, see Günter Klein, *Die zwölf Apostel: Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee* (Göttingen,: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961). On James see Richard Bauckham, *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage* (NTR London: Routledge, 1999); F. F. Bruce, *Men and Movements in the Primitive Church: Studies in Early non-Pauline Christianity* (Exeter:

mentions the twelve and three as well.[90] Jesus is shown not only instructing his disciples, but sending them out on their own to preach: we are told in Mark that Jesus explained everything to his disciples (4:34), that he gave them special instructions before sending out (6:8-12), and that they reported back to him on how the mission went (6:30).[91] We are also told in Acts that the twelve and others were with him from the beginning (1:21-22), which means there was a fair number of people who spent a couple years with Jesus learning his teachings and helping with his mission.[92]

According to Acts, after Jesus's death this structure was expanded with the creation of the seven to look after the Greek-speaking followers (6:3–5).[93] We are also told in John that Judas was the treasurer for Jesus (12:6), and one assumes that this role was taken over by someone else, especially as we are told in Acts that the community, now based in Jerusalem, held everything in common (4:32). Part of the duties of the twelve and the seven was the distributing of food to other community members, especially the poor (6:1-2).

The twelve also had oversight in the mission of spreading the word. We are told that Philip, a member of the seven, went to Samaria and had success (8:4–13), and that when the "apostles of Jerusalem" (8:14), presumably the twelve,[94] heard of this, they sent Peter and

---

Paternoster, 1979), 86–119; G Kittel, "Die stellung des Jakobus zum Judentum und Heidenchristentum," *ZNW* 31 (1931): 145–57.

[90] Gal 2:9, 1 Cor 15:5. Some have tried to argue that 1 Cor 15:5 is a combination of two competing statements: one with Peter and twelve and another with James and all the apostles. There is no evidence, however, for this in the text, and the argument is based on view of the early church so divided that both Peter and James could not be mentioned together positively, especially by Paul. On this see Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (trans. James W. Leitch; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 251–54. On Gal 2:9 see above n. 88 on page 18.

[91] 4:34 reflects the editorial hand of Mark, and is not picked up by Luke and Matthew. Some see 4:34 as coming from the same source as 4:11–12 (Luke 8:9–10, Matt 13:10–13, Jesus explaining the mystery of the kingdom to the disciples alone) as in both the disciples become insiders to special teaching. Whatever the source situation, there appears to be traditions that show Jesus teaching the disciples in private. On the theory of a second source for the parable section and references see Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Beginning of the Gospel: Probings of Mark in Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 239–42, 256. The sending out of the twelve is picked up by Luke and Matthew and combined with Q traditions (Luke 9:1–6, 10, 1–12, Matt 9:35–10:16). Though the focus of the sending is the authority given them over demons, it is clear they are also proclaiming (Mark 6:11–12, 30 and par.). Proclaiming is, as Adela Yarbro Collins, *Beginning*, 314, points out, the same as teaching (see Mark 1:21, 2:1).

[92] On the twelve and choice of Matthias see above nn. 87 on page 18 and 89 on page 18.

[93] Though the word "deacon" is not used the related term *diakonia* is used for their activity; see James D. G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* (NC Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996), 83; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 344. Fitzmyer thinks this scene may reflect a latter structural development within the church. On this and other references see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 345. However, the criterion of embarrassment makes it unlikely that Luke invented the situation where the seven were formed, since it shows the Greek-speaking widows being neglected in the distribution of food by the twelve.

In regards to the Greek-speaking Christians, the predominant view was that the Hellenists and Hebrews in Jerusalem were ideologically separate parties. This was part of an old picture of conservative legalistic Hebrews and liberal universalist Hellenists. This picture is being consistently challenged; see Craig C. Hill, "Acts 6:1–8:4," in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 129–53; Hill, *Hellenists*. There was also a division seen in regards to Christology, which is discussed below on page 37.

[94] So Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 405.

John to see what was happening (8:14–24).[95] In other words, Peter and John are sent to check up on things. Later, Peter, one of the three, has a trip to Caesarea, where he converts some Gentiles (10:1-48). Then we are told that the apostles and other believers heard this, and that Peter returns to Jerusalem where he has to defend his actions (11:1–18).[96] It would seem that even members of the three had to answer for their actions. In short, Acts describes a hierarchical situation with defined leadership roles. The example of Peter shows these leadership roles were not ones of absolute authority: even he, one of the three, had to answer for his actions.

Acts also describes the spread of the movement outside of Palestine. We are told that the persecution in Jerusalem scattered believers to Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch (11:19). Some of those from Cyprus and Cyrene then started preaching to Gentiles in Antioch (11:20). News of this came to the church in Jerusalem, which then sent Barnabas to check up on things (11:22).[97] Barnabas in turn went to find Paul and brought him to Antioch (11:25-26). Paul and Barnabas then go to Cyprus along with John Mark from Jerusalem (13:4, 13).[98] Though this is presented as being due to the Holy Spirit (13:2), and being purely a missionary journey, it is suspicious that they went precisely to one of the places the scattered believers who had preached to the Greeks had come from, especially as this falls into a consistent pattern of checking up on new communities.[99]

Acts then reports that John Mark stays with Paul and Barnabas during the visit to Cyprus, but then leaves them and returns to Jerusalem (13:13),[100] while Paul and Barnabas go over to the mainland and preach in Galatia (Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, and Lystra:

---

[95] Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 405, argues that the use of the term "apostle" implies that this is an official visit. C. K. Barrett (*The Acts of the Apostles: A Shorter Commentary* [London: T & T Clark, 2002], 120) also sees this passage as suggesting inspection. Hans Conzelmann (*Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* [trans. James A. Limburg, et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987], 65) notes the apostles having a supervisory role, but sees it limited to ordination.

[96] Fitzmyer calls this section "Peter's Self-Defence at Jerusalem, Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 469. There are problems with the historicity of the Cornelius incident regarding Peter's vision: if Peter had had such a vision, ate with Cornelius, and successfully defended himself against the rest of the church leadership, then Gal 2:11, where he stops eating with Gentiles because people from James come, makes no sense. Barrett, *Acts: Shorter*, 152–53, notes these and other historical inconsistencies, but does not think the story is invented by Luke, because it would create difficulties for him. Barrett rather sees as a foundational story from Caesarea. Conzelmann, *Acts*, 44, likewise sees the vision as a pre-Lukan artifice. The Cornelius incident is most likely based on an actual event, and it is likely that after the Spirit was seen as coming to Cornelius that Peter ate with him for the reasons supplied in Acts, namely that God had sanctified Cornelius with his Spirit (11:17). However, this seems to be the only such incident. Such a conversion would also explain why Peter was later given charge of the mission to the nations (Acts 15:7).

[97] This too is an official visit: "the church in Jerusalem . . . sent Barnabas to Antioch." So Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 477. Other scholars find this suspect as they see the controlling nature of the church presented in Acts as a Lukan invention; for example, Martin Hengel, *Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM, 1979), 101. However, as will be shown, the controlling nature of early Christianity presented in Acts fits with the picture presented in Paul's letters.

[98] John Mark is called a *hyperetes*; this term has the general meaning of helper, but was also a term used for a synagogue attendant who helped with the lectionary reading. Luke also uses the term for "minister" of the word (1:2). For further discussion and references see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 501

[99] It is also possible there is no connection, since Barnabas was born on Cyprus (Acts 4:36). The reason given in the text for going is a vision. However, there are usually more mundane reasons as well. Why start missionary work in the empire now? Why Cyprus? Cyprus makes sense, because some of those whom Barnabas was sent to check up on were from Cyprus. Evangelism would then be a side product, and success perhaps led to the mission continuing.

[100] The mainland mission seems to be unexpected, since John Mark decides to leave (Acts 13:13).

13:13–14:23). We are told that they appointed elders, that is, people in charge, in each of the churches in this city (14:23).[101] We are then told that people went from Judea to Antioch and taught that Gentile believers must convert to Judaism and be circumcised (15:1).[102] Paul and Barnabas upon returning "had no small discussion and debate with them," and we are told that Paul and Barnabas then go up to Jerusalem to "discuss this question with the apostles and the elders," that is, those in charge (15:2).[103]

There are problems with Luke's account here, because the Jerusalem meeting has to come after Paul's second mission, and Luke places the second mission after the Jerusalem meeting and a disagreement with Barnabas. Also, Luke does not mention Paul's disagreement with Peter as recounted in Galatians, which also gives a slightly different account of Paul's journey to Jerusalem. However, the two accounts can be reconciled, and both display a situation of control and oversight in regards to the mission.

The following is the generally accepted chronology of the time span from Paul's conversion to his third missionary journey: Paul's conversion (34 CE), activities in Damascus and Arabia (34–37 CE), Paul spends two weeks in Jerusalem (37 CE), activities in Syria and Cilica (the "unknown" years 37–43 CE), the first missionary journey to Cyprus and south Galatia (43–45 CE), second missionary journey to north Galatia and the Grecian mainland (46–51 CE), council in Jerusalem (51CE), conflict with Peter in Antioch and start of third missionary journey (52 CE).[104] The precise dating during the unknown years and the first missionary journey are unknown. Paul's conversion took place during the persecution of the Hellenists which saw them disperse to Pheonicia, Cyprus, and Antioch. Paul thus arrived in Syria three or so years after the community was founded in Antioch. However, he does not stay in Antioch, but goes to his home town of Tarsus (Acts 11:25). At some point people from Cyprus and Cyrene come to Antioch and preach to the Gentiles, news of this arrives to Jerusalem, and Barnabus is sent to Antioch. Barnabus then seeks out Paul, and they go on the first missionary journey.

---

[101] Elders were authority figures in the Jewish community; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 483. This may be an anachronism, since Paul does not speak of elders in his letters, except for the pastorals, whose authorship is disputed. However, he does speak of "of those who have charge of you" (1 Thess 5:12), "overseers and deacons" (Phil 1:1), and again "deacon" (Rom 16:1). See Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 535. It is hard to imagine that Paul and Barnabas spent time to found churches and did not put any organizational structure in place. On the parallel structure of offices between synagogue and church see Burtchaell, *From synagogue.*

[102] The vagueness of those described ("certain individuals came down from Judea") points to Luke wishing to make it sound like it is not an official delegation; see Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 541; Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles, A Commentary* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 442–43 However, they seem to have some sort of official capacity as they are teaching. Luke, though, makes it clear later that these people were not sent with specific instructions from Jerusalem (15:24).

[103] Paul in Galatians says he went to Jerusalem to speak to the "acknowledged leaders" because of a revelation and to make sure his mission work was not done in vain (2:1–2). However, he later speaks of "false brothers secretly brought in to spy on the freedom we have in Jesus Christ" (2:3). This was presumably in Antioch; so J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 196. If this is so, then Luke and Galatians agree that there were people in Antioch opposed to Paul and his views on Gentiles, and that Paul went to speak to the leaders in Jerusalem concerning the matter. Most scholars see Paul and Barnabas being official representatives of the church in Antioch; so James D. G. Dunn, "The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem According to Galatians 1 and 2," *NTS* 28 (1982): 474, with n. 65 for more references.

[104] On the chronology of Paul's missions and the Jerusalem Council see Robert Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), chs. 4–5; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 24–31.

It is likely that this first mission was under the leadership of Barnabas (Paul does not take ownership of these communities as those founded on later missions).[105] However, at some point Paul decided to do missionary work without Barnabas. The second mission is seen as beginning in 46 CE, and this would leave at least three or so years for Paul to be doing missionary work based in Antioch with Barnabas. Luke presents the disagreement with Barnabas coming just before Paul's second mission. It would seem unlikely that Luke would invent a disagreement between Paul and Barnabas. Also, the second mission seems to have been unofficial; Paul reports in Gal 2:2 of his visit in Jerusalem: "I laid before them . . . the gospel that I proclaim among Gentiles, in order to make sure that I was not running, or had not run, in vain." (Gal 2:2).[106] Paul definitely acknowledges the authority of the leaders in Jerusalem here and elsewhere in the letter (Gal 2:9 refers to the three as "pillars");[107] he implies that they would have the authority to nullify what he had accomplished in his second mission. In other words, the second mission was not authorized by the church leadership.

Thus, it is probable that Paul and Barnabas, the person sent by Jerusalem to Antioch to take charge, did have some sort of disagreement. It is likely that Paul and Barnabas would have wished to check up on the churches they had founded (15:36). However, because of the disagreement, Barnabas and John Mark checked up on the churches in Cyprus, and Paul, taking with him trusted companions, checked up on the mainland churches (15:39-41). Paul then continued overland through Galatia (16:6) and on to Troas (16:8). It is during this second mission that Paul likely developed his views that the Gentiles should become full and equal members of the community without having to follow the Torah completely.[108] He then returns to Antioch and convinces the leadership there. Then, realizing that his mission would only succeed if he had the blessing of those chosen by the Messiah, he lays what he has done at the feet of the Jerusalem authorities. Paul going off on his own would also explain why people do not go and check up on him in Galatia until after he returns from this mission: they would not have known where he had gone.

At the council in Jerusalem, Acts presents Peter as defending Paul and Barnabas, which fits with what Paul says in Galatians about Peter eating Gentile food. Luke also says that Peter had earlier been given charge of the mission to the nations (15:7), that is, the mission outside of Israel.[109] Two leaders from Jerusalem (Judas Barsabbas and Silas, who is the Silvanus who later accompanied Paul[110]) return as official representatives with Paul and Barnabas with a letter (15:22-33). After some time these two leaders return and Paul and

---

[105] Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul*, 95.

[106] There is a tension in the letter: on the one hand Paul clearly sees the leaders in Jerusalem as having authority, but on the other hand he sees God working through him as a higher authority. On this tension see Dunn, "Relationship," 461–78. Dunn thus sees the visit more as two equals conferring and not as Paul going "cap in hand" (469), but that Paul was worried the Jerusalem leaders could nullify the effectiveness of his mission. On this see Martyn, *Galatians*, 192.

[107] There is tension here also: on the one hand Paul refers to them as pillars; and on the other hand, he does not say himself that they are pillars, but rather that the Jerusalem church holds them to be pillars.

[108] If Paul had insisted that Gentile converts be considered full members of the community and that it was acceptable not to follow the food restrictions during communal meals before his second mission, then there would have been serious division in Antioch while he was away, and the issue would have been dealt with without him.

[109] Though the text is clearly referring back to the conversion of Cornelius and thus referring to "nations" in a sociological sense as Gentiles, the term still carries a geographic meaning. The nations thus refers both to the countries outside of Israel and to their inhabitants.

[110] Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 564; John Gillman, "Silas," *ABD* 6:22–23.

Barnabas stayed in Antioch teaching and proclaiming (15:33–35). Luke then describes the disagreement with Barnabas, which is likely presented here to avoid mention of the dispute between Peter and Paul.

There is, in short, a definite and consistent pattern of control and checking up presented in Acts. This pattern is confirmed by the letters of Paul. Every letter, except Romans, deals with problems in various churches and gives evidence that people were reporting back to Paul on how the various churches were doing; Paul then sends a letter with his response.[111] In other words, Paul controls from a distance through his letters. The letter to the Galatians confirms much of Luke's presentation.[112] The cause for this letter is that someone had reported to Paul that some people had gone and told the Galatians after the council that they had to follow the Torah. Paul is naturally very upset. He recounts the journey to Jerusalem. He confirms that there were people from Jerusalem in Antioch opposed to him (false brothers sent to spy on him, 2:4) and that he went to Jerusalem to speak with "acknowledged leaders" (2:2). He reports the conclusions of the council (2:6–10), and says that he and Barnabas had been given leadership to the uncircumcised (2:9).[113] The three are said to have been given charge of the circumcised (2:9), which appears to contradict Luke who says that Peter was given charge of the mission to the nations (15:7). However, if this is taken to be the area outside of Palestine, then there is no disagreement.[114] Galatians also tells us Peter came to Antioch, presumably as part of his responsibility as leader in charge of the mission to the nations.[115]

The letter continues with a description of the disagreement between Paul and Peter over eating with non-Jewish Christians (2:11–21). Paul tells us that Peter used to eat with non-Jewish Christians, but stopped with the arrival of some people sent by James, the leader of the church in Jerusalem (2.12). The other Jewish Christians, "even Barnabas," followed Peter's lead (2:13). Paul then strongly rebukes Peter (2:14–21). Luke does not mention this incident, presumably because it puts either Paul or Peter or both in a bad light. Peter, Barnabas, and the other Jewish Christians clearly saw these people as coming from someone with authority who might not approve of their actions.[116] The whole situation presented in Galatians shows a controlling structure with clearly defined leaders much like that presented by Luke in Acts.

---

[111] Since many letters are believed to be composites of shorter letters, the number is higher than those found in the canon.

[112] See also above n. 103 on page 21.

[113] Acts does not actually say that Paul and Barnabas were given leadership over the Gentiles, but the leaders in Jerusalem do approve the role of Paul and Barnabas by approving their actions.

[114] There would thus be a double structure: James and the twelve in Jerusalem would be in charge of the church in Israel, Peter in charge of the mission to the nations, and within the nations Peter in charge of the Jewish Christians and Paul in charge of the Gentile Christians. However, since Peter was part of the group that gave Paul his authority in the first place, Peter would still be above Paul in the hierarchy.

[115] Betz likewise sees Peter coming as the official representative of Jerusalem: Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 106. See also the previous note.

[116] Martyn, *Galatians*, 233, on this says that "the ensuing course of events shows that they constituted an official delegation, empowered by James to journey to Antioch and to deliver a message to Peter." As Martyn, *Galatians*, 233, points out, the message could not have been about rescinding the council's decision concerning Gentiles, but it could well have dealt with Jews and Gentiles at table, namely, that Jewish Christians were still obligated to follow the Torah. So also Ziesler, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (London: Epworth, 1992), 18–19.

Paul's letter to the Galatians confirms that hierarchical control was a strong element in the earliest church. This pattern of control is continued by Paul, who appointed leaders in the various churches he establishes ("those who have charge of you," 1 Thess 5:12; "overseers and deacons," Phil 1:1; and again "deacon," Rom 16:1). He also had people reporting back to him on how things were going, or otherwise he would not have known of the problems he wrote about. In other words, he kept very tight control over the churches. This was done not only by letter, but also by sending deputies.[117] He also returned to check up on things in person, as evidenced by his repeat visits to the communities he founded.[118]

To conclude, both Acts and the letters of Paul present a situation where the acknowledged leaders of the Church, whether the three, the twelve, or Paul, have authority and oversee the founding and maintenance of communities in the urban centres of Roman Empire. This oversight was done through the appointment of people to positions of leadership, personal visits, and letters. This leadership would thus supply an appropriate mechanism for the control of oral traditions concerning Jesus.

Control, Unity, and Communication

The leaders of the early Christian community would only be able to exert authority if there was also a strong sense of unity within the community. If members of the community only had a weak sense of belonging to a whole, then the community could easily fragment into different groups with different theologies. Such fragmentation would lead to situation where it would be difficult to control the oral tradition. The community would not function like a village within a large urban centre, but as loosely knit groups with a similar interest. The question of the sense of unity within the early Church is consequently vital for understanding what sort of control there may have been for the oral tradition.

On the surface it would seem that the early Church did fragment: Paul went off and founded his own communities and had profound disagreements with others in positions of leadership. Yet despite his disagreements with Peter and others, Paul insists that the early Christian movement is one community: all are part of the body of Christ, and he and other leaders all preach the same gospel (1 Cor 1:12–13). There is thus no division between a Jew in Christ and a Greek in Christ for all are one in Christ (Gal 3:28); hence his anger with Peter. The disagreement with Peter did not lead to division in the church; in fact, Paul is horrified when hears of divisions in Corinth based on various leaders within the church, and specifically mentions Peter and Apollos (1 Cor 12–13). Paul is very specific, and says: "Now I appeal to you brothers and sisters, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you be in agreement and that there be no divisions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same purpose" (1 Cor 1:10).[119] The concept of unity and being one community

---

[117] For example, 1 Cor 4:17, 1 Thess 3:2.

[118] The argument presented here is not one for a monolithic church; there were many theological differences. However, there was a definite ideal for unity within the church and a desire for theological harmony. In some cases people could agree to disagree, but in others, for example, the issue of whether Gentiles need follow the Torah, the disagreements could lead to some people leaving the church. However, there was still the desire by both Paul and his opponents that the church be united on the issue. What does not seem tolerable to both sides of this issue is for people to go off and form Christian communities and choose whatever theologies they so desired. Rather, each side saw the church as whole with defined leaders with responsibilities of oversight.

[119] As William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther (*I Corinthians: A New Translation* [AB 32; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976], 149) point out the seriousness of unity is shown by Paul giving the matter immediate attention in the letter.

is a steady theme in Paul's letters, and seems to be the driving goal of one of his last letters, the letter to the Romans.[120] Also, Paul, despite his disagreements with the Jerusalem church, raised money for them, [121] and returned to Jerusalem and, if Acts is correct, submitted to the will of James (21:17–26).

Also, the central disagreement between Paul and the leadership in Jerusalem—whether or not Gentile Christians should follow the Torah—centres on the issue of unity. Both Paul and his opponents worked from the premise that the Christian community was a whole and should not be divided. Paul's opponents thought that to be fully a member of the community one had to follow the Torah. Paul thought the opposite: he believed that the Torah had been superseded by a higher law. Both were seeking unity and full membership for all, and both saw a central symbol of this unity being the communal meal. Sharing food in the ancient world was a symbol of both friendship and community. Thus, though Paul and his opponents had opposite views regarding the Torah, both wished the community to come together and eat together and be one community.

The concern for unity is not only shown by Paul's letters, but also by the fact that the letter is the most common form of the earliest Christian writings. Each letter is about some problem; the writer sends a letter to preserve unity in thought and action. As Richard Bauckham points out, each letter is also evidence of communication and contact between the early Christian communities.[122] Not only does the writer know what is going on in the recipient community, the writer also knows to whom and where to send the letter. It would be presumptuous to assume that the letters we have are all the letters sent back and forth. There is no way of gauging what percentage they represent, and whether they represent the tip of an iceberg or a majority. Nevertheless, the number we have from the first century of Christianity is quite numerous. These letters are also by people in authority, and their preservation shows respect for that authority.

Bauckham lists all the named people in Paul's letters and Acts who travelled between Christian communities.[123] In addition there are all the unnamed people who took part in the reporting and carrying of letters. Again, we do not know whether those mentioned are the tip of the iceberg or a majority. Since many Christians were Jews, one can imagine that many would also be travelling to Jerusalem for festivals when circumstances allowed. For Christian Jews there was the added incentive to go to the mother church and the city where Jesus died and was raised, and where they would also have the opportunity to meet his family and the people who had been chosen by him, travelled with him, and were trained by him.

The concern for unity, along with travel between communities, would allow plenty of opportunity for checking up and for keeping control. This would be especially true in the

---

[120] The constant refrain throughout is how both Jews and Greeks both face judgement and are saved in Christ. For a lengthy discussion on the occasion and purpose of this letter with bibliography see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 68–84. On the centrality of unity between Jewish and Gentile Christians see 79–80.

[121] 1 Cor 16:1–4, 2 Cor 8–9, Rom 15:25–28. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 721, correctly sees the goal of the collection to be to create harmony between the new Gentile churches and "the mother church" in Jerusalem. See Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 723–24 for further bibliography.

[122] Richard Bauckham ed. *The Gospels for all Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 38–39. Letter writing was a continuous practice from the time of Paul through the mid-second century.

[123] Bauckham ed. *Gospels*, 34–35.

large region where Paul founded churches, because he would have set the example. Considering the evidence, one is thus justified in speaking of the communication between churches in the first century as frequent.[124]

To conclude this section, I would like to make clear what I am not advocating. I am not saying that there was no disunity, nor am I saying there were no differences between Christian communities, nor am I saying that the church leaders had complete control over their communities. As with any large spread-out and growing organization there was disagreement on issues, including those concerning who should be in charge. The letters of Paul and others, such as John, Clement and Ignatius, are replete with evidence of such disagreements. However, I think that these differences on the whole have been vastly overstated, and the aspects of these letters that express an overwhelming desire for unity, the deeply felt view that Christians are all one community, and the evidence of control and organization from the beginnings of the Christian movement have, on the whole, been given short shrift. Some may think that the views on these issues expressed in this thesis have gone too far in the other direction, and that the extent of control and unity is overstated, and that the differences have been underplayed too much; however, it is to be remembered that the goal is to present the evidence for unity, community, and control, because it has on the whole not been fully taken into account. Yes, there were serious differences in the early church, and some of these differences would lead to people leaving; however, for the most part, in the first century the desire for unity seems to have triumphed, and, on the whole, prevented disagreement from dividing the community into separate communities.

The Effect of Control, Unity, and Communication on Oral Transmission

The leadership structures, sense of unity, and frequent communication evidenced in the later part of the first century in Acts, and in the letters of Clement and Ignatius at the turn of the century, seem to have their roots in the founding of the Christian communities at the time of Paul. This means that even though Christianity was an urban Diaspora network, it had the necessary ingredients for the control of oral transmission as observed by Bailey. The leaders in the Christian communities would function as elders, and the communities would function like villages due to the strong sense of unity. The sense of unity would intensify as the community came increasingly under attack from not only the Roman authorities, but also Jewish communities. Consistency between communities would be enabled by the frequent travel and communication by people in authority.

Though there is strong evidence of control over the communities by those in authority the question remains as to whether this control extended to the oral traditions concerning the words and deeds of Jesus. The more important these traditions were to the early church, the more likely there would be control exerted over the traditions. This principle was observed by Bailey. Both the words and deeds of Jesus would have been important to the early church. The teaching of Jesus would have been important to the church, because it saw itself as continuing his mission,[125] and, as will be shown, Jesus's deeds were important, since they

---

[124] On communication between churches see Michael B. Thompson, "The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation," in *The Gospels for all Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), 49–70.

[125] This is best shown in the gospels themselves. The theme of the mission and its continuation is a central theme to all four gospels. In all four Jesus begins his ministry by collecting disciples and in all four they are supposed to continue the ministry after his death. This is true even for Mark where the original ending ends the gospel with a big "what if:" what if the woman had remained afraid and not told anyone. Luke continues in

demonstrated that he was the Lord Messiah.[126] If this is the case, then the uncontrolled informal model of the form critics would be wrong on almost all accounts. We shall look first at the direct evidence for the control of tradition concerning Jesus, and then at the overall importance the words and deeds of Jesus would have had for the early Christians.

The evidence from the synoptic gospels indicates that Jesus's teaching was passed from him to his disciples via formal controlled transmission: there is an identified teacher, Jesus, and identified students, the disciples. For those who travelled with Jesus for the one to three years of his ministry, it would be hard to imagine they did not know this teaching inside out; after all, there is not a lot of material,[127] and the disciples are presented as being continuously with Jesus.[128] The control over Jesus's deeds would have most likely have been informal. The control would have come through the exercise of collective memory (shared memory and shared schematization), much as in the situations described by Bailey.[129] Jesus

---

Acts, and shows the mission spreading out. Matthew ends with an explicit commissioning to go to the nations, and John ends with the disciples symbolically catching fish and a Eucharistic meal (21:4–14). This focus on mission is why I agree with Bauckham that the gospels were likely written for "all Christians." Many scholars seem to see the gospels as either written for their own communities or written for all Christians. However, the two are not mutually exclusive especially as the problems facing the different communities would have been similar. For example, while Mark reflects the situation of dire persecution in Rome and the need to continue the mission despite fear, this would become true for all the Christian communities. On the Roman setting for Mark and the theme of fear and persecution see Brian J. Incigneri, *The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel* (BIS 65; Leiden: Brill, 2003), ch. 5.

[126] This will be done in the chiastic analysis in ch. 2.

[127] There are about 85 sayings in Q, which with non-Q sayings comes to roughly a hundred sayings. This is not a lot of material to learn by heart, especially as many of the sayings are repetitious, as, for example, the lost and found sayings.

[128] The disciples are shown leaving their jobs and family to follow Jesus (Mark 1:16–20, 2:13–17, 10:28–31, and par.). On the call stories see above n. 86 on page 18. Mark 10:28–31 has also been questioned, since Peter says the disciples have left all behind, while the evidence points to this not being the case: Peter is shown at his house (Mark 1:29–30), and may have continued to possess a boat (3:9; 4:1, 36), and a net (Matt 17:24–27). On this see Ernest Best, *Disciples and Discipleship: Studies in the Gospel According to Mark* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986), 17–18. However, Best is being a little to literal. Peter's house and boat are being put to use in the service of the mission. The boat, net, and even the house may not have been exclusively his, but owned by his extended family. Peter is later shown leaving Galilee for Jerusalem, and then Antioch, before dying in Rome. 1 Cor 9:5 also indicates he may have travelled with his wife, but again, this is done while on mission. All the evidence (various sayings of Jesus, Acts, and Paul) indicates that many of the apostles did devote themselves to the mission completely. Consequently, though Mark is likely to have modelled the call stories on Elisha (see above n. 86 on page 18), the basic premise that the disciples devoted themselves completely to Jesus and his mission remains highly probable. For further discussion and additional reasons for general historical reliability of Mark 10:28–30 see Robert Horton Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993), 566–69.

[129] On collective memory and schematization see above on page 15; on Bailey see above on page 13. As the disciples and Jesus were travelling together collective memory would form, and their interpretation of the miracles would be the same as their mentor's. Jesus seems to have interpreted the miracles as an indication that the kingdom of God has come (Luke 11:20/Matt 12:28, Luke 7:18–23/Matt 11:2–6). Some have argued that Luke 11:20/ Matt 12:28 makes no sense; because if Jesus's miracles indicate the kingdom has come, then the exorcisms of others would indicate the same; see, for example, Francis Wright Beare, *The Gospel According to Matthew: Translation, Introduction, and Commentary* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981), 278–79. W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* [3 vols.; ICC Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988], 2: 339) rightly argue that Jesus's statement only makes sense if the stress is placed on Jesus doing the miracles means the kingdom has come. However, this does not mean that Jesus is here implying an Christological role for himself as they argue. Rather, Jesus is saying that his message

and his followers would thus act in this regard like a travelling village. This is even more likely in as much as Jesus considered himself and his disciples to be one family.[130] Consequently, Jesus's teaching would have a stable form under his guidance, and the accounts of his miracles would have a stable form due to both the influence of collective memory and the schematization supplied by Jesus.

Based on the evidence, there is no reason to think that this form of transmission for the words and deeds of Jesus did not continue in the Jerusalem church, which was headed by the three and the twelve and included others who were with Jesus his whole career.[131] One must assume that one of the reasons that Jesus set up a hierarchy within his followers was so that they could continue his mission if something happened to him, which after the death of John would be expected.[132] There is no reason to think that the traditions would drastically change after Easter. True, some of Jesus's teaching would now be interpreted as indicating he was the Lord Messiah, but the change in schematization would not affect the rest of his message, namely, that people must repent in preparation for the coming day of the LORD.[133] If anything, the status and importance of Jesus's teaching would increase, since it was no longer the teaching of a prophet, but of the Lord Messiah.

In regards to Jesus's deeds, there is also no need to think that the change in schematization would radically change these traditions: the miracles, instead of indicating that the kingdom was dawning,[134] would now indicate that Jesus was the LORD. The schematization or framework would change the way the miracles were interpreted, but there is no reason that the actual miracle traditions themselves would change. This is shown by the synoptic gospels: with a couple of exceptions, the miracles are just presented without any

---

from God (that the kingdom is at hand) must be correct as God has allowed the exorcisms to take place. Consequently, his miracles do indicate that the kingdom is dawning.

On the historicity of Luke 7:18/Matt 11:2–6 see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2: 244–46; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8–20* (trans. James E. Crouch; Her; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 130–32. In this saying Jesus makes constant reference to Isaiah and the coming of the Day (Isa 26:19; 29:18–19; 35:5–6; 61:1): the miracles thus indicate that the Day is at hand. For a discussion of the references to Isaiah see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2: 242–46. See also below on page 39, n. 204 on page 39, and n. 206 on page 39.

[130] Mark 3:31–35 and par. Though the saying uses the general "whoever," it is clearly referring to the people Jesus is teaching, that is, his disciples.

[131] In Acts 1:21 Luke says that the qualifications to join the twelve was that the person must have witnessed Jesus's entire mission from its inception with John the Baptist. On this passage, see above n. 89 on page 18.

[132] Jesus seems well aware that he was in danger after the death of John the Baptist; after all, his mentor had been arrested and killed for spreading the same message. This makes Jesus's predictions about his death highly plausible. It also makes plausible his warnings to his disciples that if they follow him they must be willing to die. Mark connects these two by placing the warning to the disciples (8:34–9:1) right after the first prediction (8:27–33). The need for the message to be spread would remain after Jesus's death, just as it did after John the Baptist's. On this and other grounds for authenticity of this saying see C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (New York: Scribner, 1961), 40; E. J. Pryke, *Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel: A study of Syntax and Vocabulary as Guides to Redaction in Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 163–64; Heikki Räisänen, *The "Messianic Secret" in Mark* (trans. Christopher Tuckett; SNTW; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990), 177.

[133] This is shown by the fact that Jesus does not unequivocally declare himself to be the Messiah in any of his teaching or words except at his trial (Mark 14:62, Luke 22:67–69, Matt 26:64), where the "secret" is revealed. For example, after Peter says Jesus is the Messiah, Jesus does not confirm it, but rather rebukes the disciples and tells them not to tell anyone (Mark 8:30, Luke 9:21, Matt 16:20). As commentators are quick to point out, this is not a denial of the claim, however, it is also not affirmation of it. The lack of Jesus's declaration creates the "messianic secret." For a history of this concept and references see Tuckett, "Messianic,"

[134] See above n. 129 on page 27, and below on page 39.

interpretation, [135] and the only guide as to how they were interpreted comes, as will be shown, from the structure of the gospels.[136]

Thus, despite the new schematization after Easter, the Jesus traditions would have maintained their basic shape. The type of control for the words and deeds would also have been maintained. The model of teacher-disciple was kept, except now the apostles were the teachers, and the new disciples the students. Acts tells us that new converts devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching (2:42).[137] We are also told that Peter and John were told by the authorities not to speak or teach in the name of Jesus (4:18),[138] and that every day both in the temple and at home the apostles did not cease to teach and proclaim (5:42).[139] Peter and John, two members of the three, are thus presented as being the primary teachers. Other people are also designated as being teachers: "Now in the church at Antioch there were prophets and teachers: Barnabas, Simeon who was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen a member of the court of Herod the ruler, and Saul." (13:1)[140] Paul also identifies teachers in his communities: they are ranked third after apostles and prophets (1 Cor 12:27). Naturally, this does not mean that one could not have been an apostle, prophet, and teacher at the same time; for example, Paul himself was all three. There is thus evidence of formal controlled transmission of tradition with identified teachers and identified students (new converts). It is not certain whether the deeds of Jesus would have been considered part of the

---

[135] The only interpretation is supplied by the demons during exorcisms when they declare Jesus to be the Messiah (1:24, 34; 3:11, 5:7). However, though Jesus tells them to be quiet, there is no evidence that the audience of the miracles hears them; for example, no-one ever asks why the demons declare Jesus to be the Messiah, and people later wonder who Jesus is (1:27; 2:7; 4:41; 6:3). So Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 38–39. Gundry, *Mark*, 84–85, does not see these passages where Jesus tells the demons to be quiet as part of the messianic secret, but rather as Jesus stopping the demons magically using his divine names. It is not known when the demon declarations entered the tradition; they could well have been introduced by Mark. Other interpretation seems to have entered the tradition through the symbolization of details; for example, the numbers in the two feedings. It is not until the Gospel of John that we have the miracles explicitly declared as signs that Jesus was the Messiah.

[136] This will be shown in the chiastic analysis in ch. 2.

[137] Conzelmann, *Acts*, 23, sees the phrase "apostles' teaching" as placing the emphasis on the content rather than the formal handing on of tradition. However, the emphasis is on the converts joining the community as a whole (they also devote themselves to fellowship, the breaking of bread, and prayer). As such they are presented as students learning all these things and becoming members of the community. Conzelmann is making too much of one phrase that presents a clear situation of teacher-disciple, and thus the formal handing on of tradition.

[138] Barrett, *Acts: Shorter*, 59, sees the text as referring to both public proclamation and "the private teaching of individuals and small groups," that is to formal teaching. This makes sense as teaching done to the general public would fall under the rubric of speaking. However, one should not see a hard and fast division between the two as proclaiming would include the teaching of Jesus (the kingdom is at hand, the opportunity of forgiveness, and how to behave to be saved).

[139] As Barrett, *Acts: Shorter*, 82, points out, the phrase "home" could refer either to their private homes or to a specific meeting place they owned. Either way, the location points to the formal handing on of the teaching.

[140] Barrett, *Acts: Shorter*, 190–91, points out that this is the only place the word "teacher" is used in Acts, but cognate words are common (to teach, teaching: 19 times). Dunn, *Acts*, 172, sees this reference as pointing to a church that has a less organized structure than in Jerusalem, and thus has a more charismatic Spirit-based leadership. This is deducing a lot from a few words. It would mean that those in leadership in Jerusalem were not teachers and prophets. But members of the twelve and seven are shown to be; for example, Peter (2:14–36, 5:9) and Stephen (7:1–60). Acts implies that Barnabas and Paul take on the leadership role: Barnabas and Paul are presented teaching the church for about a year before their mission (11:26). The mention of these people implies there were people with definite leadership roles.

teaching material that was formally passed on. However, they probably were, since, as will be shown, they were used to show Jesus was the Lord Messiah.[141]

The church in Jerusalem would act like a village in regards to the control of tradition. Instead of village elders there were the disciples taught by Jesus, especially the twelve and the three. The control proposed here for Jerusalem would also manifest itself in the communities outside of Palestine as, for example, in Antioch. The church in Antioch was founded by disciples who had fled Jerusalem during a period of persecution (Acts 11:19). One would imagine they would found a community along the lines of the one in Jerusalem, especially since they kept in contact with Jerusalem (Acts 11:22).[142] As was shown above, there was a lot of travelling back and forth between Jerusalem and Antioch, and the travel included important leaders from the Jerusalem.[143] The control exerted by these leaders would not only have been over the issue of circumcision, but would have been over the mission, that is, the teaching and proclaiming as a whole. The visitors from Jerusalem included those who had been disciples of Jesus,[144] and one of the three, Peter. The community in Antioch would thus have the opportunity to learn about the words and deeds of Jesus from eyewitnesses. These esteemed visitors would have corrected any errors in the tradition, and thus in the end there would have been very little difference between the teaching in Antioch and Jerusalem.

It has been assumed by some scholars that Paul was not interested in the teaching and deeds of the earthly Jesus, since his letters barely mention them. In fact, the only explicit mention is in regards to Jesus's teaching on divorce: "I give this command—not I but the Lord—that the wife should not separate from her husband" (1 Cor 7:10). Paul then goes on to say, "to the rest I say—I and not the Lord—..." (7:12), and then gives some further teaching on marriage. This passage, as many have pointed out, puts the lie to the notion that the early Christians did not distinguish between the words of the earthly Jesus and other teaching.[145] Paul in this case is certainly aware of Jesus's teaching, and one must assume he was aware of the rest of Jesus's teaching, because he had ample opportunity to learn it in Damascus, Jerusalem, and Antioch.[146] As we have seen, he is labelled a teacher in Antioch

---

[141] This will be shown in the chiastic analysis in ch. 2.

[142] This does not mean there was a division like that of the twelve and a seven, but rather that there were recognized people with authority on teaching and also people designated to look after the poor. As pointed out above in n. 140, Barnabas and Paul appear to take on leadership roles. At this stage, it was most likely just Barnabas, the one sent as representative of the leadership in Jerusalem, who had the leadership role with Paul as his helper: Luke has Barnabas bring Paul to Antioch (11:25).

[143] See above the section "Leadership and Oversight in the Gospels, Acts, and Paul" beginning on page 17.

[144] John Mark and Barnabas were probably both disciples of Jesus: Barnabas, a native of Cyprus, seems to be established in Jerusalem as he sells a field to help support the early community near the beginning of Luke's account of the community (Acts 4:36). John Mark was Barnabas's nephew, which seems to indicate the larger family was perhaps in Jerusalem.

[145] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 268; Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, 221–22; Meier, *Marginal*, 1:45–46; David Wenham, *Paul, Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995), 242–46.

[146] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 266; Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years* (trans. John Bowden; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 133–50, 204–243. Paul spent a couple of weeks in Jerusalem at Peter's house (Gal 1:18, cf. Acts 9:26–30 and the discussion in Hengel and Schwemmer), a year teaching with Barnabas in Antioch (11:26), a year or so travelling with Barnabas, and time in Antioch after this mission, for a total of at least three years; see above on page 22. For a list of references on Jesus tradition in Paul see Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, 217, n. 47. One of the most comprehensive studies is Wenham, *Paul*.

by Luke in Acts (13:1). There is also evidence of formal teaching in Paul's letters in his use of the technical terms for the handing on and receiving of tradition (1 Cor 11:2, 23, 15:1, 3; Gal 1:9; Col 2:6; 1 Thess 2:13, 4:1; 2 Thess 3:6).[147]

Also, one should not expect mention of Jesus's teaching in Paul's letters. Paul's letters are about specific problems in the communities he founded: one would only expect direct mention if there was some dispute over how to interpret Jesus's teaching.[148] However, Jesus's teaching is not complicated and would have been easy to learn.[149] Also, any difficulties in understanding it would have been dealt with as it was taught. The same would go for the traditions about his deeds. The problems in Paul's communities stem from situations that were on the whole completely alien to Jesus in Palestine, that is, problems of a community that included non-Jews who did not practice the Torah, some of whom may have had little background in Jewish morals. For example, Jesus would not have discussed whether one should be able to eat food consecrated to idols or not (1 Cor 8:1-13), or whether Gentiles should follow the Torah if they wanted to join the community (for example, Galatians, Romans). For the most part, Paul is facing situations that Jesus would not have imagined. Despite this, a careful analysis of Paul's letters shows that the teaching of Jesus does lie behind a lot of what Paul says.[150]

As mentioned, Paul had ample opportunity to learn the Jesus tradition.[151] He began as a persecutor of the movement, and would have heard traditions then, albeit, as an outsider. He then spent time in Damascus with the disciples there (Acts 9:19–25, Gal 1:17–18).[152] After two years of mission work there, he returns to Jerusalem and stayed with Peter for two weeks (Gal 1:18). From his own account, it seems he was in virtual hiding; the only other person he met was James, the brother of Jesus, and leader of the church in Jerusalem. As others have pointed out, it is unlikely he spent this time discussing the weather. Rather, he would have discussed Jesus and his teaching from those who had known Jesus intimately. Many years after this Paul spent a good amount of time in both Antioch and Cyprus with John Mark and Barnabas (Acts 11:26, 12:24–13:12). Since both Barnabas and John Mark were from the Jerusalem community and trusted by the leadership to check up on things in Antioch, they would have been thoroughly versed in the Jesus traditions, especially since Luke describes Barnabas as a teacher (Acts 13:1). Luke also describes Paul teaching for a year with Barnabas in Antioch before the trip (11:26). Paul then travelled extensively with Barnabas on the mainland going inland to Galatia (Acts 13:13–14:28). After this, he returned to Antioch and spent some time there before setting out on his own.[153] It is inconceivable that in all this time spent with people who would have known the traditions of Jesus backwards and forwards that Paul himself would not gain the same level of knowledge, especially as he seems to have been an over-achiever and was able to put himself forward as a leading

---

[147] On these and other passages indicating formal transmission of traditions see Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 264–71; Gerhardsson, *Reliability*, 16–19

[148] On the "silence" in Paul see Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, ch. 5.

[149] Though some of the parables are perhaps difficult to comprehend, their meaning was explained to the disciples (Mark 4:10–11 and par., Mark 4:33), and presumably passed on to those they taught. See also above n. 127 on page 27.

[150] See above nn. 145 and 146 on page 30.

[151] See above n. 146 on page 30.

[152] For discussion on this see Hengel and Schwemer, *Between Damascus*, chs. 2–5.

[153] He was most likely had at least three in Antioch with Barnabas: see above on page 22, and n. 146 on page 30.

missionary in charge of the mission to non-Jews. Also, since there do not seem to be any disputes between Paul and others over the teaching and deeds of Jesus, it is likely that his teaching on these items would be the same as that of the Jerusalem church.

The argument made earlier in regards to the stabilization of the tradition in Antioch would also apply to the other major centres that seem to have acted as mother churches: Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome.[154] Paul spent a lot of time in each of these places, and in others as well. He did not go into a town or city and then quickly leave, unless forced to. Rather, he spent weeks and sometimes months ensuring the community was properly taught.[155] He then kept a close eye on them after he had left, with people reporting back to him. Finally, he himself revisits in person to make sure everything is in order.[156] One of Paul's close associates, Silvanus, was Silas, one of the trusted leaders from Jerusalem (Acts 15:22–32).[157] Considering the frequent travel and controlling nature of the early church, one must assume that other members from Jerusalem, including people who had been disciples of Jesus, would have visited the major centres. The most prominent example is Peter, the head of the mission to the nations, who would surely have had some people from Jerusalem with him. The whole scenario makes it very likely that there would have been a stabilization of the Jesus traditions throughout the Christian community in the Roman Empire. In other words, similar types of mechanisms for the control of oral traditions observed by Bailey would soon have been found if not in all the Christian communities, at least in those associated with the major centres, which would have been the majority of them.

The Importance of the Jesus Traditions

Jesus as LORD

The studies of Bailey and others show that the more important traditions are to a community, the more control is placed on them.[158] The form critics argued that the earthly traditions were not so important to the early Christians, and that the focus was on Jesus the risen Messiah, not Jesus the earthly teacher and doer of miracles. This understanding is partly based on the argument from silence in regards to the letters of Paul,[159] but it is also due to their understanding of the development of Christology. Boussett's work, which proposed a change in the understanding of the Messiah as Christianity went from Palestine and into the Hellenistic Roman world, was highly influential.[160] It argued for a gradual change from an earthly to a more heavenly Messiah, that is, from a low Christology to a high Christology where Jesus is seen as a manifestation of God.

---

[154] The main centres thus coincide with the main Roman administrative centres.

[155] For example, Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul*, 28, 31, has Paul twenty months in Galatia, nineteen months in Macedonia, seventeen months in Corinth, twenty-six months in Ephesus, another winter in Macedonia, and another winter in Corinth. See also Jewett, *Chronology*.

[156] For example, on his second journey Paul visits many of the places visited on his first journey (Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch of Pisidia), and on his third journey, many of the places of the second (cities revisited in second journey, plus Ephesus, Troas, and the cities in Macedonia from Troas to Corinth twice). For the variations in details of dates and itineraries see Jewett, *Chronology*; Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul*. For a short summary see Hans Dieter Betz, "Paul," *ABD* 5:189–92.

[157] Gillman, "Silas,"6:22–23.

[158] Bailey, "Informal," 42–45; Bailey, "Middle," 365; Vansina, *Oral tradition*, 31–39.

[159] See above on page 30.

[160] Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A history of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus* (trans. John E. Steely; Nashville: Abingdon, 1970).

This understanding has been steadily challenged in the work of Larry Hurtado.[161] Hurtado focuses on worship of Jesus in early Christian literature. This is because, as he points out, though there were other heavenly beings in the Judaism of the time, Judaism's distinguishing factor was that it worshipped only one heavenly being, God.[162] This is what separated Judaism from the other nations. The driving force for Hurtado's work is the question: how did the human Jesus come to be worshipped as God?

Hurtado admirably demonstrates that Jesus was worshipped as God in Paul's communities.[163] There is not the space here to analyse all the evidence that Hurtado, and consequently Gordon Fee, marshals.[164] Hurtado begins with the key Christological titles used: Messiah, Son of God, and Lord.[165] "Son of God" clearly points to Jesus's divine status, and "Lord" has clear parallels to the use of the term for God in Hebrew scripture.[166] Hurtado then gives evidence of the belief in the pre-existence of Jesus and the redemptive nature of his death in Paul's letters.[167] Hurtado thus demonstrates the extraordinary place given Jesus in Pauline Christianity, extraordinary as this comes from an extremely devout Jew. Hurtado then goes on to show that this devotion includes worship: there are prayers to Jesus, invocation and confession of Jesus, baptism in his name, the Lord's Supper as cult meal, and hymns.[168] All this evidence is best explained by Jesus being worshiped as a manifestation of God.

---

[161] Larry W. Hurtado, "First Century Jewish Monotheism," *JSNT* 71 (1998): 3–26; Larry W. Hurtado, *How on Earth did Jesus Become a God?: Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005); Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003); Larry W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).

[162] Hurtado, *Lord*, 29–53 See also Hurtado, "Monotheism,"; Hurtado, *One God.* Crossley and Horbury dispute this. However, though language associated with God may be applied to other figures and heavenly beings, there is no evidence that such beings were actually worshipped; see James G. Crossley, "*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*," *JEH* 56 (2005): 118–20; William Horbury, "*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*," *JTS* 56 (2005): 531–39 On the relationship between God and angels see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "'Angels' and 'God': exploring the limits of early Jewish monotheism," in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (London: T & T Clark International, 2004).

[163] On the whole, peer reviews of Hurtado are very positive, especially concerning this central thesis. Those in disagreement focus on either Hurtado's analysis of Paul or Q. In regards to Paul, Hurtado makes a convincing argument because of the breadth of evidence he presents. As with many arguments, the whole is more than the sum of the parts. One could take any one piece of evidence that Hurtado presents and raise objections and explain it in other ways. However, when one combines all the evidence the most plausible explanation is that Jesus was worshipped in the Pauline communities. I thus disagree with Crossley, "Lord Jesus," 118–20. This evidence is in turn "astounding," etc., and as Hurtado points out in his reply to Casey, such language is appropriate in discussing the situation; see Maurice Casey, "*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in the Earliest Church*," *JSNT* 27, no. 1 (2004): 83–96; Larry W. Hurtado, "Devotion to Jesus and Historical Investigation: A Grateful, Clarifying, and Critical Response to Professor Casey," *JSNT* 27, no. 1 (2004): 97–104.

[164] Hurtado, *Lord*, 79–154, and the six-hundred-page study by Gordon D. Fee, *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007).

[165] Hurtado, *Lord*, 98–118; Fee, *Pauline*, chs. 14–15. Fee's work is divided into two parts. In the first part he looks at the evidence in each letter individually, and in the second part he does a synthesis of the evidence. I will refer only to the references in the synthesis section, but each of the categories discussed here can be found in under the headings for each letter in the extensive table of contents, vi–xix. See both of these works for further references on the individual topics.

[166] Hurtado, *Lord*, 112; see also Fee, *Pauline*, ch. 15.

[167] Fee, *Pauline*, 500–12, 546–51; Hurtado, *Lord*, 118–32.

[168] Hurtado, *Lord*, 137–50.

Hurtado then argues that this was not unique to Paul's churches, because there is no hint of dispute in his letters or Acts over his understanding of Jesus as Christ.[169] The model of control argued above adds weight to this argument. Hurtado also points to the two Aramaic terms found in Paul's letters, *maranatha* and *Abba*, and argues that this usage must have originated in the Palestinian churches.[170] *Maranatha* connects Jesus with the divine title Lord, and *Abba* refers to God the father. Hurtado rightly argues that there is evidence of binitarianism in earliest Christianity that seems to go back to its very beginnings.[171]

If Hurtado's and Fee's interpretation is correct, and I think it is, then Paul's constant reference to Jesus as lord is actually to Jesus as LORD, i.e., YHWH. This is confirmed in his letters where the day of the LORD becomes the Day of the Lord Jesus Christ, or Day of Lord Jesus, or Day of Christ.[172] The strongest confirmation comes from the Christological hymn found in Philippians:

> Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus,
> who, though he was in the form of God,
> did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited,
> but emptied himself,
> taking the form of a slave,
> being born in human likeness.
> And being found in human form,
> he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death–
> even death on a cross.
> Therefore God also highly exalted him
> and gave him the name that is above every name,
> so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bend,
> in heaven and on earth and under the earth,
> and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord,
> to the glory of God the Father. (2:5-11)

Most commentators see Paul here inserting an earlier hymn commonly used in worship into his letter.[173] The name above every other name can only be one name in Judaism, YHWH,[174]

---

[169] Hurtado, *Lord*, 165–67.

[170] Hurtado, *Lord*, 173–76.

[171] Hurtado argues that it was the mystical visions of Easter that allowed Jesus to be seen as a manifestation of God. With this I am in full agreement. However, as I have argued elsewhere (Steven Richard Scott, "The Binitarian Nature of the *Book of Similtudes*," *JSP* 18 (2008): 55–78), I do not think this is enough; there must have already been something in the Judaism of the time that allowed for such visions to take place. This is contra Hurtado, who emphatically denies that there was any form of binitarianism in the Judaism of the time. However, I demonstrate that a careful analysis of the Similitudes of Enoch shows that binitarianism was present. I argue that a distinction is made between the Lord of Spirits and the Name of the Lord of Spirits, and that the Name of the Lord of Spirits is the same figure as that otherwise referred to as the Righteous One, the Chosen One, the Son of Man, and Messiah. The Lord of Spirits has the characteristics of God the Father: he is presented as the Ancient of Days, an old man on a throne, which is the traditional imagery of El as father of the gods in Canaanite literature. The Name of the Lord of Spirits would be the sacred name YHWH, which could not be mentioned; hence the variety of euphemisms to refer to this figure. YHWH, referred to as LORD, was traditionally a young warrior storm god, who is depicted as riding on his clouds. These two figures are also found in the widely accepted Book of Daniel.

[172] Rom 2:16, 1 Cor 1:8, 2 Cor 1:14, Phil 1:6, 10, 2:16 (some of these are quoted below on page 36); see also Fee, *Pauline*, 568–74.

[173] Martin Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 1.

the name of the storm warrior manifestation of God as opposed to the ancient of days manifestation.[175] This hymn thus says that a manifestation of God, who was equal with God, pre-existed[176] and became a human, that is, emptied himself of his divine attributes, and then humbled himself to death on a cross, which led to God raising him to heaven and giving back his divine status. God is thus divided into God the Father and God the LORD, that is Jesus Christ.[177]

The question asked in this section was how important would the Jesus traditions have been to the early Christians? This now becomes, how important would traditions about YHWH walking on earth have been to them? The answer for a Jewish sect can only be, important in the utmost possible manner. The only comparison is the revelation on Sinai, and even then God did not come and walk and talk with his people. Jesus's teaching on how to behave and follow the Torah would be on par with the Torah itself: both represent the word of God.[178] With such a scenario, it is hard to imagine that his teaching would not be preserved as carefully and honestly as possible. Just as Jesus's teaching would gain importance, so would his actions. They, as will be argued below, were important in the argument that Jesus was YHWH, the LORD Messiah. In addition to the traditions about Jesus gaining importance because he became the LORD Jesus Christ, the people he chose as leaders, the twelve and the three, would also gain in prestige: they are not just people chosen by a human leader to have authority, but people chosen by God.

The Importance of Miracles Showing Jesus as Raiser of the Dead

A key function of God in his LORD manifestation is the ability to defeat evil, represented by Leviathan, the dragon in the sea.[179] While the LORD constantly keeps this manifestation of evil chaos at bay from the order of creation, on the day of the LORD the LORD will kill the dragon in the sea once and for all.[180] This will usher in a new kingdom where God's rule, the perfect order of creation, will be completely unopposed.[181] A key element of the day of the LORD is the judgement of humanity, both the living and the dead.[182]

---

[174] So Fee, *Pauline*, 396–97; Martin Hengel, *Studies in Early Christology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995), 155–56.

[175] On the two manifestations in the Hebrew Bible see Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973). See above also n. 171 on page 34. Paul refers to the Father (the Ancient of Days) manifestation as God and Jesus as Lord; for example, a common part of the opening of his letters is "peace from God our Father and the Lord" (1 Rom 1:7, 1 Cor 1:3, 2 Cor 1:3, Eph 1:2, Phil 1:2, and cf. Gal 1:1, 1 Thess 1:1, 2 Thess 1:1).

[176] On pre-existence in this hymn see Hurtado, *Lord*, 118–23 On this hymn in general in regards to Christology see Brian J. Dodd and Ralph P. Martin, *Where Christology Began: Essays on Philippians 2* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1998); Fee, *Pauline*, 370–400.

[177] On this division being present in the Judaism of the time see above n. 171 on page 34.

[178] This seems to be Matthew's interpretation with the Sermon on the Mount and its Sinai echoes (5:1–7:27).

[179] For example, Ps 74:12–17. See Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 118–20; John Day, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament* (35; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); John Day, "Leviathan," *ABD* 4:295–96.

[180] Isa 27:1.

[181] For descriptions of this perfect creation see: Hos 2:22, Amos 9:13, Joel 3:18, Hag 2:18, Zech 8:12, Mal 3:10, Isa 4:2, 30:23, 32:15, Jeremiah 31:12, Ezekiel 34:14, 34:27, 36:20.

[182] The concept of the dead being raised for judgement does not make its appearance until the Hellenistic period with the Enochic literature: *1 En.* 22, Dan 12:2. On the origin of this belief see H. Birkeland, "The Belief of the Resurrection of the Dead in the Old Testament," *ST* 3 (1949): 60–78.

In order to judge the dead, the LORD will raise them:

> Prophesy to these bones, and say to them:
> O dry bones, hear the word of YHWH.
> Thus says lord YHWH to these bones:
> I will cause spirit to enter you, and you shall live.
> I will lay sinews on you,
> and will cause flesh to come upon you,
> and will cover your skin,
> and put spirit in you, and you shall live;
> and you shall know that I am YHWH. (Ezek 37:4–6)

At the time of Ezekiel it is believed that the concept of the resurrection of the dead did not exist in Israelite religion, and consequently this passage would have been interpreted symbolically as representing the restoration of Israel from exile.[183] However, by the time of Jesus those who believed in the resurrection of the dead would have read this as a description of the dead rising on the day of the LORD.[184] By this unique miracle the people will know that YHWH is YHWH, because only YHWH could have such power over death. In other words, by raising the dead the LORD demonstrates he is in fact the LORD.

As mentioned above, for the Christian the day of the LORD becomes the day of the LORD Jesus Christ.[185] It is now Jesus as LORD who will come on his Day to raise the dead and judge:

> But by your hard and impenitent heart you are storing up wrath for yourself on the day of wrath, when God's righteous judgement will be revealed. For he will repay everyone according to their deeds . . . on the day when, according to my gospel, God, through Jesus Christ, will judge the secret thoughts of all (Rom 2:5–6, 16)[186]

> . . . so that you are not lacking in any spiritual gift as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ. He will also strengthen you to the end, so that you may be blameless on the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. (1 Cor 1:7–8)[187]

---

[183] See R. E. Clements, *Ezekiel* (WeBC; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 165; Michael V. Fox, "The Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of the Bones," *HUCA* 51 (1980); Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 22A; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 747–49.

[184] See Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37*, 749–51.

[185] See above on page 34, especially n. 172.

[186] The traditional view was to interpret this passage as God carrying judgement out through a human surrogate; for example Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 312. The examples from Hebrew literature are the Elect One (seen as Enoch) in *1 En.* 45:3–6 or Melchizedek (11QMelch) or Abel (*T. Ab.* 13:5). However, the day of the LORD never becomes the Day of the Lord Enoch, Melchizedek, or Abel. Also, I have argued elsewhere, "Binitarian," 55–78, that the Elect One (Son of Man) in the Similitudes of Enoch is actually identified with the Name of the Lord of Spirits, that is, YHWH. Melchizedek, or the "king of righteousness," was the king of Salem, later Jerusalem (Gen 14:18–20), and came to be viewed as the eternal priest. This figure, however, takes on godlike qualities in the Qumran literature, and has been identified with the Prince of Light and Archangel Michael, amongst others. In Hebrews this figure is identified with Jesus, who was also identified with the Son of Man. I would suggest the Prince of Light/Melchizedek is none other than the YHWH manifestation of God. On Melchizedek see Michael C. Astour, "Melchizedek (Person)," *ABD* 4; George J. Brooke, "Melchizedek (11QMelch)," *ABD* 4; Annette Steudel, "Melchizedek," *EDSS* 1 In regards to *T. Ab.*, in this passage only a human, not God, is seen as doing the judging, which goes against Hebrew scripture; cf. Mal 3:2–4:3.

[187] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 28: "'day of Yahweh' . . . is reinterpreted to apply to Jesus."

> I am confident of this, that the one who began a good work among you will bring it to completion by the day of Jesus Christ . . . so that in the day of Christ you may be pure and blameless (Phil 1:6, 10)
>
> For since death came through a human being, the resurrection of the dead has also come through a human being; for all die in Adam, so all will be made in alive in Christ . . .. after he (Christ) has destroyed every ruler and every authority and power . . . The last enemy to be destroyed is death. For "God has put all things in subjection under his feet." (1 Cor 15:21–27)[188]

In order to make the extraordinary claim that Jesus is the LORD, extraordinary evidence would be required. Jesus's miracles of healing would help in making this claim. However, though the number and quality of Jesus's miracles were extraordinary, there were other known healers in the ancient world. Consequently, traditions of Jesus raising people from the dead would be especially important in showing Jesus to be the LORD. However, even these would not be definitive to a Hebrew audience, since Elijah and Elisha also raised people from the dead.[189] As will be shown, both of these problems will be addressed by Luke in his story of the WNS.[190] The importance of the healing miracles to the early Christians, and especially those showing Jesus as raiser of the dead, will be demonstrated in the next chapter. This importance means that there would likely be tight control over the oral traditions concerning Jesus's miracles.

Opposition to Jesus as LORD and its Effect on the Oral Tradition

The claim that Jesus was LORD is also supported by the fierce opposition from other Jews. It is actually surprising that it was not fiercer. Acts in its description of the stoning of Stephen indicates that a high Christology was at the root of the persecution. Though Stephen said many things to upset his audience, what pushed them over the edge was his claim to see Jesus as the Son of Man, i.e., the LORD Messiah, standing at the right hand of God (7:56).[191] At this his audience "covered their ears and with a loud shout all rushed together against him" (7:57). They then dragged him out of the city and stoned him, which was the punishment for blaspheming God (7:58).[192] This blasphemy also led to a severe persecution in which Paul took part (8:1).[193]

---

[188] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 270, does not see 15:27 in future terms contra to Orr and Walther, *I Corinthians*, 333. Death cannot have been destroyed as it was still flourishing before and after Paul wrote the letter. Conzelmann sees Jesus's resurrection as the point death was destroyed. However, though death was here defeated by Jesus it was not yet completely destroyed.

[189] 1 Kgs 17:17–24 (Elijah), 2 Kgs 4:8–37 (Elisha) By raising her child from the dead the widow declares she knows Elijah is "a man of God, and that the word of the LORD" is in his mouth. See also below on page 281.

[190] See below on page 281.

[191] See also Acts 6:11: Stephen was accused by suborned men of blasphemy against Moses and God. On this and 7:56 see Hurtado, *Lord*, 176 The speech of Stephen contradicts the accusation of blasphemy against Moses; so Barrett, *Acts: Shorter*, 96–98. This leaves the charge of blasphemy against God. Others (Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 389; Haenchen, *Acts*, 295) understand Jesus standing at the right hand of God not in terms of the seated El and standing YHWH, but just as vindication of Stephen and the Christians in the sight of God. However, both see this statement as pushing the crowd over the edge.

[192] Lev 24:10–23, *Sanh.* 7:4. See Barrett, *Acts: Shorter*, 110; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 60; Dunn, *Acts*, 100–101; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 390–91.

[193] Some see this persecution solely aimed at the Hellenists. The key phrase is "a great persecution broke out against the church in Jerusalem" (8:1): it was against the whole church not just the Hellenists. Luke is here focusing on the Hellenists, and he later tells of how the Palestinian Jews were persecuted: James the brother of John was beheaded by Agrippa (12:2), and Peter was arrested (12:3). As Dunn (*Acts*, 161–62) points out,

Without such high Christology, it is hard to explain the persecution of Jews against Christians. It is hard to imagine that Jesus's teaching would lead to such a response: many others believed that the day of the LORD was about to arrive, and he was not the only one to advocate following the Torah through the interpretive lens of the double love commandment.[194] There is also no evidence that the Jerusalem community did not fully follow the Torah or preached a lessening of it.[195] Acts does say that Peter ate unclean food with Cornelius (11:3); however, this seems to be the only occasion.[196] Paul's letter to the Galatians makes it clear that Jerusalem Christians followed the dietary laws (2:11–12).[197] It is also hard to imagine that preaching that Jesus was the earthly Davidic messiah, and that he had been raised to heaven like Elijah, would be seen as blasphemy. At worst, the early Christians would be seen as deluded and completely wrong: Jesus could not be the promised Davidic Messiah, because he was killed and never became king. It is only the claim that Jesus was YHWH that properly explains the vehement opposition from other Jews.

This opposition took place not only in Jerusalem but elsewhere as well. From Roman sources we hear that there were large disturbances in the Jewish community in Rome over a certain Christos, disturbances that lead to the expulsion of all Jews from the city by the Emperor Claudius.[198] This took place before Paul's mission to the Gentiles. We hear from the letters of Paul and Acts that his preaching led to attempted executions and whippings in the Jewish communities he preached in.[199] Though Paul argued that Gentiles did not need to follow the Torah, there is no evidence that he argued Jews had to give up the Torah except at the communal meals. Paul even seems later to have reversed his position on this point: in Rom 14:14–23 Paul seems to criticize those who eat what others (presumably Jewish Christians) see as being unclean. [200] This would put the onus on Gentiles to follow dietary laws at joint meals. Besides it would be hard to imagine that Paul and others were the only Jews not to follow the dietary laws on occasion. Such occasional departure from the dietary

---

Agrippa was known for his piety and held in respect by the Pharisees and the people, and thus this persecution against the blasphemous church makes sense.

[194] On Jewish traditions of the double love commandment see Theissen and Merz, *Historical*, 384–89. For example, R. Hillel also summed up the Torah by the golden rule (*b. Šab.* 31a), and R. Akiba taught that the command to love one's neighbour was the greatest and most comprehensive of the Torah (*Sipra Lev 19:18*).

[195] In fact James, the brother of Jesus and head of the church, was known for his righteousness. Paul's letter to the Galatians and Acts' response to Peter also indicate that the Christians in Jerusalem followed the Torah (Acts 11:1–18, Gal 2:11–12).

[196] See above n. 96 on page 20.

[197] It would appear that the Jewish Christians in Antioch, including Peter, had given up the food laws and were eating with the Gentiles: "I said to Cephas before them all, 'If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel Gentiles to live like Jews?" (2:14). With the arrival of the people from Jerusalem, Peter and the other Jewish Christians stopped eating with the Gentiles (2.11–12). In order to eat as a group the Gentile members would have to eat according to the food laws, and consequently live like Jews; so Martyn, *Galatians*, 236. Paul is not saying that Peter demanded that Gentiles be circumcised and follow the whole Torah; see Betz, *Galatians*, 112.

[198] Seutonius, *Claudius* 25:4. The expulsion is believed to have taken place in the forties. Theissen and Merz date it to 49 CE following Peter Lampe: Theissen and Merz, *Historical*, 83–84, Peter Lampe, *Die stadtrömische Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderte* (WUNT 18; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989). Paul is described as causing disturbances or riots (more likely mobbings) in Acts 13:50, 14:5, 14:19, 16:22, 17: 5–6, 18:12–17, 19:23.

[199] 2 Cor 6:4–5, 11:23–25, Acts 14:5, 16:22. On the "catalogues" of suffering see Victor Paul Furnish, *2 Corinthians* (AB 32A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984), 344–45, 354, 535.

[200] So Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 696.

laws is unlikely to be the cause of the vehemence he stirred up. However, claiming a crucified man was actually YHWH would explain it.

This opposition would put the Christians in a very defensive position. They backed their claim that Jesus was the LORD Messiah with the visions they had and with the deeds of Jesus. In regards to the latter, though there is no direct claim that the deeds of Jesus were used to show he was the Messiah until the Gospel of John,[201] there is some indirect evidence. In the next chapter, for example, it will be shown how chiastic structure was used to prove Jesus was the Messiah. Other evidence includes the Q saying in response to the questions from John the Baptist. John apparently wondered if Jesus was the "one to come," and Jesus replies cryptically: "Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have good news brought to them. And blessed is anyone who takes no offence at me" (Luke 7:22–23).[202] We shall later see how Luke structures this whole section, which includes the WNS, to show that the nature of Jesus's miracles demonstrate he is more than a healer and a prophet.[203] Whatever the schematization of this saying before Easter, after Easter it would be hard not imagine that it was interpreted as saying that Jesus's miracles indicate he is the LORD Messiah.[204]

That the early Christian community understood the miracles to show that Jesus was the LORD Messiah is also indicated by the healing done in the name of Jesus as Messiah. For example, Acts says that Peter told a lame man from birth to get up "in the name of Jesus Christ" (3:6).[205] Later we are told that Paul and Barnabas "remained speaking boldly for the Lord, who testified to the word of his grace by granting signs and wonders to be done through them." (14:3) In other words, the miracles showed that they had the blessing of the LORD and justified their message that Jesus was LORD.[206] In Galatians, Paul says that the Galatians by believing, receiving the Spirit, and being able to perform miracles were shown Jesus Christ crucified before their very eyes (3:1-5).[207] In other words, by believing that the

---

[201] In John the miracles become signs that point to who Jesus is; for example, 2:11, 12:37.

[202] On this saying see above n. 129 on page 27.

[203] See following note.

[204] See above n. 129 on page 27. Jesus does not really answer John's question, but indicates by references to Isaiah that the Day is dawning. One could place a "yes" or a "no, but" in front of Jesus's reply and either would make sense. The cryptic reply adds to the "messianic secret," and puts the emphasis on the Day and not the "one to come."

[205] The name is not used here in a magical sense, but rather is rather the means by which the power of Jesus is called upon. So Barrett, *Acts: Shorter*, 38–39; Dunn, *Acts*, 41; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 278–79.

[206] As Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 255, 527, points out, this parallels the gospels where God authenticates the words of Jesus by allowing the miracles. See also above n. 129 on page 27.

[207] "It was before your eyes that Jesus Christ was publically exhibited as crucified!" (Gal 3:1) is usually taken as Paul referring to his vivid oratory skills when he first proclaimed to the Galatians. So Betz, *Galatians*, 131; Martyn, *Galatians*, 283. The demonstration of Christ crucified, however, is shown by the Spirit. This comes our clearly in the chiastic structure of the passage:

A1 2:21 I do not nullify the grace of *God*;

B1 for if justification comes through the law, then Christ died for *nothing*.

C1 3:1 You *foolish* Galatians! Who has bewitched you? It was before your eyes that Jesus Christ was publicly exhibited as crucified!

D 3:2 The only thing I want to learn from you is this:

Did you *receive the Spirit* by doing the *works of the law or by believing what you heard*?

C2 3:3 Are you so *foolish*? Having started with the Spirit, are you now ending with the flesh?

B2 3:4 Did you experience so much for *nothing*? –if it really was for *nothing*.

crucified Jesus was the Messiah, that is, God, they were able to do miracles, which in turn showed that what they believed was true. Likewise, in First Corinthians Paul says he did not convince with wisdom but only through the crucified Jesus Christ, which we find out is through the Spirit and the power of God (2:1-5).[208] The power of Jesus is equated with the power of God. If the miracles performed through the dead and risen Jesus showed that Jesus is the Messiah, then the miracles of the living Jesus performed would also have done so.

The above argumentation by Paul is similar in concept to Jesus's reply when his opponents accuse him of performing miracles through the power of Satan (Mark 3:23–30, Luke 11:17–23, Matt 12:25–37). Here Jesus argues that the accusation makes no sense because healing goes against the purposes of Satan (the goal of Satan is to undo the right order of creation and create chaos, not the opposite).[209] Consequently, Jesus's miracles must come from God, and the kingdom of God (creation without chaos) has come to the healed (Luke 11:20, Matt 12:28).[210] Since the miracles come from God, then Jesus's message that the kingdom is about to arrive must also come from God, because God would not allow miracles to be performed by someone who lied about their message coming from God.

The use of the miracles of Jesus to show that he was the Messiah would have put added pressure on the oral tradition. Those who opposed the idea that Jesus was YHWH would have used every argument they could think of to argue he was not the LORD. They would question not only whether the miracles did in fact show Jesus to be the Messiah, but also whether they actually took place. Our analysis of Luke and the WNS will show that the former was likely the case.[211] The miracles of raising the dead would be questioned, since they are the most astounding miracles and, as we shall see, are given place of honour in showing Jesus to be the LORD Christ.[212] One can expect that every detail would be contested in the highly confrontational atmosphere with non-believing Jews who thought that the Christian claims were blasphemous and dangerous, because they led people astray. In regards to the raising-of-the-dead miracles, the first question asked would have been whether the person was really dead or not.

A2 3:5 Well then, does *God supply you with the Spirit* and work miracles among you by your doing *the works of the law, or by your believing what you heard*?

This chiasm is adapted from John Bligh, *Galatians: A Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle* (HC 1; London: St. Paul, 1969), 224–25 but without his proposed changes to the passage. The wings (A1, A2) and hinge (D) focus on the Spirit coming by the grace of God by believing and not by works of the law. By turning to the law, the Galatians are turning not only what they experienced but also Christ's death into nothing (B level). This in turn makes them foolish (C level). On both the B level and the C level Jesus's death (B1 and C1) is through the chiasm equated with the experience of the Spirit (B2 and C2). This is because Jesus's death was believed to have allowed the Spirit to come. Consequently, having the Spirit exhibits Jesus's death.

[208] There is some question as to whether "Spirit" and "power" are objective or possessive genitives. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 55, argues that adopting the objective genitive would mean that Paul's position would then be similar to his opponents in Corinth: both would be arguing that the gifts of the Spirits (ecstatic phenomena and miracles) prove their point. However, it is not clear that the Corinthians are making this point. Paul is not only arguing that his words are proven by the gifts of the Spirit, but that these gifts come with power, that is, they are remarkably powerful gifts he has. Orr and Waltherr, *I Corinthians*, 156, argue that the two words could be translated "spiritual power" or "powerful Spirit."

[209] As Collins, *Beginning*, 233–34, points out, the binding of Satan is equivalent to God binding Leviathan, the chaos monster (Job ch. 41).

[210] See above n. 129 on page 27.

[211] See below on page 281.

[212] This will be shown in the chiastic analysis in ch. 2.

Remembrance and Schematization

In a predominantly oral society reference to eyewitnesses becomes important for a story to be believed. This would be especially true in the case of reported events that others would wish to dispute. Such would be the case, as just argued, with the traditions about Jesus that were used to show he was the LORD Messiah. Reference to eyewitnesses would also indicate that the traditions about Jesus were important to the community. If the traditions about Jesus deeds were used to show he was the LORD Messiah, and these traditions were questioned by opponents, then there would be pressure on the tradition to change in order better to show that Jesus was the Christ. There is no evidence that Jesus publicly claimed that he was the LORD. Consequently, the most likely point for such change would be after the death of Jesus when the community started to claim he was the LORD. There would be a change in the meaning supplied by Jesus for the meaning of the miracles to that supplied by the early Church. This change in schematization would be balanced by the conservative nature of controlled oral tradition: since the oral tradition is the property of the community as a whole, and is know by the whole community, it is difficult to change without the assent of community, especially if the community is also made up of eyewitnesses.

We shall therefore briefly look at eyewitness in the ancient world and at the applied schematization.

Eyewitness and Oral Tradition

Two recent studies have highlighted the importance of eyewitness in the gospels, namely, Samuel Byrskog's *Story as History—History as Story* and Richard Bauckham's *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*.[213]

Byrskog's analysis is also partly an enquiry into the nature of the gospels. He argues that they are best seen as a type of history, not according to our understanding of history but according to the understanding of history in the Roman-Hellenistic world.[214] He begins his

---

[213] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*; Samuel Byrskog, *Story as History - History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (WUNT 123; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

[214] Byrskog does not directly make this claim. He points out that the gospels are histories in that they purportedly recount historical events, and that they also have some of the characteristic of stories (1–3). He then goes on to show that ancient historiography also combined this blend of history and story. Christopher R. Matthews ("Story as History, History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History," *JBL* 121 [2002]: 176–77) complains that Byrskog does not justify equating the activity of ancient historians and that of the gospel writers. However, as just mentioned, Byrskog rightly points out that the gospels by definition are a type of history (they purportedly record the historical events surrounding a historical person), and shows that they fit the genre of ancient history in terms of autopsy and being the mixture of history and story. Byrskog also agrees with Richard A. Burridge (*What are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992]) that the gospels have certain resemblances with ancient biography, but hesitates to call them that as it was a wide ranging genre that ranged from more historically minded works to mostly fictional romances (44); and that ancient historiography had higher demands for factual comprehensiveness (216). I would classify the gospels as a type of biographical histories. As Peter M. Head ("The Role of Eyewitnesses in the Formation of the Gospel Tradition: A Review Article of Samuel Byrskog, Story as History—History as Story," *TynBul* 52, no. 2 [2001]: 294) points out most of Burridge's examples were written by people who knew the subject of the biography, and that non-professional authors of biographies were thus most likely to be written by someone who knew the person. This in turn would add to Byrskog's argument about the importance of eyewitnesses, that is, of people who knew the events they were reporting.

analysis with a study of autopsy or "eyewitness" with special attention to historical works.[215] Autopsy by a historian referred to the historian going to the location and witnessing the events as they transpired: here the historian is the eyewitness.[216] The ancient historian also interviewed people who had actually witnessed the events, which is referred to as indirect autopsy by Byrskog.[217] This indirect autopsy is the collecting of a type of oral tradition. The ancient historian thus relied on orality and autopsy, with the primacy given to autopsy. Byrskog does not make the distinction between oral traditions found at a site and oral traditions found elsewhere. However, for the ancient historian the place where or the people from whom a tradition is heard from does seem to be important. For example, in the examples Byrskog gives of Herodotus quoting oral material, Herodotus is careful to mention from which community or person he heard the tradition (for example, Persians, Phoenicians, Delphians, Cyrenes, priests, Tymnes, or Orchomenus).[218] Herodotus also went to places to enquire about history well in the past; for example, he went to Tyre to enquire about Hercules and his temple there.[219] This makes sense if, as Bailey observed, there was tight control exorcised by a community concerning its important historical events.[220] Consequently, the most reliable traditions would be found in the communities directly related to the historical incident, who would most often be found where the event took place. This would supply a third category of autopsy in addition to direct and indirect autopsy.

Just as sight (autopsy) was valued over hearing (orality), hearing was valued over written traditions,[221] since oral traditions contained the living voice of a tradition.[222] Written sources were seen as supplementary to the oral discourse.[223] This is quite different from our modern historical values. We tend to view oral tradition as untrustworthy, because we view it as uncontrolled, that is, on the same level as rumour and gossip. We value written reports by people who are distanced from the events. In the ancient world oral traditions were valued because they were controlled by the communities to which they were important. In addition, the best oral reports were from eyewitnesses who were directly involved, since they gave an inside perspective and could provide meaning to the events described.[224] These people could

---

[215] Byrskog, *Story*, 48–65. Byrskog has been both criticized and praised for his analysis of ancient historians. For example Werner Kelber ("Story as History, History as Story: the Gospel Tradition of Ancient Oral History," *JR* 82, no. 2 [2002]: 470) praises the analysis as detailed and informed. Others see the survey of ancient historians as too short (Head, "Role," 285–86; Brian D. Johnson, "Story as History, History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History," *EvQ* 76 [2004]: 77). Christopher Matthews, "Story," 177, thinks that our knowledge of ancient historians is too fragmentary and that the evidence is more diverse than Byrskog presents. Head, "Role," 285, also thinks that Byrskog generalizes too much, but says that Byrskog's main point, namely, that autopsy was important for ancient historians, is well taken. Byrskog's work is not intended to be an exhaustive analysis of ancient historiography, but it does discuss the views of some of the major historians in the ancient world (Herodotus, 53–57; Thucydides 58–59, Polybius, 59–62, Josephus; 62–63; Tacitus, 63–64; Strabo, 98) and refers to them throughout his work. As Head remarks, Byrskog does enough to make his point and most likely limited the analysis in order to move on to show how autopsy is also found in the early Christian texts.

[216] Byrskog, *Story*, 64, 92.

[217] Byrskog, *Story*, 64, 92.

[218] Byrskog, *Story*, 95.

[219] Byrskog, *Story*, 55–56; Lionel Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (Toronto: Hakkert, 1974), 95–111.

[220] Bailey, "Informal," 7, 42–45.

[221] Byrskog, *Story*, 107–27.

[222] Byrskog, *Story*, 112–13.

[223] Byrskog, *Story*, 116, 126–27.

[224] Byrskog, *Story*, 146–57, 176–90.

provide the story to history: without this schematization the history would be meaningless. Again, this is quite different from the modern historian's ideal detached observer.[225]

Byrskog gives examples from the gospels and other early Christian works that show the importance of eyewitness to the early Christians.[226] The most telling examples are Luke's prologues.[227]

Bauckham in his *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* expands on Byrskog's analysis and argues that one of the reasons some people are named in the gospels and others are not is because they were eyewitnesses within the community.[228] He also argues that the primacy of Peter in all four gospels is partly due to him being the prime witness.[229] Not only was he the leader of the mission outside of Palestine, he was also one of the twelve who with others had travelled constantly with Jesus since the beginning of Jesus's mission.[230] He was also a member of the three, the inner circle of the twelve who appear to be Jesus's closest confidents; these three are shown as being present even when others are excluded.[231] And he was a partial observer at Jesus's trial before the council.[232]

That one of the primary roles of Peter and the other disciples is that of witness is shown in Luke's speech of Peter in Acts:

> You know the message he (God) sent to the people of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ—he is Lord of all. That message spread throughout Judea, beginning in Galilee after the baptism that John announced: how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power, how he went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him. *We are witnesses to all that he did both in Judea and in Jerusalem*. They put him to death by hanging on a tree; but God raised him on the third day and allowed him to appear, *not to the people but to us who were chosen by God as witnesses*, and who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead. He commanded us *to preach to the people and to testify* that he is the one ordained by God as judge of the living and the dead. All the prophets testified about him that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name. (10:36-43)[233]

In this speech by Luke the primary role of the disciples is that of witness not only to the events during Jesus's life time, namely his preaching and miracles, but also to the events of Easter. In this they are continuing the work of the prophets who also testified about Jesus

---

[225] Byrskog does give examples of traditions passed on by people who were "detached and involved," namely, communities with defined traditionists: he gives the rabbis and Christian teachers as two of his examples. Others include Egyptian priests, Persian "*logioi*," and Greek "*mnemones*." Byrskog, *Story*, 157–59.

[226] Byrskog, *Story*, 223–53 Byrskog gives both Jewish and Christian examples at the end of each section: 65–91 ("Autopsy as a Means of Enquiry"), 101–105 ("Autopsy as Orality"), 127–38 ("Orality and Literacy"), 165–75 ("Eyewitness as Interpreter"), and 190–97 ("Oral Historian as Interpreter").

[227] Byrskog, *Story*, 228–34.

[228] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 39–55.

[229] Bauckham discusses the practice of "inclusio of eyewitness" found in the gospels and other literature (ch. 6). This inclusio occurs where the prime witness is the first and last named. It occurs in regards to Peter in Mark (124–27), John (127–29), Luke (131). Matthew does not use this, but the primacy of Peter in Matthew is clear.

[230] On the twelve see Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, ch. 5.

[231] For example, at the raising of JD, the transfiguration, and the Garden in Gethsemane. Peter is also present when Jesus is tried before the Jewish authorities.

[232] This is where Peter makes his famous denial (Mark 14:53–72, Luke 22:45–71, Matt 26:57–75, John 18:15–27). The criterion of embarrassment makes it likely that this scene is based on historical events.

[233] Italics mine. For a discussion of this see Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 115

(10:43). That the role of eyewitness was the prime responsibility of the twelve is also shown by the replacement of Judas with someone who had been with Jesus "from the beginning."[234]

The emphasis on witness and testifying in the tradition makes sense in a predominantly oral society: in order for miraculous events to be believed, one needed to be able to point to people who had witnessed them. In an antagonistic and confrontational atmosphere where the opposition wished to discredit these reports of the miraculous, eyewitness would have been essential.

Schematization and Oral Tradition

Just as modern historians are suspicious of oral tradition, they also are suspicious of schematization, the placement of meaning on events. However, schematization was seen as a key element in ancient historiography. This is one of the main points made by Byrskog, and gives the title of his work: *Story as History—History as Story*.[235] Without schematization—a story—the relation of historical events became a meaningless string of events.

Because of the value placed on schematization, it would have been present from the beginning, that is, from when the tradition first emerged from individual memory to collective memory.[236] This was seen in the example of the death at the wedding given by Bailey.[237] Also, Bailey observed that one of the key elements that could not be changed in oral tradition was the point or meaning of an oral tradition.[238] In oral tradition schematization is as important, or more important, than the details. This is shown in other studies of oral tradition—the details, for example, of what people are wearing at a wedding or what types of musicians are playing could be expanded upon or even deleted as long as the point of the story remained intact.[239]

This creates a problem for traditional redaction criticism and the type of modern history based on it: in redaction criticism the goal is to remove the schematization and be left with the pure historical details. However, details directly connected with the schematization are more likely to be historically correct: other details could be added to or deleted according to the preference of the tradition teller. Form and redaction criticism also work on a model where schematization is seen as being easily changeable. Thus, as the needs of the community changed, the schematization around a tradition would change. The goal of

---

[234] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 114–15; see also the whole of ch. 6: "Eyewitnesses 'from the Beginning."

[235] Byrskog, *Story*, chs. 4–6. A couple of commentators have found Byrskog unclear on his relationship between history and story; for example, Kelber, "Story," 271; Matthews, "Story," 177. However, they seem to view the relationship between history and story as that between fact and fiction. Story does not equal fiction, but rather schematization, which in turn can involve fiction. The terms "remembered events" and "schematization" are perhaps better. Oral history tends to have key schematized remembered events which cannot be altered, and other non-essential items that can be elaborated upon or deleted. In Bailey's example of the wedding incident, key events are schematized and cannot be changed (the basic storyline). However, non-essential items can be expanded upon. From the perspective of fact and fiction, the schematized part would actually be fact, and the non-schematized part (non-essential details) would be fiction. The distinction between fact and fiction can become very blurred; for example, a historian may have researched and come to an assessment of a historical person's perspective on some subject, and then write a speech and put it on the lips of the person. This is not fact as the person never gave the speech, but it is not fiction as it perhaps accurately represents the view of the person. An example of this is Luke's speech by Peter just quoted above 43.

[236] See above on page 15.

[237] See above on page 15.

[238] See above on page 14.

[239] See above n. 68 on page 14.

Bultmann and his heirs was thus to propose different stages and situations for Christianity as it grew and spread in order to propose the likely schematization added by the community at each stage.[240] Once this was done, the schematization could then be removed and the pure historical data would remain. However, this is based on a false model of how oral societies work.

This is not to say that schematization cannot change in oral societies, or that there cannot be competing schematizations for a historical event. For example, with the miracles of Jesus, Jesus and his followers saw the miracles as part of the special dispensation from God that proved Jesus's message that the kingdom of God was dawning, but the opponents of Jesus argued that the miracles were the product of Satan and that Jesus was a false prophet. Then after Jesus's death the schematization for the miracles changed for his followers: they were no longer miracles performed by a prophet sent by God, but miracles performed by God as the LORD Messiah. The miracles' meaning changed from showing that the kingdom of God was at hand to showing that Jesus was the LORD. However, this does not mean that the traditions about the miracles would suddenly change: the miracle stories would still need to remain intact, since the important point was that someone was once sick and then was miraculously cured. In this case the overall schematization around the miracle traditions changed, but the schematization within each miracle remained intact.[241]

In other words, schematization in and of itself does not indicate that a particular element in a tradition does not have a historical foundation. On the other hand, this does not mean that redaction criticism is not a useful tool. It is most useful in studying written traditions to discover the particular schematization of a particular author. As already mentioned, chiastic analysis will be used to help discover the particular meaning the raising-of-the-dead traditions had for not only the particular author, but also the early Christian community. Understanding this meaning will help determine which aspects of the traditions were perhaps introduced to produce a particular schematization.

Orality and Methodology

We shall now look at the methodology for examining oral traditions, and how this differs from the methodology for examining written traditions.

Oral Analysis

The advances made in the study of how predominantly oral societies pass on traditions require a different type of historical analysis than the traditional analysis that is often based on form and redaction criticism. The analysis that is adopted here, for lack of a better term, will be called oral analysis.[242] The goal of this analysis is to determine the shape of a particular oral tradition. This can only be done if one has two or more versions of a tradition to compare. Luckily, in the synoptic tradition there are usually three versions of Jesus's

---

[240] On the problems of form criticism see above on page 9.

[241] The exception is the introduction, perhaps by Mark, of the supernatural world (both God and demons) declaring Jesus to be the Son of God. This is part of Mark's messianic secret where only the spiritual world knows that Jesus is the Messiah. These spiritual elements were presumably not seen by the audience witnessing the miracle as the witnesses are never shown discussing why a demon is hailing Jesus as the Messiah. See above n. 135 on page 29.

[242] The analysis adopted in this thesis is a more detailed version of Dunn, *Jesus*, 210–37.

deeds; some of those deeds are also found in John as well. In the case of Jesus's resurrection miracles, there are two miracles with multiple versions (JD and the PB)

Oral analysis is essentially a comparative analysis used to try and determine which elements are essential to the tradition and cannot be changed, which elements can be changed, and which elements can be added or left out. This analysis combined with more traditional analysis should allow the general shape of the oral tradition to be determined. Once this has been done, a historical analysis can be performed to determine the historical plausibility of the tradition.

This process is quite different from an analysis where one views the primary sources first of all as written sources. This is because of the different nature of oral and written sources. Written traditions are by definition more static, whereas oral traditions tend to be dynamic. Oral traditions tend to change with each telling, and the telling is dependent upon the teller and the situation. An oral tradition has a core that must be part of the tradition and other elements that can be deleted, changed, or added. The repository, so to speak, of this information is the collective memory of a community. After hearing several performances of an oral tradition, the shape of it becomes known to a member of a community. Consequently, even though a particular performer may shorten certain elements in the telling, the full tradition would still be recalled by the community. This is referred to as "traditional referentiality" where a whole tradition is referred to by recitation of a part.[243] Though certain elements can be deleted or added, this does not mean that a particular version of an oral tradition is based on a different tradition; but rather it is the version that the performer decided to tell at that time according to the rules for that type of tradition within her or his community. This is not the case when studying from the perspective of written traditions, where an added element is often viewed as coming from a different source. In other words, in studying written traditions the focus is more on the author than on the tradition, whereas in the studying of oral tradition the focus is on the tradition rather than the teller.

The above holds true even when authors in a predominantly oral society are using written sources, as is the case with Luke and Matthew with Mark and Q. Dunn has shown how the variation between Mark, Luke, and Matthew conforms to the patterns found in the variation of traditions found in oral societies.[244] Thus, though Luke and Matthew use Mark as a template, they feel free to change things in accordance with the accepted shape of the oral tradition within the Christian community. This does not mean to say that the schematization of the gospel writers is not important. Redaction criticism in this respect still has its place, and is useful in determining how these writers may have changed and adapted the oral tradition. Also, if a central element seems to be changed by either of the three, as is

---

[243] On "traditional referentiality" Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, 230, say in regard to the work of John Miles Foley ("What's in a Sign," in *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World* [MBCBS 188; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 7, 11): "John Miles Foley has opened new vistas in our understanding of orally oriented texts and the notion of 'traditional referentiality,' wherein dense idiomatic expression is the assumption, and which 'only the properly prepared audience is equipped to understand.' Foley notes that 'traditional referentiality enables an extremely economical transaction of meaning, with the modest, concrete part standing in for a more complex whole. *Pars pro toto* is the fundamental principle.' Thus, in an orally dominant context, each written text with its subtle allusions and echoes is but 'a thin slice of the tradition's vast, rich, and uncharitable narrative possibilities.'" The last quotation in the passage is from Mark Amodio, *Writing the Oral Tradition: Oral Poetics and Literate Culture in Medieval England* (POL Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004), 14. See also R. Baumann and C. L. Briggs, "Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Culture," *ARA* 19 (1990): 59–88.

[244] Dunn, *Jesus*, 210–37, and throughout the rest of the book.

the case with Matthew and JD, then one must ask why this is so. This and other intricacies of oral analysis will be discussed in the chapters that follow.

Oral Tradition versus Written Tradition

One of the criticisms of Byrskog was that he overstated the valued placed on oral traditions over written traditions. Byrskog leaves one with the impression that written traditions in the ancient world were not valued at all. One only needs to look at Judaism and the value placed on Hebrew scripture to see that there are times the written text can be highly valued. Accordingly, Head, against Byrskog, points out that writing was valued for its nature as a permanent record.[245] Writing was thus not always disparaged, but was also valued because of its unchanging nature.

Another criticism of Byrskog, which would also apply to Dunn, is that the relationship between written and oral traditions needs to be made clearer.[246] Werner Kelber, for example, sees a sharp distinction between written and oral texts, and argues that they function in quite different ways. Typical of the oral traditions is a certain degree of flexibility which is balanced by stability: there is the mixture of essential elements and creativity.[247] In written texts the tradition is frozen. However, Kelber does recognize that the written text can exhibit the qualities of an oral text, and refers to Mark's gospel as frozen orality.[248] The oral nature of Mark's gospel has been noted by various scholars, and it is fairly well accepted that it was written to be performed orally.[249] This adds weight to Dunn's thesis that though the gospels are written texts they were written from the perspective of orality.[250]

Consequently, though the distinction between oral and written traditions is important, it is also important to remember that the texts were written from an oral perspective. This in turn allows one to do oral analysis on the texts. This does not mean one should forget the written nature of the texts. They may be frozen orality, but in being frozen they become written texts. It is not a question of analyzing the gospels as either written texts or oral texts, but as both. This thesis will look at them both from the terms of writing (chiastic structures) and orality (oral analysis). Also, since the gospels are written, many of the insights found through redaction criticism are still valid: there are still patterns in how each individual author treats the traditions. However, the traditions in this thesis will be seen as coming from both an oral milieu and from a written milieu (Q for all three synoptic authors, and Mark for Luke and Matthew), but the gospel writers will be seen as handling both oral and written traditions from the perspective of a primarily oral society.

In line with the recognition that the gospels were designed to be read aloud to an audience, is the growing realization that the authors of the gospels used chiastic structuring. This device, which will be analysed in the next chapter, allows not only for memorization, but also supplies a key to the schematization for the text. Both would be necessary for the performer: the ability to memorize keeps the permanent nature of the gospel, and the schematization allows the text to be explained. From this perspective the performer would

---

[245] Head, "Role," 287–88.
[246] Head, "Role," 281.
[247] Kelber, *Oral*, 27–33. See also Lord, *Singer*, 120.
[248] Kelber, *Oral*, 91, 94.
[249] Joanna Dewey, "The Gospel of Mark as an Oral-Aural Event: Implications for Interpretation," in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1994), 145–63; Whitney Taylor Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 2003).
[250] For Dunn's view on Kelber see Dunn, *Jesus*, 199–204.

also be a teacher. However, with the growing use of the codex, knowledge of the chiastic structures would no longer be needed, and the gospels would leave their oral dimension behind.

Related to the question of the relationship between oral tradition and written text is the question of why a written text would be needed? There is not the space here to do this question justice; instead, a couple of observations and suggestions will be given. First, the gospels appear as the first generation of Christians, that is, the eyewitnesses of Jesus, would be dying. The gospels would thus supply a more permanent witness. At the same time, there were movements with a different schematization, namely Docetism and Gnosticism. Both of these are based on Hellenistic philosophy which saw a sharp division between the spiritual (good) and the material (evil). Evidence for this is shown especially in the Johannine literature (contra Docetism) and the Gospel of Thomas (proto Gnosticism). The Gospel of Thomas, generally dated towards the end of the first-century, shows that the Jesus traditions were starting to be shaped to fit a Gnostic perspective. Those opposed to such changes would see the need of a permanent record; hence the creation of the gospels with their "correct" schematization.

Oral and Written Traditions and Historical Reliability

In oral societies, the traditions are not the property of individuals, but are rather the property of the community as a whole. This is different from societies where written traditions dominate: written traditions are associated with the author and tend to be seen as the property of the author. This can be seen in early Christianity where the written gospels seem to be associated with the author from their beginnings. Each gospel is a "gospel according to . . ." In other words, each gospel was seen as a particular author's understanding of the good news. The author would have been allowed more freedom to change tradition since the text was seen as her or his special perspective. However, in the performance of oral tradition there would have been less freedom, since the tradition belonged to the community. It would have been difficult for an individual member of the community substantially to change a valued tradition, because the teller of the tradition would have immediately been corrected.[251] Just as it was difficult for valued traditions to be changed, it would also have been difficult for new traditions to be introduced. The person introducing the new tradition would be immediately questioned as to where they got the tradition from, and it would need to be verified by an eyewitness.

In the early stage of Christian expansion eyewitnesses were readily available. For example, Peter travelled to and spent time in Antioch and Rome and most likely the major cities in-between.[252] During his time in these places there would have been a huge interest within the Christian community in his personal memories of Jesus's teaching and deeds. The same would have been true for other eyewitnesses to Jesus's ministry. Given the model of frequent travel and communication between Christian communities, the desire for unity, and the controlling nature of the early church, it would have been very difficult for un-vouched

---

[251] Bailey, "Middle," 365; Vansina, *Oral tradition*, 48–49.

[252] 1 Cor 1:12, and 3:22 indicate he may have travelled to Corinth. As leader of the mission outside Palestine, and in view of the controlling nature of the early church, Paul probably visited many communities on his way to Rome. Peter does not seem to be in Rome when Paul writes his letter to the Romans (Peter is not mentioned), which would mean that there are several years between his arrival in Antioch and his arrival in Rome. The minimum is about four years: Jewett, *Chronology*, 161; Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul*, 31, 332.

for traditions to enter the oral repository. As the synoptic gospels seem to be arranged collections of Jesus's individual sayings and deeds—that is, a collections of the type of material one would expect to find in the oral tradition—there is fairly high level of plausibility that these traditions are historically reliable.

This does not mean to say that everything presented in the synoptic gospels is reliable. For example, Luke and Matthew present unique and contradictory material concerning the birth of Jesus. Most scholars have difficulty accepting this material as a reliable tradition based on historical events. The question then becomes, what would have allowed for new traditions to be created? Three conditions would need to have been met. The first condition would be the perceived need for the tradition. In the case of the birth stories there would have been the need to show that the Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth, was not born in Nazareth, but born in Bethlehem as predicted by the prophets. There would also have been the need to show that God did not commit adultery by conceiving Jesus in a married woman, and hence Mary conceives before she is married. The second condition would be that the stories would have to have been created some time after the events when there would have been few eyewitnesses with whom to check details. Luke and Matthew were both written after the Jewish war when not only were most eyewitnesses dead, but Palestine was also devastated. With Jerusalem shut off from Jews, there would have been very little reason for Jews living in the Roman Empire to travel to Palestine. The third condition is that the author would have to explain how she or he came to hear of the tradition. For example, they would have to say that they did some special investigating, in other words, performed autopsy. Such is the case with the opening of Luke's gospel. Even if these conditions were met, it would still be difficult for someone to introduce new traditions. The person would have to be respected within the community, and would also need to have the backing of other leaders within the community.

This thesis will argue that these conditions are met with regards to the story of the WNS found in Luke. The conclusion will also show that there is evidence that some people were questioning some of the stories found in the gospels.

Summary

The arguments presented here for the historical framework are complementary and overlap with the arguments presented in much more detail by Paul Rhodes Eddy and Gregory A. Boyd in their *The Jesus Legend: A Case for the Historical Reliability of the Synoptic Jesus Tradition*.[253] They methodically dismantle the arguments proposed for strong scepticism against the synoptic traditions[254]—that is, the case for these traditions being legendary rather tha historical—and argue that if the standard historical criteria used to determine the general reliability of historical documents are applied, there is a good case for the general historical reliability of the synoptic Jesus tradition.[255]

Eddy and Boyd therefore maintain that there is an "a posteriori" burden of proof for those who wish to argue against the reliability of the tradition.[256] This is to be distinguished from an "a priori" burden of proof, namely, the burden of proof required for anyone wishing

---

[253] Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*.
[254] Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, Parts 1–3 (39–308).
[255] Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, 309–362, 407–54.
[256] Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, 369–71, 406, 452–54.

to assert any particular historical claim.[257] Since this thesis accepts the arguments presented by Eddy and Boyd, it recognizes the need for both burdens of proof: a priori, because this thesis wishes to argue for the historical reliability of the JD and the PB, and a posteriori, because this thesis wishes to argue against the historical reliability of the WNS.

In the case of the JD and PB the thesis will argue that there is strong evidence that the stories are based on oral tradition, that the stories are historically plausible, and that they are unlikely to have been invented, since they are not very good raising-of-the-dead stories. In fact both were so problematic that Luke and Matthew radically changed one or both of the stories. In the case of WNS, it will be argued that there is no evidence that the story was based on oral tradition, that there are good reasons as to why it seems to be invented, and that there is evidence to suggest that the story was meant to be understood on more of a symbolic or metaphorical level of meaning rather than on a historical or literal one.

In summary, the historical framework outlined in this chapter is quite different from some models presented in the past. The picture described here is one of control and unity from the beginning when Jesus first started to collect people to help in his mission. This picture of the early days will be expanded on in the following chapter. As we shall see, Jesus demanded the utmost from his disciples: they had to completely drop their past lives and devote themselves completely to Jesus and his mission. They left behind houses, jobs, and family (unless they joined the movement as well). However, in return the group they joined consciously viewed itself as family, a family who did the will of God, above all spreading God's message, which in turn was why Jesus collected followers and disciples in the first place.

The historical framework in this thesis can be summarized as follows. Jesus collected and trained people not only in the message of good news regarding the forgiveness of sins in preparation for the coming Day and kingdom, but also in how one should behave after one has been forgiven. Though the latter could be simply summed up by the double love commandment, the following of these two commandments had to be complete and utter. The same complete devotion demanded for those who helped spread his message was also demanded in regards to obeying these two commandments. This comes out clearest in the "anti-theses" section of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:21–48), which is summed up by the stringent "Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly father is perfect." In short, Jesus demanded the most not only from his followers, but also to those who accepted the message of forgiveness.

Jesus was not likely to be any less demanding in his training of his helpers to help spread the message. As we shall see, he expected the same commitment from them as he exhibited, which included being willing to die for the cause. Jesus is shown not only training his disciples, but sending them out on their own. They then return and report back to him. As argued above, there is a strong element of control and oversight from the beginning. This control is not only in how they spread the message, but also in how they behaved. He also seems to have been very organized: he set up twelve of his followers as leaders, and within this twelve a special group of three. There is even evidence of a treasurer. One of the reasons this structure was implemented was that he foresaw his own death, and wished the message to continue spreading.

In this he admirably succeeded. The twelve based themselves in Jerusalem and continued spreading the message of good news of the dawning Day and of how to behave in

---

[257] Eddy and Boyd, *Jesus Legend*, 369–71.

preparation for it. The message was also expanded in regards to their recently deceased leader. His followers after his death started to have visions where Jesus was seen as the LORD. This in turn changed the interpretation of the miracles Jesus performed. Jesus had already used his miracles to argue that they demonstrated that he was God's messenger. After his death they were interpreted to show Jesus was God. This last will be demonstrated fully in the next chapter. With Jesus becoming God on earth, the value and importance of his teaching and actions to the community would increase from their already high standing. Because of their importance to the community, these traditions would be carefully guarded and protected by the community.

The early community seems to have also continued Jesus's controlling and demanding manner even for those in authority. Leaders go out on missions and report back, and other people are sent out to check up on what was done. This is even the case when the mission spreads out beyond the borders of Israel, the prime example being Antioch. There seems to be fairly frequent traffic of people reporting back and forth from Jerusalem. Before long, the same control that was in Jerusalem would be in Antioch. This is not to say there were not disagreements; for example, the discussion over Gentiles and Torah quickly became a "wedge issue."

This control and the close knit nature of the community, who viewed themselves as one family, would mean that the same sort of stable conditions for the preservation of traditions would be in place as there is in a village or other small community. The traditions would be passed on and care would be taken that this was done correctly. There would be very little room for change in the oral tradition, especially as the leaders and guardians of the tradition were also eyewitnesses.

Even though Paul at time had disagreements with others in leadership roles, he still maintains that the Christian community is one family that is not to be divided. He also is very controlling. There is therefore no reason to think that his message, besides the issue of Gentiles and Torah differed in any substantial way from the rest of the church. This would be particularly true for the traditions concerning Jesus's teaching and actions. Paul spent considerable time in the communities he set up, visited them repeatedly, had people reporting back to him, and when he could not go in person sent letters and emissaries. There is also evidence of others checking up on the communities Paul founded.

The importance of all this travelling and checking up is that the same situation of control found in Jerusalem and Antioch would soon be in place in these communities. This would be especially true in the major centres such as Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome. Some of the people visiting these centres would have been eyewitnesses, the most prominent example being Peter. In all of these places the traditions about Jesus's teaching and actions would become firmly established. The controlling nature of early Christianity is exhibited in the earliest documents (the letters of Paul) and continues through the rest of the first century (Acts, canonical and other letters) and into the second century (Ignatius). All of this builds for a strong argument for the general reliability of the gospel tradition concerning Jesus's words and deeds.

This model is quite different from those that have been presented in the past. Some even present the exact opposite picture, namely one of no control where anyone who wants to can simply go off and spread the message, found a community, and change the message and traditions as they please. Models that tend in this direction allow for one to speak of very distinct communities and theologies developing, and consequently different "Christianities." Over time this did indeed become true, but for the earliest history of the Church this does not

seem to be the case, with two important exceptions: the division over Gentiles and Torah seems to have eventually have caused some to dissociate from the main body, and there were likely some followers of Jesus who did not accept that he was LORD. In regards to the first exception agreement seems to have been reached between Paul and the Jerusalem leadership on the issue, and thus a major fracturing of the church avoided. In regards to the second exception, these followers of Jesus cannot be considered Christians, because they do not believe Jesus was the Messiah. Other divisive issues do not seem to have come to prominence until the second century.

Because the historical framework determines what one considers plausible or implausible in a historical analysis, a different historical framework will likely affect the conclusions, though not always. In this thesis the different framework will become most apparent in the analysis of the differences between the synoptic of the raising-of-the-dead stories, because the traditions will be analysed primarily as oral traditions rather than as written traditions. This difference will affect how one views changes: differences in the tradition do not necessarily mean different sources, but rather the variability allowed in the telling of a tradition. The goal is not simply to remove what appear to be redactional elements to find a historical core, but rather to determine the general shape of the tradition and to discover the nature of the variable items. The goal is to discover the oral core of a tradition, and then determine whether it is likely that this core is based on historical events or not.

That being said, the traditions we are dealing with are written down and organized into written texts. Thus it is also important to analyse the material in the gospels as written text. This is the subject of the next chapter, where the structural organization of the traditions is examined. This in turn is a type of literary analysis as chiasm is both a mnemonic device and literary technique.

Chapter Two: Chiastic Analysis

Introduction

A chiasm is material arranged according to the pattern A B C . . . X . . . C' B' A'. The corresponding levels have the same theme or subject, and the hinge, X in the example, usually indicates the central theme of the chiasm. A and A' are referred to as the wings, and they often have the same theme as the hinge or directly relate to the hinge: the wings and the hinge thus often supply the central topic or theme of the chiasm. Chiasms can be any length, the shortest being the so-called Markan Sandwich or inclusio, which is of the pattern A B A'. Since some chiasms are double chiasms, I will be using the notation A1 and A2 as in A1 B1 C1 B2 A2 B3 C2 B4 A3. This pattern has a double hinge (C level), and three wings (A level).

The study of chiasm in the New Testament by the scholarly community has been steadily increasing. However, there seem to be as many chiasm sceptics as there are chiasm promoters. The majority of scholars seem to be willing to accept micro-chiasms, but are sceptical about macro-chiasms.[258] There are two main criticisms directed at the general study of chiasms. First, the proposed chiasms are as likely to be the invention of the chiastic scholar as the original author, because one could find a chiasm in any text, since the variety of ways one can find parallels is vast.[259] Another way this criticism is sometimes phrased is by pointing out that there is no clear methodology for determining the presence of chiasms. The primary goal of this chapter is to address this issue, and propose a new methodology for analyzing chiasms. The second major criticism is that there is no evidence in ancient Greco-Roman literature describing this type of construction for written texts.

This chapter will begin by briefly addressing the last criticism, and then will address the first criticism in detail. The discussion on methodology will begin with an overview and brief discussion of past criteria proposed for analysing chiasms, and will then describe and implement the new methodological approach. The new methodology will be applied to a large section of Mark which contains JD (JD), the one raising-of-the-dead miracle found in all three synoptic gospels. This methodology will clearly demonstrate that the proposed chiastic structures were due to the author of the text, namely, Mark. The chiasms in turn will show the importance of the miracles in showing who Jesus was for Mark, and consequently Luke (Matthew uses a different chiastic arrangement). At the same time, the analysis will also show the importance of Jesus's teaching for the community, and the key role of the disciples, especially the twelve and the three. The analysis will show that the gospel writers not only give clear authority to the twelve, but also that this authority included the handing on of tradition. This is explicit in regards to Jesus's teaching and implicit in regards to Jesus's miracles.

On the Lack of Evidence of Chiasm in Greco-Roman Times

As just mentioned, those critical of chiastic studies argue that there is no evidence in the Greco-Roman literature on composing written texts of chiasm being used as a structural device. This is a valid criticism, because we have much literature on compositional style

[258] I use the term "micro-chiasm" for small simple chiasms and "macro-chiasm" for chiasms that contain larger quantities of text and are often made of smaller chiasms.

[259] For example, Ernest Best, *Mark: The Gospel as Story* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1983), 105–6.

from the period, and there is no mention of such a technique. However, such a criticism is only valid if we look at the gospels solely as written products by people embedded only in the Greco-Roman culture. In fact, though the gospel writers are writing in Greek, and live within the Greco-Roman culture, they are also members of a Jewish sect, and were most likely Jews. This means that their cultural focus is not Greco-Roman, but Jewish. Consequently, Christian writings have more in common with Jewish writings, which are continuously referenced, and it is just as likely that they are using Jewish compositional techniques as opposed to Greco-Roman techniques. If this is the case, then the concentric structuring style could well be a Jewish technique.

If it can be shown that this is the case, then the above argument from silence will fail. In fact there is plenty of evidence of the use of chiasm not only in Jewish writings, but also in ancient Semitic literature in general. We shall begin with Sumerian-Akkadian literature, then Canaanite, Hebrew, and finally Talmudic. There is not the space to do an in-depth analysis of each of these cultures' use of chiasm, nor is it necessary. The use of chiasm has already been well documented in each case, and only a few examples will be given. Instead the reader will be directed to the studies and literature that demonstrates the widespread use of chiasm.

Evidence for the use of chiasm goes back to very roots of ancient Near Eastern literature. For example, the following micro-chiasm comes from the *Epic of Gilgamesh*: "After **heaven** from *earth* had been moved, after *earth* from **heaven** had been separated."[260] A more extended example is from *Enki and the World Order*: "He proceeded to the shrine Ur (a), Enki (b), the king of the Abyss, decrees (c) its fate (d): City (e) . . . (5 line description of Ur) . . . City (e) whose fate (d) has been decreed (c) by Enki (b), shrine Ur (a), may you rise heaven high."[261] Here a five word chiasm forms an inclusio around the description of the city. There is thus an A–B–A pattern on the larger structural scale. Other examples are too long to quote in detail, and the reader is directed to Robert Smith's chapter in *Chiasmus in Antiquity*.[262] Smith gives a clear example of a hundred-line chiasm from *The Descent of Ishtar to the Netherworld*, in which Ishtar removes seven items and then puts them on in reverse order,[263] and proposes a very credible macro-chiasm for the entire *Epic of Gilgamesh*.[264]

John W. Welch in the same volume gives many clear examples of chiasm in Ugaritic literature.[265] Again these range from micro-chiasms, to mid length chiasms, to macro-chiasms. The following example from Text 37 is very clear:

---

[260]Robert F. Smith, "Chiasm in Sumero-Akkadian," in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegisis* (Hildersheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 17; Repr. Provo, Utah: Reseach Press, 1999. Bold and italics mine. Smith's source is Samuel Noah Kramer, *Sumerian Mythology: A study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B.C.* (New York: Harper, 1961), 36–37, pl. VIII, n. 37. Smith gives many other examples.

[261] Smith, "Chiasm," 23. Smith's source is Kramer, *Mythology*, 60. Items in brackets mine.

[262] Smith, "Chiasm," 17–35.

[263] Smith, "Chiasm," 25–26.

[264] Smith, "Chiasm," 27.

[265] John W. Welch, "Chiasmus in Ugaritic," in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegisis* (Hildeshwim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 36–49; Repr. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999.

A1 Baal threatens Yamm (1–6)
B1 Yamm demands Baal's death (7–11)
C1 Yamm instructs his messengers (11–17)
D1 The messengers depart (18–21)
E1 The gods lower their heads (22–23)
F1 Baal rebukes the gods and order the tablets read (24–25)
F2 Baal commands the gods and accepts responsibility (26–27)
E2 The gods lift their heads (28–29)
D2 The messengers arrive (30–31)
C2 Messengers deliver Yamm's message (31–35)
B2 El declares Baal a captive of Yamm (36–37)
A2 Baal attempts to assault Yamm's messengers and threatens Yamm by message (38–47)[266]

Each unit heading describes the sole action of the unit. Another very clear example Welch gives is from the Anat section of the *Baal–Anat Cycle*, which covers six tablets.[267] In this six-level chiasm much of the text in a chiastic unit is repeated almost verbatim in the unit's parallel unit.

This brings us to chiasm in Hebrew literature. There is now a very large body of work that demonstrates the wide use of chiasm in the Hebrew Bible.[268] The usage ranges from micro-chiasms to macro-chiastic structures. The following is a very clear example of the latter from the Book of Esther (early third century BCE):

A1 The king's debauch (1:1–22)
B1 Esther's appointment (2:1–20)
C1 Mordecai's loyalty (2:21)
D1 Execution (2:22–23)
E1 Haman's rise, the first royal decree, the Jews fasting (3:1–4:17)
F1 Esther's first banquet (5:1–8)
G1 Haman's boast (5:9–14)
H "On that night, the king could not sleep" (6:1–3)
G2 Haman's humiliation (6:4–14)
F2 Esther's second banquet (7:1–4)
E2 Haman's downfall, the second royal decree, the Jews celebrating (8:1–7)
D2 Execution (9:1–28)
B2 Esther's decree (9:29–32)
A2 The king's greed (10:1)
C2 Mordecai's glory (20:2–3)[269]

Each heading describes the main action for the chiastic unit. Such perfect symmetry of the natural structural sections of the Book of Esther does not happen by accident, but as with the other examples, demonstrates a conscious act by the author.[270]

---

[266] Welch, "Ugaritic," 40.
[267] Welch, "Ugaritic," 46. See also the eighty-line chiasm from Text 52, "The Birth of Dawn and Dusk" on the following page.
[268] See the bibliography in John W. Welch and Daniel B. McKinlay eds. *Chiasmus Bibliography* (Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999), 77–115. Also see Yehuda T. Radday, "Chiasmus in Hebrew Biblical Hebrew Poetry," in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures Analyses, Exegesis* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 50–117; Repr. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999, and Wilfred G. E. Watson, "Chiastic Patterns in Biblical Hebrew Poetry," in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 118–168; Repr. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999.
[269] Watson, "Chiastic," 54. The C level is outside the chiastic pattern presented here. On this level see Watson's comments.
[270] On this concept, see below on page 58.

Finally, the following is an example from *b. Sabb.* 119a, and tells the story of a certain Joseph known for honouring the Sabbath:

A1 A Gentile receives a prophecy
Yosef-moqir-shabbat had a certain Gentile in his vicinity who owned much property. Said to him the astrologers: "All your property, Joseph-who-honours-the Sabbath will enjoy it."
B1 Gentile sells his property
So he went and sold his property
C1 Gentile buys pearl
and bought instead a pearl which he put into his garment.
D1 Gentile loses pearl
When he crossed on a ferry, the wind blew his garment off and cast it into the water
E A fish swallows the pearl
where a fish swallowed it.
D2 Fish with pearl is caught
[Some fishermen] hauled it up and brought it on Sabbath before the evening.
C2 Joseph buys the fish and finds the pearl
He said, "Who would buy at this hour?" They said, "Go take it to Joseph-who-honours-the-Sabbath who is wont to buy." They took it to him, he bought it, opened it and found the pearl.
B2 Joseph sells the pearl
and sold it for twelve purses of gold denarii.
A2 Wise man speaks
A certain old man met him and said to him: "He who lends to the Sabbath, the Sabbath repays him."[271]

Again, such clear structural arrangement does not occur by accident.[272] For other examples from Talmudic-Haggadic narrative see Joseph Frankel's chapter in *Chiasmus in Antiquity*.

The use of chiastic structures can thus be seen to have a very long history in Semitic literature. The same cannot be said of Greco-Roman literature. While micro-chiastic structures of a sentence or so are very common, larger chiastic structures are rare. The one exception is Homer, who uses both micro- and macro-chiastic structures. Here are a couple of examples of micro-chiasms: "a **king** *good* and *mighty* **warrior**" (Il 3:179), "of **words** a *speaker* and a *doer* of **deeds**" (Il 9:443), and "**wives** *noble* and *innocent* **children**" (Il 24:730).[273] Structural inversions also occur on larger scales. For example, in Il 2:758–69 the muse is asked (a) who is the best fighter and (b) who has the best horses, and the muse replies that (b) the best horses are those of Eumelos and (a) the best warrior is Aias.[274] A more extended example is the conversation of Odysseus with his mother where Odysseus asks seven questions, and his mother answers them in reverse order. This last was even noted in ancient times. Other clear chiastic patterns extend over several books in Homer. Chiastic structures have long been recognized in the study of Homer, and are often referred to as *hysterion proteron*, "the latter first." The origins of the widespread use of this technique were a mystery to scholars of Homer in the early part of the last century.[275] However, if one takes

---

[271] Jonah Fraenkel, "Chiasmus in Talmudic-Aggadic Narrative," in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 184; Repr. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999. Headings mine.
[272] On accident versus design see below on page 58.
[273] John W. Welch ed. *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 251. My italics and bold.
[274] John W. Welch, "Chiasmus in Ancient Greek and Latin Literatures," in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 253.
[275] For example, Samuel Eliot Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer* (SCL 15; Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1938), 128.

into account the heavy use of this technique in Semitic literature, the origin is not a mystery, as Hans Kosmala notes: "Very probably it is a Semitic inheritance, like the alphabet." [276]

This last is made more probable because, despite the influence of Homer on Greek thought and literature, the use of larger chiastic structures is rare in Greek writing. However, this does not mean that Greco-Roman authors were not aware of the technique and sometimes used it. The following is an example from the speech of Proteus in Virgil's *Georgics* IV, 453–527:

A1 Death beside a stream owing to rejection of love
B1 Impressive Greek geographical names
C2 Persistent singing, utterly indifferent to world around
D1 Simile of birds
E1 The infernal streams
F Heart of the story
E2 An infernal stream
D2 Simile of a bird
C2 Persistent singing, utterly indifferent to world around
B2 Impressive Greek geographical names
A2 Death beside a stream owing to rejection of love[277]

The rarity of such larger chiastic structures makes it understandable that the technique is not described in Greco-Roman literature on composing written texts. However, that the technique was known makes it plausible that a writer in the Greco-Roman world would use it. If a writer was writing from a cultural perspective that has its roots in the Semitic world, then the extensive use of chiasm is very plausible. It should also be remembered that the concept of chiastic structuring is not a complex idea. This does not mean to say that the implementation of the idea in a text is simple, especially if the author wishes to use chiasm on both the micro- and macro-levels.

Finally, it should be pointed out that questions of origin are secondary to showing the existence of a chiasm. If chiastic structures can be shown to exist in the gospels, and if it can be shown that they were the product of the gospel authors, then the question of how the authors learned such techniques becomes a secondary historical problem. It must also be remembered that literary devices and techniques have often been found in ancient literature, and that we have no literature describing the techniques. The lack of such literature does not indicate that such devices were not used by ancient authors, but rather points to the paucity of the historical record. For example, the use of acrostics is well established in ancient Hebrew, Akkadian, and Egyptian literature. However, we do not have any texts that describe the use of such a device. Nevertheless, the use of acrostics is well established. This is because the probability of the first letters or syllables forming an alphabetic sequence or a phrase is extremely unlikely. This unlikelihood establishes the fact that acrostics were consciously used by ancient Near Eastern authors. I use the term consciously because, though it is possible, there is no evidence that the human mind sub-consciously produces such patterns when composing. The question of how these authors learned the technique and were able to produce acrostics is secondary to the fact that these authors created acrostics.

---

[276] Hans Kosmala, "Form and Structure in Ancient Hebrew Poetry," *VT* 14 (1966): 445. Quote taken from Welch, "Greek," 257.

[277] Gilbert Norwood, "Vergil, *Georgics* IV: 453–527," 36 (1941): 354. Taken from Welch, "Greek," 262.

The same argument will now be made for the chiastic patterns found in Mark 1:12–6:46, but in more detail, with a statistical analysis to support the findings.

Methodology for Judging Chiastic Structures

Introduction

As has already been mentioned, the use of chiasm has become widely accepted in the study of the Hebrew Bible,[278] but has been slow to gain acceptance in the study of the New Testament. The main methodological criticism is that one could find parallels between any two textual units, because there are so many ways that one can create parallels. In other words, the proposed chiasm is perhaps the product of the scholar's imagination (not the author's), and does not tell us anything significant about the arrangement of the text by the author. To address this issue a large section of Markan text will be divided into its base units, and an analysis will be done of the parallelism between each unit and every other unit. This will be done both on a larger and a smaller scale. The analysis will show that while it is true that one can likely find one or two parallels between two longer units of text, it is not true that one can find significant parallelism between any two such units. When it comes to shorter units of text, it will be shown that there is a good chance that there is no parallelism whatsoever. This will demonstrate that one cannot necessarily find parallelism, and especially significant parallelism, between any two pieces of text. This in turn would indicate that chiasms based on significant parallelism are not simply the product of an overactive scholarly imagination, but rather that an unusual pattern has been observed in the text.

A second and related question then arises: "Could this found pattern be due to chance?" This brings in the question of probability, which in turn, cannot be answered without some sort of statistical analysis. Such an analysis will be performed on the long section of Mark 1:12–6:46. The data will tell us the probability of any two units having a certain number of parallels. One will then be able to calculate the probability of a chiasm made up of a series of said units.

Such an analysis will determine the likelihood of whether or not the found chiasm could be due to chance or not. If it is found that the probability of such a structure occurring by chance is extremely low, then it must be by design. Such a conclusion produces a secondary question of whether or not the design was conscious. For example, it could be argued that the natural process of composing and telling stories is chiastic in nature. This would mean that the proposed chiasm could be the product of the sub-conscious working of the author's mind. To answer this question a psychological analysis of human compositional technique would have to be done, which is beyond the scope of this thesis. To my knowledge, there have not been any studies that indicate that the human mind when composing stories tends to compose in a concentric manner as proposed by this thesis. This would indicate that the human mind does not tend to compose in a concentric pattern, because in all the intensive and critical analysis of literature carried out in the last couple of centuries no such widespread patterning has yet been discovered. Surely such patterning, if it were part of the natural process of human composition, would have been found in the works of Jane Austen, Thomas Hardy, T. S. Eliot, or James Joyce, all of which have been studied

[278] See above on page 55.

inside and out.[279] It may be the case that there is no evidence because no one has thought to do such an analysis, but until a study showing that the human mind does work in such a manner when composing text, then it is quite valid to assume that it does not. This would lead to the conclusion that if a chiasm is by design, it is by conscious design.[280]

This section will begin with a brief review of past criteria developed, and show that most do not address the question of whether a chiastic structure could be due to chance. This will be followed by a discussion of probability theory and the methodological problems of applying it to the study of chiastic structures. Other problems discussed include the choosing of chiastic units and valid parallelism. The central section will be the application of the methodology and discussion of the results. This will lead to the development of a new set of criteria, and a discussion of how meaning is generated through chiasm. Finally, it will be demonstrated that Luke was aware of some of Mark's chiastic structures, and two chiastic structures in Luke and Matthew will be analysed.

Previous Criteria Developed

The first scholar to develop criteria was Nils Wilhelm Lund, who developed "seven laws of chiastic structure": [281]

1) The centre is always the turning point.
2) At the centre there is often a change in the trend of thought, and an antithetic idea is introduced.
3) Identical ideas are often distributed in such a fashion that they occur in the extremes (wings) and at the centre (hinge) of their respective system, and nowhere else in the system.
4) There are many instances of ideas occurring at the centre of one system and recurring in the extremes of a corresponding system.
5) There is a definite tendency of certain terms to gravitate towards certain positions within a given system.
6) Larger units are frequently introduced and concluded by frame passages.
7) There is frequently a mixture of chiastic and alternating lines within one and the same unit.

---

[279] Best, *Mark*, 106, argues that concentric structuring may be natural to some minds. However, if this were so, then such patterning would surely have been found and noted in modern authors. Also, though accidental chiastic patterns may occasionally occur—Best gives an example of himself answering questions in reverse order—it is unlikely that such accidents would occur on the consistent level that will be shown in this thesis.

[280] John Welch in discussing this question argues that conscious design is difficult to show if the literature containing chiasms belongs to a literary tradition where chiasm is the norm, because the author could take up the technique sub-consciously. This argument, however, works from the premise that chiastic structures are indeed present and in fact widespread. If the use of chiasm was so widespread in the literature of a culture, it would have to have been consciously introduced at some point, because it does not seem to be a natural technique exhibited by all humans. In other words, the knowledge of composing using chiasm would have been known, and then lost. This is highly implausible, because examples of the technique would be so prevalent.

[281] Nils Wilhelm Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in Formgeschichte* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942), 41. For a negative critique of Lund's criteria and those proposed by the other scholars discussed in this section see Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, "Philippians as a Macro-Chiasm and its Exegetical Significance," *NTS* 44 (1998): 213–21.

These laws are based on chiasms already found, as Lund clearly states: "The fact remains, however, that when a great many passages have been studied and compared, certain recurring features impress themselves upon the reader."[282] In other words, these laws do not help to determine whether the chiasm was the design of the author, or whether it is due to chance and is the fabrication of the chiasm proposer. Lund's laws assume that the found chiasms are valid chiasms designed by the author. In other words, Lund's laws are descriptive and not prescriptive. The same is true for two additional criteria proposed by Ian H. Thomson: that parallel units are often of similar length, and that the hinge often reveals the author's thought.[283]

That the laws and criteria proposed by Lund and Thompson are descriptive and not prescriptive is a serious flaw. Such criteria should help determine whether or not a found chiasm is due to chance or the design of the author, either consciously or sub-consciously. A found chiasm has little value if it is simply due to chance: the chiasm becomes nothing more than an odd pattern that can occasionally occur in any text. It is no more interesting than the fact that in some paragraphs the number of times the occurrence of the letter "a" is the same as that of the letter "e". What is important is whether the found pattern is due to the author. If it is due to the author, then it tells something about the author in terms of compositional style, and potentially the meaning she or he intended for the passage.

Although the laws and criteria proposed by Lund and Thomson are for the most part descriptive, they are prescriptive in the sense that the more particular and detailed a found pattern, the less likely that the pattern is due to chance. For example, in the case of acrostics, it is highly unlikely that the pattern could be due to chance, and because the pattern is so precise, it must be the design of the author. Consequently, the more a certain passage conforms to specific criteria, the less likely it is due to chance. In this respect, the laws and criteria proposed by Lund and Thomson can be used prescriptively.

The work on criteria did not progress until a study of David J. Clark, who in his analysis of the work of Joanna Dewey and her criteria developed five of his own based on the type of parallelism found:[284]

1) Content: this type of parallelism can be both explicit and implicit (an idea or concept that needs to be abstracted out from the passage). Though abstracted, there should still be a significant similarity between content. It could be anything from an identical piece of clothing to a rebuke by the central character.
2) Form or Structure: here the forms of different units are virtually identical or very similar; for example, both could be a parable with a similar structure.
3) Language: here the parallelism consists of the same catchwords, or words with the same roots or grammatical forms.
4) Setting: this is a more focused type of content parallelism; for example, the units may have the same place and time.

---

[282] Lund, *Chiasmus*, 40.

[283] Ian H. Thomson, *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters* (JSNTSS 111; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 27. Thomson's second criterion can be seen as a variation of Lune's second law.

[284] David J. Clark, "Criteria for Identifying Chiasm," 35 (1975): 63–66; Joanna Dewey, "The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2:1–3:6," *JBL* 92 (1973). Dewey (Dewey, "Literary," 394, 396, 399) specifically mentions the first three, and refers to the fourth. See also Joanna Dewey, *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1–3:6* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1979), 131–36 where she discusses her criteria in detail.

5) Theology: here both units could make the same theological point. This criterion should be used sparingly, because a theological point can easily be read in that was not intended by the author.

Since the fourth and fifth criteria focus on specific types of content, parallels can be found in three general categories: content, form, and language. Again, these criteria are more descriptive than prescriptive, except in the sense that the higher the number of parallels, and the more unique and precise the parallels, the less likely that the parallels are due to chance. For example, if two passages are exactly the same, that is, have the highest number of possible parallels, then it is extremely unlikely that the repetition is due to chance.

The next author to propose criteria was Craig Blomberg, who identified nine:[285]

1) There must be a problem with the structure that conventional outlines fail to resolve.
2) There must be clear examples of parallelism between the parts of the chiasm, and the parallels should be multiple.
3) There must be widespread verbal and grammatical parallelism.
4) The verbal and grammatical parallelism should be central to the passage.
5) The verbal and grammatical parallelism should be unique to the passage.
6) Parallels should be noted by other commentators who are not looking for chiasms.
7) The breaks in the chiastic outline should be those that other scholars agree upon.
8) The centre of the climax should be recognizably significant for its theological or ethical import.
9) Ruptures within the chiastic outline should be avoided.

These criteria put emphasis not only on the clarity and number of the parallels (2 and 6), but also prioritize language parallels over parallels of form and content (3, 4, and 5). This is an attempt to make chiastic analysis more quantifiable. However, though this desire is admirable, it potentially leads to valid chiasms being dismissed too easily. Though content parallels are hard to quantify, they can still be extremely clear. For example, the story of JD (JD) forms a two-level chiasm with the Haemorrhaging Woman (HW): A1 JD part one, B HW, A2 JD part two. There are only three word parallels between the JD part one and JD part two, which is not that many considering the length of the two passages. The main parallelism occurs on the conceptual level of form and content, where there are seven parallels. Consequently, in this clear chiastic structure the main parallelism is conceptual. The most important parallel between A1 and A2 is that of content: they are part of the same story. It is not apparent how this parallelism is any less clear than parallelism of language. The only difference is that content, unlike verbal and grammatical parallels, is less easily quantifiable.

Blomberg makes an important contribution by dicussing breaks between chiastic units (7 and 9). Since chiasm is a structural device, the units should follow the natural structures of the text: it is unlikely that an author using chiasm to structure her or his text would put the chiastic breaks in the middle of the natural textual units (7), or would have text that did not follow the pattern (9). Naturally, there is no definitive rule for where the chiastic breaks occur, because chiasms can vary in size: chiastic units can be as small as words for micro-chiasms consisting of a sentence, or as large as a complete story for macro-chiasms

[285] Craig Blomberg, "The Structure of 2 Corinthians 1–7," *CTR* 4 (1989): 5–7.

covering larger quantities of text. Analysis of the breaks is not quantifiable and is largely subjective, and consequently Blomberg suggests that they be ones that other scholars agree upon (7).

Blomberg's first criterion, "there must be a problem with the structure that conventional outlines fail to resolve," does not help determine whether the proposed chiasm is due to chance or not. This would suggest that authors would only choose to use chiasm in problematic texts. It is quite possible that a particular author could use linear and concentric structuring devices at the same time. Also, it has to be remembered that a chiasm is both a linear and a concentric device: the chiasm moves in a linear fashion from first wing to the hinge, and then returns in both a concentric and a linear manner from the hinge to the second wing.

Despite the above criticisms, Blomberg's criteria do help establish the likelihood of whether or not a proposed chiasm is due to chance or design: the more precise the parallelism, that is, the greater the number and clarity of the parallels, and the more unique the parallelism, the less likely that the parallelism could be due to chance.

Probability and Chiasm

As argued above, the main goal of a chiastic analysis should be to determine the probability of whether a found chiasm is due to chance or design. As just mentioned, some of the above criteria help indicate this likelihood, but they do not really tell us anything precise about the probability: they only give us an indication of the probability. To resolve the problem one needs to do a statistical analysis of the parallelism between a large number of units. No such analysis has to date been undertaken. Since chiastic analysis is an important aspect of this thesis, an analysis of a large section of Mark (1:12–6:46) has been undertaken. The results of the analysis are presented in appendices A and B. We will begin with an outline of the methodology, and at the same time elucidate some of the basic concepts of probability theory, before discussing some of the methodological problems in more detail.

The section Mark 1:12–6.40 was chosen because it contains JD, the one raising-of-the-dead story found in all three gospels. It was also chosen because, as it will be argued, this large section of text contains a large chiasm made up of smaller chiasms. This section comprises just over one third of Mark's sixteen chapters and contains a variety of material: miracle stories, controversy stories, parables, disciple stories, and stories of Jesus's dealings with the general public. As such, it is representative not only of Mark but also of the synoptic gospels. We shall turn to this last point in more detail below.[286]

Mark 1:12–6:40 is divided up into its constituent units. This is done in two ways: first, into thirty-six units, and second, into sixty-one units. The results of the analysis will then be indicative when looking at chiasms that are made up of either longer or shorter units. Also, as it will be shown, Mark makes chiasms with both longer and shorter units; a twofold analysis will allow greater accuracy when calculating the probability of such chiasms. The longer unit division, henceforth LUD, will produce a sample space of 630 different pairs of units (36 x 35 / 2), and shorter unit division, henceforth SUD, will produce a sample space of 1830 different pairs of units (61 x 60 / 2). The two divisions thus allow for sample spaces with a very high number of events, which in turn will increase the predicative value of the

[286] See below on page 139.

results when dealing with similar types of material. Precisely how the units are divided will be discussed in the following section.[287]

The number of parallels between each pair of units is then determined and added up. The methodology of how to determine a parallel will be discussed below.[288] For example, it will be shown that the temptation of Jesus (unit 1) in the LUD has zero parallels with fifteen other units, one parallel with seven other units, two parallels with seven other units, three parallels with three other units, and four parallels with one other unit, and five parallels with two other units. This unit has one of the least amounts of parallelism with other units. Longer units, such as the healing of the paralytic (unit 9), in the LUD have at least two parallels with every other unit, and the number of parallels with other units reaches into the high teens and low twenties. The highest number of parallels is twenty-two in the LUD (between the healing of the paralytic and the Beelzebul controversy), and twenty-one in the SUD (between the parable of the seed on different ground and the explanation of the parable of the seed on different ground).

These totals are then added up. For example, the total for zero parallels for all the units is 180. However, this has to be divided in two, because each pair of parallels has been counted twice: for example, the temptation in the LUD has zero parallels with the HW (HW), and this is counted once in regards with the story of the temptation, and once in regards to the HW. Thus, there are ninety pairs of units where there is absolutely no parallelism. We can now determine the probability that any particular unit will have zero parallels with another unit. The probability (P) of an event (E) equals the number of occurrences of the event (s) divided by number of elements in a sample space (S).[289] This is represented by the equation P (E) = s / S. In this case, the event is zero parallels, and the sample space is the total number of pairs of units, which, as previously mentioned, is 630. Consequently, for the LUD, the equation becomes P (0 //s) = 90 / 630, which equals.14.[290] In other words, in LUD there is a 14% probability, or a 1 in 7 chance, that a particular unit has zero parallels with any other unit. This in turn means there is an 86% chance that there is at least one parallel with any other unit. This follows the rule that P (E) + P ($\bar{E}$) = 1,[291] where $\bar{E}$ is the complement of E, or "not E." In the current example, P ($\bar{E}$) is P (//s $\geq$ 1) which would then equal 1 -.14, or.86, that is, 86%.

While it is useful to know the probability that any two units will have six parallels, this does not in and of itself tell us the likelihood of a particular chiasm occurring. For example, the following chiasm made up of LUD units:

---

[287] See below on page 67.

[288] See below on page 74.

[289] Allan G. Bluman, *Probability Demystified* (DeSe New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005), 3. The following will be using very basic probability theory, which is usually covered in the first few pages of books on probability theory. For those completely new to probability theory I recommend the above book. For those who have some understanding of probability theory, and also some background in set theory and notation, the following may also be useful: Lee J. Bain and Max Engelhardt, *Introduction to Probability and Mathematical Statistics* (Boston: Duxbury, 1987); Kai Lai Chung, *Elementary Probability Theory with Stochastic Processes* (UTM New York: Springer, 1979); Michael Evans and Jeffrey Seth Rosenthal, *Probability and Statistics: the Science of Uncertainty* (New York: W. H. Freeman, 2004); Sheldon M. Ross, *A First Course in Probability* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006).

[290] The lower this figure, the lower the probability. A probability of 1 means that it is likely the event will occur.

[291] Bluman, *Probability*, 7.

A1 Four called ([unit] 3)
B1 Capernaum demoniac (4)
C1 Simon's mother-in-law (5)
D1 Healing at Simon's (6)
D2 Jesus and the four in desert and proclaiming (7)
C2 Leper healed (8)
B2 Paralytic healed (9)
A2 Levi called (10)

The statistical analysis will show that the A level has ten parallels, the B level sixteen parallels, the C level four parallels, and the D level seven parallels. We need to know what the probability is of such a chiasm occurring, that is, a four-level chiasm with one level that has sixteen or more parallels, a second that has ten or more parallels, a third with seven or more parallels, and fourth with four or more parallels. In order to do this, a greater understanding of probability theory is needed.

The situation is analogous to predicting the likelihood of a particular hand of cards; for example, a hand with four cards: a queen, a ten, a seven, and a four. To calculate such a hand one needs to first calculate the probability of each individual event, that is P (Q), P (10), P (7), and P (4). Since there are four of each event in a deck of cards, and the sample space (the deck of cards) has fifty-two cards, the probability of each item is 4/52, or 1/13, or.077. However, once a card is drawn, the sample space is diminished by one. Consequently, the probability for the second card is 4/51, for the third card 4/50, and the 4/49 for the fourth card. To calculate the probability of the hand one needs to apply the multiplication rule, which states that the probability of a number of events is equal to the probability of each event multiplied. This is expressed as P (A and B and C ...) = P (A) x P (B) x P (C) ...[292] Thus, the probability of the above hand, P (Q and 10 and 7 and 4), equals P (Q) x P (10) x P (7) x P (4), that is, 4/52 x 4/51 x 4/50 x 4/49, or 16/649 740 0, which is.000 002 46, or roughly 1 in 2.5 million times.

However, this situation is not really analogous: we do wish to know the probability of a precise hand, but the probability of a certain type of hand. To make the situation analogous we need to calculate the probability of hand where one card is a queen or higher, a ten or higher, a seven or higher, and a four or higher. In such a situation the number on the card can be seen as equivalent to the number of parallels. We shall begin with the highest card, the queen, and work down.[293] Since when the ace is considered "low" there are eight cards that are a queen or higher (four queens and four kings), the P (≥Q) is 8/52. For the ten the situation is little more complicated, because the queen is also a card higher than or equal to ten. Once the queen has been drawn, there are fifteen cards left that are ten or higher (four tens, four jacks, three queens, and four kings). Also the sample space has been reduced from fifty-two cards to fifty-one cards. Consequently, P (≥10) is 15/51. Likewise, P (≥7) is 26/50, and P (≥4) 37/49. Thus, P (≥Q and ≥10 and ≥7 and ≥4) is 8/52 x 15/51 x 26/50 x 37/49, or 115440/6497400, which is.0178, or 1 in a 56 times.

In the above examples the probability of drawing a card is affected by the cards that have been previously drawn. However, there is not much difference if one made the calculations as if each draw of a card was independent, that is, as if a card is drawn and then reinserted into the deck before the second card is drawn. For example, the first calculation

[292] Bluman, *Probability*, 59.
[293] One could calculate beginning with any card, but the calculations are simpler when one starts with the highest card and works down.

would become 4/52 x 4/52 x 4/52 x 4/52, or 16/7 311 616, which is.000 002 18 (as opposed to.000 002 46), and the second calculation would become 8/52 x 16/52 x 28/52 x 40/52, or 143 360/7 311 616, which is.0196 (as opposed to.0178). The reason for this is that the sample space is reasonably high. The larger the sample space, the smaller the difference between results. Since the sample space for unit pairs ranges from 630 (LUD) to 1830 (SUD), the differences between results will be very small. Also, the concern of this thesis is not with precise calculations of probability, but rather the general probability of a particular chiasm; that is, in general terms, whether the occurrence of a particular chiasm is very likely, likely, neither likely or unlikely, very unlikely, or extremely unlikely. A difference between 1 in 56 times versus 1 in 51 times is not relevant to the purposes of this thesis.[294]

This can be shown with the above chiasm. Leaving aside a couple of methodological problems, which will addressed below, if we treat the above chiasm as analogous to cards drawn from deck, then the P (≥16 //s and ≥10 //s and ≥ 7//s and ≥ 4//s) equals P (≥16 //s) x P (≥10 //s) x P (7//s) x P (≥ 4//s). P (≥16 //s) equals the total number of pairs with sixteen or more parallels, which happens to be sixteen, divided by the total number of pairs, which is still 630. For P (≥ 10 //s) it will be the total number of pairs with ten or more parallels minus one (for the parallel greater than sixteen) divided by 630 minus one (for the parallel greater than sixteen). This is 59/629. For P (≥7 //s), it is 138/628, and for P (≥4 77s) it is 299/627. Consequently, the probability of this chiasm occurring is 16/630 x 59/629 x 138/628 x 299/627, or 38 951 328/ 156 033 690 120, which is.000 249 6. However, if we did not make the adjustments, the calculation would be 16/630 x 60/630 x 140/630 x 301/630, or 40 454 400/157 529 610 000, which is.000 256 8. In other words, the difference is between 1 in 4 006 and 1 in 3 894 times, which is for both highly unlikely. As mentioned above, such minute differences will not affect the results for the purposes of this thesis.

From the above calculations it would seem that the probability of the above chiasm occurring is roughly.000 256 8. However, in analysing chiasms we are not dealing a hand of cards. We wish to know the likelihood of such a sequence occurring anywhere in the thirty-six units; that is, what is the probability that such a chiasm of eight units could occur anywhere in the section Mark1:12– 6:46? Returning to the card analogy, this is equivalent to asking if one were to deal out the whole fifty-two cards in a row on a table, what would be the probability that any sequence of four cards would have one card ≥Q, another card ≥10, another ≥7, and another ≥4. Since there are forty-nine sequences of four cards (1–4, 2–5 . . . 49–52), it is equivalent to forty-nine hands being dealt. The probability would thus be the probability for one hand times forty-nine, that is,.0178 x 49, or.8722. In other words there is roughly an 87% chance that such a hand would occur in such a scenario. In regards to our chiasm, there are twenty-nine sequences of eight units (1–8, 2–9 . . . 29–36). Consequently, the probability of such chiasm occurring in the thirty-six units is.000 2568 x 29, or.007 447 2. In other words, the probability is roughly.75%, or 1 in 134 times. If we had done the full calculation the result would have been.007 238 4, or 1 in 138 times.

We will also be wanting to calculate the probability of two chiasms occurring in the section of Mark 1:12–6:46; say, for example, two chiasms of eight units with a probability of.000 256 8. This will use same principle as the calculation in the previous paragraph.

---

[294] In fact, since the goal of this thesis is to argue that the probability of the proposed chiasms is extremely low, and the simpler calculations result in a higher number probability number, the methodology works against the goal of thesis. In other words, it helps the opposing argument by making the proposed chiasms seem more probable than they actually are.

However, the calculation for the number of different ways two eight-unit chiasms can occur is more complicated. Fortunately, a formula has been developed called the permutation rule. In the examples in the previous paragraph we are actually asking how many permutations are there of one item with eight units and twenty-eight (36 - 8) items of one unit. There is a formula for this known as the second permutation rule, which is used when some of the items in the permutation are identical, in this case the twenty-eight items of one unit.[295] The formula is n! / r (1)! x r (2)! x . . . r (p)! where n is the total number of items, and r (1) + r (2) + . . . r(p) = n. The "r"s are numbers of identical items, which in this case would be 1 for the one eight-unit item, and 28 for the twenty-eight one-unit items. Consequently, the formula in this example becomes 29! / 1! x 28!, which can also be written as 29! / 1! 28!. The exclamation mark means that the number is multiplied by the number minus one, and then the same is done to the resulting number, until the number 1 reached. Thus, 29! equals 29 x 28 x 27 . . . 3 x 2 x 1, 28! equals 28 x 27 x 26 . . . 3 x 2 x 1, and 1! equals 1. This also means that 29! equals 29 x 28!, and thus 29! / 28! equals 29. Consequently, 29! / 1! 28! equals 29, which is the same figure reached in the previous paragraph. In the card example, there would be one set of four cards and forty-eight (52-1) sets of one card, and the formula would thus be 49! / 1! 48!, or 49. In the case of two eight-unit chiasms, there would be twenty (36 - 16) single units left over, and consequently twenty-two (20 + 2 for the two eight-unit chiasms) sets. The formula would then become 22! / 2! 20!, or 22 x 21/ 2, because 22! is the same as 22 x 21 x 20!. The answer would then be 462 / 2, or 231. There would thus be 231 different ways in the sequence of thirty-six units one could have two chiasms of eight units. Consequently, the probability of having two eight-unit chiasms each with a probability of.000 256 would be.000 256 x.000 256 x 231, or,.000 015 1.

To further complicate matters, it will often be the case that two chiasms may overlap, that is, they are joined together; for example, two eight-unit chiasms may be joined. In this scenario it is like having one large chiasm of fifteen units (16 - 1 for the unit joining). The probability of such a double chiasm would be the probability of the occurrence of the number of parallels for each level multiplied, and this total multiplied by the number of ways the new fifteen-unit double chiasm could occur in the sample space. This would be the same as the probability of each chiasm, excluding the number of ways it could occur multiplied, and that figure then multiplied by the number of ways the double chiasm could occur. The formula would then become: P (double chiasm) = P (chiasm 1) / (# of ways chiasm 1 can occur) x P (chiasm 2) / (# of ways chiasm 2 can occur) x (# of ways the double chiasm can occur).

Some may wish to argue that it is methodologically unsound to compare the drawing of hands from a shuffled deck of cards to the units of text in a gospel which have presumably been arranged by the author. To a degree this is correct; the situations are not completely analogous. The situation of the gospel units is not like hands drawn from a deck of cards, but similar to the situation where fifty-two cards are laid out in a row, and one is trying to determine whether or not the patterns seen in the cards are due to chance or to someone arranging the cards into the patterns. In such a scenario, if the cards laid out are in the sequence ace to king of diamonds, ace to king of hearts, ace to king of clubs, ace to king of spades, then one would conclude that someone had to have arranged the cards in such a fashion, because such a precisely ordered arrangement is so extremely unlikely. The probability of such an arrangement is 1 / 52 x 1 / 51 x 1 / 49 . . . 1 /1, which is written 1 / 52!,

---

[295] On calculating permutations and the second permutation rule see Bluman, *Probability*, 100–101; Ross, *A First Course in Probability*, 3–5.

in other words, an incredibly small number. On the other hand, if 1 pair of cards is found in the arrangement, then one would not be able tell if this was due to chance or design, because it is almost certain that there would be at least one pair (P [1 pair] x number of ways a pair can occur, which is 3 / 51 x 50, or 2.94). In fact it would be more unusual for there to be no pairs at all, because on average there should be around three pairs in the laid out cards. Naturally, we are dealing with situations that fall somewhere between these two extremes, more akin to there being six straights of four cards in the arrangement.

In actual fact, whether the units were originally arranged by an author or arranged by chance is irrelevant in determining if the found patterns were by conscious design. For example, instead of the cards being shuffled and then dealt, we could ask someone to arrange the cards in a row any way they like. Here we know that the cards have been arranged, and then try to decide if the found patterns are due to the conscious design of the arranger. To determine this question, one would use the same methodology as in the situation where one did not know if someone had arranged the cards. In the case of the Gospel of Mark, we know that Mark arranged the units in a certain order, and we are asking whether particular patterns in the arrangement, in this case, chiasms, are more likely to have come about by chance or by Mark's conscious design. We shall return later to some further methodological questions which are best dealt with by example, and turn to the question of the division of chiastic units and the determination of valid parallels.

The Selection of the Chiastic Units

It is important when dividing chiastic units that one respects the natural divisions of the text, because one is trying to discover a possible pattern by the author of the text, and not one that is imposed on the text by the chiastic scholar. One must therefore respect the text as it is, unless the text seems to have been altered by a later redactor. One must also be careful not to impose one's own aesthetic values into the process. A good example of this is the supposed rule that chiastic units be of the same length. As we shall see the natural units of Mark 1:12–6:46 vary greatly in length, from a couple of sentences to a dozen or so. If this rule was applied, then this would exclude the possibility that Mark could have arranged the units in chiastic patterns. However, there is no evidence that Mark felt bound by such rules.

We will begin by looking at the natural divisions of the text in order to view the text and its divisions from the perspective of the author as best as possible. This will produce an initial set of units (the longer unit division, or LUD). The formal characteristics of the LUD are then noted, and it will be argued that the material falls into four formal types. The LUD will then be looked at to see if the units can be broken down into smaller units. It will be noted that many of the introductions and conclusions for the LUD units fall into the formal categories already noted. This produces a smaller unit division (SUD) which is based on the formal types of the LUD. The result, as with the LUD, hopefully will be a division of the text that fits the perspective of the author as closely as possible. Thus two sets of units will be produced, one of 36 units (LUD) and the other of 61 units (SUD). Though the first is labelled the "longer unit division" it does not mean that all the units are long: they are simply longer in general than the shorter unit division. In many cases the units are the same in both divisions; in other words, some of the shorter LUD units are not divided. We shall now look at the two divisions and discuss some of the units where the division of the text is not clear.

The LUD units follow as closely as possible the natural divisions of the text. They are:

1) The temptation in the wilderness (1:12–13).
2) Jesus proclaims in Galilee (1:14–15).
3) The call of the four (1:16–20).
4) The healing of the Capernaum demoniac (1:21–28).
5) The healing of Simon's mother-in-law (1:29–31).
6) A general healing at Simon's house (1:32–34).
7) Jesus with the four in desert and proclaiming around Galilee (1:35–39).
8) The healing of a leper (1:40–45).
9) The healing of a paralytic (2:1–10).
10) The call of Levi (2:13–14).
11) The controversy over eating with sinners (2:15–17).
12) The controversy over the disciples not fasting (2:18–22).
13) The controversy over plucking grain on Sabbath (2:23–28).
14) The controversy over healing on the Sabbath (3:1–6).
15) A general healing by a boat (3:7–12).
16) The appointment of the twelve (3:13–19a).
17) The Beelzebul controversy (3:19b–30).
18) Jesus's family are arrive and Jesus declares his followers family (3:31–35).
19) Jesus teaches from a boat (4:1–2).
20) The parable of seed on different ground (4:3–9).
21) Jesus explains why he teaches in parables (4:10–12).
22) The explanation of the parable of the seed on the ground (4:14–20).
23) The parable of the lamp (4:21–23).
24) The parable of measure for measure (4:24–25).
25) The parable comparing the kingdom to seed growing in secret (4:26–29).
26) The parable comparing the kingdom to a mustard seed (4:30–32).
27) Conclusion to the parable section (4:33–34).
28) The miracle of the stilling of the storm (4:35–41).
29) The healing of the Gerasene demoniac (5:1–20).
30) Jairus makes a request (5:21–24).
31) The healing of the HW (5:25–34).
32) The raising of JD (5:35–43).
33) Jesus teaches in Nazareth (6:1–6a).
34) The twelve are instructed (6:6b–13).
35) The story of Herod and John the Baptist (6:14–29).
36) The feeding of the five thousand (6:30–6:46).

These divisions follow the natural divisions: in each case they are a separate and distinct story. There are, however, a few places where one could divide the material differently:

1) The first concerns units 5 and 6, the healing of Simon's mother-in-law, and the general healing at Simon's. One could argue that these are actually one unit, because they both take place at Simon's house. On the other hand, they are two separate incidents and are separated in time: one seems to take place in the afternoon, and the other, that evening. [296] Also, there are places in the gospel where descriptions of

[296] So Dewey, *Markan*, 178; D. Dideberg and P Mourlon Beernaert, "Jésus vint en Galilée," 98 (1976): 314–17.

general healing are clearly separate units; for example, unit 15, Jesus heals by a boat, and the general healing of the sick in Gennesaret (6:53–56). Consequently, it was decided to treat these two stories as separate units.

2) The second concerns unit 10, the call of Levi, and unit 11, the controversy over eating with sinners that takes place in Levi's house. Again one could argue that they be considered one unit, because they both involve Levi and one follows directly after the other.[297] However, as with the previous division, they are two separate incidents, and the call of Levi has clear and definite parallelism with the call of the four, which is clearly a separate story. Consequently, it was decided to treat the two incidents as separate units.
3) The third concerns units 17, the Beelzebul controversy, and unit 18, Jesus declares his followers family. The Beelzebul controversy could be divided into two units, or conversely, Jesus declares his followers family could be seen as part of the Beelzebul controversy. Consequently, these two units could also be considered as either one or three units. The Beelzebul controversy begins with Jesus's family hearing that Jesus is possessed by a demon, and this could be treated as a separate unit as opposed to the introduction to the Beelzebul controversy. It was decided to treat these as one unit, because the rumour the family hears and the accusation made in the Beelzebul controversy are virtually the same: the accusation is that Jesus performs his miracles through Beelzebul; in other words, he is either possessed by Beelzebul or working in league with him.[298] In either case, the Holy Spirit, through whom Jesus does his work, is being maligned, and Jesus's response answers both accusations. The incidents also both seem to take place at the same time and the same place: Jesus and the disciples are at Simon's house and is surrounded by the crowd (3:19b–20), Jesus's family hear the rumour and go to get him (3:21), the scribes voice the accusation concerning Beelzebul (3:22), and Jesus responds to the accusation (3:23–30). Consequently, the story of Jesus's family (3:21) can be seen as part of an introduction to the Beelzebul controversy. Unit 18, Jesus declares his followers family, could also be seen as part of this story: after Jesus finishes responding to the accusation, his family arrives and wishes to see him, Jesus then teaches on family. While this also takes place in the same location and at the same time as the Beelzebul controversy, and also continues the story of Jesus's family, the topic of these verses has nothing to do with the Beelzebul controversy. Consequently, it was decided to treat this as separate unit.
4) Finally, unit 35, Herod and John the Baptist could be divided into two units: Herod hearing the news concerning Jesus (6:14–16), and the death of John the Baptist (6:17–29). Again, it seems as if the first part is an introduction: some people and Herod think that Jesus is John the Baptist resurrected, and then it is explained how John died. Thus it was decided to treat the two parts as one unit.

The SUD is formed by dividing some of the units of the LUD. An analysis of the types of material used in the LUD will help in deciding the division of the material into smaller units, because if Mark were to use to create different levels of chiasm, he is likely to use the same types of material he uses for longer chiastic units as he does for shorter chiastic units. The

[297] This is the view of Dewey, "Literary," 394.
[298] So Gundry, *Mark*, 177.

LUD is made up of four primary groups of material: stories of Jesus and his disciples ([units] 3, 10, 16, and 34), stories of Jesus and his mission in regards to the general public (2, 6, 15, and 19), specific examples of Jesus's power (4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 28, 29, 31, 32, and 36), and specific examples of Jesus's wisdom (9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26). It should be noted that units 9 (the healing of the paralytic) and 14 (the healing on the Sabbath controversy) are both examples of Jesus's power—they are healings—and wisdom—they are controversy stories where he bests his opponents. This formal division accounts for all but eight of the units (1, 7, 18, 21, 27, 30, 33, and 35). These eight, however, can fit into the four formal categories of the other units. We shall briefly look at these units:

1) The temptation (1) can be seen as an example of Jesus's miraculous nature: he fasts for forty days, resists the devil's temptations, and is served by heavenly beings (1:12–13).
2) Jesus and the four in the desert (7) is in one sense a general public story—Jesus proclaims and heals in Galilee (1:39)—but it is also a disciple story, because it shows Jesus's private relationship with the disciples: the four are alone with him in the desert where he explains his mission to them (1:37–38), and he then takes them along as he performs his mission (1:39).
3) Jesus declares his followers family (18) can be seen as a disciple story: he confers the special status of family on those who do the will of God, that is, who help in God's mission, as opposed to those who are trying to stop his mission such as his real family, who are trying to restrain him because of a rumour. It could also be seen as an example of his wisdom. However, though it is an example of his teaching, it is more a pronouncement and the giving of status than it is an example of wisdom.
4) Jesus explains why he teaches in parables (21) could be seen as a general public story, because he explains why he teaches the public in parables. However, he is not speaking to the public, but rather to the disciples in private. Consequently it is both a disciple story and a specific example of his wisdom, because it gives an example of his teaching to the disciples.
5) The conclusion to the parable section (27) can be seen as either a general public story—we are told that Jesus taught the public only in parables (4:33–34a)—or as a disciple story—we are told that Jesus explained everything in private to the disciples (4:34b). However, since this unit is the conclusion to the parable section, which primarily gives examples of his teaching to the general public, and most of the unit's text is focused on his teaching, it can be classified as primarily a general public story.
6) Jairus makes a request (30) is the introduction to the raising of JD (32); however, it is separated from the actual miracle by the healing of the HW (31). Consequently, it would not be quite proper to call this section a miracle story, and thus an example of Jesus's power. As it stands it does not quite fit into the four categories. At best it can be seen as a general public story: we are told that a great crowd gathers around Jesus, and then Jairus, a leader of the synagogue and consequently an official public figure, makes a request. Jairus from this perspective becomes representative of a certain part of the public's response to Jesus.
7) Jesus teaches in Nazareth (33) can be seen as either a general public story—he teaches in the synagogue and heals a few people (6:2, 5)—or a specific example of his wisdom—it is a controversy story where the Nazarenes cannot accept a local person having such knowledge, and responds with a saying (6:3–4). However, the

focus is on Jesus's dealing with the public and their response, and the story can be classified as primarily a general public story.

8) The story of Herod and John the Baptist (35) can be classified as a general public story because it gives the official public response, in the form of King Herod, to John the Baptist's, and hence Jesus's mission.

Consequently, one can formally classify Mark's textual units into four different types. If Mark thought of the material in this way, then one should be able to detect smaller units that fall into these categories.

This does indeed seem to be the case. For example, many of the introductions or conclusions of the longer units fall into the category "general public stories." These are:

1) (Sub-unit) 4.1: Jesus teaches in the Capernaum synagogue (1:21–22): this is the introduction to the healing of the Capernaum demoniac ([which becomes sub-unit] 4.2).
2) 4.3: the news spreads in Galilee (1:28): conclusion to the healing of the Capernaum demoniac (4.2).
3) 7.2: Jesus and the four proclaim (1:39): this is the conclusion of Jesus and the four in the desert (7.1).
4) 8.2: the Leper proclaims (1:45): this is the conclusion to the healing of the Leper (8.1).
5) 9.1: Jesus teaches at home (2:1–2): this is the introduction to the healing of the paralytic (9.2).
6) 10.1: Jesus teaches by the sea (2:13): this is the introduction to the call of Levi (10).
7) 11.1: Jesus eats with many (2:15): this is the introduction to the eating-with-sinners controversy (11.2).
8) 17.1: Jesus's family part one (3:19b–21): this is the introduction to the Beelzebul controversy (17.2).
9) 29.2: the news spreads in Gerasa (5:14–17): this is the first part of the conclusion to the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (29.1).
10) 29.4: the Gerasene proclaims (5:20): this is the third part of the conclusion of the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (29.1). This is much like the other proclaiming accounts of either Jesus (3, 7.2, 34.1) or the disciples (34.3) or by healed people (8.2). It is thus an example of the word spreading to the public—one can also include news of Jesus's work spreading in this category, such as, the news spreads in Galilee (4.3) after Jesus's healing of the Capernaum demoniac (4.1–2), the news spreads in Gerasa (29.1), and Herod hears the news concerning Jesus (35.1). All these sub-units are thus general public stories.
11) 34.1: Jesus teaches in villages (6:6b): this is the introduction to Jesus instructing the twelve (34.2). This sub-unit could equally be seen as part of the preceding story, Jesus teaching and healing in Nazareth (33): it is an independent statement with no direct ties to the preceding or following material.
12) 34.3: the twelve proclaim (6.12–13): this is the conclusion of Jesus instructing the twelve (34.2).
13) 35.1: Herod hears of Jesus's activity, and what people think about Jesus (6:14–16): this is the introduction to the death of John (35.2).

14) 36.2: Jesus teaches the crowd that follows (6:33–34): this is part of the introduction of the feeding of the five thousand (36.3).

With the exception of the last item (36.2), the removal of these sub-units does not affect the original stories. In other words, in each case the remaining text can stand alone. In regards to the last item (36.2), this unit is necessary for the story of the feeding of the five thousand because it explains how and why Jesus was with a large crowd of people in a deserted place. Also, for the most part the sub-units can stand alone as complete stories, the exceptions being 8.2, the leper proclaiming (it needs to be explained why the leper is proclaiming), and 29.2, the response of the Gerasene public (it needs to be explained why they are asking Jesus to leave).

Consequently, by paying attention to the formal nature of Mark's clear units, further sub-units can be detected. In almost all of the above cases the new sub-units, both the text removed and the text remaining, form new units that could stand alone and which more clearly fall into their formal categories. For example, in the case of Jesus in the Capernaum synagogue, with the removal of general public elements (Jesus teaching in the synagogue [4.1] and the news spreading [4.3]), the remaining text [4.2] becomes solely a healing story. The exceptions are the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (29) and the feeding of the five thousand (36). However, it will be shown that the remaining material can be further sub-divided.

Other units can also be neatly sub-divided along formal lines:

1) 12.2: the parable of new cloth (2:21): this is the first part of the conclusion to the controversy over the disciples not fasting (12.1). The new sub-unit along with the following sub unit are purely parables, and remaining text is solely a controversy story.
2) 12.3: the parable of new wine (2:22): this is the second part of the conclusion to the controversy over the disciples not fasting (12.1).
3) 18.1: Jesus's family part two (3:31–33): this is the introduction to Jesus declares his followers family (18.2). This division divides unit 18 into a general public section (18.1)—the arrival of Jesus's family to a crowd sitting around Jesus and listening to his teaching—and a disciple section (18.2)—Jesus declaring that his followers are his true family.
4) 27.2: Jesus teaches everything to the disciples (4:34b): this is the final statement of the conclusion to the parable section (4.33–34). This divides the material according to whether it focuses on the general public (4.33–34a) or on the disciples (4.34b). The first part becomes unit 27.1, Jesus teaches the public only in parables. Both units can stand alone as separate statements.
5) 29.3: The Gerasene is not accepted as a disciple (5:18–19): this is the second part of the conclusion of the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (29.1). This is a disciple story, because in asking to be with Jesus, the Gerasene is asking to be a follower, that is, to become a disciple. However, Jesus rejects him, and tells him to proclaim in the Decapolis.

The above analysis indicates that other sections that do not clearly fall into the four categories are possible sub-units. Also, since all of the sub-units have so far been either

introductions or conclusions to the main units, other introductory or concluding sections are also possible sub-units. These are:

1) 28.1: Jesus leaves crowd in a boat (4:35–36): this is the introduction to the stilling of the storm (28.2). This division separates the specific example of Jesus's power (4:37–41) from its introduction, which can be seen as both a general public story—Jesus leaves the crowd in a boat, presumably to get away from them—and also a disciple story—it shows Jesus going away in private with the disciples.
2) 30.1: Jesus returns in a boat (5:21): this is the introduction to Jairus's request (30.2). This is a general public story: Jesus returns and is surrounded by a great crowd.
3) 32.1: messengers arrive for Jairus (5:35–37): this is the first part of the introduction to the raising of JD (32.3). Messengers arrive for Jairus from his house to say that his daughter has died. This can be seen as a general public story because it gives the "commonsense" response: Jesus is no longer needed because the daughter is dead.
4) 32.2: The mourning crowd at Jairus's house (5:5:38–40a): this is the second part of the introduction to the raising of JD (32.3). This is a general public story because it shows Jesus interaction with the crowd. The removal of these two introductory sections makes the remainder purely an example of Jesus's power. On the other hand, these two scenes could also have been seen as essential elements to the miracle, because the messengers and the mourners bring the news that JD is dead. In addition, the oral analysis of JD will indicate that these scenes are essential elements. These two scenes will be kept separate, because it is easier to combine units into one unit and calculate parallels than to divide a unit into sub-units and count parallels.
5) 36.1: the twelve return (6:30–32): this is the first part of the introduction to the feeding of the five thousand (36.3). This is primarily a disciple story—it tells of the twelve's return and their leaving with Jesus for a deserted place—but it is also a general public story—the crowd is so great that they cannot eat, and consequently they have to leave for a deserted place.
6) 36.4: the twelve are sent ahead (6:45–46): this is the conclusion to the feeding of the five thousand. This can be seen as both a disciple story—Jesus sends the disciples alone to the other side (6:45a)—and a general public story—he dismisses the crowd and goes up the mountain to be by himself (6:45b-6:46).

There were also a few possible introductions or conclusions that were considered as possible sub-units, but were rejected:

1) Possible 13.2: Jesus says the Sabbath was made for humankind (2:27–28). On the one hand this is separate statement made after his illustration of David eating the bread of the Presence (2.25–26). On the other hand, the illustration of David is not quite complete on its own, and the statement about the Sabbath makes it clear that Jesus and David are not breaking the law, because they are still following the intent of the law. This is unlike the situation with the parables on new cloth (12.2) and new wine (12.3) after the fasting controversy. There Jesus has already fully addressed the issue of not fasting (1:19–20), and it is not precisely clear how these parables relate to the issue of fasting. Consequently, it was decided not to treat this as sub-unit. This may have been a mistake, because, as we shall see, treating this as sub-unit provides added parallelism between the controversy and parable sections.

2) Possible 14.2: the Pharisees conspire with the Herodians to destroy Jesus (3:6). This is the reaction to Jesus healing the man with the withered hand and the surrounding controversy. It was decided not to treat this as separate sub-unit even though it would be a general public story, because it takes place of the usually positive audience reaction to a miracle.[299] Though the reaction of an audience to a miracle can be seen as the reaction of the general public, such reaction is part of the typical recounting of a miracle. In other words, it is a standard part of a miracle story. Consequently, such reactions are not so much the reaction of the general public as of the specific witnesses to the miracle.
3) Possible 17.3: Jesus says those who blaspheme the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven (3:38–30). This relates directly to the Beelzebul controversy (17), and is part of Jesus's response. It was thus decided to treat this as part of the controversy and not a conclusion.
4) Possible 30.3: a large crowd follows Jesus and Jairus (5:24). Unlike 30.1, which is clearly introductory and not really necessary to the Jairus story, this verse is a part of the story.
5) Possible division of the 35.2, the death of John the Baptist. While there are couple of scenes in this story, they are all integral to the story. This is different from stories of the Gerasene Demoniac, where the healing (29.1) could stand completely on its own, and to a degree with the feeding of the five thousand (36.3), where only a small adjustment—the addition of a short statement at the beginning saying Jesus had been teaching a large group of people in the wilderness—would make the story stand alone.

The above division of some of the LUD units creates a new set of 61 units, the SUD, and consequently a sample base of 1830 pairs of units to analyse.

To conclude, in deciding how to divide Mark's text, the natural divisions of the text were followed as closely as possible. This was in order to view the text and its divisions from the perspective of the author. This produced 36 units of lengths varying from a couple of sentences to a dozen sentences. By noting the types of material that made up these units, it was argued that potential sub-units were likely to fall into the same typology. The resulting analysis showed that many of the introductions and conclusions that were not directly necessary to the main story did indeed fall into this typology. Furthermore, many of these sub-units were similar to some of the original units. These sub-units, it was argued, are therefore also likely to represent divisions that would be considered distinct units of text by the author. Then other introductory and concluding sections of text were looked at, and new sub-units similar to those already discovered were found. This resulted in a new set of smaller units (SUD) based on the longer unit division (LUD). It is these two sets of units that will be used for the statistical analysis.

The Selection of Parallels

The next stage of the analysis is the decision of which parallels to consider valid, and which parallels to ignore. Since we do not know which parallels Mark would consider valid parallels, the widest possible range of parallelism will be taken as valid. The only limitation will be parallelism that would be too common to be of use to make parallels. For example,

[299] See Theissen, *Miracle*, 72.

the use of the definite article would not make for valid parallelism, because it appears in almost every sentence. This chapter will look at the different types of possible parallelism, and for each category examples will be given, along with the parallels that were not considered valid. The specific parallels used are listed in appendix A.[300]

The first category of parallelism used is word parallelism. As just noted, some words are too common to be considered valid parallels; these include definite and indefinite articles and commonly used prepositions. Other words are also found in most larger units; for example, the verb "to come or to go"[301]—most units involve either Jesus and the disciples going somewhere or people coming to them—or the verb "to say"[302]—most units involve someone speaking. Other verbs ignored include "to have," "to do," "to become," and "to be."[303] Also, mention of Jesus or the disciples is found in most scenes, and consequently "Jesus" and "disciples"[304] were also ignored.

Besides the question of words not to include, there is the question of words that are very similar to each other. For instance, does one count words that are in a different tense or case or number? From one perspective these could be seen as different words, because they are spelled differently, but from another perspective they are the same word, but simply in a different case, etc. This thesis is following the latter perspective: tense, case, and number are ignored. Also, words that have the same root and simply have an added or different prepositional prefix are counted as the same word. For example, "to go into," "to go out," and "to go"[305] are treated as the same word and ignored because "to go" is too common a word, and "to look," "to look around," and "to look up"[306] are treated as the same word and counted. Also words that have similar roots and meanings, but are listed as different words in the dictionary are also counted as one word; for example, "home," and "house."[307]

There is also the question of how to count words that are used twice. This presents a couple of methodological problems: if one unit mentions a word two times, and another three times, does this count as one, two, two-and-a-half (the average), or three parallels? Also, should the mention of a word twice in two units be counted as the same level of parallelism as two different words each mentioned in two units? In regards to the first problem, there is clearly a greater degree of parallelism between two units where a word is found twice in each unit than there is in two units where a word is found only once in each. In regards to the second problem, the parallelism of one word repeated is not as great as two different words, because it is often unavoidable to repeat some words, and consequently the parallelism may not be intended. It was decided to take the simpler route and ignore repeated words in the analysis.

Parallelism besides word parallelism can be labelled under the broad heading conceptual parallelism. Conceptual parallelism, however, can be divided into three main categories: formal, structural, and content. Formal parallelism refers to the type of material the unit belongs to; for example, is it specific example of Jesus's power or wisdom, a

---

[300] See below on page 322.
[301] ἔρχομαι
[302] λέγω
[303] ἔχω, δύναμαι, γίνομαι, εἰμί
[304] Ἰησοῦς, μαθήτης
[305] εἰσέρχομαι, ἐξέρχομαι, ἐρχομαι
[306] βλέπω, περιβλέπω, ἀναβλέπω
[307] οἶκος, οἰκία

disciple story, or a general public story. These can be further sub-divided; for example, an example of Jesus's power may be a healing or an exorcism, and a specific example of Jesus's wisdom may be a controversy story or a parable. Structural parallelism most often refers to a similar sequence of events; for example, Jesus may be walking, see someone doing something, call them, and then the called person leaves what they are doing.

The last type of conceptual parallelism, content parallelism, is a broad category, and can include almost everything. It can refer to the location, time of day, action, objects, or themes. Sometimes the actions or objects are covered by word parallelism; for example, the location of being by the sea is covered by the word "sea." In other cases different words are used for the same or similar action or object. For example, the words demon and unclean spirit refer to the same beings, and that these beings may cry or shout out some words refers to the same action. Consequently, where the same words are used for the same objects or actions there will be a greater number of parallels to reflect the greater parallelism. For example, if a demon is shouting out in one unit and an unclean spirit is crying out in another there will be two parallels, one because there is a demon/unclean spirit mentioned,[308] and another because the demon/unclean spirit is crying out/shouting. On the other hand if both units have a demon crying out, then there would be two additional word parallels, for a total of four parallels.

There can consequently be a certain multiplication of the number of parallels as one moves from general to specific parallelism. For example, two units may both be accounts of a miracle. They may both also be exorcisms, and in both Jesus may command the demon to come out. The demons may both refer to Jesus by a christological title. Also, many of the words used may be the same. Consequently, two units containing exorcisms can easily have a high number of parallels. For example, in the LUD, the stories of the Capernaum and Gerasene demoniacs have 18 parallels between them.

In general the analysis tries to include as many parallels as possible. This is for two reasons. First, one of the goals of the analysis is to assess the validity of the claim made by sceptics of chiastic studies that one can find parallelism between any two units. Second, by including as many parallels as possible, the risk of missing possible parallels is diminished. That possible parallels are missed is inevitable.[309] However, the more parallels one has included, the less impact missed parallels will have on the overall statistical analysis. For example, a study which had missed 50% of the possible parallelism would not be as accurate as one that missed 1% of the possible parallelism. Along the same lines, the inclusion of weak parallelism will also help off set missed parallelism. The inclusion of weak parallelism helps the argument that one can find parallelism between any two units. Consequently, if this argument can be shown to be wrong even with the inclusion of weak parallelism, then the opposite argument will be that much stronger. The list of parallels, both word and conceptual, is presented in appendix A,[310] and the results of the number of parallels between each pair of unit is presented in appendix B.[311] We shall now do a brief survey of the results, before performing probability calculations on possible chiastic structures.

---

[308] In actual fact this parallel is not counted since it is covered by the parallel of an exorcism being performed or discussed.

[309] As is the case with all such studies, new parallels are thought of after one has done all the tallying and calculations. One could be endlessly readjusting totals and consequent figures. However, there reaches a point where one has to say that what has been done is enough.

[310] See below on page 322.

[311] See below on page 370.

An Initial Survey of the Results

Our survey of the results will begin with the LUD before moving to SUD. As shall be shown, the initial survey confirms what one would expect, namely, that the longer the two units compared, the more likely there will be a high number of parallels, and when two units of a similar formal type are compared, the more likely they are to have a higher number of parallels. Consequently, a higher number of parallels are needed between two long units for the parallelism to be considered significant, and likewise for a chiasm made up of units of the same formal type. It will also be shown that it is not possible to find valid parallelism between any two units. This is especially true as the size of the unit diminishes. The concept of what can be considered good parallelism will also be discussed along with what this means for the probability analysis.

For the LUD the final results are as follows:

Number of parallels	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number of pairs	90	70	94	75	67	54	40	32	27	21
Percent of total	14.29	11.11	14.92	11.90	10.63	8.57	6.35	5.08	4.29	3.33
Number ≥	630	540	470	376	301	234	180	140	108	81
Percent ≥	100	85.71	74.60	59.68	47.78	37.14	28.57	22.22	17.14	12.86

Number of parallels	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	23[312]
Number of pairs	15	9	6	6	5	3	8	1	3	1	1	1	1
Percent of total	2.38	1.43	.95	.95	.79	.48	1.27	.16	.48	.16	.16	.16	.16
Number ≥	60	45	36	30	24	19	16	8	7	4	3	2	1
Percent ≥	9.52	7.14	5.71	4.76	3.81	3.02	2.54	1.27	1.11	.63	.48	.32	.16

The full results can be found in the tables in appendix B.[313] The first thing to note is that 90 of the 630 pairs of units, or 14%, had no valid parallelism between each other whatsoever. A further 11% had only one word parallel or conceptual parallel between them. In other words, 25% of the pairs of units had no or next to no valid parallelism between them. On the other hand, 75% had at least two parallels, and almost 50% had at least four parallels. Furthermore, almost 10%, that is 60 pairs of units, had ten or more parallels. Consequently, while it is not true to say that one could find valid parallelism between any two pairs of units, it is likely that one can find valid parallelism between two pairs of units.

The question is, what can be considered good parallelism? "Good" is a highly subjective term, and to a degree arbitrary. However, it is clear that if 85% have more than a certain number of parallels, then this is extremely poor parallelism. Also, if only 1% of units have more than a certain number of parallels, then this is extremely good parallelism. Also if 50% have certain number of parallels then this is a medium level of parallelism. However, since a 50% chance is still fairly high, this could still be considered a low level of parallelism. Consequently, based on the above results, the following rating system for the LUD is proposed:

---

[312] There are no pairs with twenty-two parallels.

[313] See below on page 402.

Rating	Negligible	Low	Medium	Good	Very good	Excellent	Extremely excellent
Number of parallels	0–2	3–4	5–7	8–9	10–12	13–15	16–23
Percent ≥	100	59	37	17	10	5	2.5

Thus 59% of the unit pairs have at least a low level of parallelism, 37% at least a medium level, 17% at least a good level of parallelism, and so forth.

However, the above figures do not tell the whole story. The results for individual units show that there are naturally more parallels between longer units than there are between shorter units. A comparison between some of the longer units is shown in the following chart:

	Par h (9)	Beel (17)	S on gr (20)	G dem (29)	Death (35)	5000 (36)
Paralytic (9)	———	23	4	18	8	11
Beelzebul (17)	23	———	3	11	9	9
Seed on Ground (20)	4	3	———	1	3	4
Gerasene Demoniac (29)	18	11	1	———	10	21
Death of John (35)	8	9	3	10	———	10
Feeding of the 5000 (36)	11	9	4	21	10	———

If one excludes the parable of the seed on ground, there is relatively high parallelism between the other units: at least eight parallels. However, the example of the parable shows that length in and of itself does not account for everything: note there is only one parallel between the parable (20) and the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (29), one of the longest units in the sample space. If one takes the three longest units, the Gerasene demoniac, the death of John (35), and the feeding of the five thousand (36), the parallelism ranges from ten for two of the possible pairs to twenty-one for the remaining pair. The difference is because two of the units are miracles, and therefore have greater parallelism. To conclude, while it is more likely that longer units will have a greater number of parallels, other factors clearly play a more significant role. However, it is also clear, that in general, the longer the unit, the higher the number of parallels likely. Thus, though the seed parable according to the above chart has four parallels with the healing of the paralytic (9) and it would be considered low parallelism, it should perhaps be negligible, because of the length.

It must also be remembered in dealing with this type of analysis, that numbers do not tell the whole story. One often needs to go into the details as well. For example, in the above chart the seed parable (20) has four parallels with both the healing of the paralytic (9) and the feeding of the five thousand (36). However, the seed parable is more similar to, and thus has stronger parallelism with, the feeding of the five thousand. There are three word parallels (reported/hear, earth/land, brought/bringing) and one conceptual parallel (they are both specific examples of Jesus's wisdom) with the healing of paralytic, and two word parallels (yielded/give, hundreds/hundredfold) and two conceptual parallels (both have the theme of increase, and both contain large numbers) with the feeding of the five thousand. The parallelism with the healing of the paralytic is very weak: the three words are not key to the units, and the conceptual parallel is very basic. However, the parallelism with the feeding of the five thousand is strong: the words are key to the stories (the parable is about different yields, and the miracle is about giving, and the giving and yielding is made important by the high numbers such as a hundred), and the conceptual parallels are central to the stories (both

are about increase reflected in high numbers). Consequently, when it comes to subjective evaluation, one also needs to go beyond the numbers.

This, however, will not affect the probability analysis, because the probability analysis is not concerned with how good the parallelism is, but with the likelihood of certain level of parallelism. Consequently, it does not matter whether one is comparing long units or short units, because the above statistical analysis is an average of parallels between units of different length. The concern of the probability analysis is solely the likelihood of the proposed chiasms occurring. True, one could individually analyse each of the 630 pairs, judge each one's level of parallelism subjectively, and produce a sample space based on a subjective ratings. However, this set of statistics based on such a rating would be open to criticism of bias and subjectivity.

Furthermore, I do not think that the results, even if the ratings were relatively free of bias, would be substantially different, because for the most part the system used in this thesis seems to produce good results: the units that one would expect to show a high degree of parallelism do. For example, the parable of the seed on ground (20) clearly has an extremely high degree of parallelism with its explanation (21), and the results show this: there are twenty parallels (twelve word parallels and eight conceptual parallels). In the other words, the parallelism is excellent in the extreme. The next closest is the parable of the mustard seed (26), where there is also clearly strong parallelism (both are parables about seeds and increase): there are ten parallels (four word parallels and six conceptual parallels), which is still very good parallelism. Other examples include the call of the four (3) and the call of Levi (10), which have ten parallels between them.

One would also expect that units which are of a similar type of material would have strong parallelism. For example, the following chart shows the number of parallels between the miracle stories:

	C dem	S's m-i-l	Lep h	Par h	Storm	G dem	HW	JD	5000
Capernaum demoniac (4)	——	2	*7*	**16**	**13**	**18**	3	6	5
Simon's mother-in-law (5)	2	——	4	**7**	4	4	2	**15**	4
Leper healed (8)	**7**	4	——	**10**	5	**16**	**10**	**11**	**12**
Paralytic healed (9)	**16**	*7*	*10*	——	**15**	**18**	*13*	9	*11*
Storm stilled (28)	**13**	4	5	**15**	——	**16**	**9**	**16**	**16**
Gerasene demoniac (29)	**18**	4	**16**	**18**	**16**	——	*9*	**11**	**21**
HW	3	2	**10**	**13**	**9**	**9**	——	**14**	**10**
JD	6	**15**	*11*	9	**16**	*11*	**14**	——	**12**
Feeding of the 5000 (36)	5	4	**12**	**11**	**16**	**21**	*10*	**12**	——

Reading across each row, the figures in bold represent those which are in the top eight[314] parallels for that unit, and the figures in italics are those where the unit is within the top eight parallels for the corresponding unit. For example, for the Capernaum demoniac (4), the Paralytic healed (9) is within the top eight parallels for the Capernaum demoniac (4), and the Capernaum demoniac is within the top eight parallels for the Leper healed (8). Consequently, for the thirty-six (9x8/2) pairs, twenty of the pairs have at least one unit where the parallelism is within the top eight. In other words, for the miracle stories, there is a probability of 70% that the strongest parallelism will be with other miracle stories. Also, fourteen pairs or 38% have thirteen or more parallels, which compares to 5% for the entire

[314] There are nine units being compared; in other words, each unit is compared with eight other units.

sample space. However, note that two miracle stories do not necessarily have a high degree of parallelism: there are seve pairs of units with four or less parallels.

A similar high level of parallelism can be seen in the specific examples of Jesus's wisdom, that is, the controversy stories and the parables:

Unit	9	11	12	13	14	17	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Paralytic healed (9)	—	**15**	7	**10**	**16**	**23**	*4*	*6*	*5*	*2*	*3*	*8*	*3*
Sinners controversy (11)	**15**	—	**9**	**14**	**9**	**16**	3	3	3	*3*	*3*	2	2
Fasting controversy (12)	**7**	**9**	—	**13**	**6**	**7**	2	1	**4**	*2*	*3*	**5**	*3*
Plucking controversy (13)	**10**	**14**	**13**	—	**11**	**11**	**5**	3	*4*	*2*	*3*	**7**	*4*
Healing controversy (14)	**16**	**9**	**6**	**11**	—	**8**	*4*	3	2	*2*	*4*	*4*	2
Beelzebul controversy (17)	**23**	**16**	7	**11**	**8**	—	3	*5*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*5*	*4*
Seed on ground (20)	**4**	3	2	**5**	**4**	3	—	3	**20**	**9**	**7**	**5**	**10**
Why teaching in parables (21)	**6**	3	1	3	3	**5**	3	—	**5**	**4**	**4**	**5**	**4**
Parable explained (22)	**5**	3	**4**	**4**	2	**4**	**20**	**5**	—	**4**	**6**	**9**	**9**
Lamp (23)	**2**	**3**	**2**	**2**	**2**	**3**	**9**	**4**	**4**	—	**5**	**4**	**5**
Measure (24)	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**4**	**3**	**7**	**4**	**6**	**5**	—	**4**	**4**
Seed in secret (25)	**8**	2	**5**	**7**	**4**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**9**	**4**	**4**	—	**11**
Mustard seed (26)	**3**	2	**3**	**4**	2	**4**	**10**	**4**	**9**	**5**	**4**	**11**	—

In this case we are comparing thirteen units, and therefore there are seventy-eight different pairs. Of these seventy-eight only ten pairs, or 13%, do not have one of the units where the parallelism is not in the top fifteen for one of the units. This is most remarkable when one looks at the parable units (20, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26): for each unit there are only couple of cases where the parallelism is not in the top twelve for that unit. In other words, the highest parallelism is almost only with other examples of Jesus's wisdom. Also, the strongest parallelism for the parables is with other parables, and the strongest parallelism for the controversy stories (9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 33) is with other controversy units. This is shown by the high number of bold numerals in the bottom right and top left quadrants respectively.

Thus, the results from the LUD show that, in general, longer units are more likely to have more parallels with each other, and units of a similar type are also more likely to have more parallels with each other. However, this is not always the case. We shall now turn to the SUD, where the results show a similar tendency.

The results for the SUD are:[315]

Number of parallels	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number of pairs	609	416	295	186	131	68	48	24	17	14
Percent of total	33.28	22.73	16.12	10.16	7.16	3.71	2.62	1.31	.92	.77
Number ≥	1830	1221	805	510	324	193	125	77	53	36
Percent ≥	100	66.72	43.99	27.87	17.70	10.55	6.83	4.21	2.90	1.97

Number of parallels	10	11	12	13	14	16	17	20[316]
Number of pairs	4	8	1	5	1	1	1	1
Percent of total	.22	.44	.05	.27	.05	.05	.05	.05
Number ≥	22	18	10	9	4	3	2	1
Percent ≥	1.20	.98	.55	.49	.22	.16	.11	.05

[315] The full results charts can be found below on page 390.

[316] There are no pairs with fifteen, eighteen, or nineteen parallels.

With the reduction in the size of the units, there is notable drop in the average number of parallels between units. Whereas roughly 15% of the pairs had no parallelism in the LUD, 33% have no parallelism in the SUD, and whereas roughly 60% of pairs had three or more parallels in the LUD, only 28% of the pairs have three or more parallels. If we use the same rating system developed for the LUD, then there is substantial difference in what can be considered good parallelism:

Rating	Negligible	Low	Medium	Good	Very good	Excellent	Extremely excellent
Number of parallels	0	1	2–3	4	5–6	7–8	9+
Percent ≥	100	67	44	18	11	4	2

This compares to the LUD:

Rating	Negligible	Low	Medium	Good	Very good	Excellent	Extremely excellent
Number of parallels	0–2	3–4	5–7	8–9	10–12	13–15	16+
Percent ≥	100	59	37	17	10	5	2.5

In general the number of parallels needed to be within a certain percentile is halved. This makes sense, because the SUD has just under twice as many units as the LUD, and consequently the average size of an SUD unit is roughly half the size of an LUD unit. The following table shows the percentage greater than or equal for the number of parallels in the SUD, and the equivalent number of parallels for that percentage in the LUD:

# of //s in SUD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	16
% ≥ in SUD	67	44	28	18	11	7	4	3	2	1.2	1.0	.6	.5	.2	.16
Equivalent # of //s for % ≥ in LUD	2.5	4.5	6	8	9.5	11.5	13.5	15.5	16.5	17	18.5	19.5	20		23

This shows that when the size of the units doubles, the number of parallels also roughly doubles except where there is a high number of parallels.

As with the LUD, the strongest parallelism in the SUD is in general between stories of a particular formal type. This can be seen with the disciple stories:

Unit	3	7.1	10.2	16	18.2	27.2	29.3	34.2	36.1
Four called (3)	—	2	**9**	***11***	*3*	1	**4**	3	**4**
Jesus and four in desert (7.1)	2	—	2	**5**	1	2	1	**4**	*7*
Levi Called (10.2)	***9***	2	—	**6**	**3**	1	2	1	1
Twelve appointed (16)	***11***	*5*	**6**	—	*4*	*2*	3	***11***	5
Disciples declared family (18.2)	**3**	1	**3**	**4**	—	1	1	2	1
Disciples taught everything (27.2)	1	**2**	1	**2**	1	—	1	**3**	**3**
Gerasene not accepted (29.3)	**4**	1	2	3	1	1	—	3	***6***
Twelve instructed (34.2)	3	*4*	1	***11***	2	*3*	3	—	**6**
Twelve return (36.1)	*4*	**7**	1	5	1	*3*	**6**	**6**	—

Though the strength of the parallelism is not quite as strong as that between the specific examples of Jesus's power or wisdom, there is still very strong parallelism between 47% of the pairs; that is, for 47% of the pairs, the number of parallels for one of the units is within its top nine for parallelism. The same is true for the remaining formal category, namely, the

general public stories.[317] This is especially true for the sub-categories: general teaching stories, general healing stories, proclaiming stories, news spreading stories, and large crowd stories that do not fit into the other categories.

To conclude, the initial survey of the results shows to an extent what one would expect, namely, that there is more likely to be a higher number of parallels between units of a similar type than units of different types. Also, there is more likely to be a higher number of parallels between longer units than shorter units. Consequently, for two longer units to be considered to have good parallelism, a greater number of parallels is needed than for two shorter units. In other words, the longer the two units compared, the greater the number of parallels required for that pair to be judged to have significant parallelism.

It was also shown that the claim that one can find valid parallelism between any two units is false. This is especially true as the size of the units decreases in size. In the SUD fully one third of the pairs of units there was no parallelism whatsoever. Furthermore, only 44 % of the pairs had more than one parallel between them. Thus for 55% of the pairs there is an extremely low level of parallelism. Consequently when one compares two very short units, one only needs a few parallels for the parallelism to be significant. For example, five to six parallels can be considered very good parallelism for the SUD, because there is only a probability of.11, or roughly one in ten, that two units will have this degree of parallelism.

We shall now use these results to do some probability analyses on some proposed chiastic structures.

A Probability Analysis of Some Chiastic Structures in Mark 1:12–6:46

This section will begin with an analysis of some potential chiastic structures based on the natural larger structural patterns of Mark 1:12–6:46. The results will show that the probability of these chiasms occurring by chance is extremely low. This last point will be emphasized by doing a probability analysis of the chiasm if it is moved one unit over in either direction. The results of the analysis of these latter structures will show that unlike the original structures, they either have high probability figures, or are invalid as chiastic structures. The second section will focus solely on the question of the rarity of chiastic structures. This will be done by analyzing all possible three-, four-, and five-level chiasms in the SUD. It will be shown that viable chiastic patterns are rare, and ones with a low probability figure extremely rare. The results will also show that the vast majority of the viable chiasms are centred on the chiasms analysed in the first section. In the third section, the results of the probability analysis of the first section will be looked at in more detail, and it will be shown that a larger chiastic structure can be formed that covers the whole of Mark 1:12–6:46. The probability of this structure will then be calculated. In the process, a modification of the LUD and SUD will be proposed.

Initial Analysis of Some Chiastic Structures

The first methodological question is deciding where to look for chiastic structures. This will require a quick overview of Mark 1:12–6:46 to see if there are any natural large structural patterns such as certain groupings of material, because if an author is using chiasm as a structuring device, then the chiasms should fit within the natural structures the author

[317] See the SUD result chart below on page 390.

has created.[318] This is the same principle used in deciding on the individual units for the sample spaces. This will be done first for the LUD and then for the SUD. There is also the secondary methodological question of where to set the boundaries of a chiasm. Many scholars of chiasm have noted that there is often parallelism between the wings and hinges of a chiasm. Consequently, the limits of a chiasm are likely to be where there is significant parallelism between the hinges and wings. Also, it has often been noted that Mark uses the technique known as inclusio to mark sections of text. Consequently, a clear inclusio is likely to provide the wings of a chiasm. Where these elements fail, there is a third possible indicator of the limits of a chiasm, that of meaning. Scholars of chiasm have often noted that the hinge and wings often highlight the central theme of the text covered by the chiasm. Consequently, if the juxtaposition of the wings and hinge with the other levels seems to generate meaning, or rather, a coherent point, then this will also likely indicate the boundaries of the chiasm. The question of how a meaning is developed through chiasm will follow the probability analysis.

In the division of the LUD into the SUD, it was noted that the material could be divided into different types of forms. These categories were then used to produce clearly defined sub-units. This in turn indicates that Mark had these formal types in mind when arranging his material. A further indication of this is Mark's grouping of the specific examples of Jesus's power and wisdom: Mark 1:21–2:12 consists mostly of four specific examples of Jesus's healing power (the healings of the Capernaum demoniac, Simon's mother-in-law, the leper, and the paralytic), Mark 2:15–3:6 consists of four controversy stories (the controversies over eating with sinners, not fasting, plucking grain, and healing on the Sabbath), Mark 4:3–32 consists mostly of parables (the seed on ground and its explanation, lamps, measure for measure, the seed growing in secret, and the mustard seed), and Mark 4:35–5:43 consists of four miracles (the stilling of the storm, and the healings of the Gerasene demoniac, the HW, and JD). These groupings form a chiastic structure:

A1 Other material ([units] 1–3)
  B1 Specific examples of Jesus's power: 4 miracles (4–9)
    C1 Specific examples of Jesus's wisdom: 4 controversy stories (11–14)
      D Other material (15–19)
    C2 Specific examples of Jesus's wisdom: 5 parables/4 seed parable sections (20–26)
  B2 Specific examples of Jesus's power: 4 miracles (28–32)
A2 Other material (33–36)

We have already seen that there is strong degree of parallelism between the two miracle sections (B1 and B2) and between the two wisdom sections (C1 and C2).[319] It is also unusual that there are exactly four examples in three of the four groupings (B1, C1, and B2). C2, the parable section, appears not to follow this pattern; however, upon closer inspection, there are four blocks of material concerning seed parables: the parable of the seed on ground, its explanation, and the parables of the seed growing in secret and the mustard seed. The closeness in relationship between these four units of text has been noted by many authors,

[318] On smaller, or micro-, structural elements being compatible with larger, or macro-, structural elements, see B. M. F. van Iersel, "Concentric Structures in Mark 1:14–3:35 (4:1): With Some Observations on Method," *BibInt* 3 (1995): 81–84.

[319] See above on page 80.

some of whom do not consider the other material to be parables.[320] From this perspective there would be four units of parable material. Be that as it may, there are clearly four units all dealing with comparisons of the kingdom with seeds growing. Consequently, there are four blocks of material all giving four specific examples of either Jesus's power or wisdom. This could simply be a coincidence; however, this is unlikely, and seems to be an indication of deliberate structural arrangement by Mark. If this is so, then it would make sense that smaller structural units would fall into the larger structural pattern outlined above. We shall now look at possible chiastic patterns centred on the four groupings of power and wisdom material and the material in-between (hinge D in the above chiasm).

We shall begin with the LUD before moving onto the SUD. We have already calculated the probability of one chiasm in discussing the methodology of calculating probability. It is centred on the first grouping of miracles, and runs as follows:[321]

A1 Four called ([unit] 3): 10 //s
B1 Capernaum demoniac (4): 16 //s
C1 Simon's mother-in-law (5): 4//s
D1 Healing at Simon's (6): 7 //s
D2 Jesus and the four in desert and proclaiming (7)
C2 Leper healed (8)
B2 Paralytic healed (9)
A2 Levi called (10)

The two call stories (3, 10) were included in the chiastic pattern as they form a clear inclusio around the miracle section, and there is also a disciple story in the hinge section (7). To calculate the probability of such a chiasm, one multiplies the probability for each level having its number of parallels, and then multiplies this total by the number of ways such a grouping of units could fall within the sample space. This can be expressed in the following formula:

P (chiasm) = [P (≥ # //s for A level) x P (≥ # //s for B level) x P (≥ # //s for C level) x .....] x [(# of units in sample space - # of units in chiasm) + 1][322]

---

[320] Dewey, *Markan*, 151, for example, does not consider the lamp saying a parable. She justifies applying modern categories by pointing to the section on Beelzebul where Mark, as mentioned above, also applies the term parable. According to Dewey, Mark was aware of the difference between general sayings parables and "true" parables. She sees the material in the Beelzebul section as sayings material rather than "true" parables. Dewey thus discounts the opinion of the very author whose material she is classifying. True, it is possible that Mark was aware of the difference and intended his readers to be. But Mark was just as likely to have considered the modern distinction unimportant. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the parable of the lamp was a saying of the time. The only difference between a metaphorical saying and a parable in the modern sense is length: the proverb is short and pithy, and the parable is longer and detailed, and consequently often takes on the form of a story. That being said, Dewey's point that there is definite similarity between the seed parable sections which makes them different from the other material is well taken.

[321] The chiastic nature of this section has also been noted by Clark, "Criteria," 66–72. His proposal is virtually the same, and runs as follows (with equivalent LUD units in parentheses): A1 1:16–20 (3), B1 1:21–28 (4), C1 1:29–34 (5–6), D 1:35–39 (7), C2 1:40–45 (8), B2 2:1–12 (9), A2 2:13–14 (10). For a critical analysis of Clark's proposal see Dewey, *Markan*, 172–80. Dewey's central complaint concern's Clark's division of the units. She sees Clark's C1 as two units. As discussed previously, units 5 and 6 can be seen as either one or two units; see above on page 68. As will be discussed, units 5 and 6 should be joined in the LUD; see below on page 110.

[322] The last part of the equation is the number of ways the chiasm can occur, which was expressed by the second permutation rule: n! / r (1)! r(2)!, . . . r (p)! See above on page 66. In this case this would be 29!/ 28!

For this chiasm it is:

[P (≥ 10 //s) x P (≥ 16 //s) x P (≥ 4 //s) x P (≥ 7 //s)] x [(36 - 8) + 1]

This equals.0 952 x.0 254 x.4 478 x.2 222 x 29, or.007 447. Thus the probability of this chiasm occurring is.7 %, or one in 143. In other words it is quite rare for such a pattern to occur.

The rarity of the above chiasm can be shown by moving the chiasm one to the left, or one to the right and then repeat the calculations. If one moves the chiasm one to the left, then one gets the following chiastic structure:

A1 Proclaiming in Galilee (2): 4 //s
B1 Four called (3): 0 //s
C1 Capernaum demoniac (4): 6 //s
D1Healing at Simon's (5): 2 //s
D2 Simon's mother-in-law (6)
C2 Jesus and the four in desert and proclaiming (7)
B2 Leper healed (8)
A2 Paralytic healed (9)

The probability for this chiasm is:.4 778 x 1 x.2 857 x 7 460 x 29, or 2.95. In other words there is a good degree of certainty that such an arrangement would occur. In fact, it is likely to occur roughly three times within the thiry-six units. However, the chiasm is also invalid, because there are zero parallels on one level (B). If one moves the chiasm one to the right, the following chiasm results:

A1 Capernaum demoniac (4): 2 //s
B1 Simon's mother-in-law (5): 2 //s
C1 Healing at Simon's (6): 8 //s
D1 Jesus and the four in desert and proclaiming (7): 5 //s
D2 Leper healed (8)
C2 Paralytic healed (9)
B2 Levi called (10)
A2 Sinners controversy (11)

The probability of such a chiasm is:.746 x.746 x.1 714 x.3 714 x 29, or 1.07. In other words it is almost certain that such an arrangement would occur once within the thirty-six units.

We now turn to the second grouping of miracle stories. This group is bound by an inclusio of Jesus teaching: in unit 27 we are told Jesus taught the public in parables, and in unit 33 Jesus is teaching in Nazareth. The chiasm runs as follows:

1!. "n" is calculated by taking the total number of units (36) and subtracting the units in the chiasm (in this case 8), and then adding 1 for the 8 unit chiasm. Thus, the formula when the probability of only one chiasm of "a" units in length will be (36 - a + 1)! / (36 - a)! 1!, which will always be 36 - a + 1, because (36 - a + 1)! equals (36 - a + 1) x (36 – a)!

A1 Parable section conclusion (27): 4 //s
B1 Storm stilled (28): 16 //s
C1 Gerasene demoniac (29): 9 //s
D Jairus's request (30)
C2 HW (31)
B2 JD (32)
A2 Teaching in Nazareth (33)

The probability for this chiasm is.4 778 x.0 254 x.1 286 x 30, or.0 468. This is roughly a 5% chance or 1 in 20. While the chances of the above chiasm occurring is not as rare as the first miracle section.0 468 is still a fairly low figure. Again, if one moves the chiasm one to the left, the probability is 3.77,[323] that is, it would likely occur roughly 4 times, and if one moves the chiasm one to the right, the result is.2921,[324] which is roughly a 30%, or 1 in 3 times.

We now turn to the first wisdom section, which consists of the controversy stories:[325]

A1 Levi called (10): 5//s
B1 Many eat with Jesus (11): 9 //s
C1 Fasting controversy (12): 13//s
C2 Plucking controversy (13)
B2 Healing controversy (14)
A2 Healing by boat (15)

The inclusio is not immediately clear; however, the call of Levi (10) begins with Jesus teaching a crowd by the sea, and the healing by the boat (15) Jesus heals a crowd by the sea. In other words, the two units combined show Jesus's two activities of teaching/proclaiming and healing/exorcising. The probability for this chiasm is.3 714 x.1 286 x.0 476 x 31, or.0 705, which is 7 % or 1 in 14, which is still a reasonable number.

For the parable section, the chiasm is as follows:[326]

---

[323] P (26–32) is.857 1 (1 //), P (27–31) is.857 1 (1 //), P (28–30) is.171 4 (8 //s)

[324] P (28–34) is.596 8 (3 //S), P (29–33) is.171 4 (8 //a), P (30–32) is.095 2 (10 //S). Note that despite the relatively high parallelism on two levels, the final figure is still high, because a seven-unit chiasm can occur thirty times and the other level only has three parallels.

[325] The chiastic nature of this section has long been noted; see Dewey, "Literary," 394–99; Lund, *Chiasmus*, 303. Lund's chiasm is the same as presented above, but has the parables of old and new (12.2–3) as the hinge. It will be argued that these two parables should be considered a separate unit in the LUD, and consequently the hinge of this chiastic structure; see below on pages 110–113. Dewey's chiastic structure begins with the healing of the paralytic (9), which is also a healing controversy, and she considers the call of Levi (10) and the controversy over eating with sinners (11) as one unit: A1 controversy over forgiving sins (9), B1 controversy of eating with sinners (10–11), C controversy over not fasting (12), B2 controversy over plucking grain (13), A2 controversy over healing on the Sabbath (14).

[326] The chiastic nature of the parable section, with slight variations, has been noted by many scholars: Dewey, *Markan*, 150–52; G. Fay, "Introduction to Incomprehension: The Literary Structure of Mark 4:1–34," *CBQ* 51 (1989): 68; Jan Lambrecht, "De vijf parables van Mc. 4. Structuur en theologie van de parabelrede," *Bijdr* 29 (1968): 45–48; Jan Lambrecht, *Once More Astonished: The Parables of Jesus* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 86–87; Jan Lambrecht, "Redaction and Theology in Mk. IV," in *L'Évangile selon Marc: Tradtion et rédaction* (BETL Leuven: Leuven University, 1969), 303–4; Benoit Standaert, *L'Évangile selon Marc: composition et genre littéraire* (Nijmegen: Stichting Studentenpers Nijmegen, 1978), 210–18; Augustine Stock, *Call to Discipleship: A Literary Study of Mark's Gospel* (GNS 1; Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1982), 303–4. For further references see Fay, "Introduction," 65, n. 3. Two good examples of the type of variation found are Dewey and Fay. Dewey's chiasm is a simple three-level chiasm: A1 introduction (19), B1 parable material (20–22), sayings material (23–24), B2 parable material (25–26), A2 conclusion (27). This chiasm, it will be argued, is the most likely for the longer unit division; see below on page 119. Fay's chiasm is as follows: A1

A1 Teaching from boat (19): 4 //s
B1 Seed on ground (20): 10 //s
C1 Why teaching in parables (21): 5 //s
D1 Parable explained (22): 6 //s
E1 Lamp (23)
D2 Measure (24)
C2 Seed in secret (25)
B2 Mustard seed (26)
A2 Parable section conclusion (27)

This chiasm has a very clear inclusio: A1 and A2 are the introduction and conclusion respectively for the parable section. Both speak of how Jesus taught the public in parables, and the intervening material gives examples of the parables. Consequently, this whole section is commonly referred to as the parable section. The probability for this chiasm is.4 778 x.0 952 x.3 714 x.2 857 x 28, or.1 357. The probability for this chiasm is not as low as the other two chiasms looked at: it is 14% or a 1 in 7 chance of occurring. However, the units for this chiasm will remain virtually unchanged in the SUD—the only change will be with A2 (27)—and the probability will decrease, because the probability for the number of parallels decreases in general for the SUD.

The final chiasm for the LUD we shall look at is hinge section:[327]

A1 Healing by boat (15): 6 //s
B1 Twelve appointed (16): 6 //s
C1 Beelzebul (17)
B2 Disciples declared family (18)
A2 Teaching from boat (19)

The probability for this chiasm is.2 857 x.2 857 x 32 is 2.612. In other words, such a chiasm is likely to occur almost 3 times in the sample space. The reason for this is the shortness of the chiasm combined with relatively low parallelism. This is despite the clear similarity of the inclusio: both are large crowd scenes where Jesus uses a boat because of the crowd. The only real difference is that in one Jesus is shown healing and in the other teaching. Be that as it may, this is definitely not a viable chiasm because its probability is greater than or equal to 1.

We have now looked at, excluding the material at the beginning and end, the main groupings of material in the section Mark 1:12–6:45. We can now calculate the probability of four such chiasms occurring together in the sample space. Since the first two chiasms and the last two chiasms are joined, each pair is treated as one double chiasm. To calculate the probability of the four chiasms joined into two double chiasms, one multiplies the probability

---

introduction (19), B1 parable material (20), C1 parabolic method (21), D Interpretation of the sower (22), C2 parabolic method (23–24), B2 parabolic material (25–26), A2 conclusion (27). While Fay's proposal produces a viable chiasm, he fails in his choice of unit divisions. While it is valid to consider the the parables of the lamp and measure for measure (23–24) and the parables of the seed in secret and the mustard seed (25–26) as single units, to do so and not combine the parable of the seed on ground and its explanation—as Dewey does—is not valid because he is mixing two levels of unit. In other words he is mixing what are termed larger and smaller units of text in this thesis, where larger and smaller do not refer to the exact size of the text, but more to the structural level of the text. This division will become clearer in the section "Refining the Found Chiastic Structures" below on page 104.

[327] This chiastic structure has been noted by van Iersel, "Concentric," 94.

of each chiasm excluding the number of ways it can occur in the sample space, and multiplies this figure by the number of ways the two double chiasms could occur in the sample space.[328] Since the first and second chiasms and the third and fourth chiasms overlap, they are counted as two continuous units, one of twelve units and one of fifteen units. Consequently the number of ways two such chiasms could occur in the sample is (36 - 27 + 2)!/(36-27)!1!1!, or 11!/9!, which is 11 x 10, or 110.[329] The probability for each of the four chiasms excluding the number of ways it can occur are.000 256 8 (.007 447 / 29),.001 56 (.046 8 / 30),.002 274 (.070 5 / 31), and.004 846 (.135 7 / 28) respectively. Consequently, the probability for the two double chiasms occurring is.000 256 8 x.001 56 x.002 274 x.002 274 x 110, which is.000 000 048 56, or.000 005%, or 1 in 205 927 253. In other words it is so unlikely that four such chiastic structures could be found in Mark 1:12–6:46, one must conclude that these patterns did not occur by chance.

We shall now look at how these structures change in the SUD. In general, with the sub-division of some of the units longer and more precise chiastic patterns emerge. Also, a repeating pattern according to the formal type of the unit begins to emerge. We shall analyse the structures in the same order as for the LUD, which in turn will allow easier comparison of structural similarities between both the power chiasms and the wisdom chiasms.

The first miracle section using SUD units produces a much longer chiastic structure:

A1 The temptation (1): 1 //
B1 Proclaiming in Galilee (2): 1 //
C1 Four called (3): 9 //s
D1 Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): 3 //s
E1 Capernaum demoniac (4.2): 13 //s
F1 News spreads in Galilee (4.3): 2 //s
G1 Simon's mother-in-law (5): 4 //s
H1 Healing at Simon's (6): 6 //s
I Jesus and the four in desert (7.1)
H2 Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2)
G2 Leper healed (8.1)
F2 Leper proclaims (8.2), and teaching at home (9.1)
E2 Paralytic healed (9.2)
D2 Teaching by sea (10.1)
C2 Levi called (10.2)
B2 Many eat with Jesus (11.1)
A2 Sinners controversy (11.2)

This is a nine-level chiastic structure, and is a more precise structure than the four-level structure in the LUD. Instead of the call of the 4 (3) and the call of Levi (10.2) as the wings, this one has the temptation (1) and the sinners controversy (11.2). This may seem odd, since the chiasm now extends well beyond the actual miracle section. Though there are not a high number of parallels between the new wings and the hinge, the parallels are clear and unique. The temptation (wing A1) and the Jesus and the four in the desert (hinge I) are the only places besides the twelve leaving in boat (36.4) where Jesus is completely alone. It is of note that this last unit occurs right at the very end of the larger section we are looking at (Mark 1:12–6:46). Also, Jesus and the four in the desert (7.1) and the Sinners controversy (11.2) are the only two places in Mark 1:12–6:46 where Jesus directly talks about his mission: they

[328] See above on page 65.
[329] In regards to this formula (the second permutation rule) see above on page 66.

each contain an "I have come" saying.[330] In 7.1 Jesus has come to proclaim (1:38), and in 11.2 Jesus has come to call sinners (2:17).[331]

There is also quite low level parallelism between on the B level: there is one parallel. However, it is formal in nature. In fact the chiasm can be seen to divide along formal lines:

A1 The temptation (1): PWS (power and wisdom story)
B1 Proclaiming in Galilee (2): GPS (general public story)
C1 Four called (3): DS (disciples story)
D1 Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): GPS
E1 Capernaum demoniac (4.2): PS (power story)
F1 News spreads in Galilee (4.3): GPS
G1 Simon's mother-in-law (5): PS
H1 Healing at Simon's (6): GPS
I Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): DS
H2 Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): GPS
G2 Leper healed (8.1): PS
F2 Leper proclaims (8.2), and teaching at home (9.1): GPS
E2 Paralytic healed (9.2): PS
D2 Teaching by sea (10.1): GPS
C2 Levi called (10.2): DS
B2 Many eat with Jesus (11.1): GPS
A2 Sinners controversy (11.2): WS (wisdom story)

As previously noted, the temptation (1) is hard to classify. While it is clearly a miraculous story, because it involves spiritual beings (the Spirit, Satan, and angels), it is not a story about Jesus's miraculous power, unless one sees his defeat of Satan as miraculous. Mark's version of the temptation is very short compared to the Q version found in Luke and Matthew. From the model of frequent communication adopted in this thesis, it is highly likely that Mark and his audience were aware of this version.[332] Also, it is commonplace in oral societies to refer to other material the intended audience knew without fully repeating it.[333] I suggest that that is what Mark is doing here. If this is so, then the temptation story can also be seen as a wisdom story: in the Q version Jesus resists Satan's temptations through his wisdom.

From the above outline, on formal grounds, a pattern begins to emerge: PWS, *GPS, DS, GPS,* PS, GPS, PS, *GPS, DS, GPS,* PS, GPS, PS, *GPS, DS, GPS,*WS. This pattern of power or wisdom stories (PS, WS, PWS) divided by a general public story (GPS), followed by a disciple story (DS), followed by another general public story (GPS) will be repeated throughout the section. As we shall see, this repetitive pattern allows for further sub-chiasms

[330] On the "I have come sayings" see Simon J. Gathercole, *The Pre-Existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006), part 2. One could also see the temptation along with the baptism with which it is closely tied—the temptation follows right after the baptism and begins "And the Spirit immediately drove him out into the wilderness" (1.12)—as a type of initiation rite. Consequently, Jesus begins his mission in unit 1, and we are given further indications of what that mission is in units 7.1 and 11.2. This would indicate that the intervening material is an expansion on what Jesus's mission involves.

[331] Unfortunately the word parallelism of "I have come" is not counted, because the verb to come is too common.

[332] See above on page 24.

[333] See above on page 46.

to be created.[334] Thus, though some of the levels have only one parallel, it is of a formal nature, and is part of a greater pattern.

The reader will have noticed that one of the chiastic units (F2) is actually two units combined, namely, the leper proclaims (8.2) and Jesus teaching at home (9.1). Though these are parts of two different stories there is a strong degree of parallelism between these general public units (five parallels). These two units are further connected through a micro-chiastic structure:

A1 Leper proclaims the word: 2//s (proclaiming/teaching, and "word")
1:45 But *he went out* and began to proclaim it freely, and to spread the *word*,
B1 Crowds prevent action: 3 //s (crowd preventing movement, "that," "no longer")
so *that* Jesus could *no longer* go into a town openly, but stayed out in the country;
C1 Crowds come:2 //s (many gather, location given)
and people came to him from every quarter.
D1 Jesus returns to Capernaum
2:1 When *he returned* to Capernaum after some days,
C2 Crowds come
it was reported that he was at home. 2:2 So many gathered around
B2 Crowds prevent action
that there was *no longer* room for them, not even in front of the door;
A2 Jesus speaks word
and he was speaking the *word* to them.

Considering how short each unit is, that each level should have two to three parallels is quite unusual. This chiasm is made up of two of the shorter units in the SUD, and on average in the SUD, which includes units that are for the most part many times longer than the two above units, only 44% have two or more parallels, and 28% have three or more parallels. Consequently, the two to three parallels for each level can be considered a high level of parallelism. Therefore, it would seem that Mark saw a very close connection between these two units, and one is justified in joining these two units together and treating them as one.

Returning to the chiasm centred on the first power section in the SUD, the probability for this chiasm is.667 2 x.667 2 x.019 7 x.278 7 x.004 9 x.439 9 x.177 0 x.068 3 x 45 (61- 17 +1), which equals.000 002 8, or.000 3%. In other words, the odds are 1 in 333, 333 that the above arrangement would occur, that is, it would be virtually impossible for such a chiastic pattern with that level of probability to happen by chance.

If one were to move the chiasm one unit to the right, then there would be the following structure:

---

[334] The repetitive nature of the above chiasm allows each half of the chiasm to form a chiastic structure centring on the Capernaum demoniac (4.2) and the paralytic (9.2) respectively. The first chiasm is as follows: A1 Jesus possessed by Spirit and cast out into desert alone (1), B2 general proclaiming (2), C1 four called (3), D1 teaching in Capernaum and people remark (4.1), E demon cast out in Capernaum (4.2), D2 people remark and news spreads (4.3), C2 four named and Simon's mother-in-law serves after being healed (5), B2 general healing (6), A2 Jesus alone in desert and the four join (7.1). In this structure the healing of Simon's mother-in-law can be considered a disciple story because she serves Jesus and the four, and in the parallel structure in the second half the leper can be seen as disciple because he proclaims the word. The chiastic structure in the first half has partially been recognized by W. Stenger ("'Die Grundlegung des Evangeliums von Jesus Christus': Zur kompostionellen Struktur des Markusevangeliums," *LB* 61 [1988]: 42): A1 proclaiming in Galilee (2), B1 four called (3), C1 Capernaum demoniac (4), B2 Simon's mother-in-law and healing at Simon's (5–6), A2 Jesus and four proclaim and leper healed (7–8).

A1 Proclaiming in Galilee (2): 1 //
B1 Four called (3): 3 //s
C1 Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): 1 //
D1 Capernaum demoniac (4.2): 0 //s
E1 News spreads in Galilee (4.3): 1 //s
F1 Simon's mother-in-law (5): 7 //s
G1 Healing at Simon's (6): 7 //s
H1 Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): 0 //s
I Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2)
H2 Leper healed (8.1)
G2 Leper proclaims (8.2), and teaching at home (9.1)
F2 Paralytic healed (9.2)
E2 Teaching by sea (10.1)
D2 Levi called (10.2)
C2 Many eat with Jesus (11.1)
B2 Sinners controversy (11.2)
A2 Fasting controversy (12.1)

The probability for this chiasm would be.6672 x.2787 x.6672 x 1 x.6672 x.0421 x.0421 x 1 x 45, or.006602, which is.7%, or 1 in 143. This may sound impressive; however, the above chiasm is disqualified because on two of the levels there is no parallelism whatsoever (D and H). Part of the rarity for a long chiasm is found in the odds of having no parallels: there is a one in three chance that any two units will have no parallelism. In the above chiasm two out of the eight pairs have no parallelism, which is fairly close to the norm: in nine pairs one would expect three to have zero parallels on average. The following chart shows the percentages for each number of parallels for the above chiasm, the entire sample space, and for the original chiasm:

# of //s	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	13
One over chiasm %	25	75	38	38	25	25	25	25	0	0	0
Entire sample space %	33	67	44	28	18	11	7	4	3	2	.5
Original chiasm %	0	100	75	63	50	38	38	25	25	25	13

The parallelism in the original chiasm far exceeds the average, and this is reflected in its very low probability figure. When the chiasm is moved one over, it is fairly close to the average of up to three parallels, and exceeds up to seven parallels. This shows that having 25% with seven parallels is exceptional; however, because there are also 25% with zero parallels, the exception does not point to chiastic structuring.

We now turn to the second miracle section:

A1 GPS Public taught in parables (27.1): 2 //s
B1 DS Disciples taught everything (27.2): 3 //s
C1 GPS Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): 1 //s
D1 PS Stilling of the storm (28.2): 11 //s
E1 PS Gerasene healed (29.1): 5 //s
F1 GPS News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): 3 //s
G1 DS Gerasene not accepted (29.3): 2 //s
H GPS Gerasene proclaims (29.4),
G2 GPS Jesus returns in boat (30.1)
F2 GPS Jairus's request (30.2)
E2 PS HW (31)
D2 PS Jairus's messengers (32.1), Jairus's mourners (32.2), and JD raised (32.3)
C2 GPS Teaching in Nazareth (33), Teaching in villages (34.1)
B2 DS Twelve instructed (34.2),
A2 GPS twelve proclaim (34.3)

While many elements of this chiasm are the same as the chiasm in the LUD, the division of units into smaller units allows for further parallelism. For example, now the chiasm's wings and hinge all focus on teaching/proclaiming: in A1 Jesus teaches the public, in H a gentile proclaims, and in A2 the twelve proclaim. The hinge area is also expanded upon through the division of the end of the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (29). Jairus's request (30.2) moves from being the hinge to the E level and paired with the Gerasaene public's request that Jesus leave (29.2). Here we have an opposition of response to Jesus's miraculous power: Jairus has heard of it and wants to partake in it, and the Gerasenes are afraid and want nothing to do with it. The new unit of the Gerasene asking to be a disciple as Jesus steps into the boat to leave (29.3) is paired with Jesus returning in the boat to the other side to a crowd (30.1). This leaves the Gerasene proclaiming (29.4) as the new hinge. It should also be noted that the pattern of GPS-DS-GPS between the power and wisdom units continues. The chiasm begins and ends with such a sequence, and though the hinge area has the sequence GPS-DS-GPS-GPS-GPS, the three GPS units form one long GPS section of text, which produces the GPS-DS-GPS pattern.

As with the first miracle section a couple of the SUD units have to be combined to form a chiastic unit. In C2 the two general public units are combined. As was previously discussed, the teaching in villages unit (34.1) could be seen as being associated more with either Jesus teaching in Nazareth (33) or with the twelve being instructed (34.2).[335] In forming the LUD it was decided to associate this short sentence with the twelve being instructed. Upon reflection this may have been a mistake, because it seems to form a micro chiasm with Jesus teaching in Nazareth:[336]

[335] See above on page 71.
[336] The chiasm was noted too late in the project to change the initial decision.

A1 Jesus leaves and goes to Nazareth and teaches: 2 //s (leaving, teaching)
6:1 He left that place and came to his hometown, and his disciples followed him. 6:2 On the Sabbath he began to teach in the synagogue,

B2 Nazarenes amazed at wisdom and power 3 //s (amazement, Jesus's hands, Jesus's power)
and many who heard him were astounded. They said, "Where did this man get all this? What is this wisdom that has been given to him? What deeds of power are being done by his hands!

C1 Nazarenes comment on family 1 // (family/kin)
6:3 Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?"

D Nazarenes take offence
And they took offence at him.

C2 Jesus comments on kin
6:4 Then Jesus said to them, "Prophets are not without honour, except in their hometown, and among their own kin, and in their own house."

B2 Jesus can do no deed of power
6:5 And he could do no deed of power there, except that he laid his hands on a few sick people and cured them. 6:6 And he was amazed at their unbelief.

A2 Jesus leaves and teaches in villages
Then he went about among the villages teaching.

This is a clear chiasm with clear thematic parallels.

The second place that SUD units have to be combined is in D2. Again an error was perhaps made in forming the SUD. As noted when discussing the formation of the SUD, it was unclear as to whether to treat 32.1–2 as an introduction to the miracle story of JD or to treat it as part of the miracle story. It was decided to treat it as an introduction because they were two separate scenes.[337] This, however, may not have been the way that Mark viewed these units. As this is a fairly significant combining of units, a methodological problem arises: should one use the same probability figures as if the three units were one unit. To err on the side of caution, the probability figures from the LUD (which are higher) will be used for this level; this is indicated by the use of italics for these figures.

We are now ready to calculate the probability:.439 9 x.278 7 x.667 2 x.*071 4* x.105 5 x.278 7 x.439 9 x 44 (61-18 +1), or.003 323, which is.3%, or 1 in 333. If we were to move the chiasm one to the left the probability would be 1 x.177 0 x.*857 1* x.439 9 x.667 2 x.105 5 x.177 0 x 44, or.0365 8, which is 4% or 1 in 25.[338] This chiasm, however, is invalid because there are no parallels for the first level. If one were to eliminate the A level, then it would be viable, and the probability would be virtually the same (.0382 5). If one were to move the chiasm one to the right the probability would be 1 x.439 9 x.667 2 x.667 2 x.*371 4* x.439 9 x.667 2 x 44, or.939 2, which is 94%, or 1 in 1.06.[339] In other words it is likely that such a formation would occur even if one removed the first level which has zero parallels, which prevents the chiasm from being considered valid.

We shall now look at the first wisdom section:

---

[337] See above on page 73.
[338] 26–34.2 (0 //s), 27.1–33/34.1 (4 //s), *27.2–32 (1 //)*, 28.1–31 (2 //s), 28.2–30.2 (1 //s), 29.1–30.1 (5 //s), 29.2–29.4 (4 //s).
[339] 27.2–35.1 (0 //s), 28.1–34.1 (2 //s), 28.2–34.2 (1 //), 29.1–33/34.1 (1 //), *29.2–32 (5 //s)*, 29.3–31 (2 //s), 29.4–30.2 (1 //).

A1 PWS Paralytic healed (9.2): 17 //s
B1 GPS Teaching by sea (10.1): 4 //s
C1 DS Levi called (10.2): 6 //s
D1 GPS Many eat with Jesus (11.1): 3 //s
E1 WS Sinners controversy (11.2): 9 //s
F1 WS Fasting controversy (12.1): 13 //s
G1 WS New cloth (12.2): 6 //s
G2 WS New wine (12.3)
F2 WS Plucking controversy (13)
E2 PWS Healing controversy (14)
D2 GPS Healing by boat (15)
C2 DS Twelve appointed (16)
B2 GPS Jesus's family part one (17.1)
A2 WS Beelzebul controversy (17.2)

This chiasm is greatly expanded from the chiasm in the LUD. It now fully comprises all the controversy stories with the addition of the paralytic healed (9.2), which is also a controversy story, and the Beelzebul controversy (17.2). It is of note that the parallelism between these two new wings is the second highest in the SUD sample space (in the LUD they have the highest parallelism at twenty-three parallels). The division of the call of Levi (10) into its teaching (10.1) and call (10.2) parts allows for pairing with Jesus's family part one (17.1), the introduction of the Beelzebul controversy, and the appointment of the twelve (16). The segregation of the introduction to the sinner's controversy (11.1) allows for parallelism with the healing by the boat (15). Finally, the separation of the two parables from the fasting controversy allows for a new double hinge. Again note the repetitive GPS-DS-GPS pattern between the PWS units.

The probability for this chiasm is.001 1 x.177 0 x. 068 3 x. 278 7 x.019 7 x.004 9 x.068 3 x 48 (61 - 14 +1), or.000 000 005 775. This is an incredibly small figure and is equivalent to.000 000 6 %, or 1 in 166 666 666. In other words such a chiastic arrangement is certainly not by accident. It is by far the clearest chiasm so far. If one were to move this chiasm one to the left, that is, beginning with 9.1 (teaching at home), then the probability for the chiasm would be:.068 3 x.439 9 x.177 0 x.667 2 x.439 9 x. 439 9 x.439 9 x 48, or.014 50, which is 1% or roughly 1 in a 100.[340] If one were to move the chiasm one to the right, that is, beginning with 10.1 (teaching by the sea), then the probability for the chiasm would be:.278 7 x.667 2 x.278 7 x.667 2 x.177 0 x.439 9 x.439 9 x 48, or.056 847, which is 6%, or roughly 1 in 17.[341] While both of these chiasms are viable, and have fairly low probability figures, they do not compare to the extremely low figure of the original chiasm. It should also be noted that in moving the chiasm one to the left or the right, the new chiasms still share in the original hinge. If one moves the chiasm one additional unit to the right or left, then the two new chiasms become invalid, because the chiasm moved two to the left will have three levels with zero parallels, and the chiasm moved to the right would have two levels with zero

[340] 9.1–17.1 (6 //), 9.2–16 (2 //s), 10.1–15 (4 //s), 10.2–14 (1 //), 11.1–13 (2 //s), 11.2–12.3 (2 //s), 12.1–12.2 (2 //s).
[341] 10.1–18.1 (1 //), 10.2–17.2 (3 //s), 11.1–17.1 (16 //s), **11.2–16 (0 //s), 12.1–15 (0 //s), 12.2–14 (0 //s)**, 12.3–13 (7 //s).

parallels.[342] It will be shown in the following section that almost all viable chiasms are centred on the hinges or wings of the power and wisdom chiasms.

The second wisdom chaism, unlike the previous chiasms, is little changed from the LUD version. It runs as follows:

A1 Disciples declared family (18.2): 1 //
B1 Jesus teaches from boat (19): 4 //s
C1 Seed on ground (20): 10 //s
D1 Why teaching in parables (21): 5 //s
E1 Parable explained (22): 6 //s
F Lamps (23)
E2 Measure (24)
D2 Seed in secret (25)
C2 Mustard seed (26)
B2 Public taught in parables (27.1)
A2 Disciples taught everything (27.2)

The only difference is the opening section. The wings are two disciple stories in which the disciples have special status. They relate to the hinge in that the hinge is about the hidden being disclosed, and in A2 we are told all was disclosed to the disciples, who in turn have been given special status as the true family of the Lord in A1. The probability for this chiasm is.667 2 x.177 0 x.012 0 x.105 5 x.068 3 x 51, or.000 520 7, which is.05%, or 1 in 2000. This compares with the 14%, or 1 in 7 for basically the same chiasm in the LUD. The difference is the lower probability figures in the SUD. True, the above chiasm is one level longer, but this does not make much difference, because there is only one parallel in the new level (producing a figure of.6672), which is easily offset by the higher number for the ways the chiasm could occur in the sample space (51 instead of 28)—in fact the probability figure rises, because 51 x.667 2, that is, 34, is higher than 28. The SUD gives a better reflection, because though the above chiasm has two long units (20, 22), it also has six very short ones (18.2, 19, 23, 24, 27.1, and 27.2). In addition, the remaining three units (21, 25, and 26) are on the shorter side of medium length.

Again if one were to move the chiasm one to the left, that is, beginning with 18.1 (Jesus's family part two), then the probability would be:.667 2 x.439 9 x.667 2 x.042 1 x.177 0 x 51, or.074 42, which is roughly 7%, or 1 in 14.[343] This is a reasonable probability figure, but not as good as the.05% for the original chiasm. If one were to move the chiasm one further to the left, that is beginning with 17.2 (Beelzebul), it would be disqualified, because the D level (19/23) would have zero parallels. If one were to move the chiasm one to the right, that is, beginning with unit 19 (teaching from boat), then the probability would be:.068 3 x 1 x.278 7 x.019 7 x.177 0 x 51, or.003 385.[344] However, this chiasm would be disqualified, because there are zero parallels for the B level.

We now turn to the hinge section:

---

[342] Two to the left: 8.2–16 (1 //), 9.1–15 (3 //s), 9.2–14 16 //s, **10.1–13 (0 //s), 10.2–12.3 (0 //s)**, 11.1–12.2 (0 //s), 11.2–12.1 (7 //s). Two to the right: 10.2–18.2 (3 //s), 11.1–18.1 (3 //s), 11.2–17.2 (11 //s), 12.1–17.1 (1 //), **12.2–16 (0 //s), 12.3–15 (0 //)s,** 13–14 (11 //s).

[343] 18.1–27:1 (1 //), 18.2–26 (2 //s), 19–25 (1 //), 20–24 (7 //s), 21–23 (4 77s).

[344] 19–28 (6 //s), **20–27.2 (0 //s)**, 21–27.1 (3 //s), 22–26 (9 //s), 23–25 (4 //s).

A1 GPS Healing by a boat (15): 7 //s
B1 DS Twelve appointed (16): 4 //s
C1 GPS Jesus's family part one (17.1): 6 //s
D WS Beelzebul controversy (17.2)
C2 GPS Jesus's family part two (18.1)
B2 DS Disciples declared family (18.2)
A2 GPS Teaching from boat (19)

As with the previous chiasm, there is little difference between this one and the LUD version. There is one extra level due to the division of units 17 and 18. This allows an extra level involving Jesus's family, which clearly forms an inclusio around the Beelzebul story. There is also a very precise GPS-DS-GPS pattern on either side of the WS hinge. The probability for this chiasm is.042 1 x.177 0 x.068 3 x 53, or.026 97, which is 3%, or 1 in 33. While this is a higher probability figure than others we have looked at, it is still quite respectable, and much better than the LUD version which had a 2.67% chance of occurring. The difference here is primarily the extra level: the new Jesus's family level has six parallels, which has a probability of.0683.

Again, if one were to move the chiasm one to the left, and begin with the unit 14 (healing controversy), then the probability would be.439 9 x.278 7 x. 177 0 x 53, or 1.150, which is 102%.[345] In other words, it is likely that such a chiasm would occur once in the sample space. If one were to move the chiasm one to the right and begin with unit 16 (twelve appointed), then the probability would be.667 2 x.177 0 x.439 9 x 53, or 2.753, which is 275%.[346] In other words, such a chiasm is likely to occur roughly three times in the sample space.

To conclude, in the SUD there are five very viable chiasms centred on the main structural groupings of Mark 1:12–6:46. These chiasms cover the majority of the text: the only units not included are the final two stories (units 35 [Herod and John] and 36 [the feeding of the five thousand]). To calculate the probability of the five joined chiasms occurring, one multiplies the probability of each chiasm excluding the number of ways it can occur in the sample space, and multiplies this figure by the number of ways the five joined chiasms could occur in the sample space, which is 3. The calculation is thus.000 002 8 x.003 323 x.000 000 005 775 x.000 520 7 x.026 97 divided by the ways each chiasm could occur in the sample space, which is 45 x 44 x 48 x 51 x 53, and then multiplied by 3.[347] This figure is the incredibly small 9.335 e27(the "e" means one moves the decimal place 27 places to the left). In other words, the finding of five such chiasms joined simply could not occur by chance.

However, this leads to a potential problem. We now have two sets of chiasms that could not be due to chance, one based on the LUD and one based on the SUD. However, the two sets of chiasms can be seen as variations of the same chiastic structures, because many of the levels of the LUD chiasms remain intact in the SUD either wholly or with slight modifications. The ability to find various viable chiastic patterns centred on the power and wisdom sections, not only the LUD and SUD, but also chiastic structures that are almost centred on the chiastic structures in the SUD,[348] points to a limitation of the probability

[345] 14–18.2 (2 //s), 15–18.1 (3 //s), 16–17.2 (4 //s).
[346] 16–20 (1 //), 17.1–19 (4 //s), 17.2–18.2 (2 //s).
[347] 1st power chiasm, 2nd power chiasm, 1st wisdom chiasm, 2nd wisdom chiasm, and hinge chiasm respectively. See the calculations for each chiasm for how these figures were derived above on pages 88, 91, 93, and 95.
[348] The controversy chiasm one to the left or right, and the parable chiasm one to the left.

analysis: while the probability analysis can indicate that certain chiastic patterns centred on a certain location are not due to chance, it cannot determine the precise chiastic structure designed by the author. Rather, the probability analysis locates certain nexus of concentric patterns around a point that are unlikely, or extremely unlikely, due to chance. In other words, the probability analysis has shown that the material has been arranged by the author to allow concentric patterns in a confined area, in this case the central portions of the power and wisdom sections, but does not say precisely which patterns are the exact designs of the author. This last will require further analysis and comparison of the chiasms. However, first, it will be shown that the above chiastic arrangements are extremely rare, and that almost all of the viable three-, four-, and five-level chiasms in Mark 1:12–6:46 in the SUD are centred directly on or nearly directly on the hinges and wings of the power and wisdom chiasms.

Chiastic Patterns Are Rare

It may be that some people are still not convinced and still think that such chiastic arrangements are easy to find. They may also wish to argue that since in a couple of instances chiastic units were joined to create a chiasm, a viable chiastic structure is more likely to occur. To address these concerns a couple of experiments were performed. First, the parallelism for every possible three-level (A-B-C-B-A), four-level (A-B-C-D-C-B-A), and five-level (A-B-C-D-E-D-C-B-A) chiasm was looked at in the sample space, and second, for every possible five-level chiasm the first unit (A1) was joined with the unit preceding it. Naturally, this could not be done for the first possible five-level chiasm. The full results are found in appendix B.[349] The resulting probability figures were graded as follows: "N" for non-viable (chiasms where one of the levels had zero parallels), "L" for chiasms that were viable but likely to occur (a probability greater or equal to 1), "V" for viable (chiasms with a probability between.1 and 1), "G" for good (chiasms with a probability less than.1). It was noted in the previous section that in most cases when a chiasm was moved one to the left or right a non-viable chiasm occurred. However, in some cases viable chiasms did occur. The following analysis will show that almost all viable chiasms occur very close to the hinges or the wings of the chiasms centred on the power and wisdom chiasms, or the Beelzebul hinge section. Moving the chiasm one over to the right or left kept the new chiasms roughly centred on the power or wisdom sections, and in the strongest ones (those in the controversy section), a hinge unit was shared by the new chiasms, because the original chiasm was double hinged.[350]

For the 57 possible three-level chiasms, 24 (42%) were non-viable, a further 23 (40%) were likely to occur, and 10 (18%) were viable chiasms. There were no good chiasms. That being said, the viable chiasms are worth a closer look. Four of these chiasms centre on the hinges of the major chiasms analysed above ([chiasms beginning at units] 5, 11.2, 16, and 21), and a further two centre on the exact midpoint between the major chiasms (9.2 centred on Levi called, and 14 centred on the twelve being appointed). This means that 60% of the viable three-level chiasms are likely intentional because they fit the larger chiastic pattern analysed above, which in turn was proven to be by design.

---

[349] See below on page 392.

[350] The original chiasm has the new wine and the new cloth parables as the hinge (12.2–3); moving the chiasm one to the left has the fasting controversy (12.1) and new wine parable (12.2) as the hinge, and moving the chiasm one to the right has the new cloth parable (12.3) and the plucking controversy as the hinge (14). See above on page 93.

Of the remaining chiasms, two more occur in the parable section, which is not surprising because there is a reasonably high level of parallelism between most of the units. Both of these chiasms may be intentional. The first begins with the parable of the seed on ground (A1), and has the explanation of the seed on ground as the hinge (C), shown below in bold. This pair of units has the highest number of parallels for any pair in the SUD. The second wing (A2) is the parable of measure for measure, which like the seed on ground parable has the theme of receiving not only what one puts in, but more. The seed on ground (A1) and its explanation (C) form an inclusio around Jesus's explanation of why he teaches the public in parables (B1). In this unit we are also told that Jesus taught the disciples the secret of the kingdom of God. This unit is paired with the parable of the lamps (B2), which has the theme of Jesus's teaching being like a lamp, and we are told nothing is secret, except to be brought to light (4:22). The opposition of the two units would mean that the secret told the disciples (B1) is to be taught to others (B2). Consequently, the chiasm highlights the relationship between hearing Jesus's teaching (the word in A1 and C) and the effort required to properly understand it (bad soil versus good soil in A1 and C, and the measure for measure in A2). When one understands the teaching (B1), it is supposed to be communicated (B2) so it can grow and spread (the grain producing bountifully in A1 and C). That such a clear message could be produced by the opposition of the hinges and wings, and the B level, indicates that this chiasm is probably intentional.

The second chiasm (in italics below) in the parable section begins at the hinge of the previous chiasm (parable explained: C in bold below/A1 in italics), centres on the second wing of that chiasm (measure for measure: A2 in bold, C in italics), and has the mustard seed as the second wing (A2 in italics). A similar message is produced, because the B level of these two chiasms both have the theme of secrecy (lamps bringing secrets to light, and seed being sown in secret and producing plentifully). There is consequently a symmetrical repeating pattern in the parable section proper which produces the three viable chiasms. This can be shown as follows:[351]

A1 Seed on ground (20) **A1** (productivity)
  B1 Why teaching in parables (21) **B1** (secrecy)
    C1 Parable explained (22) **C** *A1* (productivity)
      D Lamps (23) **B2** *B1* (secrecy)
    C2 Measure (24) **A2** *C* (productivity)
  B2 Seed in secret (25) *B2* (secrecy)
A2 Mustard seed (26) *A2* (productivity)

However, it is only the one centred on D, the very centre of the parable section that can be extended beyond the parable section and produce a very low probability figure.[352]

We are now left with two remaining viable three-level chiasms, one beginning at 29.1 (Gerasene healed) and the other beginning at 31 (HW). The first has its hinge as the Gerasene disciple being refused as a disciple (29.3). This is very close to the hinge of the second miracle section, and, as will be discussed below, it can also be seen as part of the hinge.[353] The remaining chiasm centres on 32.2 (Jairus's mourners), and this may simply be

[351] The arrangement explains the large number of chiastic patterns proposed for this section; for example, see Lambrecht, "Vijf parabels," 45–48; Lambrecht, *Once More*, 86–87; Lambrecht, "Redaction,"; Standaert, *Marc*, 210–18; Stock, *Call*, 303–4. See Fay, "Introduction," 65, n. 3 for more references.

[352] See above on page 95.

[353] See below on page 119.

due to chance, because no clear message appears. This is made more likely because there is a possibility that unit 32 (JD) should not have been divided.[354]

To conclude, for the three-level chiasms, the majority are non-viable or likely, which left 18% viable. The majority of these centred either on the hinges or the mid-points between the major power and wisdom chiasms. Of the remaining four, three are closely related to these arrangements, and one may be due to chance. This would indicate that for three-level chiasms simply being viable, that is, having a probability less than 1 is significant. The following chart shows the number parallels required to reach a figure less than 1:

# of //s for one of the levels	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Probability for that number	.6672	.4399	.2787	.1770	.1055	.0683	.0421	.0290	.0197
x 57 (# of ways chiasm can occur)	38.030	25.074	15.886	10.089	6.014	3.893	2.400	1.653	1.123
1/	.0263	.0399	.0629	.0991	.1663	.2569	.4167	.6050	.8906
# of //s required to reach above figure for the remaining level	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
# of //s required to reach a probability of.1 for the remaining level	14	14	12	11	10	9	8	7	6

For example, if one level had one parallel, the other level would require nine parallels to be viable. This figure is reached by taking the probability for one parallel and multiplying it by the number of ways the chiasm can occur and dividing it by 1, because to calculate the probability of a three-level chiasm the formula is P (level A) x P (level B) x # of ways the parallel can occur in the sample space. Consequently, if level A has one parallel, its probability is.667 2, and the number of ways a three-level chiasm can occur is 57, and if we wish the probability of the chiasm to be 1, then the equation becomes: 1 (probability of chiasm) =.667 2 x P (level B) x 57. This is the same as 1 = 38.030 x P (level B), and thus P (level B) = 1/38.030.

We shall now turn to the 55 possible four-level chiasms, which produce a similar result to the three-level chiasms. The non-viable chiasms increase to 28, or 51%, which is to be expected. Of the remaining chiasms, 17 (31%) have a probability higher than 1, which leaves 11 viable chiasms. Of these 5 have a probability less than.1, or 10%, and can thus be rated good. Of these 5 chiasms three are centred on the major power and wisdom chiasms: one beginning at unit 11.1 (Jesus eats with many) and centred on unit 12.2 (the parable of the cloth), one beginning at unit 15 (healing of the boat) and centred on unit 17.2 (Beelzebul), which is equivalent to the major hinge chiasm analysed above, and one beginning at unit 20 (parable of seed on ground) and centred on unit 23 (parable of the lamps). Of the remaining two, one occurs in the parable section, begins with unit 21 (why Jesus teaches in parables) and is centred on unit 24 (measure for measure), which, as will be discussed below, can be seen as part of the hinge.[355] The last chiasm with a probability less than.1 begins with unit 32.3 (JD raised) and centres on 34.2 (twelve instructed). This last seems to fit into the pattern of the larger chiastic structure. The major power or wisdom sections (PWSn) are divided by material that forms the pattern general public story (GPS), disciple story (DS), general public story (GPS):

---

[354] See above on page 73.

[355] See below on page 114.

PWSn 1: Temptation (1)

GPS: Proclaiming in Galilee (2)
DS: Four called (3)
GPS: Teaching in Capernaum (4.1)

PWSn 2: Capernaum demoniac (4.2) – paralytic healed(9.2): hinge: GPS: Healing at Simon's (6)
DS: Jesus and the four in desert (7.1)
GPS: Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2)

GPS: Teaching by sea (10.1)
DS: Levi called (10.2)
GPS: Many eat with Jesus (11.1)

PWSn 3: Sinners controversy (11.2) – healing controversy (14)

GPS: Healing by boat (15)
DS: 12 appointed (16)
GPS: Jesus's family part one (17.1)

PWSn 4: Beelzebul controversy (17.2)

GPS: Jesus's family part two (18.1)
DS: Disciples declared family (18.2)
GPS: Teaching from boat (19)

PWSn 5: Seed on ground (20) – mustard seed (26)

GPS: Public taught in parables (27.1)
DS: Disciples taught everything (27.2)
GPS: Jesus leaves in boat (28.1)

PWSn 6: Stilling of storm (28.2) – JD (32.3): hinge area: GPS: News spreads in Gerasa (29.2)
DS: Gerasene not accepted (29.3)
GPS: Jesus returns in boat (30.1), and Jairus's request (30.2)

GPS: Teaching in Nazareth (33), and teaching in villages (34.1)[356]
DS: Twelve instructed (34.2)
GPS: Herod hears news (35.1), and death of John (35.2)

PWSn 7: Teaching and feeding of the 5000 (36.1–4)

In the analysis of the viable three-level chiasms, we noted that one centred on the call of Levi (10.1), one centred on the twelve appointed (16), and one centred on the Gerasene not accepted (29.3). The present analysis confirms the chiasm centred on the Gerasene not accepted (29.3), and adds a further chiasm centred on the twelve instructed (34.2). Consequently, all the four-level chiasms with a probability less than.1 have their hinges at the centre of the power and wisdom sections or the mid-points between them. This leaves only three of the GPS–DS–GPS dividing groups between the power and wisdom sections

[356] On the close relationship of these two units, see above on page 92.

without a viable chiasm centred on them, namely, the ones centred on the four called (3), the disciples declared family (18.2), and the disciples taught everything (27.2). These all do produce possible chiasms, but their probability is greater than 1, and thus one cannot judge through a probability analysis whether or not they were intentional.

It is also of note that of the six viable four-level chiasms three are directly associated with the larger chiastic structure: one beginning at unit 4.3 (news spreads in Galilee) and centred on unit 7.1 (Jesus and the four in desert), the hinge of the first power chiasm, one beginning at unit 9.1 (teaching at home) and centred on unit 10.2 (the call of Levi), mid-way between the first two power and wisdom sections, and one beginning at unit 29.1 (Gerasene healed) and centred on unit 29.4 (Gerasene proclaims), the hinge of the second power chiasm. Another one begins at unit 28.2 (stilling of storm) and centres on unit 29.3 (Gerasene not accepted), which is the hinge disciple story of the GPS–DS–GPS at the centre of the second power chiasm (PWSn 6 in the above outline).

This leaves two viable chiasms. The first begins at unit 19 (teaching from boat) and is centred on unit 22 (parable explained). This chiastic structure was discussed in the analysis of the three-level chiasms. This seems to be a false extension of what seems to be a very good smaller chiasm, since there is only one parallel between unit 19 (A1) and unit 25 (A2, seed in secret), which compares to the extremely high parallelism of the wing and hinge sections of the three-level chiasm (20 //s and 7 //s). The last viable chiasm begins with 34.2 (the instruction of the twelve), and has unit 35.2 (death of John) as its hinge. The last wing is unit 36.3, the feeding of the five thousand. This chiasm seems to be due to chance, because there is no clear connection between the wings, or between the wings and the hinge.

To conclude, the study of all the possible four-level chiasms shows that all of the chiasms with a probability less than.1, and the majority of the chiasms with a probability between.1 and 1, are connected with the larger chiastic pattern proposed for Mark 1:12–6:45.

We now turn to the five-level chiasms where the same pattern continues: of the 53 possible five-level chiasms 34 (64%) are non-viable, 4 (8%) have a value greater than 1, 10 (19%) have a probability between 1 and.1, and 5 (9%) have a probability less than.1. Of the latter, 4 of the 5 tie into the greater chiastic structure proposed: the first begins at unit 10.2 (call of Levi) and centres on unit 12.2 (new cloth), the second begins at unit 14 (healing controversy) and centres on unit 17.2 (Beelzebul), the third begins at unit 19 (teaching from boat) and centres on unit 23 (lamps), and the fourth begins with unit 32.1 (Jairus's messengers) and centres on unit 34.2 (twelve instructed). The fifth one begins at 32.2 (Jairus's mourners) and centres on 34.1 (teaching in villages). This is one over from the fourth one, and since there is some confusion as to how one is to divide the units, this nexus of parallelism probably indicates some sort of chiastic structure. If one combines 32.1-3 (JD), as was suggested for the second power chiasm, then the following chiasm emerges:

A1 HW (31): 2//s
B1 JD (32): 14 //s
C1 Teaching in Nazareth (33): 6 //s
D1 Teaching in villages (34.1): 2 //s
E Twelve instructed (34.2)
D2 Twelve proclaim (34.3)
C2 Herod hears of Jesus (35.1)
B2 Death of John (35.2)
A2 Twelve return (36.1)

This new chiasm connects the HW (A1) who had suffered for twelve years and believed with the twelve being instructed (E) and successfully returning (A2). This supplies the implication that the twelve's success was due to their belief. The new chiasm consequently provides a more satisfactory wing-hinge relationship than the fourth (Jairus's messengers [32.1]–twelve instructed [34.2]–twelve return [36.1]) and fifth (Jairus's mourners [32.2]–Teaching in villages [34.1]–Death of John [35.2]) chiasms. The probability for the new chiasm is.00233 if one uses the SUD figure for the combined units 32.1–3 (JD), or.0381 if uses the LUD figure for 32 (JD). Either way, it is a respectable figure and compares favourably with the figures for the fourth and fifth chiasms above,.08 and.02 respectively. Also, if JD is not divided, then the probability for the fifth chiasm centred on 34.1 becomes greater than 1 (1.27).[357] This would mean that all the five-level chiasms with a probability less than.1 are directly connected with the larger chiastic structure involving the power and wisdom sections.

Of the 10 viable chiasms with a value between 1 and.1, 6 have a probability greater than.7, in other words, a figure very close to 1. We have discussed three of the four remaining chiasms above in regards to the four-level chiasms: the first begins at unit 18.2 (disciples declared family) and centres on unit 22 (parable explained), the second begins at unit 28.1 (Jesus leaves in boat) and centres on unit 29.3 (Gerasene not accepted), and the third begins at unit 28.2 (stilling of storm) and centres on unit 29.4 (Gerasene proclaims).[358] The remaining chiasm begins at unit 1 (temptation) and centres on unit 4.2 (Capernaum demoniac). This chiasm also fits into the larger structure proposed above:

A1 PWS: The temptation (1)
B1 GPS: Proclaiming in Galilee (2)
C1 DS: Four called (3)
D1 GPS: Teaching in Capernaum (4.1)
E PWS: Capernaum demoniac (4.2)
D2 GPS: News spreads in Galilee (4.3)
C2 PWS (DS also?): Simon's mother-in-law (5)
B2 GPS: Healing at Simon's (6)
A2 DS (PWS also?): Jesus and the four in desert (7.1)

The first half of the chiasm clearly follows the PWS-GPS-DS-GPS-PWS sequencing. It also is possible that the sequencing continues on the other side. In the story of Simon's mother-in-law, the four are again named. Also, Simon's mother-in-law serves them. She thus functions as a disciple in that she is helping the mission. Thus it would seem that not only was Simon's house a base, but his whole family seems to support the mission, Paul mentions that Simon's wife accompanied Simon on his missionary activity. In addition, the healing of Simon's mother-in-law has the least of amount of parallelism with the other miracle stories. One could consequently be justified in classifying this unit as also being a disciple story. One would then have the pattern continue, with the only the final unit not falling into place. However, this unit also has a miraculous element: it contains one of the "I have come" sayings which point to Jesus's heavenly, that is, miraculous origins. Consequently one can argue that this chiasm falls into the pattern sequencing observed for the larger power and wisdom sections, and that all the five-level viable chiasms with a probability less than.7 are related to the larger chiastic structure proposed by this thesis.

---

[357] 30.2–35.2 (2 //s), 31–35.1 (2 //s), 32–34.3 (2 //s), 33–35.2 (3 //s):.439 9 x.439 9 x.439 9 x.278 7 x 53 = 1.27.
[358] These are the hinge, parable, and 2nd power chiasms; see above on pages 95, 95, and 91 respectively.

The Effect of Joining Units on Probability

In some cases units in the SUD were joined because they produced better chiasms with lower probability figures. However, there remains a question of the validity of such a move, and how such joining affects the probability calculations. In the section on how the units were divided, every effort was made to follow the natural divisions of the text and, when dividing the text into smaller units, to follow the principles that were used for the clear divisions of text.[359] The goal was to try to be as close to the type of divisions that the original author would have recognized. However, this is not a hard-and-fast science, and at times decisions were made that may have been the wrong decisions. One such case seems to have been the division of JD. While the scenes involving the messengers and the mourners are separate scenes to the actual miracle, it does not meant that they would have been considered introductory by Mark. In fact, as we shall see, they seem to be essential parts of the story.

In two other instances two adjoining units not directly connected—except by proximity—were joined: unit 8.2 (leper proclaims) with unit 9.1 (teaching at home), and unit 33 (teaching in Nazareth) with unit 34.1 (teaching in villages). In both cases the joined units have very similar themes: the first pair has the central theme of the crowds inhibiting action, and the second pair the theme of teaching. Furthermore, it was shown in both cases that the joined units formed smaller chiasms. These had high parallelism despite the shortness of each unit used to form the chiasms. In other words, it is likely that Mark saw the joined pairs as connected with each other. This definitely seems to be the case with the second pair, because the joining creates the GPS-DS-GPS pattern seen elsewhere in the gospel. This may also be the case with the healed leper. It was argued above that though the story of Simon's mother-in-law is foremost a healing story, it also has the elements of a disciple story: it takes place in the first disciple's home, the names of the first four disciples are repeated, and the mother-in-law serves them. The leper story also has disciple elements: the leper goes out and proclaims the word. The story of the leper is thus also the story of how someone became a follower. From this perspective, if one treats the leper story also as a disciple story, then one has the pattern GPS-DS-GPS with the units 7.2 (Jesus and the four proclaim), 8.1 (the story of the Leper) and the combined 8.2 and 9.1. Consequently, there is plenty of evidence that indicates that Mark saw the units joined in pairs as related to each other.

Naturally, the combining of units increases the likelihood of being able to form a viable chiasm. In order to see how much of an effect such combining would have, the first unit (A1) of all the five-level chiasms, except for the first one, was joined with its preceding unit—for example, in the chiasm beginning at unit 2, unit 1 was joined to unit 2. Since there is not the time to properly recalculate the exact number of parallels that each of the new A1s has with its matching A2, the parallels for each unit were simply added. This at times will give a higher number of parallels, because there will be instances where each of the combined units have the same parallel with the A2 unit. However, despite this advantage to the argument that the combining of units will significantly increase the likelihood of a viable chiasm, the results show the opposite.

Of the 52 chiasms, 19 (37%) were affected in some manner. However, in 8 of these chiasms the added unit supplied no new parallels, and thus the change was truly miniscule, because the only difference was that the number of ways such a chiasm could occur decreased from 53 to 52. In other words the difference was the original figure for the five-

[359] See above on page 67.

level chiasm multiplied by 52/53. In the analysis of the three-, four-, and five-level chiasms the results were classified as to whether they were completely non-viable or "N" if one of the levels had zero parallels, likely or "L" if the probability was greater than 1 (100%), viable or "V" if the probability was between 1 and.1, and good or "G" if the probability was less than.1. In only 4 (8%) instances did the addition of the extra unit change the category of the chiasm: (chiasm beginning) 11.1 from L (1.1) to G (.07), 15 from L (1.1) to V (.28), 16 from L (1.1) to V (.49), and 24 from N to L (1.6). Thus, in only one instance (chiasm beginning 11.1) did the addition of an extra unit to one of the levels make a chiasm a good chiasm. In other words, for the most part (92% of the time) the additional unit made no difference, and when it did, it simply intensified what was already there.

This brief survey of all the possible three-, four-, and five-level chiasms shows that good chiastic structures are not that common, but are in fact extremely rare. The survey also highlights an important principle: the longer the potential chiastic structure, the more likely it will be non-viable chiasm. The reverse is also true, the longer a chiasm with at least one parallel per level, the more likely it is to be a viable or a good chiasm, because there is greater chance of there not being any parallels on a level as the levels increase. For the three-level chiasms 42% did not have any parallels on one of their levels; for the four-level chiasms 51% and for the five-level chiasms, 64%. This has the consequence that a very long chiasm requires a lesser number of parallels per level to be viable. For a three-level chiasm the total number of parallels for each level had to be greater than ten, or on average five per level.[360] For an extremely long chiasm, even one parallel per level may give it a probability of less than.1. For example, in the SUD the probability of one parallel is.667 2, for two levels with one parallel it is.445 1 (.667 2 x.667 2), for three levels it is.297 0, for four it is.988 2, for five it is.132 2, for six it is.088 2, for seven it is.058 84, for eight it is.039 26, for nine it is.026 19, and for ten it is.017 47. However, it is only at the last number does a chiasm become viable, because a chiasm with ten pairs will contain twenty-one units (2 x 10 + 1 for the hinge), and thus could occur forty-one times in the sample space; thus.017 47 x 41 =.716 4. A sixteen-level chiasm would become a good chiasm, that is, with a probability less than.1, with just one parallel per level. If there are two parallels per level, then an eight-level chiasm will produce a good chiasm, and if there are three parallels per level, then a six-level chiasm will suffice.

Refining the Found Chiastic Structures

The analysis so far has shown that there are viable chiasms in both the LUD and SUD centred on the groupings of power and wisdom units in Mark 1:12–6:46. From the calculations, both the LUD and SUD chiasms could not occur by chance, but, as discussed above, this does not mean that the precise chiastic structures are the intention of Mark. This section will address this issue. One problem is the very strong possibility that the LUD and SUD units do not precisely match the units that Mark would have used to form chiastic structures. While every effort was made to divide units according to the natural divisions of the text, and consequently follow the divisions intended by the author, the process is not infallible. In fact the analysis of the LUD and SUD chiastic structures highlighted certain areas where the division of units is likely wrong: for example, the division of unit 32 (JD) into 32.1 (Jairus's messengers), 32.2 (Jairus's mourners), and 32.3 (JD raised); or the association of 34.1 (teaching in villages) with 34.2 (twelve instructed) rather than 33

[360] See appendix B below on page 392.

(teaching in Nazareth).[361] With this in mind a comparison of the various chiasms centred on the power and wisdom sections will be undertaken to see if there are similarities between the structures. The result will produce two new sets of units, the MLUD (modified LUD) and the MSUD (modified SUD), which will produce more precise chiastic structures that cover the whole of Mark 1:12–6:46.

It has already been noted in the analysis of potential chiastic structures in the LUD and SUD that the groupings of power and wisdom material form a rough chiastic pattern that potentially covers the whole of Mark 1:12–6:46. If this is the case then it would make sense that there is a parallel structural pattern between these groupings of material. The rough chiastic pattern runs as follows:

A1 Other material
B1 PS 1: 4 miracles
C1 Other material
D1 WS 1: 4 controversy stories
E Other material
D2 WS 2: 4 seed parables
C2 Other material
B2 PS 2: 4 miracles
A2 Other material

Further study showed that there were chiasms with low probability figures centred on the four power and wisdom groupings, and also in the hinge section (E). It was also noticed that the material between the power or wisdom chiasms and the other units that could be considered power or wisdom units (temptation [1], Beelzebul [17.2], and the feeding of the five thousand [36]) fell into the pattern GPS-DS-GPS. This in turn forms a very long chiastic pattern:

[361] See above on pages 71, 73, 92–93.

A1 PWSn 1: The temptation (1)
B1 GPS: Proclaiming in Galilee (2)
C1 DS: Four called (3)
D1 GPS: Teaching in Capernaum (4.1)
E1 PWSn 2: Four miracles
F1 GPS: Teaching by sea (10.1)
G1 DS: Levi called (10.2)
H1 GPS: Many eat with Jesus (11.1)
I1 PWSn 3: Four controversy stories
J1 GPS: Healing by boat (15)
K1 DS: 12 appointed (16)
L1 GPS: Jesus's family part one (17.1)
M PWSn 4: Beelzebul controversy (17.2)
GPS: Jesus's family part two (18.1)
K2 DS: Disciples declared family (18.2)
J2 GPS: Teaching from boat (19)
I2 PWSn 5: Four seed parables
H2 GPS: Public taught in parables (27.1)
G2 DS: Disciples taught everything (27.2)
F2GPS: Jesus leaves in boat (28.1)
E2 PWSn 6: Four miracles
D2 GPS: Teaching in Nazareth (33), and Teaching in villages (34.1)[362]
C2 DS: twelve instructed (34.2)
B2 GPS: Herod hears news (35.1), and Death of John (35.2)
A2 PWSn 7: Teaching and feeding of the 5000 (36.1–4)

This is a 1three-level chiastic structure based in the formal type of the material. It was also shown that the hinge areas of the two power chiasms also conformed to the pattern PWSn-GPS-DS-GPS-PWSn.[363] The above pattern based on formal type is likely Markan, because there are four clear groupings of material based on formal categories (the power and wisdom sections), which seem to be the formal categories used by Mark: both the LUD and the SUD for the most part fall clearly into one of these formal categories.[364] Consequently, there is a good argument to be made that the basis of the chiastic structures is formal type.

The above outlines suggest that there should be similarities between the two power sections (E level) and the two wisdom sections (I level). It has already been noted that the two power sections contain precisely four specific examples of Jesus's power, and that the two wisdom sections contain four controversies, and four seed parables sections respectively. It was just noted that the hinge areas of the two power sections conform to the pattern GPS-DS-GPS.[365] This invites a closer look at these sections for further similarities. The following table outlines further similarities for the two power sections:

[362] On the close relationship of these two units, see above on page 92.
[363] See above on pages 89 and 91.
[364] See above on page 69.
[365] See above on pages 89 and 91.

First Power Section	Second Power Section
Miracle 1 (4.2, E1): Capernaum demoniac: "Jesus rebuked him, saying, 'Be silent and come out of him!'" (1:25)	**Miracle 1** (28.2, D1): stilling of storm: "He woke up and rebuked the wind, and said to the sea, 'Peace! Be still!'" (4:39)
Miracle conclusion (4.2, E1): people amazed: "He commands even the unclean spirits and they obey him." (1:27)	***Miracle conclusion*** (28.2, D1): people filled with great awe: "Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" (4:41)
Public (4.3, F1): news spreads "throughout the surrounding region of Galilee" (1:28)	Public? (29.1 E1): Jesus arrives "to the country of the Gerasenes" (5:1)
Miracle 2 (5, G1): healing of Simon's mother-in-law (1.29–31)	**Miracle 2** (29.1, E1): Gerasene demoniac (5.2–13)
Public (6, H1): people gather to be healed: "The whole city was gathered at the door." (1:33)	Public (29.2, F1): people gather: " . . . and told it in the city and country. Then people came . . ." (5:14)
Disciples (7.1, I): Jesus suggests to the 4 they go and proclaim in neighbouring towns (1:38)	*Disciples* (29.3, G1): Jesus tells Gerasene who asked to become a disciple to go and proclaim what the Lord has done (5:19)
Public (7.2, H2): Jesus and the four proclaim in towns (1:39)	Public (29.4, H): Gerasene proclaims in Decapolis (5:20)
Miracle introduction (8.1, G2): leper "begs" Jesus to make him clean (1:40)	***Miracle introduction*** (30.1–2, G2–F2) Jairus "begged" Jesus repeatedly to heal his daughter (5:23)
Miracle 3 (8.1, G2): Leper healed through touch (1:41)	**Miracle 3** (31, E2): HW healed through touch (5:27)
Public (8.2, 9.1, F2): crowd inhibits Jesus's movement (1:45, 2.2)	Public (32.1–2, D2): Jesus controls crowds that inhibited movement (5.37 the pressing crowd, 5:40 the mourning crowd)
Miracle 4 (9.2, E2): Paralytic healed by being told to get up	**Miracle 4** (32.3, D2): JD healed by being told to get up (5:41)

The sequential order of the parallelism creates very clear structural parallelism between the two sections. However, since there are many scholars who think that one can find parallels between any two units of text, one needs to show that the above parallelism goes beyond coincidence. The probability of such parallelism can be calculated in a similar manner as that for chiastic structures. One first needs to arrange the parallels according to the units of the two sample spaces:

1: Capernaum demoniac (4.2)—Stilling of Storm (28.2): 12 //s
2: News spreads in Galilee (4.3)—Jesus arrives in the country of the Gerasenes (introduction to 29.1): 1//
3: Simon's mother-in-law (5)—Gerasene healed (29.1): 2 //s
4: Healing at Simon's (6)—News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): 3 //s
5: Jesus and the four in desert (7.1)—Gerasene not accepted (29.3): 1 //
6: Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2)—Gerasene proclaims (29.4): 3 //s
7: Leper healed (8.1)—Jairus's request (30) and HW (31): 11 //s
8: Leper proclaims (8.2) and teaching at home (9.1)—Jairus's messengers (32.1) and Jairus's mourners (32.2): 5 //s
9: Paralytic healed (9.2)—JD raised (32.3): 9//s

The SUD units for the first power section are used as the basis for the comparison. However, there is not exact matching with the units of the second power section, which creates a couple of slight problems. First, there is not a precise unit for the news spreading in Galilee. Consequently a new unit (introduction to 29.1) was created, and the similarity between the two units, namely, that both units mention a geographic area beginning with the letter "G," is assigned one parallel. In two other places units in the second power section are joined

(pairings 7 and 8) in order to match the first power section units, and the figures were counted afresh from the base data.

The two parallel sequences are like the two halves of a chiasm; the only difference is that they are separated from each other. This, however, does not affect the probability calculations except when calculating the different number of ways that such an arrangement could occur in the sample space. Using the SUD this would be (61 – 20 + 2)! / (61-20)! 1! 1! This equals, 43!/41!, or 43 x 42, that is, 1 806. Consequently, the probability using the SUD figures would be.005 5 x.667 2 x.439 9 x.278 7 x.667 2 x.278 7 x.009 8 x.105 5 x.019 7 x 180 6, or.000 003 077. In other words, it is extremely unlikely, even taking into account that there are three places where units are joined, that the above parallelism is by accident. Even if one were to use the LUD figures for the two levels with joined units, namely 7 and 8, the figure is still low (.005 5 x.667 2 x.439 9 x.278 7 x.667 2 x.278 7 x.*071 4* x.*371 4* x.019 7 x 1 806, or.000 078 93). In both instances the probability of such parallelism occurring by accident is so low that one must conclude it was by the design of the author.

The above parallel sequences present the possibility of an alternative chiastic structure for the second power section based on the structure of the first power section:

A1 Disciples taught everything (27.2): 3 //s
B1 Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): 1 //
C1 Stilling of Storm (28.2): 6 //s
D1 Jesus arrives by boat to the country of the Gerasenes (introduction to 29.1): 0 //s
E1 Gerasene healed (29.1): 14 //s
F1 News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): 4 //s
G Gerasene not accepted (29.3)
F2 Gerasene proclaims (29.4)
E2 Jairus's request (30.1–2) and HW (31)
D2 Jairus's messengers (32.1) and Jairus's mourners (32.2)
C2 JD raised (32.3)
B2 Teaching in Nazareth (33) and teaching in villages (34.1)
A2 Twelve instructed (34.2)

There are several differences between the above chiasm and the SUD chiasm. In the original chiasm, the Gerasene proclaims (29.4) was the hinge, all of JD (32.1–3) were combined into one unit, Jesus returns by boat (30.1), Jairus's request (30.2), and HW (31) were separate units, and the chiasm extended to include public taught in parables (27.1) and the twelve proclaimed (34.3). In the original chiasm the joining of units was justified: 32.1–3 is clearly one story, and 33 (teaching in Nazareth) and 34.1 (teaching in villages) were both teaching stories and formed a micro-chiastic structure. The joining of units above can be similarly justified, except perhaps for chiastic unit E2. While the joining of Jesus returning by boat (30.1) and Jairus's request (30.2) are clearly part of the same story, they are joined in E2 to the story of the HW (31), which is clearly a different story. However, that being said, units 30.1–2 can also be seen as an introduction to the story of the HW, because a key element of the story of the HW is the crowd, and the crowd is introduced in units 30.1–2. In other words, unit 30 functions as an introduction to both units 31 (HW) and 32 (JD).

Also, there is a major problem in that there is not any parallelism on the D level. The only possible parable for the D level is that one could argue that Jesus is arriving to the country of the Gerasenes is a GPS, because it shows Jesus going to specific region. However, there is no interaction with the people who live there until much later in the story. One would then have to eliminate this level and consequently one level of the parallelism with the first

power section. Also, it does not seem to make sense to separate Jesus arriving by boat to the country of the Gerasenes from 29.1 (Gerasene demoniac), and not separate the similar returning by boat to Galilee (30.1)

On the other hand, if one were to eliminate the D level, and join D1 to E1 and D2 to C2—in other words, the introductions to the Gerasene healed and JD to their respective miracles—then the following chiasm emerges:

A1 DS Disciples taught everything (27.2): 3 //s
B1 GPS Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): 1 //
C1 PS Stilling of Storm (28.2): 11 //s
D1 PS Gerasene healed (29.1): 19 //s
E1 GPS News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): 4 //s
F DS Gerasene not accepted (29.3)
E2 GPS Gerasene proclaims (29.4)
D2 PS Jairus's request (30.1–2) and HW (31)
C2 PS JD (32.1–3)
B2 GPS Teaching in Nazareth (33) and teaching in villages (34.1)
A2 DS Twelve instructed (34.2)

The first three levels are now the same as the original chiasm in the SUD. There is still the problem of the combining of units 30.1–2 (Jairus's request) and unit 31 (HW). However, there is now clear parallelism between the beginning of 29.1 (Gerasene demoniac), Jesus arriving by boat in Gerasa, and the beginning of 30–31 (Jairus's request and the HW), Jesus returning by boat to Galilee (30.1): there are five parallels, which is quite remarkable for two very short segments of text. Consequently the joining of units 30.1–2 and 31is perhaps justified. There is also now a very clear GPS-DS-GPS sequence in the centre of the chiasm, which more precisely matches the centre of the first power chiasm: in both chiasms the hinges have Jesus suggesting proclaiming (to the four in 7.1, and to the Gerasene in 29.3), and in both following units the proclaiming takes place (7.2 and 29.4):

A1 DS Four called (3): DS (disciples story)
B1 GPS Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): GPS
C1 PS Capernaum demoniac (4.2): PS (power story)
D1 GPS News spreads in Galilee (4.3): GPS
E1 PS Simon's mother-in-law (5): PS
F1 GPS Healing at Simon's (6): GPS
G DS Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): DS
F2 GPS Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): GPS
E2 PS Leper healed (8.1): PS
D2 GPS Leper proclaims (8.2), and teaching at home (9.1): GPS
C2 PS Paralytic healed (9.2): PS
B2 GPS Teaching by sea (10.1): GPS
A2 DS Levi called (10.2): DS

In fact, except for the D level above the chiastic structures would match perfectly. The removal of this level is justifiable: D1 (4.3, news spreads in Galilee) can be seen as part of C1 (Capernaum demoniac), because it is the reaction to the miracle, and D2 is problematic in that it is joined from two different stories. The result would then be two perfectly matching chiastic structures centred on the power sections, and whose chiastic units still conform to the natural divisions of the text.

We shall now turn to the two wisdom sections. The SUD chiasm for the controversy section has a very clear double hinge: the two parables of new cloth (12.2) and new wine (12.3). This forms the pattern: two controversy stories (11–12.1, sinners and fasting controversies), double hinge (12.2–3: two parables on old and new), two controversy stories (13–14: plucking and healing controversies). It has already been noted that the parable section contains four seed parable sections, which match not only the four controversies, but the four miracles in the power sections. Also, in the hinge area there are two non-seed parables: the parable of the lamps (23) and the parable of measure for measure (24). These two short parables have five parallels between them, and have long been noticed as different from the surrounding material.[366] There would be perfect parallelism between the wisdom sections, except for unit 21 (why Jesus teaches in parables). In this unit Jesus is alone with the disciples and says he has given the secret of the kingdom of God to the disciples, but teaches everyone else in parables (4:10–11). The explanation of the parable of the seed on ground (22) is then given. Consequently, both units take place while Jesus is alone with the disciples, and unit 21 can be seen as an introduction to unit 22: Jesus tells the disciples he is giving them the secret (21), and then we are given an example of the secret explained (22). Also, the parable of seed on ground (20) and its explanation (22) form an inclusion around unit 21, which in turn binds the three units closely together. From this perspective, the second wisdom section has the exact same structure as the controversy section: two seed parable sections (20–22), double hinge (23, 24), two seed parable sections (25, 26).

Thus so far, parallel chiastic structures have been found for the two power sections and the two wisdom sections. However, the structure for the power section is different from the wisdom section. The main difference is that the hinges for the power chiasms are single hinges and the hinges for the wisdom chiasms are double hinges. That being said, there are a couple of similarities between the chiastic structures, which point to a shared structure. First, though the two power chiasms do not have double hinges, the hinge of each chiasm has a "twin" in the following unit. In the first power chiasm the hinge is 7.1 (Jesus and the four in desert) where Jesus suggests proclaiming to the four, and this is followed by 7.2 (Jesus and the four proclaiming) where Jesus and the four proclaim. In the second power chiasm there is the same situation with 29.3 (Gerasene not accepted) and 29.4 (Gerasene proclaims). Consequently, in both power chiasms there is a potential double hinge. This, however, leaves one unit unaccounted for in each unit, namely unit 6 (healing at Simon's) in the first power chiasm and unit 29.2 (News spreads in Gerasa) in the second power chiasm. However, both these units are closely connected to their preceding units: the healing at Simon's takes place right after the healing of Simon's mother-in-law also at Simon's, which has lead some commentators to consider the two as one unit,[367] and 29.2 (News spreads in Gerasa) is the reaction, usually positive, to the healing of the Gerasene (29.1). This in turn creates the same basic pattern as the wisdom sections: two power or wisdom examples—double hinge—two power or wisdom examples:

---

[366] For example, Dewey, *Markan*, 151.

[367] See above on page 68.

A1 Specific example 1: Capernaum demoniac (4); sinners controversy (11); seed on ground (20); stilling of storm (28)

B1 Specific example 2: Simon's mother-in-law (5)/healing at Simon's (6); fasting controversy (12.1); why teaching in parables (21)/parable explained (22); Gerasene demoniac (29.1–2)

C1 Hinge 1: Jesus and the four in desert (7.1); new cloth (12.1); lamps (23); Gerasene not accepted (29.3)

C2 Hinge 2: Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2); new wine (12.2); measure (24); Gerasene proclaims (29.4)

B2 Specific example 3: Leper healed (8); plucking controversy (13); seed in secret (25); Jairus's request (30)/ HW (31)

A2 Specific example 4: Paralytic healed (9); healing controversy (14); mustard seed (26); JD (32).

There is also further parallelism between the power and wisdom sections. Both the second wisdom section and the second power section contain very clear inclusios: the parable of the seed on ground (20, 22) surrounding Jesus's explanation of the why he teaches in parables (21), and JD (30, 31) surrounding the HW (31). In addition, in both cases, to make the wisdom and power chiasms respectively structurally the same, the inclusios are in a sense treated as one unit: in the parable section, 20–22 are treated as two seed parable sections to match the two seed parables 25 (seed in secret) and 26 (mustard seed), and 30–32 are treated as two miracles to match the two miracles 28.2 (stilling of storm) and 29.1 (Gerasene healed). At first glance there does not appear to be any inclusios in the first power section or the first wisdom section; however a closer inspection reveals that there are. In the controversy section there is the following inclusio: controversy concerning the Sabbath (13, plucking controversy)—saying on Sabbath (2.26)—controversy concerning the Sabbath (34, healing controversy). The saying on the Sabbath is a second justifying principle for the plucking controversy (the first was the example of David [2:25–26]), but it equally applies to the healing controversy. In deciding on the chiastic units for the SUD the saying on the Sabbath was rejected as a sub-unit, but this may have been a mistake.[368] The first power section has the inclusio: story involving exorcism (4, Capernaum demoniac)—healing of Simon's mother-in-law (5)—story involving exorcism (6, healing at Simon's). There is total of seven parallels between units 4 and 6, which include the demons knowing who Jesus is and Jesus telling them to be quiet (1.24–25, 1:34).

In addition, the inclusios alternate in regards to which side of the hinge they are on: in the first power chiasm the inclusio is before the hinge, in first wisdom chiasm it is after the hinge, in the second wisdom chiasm it is before the hinge, and in the second power chiasm it is after the hinge. This creates a double mirroring pattern of the inclusio half of the chiasms (IH) and the non-inclusio half of the chiasms (NIH). For the first power and the first wisdom section the order is IH—NIH—N1H—IH. For the second wisdom section and the second power section the order is the same: IH—NIH—NIH—IH. Likewise for the two power sections it is IH—NIH—NIH—IH, and for the two wisdom sections it is NIH—IH—IH—NIH. In other words in both cases a chiastic pattern is created.

There is consequently a good amount of structural parallelism between the power and wisdom sections. These chiasms are very similar to the LUD chiasms, and can be seen as a refinement of the LUD chiasms, because this common chiastic structure is based primarily on the LUD units, but with slight modification. This in turn indicates that some of the divisions chosen for the LUD were perhaps wrong in that they do not equal the units Mark used for his chiasms. If this is the case, then the new chiastic structures for the LUD using

[368] See above on page 73.

these modified units should be stronger. This can be demonstrated through a probability analysis: if the probability figures are lower, then the chiasms will be stronger.

We shall begin with the first power chiasm. The LUD arrangement was as follows:

A1 Four called (3): 10 //s
  B1 Capernaum demoniac (4): 16 //s
    C1 Simon's mother-in-law (5): 4//s
      D1 Healing at Simon's (6): 7 //s
      D2 Jesus and the four in desert and proclaiming (7)
    C2 Leper healed (8)
  B2 Paralytic healed (9)
A2 Levi called (10)

From the above insights it appears the double hinge should be as follows: [369]

A1 Four called (3): 10 //s
  B1 Capernaum demoniac (4): 16 //s
    C1 Simon's mother-in-law (5) and healing at Simon's (6): 10//s
      D1 Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): 2 //s
      D2 Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2)
    C2 Leper healed (8)
  B2 Paralytic healed (9)
A2 Levi called (10)

The differences between the two chiasms occur in units C1, D1, and D2. There is a greater immediate similarity between D1 and D2 in the new chiasm even though the number of parallels goes down from seven to two.[370] However, the number of parallels goes up on the C level from four to ten, due to the high level of parallelism between the Healing at Simon's (6), and the Leper healed (8). In calculating the probability no adjustment will be made for two units being combined into one larger unit, because this is balanced by another unit being divided into two shorter units. The above new arrangement gives a probability of.095 2 x.025 4 x.095 2 x.746 0 x 29, or.004 980, which is.5 % or 1 in 200. This compares to.007 447, or.8% for the original section. In other words, a stronger chiasm is produced. This is also indicated by the stronger relationship between the wings and the hinges: in A1 Jesus tells the four they have been called to be fishers of men, and in D1 and D2 they are shown being fishers of men as they help Jesus proclaim.

For the second power section the chiasm in the LUD was as follows:

A1 Parable section conclusion (27): 4 //s
  B1 Stilling of the Storm (28): 16 //s
    C1 Gerasene Demoniac (29): 9 //s
      D Jairus's request (30)
    C2 HW (31)
  B2 JD (32)
A2 Teaching in Nazareth (33)

---

[369] This chiasm is proposed by Clark, "Criteria," 66–72. Dewey, *Markan*, 172–73, 175–80, criticizes this structure, because she thinks that the parallels between C1 and C2 are too weak, and she sees Simon's mother-in-law (5) and the healing at Simon's (6) as one unit.

[370] The low number of parallels is low partly because a couple of parallels were overlooked. The first is that both stories involve Jesus and the four, and the second is that the action begun in D1 (Jesus suggesting they proclaim) is completed in D2 (they go and proclaim).

From the above insights it appears the arrangement should be as follows:

A1 Parable section conclusion (27): 4 //s
  B1 Storm stilled (28): 16 //s
    C1 Gerasene demoniac (29.1–2): 16 //s
      D1 Gerasene not accepted (29.3): 1 //
      D2 Gerasene proclaims (29.4)
    C2 Jairus's request (30) and HW (31)
  B2 JD (32)
A2 Teaching in Nazareth (33)

In the new arrangement the C and D levels are completed rearranged. Again, the immediate parallelism between the hinges D1 and D2 in the new chiasm is not reflected by the low number of parallels.[371] In this chiasm the joining of units 30 and 31 is more than made up by unit 29 being divided into two sub-units. The probability for this chiasm is.477 8 x.025 4 x.025 4 x.857 1 x 29, or.007 62, which is.7% or 1 in a 130. This compares to.0468 for the original chiasm. Again, a stronger chiastic pattern is formed.

Turning to the two wisdom sections, the original controversy chiasm in the LUD ran as follows:

A1 Levi called (10): 5//s
  B1 Sinners controversy (11): 9 //s
    C1 Fasting controversy (12): 13//s
    C2 Plucking controversy (13)
  B2 Healing controversy (14)
A2 Healing by boat (15)

With the new double hinge, the chiasm is extended one level and becomes:[372]

A1 Levi called (10): 5//s
  B1 Sinners controversy (11): 9 //s
    C1 Fasting controversy (12.1): 13//s
      D1 New cloth (12.2): 6 //s
      D2 New wine (12.3)
    C2 Plucking controversy (13)
  B2 Healing controversy (14)
A2 Healing by boat (15)

Here the two parables are separated from the controversy material, and an immediately clear double hinge is created. This seems justified because the removal of the two parables from unit 12 (the fasting controversy) does not diminish its parallelism with unit 13 (the plucking controversy) in any way. The probability for this chiasm is.371 4 x.128 6 x.047 6 x.285 7 x 29, or.01884, which is 2 % or 1 in 53. This compares to.0705 or 7% for the original chiasm. Again, a much lower figure is produced.

Finally, the chiasm for the second wisdom section in the LUD was as follows:

---

[371] One important parallel was missed: the action begun in 29.3 (Jesus suggesting the Gerasene proclaim) is completed in 29.4 (the Gerasene proclaims).

[372] This chiasm is proposed by Lund, *Chiasmus*, 303–04.

A1 Teaching from boat (19): 4 //s
B1 Seed on ground (20): 10 //s
C1 Why teaching in parables (21): 5 //s
D1 Parable explained (22): 6 //s
E1 Lamp (23)
D2 Measure (24)
C2 Seed in secret (25)
B2 Mustard seed (26)
A2 Parable section conclusion (27)

With the new double hinge the chiasm becomes as follows:[373]

A1 Teaching from boat (19): 4 //s
B1 Seed on ground (20): 10 //s
C1 Why teaching in parables (21) and parable explained (22): 11 //s
D1 Lamp (23): 5 //s
D2 Measure (24)
C2 Seed in secret (25)
B2 Mustard seed (26)
A2 Parable section conclusion (27)

This arrangement produces more balance to the chiasm: the seed parables are exactly opposite to each other. The probability for this new arrangement is.477 8 x.095 2 x.071 4 x.371 4 x 29, or.034 98, which is 3 % or 1 in 29. This compares to.135 7 or 14% for the original chiasm. Yet again, a stronger chiastic structure is produced.

Consequently the minor adjustments to the four LUD chiasms produce in each case stronger chiastic structures, and not only that, but clearer and more aesthetically pleasing chiasms. Just as the probability figures for each chiasm are lower, the probability of all four chiasms occurring is lower. The four power and wisdom sections are now two perfectly symmetrical double chiasms. The first double unit runs from unit 3 (the call of Levi) to unit 15 (the healing by boat), that is, thirteen units long, and the second runs from unit 19 (teaching from boat) to unit 33 (teaching in Nazareth), that is, fifteen units long. The two double chiasms occupy twenty-eight (13 + 15) units, which leaves eight units. The number of different ways the two double chiasms could occur in the sample space is 10! / 8! 1! 1!, or 10 x 9, which is 90. The probability for such an arrangement is the probability of each chiasm excluding the number of ways it can occur multiplied by the number of ways the two double chiasms can occur. This is: (.004 980 / 29) x (.007 62 / 29) x (.018 84 / 29) x (.034 98 / 29) x 90, which is 3.183 e12 or 1 in 314 207 463 349. In other words, it is virtually impossible that such an arrangement could occur by chance.

Also, since the two double chiasms mirror each other, one can easily calculate the parallelism between them. The double chiasms line up as follows:

[373] This is also proposed by Dewey, *Markan*, 150–52.

1st Double Chiasm[374]	2nd Double Chiasm (mirror image)	# of //s	Probability
A Four called (3)	A Teaching in Nazareth (33)	6	.2857
B Capernaum demoniac (4)	B JD (32)	6	.2857
C Simon's mother-in-law (5) and Healing at Simon's (6)	C Jairus's request (30) and HW (31)	5	.3714
D Jesus and the four in desert (7.1)	D Gerasene proclaims (29.4)	1	.8571
D Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2)	D Gerasene not accepted (29.3)	1	.8571
C Leper healed (8)	C Gerasene Demoniac (29.1–2)	10	.0952
B Paralytic healed (9)	B Stilling of the Storm (28)	15	.0302
A Levi called (10)	A Parable section conclusion (27)	3	.5968
B Sinners controversy (11)	B Mustard seed (26)	2	.7460
C Fasting controversy (12.1)	C Seed in secret (25)	4	.4778
D New cloth (12.2)	D Measure (24)	4	.4778
D New wine (12.3)	D Lamp (23)	3	.5968
C Plucking controversy (13) (includes saying on Sabbath)	C Why teaching in parables (21) and parable explained (22)	6	.2857
B Healing controversy (14)	B Seed on ground (20)	4	.4778
A Healing by boat (15)	A Teaching from boat (19)	6	.2857

The probability for two such parallel sequences occurring in the sample space is the probabilities for each level multiplied by the number of ways it can occur in the sample space. The latter figure is the same as for the previous calculation because we are dealing with the same two double chiasms; in other words, it is 90. The probability is thus.000 013 63, which is.001%, or 1 in 73 355. In other words, it is extremely unlikely that this parallelism is by chance, and almost certain that the parallelism is due to the intent of the author.

The next question is whether the parallelism extends beyond this text to form a larger chiasm. Mark has set a definite pattern of a double hinge in the above segments, and it would thus make sense that the larger chiastic structure would also have a double hinge. It just so happens that the material between these two sections could be seen as two units. As it stands, in the LUD there are three units: 16 (twelve appointed), 17 (Beelzebul), 18 (on family). However, the last two are closely tied: the story of unit 18 actually begins in the introduction of unit 17. In other words the story of Jesus's family hearing Jesus is mad (17.1), and then going to see him (18.1), forms an inclusio around the Beelzebul story (17.2). From this perspective, since the first part of the story of Jesus's family (17.1) is also the introduction of the Beelzebul story (17), units 17–18 are part of the same story. Consequently, units 16 and 17–18 are possibly a double hinge, because they join the two double power and wisdom chiasms, which in turn mirror each other. If this is so then there are a very strong ten parallels between the two proposed hinges. This is supported by the similarity of the central themes of the two proposed hinges: in the first Jesus calls the twelve to proclaim and have

[374] This double chiasm is very similar to the one proposed by Clark, "Criteria," 66–71. His proposal is slightly askew as he maintains Dewey's structure for the controversy section, where the healing of the paralytic is considered a controversy; see above n. 325 on page 86. He also does not separate the two parables on old and new from the fasting controversy. Clark's double chiasm runs as follows: A1 call of four by sea (3), B1 healing of demoniac in Synagogue (4), C1 healing at four's house (5–6), D disciples find Jesus and they proclaim (7), C2 healing of leper (8), B2 healing of paralytic (9), A2 teaching, and call of Levi by sea (10)
E1/C3 Eating with sinners (11), D2 fasting (12), E2/C4 plucking grain (13), B3 healing on Sabbath (14), A3 healing by the sea (15).

authority over demons, and in the second the source of Jesus's authority over demons is questioned.

We shall now turn to the question of the wings. Just before the first double power and wisdom chiasm is unit 2 (Jesus proclaiming in Galilee). This is a likely candidate for a wing, because this unit announces Jesus's ministry in Galilee, and units 3–33, the material covered by the two double power and wisdom chiasms and the potential double hinge, describes this ministry. This whole section is in fact often labelled by commentators a preaching tour in Galilee.[375] The unit just after the second double power and wisdom is also about proclaiming: the twelve are instructed and sent out to proclaim on their own (34). This unit also has strong ties with the first unit of the double hinge, the twelve appointed (16): in unit 16 the twelve are appointed to proclaim and have authority over demons, and in unit 34 they are given this authority, instructed on proclaiming, and then sent out to put these new skills into practice.

Unit 34 can also be extended to include unit 35, on Herod and John, because there is an inclusio formed by units 34 (12 sent out on solo mission), 35 (Herod and John), and 36.1 (the twelve return from the solo mission). Also, unit 35 (on John and Herod) begins with what many commentators have described as a summary statement of the preceding preaching tour of Galilee: "King Herod heard of it, for Jesus's name had become known" (6:14).[376] While the "it" King Herod heard of could simply refer to the twelve's solo mission, it is more likely that all of Jesus's missionary work is referred to, because only Jesus is mentioned and the following sentences concern the question of who Jesus is. It also just happens that unit 2 begins "Now after John was arrested" (1:14), and unit 35 describes why John was arrested and what happened to him after his arrest. Furthermore, unit 36 resumes the story of the twelve's solo mission: "The apostles gathered around Jesus, and told him all that they had done and taught" (6:30). Consequently, we have an inclusio where unit 35 is enclosed by the story of the twelve's solo mission. From this perspective, one can see units 34, 35, and 36.1 as a single textual unit.

Along the same lines of reasoning unit 36 (5 000 fed) can be included, because there is a further inclusio around the feeding of the five thousand. At the beginning when the twelve return Jesus suggests they go to a deserted place in a boat (6:31); Jesus and the twelve then go to a deserted place (6.32). This recalls the units where Jesus suggests proclaiming and then the proclaiming is described: 7.1 (Jesus and the four in desert), 7.2 (Jesus and the four proclaim), 29.3 (Gerasene not accepted), and 29.4 (Gerasene proclaims), the double hinges of the power chiasms. After the feeding Jesus then sends the twelve alone in a boat to the other side (36.4). This combined with units 34 and 35 forms the following chiasm:

---

[375] For example, Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 82–84. Others also see 1:14–6:13 as a distinct section; for example Standaert, *Marc*, 25–64.

[376] For example, Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Her; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 303. In the Greek the "it" is understood: Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρῴδης.

A1 twelve instructed and sent out (34)
B1 Herod and John (35): banquet of death[377]
C1 Twelve return (36.1a, 6:30–31)
C2 Jesus and 12 leave in boat (36.1b, 6:32–33)
B2 Jesus teaches and feeds 5000 (36.2–3): banquet of life
A2 Twelve sent ahead (36.4)

This structure consequently connects the two banquets contained in units 35 and 36.2–3. Also just as the twelve being appointed (16) is connected to the twelve being instructed and sent out (34), the other hinge, the Beelzebul controversy (17–18) is connected to the feeding (36.2–3): both stories start with so many people coming and going that Jesus and the disciples could not even eat (3:20, 6:31). Consequently, it would seem that the feeding of the five thousand should be seen as part of the second wing. This is confirmed by the strong parallelism between units 16, 17, 18, the double hinge, and units 34, 35, 36 as the following table shows:

Unit	16	17	18
34	14	11	6
35	7	9	9
36	9	9	9

It would thus seem that one can propose the following double wing: 34, 35, and 36.1a (first half of the above chiasm), and 36.1b–4 (the second half of the above chiasm).

This leaves the first wing, which at this point only includes unit 2, Jesus proclaiming in Galilee. The unit before this unit is the temptation (1). This unit does not have much parallelism with the rest of sample space. However, in the LUD the temptation has the strongest parallelism with the Beelzebul controversy (17) and the feeding of the five thousand (36): five parallels with each. The temptation and Beelzebul both have the common themes of Satan and the Spirit, and of Satan being defeated. The temptation story also shows that Jesus's powers come from the Spirit; in other words, he is possessed by the Holy Spirit (n. b. that the Spirit "cast out" [1.12] Jesus into the desert), not by Satan as accused in the Beelzebul controversy (3.22). The temptation and the feeding both take place in the wilderness. In both people are served from heaven: in the temptation Jesus is served by angels (heavenly beings), and in the feeding, Jesus looks up to heaven and blesses the bread and fish that are then multiplied; in other words, the multiplication comes from heaven. This last also contradicts the accusation in the Beelzebul controversy that Jesus's powers come from Satan. Consequently, there are many links between the proposed double hinge and what appear to be double wings.

The addition of these hinges and wings adds the following to the double power and wisdom chiasms:

[377] The parallelism between the two banquets has been noted by others: John Bowman, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah* (vol. 8; Leiden: Brill, 1965), 155; Collins, *Mark*, 324; Robert M. Fowler, *Loaves and Fishes: The Feeding Stories in the Gospel of Mark* (vol. 54; Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1981), 85–86.

Wing 1 Temptation (1): 5 //s
Wing 2 (John's arrest and) proclaiming in Galilee (2): 10 //s
Double power and wisdom chiasm (3–15)
Hinge 1 Twelve appointed (16): 10 //s
Hinge 2 Beelzebul (17–18)
Double power and wisdom chiasm (19–33)
Wing 1 Twelve instructed and sent out (34), Herod and John (35), twelve return (36.1a)
Wing 2 Feeding of the 5000 (36.1b–4)

It is interesting that the new combined and divided units also total thirty-six (six for the 4 wings and 2 hinges, and thirty for the two double chiasms of 15 units [2 x 8 per chiasm -1 for the unit that joins them]), because thirty-six is three times twelve, and the number twelve figures prominently in the sample space (twelve appointed [16], twelve told the secret [21], twelve instructed [34], the HW suffered twelve years [31], JD is twelve years old [32], and there are twelve baskets of leftovers at the feeding [36]). This may also be an indication that the above structure is the design of Mark.

Be that as it may, there being thirty-six chiastic units means there is exactly the same number of units as in the original LUD sample space; these units will now be labelled the MLUD (modified longer unit division). Having the same number of units as the LUD means that the MLUD probability figures should be very similar to the LUD, because though some units are combined, which increases the likely number of parallels, the exact same number are divided, which decreases the likely number of parallels. The probability for the two parallel double power and wisdom chiasms has already been calculated, and this produced an incredibly small number. The probability of the above chiasm will be even smaller, especially as it can only occur one way. The figure would be 3.183 e12 / 90 (the number of ways the double chiasms could occur) x.3714 x.0952 x.0952 (for the three new levels of the chiasm), which is 1.190 e16. Arrangements with such probability figures simply do not occur by chance.

A comparison of the parallelism between the two double power and wisdom chiasms and the average for the LUD is instructive:

Number of parallels:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	15
Number of levels with that amount of parallels	0	2	1	2	3	2	4	0	0	0	3	1
Number of levels with parallelism ≥	0	18	16	15	13	10	8	4	4	4	4	1
% of levels with parallelism ≥	0[378]	100	89	83	72	56	44	22	22	22	22	6
% of LUD with same parallelism ≥	15	85	74	59	47	37	28	22	17	12	9	3

The comparison shows that the parallels between the double power and wisdom chiasms are consistently above the average in the LUD by roughly 15%. This may not sound like a huge amount, but one must remember that there are 630 possible pairings in the sample space. Consequently this increase is a significant increase, and it is reflected in the incredibly low probability figure.

To summarize so far, it was first noted that there was a basic structural arrangement as follows: other material—PS—WS—other material—WS—PS—other material. This can now be refined as follows:

[378] The percent figures in this column are the actual percent, not the percent greater than or equal to.

A1 Double wing
B1 Double PWS chiasm
C Double hinge
B2 Double PWS chiasm
A2 Double wing

The LUD chiasms were compared with the SUD chiasm, and a new modified LUD (MLUD) chiastic arrangement was proposed. This structure seems to be centred around the number 2, because not only is there a double hinge, double wings, and double power and wisdom chiasms, but the power and wisdom chiasms also have double hinges and pairs of power or wisdom stories:

A1 Double wing

B1 Double PWS chiasm:
A1 wing 1
B1 2 miracles with inclusio
C1 double hinge
B2 2 miracles
A2 wing 2
B3 2 controversy stories
C2 double hinge
B4 2 controversy stories with inclusio
A3 wing 3

C Double hinge

B2 Double PWS chiasm:
A1 wing 1
B1 2 seed parables with inclusio
C1 double hinge
B2 2 seed parables
A2 wing 2
B3 2 miracles
C2 double hinge
B4 2 miracles with inclusio
A3 wing 3

A2 Double wing

The clarity and simplicity of this structural arrangement with its repetitive doubling along with the extremely low probability figure indicate that this structure has to be by conscious design. Such arrangements simply do not happen by chance, and there is no evidence that the human subconscious works in such a manner. Consequently, I propose that the only reasonable conclusion is that the above was consciously designed by Mark.

In the probability analysis of the SUD units very clear chiastic patterns were found with very low probability figures. This leads to the question of the relationship between the above structure and these chiasms. The preceding analysis partially worked backwards from the power chiasms in the SUD to arrive at the above MLUD chiastic structure. In the following we shall now work forward to show how the SUD chiasms can be seen as expansions of the above chiastic structure.

The first step is the expansion of the double power and wisdom units, and the creating of a new hinge with unit next to the inclusio (in italics). This creates the following four structures:

A1 Capernaum demoniac (4.2–3)
B1 Simon's mother-in-law (5)
C1 Healing at Simon's (6)

D Jesus and the four in desert (7.1)
C2 Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2)
B2 Leper healed (8)
A2 Paralytic healed (9)

A1 Sinners controversy (11.2) 9 //s
B1 Fasting controversy (12) 5 //s
C1 New cloth (12.2) 2 //s
D New wine (12.3)
C2 Plucking controversy (13.1)
B2 Son of Man lord of the Sabbath (13.2)
A2 Healing controversy (14)

A1Seed on ground (20)
B1 Why Jesus teaches in parables(21)
C1 Parable explained (22)
D Lamp (23)
C2 Measure (24)
B2 Seed in secret (25)
A2 Mustard seed (26)

A1 Stilling of the Storm (28)
B1 Gerasene Demoniac (29)
C1 Gerasene not accepted (29.3)
D Gerasene proclaims (29.4)
C2 Jairus's request (30)
B2 HW (31)
A2 JD (32)

The two new power chiasms were discussed above when comparing the power sections,[379] and the parable chiasm is the same in both the LUD and SUD. The controversy chiasm on the other hand is completely new structure. The new structure is weaker than the original SUD chiasm. In that chiasm this section was the same as the MLUD chiasm: the fasting controversy (12.1) was paired with the plucking controversy, including the saying on the Sabbath (13.1–2), which produced thirteen parallels, and the new cloth parable (12.2) was paired with the new wine parable, which produced six parallels. Consequently, the degree of parallelism diminishes significantly, because the above will have higher probability figure and not be as strong as the original chiasm. On the other hand, Mark may not be as concerned to be making a better chiasm, but in having a certain structural similarity between the power and wisdom sections. That this is a concern has not only been shown in the MLUD chiasm, but also in the two power sections. Also, by considering the Sabbath saying (B2/13.2) as a separate unit, the parallelism with the parable section is increased: both have exactly seven clear and distinct wisdom units. With these changes to the original SUD chiasm, a very low probability figure is still produced: the calculation becomes.001 1 x.177 0 x. 068 3 x. 278 7 x.019 7 x.105 5 x.439 9 x 48, or.000 000 162 6, which though not as small as the original.000 000 005 775 is still an incredibly small number.

The next stage in the expansion of the MLUD was to expand the wing areas around the power and wisdom chiasms. This produces the GPS-DS-GPS pattern between the power and wisdom chiasms. The following shows these six joining sections and their origins in regards to the MLUD:

---

[379] See above on page 106.

GPS 1 Proclaiming in Galilee (2): unchanged: second unit of the double wing of whole chiasm
DS 1 Four called (3): unchanged: first wing of first power chiasm
GPS 2 Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): new: introduction to first miracle of the first power chiasm

GPS 3: Teaching by sea (10.1): new: first part of the wing joining the first power and wisdom chiasms
DS 2: Levi called (10.2): new: second part of the wing joining the first power and wisdom chiasms
GPS 4: Many eat with Jesus (11.1): new: introduction to the first controversy of the first wisdom chiasm

GPS 5: Healing by boat (15): unchanged: second wing of the first wisdom chiasm
DS 3: Twelve appointed (16): unchanged: first part of double hinge of whole chiasm
GPS 6: Jesus's family part one (17.1): new: introduction of second part of double hinge of whole chiasm

GPS 7: Jesus's family part two (18.1): new: first part of conclusion of the second part of the double hinge of the whole chiasm
DS 4: Disciples declared family (18.2): new: second part of conclusion of the second part of the double hinge of the whole chiasm
GPS 8: Teaching from boat (19): unchanged: first wing of the second wisdom chiasm

GPS 9: Public taught in parables (27.1): new: first part of wing joining the second wisdom and power chiasms
DS 5: Disciples taught everything (27.2): new: second part of wing joining the second wisdom and power chiasms
GPS 10: Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): new: introduction to first part of first miracle of second power chiasm

GPS 11: Teaching in Nazareth (33) and Teaching in villages (34.1): unchanged: second win of second power chiasm
DS 6: twelve instructed (34.2): new: first part of the first unit of the second wing of the whole chiasm
GPS 12: twelve proclaim (34.3), Herod and John (35.1–2) and twelve return (36.1a): new: second part of the first unit of the second wing of the whole chiasm

These joining units are exactly the same as in the SUD chiasms, except for the last grouping (GPS 11–12). The only other changes made to produce the SUD chiasms were the two power chiasms being extended by one level. In the first power chiasm a level was created with the conclusion to the first miracle (news spreads in Galilee, 4.3), the conclusion to the third miracle, and the introduction to the fourth miracle (leper proclaims, 8.2, and teaching at home, 9.1).[380] In the second power chiasm a level was created with the response to the second miracle (News spreads in Gerasa, 29.2) and the first part of the introduction to the third and fourth miracles (Jesus returns by boat, 30.1).[381] However, there is the strong possibility that these divisions extend these chiasms further than intended by Mark, because without these two expansions a second perfectly symmetrical chiastic structure covering the whole of Mark 1-12–6:46 is created:

[380] See above on page 88.
[381] See above on page 91.

A1 PWSn 1: Temptation (1)
B1 GPS 1. Proclaiming in Galilee (2)
C1 DS 1 Four called (3)
D1 GPS 2: Teaching in Capernaum (4.1)
E1 PWSn 2: A1 PS 1: Capernaum demoniac (4.2–3)
F1 PWSn 2: B1 PS 2: Simon's mother-in-law (5)
G1 PWSn 2: C1: Healing at Simon's (6)
H1 PWSn 2: D: Jesus and the four in desert (7.1)
I1 PWSn 2: C2: Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2)
J1 PWSn 2: B2 3: Leper healed (8)
K1 PWSn 2: A2 PS 4: Paralytic healed (9)
L1 GPS 3 Teaching by sea (10 1)
M1 DS 2 Levi called (10 2)
N1 GPS 4: Many eat with Jesus (11.1)
O1 PWSn 3: A1 CS 1: Sinners controversy (11.2)
P1 PWSn 3: B1 CS 2: Fasting controversy (12)
Q1 PWSn 3: C1: New cloth (12.2)
R1 PWSn 3: D: New wine (12.3)
S1 PWSn 3: C2 CS 3: Plucking grain (13.1)
T1 PWSn 3: B2: Son of Man lord of Sabbath (13.2)
U1 PWSn 3: A2 CS 4: Healing controversy (14)
V1 GPS 5: Healing by boat (15)
W1 DS 3 Twelve appointed (16)
X1 GPS 6: Jesus's family part one (17.1)
Y PWSn 4: Beelzebul controversy (17.2)
X2 GPS 7: Jesus's family part two (18.1)
W2 DS 4 Disciples declared family (18 2)
V2 GPS 8: Teaching from boat (19)
U2 PWSn 5: A1 SP1: Seed on ground (20)
T2 PWSn 5: B1 Why teaching in parables (21)
S2 PWSn 5: C1 SP2: Parable explained (22)
R2 PWSn 5: D Lamp (23)
Q2 PWSn 5: C2 Measure (24)
P2 PWSn 5: B2 SP3 Seed in secret (25)
O2 PWSn 5: A2 SP4 Mustard seed (26)
N2: GPS 9. Public taught in parables (27 1)
M2 DS 5 Disciples taught everything (27 2)
L2 GPS 10 Jesus leaves in boat (28.1)
K2 PWSn 6: A1 PS 1: Stilling of the Storm (28)
J2 PWSn 6: B1 PS 2: Gerasene Demoniac (29.1–2)
I2 PWSn 6: C1: Gerasene not accepted (29.3)
H2 PWSn 6: D: Gerasene proclaims (29.4)
G2 PWSn 6: C2: Jairus's request (30)
F2 PWSn 6: B2 PS 3: HW (31)
E2 PWSn 6: A2 PS 4: JD (32)
D2 GPS 11 Teaching in Nazareth (33) and Teaching in villages (34 1)
C2 DS 6 Twelve instructed (34 2)
B2 GPS 12. Twelve proclaim (34.3), Herod and John (35 1–2) and twelve return (36 1a)
A2 PWSn 7: Feeding of the 5000 (36.1b–4)

The above chiasm, the MSUD (modified SUD chiasm) is twenty-five levels, which produces precisely forty-nine chiastic units, which happens to be a very auspicious number in the Judaism of the time, because it is seven times seven. There are also exactly seven wisdom and power sections (in bold), 6 disciple units (in italics), and twelve general public units (normal script). This may be a coincidence, but considering the precise parallelism and

symmetry of the chiasm, it is extremely unlikely. The number of units, forty-nine, is almost exactly half way between the number of units in the LUD, thirty-six, and the number or units in the SUD, sixty-one. However, the calculation of the probability using the probability figures from either sample space is beyond the capabilities of my computer's calculator: the number is too small. However, if one only considered each level as having one parallel, the probability would the probability of one parallel, which is.8571 for the LUD and.6672 for the SUD, to the 24th power. The average for the probability figures is.7622, and thus a closer figure will be.7622 to the 24th power. For the LUD this is.02470, for the average it is.001488, and for the SUD it is.000 000 006 054. However, almost all of the levels have a much higher number of parallels, several in the double digits, which leads to figures very close to 0 whether one uses the LUD or SUD figures.

The perfect symmetry of MSUD allows for the creation of many smaller chiastic units, such as the power and wisdom chiasms, which, as we have seen, can be extended. These have been examined in the analysis of the SUD chiasms. For example, the chiasm centring on the first power chiasm Jesus and the four in the desert as the hinge (7.1, H1 [above]) runs from the temptation (1, A1) to the sinners controversy (11.2, O1).[382] The perfect symmetry also allows for other chiasms to be formed, some of which will be studied in the chapter on JD. Such patterning does not occur by chance, and this is proved by the probability calculations. The only conclusion is that the section 1:12–6:46 is very carefully crafted by Mark. The two chiastic structures that cover the whole section should not be seen as competing chiasms, but rather as variations of the same structure, because the second is clearly an expansion of the first. The two structures also give an insight as to how a complex chiastic pattern can be created. One can assume that Mark moved from the simpler to the complex. He probably began with a rough idea of a large chiasm based on examples of Jesus's power and wisdom. He may have decided upon two sets of four, because four can denote completeness—there are four directions, and four winds, etc. Be that as it may, he decided on four sections of power and wisdom material each with four examples of power or wisdom. He most likely had some idea of the hinge and wing sections at this point for both the whole chiasm and the power and wisdom chiasms. This forms the basis for the first chiastic structure with everything in pairs.[383] This fairly simple structure was then expanded upon. This would be fairly easy to do, because in oral societies storytellers have great freedom in telling a story as long as they keep the essentials of the story intact.[384] For example, they could add introductions or conclusions to stories, or expand introductions or conclusions already in the tradition. This last is especially necessary when joining separate units of tradition into a flowing narrative, because one needs to connect the units together. One special way that Mark joins units is through inclusio, which in turn is a type of chiasm. Through such expansion of the Jesus tradition Mark could quite easily create the sub-units necessary to extend his basic structure. The analysis of the material done to find natural divisions of the text support this: in many cases the introductions and conclusions can be removed from their respective units, and the remaining text tells a complete story.[385] Consequently, the above analysis not only produced two chiasms that almost certainly came from Mark, but it also points to how Mark created the chiastic patterns.

---

[382] See above on page 88.
[383] See above on page 119.
[384] See above on page 14.
[385] See above on page 71–72.

The goal of the above study was twofold. The first goal was to evaluate the criticism that one can find chiasms based on valid parallelism in any text. The second goal was to find chiastic patterns created by Mark. This last was a multi-stepped process beginning with a survey of Mark 1:12–6:46 and a division of this large section of Mark's gospel into its natural units. This produced the LUD set of units. These units were then analysed, and it was noted that the units fell into four broad formal types: specific examples of Jesus's power, specific examples of Jesus's wisdom, disciple stories, and general public stories. It was then noted that some of the LUD units contained a mixture of these types, and that they could in turn be divided according to the found formal categories. This produced a set of smaller units, the SUD. Then each LUD unit was compared with every other LUD unit for all possible parallels. Likewise each SUD unit was compared with every other SUD unit. This produced two sample spaces, one of 630 unit pairs (LUD) and one of 1830 unit pairs (SUD). For each sample space the probability for having a certain number of parallels or higher was determined. The raw material was now in place to perform probability analyses on potential chiasms.

First the overall arrangement of the units in Mark 1:12–6:46 was studied, and it was noted that there were two major groupings of specific examples of Jesus's power and two major groupings of specific examples of Jesus's wisdom. It was then noted that these power and wisdom sections formed a rough chiastic pattern. Chiasms were then looked for that centred on these groupings, and viable chiasms were found using the LUD and the SUD not only for each of the power and wisdom sections, but also for the hinge section of the rough chiastic pattern. It was shown that these patterns were indeed unique by demonstrating that if one moved the chiasms one to the left or right, unviable chiasms were produced. There were a few exceptions, but if one strayed further from the centre of the power and wisdom sections (two to the left or right) unviable chiasms were produced. In addition all potential three-, four-, and five-level chiasms were looked at in the SUD sample space. The results showed that almost all of the chiastic structures that were viable or good were related to the larger chiastic pattern forming, that is, centred on either the hinges or wings of the power and wisdom chiasms.

The fact that two sets of chiastic structures, one based on the LUD and one based on the SUD, formed viable chiastic structures, and the fact that there were also slight variations found in the study of all potential three-, four-, and five-level chiasms, lead to the question, which ones precisely were intended by Mark? The probability calculations lead to the conclusion that these patterns could not have occurred by accident, but the units allowed for slight variations of the patterns. To answer this question, the chiasms that centred on the power and wisdom sections were compared, and it was noted that there were certain commonalities. Furthermore, with minor adjustments, all the power and wisdom chiasms formed identical chiastic patterns. This lead to a re-evaluation of the LUD and SUD sets, and two new sets were proposed, the MLUD and the MSUD. With these adjustments to the LUD and SUD two related and perfectly symmetrical chiastic structures that covered the entire section Mark 1:12–6.46 were produced. The probability calculations led to only one conclusion: these patterns could not be due to chance, but rather had to be the design of someone, namely the author of the text, Mark.

In the course of the analysis several important observations were made. The first, and perhaps most important, observation for chiastic studies, was definite proof that the belief that one could find valid parallelism between any two units of text was completely groundless. It simply was not the case. True, it was shown that when comparing large units

of texts there was a strong likelihood that there would be at least one or two valid word or conceptual parallels between the units. However, no serious chiastic scholar would claim that such meagre parallelism showed good parallelism between two long units. This in turn led to proof of the common sense axiom that the longer two units are, the greater the number of parallels that were likely to be found. This leads to the criterion that the longer the units of text, the greater the number of parallels required for the parallelism to be considered good. This can also be worded as the shorter the units, the smaller the number of parallels required for the parallelism to be considered good.

It was also observed that the longer the chiasm, that is, the greater the number of levels of a chiasm, the less likely a viable chiasm could be found. Also, the longer the chiasm, the lower the number of parallels required for each level to produce a low probability figure, that is, a viable or good chiastic structure. This leads to the criterion that the longer the potential chiasm is, the more likely it is valid, and the related criterion that the longer the potential chiasm, the less parallels needed per level for the chiasm to be considered valid.

In the course of the analysis other criteria were also used. In order to determine the limits of a potential chiasm, it was argued that the wings should have parallelism with the hinge. The probability analysis did not allow for the parallelism between the hinge and the two wings to be used in the calculations. However, just as the likelihood of good parallelism between two units of any level is low, and will reduce the probability of the chiasm occurring by chance, the same reasoning also means that the higher the decree of parallelism between the hinge and the two wings, the lower the probability of the chiasm occurring by chance. An unquantifiable criterion was also used: the more the resulting chiastic structure supplied meaning, the more likely it was intended by the author.

Meaning, Purpose, and Implications

We shall now look at how meaning is created through chiastic structure in more detail. This study will not only shed light on what the units meant to Mark, but also provide insight into the purpose of using of chiastic structures. Then we will discuss the implications of the analysis of Mark 1:12–6:46 for the judging of other material. At this point a set of criteria will be proposed to judge potential chiasms in other material.

Chiasms and Meaning

It may sound odd to some people that structure can supply meaning. However, using structure to convey meaning is a common device in communication because the juxtaposition of items can highlight contrast or similarity. A chiastic pattern allows for the multiple juxtaposition of items: there are the units on the same level, units on adjacent levels, and the units in the hinge and wings. Many scholars of chiasm have observed that often the hinge along with the wings supplies the central theme of the chiasm.[386] This makes sense, because the hinge occupies the central position of the text. This is different from our writing style where the climax is usually located at the end of the text. Consequently, to judge whether the found chiastic structure also supplies meaning, one starts at the hinge, then looks at the wings to find a common theme, and then sees if the rest of the chiasm expands on the

[386] For example, Lund's first, second, and fourth laws: Lund, *Chiasmus*, 41. See above on page 59. Welch (Welch and McKinlay eds. *Bibliography*, 166) argues that a strong chiasm will emphasize the central element at the hinge, and that a chiasm is more complete when the wings create a strong sense of return; that is, the wings clearly define a boundary and give a sense of completeness.

theme. If it does, then this is an added indication that the found chiasm is not by chance, but carefully constructed by the author. Not only this, it will also tell us something about the meaning of the text for the author.

However, there is always the danger that one will read one's own interpretation into the text. To avoid this, one must adhere to the structural design when meaning is being sought. In other words, one must look to the hinge and wings for the central theme, and then see how the other levels support or comment on the central theme. One must also do one's best to understand the text from what one knows of the worldview of the author and her or his community. This is one of the reasons for spending time describing the historical framework in the previous chapter. Every effort in the following analyses was made not to impose my own interpretation onto the text, and to look at the texts from what we know of the culture of first century Christianity. One thing I can assure the reader is that the theology revealed through the chiasms does not reflect my own personal theology. For example, I do not believe in a day of judgement where some people will be thrown into eternal torment, nor do I believe a creation without any chaos or death is possible. Though postmodernists would argue that one cannot be completely objective, the goal of the historian who is trying to understand the past is to be as objective as possible and be aware of one's biases and assumptions.[387] In the following every effort was made to be objective, to discover what the chiasms meant for the author and not to impose personal interpretations.

We shall now examine three chiasms, namely, the two chiasms that cover the whole of the text from Mark 1:12–6.46, which are actually variations of the same chiastic structure, and the extended chiasm centred on the second power section.

We shall begin with MLUD chiasm:

[387] There is not the space to discuss in detail postmodern epistemology and its insights and shortcomings. A brief outline in regards to history was given in the introduction; see above on page 4.

A1 Double wing: temptation (1), proclaiming in Galilee (2)
B1 PC 1: A1 Four called (3)
C1 PC 1: B1 2 miracles: Capernaum demoniac (4), Simon's mother-in-law (5)/healing at Simon's (6)
D1 PC 1: C double hinge: Jesus and the four in desert (7.1), Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2)
E1 PC 1: B2 2 miracles: leper healed (8), paralytic healed (9)
F1 PC 1: A2/WC 1: A1 Levi called (10)
G1 WC 1: B1 2 controversy stories: sinners (11), fasting (12.1)
H1 WC 1: C double hinge: new cloth (12.2), new wine (12.3)
I1 WC 1: B2 2 controversy stories: plucking (13), healing (14)
J1 WC1: A2: healing by boat (15)
K: Double hinge: twelve appointed (16), Beelzebul (17)/on family (18)
J2 WC 2: A1: teaching from boat (19)
I2 WC 2: B1 2 seed parables: seed on ground (20), why Jesus teaches in parables (21)/parable explained (22)
H2 WC 2: C double hinge: lamps (23), measure for measure (24)
G2 WC 2: B2 2 seed parables: seed in secret (25), mustard seed (26)
F2 WC 2: A2/PC 2: A1 parable section conclusion (27)
E2 PC 2: B1 2 miracles: stilling of storm (28), Gerasene healed (29.1–2)
D2 PC 2: C double hinge: Gerasene not accepted (29.3), Gerasene proclaims (29.4)
C2 PC 2: B2 2 miracles: Jairus's request (31)/HW (31), JD (32)
B2 PC 2: A2 Nazareth (33)
A2 Double wing: twelve instructed and sent out (34)/ Herod and John (35), 5000 fed (36)

This chiasm though simple is also complex, because there are four imbedded chiasms: the two power chiasms (PC 1 and PC 2) and the two wisdom chiasms (WC 1 and WC 2). There are consequently four additional hinges (D1, H1, H2, and D2) in addition to the central hinge (K). These along with the wings are highlighted in bold above. The double hinge allows for a double focus in the chiasm. The double hinge consists of the stories of the twelve being appointed (16) and the Beelzebul controversy (17). This would indicate that the two central themes are discipleship, specifically Jesus's calling of disciples, and the nature of Jesus's powers. A quick survey shows that the theme of discipleship is found throughout the chiasm; it is found in the second wing, (A2, twelve instructed), the hinges of the power chiasms (D1, Jesus and the four in desert, and D2, Gerasene not accepted), the wings of the first power chiasm (B1, the four called, and F1, Levi called), and the first wing of the second power chiasm (F2, conclusion to the parable section). The second theme of the hinge, the source of Jesus's powers, is closely related to the identity of Jesus. This is not an explicit theme throughout the chiasm, but as we shall see, it is perhaps the central theme of the whole chiasm. We shall begin with the theme of discipleship and then turn to the theme of Jesus and his powers.

There is a very direct connection between the hinge story of Jesus appointing the twelve (16) and the story of Jesus instructing the twelve and sending them out (34), found in wing A2: in the first Jesus calls the twelve to proclaim and have authority over demons, and in the second they are instructed, given this authority, and go out and proclaim and heal. In other words, the wing unit completes the action of hinge unit. There is also very strong parallelism between the two units: eleven parallels. There is not a corresponding disciple story in the first wing; however, as previously noted, the story of the twelve being sent out encloses the story of Herod and John to form one unit, and this story is referenced in the second unit of the first wing, namely, Proclaiming in Galilee (2). This unit also has the

parallel of proclaiming, but of Jesus proclaiming. There is thus a movement from Jesus proclaiming (2) to the twelve proclaiming (34). This foreshadows the situation after Jesus's death, which in turn is foreshadowed by the death of John.

Jesus proclaiming in Galilee is also tied to his calling of disciples. As previously noted, the whole chiasm can be seen as description of Jesus's activity in Galilee, and the very first activity that Jesus is shown doing is calling the disciples, B1, the call of the four (3). This unit also has strong ties to the sending out of the twelve (34): in the first two pairs of disciples are called to be fishers of people, and in the second the twelve, which includes the four, are sent out in pairs "fishing" for people. The call of the four is also the first wing of the power chiasm. The second wing is the very similar story of Levi being called (F1), and the hinge (D1) is Jesus and the four in the desert (7.1), and Jesus and the four proclaiming (7:2). This chiastic structure consequently connects the disciples being called (wings) with the activity of proclaiming (hinge). This pattern is reflected in the wings and hinges of the second power chiasm. In the hinge (D2) the Gerasene is sent out to proclaim in the Decapolis by Jesus. There is consequently movement from proclaiming in Galilee to the people of Israel to proclaiming outside Israel to the Gentiles. There is thus a foreshadowing of the future when the mission is taken outside of Israel. There is, however, one difference between the Gerasene proclaiming and the twelve proclaiming: he is not accepted as a disciple by Jesus. This is in contrast to the twelve, who it is made clear in the first wing of the second power chiasm (F2), had everything explained to them. The second wing of the second power chiasm (B2) at first does not seem to have a connection: in this unit Jesus is rejected in Nazareth. However, this rejection is by his home town, and Jesus says prophets do not have honour "in their home town, among their own kin, and in their own house" (6:5). This too foreshadows Jesus's future rejection by the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem. Consequently, Mark through chiasm connects this rejection to the proclaiming in Gentile lands, a belief that is reflected elsewhere in early Christianity.[388]

To summarize, by following the theme of discipleship from the hinge to the wings of the main structure, and then to the hinges and wings of the two power chiasms, a coherent message appears: the call and training of disciples was an important part of Jesus's message, and was done in preparation for future events which would take the mission outside Israel. This explains the arrest and death of John being imbedded in the two wing units, Proclaiming in Galilee (2), and Jesus instructing the twelve and sending them out (34): John's arrest and death foreshadows Jesus's own arrest and death. Consequently, the call and training of the twelve can be seen as Jesus's foreknowledge of future events, namely, his own arrest and death. This knowledge is illustrated in the fasting controversy where Jesus says that the time will come when the Bridegroom (Jesus) will be taken away from the disciples and they will mourn (2:20). That such a consistent message can be produced from moving through the hinges and wings of the chiasm is further indication that the chiastic structure was created by the author: such things do not occur through chance, and there is no indication that the human sub-conscious structures texts in such a manner when composing them.

We shall now turn to the second theme, the nature of Jesus's power, the central question of the second unit of the double hinge of the whole chiasm (K, the Beelzebul

---

[388] Though this sentiment is not directly expressed, it seems to be an underlying theme in much of early Christian writing. See, for example, Paul's discussion of Israel's lack of belief in regards to the adoption of the Gentiles (Rom 9:1–11:36), or the rejection of Jesus by "the Jews" throughout the Gospel of John with Peter, the leader of the mission to the Gentile lands, especially commissioned at the end of the gospel.

controversy). In this story, Jesus is accused of being possessed by Satan and of deriving his powers come from Satan. Jesus makes clear the absurdity of this accusation: if Jesus is doing the work of Satan, then why is he undoing Satan's work by exorcising demons and healing people. The reader already knows that Jesus is not possessed by Satan, but by the Holy Spirit. This is emphasized in the first wing (A1) where the Spirit drives Jesus into the desert. Jesus is here under the control of the Holy Spirit, and the word Mark uses is the same word that is used elsewhere to describe Jesus exorcising demons.[389] In this wing we are told that Jesus resisted Satan's temptations; in other words, he is definitely not in league with Satan. Since the temptation story takes place while Jesus is possessed by the Holy Spirit, there is the implication that his ability to overcome Satan is in part due to the Holy Spirit. This brings us back to the Beelzebul controversy where Jesus sees the charge against him not as an attack on himself, but rather as an attack on the Holy Spirit: he tells his accusers that the one sin that will not be forgiven is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit (3:29), and Mark adds that Jesus said this because his accusers had said "He has an unclean spirit" (3:30). In other words, Jesus's power, that is, his ability to overcome the strong man (3:27), a reference to Satan, is due to his being possessed by the Holy Spirit. Consequently, the temptation story (A1) helps clarify the themes of the Beelzebul controversy (hinge K), namely, how Jesus conquers Satan. The theme of Jesus's powers being heavenly is subtly picked up in the second wing (A2), where Jesus looks up to heaven during the performance of the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand. Consequently, Jesus's powers come from heaven through the Holy Spirit, and not through Satan as charged.

Both the temptation (A1) and the feeding of the five thousand (A2) take place in the desert. However, there is big difference: in the temptation Jesus is alone, except for spiritual beings, and in the feeding he is surrounded by many people. During the feeding story Jesus teaches and passes around bread and fish. As many have pointed out, this has eucharistic symbolism.[390] There is also eschatological symbolism; the feeding recalls the eschatological banquet which will usher in the kingdom of God at the end of the era.[391] The collection of the twelve baskets is then seen as symbolizing the gathering of Israel at this time. The juxtaposition of A1 and A2 through chiasm would indicate that the purpose of the Spirit in the temptation story in the first wing is the gathering of Israel in the second wing. This in

---

[389] For example, 1:34, 35; 3:15, 22, 23.

[390] There is clear parallelism between the miracle and the Last Supper. On this parallelism see G. H. Boobyer, "The Eucharistic Interpretation of the Miracles of the Loaves in St. Mark's Gospel," 3 (1952): 161–71; Morna Dorothy Hooker, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 167; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 27A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 420; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:961–65; B. M. F. van Iersel, "Die wunderbare Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition," 7 (1964): 167–69. Against see Fowler, *Loaves*, 139–47; Gundry, *Mark*, 331–32; Jürgen Roloff, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus: Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), 241–51. The following highlights the parallelism between Mark 6:41 and 14:22: "**Taking** the five **loaves** and the two fish, he looked up to heaven, and **blessed** and **broke** the loaves, and **gave them to his disciples** to set before the people; and he divided the two fish among them all" (6:22); "While they were eating, he **took** a **loaf** of bread, and after **blessing** it he **broke** it, **gave it to them**, and said, '**Take**; this is my body'" (14:22). In both bread is taken, broken, blessed, and given to the disciples.

[391] On the eschatological banquet aspects of the feeding see Collins, *Mark*, 322–23. At this banquet the chaos monsters Leviathan and Behemoth are eaten. The Qumran Essenes also saw the ideal Israel as being arranged in thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens in preparation for the end Days (CD 13.1–2; 1QS 2:21–23, 1QSa 1:14–5, 28–29, 2:11–22; 1QM 3:13–4:4, 16–17). On these passages see Collins, *Mark*, 324–25; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 131.

turn is accomplished through Jesus's mission, which is described during the intervening material. This conclusion is also borne out through the juxtaposition of the two units of the first wing: right after Jesus has resisted the temptations (A1, 1), he begins proclaiming (A1, 2). In the second wing, there is the juxtaposition of the twelve proclaiming (A2,1) with the twelve helping Jesus with the miracle of the feeding (A2, 2, 6:41), the only time they help in the performance of a miracle. This would indicate a central role for the disciples in gathering the twelve tribes, a role emphasized by there being twelve disciples.[392]

This returns us to the theme of proclaiming. It was noted above that the wings and hinges of the two power chiasms focus on Jesus calling and training disciples and proclaiming. There is thus a connection made between Jesus's miraculous ability and these activities. If the purpose of the Spirit is to gather people through the mission, and if the miracles are due to the Spirit, this connection makes perfect sense: the purpose of the miracles is to bring people to the mission. The two central themes consequently become intertwined, which in turn explains the double nature of the chiastic pattern.

The Beelzebul story not only puts the emphasis on Jesus's powers being from God, but also on the nature of Jesus himself. This becomes a second theme of this unit. During his response to the accusation Jesus gives a parable where he says that in order to break in to a strong man's house, that is, Satan's house, one must first bind the strong man (3:27). The implication is that Jesus is the one who can bind Satan. However, the only person who can bind Satan, the representative of Evil, is God, specifically, God in his YHWH manifestation.[393] This would point to Jesus being the heavenly LORD messiah. This is also indicated in the feeding of the five thousand: Jesus is the one who will gather Israel, feed his people, and take them into the new kingdom of God.

The two power chiasms reinforce the idea of Jesus being the one who can bind Satan by showing his complete power over all manner of evil. In the miracles of the first power section (C1 and E1) he is seen as curing all types of disease: madness or possession (Capernaum demoniac, 4), fever (Simon's mother-in-law, 5), skin disease (leper, 8), physical injury or deformity (paralytic, 9), and all manner of people with "various diseases" and possession (healing at Simon's, 6). In the miracles of the second power section (E2 and C2), the greatness of his power over evil is shown: in the first miracle he is shown controlling the raging sea (stilling of storm, 28), an ancient symbol of evil and chaos,[394] in the second miracle he controls legions of demons (Gerasene demoniac 29.1–2),[395] in the third miracle

---

[392] The parallelism between the feeding and the Eucharist would indicate this; see above n. 390 on page 129.

[393] This is made clear in the Book of Job where YHWH says he is the only one who can control the chaos monsters Leviathan and Behemoth (40:15–34), who represent evil in its totality. See below n. 405 on page 135.

[394] In ancient Semitic mythology it was through the defeat and division into order of the watery chaos by the warrior storm god that creation was brought about. See, for example, Gen. 1:1–10, Ps 24:2, 104:5–9, and the Babylonian creation epic the *Enuma Elish*. The sea was symbolized by a seven headed dragon, which in Canaan and Israel was called Lotan/Leviathan. On this see Day, *God's Conflict*; John Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan* (vol. 265; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 98–102; John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2006), 184–88.

[395] The demons called legion have traditionally been taken by scholars as a reference to Rome, and consequently the herd of pigs as Jesus's triumph over the Roman Empire. This may be intended, but on a more literal level the prima facie meaning is that Jesus has control over Satan's armies of demons. As Collins, *Mark*, 269–70, points out, there is no theme of opposition to Rome in Mark. She too sees the primary meaning as showing Jesus's superiority over Satan and his kingdom. On the demons representing Roman armies, see Ched

even the fringe of his cloak emanates curing power (HW, 31),[396] and in the fourth miracle he is shown defeating death (JD, 32).[397] The question of Jesus's power becomes, "Who then is this, that even the wind and sea obey him?" (4:41). This question asked after the first miracle in the second power section echoes the question asked after the first miracle of the first power section, "What is this? A new teaching—with authority! He commands even the unclean spirits and they obey him" (1:27). Who then commands the wind and the sea and demons? The answer is not Satan, as suggested in the Beelzebul controversy, but rather someone stronger than Satan. In Israelite tradition, the only answer can be God, or more specifically, God in his storm warrior aspect, that is, God as YHWH, the LORD.[398] Consequently, the purpose of the miracles is not only to help bring people to the message, but also to show that Jesus is the LORD messiah.[399]

So far we have not discussed the two wisdom chiasms. These are connected to the Beelzebul story, because it is also a controversy story. The hinge of the controversy chiasm, (H1), the parables of new cloth and new wine, emphasizes that something new is occurring. The context of the parable would indicate that the Jesus's followers are the new wineskins into which the new wine is poured.[400] This seems to be a foreshadowing of the coming of the Spirit to the disciples after Jesus's death, which in turn will lead to a re-evaluation of the old ways, that is, the Torah. The coming of the Spirit is itself a foreshadowing of the eschatological kingdom of God where the Spirit will be poured out on all. This would fit with the interpretation of the cloth being a reference to the cosmos, and thus the new cloth would be a reference to the new cosmos ushered in with the kingdom of God.[401]

The two wings of the controversy section, teaching by the sea and the call of Levi (F1) and the healing by the boat (J1), at first seem to have no connection to the parables of old and new. However, if the new wine represents the Spirit, then this implies that Jesus's teaching (the first part of the call of Levi) and the Jesus's healing (the healing by the boat) are due to the Spirit. We have already seen how the later is true, but have not enquired whether Jesus's teaching comes from the Spirit. However, during Jesus's first demonstration of his teaching and power in the Capernaum story, Jesus's healing and teaching are interconnected. The audience are astounded at his teaching with authority, and after the

---

Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988), 191–92; Theissen, *Miracle*, 76.

[396] This recalls the Book of Similitudes where unrighteousness (evil) is said to vanish before the presence of the Son of Man (1 Enoch 49:2).

[397] This has long been noted; for example, Josef Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1981), 148; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), 102; Dieter Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987), 105. Francis J. Moloney (Moloney, *Mark*, 97–98) sees an increase in the power over evil Jesus exerts: nature, demons, incurable illness, death. Naluparayil (Jacob Chacko Naluparayil, *The Identity of Jesus in Mark: An Essay on Narrative Christology* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2000), 214) also sees the ascending nature of power. I would argue that the two outer ones show the greatest power, especially on a symbolic level, but agree that death is given prominence as the final miracle.

[398] See above n. 393 on page 130.

[399] For a more detailed discussion on these miracles in regards to Christology, see Naluparayil, *Identity*, 212–19, who comes to the same conclusion.

[400] This view is in accord with the interpretation of the new wine as being a symbol of salvation: Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (trans. S. H. Hooke; London: SCM, 1963), 118–19; Moloney, *Mark*, 67.

[401] Marcus, *Mark*, 238. The cosmos was often symbolized as a cloth; the old cloth would thus be the old cosmos. Marcus is here following Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (trans. S. H. Hooke; London: SCM, 1972), 117–18.

healing they are again astounded, and say, "What is this? A new teaching—with authority! He commands even the unclean spirits and they obey him." Here Jesus's teaching and healing are seen as part of the same thing, and as something new. This connection between Jesus's teaching and healing is also found in the greater structure of the chiasm: each half of the chiasm consists of a double overlapping power and wisdom chiasm. This opposition of power and wisdom miracles is common throughout the expanded chiastic structure.[402]

Thus, Jesus appears with new power and new wisdom, and the source of this power and wisdom is the Holy Spirit. The prime recipients of this teaching are the disciples, the new wineskins. This comes to the fore in the second wisdom chiasm. In the two wings the public is taught in parables (J2 and F2), but everything is explained to the disciples (F2). In the first part of the hinge (H2, parable of the lamps) Jesus says, however, that nothing is to remain secret, but all is to be disclosed (4:21–22). On the other hand, Jesus says in the second part of the hinge (H2, measure for measure) that this revealing does not produce instant understanding: effort is required and one must pay attention to what one hears (4:24). The secret referred to is the secret of the Kingdom, and this secret has been given to the twelve (4:11), who have had everything explained to them (F2). The hinge parable of the lamps indicates that they are to pass on Jesus's wisdom (the secret) so that all will be revealed; in other words, they are the lampstands that will hold the light of Jesus's teaching. This returns to the theme of proclaiming and the disciples: the disciples, more specifically, the twelve, have been chosen by Jesus, the LORD, and given a share of his power and wisdom to continue his work.

This brief analysis demonstrates that by concentrating on the wings and hinges of the above chiasm the central themes of the text emerge. The two central themes are Jesus choosing and instructing his disciples to continue the mission (twelve appointed) and the question of the source of Jesus's power and wisdom (Beelzebul controversy). This last is also the question of the true identity of Jesus, because there can be only one source of such great power. It is highly unlikely that the key points of these themes would fall precisely at the wings and hinges, and allow the type of analysis just done. Consequently, the meaning derived through this analysis is added proof of the chiasm being due to the author rather than the imagination of the chiastic scholar.

We shall now briefly look at the MSUD expansion of the above chiastic structure, before turning to a slightly more in-depth look at the second power section.[403] The MSUD chiasm is both an extension and a refinement of the above chiasm. The expanded chiasm produces the extended pattern PWSn-GPS-DS-GPS-PWSn, which allows meaning to be provided in a different manner. This repeated sequence places the disciple stories at the hinge of six sub-chiasms. There is also a clear progression in the DS stories: they are called in the first two (call of the four and the call of Levi), given special status in the middle two (twelve appointed, disciples declared family), and in the final two are given special teaching (disciples taught everything, twelve instructed). The chiastic pattern implies that the most important disciple stories are those where they are given special status. The sandwiching of each disciple story between two general public stories implies that the disciples are central to

---

[402] See for example the opposition of Jesus healing by a boat (15) with Jesus teaching from a boat (19) in the MSUD chiasm (see above on page 121) and SUD hinge chiasm (see aove on page 95), or the opposition of the healing at Simon's (6) with Jesus and the four proclaiming (7.2) in the SUD first power chiasm (see above on page 88). This panelling seems to indicate that the teaching and miracles are seen by Mark as two equal halves of Jesus's mission.

[403] This chiasm is found above on page 121.

Jesus's public mission. That there are precisely twelve GPS stories in the pattern is hardly a coincidence. The number twelve, as just noted, is a common theme throughout the whole chiasm, and the chiasm ends with twelve baskets of food being collected. The implication is that Jesus's mission to the public is a gathering a new Israel, and that the twelve disciples are to be new people in charge, the new patriarchs as it were.

The PWSn-GPS-DS-GPS-PWSn also puts a focus on the fact there are precisely seven power and wisdom sections. This emphasizes that something new is taking place: seven is the number of creation, and more precisely, the perfect order of creation.[404] These sections begin with Jesus alone with the Spirit and Satan in the desert (the temptation, 1), and end with Jesus in the desert with the five thousand (feeding of the five thousand, 36.1b–4). Many commentators have pointed out both the eschatological and eucharistic imagery of the feeding. The implication is that Jesus and his mission mark the end of the present creation and the beginning of the new creation, because the eschatological banquet marks both the end of the old corrupt creation—people feast on the defeated chaos monsters—and the beginning of the new creation without evil—represented by the chaos monsters. It is of note that this is the only miracle where the disciples help with the miracle: the twelve help Jesus pass out the bread and the fish. The implication is that the disciples, represented by the twelve with their function as the guardians of the LORD's new teaching, are helping bring about the eschatological banquet. The eucharistic imagery implies this is done through the eucharist: by proclaiming and bringing people into the banquet the new Israel, symbolized by the twelve baskets, is collected. Consequently, one way the MSUD chiasm re-enforces the themes of the MLUD chiasm and expands on them is through a type of numerology. We shall now turn to the second power chiasm.

The second power chiasm demonstrates the importance of adjacent units as well as the units opposite in the formation of meaning. We have already seen this above where the call of the four immediately following the introduction of Jesus proclaiming in Galilee shows the importance of calling disciples for the mission. Also, there was a linear progression in the disciple stories from calling, to special status, to training. Such observations remind one that a chiasm is a linear design as well as a concentric design: it proceeds in a linear manner from the first wing to the hinge and then to the second wing, and it is concentric in that the linear path from the first wing to the hinge is reversed from the hinge to the second wing. The second power chiasm in the SUD runs as follows:

---

[404] God created the cosmos in seven days (Gen 1:1–2.3). True, the actual creating part took place in six days, but seventh day is included as the day of rest. At the end of his activity "God saw everything that he had made, and indeed it was very good" (1:31). In other words, it was perfect. In the Ancient Near East the number seven represented the order of creation, because the prime symbols of this order were the heavenly luminaries that crossed the heavens on regular and orderly basis; there were the seven principle luminaries: the sun, the moon, and the five visible planets. A symbol of these seven *lumashu* or "constellations" was placed on the cornerstones of temples in Mesopotamia. On this see Baruch Halpern, "The Ritual Background of Zechariah's Temple Song," *CBQ* 40 (1978): 173–74. The order of creation was manifest at creation, and consequently in the seven days of Genesis 1.

A1 Public taught in parables (27.1)
B1 Disciples taught everything (27.2)
C1 Jesus leaves in boat (28.1)
D1 Stilling of the storm (28.2)
E1 Gerasene healed (29.1)
F1 News spreads in Gerasa (29.2)
G1 Gerasene not accepted (29.3)
H Gerasene proclaims (29.4)
G2 Jesus returns in boat (30.1)
F2 Jairus's request (30.2)
E2 HW (31)
D2 JD (32)
C2 Teaching in Nazareth (33), Teaching in villages (34.1)
B2 twelve instructed (34.2),
A2 twelve proclaim (34.3)

This chiasm has two longer linear sequences embedded in it—the story of Jesus in Gerasa (29:1–4), and the story of JD and the HW (30.1–32)—and three shorter linear sequences—the conclusion to the parable section (27:1–2), the stilling of the storm (28:1–2), and the twelve instructed and sent out (34.2–3). The hinge of this chiasm (H) is the last unit of the Gerasa sequence: the Gerasene proclaims in the Decapolis (29.4). This unit is connected to the wings A1 and A2 through the theme of proclaiming: in the first wing Jesus is teaching the public in parables (27.1), and in the second wing the twelve are proclaiming (34.3). Consequently there is an equation of Jesus's proclaiming (A1), the disciples proclaiming (A2), and the proclaiming by the Gerasene demoniac (G). However, the adjacent units modify this picture: in B1 and B2 we are told that the twelve were personally instructed in Jesus's teaching and on how to proclaim, and in G1 that the Gerasene disciple was not accepted as a follower. Consequently, his proclaiming is not of the same calibre as that of Jesus or the disciples. However, the importance of this untutored proclaiming is indicated by its hinge position. As argued above, this seems to be because it foreshadows the future Gentile mission, which will be under the guidance of the twelve, specifically, Peter, who is given prominence in Mark as the first disciple called (1:16), the first disciple in the list of the twelve (3:16), and the first disciple named in the three (5:37, 9:2, 14:33). The hinge placement also points to the goal of Jesus's mission (A1) and that of the disciples (A2): the eventual Gentile mission (H).

The placement of proclaiming and disciple stories at the wings and hinge of this chiasm of stories showing Jesus's power indicates that the purpose of the miracles is to bring people to the message. The response of the Gerasene demoniac to his healing is then the ideal response: he goes out and spreads the good news. Consequently, the ideal response to the miracles is the desire to become a disciple, which is shown by the ex-demoniac in the unit adjacent to the hinge (G1). This is in contrast to the unit before that (F1), where the Gerasene public responds to the miracle with fear and ask Jesus to leave. This in turn is in contrast to Jairus in the opposite chiastic unit F2, who responds about news of Jesus's power by desiring a miracle for his daughter. The crowds on the Galilee side of the sea (G2) also give a positive response: they do not want Jesus to go away, but rather they flock to him. In this they are like Jairus, who comes out of the crowd to beg for help. Consequently, these units in the hinge section can be seen as the different types of responses to Jesus and his exhibition of powers: being afraid and asking Jesus to leave (F1), asking Jesus for a miracle (F2), asking to become a disciple (G1), coming to Jesus to hear and see him (G2), and

proclaiming the good news (H). The chiastic pattern prioritizes these responses: those closest to the hinge are more important than those further away.

The theme of response to Jesus is closely related to the theme of belief: in regards to the response in Nazareth, we are told that Jesus was amazed at their unbelief (6:6). The theme of faith begins in D1 (stilling of storm, 28) where Jesus asks the disciples why they are afraid, and then asks them whether they have any faith (4:40). In the parallel unit D2 (JD, 32) this theme of fear and belief is again iterated: Jairus is told not to fear, but to believe instead (5:36). In the latter unit (D2) the faith is the faith that Jesus can perform the outstanding miracle of raising someone from the dead. However, in the former (D1) the miracle has already been performed, and the lack of faith is in regards to the response to the miracle. Jesus's comment is here followed by disciples asking the question, "Who then is this who then, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" (4:41). The lack of faith is thus connected with knowing who Jesus is. This miracle that shows Jesus as the master of the sea is paired with JD (D2), where Jesus shows his power over death. Jesus thus shows his power over the two main ancient Near Eastern symbols of evil and chaos: the sea and death. In Canaanite these two chaos figures are referred to as Lotan and Mot, which in Hebrew seem to become Leviathan and Behemoth.[405] The only person who has such power over these chaos monsters in the Israelite/Jewish tradition is the warrior storm God YHWH, that is, the LORD.[406] Consequently, the answer to the question posed by the witnesses to the storm is that Jesus is the LORD. Faith is thus tied to believing who Jesus is: if they knew who Jesus truly was, they would not be afraid, because the LORD was with them. Jesus also seems to be asking the same faith of Jairus: he is not so much asking him to believe that everything will be alright, but asking him to believe that he can conquer death.

In contrast to the disciples in D1 (stilling of the storm), in the following unit E1 (Gerasene healed) the legion of demons know who Jesus is and they come to Jesus and bow before him and hail him as the "Son of the most High God" (5:7). In the parallel miracle in E2 (HW, 31) the HW also falls down before Jesus, and Jesus commends her on her faith (5:33–34). The falling of the HW can thus be seen as a form of reverence. It is of note that we are told that the HW is afraid, yet still she comes forward and tells the "whole truth" (5:33). In other words, her fear does not prevent from proclaiming what happened to her. It is then that Jesus commends her on her faith (5:34). Consequently, the faith that Jesus commends her on can be seen as not just the faith of believing that she would be healed, but also of overcoming fear and coming forward. In this she is like Jairus in the following unit D2, who overcomes his fear through faith, and in contrast to the disciples, who were afraid and lacked faith in D1. With the HW the having of faith and overcoming fear is connected with proclaiming (telling the whole truth), and consequently to the central theme of the chiasm.

---

[405] There is some debate over what Behemoth actually represents. However, in the ancient Semitic world chaos/evil was represented by primarily two chaos monsters, a dragon in the sea (Tiamat in Babylonia, Lotan in Canaan/Phoenicia) and death (Erra in Babylonia and Mot in Canaan/Phoenicia). As the book of Job (40:15–34) presents two chaos monsters, one of which is Leviathan/Lotan, it makes sense that the other represents Mot especially as Behe-Moth could be seen to contain "Mot". Furthermore, Behemoth is associated with the desert (1 Enoch 60:7–8), as is Mot. Behemoth is usually seen as being translated as "great ox," but it is likely that there is a play on words. On Behemoth see Day, *Yahweh*, 102–103. On Lotan, also referred to as Yamm, and Mot see Helmer Ringgren, *Religions of the Ancient Near East* (trans. John Sturdy; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973), 148–49.

[406] See above n. 393 on page 130.

The parallel of the HW (D2) falling before Jesus with the Gerasene demoniac bowing before Jesus (D1) indicates the proper response to Jesus, namely, worship. The faith of the HW can thus be seen as foreshadowing the proper response to Jesus when his true identity is revealed. Likewise, the falling of Jairus in the preceding unit C1 (Jairus's request) can be seen in a similar manner. Here Jairus is exhibiting belief that Jesus can heal his daughter, and when Jesus later tells him not to be afraid, Jesus is asking him to continue the belief exhibited earlier. However, as mentioned above, there is an added element: it is now to believe that Jesus can raise the dead, and the belief begins to take on a christological aspect. Consequently, the kneeling of both the HW and Jairus before Jesus can be seen as anticipating the future worship of Jesus, which in turn will be considered the proper response to Jesus.

In the second half of the chiasm there is also a linear progression in the response of the crowd: it moves from positive to negative. In G2 (Jesus returns in boat, 30.1) the crowd is neutral to positive as they flock to Jesus (5:21), but by the end of F2 (Jairus's request, 30.2) the crowd is described in a negative way as pressing in on him (5:24). This negativity grows in the next two units. In E2 (HW) the crowd is again described as pressing in on Jesus, and not only this, as negatively inhibiting Jesus's goal of finding out who touched him (5:31); then in D2 (JD, 32) the crowd laughs at him (5:40). The negativity of the crowd culminates in C2 (teaching in Nazareth, 33), where the crowd takes offence at Jesus (6:3). As a whole the crowd is ever present in the second half of the chiasm, and the non GPS elements are enclosed by reference to the crowd: *Jesus returns to crowd (G2)*, Jairus's request (F2), *crowd presses in (end of F2)*, HW healed (first part of E2), *crowd inhibits Jesus (middle of E2)*, woman comes forward (end of E2), *Jesus dismissed crowd and mourning crowd laughs at Jesus (beginning of D2)*, JD raised (end of D2), *crowd (Nazarenes) rejects Jesus and Jesus teaches in villages (C2)*, twelve instructed (B2), *crowd taught and healed by disciples (A2)*. The same pattern does not occur in the first half of the chiasm. In the first part of the chiasm the units are instead divided by reference to the sea: *Jesus teaches crowd by sea (A1)*, Jesus teaches disciples (A1, B1), *Jesus leaves in boat to cross sea (C1)*, stilling of storm (D1), *Jesus arrives in boat to shore (beginning of E1)*, Gerasene healed (E1), *possessed pigs run into sea (end of E1)*, News spreads in Gerasa (F1), *Jesus enters boat (beginning of G1)*, Gerasene not accepted (G1), Gerasene proclaims (H), *Jesus returns in boat to crowd (G2)*. Consequently, just as the units in the second half of the chiasm are divided by references to the crowd, the units in the first half are divided by reference to the sea, and the sea is ever present in the first half just as the crowds are ever present in the second half. This creates a juxtaposition of crowd and sea, which in turn gives the crowd an added negative tone, because the sea is a symbol of evil and chaos.

As was just mentioned, the crowd in the second half of the chiasm becomes increasingly negative; this is culminated by the rejection of Jesus's by his own "kin" and "house" (6:4). This scene foreshadows Jesus later rejection by the crowd at the cross (15:13–14). Here it would seem that evil represented by the crowd succeeds; however, Jesus though killed will ultimately succeed and conquer evil represented by death. This too is foreshadowed in the present chiasm where Jesus conquers the sea, sends legions of demons into the sea, and raises the dead. Consequently, the miracles showing Jesus's power over evil and death likewise foreshadow the ultimate miracle, Jesus's own resurrection as the Son of God, and thus his power over evil and death. Consequently, though evil represented by the sea and the crowd surround Jesus in this section, he shows his power over them: he stills the storm (D1), and he dismisses the crowd and puts them outside (D2). There is thus a

foreshadowing of future events throughout the chiasm: Jesus's rejection by his people, his death, his resurrection, the recognition of Jesus as LORD, worship of Jesus as LORD, and the mission to the Gentiles.

This analysis has hopefully shown the importance of units adjacent to each other as well as units opposite each other in the chiastic arrangement, and how linear patterning interacts with concentric patterning. The multiple juxtaposition of units allows for similarity and contrast to be made on a theme, in this case the theme of response to Jesus and his exhibition of great power. The ultimate response is proclaiming. However, through the juxtaposition of units, this proclaiming becomes connected to having faith in who Jesus is and not being afraid. For Mark and his reader/hearers who were under persecution this connection between faith and proclaiming would prove important for the continuation of the mission.[407] This analysis also showed the importance of the miracles for showing who Jesus is, especially the most remarkable miracles, namely, the stilling of the storm and the raising of JD. We shall now turn to a discussion of the purpose of chiasm, and then discuss the implications of the preceding analyses for studying possible chiastic structures in other texts.

The Purpose of Chiasms

The preceding discussion of how chiasms generate meaning highlights one purpose for the chiastic structuring of text, namely, to express meaning. However, this creates a problem, because the above chiastic structures are not readily discernable. In fact the only chiastic structure that is readily discernable is the simple inclusio, the so-called Markan sandwich. Only those willing to pore over the written text would discover the chiasms would receive the meaning.[408] While one aspect of message of the parable section is that one must be willing to pay attention and put effort into understanding Jesus's teaching,[409] the effort required to work out the more detailed chiastic structures is too excessive to expect from the average hearer-reader of the gospel.

This leads to the conclusion that the meaning generated by the chiastic structures was not meant for everyone. The question then becomes who precisely was supposed to be able to grasp the structures and their meaning? The answer to this question lies I believe in another purpose for the use chiasm put forward by some scholars, namely, that chiasm was a mnemonic device.[410]

This suggestion has a lot to commend it. To begin with, in oral societies, such as that of the gospel writers, texts in general were not read aloud, but rather, spoken from memory. This would be especially true in situations where the cost of written texts might have been a concern. Mnemonic devices would thus be very useful, especially for memorizing long texts, and especially if one wished the text to be spoken as written. The above analysis of Mark

---

[407] See above on page 37.

[408] It is possible that oral performers could highlight parallel chiastic units by using different tones of voice, and that one could then hear chiasms.However, while it is true that ancient attention spans were greater than those today, I do not think that they would have been great enough to keep in mind the long chiastic structures discovered in this analysis. This is in agreement with Best, *Mark*, 106, who, however, uses this point to argue that chiastic structures are unlikely to be intended by the author, because in a predominantly oral society no author would expect his audience to be able to hear them.

[409] See above on page 132.

[410] For example, Cedric Hubbell Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958), 98. Here Whitman points out that if the concentric structuring in Homer was originally mnemonic and functional it was also an artistic principle. The last also applies to Mark.

1:12 –6:46 shows how chiasm would be a very useful aid to memory, because the chiastic structure supplies a structure on which to hang the units of the text. This could be done by first keeping in mind the simple of structure of four miracles, four controversies, four parables, and four miracles. This could then be expanded in the mind to include two introductory units, two hinge units, and two concluding units. Each power and wisdom section could then be expanded to two examples, double hinge, two examples. This is the MLUD chiasm that covers the whole section, which because of its structure, as just shown, is easily memorized. Once this is memorized, then the expansion of this into the MSUD is a fairly simple matter: one needs to remember the sequence of inclusios in the power and wisdom sections, and the GPS-DS-GPS pattern between the power and wisdom sections. With the MSUD one has all the units of the section in place, including most of the introductions and conclusions. Smaller chiastic structures, of which only a few were analysed,[411] would supply the framework for the memorization of individual units.

The above discussion shows how the analysis of Mark 1:12–6:46 supports the theory that the one of the purposes of chiasm is to aid memory. This theory also supplies a reason for having both a simpler chiastic structure for the whole of the section (MLUD) and a more complex structure (MSUD): the former supplies a framework for helping to memorize the latter. The complex nature of the chiastic structuring points to the reasonable assumption that those who had memorized the text for performance would be the primary people, if not the only people, who would know the full detail of the chiastic structuring. If this is the case, then those people who memorized and performed the gospel would also be the part of the few who would know the meaning of the chiastic structures.[412] This in turn would mean that the performers of the text were also the teachers of the text, as only they would know the chiastic structures, and consequently how the structures supplied meaning.

That the performer-teachers were the primary people, or perhaps even the only people, who would have fully understood the chiastic structuring also explains how knowledge of this structuring was lost. As the Christian communities increasingly adopted the codex and created libraries, the need for memorizing the text would decrease, and reading the text from the codex would replace performing the text from memory.[413] Such a scenario is highly plausible, because even with the chiastic structures to help memorize the text, such memorization would be a lot of work and would be seen as unnecessary with the ready availability of the codex. Also, once the gospel had been performed and its meaning explicated, the meaning would become owned by the community and passed on independently from the performance of the gospel. With the success of the codex there would be no need to know the chiastic structures for either mnemonic or didactic reasons.

Bastiaan M. F. van Iersel proposes that chiastic structuring may also have served a written purpose.[414] He argues that since Greek texts showed no indication of paragraph or

---

[411] See above on pages 90 and 92 for two examples.

[412] It should be noted that the meaning generated by the chiastic structureswas in many cases already known to the communities where the gospel was performed. For example, it is likely that Jesus's miracles were already understood to show that he was the Messiah.

[413] On the use of the codex see Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 118–19. On book production see also Alexander, "Ancient," 71–105; Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006). The codices were kept in a book cupboard, similar to the Jewish Torah shrine; see Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 117–18. On the need for book production, especially Hebrew scripture, see Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 119.

[414] van Iersel, "Concentric," 78–81.

other sectional breaks, there would be a need to indicate sections to the reciter of a text. One means this could be achieved is by having repetitive sections of text, such as an inclusio. As van Iersel points out, such demarcations would not be readily discernable upon first reading unless the parallel texts occur several times. He also notes that for such a method to work, the parallelism would have to be very clear. The analysis done on Mark 1.12–6:46 so far supports van Iersel to a degree. Some of the clearest parallelism in the chiastic structures are between units that demark sections of text; for example, the call of the four (2) and the call of Levi (10) surround the first miracle section, and the healing by a boat (15) and the teaching from a boat (19) surround the Beelzebul section. These two examples can also be extended: there is clear conceptual parallelism between call stories and the appointment of the twelve, and likewise between Jesus teaching by the sea (10.1), Jesus healing by a boat (15), Jesus teaching from a boat (19), and the conclusion of the parable section along with Jesus leaving by boat (27–28.1). These overlap and produce a combination of mention of the sea, a disciple story, and teaching or healing. This helps produce the GPS-DS-GPS pattern between the power and wisdom sections. A quick listing of the events in the dividing units shows their similarity: Jesus calls the four by the sea and teaches in Capernaum (3–4.1), Jesus teaches and calls Levi by the sea (10), Jesus heals many by the sea and appoints the twelve (15–16), Jesus declares disciples family and teaches by the sea (18.2–19), the disciples are taught everything and Jesus finishes teaching by the sea (27–28.1), and, finally, Jesus instructs the disciples who then teach, heal, and return, before departing by boat to a shore where Jesus teaches (34.2–36.2). Such clear demarcation of sections would help the reciter while performing in knowing when to pause.

While I agree with van Iersel that this is one of the functions of the chiastic structuring of texts, I do not think this is the primar purpose. I think the primary purpose is to aid in the memorization and the explication of the text. If the primary purpose were to aid readers of the text whether while reciting or otherwise, then there would be a good reason for maintaining knowledge of the chiastic structuring of the text. However, this knowledge seems to have been lost, and when the text was later divided up, the divisions do not match the chiastic divisions discovered in the analysis done here. For example, the later division of the gospels into chapters does not indicate any knowledge of the chiastic divisions: chapter one runs to the end of the healing of the leper (8), chapter two runs to the end of the plucking grain controversy (13), chapter three runs to the end of Jesus's pronouncement on family (18), chapter four runs to the end of the stilling of the storm (28), and chapter five runs to the end of the raising of JD (32). Surely if knowledge the chiastic structure were useful for reading the gospel text, then it would have been maintained. However, if the primary purpose was to aid memorization, then once the need to memorize the text disappeared so would the need for knowledge of the chiastic structure.

The Implications of the Analysis of Mark 1:12–6:46 for the Analysis of Other Chiasms in the Synoptic Gospels

In this section we will begin with a discussion of the portability of the results of the probability analysis to the rest of the Gospel of Mark and to the Gospels of Luke and Matthew. It will be argued that the results are indirectly portable. Then the implication of the results for judging smaller chiasms will be discussed. There it will be shown that for chiasms consisting of small chiastic units having only one parallel on average per level can in certain circumstances indicate a viable chiasm. Finally, the principles and criteria used and

discovered in the analysis of Mark 1:12–6:46 will be briefly discussed and enumerated. The result will provide a solid base from which to judge the probability of small chiastic structures in the synoptic gospels without performing a detailed probability analysis like that performed on Mark 1:12–6:46.

For the sake of brevity, the exact type of analysis performed on Mark 1:12–6:46 will not be duplicated when analyzing the other chiasms proposed in this thesis. The probability analysis looked at the specific probability for two sample spaces that comprised Mark 1:12–6:46. It would be useful if these figures could be used in judging chiastic structures in other texts. Naturally, this would depend on how similar the other texts were to Mark 1:12–6:46: the more similar the other texts are to Mark 1:12–6:46, the more likely the results will be similar. Consequently, the rest of Mark should produce similar results: it is a similar mix of miracles, sayings, confrontations, and disciple stories, and it also contains another story of someone's arrest and consequent death. Thus it is quite likely that an analysis of the whole gospel would produce a similar set of results.

The other two synoptic gospels are also very similar to Mark. This is partly due to their incorporation of most of Mark's gospel into their texts. It is combined with the Q gospel of sayings, and the "L" and "M" material, which is of a similar type and mix as that found in Mark's gospel. The sayings gospel Q contains specific examples of Jesus's wisdom and an expansion of the temptation story[415]. The gospels of Luke and Matthew consequently have a much higher ratio of wisdom material to other forms of material than Mark's gospel. Though it was noted that in both the LUD and SUD material of similar type was more likely to have greater parallelism, this was not always the case. Also, it should be pointed out that the parables in the parable section (20, 22–26) seem to have been chosen for their commonality of theme, and while there was a degree of parallelism between the parables in this section there was not a high degree of parallelism with other parables and sayings in Mark 1.12–6:45, such as, the parables of new cloth /12.2) and new wine (12.3). Consequently, the addition of the Q gospel to Mark is likely to cause an overall decrease in the average level of parallelism. For example, while the parables of the lost sheep (Luke 15:3–7, Matt 18:10–14), the lost coin (Luke 15:8–10), and the lost (or prodigal) son (15:11–32) will have a high degree of similarity with each other, they do not have much similarity with either the seed parables or the controversy stories, and certainly not the miracle stories, disciple stories, or general public stories.

The results from Mark 1:12–6:46 would thus not be directly portable to the gospels of Luke and Matthew, because there is likely to be a decrease in the overall level of parallelism because of the addition of Q. However, if the chiasms analysed in these gospels exhibit the same degree of parallelism that is was required to produce a good chiasm in Mark 1:12–6:46, then it is even more likely that the chiasms are good chiasms, because their true probability figures would be lower. Consequently, while the probability figures may not be directly portable, they are indirectly portable.

Another problem is that a lot of the chiasms studied in the rest of the thesis are for the most part smaller chiasms involving much smaller units of text. However, it was noted in comparing the SUD results with the LUD results that degree of parallelism was roughly double in the LUD, which corresponded to the average size of the LUD being roughly double that of the SUD. Mark 1:12–6:46 has 3 791 Greek words. Consequently, each unit in the LUD has on average roughly 105 Greek words, and each SUD unit has on average 62

[415] On the contents of Q see Robinson, et al., *Q*.

Greek words. In the NRSV the number of words is 4 653, which works out to roughly 129 words per LUD unit and 76 words per SUD unit. This would imply that in a chiasm where the average unit was half the number of words of the average SUD the probability for a particular number of parallels would be roughly half. If the same ratio holds, then for chiasm with on average 31 Greek words, or 38 English words in the NRSV, the probability of having two or more parallels would be roughly half of.44, that is,.22. Many of the chiasms looked at will have on average ten or so Greek words, which is.16 the size of the average SUD unit. Again if the same ratio holds, the probability in such a case of having one parallel or more would be.6672 x.16, or.1068, which would be roughly equivalent of having five parallels in the SUD. Naturally, the precise ratio is unlikely to hold as the size of the average unit gets smaller. However, even if it roughly holds, then it shows that even having one parallel per level in a small chiasm can be significant.

In the study of the all the possible three-level chiasms of the SUD only ten out of fifty-seven were viable, that is, had a probability less than 1, and zero had a probability less than.1. To become viable the total for the parallels of levels A and B had to be at least 10.[416] This means that on average levels A and B had to have five parallels each. In the analysis of the three-level chiasms it was shown that 90% of these viable chiasms roughly centred on hinges or wings of the larger chiastic structure. This would indicate for a three-level chiasm an average of five parallels is significant, because the larger chiastic structure was shown to be the design of Mark. This would indicate that even if the ratio of parallelism only roughly holds for chiasms with on average ten Greek words, having one parallel would be significant for a three-level chiasm, and certainly significant for chiasms with a greater number of levels.

Criteria Discovered in the Probability Analysis

We shall now turn to the principles or criteria used and discovered in the probability analysis of the chiastic structures in Mark 1:12–6:46. These will be briefly outlined and then enumerated. We will begin by looking at how the chiastic units were decided upon, then what parallels were considered valid, and finally the factors that lowered the probability figure for a chiasm.

The first step in any chiastic analysis is the division of text into chiastic units. The principle used in the analysis of the Mark 1:12–6:46 was that the units should follow as closely as possible the natural units of the text. This principle is based on the assumption that an author who chooses to use chiasm as a structuring device would follow the natural divisions of her or his text. In the above analysis of Mark 1:12–6:46 the chiastic units followed the natural divisions of the text. This does not mean that it will always be easy to decide where the division will occur precisely. However, for the most part the divisions were clear, and this produced the LUD set of units. After the chiastic analysis these units were modified. This may sound circular, and it is, in the sense that all reasoning partakes in the hermeneutic circle. But in this case the chiastic structures were firmly established based on the LUD and SUD units, and then it was observed that slight adjustment to these units would produce greater parallelism between the various chiastic structures. This led to the MLUD and MSUD chiastic structures. However, it should be noted that even with these adjustments the chiastic units still followed the natural divisions of the Markan text. That being said, there were a couple of instances where the chiastic units crossed the natural divisions

[416] See above on page 99.

between units of text. For example, the conclusion of the story of the leper (8) and the introduction of the story of the paralytic (9) were combined to form one unit.[417] In this case the joining of these two was justified by the similar nature of the two stories and the fact that they formed a micro-chiasm with strong parallelism. It was also the case that Mark often joined what seem liked separate units into one chiastic unit. This was often done through inclusio. For example, in both the MLUD and MSUD chiasms a unit that is three separate units from one perspective, the twelve proclaiming (34.3), Herod and John (35), and the twelve return (36.1), is actually a single unit. This last example also put to the lie that ancient authors followed a rule that chiastic units should be of similar size: this unit is a very long unit that parallels a much shorter unit announcing Jesus's ministry in Galilee after John's arrest. The rule that chiastic units should be of similar size appears to be the invention of modern aesthetic sensibilities rather than ancient reality. For both the MLUD and MSUD chiasms there was a large range in the size of units. The formal type of unit appeared to be more important to Mark, than its size.

The next stage in chiastic analysis was the enumeration of the parallels. In the above analysis of Mark 1:12–6:46 the widest possible range of parallelism was included. Also, no preference was given to word parallels over conceptual parallels. That being said, there were still some principles used in deciding on parallels, especially the word parallels. For example, overly common words were ignored, such as definite articles, certain prepositions, and very common verbs and nouns, because most units would contain these words. The same is true of certain conceptual parallels. For example, a parallel based on a story being about Jesus would be meaningless, because almost every unit is about Jesus—the one exception being the story of the death of John (35.2). The same would be true for the parallel that a scene contained the disciples, because they are in almost every scene. Consequently, the more a parallel is unique, the more meaningful the parallel. However, this principle is not very practical, because uniqueness is to a large degree subjective. For example, a certain author may like to use a particular word that is otherwise quite rare. Also, it leads to problems in comparing parallels: do two parallels of rare words equal four parallels of common words? This becomes even more complicated in regards to conceptual parallels. The best solution is to count as valid all parallels which are not overly common.

The probability analysis produced two main principles. The first has already been discussed, and confirmed common sense: the longer the two units compared, the greater the number of parallels needed for the parallelism to be considered significant. The second is not so obvious: the longer chiasm, the lower the number of parallels required to make the chiasm viable. Consequently, when judging a proposed chiastic structure both of these principles have to be taken into account.

Finally, two additional principles were taken into account in deciding on where to limit the chiasm. The first is based on observations made by other chiastic scholars, namely, that there is often parallelism between the hinge and the wings. In the chiasms studied in Mark 1:12–6:46 this did most often prove to be the case. In most cases the parallelism was strongest between the two wings. For example, in the MSUD chiasm the power chiasm is framed by the call of the four (3) and the call of Levi (10.2), and the wings had only moderate parallelism with the hinge, Jesus and the four in the desert (7.1).[418] However, in the SUD the chiasm is extended to include the temptation (1) and the controversy over eating

[417] See above on page 90.
[418] See above on page 119.

with sinners (11.2).[419] In this chiasm the clearest parallelism is between the first wing (temptation) and the hinge (Jesus and the four in desert)—in both Jesus is alone in the desert—and between the hinge and the second wing (sinners controversy)—both have Jesus saying why he has come. In this case the parallelism between the two wings is less clear. This example shows that chiasms can extend beyond the natural units of the text, in this case the grouping of power miracles. The same is true for the first wisdom chiasm in the SUD, which has the healing of the paralytic (9.2) and the Beelzebul controversy (17.2) as its wings, and the parables of new wine and new cloth (12.2) as the hinge.[420] In this case there is extremely strong parallelism between the two wings, and only very weak parallelism between the wings and the hinge. This shows that strong parallelism between wings and hinge is not always the case. Also, it is of note that the first power and wisdom chiasms in the SUD overlap: here not only are the natural boundaries of the text crossed (the groupings of power and wisdom material), but also the boundaries of the chiasms themselves are crossed.

The second way that the boundaries of a possible chiasm were determined was to see if the resulting chiasm seemed to produce a coherent message. The way a chiasm can generate meaning was looked at in detail above.[421] In the chiasms analysed the hinge and wings highlighted the central theme of the chiasm, and the intervening levels expanded on this theme. Since it is unlikely that the hinge and wings could point to the central theme of a randomly selected sequence of units, the finding of such meaning in a proposed chiasm is further indication that chiasm is due to design. This principle, or rather, assumption, should, however, be used with caution: it is best used to bolster already fairly strong evidence. Also, if a chiasm has been shown to be by design on other grounds, and if its juxtaposition of units does produce a clear message, then it is likely this represents the intent of the author. This last becomes even more plausible if the message also fits with what we know of the theology of early Christianity of the time.

The above principles and observations can be summarized by the following criteria:

1) The chiastic units should conform as closely as possible to the natural units of the text. Where they do not, there should be text-based justification for the proposed chiastic units.
2) Valid parallels can be almost anything; however, parallels that are common to most of the chiastic units are invalid.
3) The average parallelism of the chiastic levels should be significant, that is, above normal.
4) The longer the chiastic units in a chiasm, the greater the number of parallels needed for the parallelism to be significant.
5) The greater the number of chiastic levels, the lower the number of parallels needed for the parallelism to be significant.
6) Parallelism between the wings and hinge is further indication of the validity of a proposed chiasm.

---

[419] See above on page 93.
[420] See above on page 93.
[421] See above on page 125.

7) If a coherent message in line with what is already known of the historical milieu of the text is produced by a chiasm, then this is further indication of the validity of the proposed chiasm.

Criteria three through five are interconnected, and will vary from text to text. The analysis of Mark 1:12–6:46, as argued above, provides a rough guide for the synoptic gospels. The applicability to other texts will depend on how similar they are to the synoptic gospels. Texts with a similar degree of repetitiveness in regards to the formal types of units, conceptual parallels, and usage of words will likely produce similar results. Since the synoptic gospels are highly repetitive in this regard, the number of parallels considered to be significant in Mark 1.12–6:46 will be more than significant for most texts. A separate study will be needed for various types of texts to produce a more universal guide.

Luke's and Matthew's Adaption of Mark's Chiastic Structures

We shall now examine how Luke and Matthew adapt the material found in Mark 1:12–6:46. First, we shall look at Luke's adaptation of Mark's first double power and wisdom chiasm. Luke's changes to the Markan text will demonstrate that Luke was well aware of the chiastic structures used by Mark. This example will also show the usefulness of chiastic analysis for redaction criticism. Second, we shall look at Luke's use of Mark's second power and wisdom chiasm. Luke extends this chiasm to include other miracle traditions and the transfiguration. As such, the extended chiasm includes versions of all three raising-of-the-dead stories found in the synoptic gospels. Third, we shall look at Matthew's adaption of the Markan miracle, which he completely rearranges; yet despite this he manages to create a similar chiastic pattern of pairing wisdom and miracle material. These last two studies will be useful in the later analysis of the individual stories, because they will indicate the importance and meaning the raising-of-the-dead stories to Luke and Matthew.

Luke's Adaptation of Mark's First Power and Wisdom Chiasm

Luke changes Mark's structure, but retains the basic outline, and in doing so shows his awareness of the Mark's structures. Luke keeps the two pairs of double power and wisdom chiasms, but separates them, and forms two separate structures. We shall begin with the first double chiasm and show how Luke's changes to Mark show not only his awareness of Mark's chiasm, but also that the changes to the Markan text for the most part seem to be for chiastic purposes. We shall then look at the second double chiasm, which has more significant changes and which is surrounded by other material to form a large chiastic structure. This structure will include all three raising-of-the-dead stories, and will provide insight into Luke's use and understanding of these stories.

Luke keeps the general structure of the first double power and wisdom chiasm, but makes three major changes and many minor changes. Luke's chiasm runs as follows:

A1 Jesus proclaims in Galilee and report spreads (4:14–15)
B1 Jesus in Nazareth: Elijah and Elisha not sent to Israel (4:16–27)
(Nazarenes try to kill Jesus [4:28])
C1 Healing of Demoniac in Synagogue (4:32–37)
D1 Healing of Simon's Mother in law, crowd healed, withdrawal (4:37–44)
E1 Call of the three; a miraculous catch of fish (5:1–5:11)
D2 Healing of Leper, crowds taught and cured, Jesus withdraws (5:12–16)
C2 Healing/controversy of Paralytic (5:17–5:26)
B2 Call of Levi (5:27–28)
C3 Controversy of eating with sinners (5:29–32)
D3 Controversy of not fasting (5:33–35)
E2 Old and new: three parables (5:36–39)
D4 Controversy of plucking grain (6:1–6:5)
C4 Controversy over healing on Sabbath (6:6–6:10)
(Pharisees filled with fury and plot against Jesus [6:11])
B3 Jesus calls twelve: a new Israel (6:12–16)
A2 Great crowd from all over gather on plain (6:17–19)

The first major change involves the wings. Because Luke separates the Beelzebul hinge section and the second double power and wisdom chiasm from the above section, he needs a new frame for the section. His new framing inclusio is formed by keeping Jesus proclaiming in Galilee at the beginning of the section (A1) and ending the section with the crowd gathering on the plain (A2). Luke changes Mark's text for the first wing (proclaiming in Galilee). This creates strong parallelism between the two units. Luke adds the phrase, "a report about Jesus spread though all the surrounding country" (4:14), which creates a parallel with A2 (crowd gathering on the plain) where we are told that "a great multitude of people from all of Judea, Jerusalem, and the coast of Tyre and Sidon" had come to hear him and be healed (6:17–18). Thus, in both people from all the surrounding country come to hear Jesus. The change to Mark's text would consequently seem to be done for chiastic reasons.

The second major change is the movement of the Nazareth story to the beginning of the above section. In Mark's much longer chiastic structure, Jesus teaching in Capernaum (D1, 4.1) was paired with Jesus teaching in Nazareth (D2, 33).[422] Luke moves the Nazareth story to a position right before the Capernaum story. In other words, Luke seems to understand Mark's connection between the two stories, and wishes to make the connection clearer by placing them physically next to each other, rather than interrelate them through chiasm.[423] Luke also adds the detail that the Nazarenes tried to kill Jesus to the end of the Nazarene story. This detail adds a partial chiastic level between the B and C levels, because its structural position in the chiasm is directly opposite the Pharisees plotting against Jesus which will lead to Jesus's death.

The third major change occurs in the hinges of the power and wisdom sections. Luke moves the call of the four, now the call of the three (Andrew is removed from the story), to the hinge of the power chiasm. Luke is able to move the call story because he does not follow Mark's larger chiastic structure and consequently does not need to have two pairs of disciples called (C1of MSUD) to match the disciples being sent out in pairs (C2 of MSUD).[424] Since this parallelism is not necessary, Andrew is dropped from the story, and the

[422]See above on page 121.
[423] The strong parallelism between the two stories in Mark has been noted by others; for example, Collins, *Mark*, 288; Marcus, *Mark*, 378.
[424] See above on page 121.

call of the four becomes the call of the three most prominent disciples, Simon, James, and John. This new hinge, however, removes the structural parallelism of a double hinge with the wisdom chiasm. Luke rectifies this by adding a third old and new saying: "And no one after drinking old wine desires new wine, but says, 'The old is good'" (5:39) to the hinge of the wisdom chiasm. Consequently, there are now three parables in the hinge of the wisdom chiasm to match the three disciples of the hinge of the power chiasm.

This leaves the question of Mark's previous hinge material: the healing at Simon's and Jesus and the four in the desert. Luke seems to desire that these two units in Mark be seen as part of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law, because of changes he makes to the story of the Leper.[425] Luke adds to the story of the leper, "many crowds would gather to hear him and be cured of their diseases. But he would withdraw to deserted places and pray" (5:15b-16). In the story of the Leper there is now the following sequence: miracle, people coming to be cured, and Jesus withdrawing to the desert. This now parallels the sequence of the events after the healing of Simon's mother-in-law, where people also come to be cured (healing at Simon's), and Jesus then withdrawing to the desert (Jesus and the four in the desert and proclaiming).

It is hardly coincidental that the three major changes that Luke makes to this Markan text can all be explained in terms of chiastic rearrangement. In addition there are also many minor changes to the text which seem to be done for chiastic purposes. We shall briefly outline them, and then move on to the second double power and wisdom chiasm which forms the hinge to a larger structure which includes all three raising-of-the-dead stories.

The first minor change involves the story of Nazareth. Luke adds a discussion concerning Elijah and Elisha and how their missions extended outside of Israel to the Gentiles. Nazareth here seems to take on a symbolic role for Israel, and the rejection by Nazareth would thus parallel the future rejection of Jesus and his mission by Israel (as understood by the early Christians).[426] This change to wing A1 has a parallel to the change in hinge E1. In Luke's version of the call story, Jesus gets into a boat with Simon, and then he and Simon go into the lake and catch a huge amount of fish. Simon kneels down before Jesus and calls him "Lord" (5:8), and Jesus tells him not be afraid and that he will from now on be catching people (5:10). In this call story, Simon, who we know from Paul was head of the mission outside Israel, is singled out. Consequently, many of the fish that Simon will catch will be Gentiles. Luke in these changes to the wings and hinge of the power chiasm puts an emphasis on the Gentile mission over the mission to Israel (cf. Luke 2:30–32).

Another change to the Nazareth story involves the opposition in Nazareth. In Luke the people of Nazareth say, "Is not this Joseph's son?" (4:23), and Luke does not mention Jesus's mother or brothers or sisters. This last provided a parallel with the story of Jesus's declaration on family which was directly on the other side of Mark's double power and wisdom chiasm: on family (18)—second wisdom chiasm—second power chiasm—Nazareth (33). Since Luke has rearranged Mark, he does not require the parallel of mother, brother,

---

[425] We have seen how the healing of Simon's mother-in-law (5) and the healing at Simon's (6) can be seen as part of the same story: see above on page 68. Jesus and the four in the desert could be seen as part of this combined story, because Jesus seems to go into the desert to get away from it all, which he is seen doing elsewhere (6:31). Consequently, if this interpretation is correct, Jesus retreating is directly connected to the crowds coming to be healed.

[426] For this implication in Mark, see above on page 128.

and sisters. The other change to the Nazarene story, the attempt by the people to kill Jesus, is a clear foreshadowing of his death, and was discussed above.[427]

Luke also makes a couple of further changes to the hinge units E1 and E2. In the hinge of the power chiasm (E1, the call of the three) he makes a minor change by adding the phrase "When they brought their boats to shore, they left everything and followed him" (5:11). This wording makes a strong parallel to wing B2 where we are told in the call of Levi that "he got up, left everything, and followed him" (5:28). The change in wording adds strong verbal parallels to conceptual parallel of getting up and leaving. The emphasis, as in Mark, is on the disciples leaving their old lives behind and devoting themselves completely to Jesus and his mission. Luke makes the emphasis even stronger for the three because they leave behind a huge and valuable catch of fish in exchange for catching people. In the hinge of the wisdom chiasm (E2, three parables on old and new) Luke makes a minor change by adding the phrase "He also told them a parable" (5:36), which helps separate the parables from the fasting controversy. This would indicate that Luke saw a division between the controversy stories and the parables.

Finally, Luke also makes several minor changes to the C level which increases the parallelism. In C1 (Capernaum demoniac) Luke changes Mark's "a man with an unclean spirit" (Mark 1:23) to "a man who had a spirit of an unclean demon" (Luke 4:33), and in C2 (paralytic healed) he changes "a paralyzed man" (Mark 2:3) to "a man who had been paralyzed" (my translation, Luke 5:18). These now make better parallelism with C3 (sinners controversy), "those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick" (Luke 5:31), and C4 (healing controversy) "a man there whose right hand was withered" (Luke 6:6). Luke also adds "was teaching" (ἦν διδάσκων, 5:17) to C2 (paralytic healed) and "he taught" (διδάσκειν, 6:6) to C4 (healing controversy), which matches "was teaching" (ἦν διδάσκων, 4:31) in C1 (Capernaum demoniac). Finally, Luke makes five other minor changes to C2 (paralytic healed) and C4 (healing controversy) to make their parallelism stronger. First, in C2 Luke adds "and the Pharisees" (Luke 5:21) to Mark's "the scribes" (Mark 2:6) and in C4 adds "scribes and Pharisees" (Luke 6:7). Second, in C4 Luke adds that Jesus "knew what they were thinking" (Luke 6:8), which creates a parallel with C2's "When Jesus perceived their questionings" (Luke 5:22). Third, in C2 Luke adds that the paralytic is placed in the middle (Luke 5:19), which creates a parallel with the man with the withered hand standing in the middle (Luke 6:8, not translated in NRSV). Fourth, in C2 Luke adds the people are "filled with awe" (5:26), and in C4 he adds that the Pharisees were filled with fury (Luke 6:11), which adds a verbal parallel to the parallel of opposite reactions. Fifth, Luke makes the introductions to Jesus speaking match in both stories with the simple "he said" (5:22, 24; 6:8, 9, 10).[428]

That all the above changes, both major and minor, add to parallelism between units on the same chiastic level, or between wings and hinges, cannot simply be explained away as coincidence, because the changes add to the parallelism of a chiastic structure that has already been shown to be by design. In other words, a probability calculation would produce a lower probability figure than the chiasms in Mark, because there is a higher degree of parallelism than the chiasms in Mark. These changes demonstrate a keen awareness on the part of Luke of Mark's chiastic structure, and his desire to create a modified chiastic structure to suit his own needs.

---

[427] See above on page 145.

[428] These changes are also noted by Dewey, *Markan*, 141–42.

Luke's Adaptation of Mark's Second Power and Wisdom Chiasm

We shall now turn to Luke's use of Mark's second double power and wisdom chiasm. First we will look at the degree of parallelism of Luke's new chiastic structure to determine the strength of the chiasm; then we shall look at the meaning that such a structure provides. Luke frames Mark's second double power and wisdom chiasm with other material to create a large chiastic structure:

A1 Jesus is more than a prophet, he is the One to come
A1 A centurion shows great faith: Jesus one with authority (7.1–10)
B1 Jesus raises a widow's son and is declared a great prophet (like Elijah implied) (7 11–17)
C Disciples from John ask if Jesus is the one to come (7.18–23)
B2 John is more than a prophet (Jesus more than John implied) (7.24–28)
A2 Tax collector's show faith; Pharisees and this generation do not (7:29–35)
B1 Dinner at Simon the Pharisee's
A1 Jesus is anointed by a sinful woman (7:36–37)
B1 Simon amazed that Jesus allows a sinner to touch him (7:38–39)
C Jesus responds· parable of two debtors owing 550 denarii (7.40–43)
B2 Jesus forgives sins of woman (7 44–48)
A2 Those at table wonder. "Who is this who even forgives sins?" (7:49–50)
C Jesus is teacher and controller of evil
A1 DS: Jesus, 12, and 3 women, and other women proclaim (8:1–3)
B1 Parables: secrets of kingdom
A1 Parable of the sower (8·4–8)
B1 Secrets of Kingdom given to disciples/ parables so others do not understand (8:9–10)
C Parable of sower explained (8.11–15)
B2 Lamps are for light, "secrets" will become known (8.16–17)
A3 Those who listen will be given more (8:18)
C DS: Jesus' followers true family as they obey the word of God (8:19–21)
B2 Miracles showing Jesus's power
A1 Jesus calms a storm. Jesus controls wind and sea (8·22–25)
B1 Jesus heals the Gerasene demoniac passively· Jesus controls legions of demons (8:26–39)
C Jairus begs Jesus to heal his daughter (8:40–42)
B2 Jesus heals the HW passively: Jesus controls sickness (8:43–48)
A2 Jesus raises Jairus' daughter· Jesus controls death (8.49–56)
A2 DS The twelve are sent out (9:1–6)
B2 Feeding of the 5000: Who is Jesus?
A1 Herod wonders who Jesus is (9 7)
B1 Jesus and 12 withdraw privately to Bethsaida (9 10–12)
C The feeding of the 5000 in groups of 50 (9 13–17)
B2 Jesus is praying alone with disciples (9 18a)
A2 Jesus asks who the crowds say he is (9 18b–20)
A2 Transfiguration: Jesus is the Son and Chosen of God
A1 First prediction of Jesus's death (9:21–22)
B1 Followers must be willing to lose life (9.23–27)
C The Transfiguration "This is my Son, my Chosen" (9:28–36)
B2 Jesus cures a possessed (epileptic) boy (9.37–42)
A2 Second prediction of Jesus's Death (9.43–45)

This is a large complex chiastic structure. The overall structure is a three-level chiasm indicated by the headings in bold. Each of the units forming this chiasm is in turn made up of a three-level chiasm.

The hinge section of the overall chiasm (C in bold) is Mark's second double power and wisdom chiasm with two principle modifications. First, Luke reduces the units in the wisdom section to five by eliminating the parables of the seed in secret (25) and the mustard seed (26). This creates a clear structural parallelism with the power section with its five clearly recognizable units. Second, Luke uses a different framing device for the double chiasm. He eliminates Mark's GPS-DS-GPS pattern and replaces the wings and hinges (A1, A2, and C in bold and italics) with three disciple stories. Jesus's declaration of the disciples as family becomes the hinge (C), special Lukan material on Jesus proclaiming with women forms the first wing (A1), and the twelve being instructed and sent out forms the second wing (A2). The significance of these changes will be discussed below.

Two banquet stories, Jesus eating at the house of Simon the Pharisee and the feeding of the five thousand, create an inclusio around the double power and wisdom chiasm (B1 and B2 in bold respectively). On the surface the two units do not seem that similar, besides the formal parallel of both stories both being about meals; however there are nineteen parallels between them. These are as follows:

1) 15 word parallels: to eat (7:36; 9:13), to sit or recline (7:36; 9.14), city (7:37; 9:10), to begin (7:38, 49; 9:12), to invite/be called (7:39; 9:10), prophet (7:39; 9:18), to know (7:39; 9:11), to answer (7:40, 43; 9:18), Simon/Peter (7:40; 9:20), two (7:41; 9:13), fifty (7:41; 9:14), to give (7:44, 45; 9:13), many (7:47, 9:13), who (7:49; 9:18), and to go (7:50; 9:12).
2) 4 conceptual parallels:
    a. Both units are about banquets.
    b. Both units involve the figure of fifty and its multiples: in the banquet at Simon's Jesus tells a parable of a creditor who had two debtors, one owed five hundred denarii and the other fifty denarii (7:41–43), and in the feeding miracle Jesus feeds five thousand who are sat in groups of fifty (9:14).
    c. In both units there is a focus on the question of Jesus's identity. The dinner at Simon's begins with a woman anointing Jesus (7:37–38), which indicates she knows that Jesus is the Messiah (the anointed one), and ends with the guests wondering who Jesus is (7:49). The feeding of the five thousand is framed with an inclusio of the Herod hearing the crowd's opinion of who Jesus is (B2.A1) and Jesus asking who the crowds say he is (B2.A2). This inclusio creates a single unit of the feeding of the five thousand and the two units on the question of Jesus (B2 in bold). In addition, the second part of the inclusio ends with Peter saying Jesus is the Messiah, which mirrors the woman anointing Jesus: Jesus anointed—parable of debtors—people wonder who Jesus is; people wonder who Jesus is—feeding of five thousand—Jesus is the anointed.
    d. The theme of being a good host. At Simon's banquet, Jesus points out that Simon was not a good host as he did not provide water for Jesus's feet (7:44). In the feeding, Jesus is the perfect host: instead of sending the people off to find their own food, which the disciples suggest, he insists that they be fed, and proceeds to feed them.

These two units are 273 and 240 Greek words respectively, which produces an average of 257 words per unit which is roughly two and half times the 105 word average for the LUD

sample space. Consequently, the nineteen parallels above are roughly equivalent to eight parallels in the LUD, which in turn was significant parallelism, because only 17% of the pairs had this degree of parallelism.

The two banquets are in turn enclosed by two sections which focus on Jesus's identity (A1 and A2 in bold). Both of these chiasms will be dealt with in further detail in the chapters on the WNS and PB respectively. Each of these sections forms a three-level chiasm, which mirrors the other:

A1 A centurion shows great faith	A2 Jesus's second prediction of his death
B1 WNS	B2 PB
C Question from John	C Transfiguration
B2 Jesus on John	B1On willingness to lose life
A2 Jesus on the public reaction to John and himself	A1 Jesus's first prediction of his death

The parallelism for each level is as follows:

1) A1–A2: 9 parallels:
    a. Word parallels: 8: saying (7:1; 9:45), all (7:1; 9:43), to about to be (7.2; 9:44), afraid (7:3; 9:45), word (7:7; 9:44), man (7:8; 9:44 twice), to do (7:8; 9:43), to be amazed (7:9, 9:43).
    b. Conceptual parallels: 1:
        i. The theme of great faith: the centurion has the greatest faith of anyone in Israel, and Jesus by his willingness to go to die was seen by the early Christians as a great act of obedience and faithfulness to God (Phil 2.8).
2) B1–B2: 16 parallels:
    a. Word parallels: 9: next day (7:11; 9:37), great (7:11, 12; 9:37), crowd (7:11, 12; 9:37), disciples (7:11, 9:40), only (7:12; 9:38), son (7:12; 9:38, 41), to give (7:15, 9:42), to seize (7:16; 7:39), God (7:16, 9:43).
    b. Conceptual parallels: 7
        i. Both are miracles
        ii. In both there is a large amount of people (7:11, 12; 9:37).
        iii. A family relationship is referred to (7:12; 9:38).
        iv. In both the person healed is an only son (7:12; 9:38).
        v. The healed person is given back to the parent (7:15; 9:42).
        vi. People are amazed (7:16; 9:43).
        vii. Reference is made to God in describing the reaction of the crowd: (7:16; 9:43).
3) C–C: 11 parallels:
    a. Word parallels: 6: to report/tell (7:18; 9:36), John (7:18; 9:28), two (7:18; 9:30, 32), man (7:20; 9:30, 32), to see (7:22; 9:32), to hear (7:22, 9:35).
    b. Conceptual parallels: 5
        i. Both units concern the identity of Jesus: in the first John's disciples are sent to ask if Jesus is the one (7:7:19, 20), and in the second Jesus is shown in his heavenly glory (9:29) and God declares Jesus to be his Son (9:35).

ii. Reporting/ not reporting: the disciples of John are told to report what they see and hear (7:22), and the three are told not to report what they see or hear (9:36).
iii. The identity of Jesus is revealed by what people see and hear: Jesus responds to the question concerning his identity by pointing to his miracles which the disciples of John have seen and heard of (7:22), and the three see Jesus in his heavenly glory with Moses and Elijah (9:32) and hear the heavenly voice declaring Jesus to be God's Son (9:35).
iv. In both stories John the Baptist is present: in the first story John sends messengers (7:19), and in the second story Elijah, who was also seen as John the Baptist by Christians (for example, Luke 7:27) appears (9:32).
v. In both two men come to Jesus: in the first story two messengers arrive from John (7:18–20), and in the second story two men suddenly appear with Jesus (9:30).

4) B2–B1: 7 parallels:
   a. Word parallels: 4: man (7:25; 9:25); to see (7:25, 26; 9:27); kingdom (7:28; 9:27), God (7:28; 9:27).
   b. Conceptual parallels:
      i. Focusing on the mission at the expense of this life: in the first unit Jesus praises the greatness of John (7:28), who did not care about the luxuries of this world (7:25) and whom Luke's readers would know gave his life for the mission (9:9), and in the second unit Jesus tells his supporters that the mission is dangerous and that they must be willing to give up their life and the attractions of this world for the mission (9:24–25).
      ii. Reference is made to the kingdom of God: in the first unit Jesus says that the least in the kingdom of God is greater than John (7:28), and in the second unit he says that some of those in his audience will see the kingdom of God (9:27).
      iii. Jesus giving praise or condemnation: in the first unit John is singled out as the greatest person ever born (7:28), and in the second unit Jesus as the Son of Man will be ashamed of those who are not willing to give their life for the mission (9:26).
5) A2–A1: 5 parallels
   a. Word parallels: 2: Son (7:34; 9:22), Man (7:34; 9:22).
   b. Conceptual parallels: 3
      i. Reference is made to the scribes: in the first unit Jesus refers to the lawyers (7:30), and the lawyers were the experts in Torah, that is, this appears to be another name for the scribes, who are also experts in Torah, and who are mentioned in the second unit (9:22).
      ii. The theme of rejection by the authorities: in the first Jesus and John are both spoken of as being rejected by the Pharisees and the lawyers (7:30, 33–34), and in the second unit Jesus will be rejected by the elders, chief priests, and scribes (9.22).
      iii. Reference is made to the religious authorities: see previous parallel.

There are 1 112 Greek words in the two chiasms, and consequently 111 words on average for each of the ten units. This is only slightly higher than the LUD's 105 words on average per unit. Since there is a total of forty-six parallels for all the unit-pairs, there is an average of nine parallels per unit, which in turn is significant parallelism, because only 13% of the LUD unit pairs had this degree of parallelism or higher.

Since the A and B levels mirror each other a very long chiastic pattern is created:

A1 A centurion's boy is healed (7:1–10): 9 //s
B1 WNS (7:11–17): 16 //s
C1 John asks if Jesus is the one to come (7:18–23): 11 //s
D1 John is more than a prophet (Jesus more than John implied) (7:24–28): 7 //s
E1 Tax collector's show faith; Pharisees and this generation do not (7:29–35): 5 //s
F1 Woman anoints Jesus (7:36–39): 18 //s total for F1–H1
G1 Parable of the debtors owing 550 denarii (7:40–43)
H1 Guests ponder who Jesus is (7:44–50)
I1 Jesus, 12, and 3 women, and other women proclaim (8:1–3): 12 //s[429]
J1 Wisdom chiasm (8:4–18): 5 units: structural parallelism
K Jesus' followers true family as they obey the word of God (8:19–21)
J2 Power chiasm (8:22–56): 5 units
I2 The twelve are instructed and sent out to proclaim (9:1–6)
H2 Herod ponders who Jesus is (9 7–10)
G2 The feeding of the 5000 in groups of 50 (9 11–17)
F2 Peter declares Jesus the anointed (9 18–20)
E2 First prediction of Jesus's death (9:21-22)
D2 Followers must be willing to lose life (9:23–27)
C2 The Transfiguration: "This is my Son, my Chosen" (9:28–36)
B2 Jesus cures a possessed (epileptic) boy (9:37–42)
A2 Second prediction of Jesus's Death (9:43–45)

The different levels of the larger chiastic structure are distinguished by the font: plain for the A level, italics for the B level, and bold for the C level. From the study of Mark, it was demonstrated that a chiasm with such significant parallelism on so many levels of a long chiasm will lead to an incredibly low probability figure. Consequently, one can conclude that the above concentric pattern is the conscious design of Luke.

We shall now turn to the meaning provided by the chiastic design. We shall begin with the hinges of the wings and hinge of the larger structure (C1, K, C2). The hinge of hinge section (I1–I2 above) is Jesus's declaration that those who hear the word of God and do it are his true family. This may seem like an odd unit to have in the central position, but as we shall see, it will make greater sense as we proceed. Luke changes Mark's wording: Mark has "whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister" (Mark 3:35), and Luke has "My mother and brother are those who hear the word of God and do it" (Luke 8:19). This change of wording puts the emphasis on Jesus's teaching (the word of God) and on obeying this teaching. This change provides a link to the hinge of the second wing section (C2 above, hinge of E2–A2), namely, the transfiguration. During the transfiguration, the word of God is

[429]There are twelve parallels, eight word parallels and four conceptual parallels. Word parallels: city (8.1; 9:5), village (8:1; 9:6), to proclaim (8.1; 9:2), to bring (8:1; 9:6), kingdom (8.1; 9:2), God (8:1; 9:2), twelve (8:1; 9:1), heal (8:2; 9:1, 6). Many of the word parallels are due to Luke's rewording of Mark's version of the twelve being instructed and sent out. Conceptual parallels: both are disciple stories, in both there is proclaiming to the public, both involve the twelve, and both contain the theme of provisioning (women provide out of own resources, and the twelve are to take nothing).

literally heard, and God says "This is my Son, my Chosen, listen to him" (Luke 9:35). Here there is also an emphasis on obeying Jesus: "to listen to" has the sense of listening and doing.[430] Luke makes a slight change here to Mark's wording: he changes Mark's "my Beloved" (Mark 9:7) to "my Chosen" (Luke 9:35). This in turn creates a parallel to the hinge of first wing section (C1 above, hinge of A1–E1). In this hinge John sends messengers to enquire if Jesus is the one to come (7:18–19). In other words, they are to ask if Jesus is the Messiah, that is, the Chosen one of God. As we have seen, God himself answers this question in the corresponding hinge. The hinges of the larger chiasm are as follows: is Jesus the one to come? (C1), those who obey the word God are Jesus's family (K), God says that Jesus is his son and chosen one and must be listened to (C2). A connection is consequently made between the identity of Jesus and obeying him: Jesus is the one to come (C1), God's chosen (C2), and must be obeyed (C2), and those who obey him will become part of Jesus's family (K). Since Jesus is alos the Son of God, those who obey Jesus are also part of the family of God. Kinship to God is thus transferred from descent from Jacob and obeying the Torah to simply obeying Jesus.

For Luke the question of who Jesus is is not as important as the consequences of the answer: simple belief is not enough, one must also do. However, in order to do what Jesus says, one must first believe who he is. Consequently, the question of Jesus's identity is still very important. As with Mark, Jesus's identity is shown through his miracles. When Jesus replies to John, he is cryptic: he does not reply directly, but responds by pointing to his miracles. The implication is that the miracles indicate that Jesus is the Messiah. The placement of the miracles of raising people from the dead shows the special importance of these miracles for Luke. As with Mark the raising of JD has the important position as last in the four miracles showing Jesus's great power. Luke introduces a new story, the WNS. This is placed by Luke in the first wing section (A1–E1) just before John's question concerning the identity of Jesus (C1). Jesus in his reply to John says: "Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have good news brought to them" (7:22). In this list the dead being raised has the prime climax position of the list of miracles, and, as many commentators have pointed out, the story of the WNS (B1 above) comes right before this unit. Raising the dead, and in particular, the WNS, is consequently very important in showing who Jesus is.

Thus, in the first wing of the larger chiastic structure the miracles indicate that Jesus is the Messiah, in the second wing God confirms Jesus is the Messiah, and in the hinge we are told that one should obey the Messiah (Jesus) in order to become part of his kin. However, the text does not say why this last should be considered important. The answer lies in the B level of the larger chiastic structure (the units in italics above), namely, the dinner at the house of Simon the Pharisee (F1–H1) and the feeding of the five thousand surrounded by questions concerning the identity of Jesus (H2–F2). Both of the stories of the dinner and the feeding have an eschatological emphasis. The hinge of the story of the dinner at Simon's house, the parable of the debtors (G1) focuses on the forgiveness of debts, which is told in regard to the sinful woman whose sins are forgiven (F1, H1). The forgiving of sins is the centrepiece of the good news, because it will allow one to enter the future kingdom of God. The feeding of the five thousand (G2) also has an eschatological theme, because, as

[430] Henry George Liddell, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), s.v. ἀκούω.

discussed above, it foreshadows the eschatological banquet.[431] Both these units are enclosed by units concerning the identity of Jesus: the sinful woman anoints Jesus (F1) and Peter declares Jesus the anointed (F2); the guests wonder who this is who forgives sins (H1) and Herod hears what the crowds are saying concerning the identity of Jesus (H2). Consequently, the chiastic structure seems to say that Jesus is the anointed one who will forgive sins and lead his people (represented by the twelve baskets gathered at the feeding) into the new kingdom of God. Consequently, the importance of being part of Jesus's family (hinge K), that is, his people, is that it will allow one to enter the kingdom. In other words, the requirement for entering the kingdom is both belief and obeying what Jesus says. This conclusion explains the placement by Luke of the unit on declaring Jesus's disciples family as the hinge of Mark's second power and wisdom chiasm: one needs both belief, provided by the miracles, and Jesus's teaching, symbolized by the parables, in order to enter the eschatological kingdom of God. The conclusion also explains why Luke has surrounded the power and wisdom chiasm units with disciple stories: one receives this knowledge and belief through the disciples who were personally instructed by Jesus (second wing), accompanied Jesus and helped him on his mission (first wing), and consequently also were the witnesses to the miracles. There is thus an emphasis on the disciples as the guardians of the miracle and teaching tradition.

In conclusion, Luke has a very similar message to Mark: in both the purpose of the miracles is to help with the proclaiming and teaching, but in Luke the focus is also on obeying the teaching. We shall now briefly look at Matthew's adaptation of Markan material, and show that he has a similar understanding of the purpose of the miracles.

Matthew's Adaptation of Mark's Power Sections

Unlike Luke, Matthew completely rearranges the material found in Mark's power sections: he combines the two sections, drops some miracles, changes the rest, and adds new material. However, Matthew keeps the balance of power and wisdom sections by pairing his new miracle section with his Sermon on the Mount.[432] Consequently, the combined structure contains what Matthew sees as Jesus's most important teaching and almost all of the miracles to be found in the gospel. Matthew's chiastic arrangement is as follows:[433]

---

[431] See above on page 129.

[432] The clearly complimentary "two panel" effect has been noted by others; for example, see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:1, 5.

[433] The chiasm is a variation of that proposed by Lund, *Chiasmus*, 304-11.

A1 Location of mission: Jesus goes to Galilee of Gentiles 4:12–16

A1 Jesus goes to Galilee, B1 Capernaum by Sea, C1 territory of Zebulun and Naphthali, D word of Isaiah fulfilled, C2 land of Zebulun and Naphthali, B2 by sea across Jordan, A2 Galilee receives light

B1 Call of the four 4:17–23

A1 Jesus proclaims kingdom, B1 by sea of Galilee, C1 sees two brothers, D1 casting nets, E1 follow me, D2 leave nets, C2 follow Jesus, B2 Jesus moves along, C3 sees two brothers, D3 in boat mending nets, E2 Jesus calls, D4 leave boat, C4 follow Jesus, B3 Jesus goes throughout Galilee, A2 teaching and proclaiming kingdom

C1 Summary: Teaching, healing, crowds from all Israel 4:23–5:1

A1 Jesus goes throughout Galilee, B1 teaching in synagogues, proclaiming and healing all diseases, C fame in all Syria, B2 cures all diseases, A2 crowds from all over Israel

Jesus goes up mountain with disciples.

D1 Sermon on mount: Jesus is giver of Wisdom[434]

A1 The 9 beatitudes 5:2–12

A Poor in spirit (do not respond to attacks of slander etc.), B those who mourn, C the meek, D those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, E the merciful, D the pure of heart (hunger and thirst for righteousness), C the peacemakers (are meek as they are not aggressive), B persecuted for righteousness' sake (persecuted usually mourned), A the reviled and slandered

B1 3 teachings on being righteousness and light 5:13–19

A You are Salt, B you are Light, C exceed Law and Prophets (have salt?)

C 9 teachings on what to do and not do

2 x 3 sayings on exceeding Torah ("have heard it said") 5:20–47

A not murder: must not have anger or insult, but must reconcile, B not commit adultery: tear out own eye, cut of own hand (focus on own sins), C ("also said") not commit divorce: divorce is adultery (a marriage is swearing to faithfulness), C not swear falsely: do not swear, just say yes or no, B an eye for an eye: do not retaliate, give to everyone (do not focus on another's sins), A love neighbour and hate enemy: love enemies (do not have anger and murder)

3 teachings on doing things with humility ("do not") 5:48–6:18

A Giving of alms: do not let others know, B how to pray/ Lord's prayer: do not let others know, or heap empty phrases, forgive others, A on fasting: do not let others know

B2 3 teachings on wealth and light 6:19–24

A Do not store earthly treasures, but heavenly ones, B eye is lamp, C cannot serve both God and wealth (focus on heavenly treasures?)

A2 9 teachings on how to behave 6:25–7:27

A Do not worry about physical things: strive for righteousness, B do not judge, C do not give holy to dogs or swine (animal metaphor), D ask (pray) and it will be given: like child asking father for bread and fish, E golden rule: do unto others, D narrow gate is difficult: need prayer, C beware wolves in sheep's clothing: tree and fruit (animal metaphor), B not everyone who says, "Lord, Lord," will enter the Kingdom (on Judgement day), A hearing and doing: house and flood (have foundation of righteousness)

---

[434] Compare Dale Allison: A1 introduction (crowds and mountain), B1 nine beatitudes, C:A summary statement (salt and light), C:B the three pillars (C:B:A1 introductory statement on law and prophets, C:B:B main teaching in three groups, C:B:A2 concluding statement golden rule is law and prophets), B2 three warnings (two ways, false prophets, two builders), A2 conclusion (crowds and mountains). His central sections (the three pillars) runs as follows: A1 Jesus and Torah (general principles followed by two triads on exceeding the Torah); B1 The Christian cult (general principle; triad on almsgiving, prayer, and forgiveness), C1 Social issues (triad on God and mammon, triad on one's neighbour). Dale C. Allison, "The Structure of the Sermon on the Mount," *JBL* 106 (1987); Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 63.

E Summary of teaching: crowds astounded at authority 7:28–29
Jesus finishes teaching, crowds astounded, taught with authority, not as scribes, comes down mountain.

D2 Nine Miracle Stories: Jesus has power over evil
A1 Three healing stories
1 Leper, "immediately" cured 8:1–4
2 Centurion's servant, Gentile, according to centurion's faith: Jesus one with authority 8:5–13
3 Peter's mother-in-law, demons, sick: Jesus takes on infirmities of people (Isaiah), 8:14–17
(Great crowds gather around Jesus)
B1 Disciples
1 Scribe wishes to follow: Son of Man has nowhere to lay head 8:19–20
2 Another disciple wishes to bury father: let dead bury their own: do not mourn 8:21–22
C Three miracles
1 Jesus stills the storm, lack of faith, who is this 8:23–27
2 Two Gadarene demoniacs, Gentiles (have pigs), Son of God 8:28–9:1
3 Paralytic, Son of Man can forgive sins, scribes accuse 9:2–7
(Crowds glorify God)
B2 Disciples
1 Matthew, a tax collector (anti-scribe), called, question of eating with sinners (place to stay), desire mercy not sacrifice (Hosea) 9:9–13
2 Question of Fasting, cannot mourn, Jesus is Bridegroom, old and new 9:14–17
A2 Three healing stories
1 HW "instantly" cured, girl raised from dead 9:18–26
2 Two blind men – according to their faith, Son of David 9:27–31
3 Mute person by casting out demon 9:32–34
(Crowds amazed, Pharisees accuse)

C2 Summary: Crowds, teaching, proclaiming, healing, crowds 9:33–36
Jesus teaches in synagogues, proclaims good news, and heals all, has compassion as crowds without a shepherd

B2 Disciples: Jesus calls 12 apostles 9:37–10:4
A1 Labourers few, B1 lord of harvest to send out labourers, C1 twelve given authority over disease and demons, D1 names of twelve, E1 names given,[435]

A2 Location of mission: just Israel 10:5–10
D2 Twelve given instructions, E2 instructions given (not to Gentiles or Samaritans, but to Israel, D3 proclaim good news, C2 told to cure sick and cast out demons, B2 give without payment as payment received (forgiveness from Lord of Harvest), A2 labourers deserve food.

Matthew uses multiples of three in the construction of this chiasm.[436] There are three framing wings (A–C), the Sermon on the Mount is arranged into groups of nine sayings, and there are nine miracle stories arranged into three groups of three. This last actually produces ten miracles as one story contains two miracles (HW and JD: D2.A2.1).[437] There is not the space

[435] A1 Simon also Peter and Andrew, B1 James son of and John, C Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, and Matthew the tax collector,B2 James son of and Thaddaeus, A2 Simon the Cananaean and Judas who betrayed.
[436] On Matthew's love of the triad see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:62–67; 2:3.
[437] Having ten miracles supplies a Mosaic reference, which in turn produces two panels in the chiasm, one presenting the new Torah (Sermon on the Mount) and one presenting the new power (the ten miracles). On the Mosaic allusion see, for example, Erich Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1927), 72; Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1949), 93. Davies and Allison (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2: 1) note this, but think that the emphasis is more

to do an analysis of the whole chiastic structure; instead we shall simply focus on the miracle section (D2).

We shall begin with an outline of the parallels between the different levels. In the first section the items in bold are from the "M" material, and the items in italics are due to Matthean changing the words of either Mark or Luke.

1) A1–A2: 41 parallels
   a. Word parallels: 27: *to follow* (8:1, 10; 9:27), crowd (*8:1*, 10, 18; 9:23, 25, 33), *behold* (8:2; 9:18, 20, 32), kneel (8:2; 9:18), *Lord* (8:2, 5, 8; 9:28), *to be able* (8:2; 9:28), hand (8:3, 15; 9:18), to touch (8:3, 15; 9:20, 21, 29), *to see* (8:4; 9:30), *no-one* (8:4; 9:30), **to show/bring** (8:4, 16; 9:32), home/house (*8:6*, 14; 9:23, *28*), alone (8:8; 9:21), man (8:9; 9:32), to do/make (8:9 twice, 9:28); amazed (8:10; 9:33), faith (8:10; 9:22, 29), Israel (8:10; 9:33), *son* (8:12; 9:27), to cast out (*8:12*, 16; 9:25, 33, 34), faith (8:13; 9:28), *to become* (8:13; 9:26), *hour* (8:13; 9:22), *that* (8:13; 9:22, 26, 31), to see (8:14, 18; 9:22, 23), to get up (8:15; 9:19, 25), demoniac (8:16; 9:32); five parallels are due to Matthew adding words to both A1 and A2, and five are due to Matthew adding a word to A1 or A2.
   b. Conceptual parallels: 14 parallels
      i. Both contain three miracle stories: one may count the story of the HW and JD as one story since the miracle of JD forms an inclusio around the HW.
      ii. Both end with a summary of the crowd's reaction: in A1 many are brought to Jesus to be healed in order to fulfil prophecy (8:16–17), and in A2 the crowds are amazed because they have never seen anything like this before (9:34).
      iii. In the second miracle story of both A1 and A2 Jesus tells the recipients that they are healed according to their faith (8:13, 9:29).
      iv. In the first miracle story of both A1 and A2 the person is healed instantly (8:3, 9:22).
      v. In the second miracle story of A1 and the third miracle story of A2 reference to something being unique "in Israel" (8:10, 9:33).
      vi. In the first miracle story of both A1 and A2 the person in kneels before Jesus and requests a healing (8:2, 9:18).

---

on the number nine. Likewise, Robert Gundry (*Matthew: A Commentary on his Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994], 137–38) notes the parallelism, but concludes that since Matthew does not seem that interested in number, or counting out the miracles, Matthew is not trying to make the parallel. But Matthew does seem interested in number: note his use of the triad. Counting out miracles does not appear to be Matthew's style, unlike John; John only does the counting for the first two miracles (2:11, 4:54, and yes, it is a chiastic parallel). Also, considering Matthew's love of three and nine (three times three), it seems odd that he uses JD and HW as he does. He could easily have used this double miracle story and had only one other miracle in the group, or he could have used another miracle story. However, he does not, and thus is able to keep a triadic pattern and make the Mosaic reference. For a review of the arguments for and against seeing the Sermon on the Mount as the New Torah see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1: 423–24. Note that the hinge section is the "you have heard it said", or "the antitheses" where Jesus exhorts the people to a "better"(Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1: 504), or "higher" (Ulrich Luz, *Matthew: A Commentary* [3 vols.; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989], 1: 273) righteousness than the Torah demands.

vii. *In the first miracle story of A1 and the second miracle story of A2 mention is made of Jesus's ability to heal (8:2, 9:28).*
viii. *The recipients of the healings in the first miracle and second miracle stories of A1 and in the second miracle story of the A2 address Jesus as "Lord" (8:2, 8, 9:28).*
ix. *In the first miracle story of A1 and the second miracle story of A2 the recipients of the miracle are told to keep quiet (8:4, 8:30).*
x. In the first and third miracle stories of A1 and the first and second miracle stories of A2 the healing is through touch (8:3, 15, 9:25, 29).
xi. In the first and second miracles stories of both A1 and A2 a request is made to Jesus for a healing (8:2, 6, 9:18, 27).
xii. In the third miracle story of A1 and the first miracle story of A2 the sick person is lying and then gets up when healed (8:14, 9:25).
xiii. *In the third miracle story of A1 and the first miracle story of A2 the miracle is through silent touch (8:14, 9:25).*
xiv. *In the first miracle story of A1 and the second miracle story of A2 the miracle is through both touch and command (8:3, 9:29).*

2) B1–B2: 9 parallels
   a. Word parallels: 3: to follow (8:19, 22, 23; 9.9 twice), son (8:20; 9:15), man (8:20; 9:15).
   b. Conceptual parallels: 6
      i. Both contain two disciple stories: in B1 two different disciples come to Jesus and in B2 there is the call of Matthew with the controversies over eating with sinners and not fasting. The last can be seen as two or three units. However, the call of Matthew and the following dinner can be seen as parts of one story. As such, it can be seen as a disciple story as well as a controversy story. The fasting controversy also concerns the disciples: the controversy is about the disciples of Jesus not fasting.
      ii. Each story in B1 and B2 ends with a saying or parable from Jesus.
      iii. Theme of not mourning: in the second story in B1 the disciple is told to let the dead bury the dead (8:21–22), and in the second story of B2 the disciples cannot mourn because the Bridegroom is with them (9.15).
      iv. Jesus refers to himself using a Messianic title: "Son of Man" (8:20), "the Bridegroom" (9:15). In regards to the last, the LORD was seen as the bridegroom and Israel as the bride in Hebrew theology.
      v. Traditional rituals not followed: in the second story in B1 the disciple is not allowed to go and bury his father (8:21–22), and in the second story of B2 Jesus's disciples are not fasting (9:14).
      vi. In B1 a scribe asks to follow Jesus (8:19) and in B2 Jesus tells Matthew the tax collector to follow him (9:9).

3) A1–C: 35
   a. Word parallels: 22: to follow (8:1, 10; 8:23), crowd (8:1, 10, 18; 9:8), many (8:1, 11; 8:30), behold, (8:2; 8:24, 29, 32, 34, 9:2, 3), Lord (8:2, 5, 8; 8:25), to go (8:4, 6; 8:32, 9:6), to bring/show (8:4, 16; 9:2), distress (8:6; 8:29); to lie (8:6, 14; 9:2), paralyzed (8:6, 9:2 twice, 9:6), man (8:9; 8:27), authority (8:9;

9:6, 8), amazed (8:10; 8:27), faith (8:10; 9:2), son (8:12; 8:29, 9:6), to cast out (8:12, 16; 8:31), that (8:13; 8:28), to see (8:14, 18; 8:34, 9:2, 4, 8), to leave (8:15; 9:2, 5, 6), to get up (8:15; 8:25, 26, 9:5, 6, 7), demoniac (8:16; 8:28, 33), other side/beyond (8:18; 8:28).

b. Conceptual parallels: 13
   i. Both contain three miracle stories.
   ii. Both end with the reaction of the crowd: in A1 a crowd brings people to be healed (8:16–18), and in C the crowd is filled with awe and glorifies God (9:8).
   iii. In the second miracle story in both a gentile is healed: the centurion (8:8), and the Gadarenes (9:28).
   iv. In the second miracle stories Jesus uses the phrase "go" during the performance of the miracle: Jesus tells the centurion to go and the child will be healed according to his faith (8:13), and Jesus tells the demons to go into the swine (9:31).
   v. In the second miracle story of A1 and the third miracle story of C the sick person is paralyzed (8:6, 9:2).
   vi. In the first and second miracle stories of A1 and the first miracle of C the recipients of the miracle address Jesus as "Lord" (8:1, 6, 25).
   vii. Opposition of paralytic being brought: in the second miracle story of A1 the paralytic is left at home, and in the third miracle story of C the paralytic is brought to Jesus.
   viii. Jesus comments on the faith of the recipient in the second miracle story of A1 (8:13) and the first and third miracle stories of C (8:26, 9:2).
   ix. In the second miracle story of A1 and the first and third miracle stories of C Jesus's authority is commentated on (8:9, 27, 9:6).
   x. In the third miracle story of A1 and the third miracle story of C the sick person is lying down (8:14, 25).
   xi. In the third miracle story of A1 and the third miracle story of C the healed person gets up (8:15, 9: 7).
   xii. In the first and second miracle stories of A1 and all three miracle stories of C the miracle is performed through command (8:3, 13, 26, 32, 9:6).
   xiii. Jesus is in the process of crossing to the other side (8:18, 23, 9:1).

4) C–A2: 27 parallels
   a. Word parallels: 18: to follow (8:23; 9:27), behold (8:24, 29, 32, 34, 9:2, 3; 9:18, 20, 32), to sleep (8:24; 9:24), to get up (8:25, 26, 9:5, 6, 7; 9:19, 25), Lord (8:25; 9:28), to save (8:25; 9:21, 22 twice), man (8:27; 9:32), amazed (8:27; 9:33), that (8:28; 9:22, 26, 31), demoniac (8:28, 33; 9:32), to cry out (8:29; 9:27), son (8:29, 9:6; 9:27), to cast out (8:31; 9:25, 33, 34), to die (8:32, 9:24), to see (8:34, 9: 2, 4, 8; 9:22, 23), faith (9:2; 9:22, 29), to take heart (9:2; 9:22), crowd (9:8; 9:23, 25, 33).
   b. Conceptual parallels: 9
      i. Both contain three miracle stories.
      ii. In both the three miracle stories end with the crowd's reaction (9:8, 33).

iii. In the second miracles stories two people are healed (8:28, 9:27).
iv. In the second miracle stories Jesus is hailed with a Messianic title (8:29, 9:27).
v. In the third miracle story the sick person is brought to Jesus (9:2, 32).
vi. In the third miracle story of C and the first miracle story of A2 the sick person is lying down (9:2, 25).
vii. In the third miracle story of C and the first miracle story of A2 the healed person gets up (9:7, 25).
viii. The second miracle story of C and the third miracle story of A2 are exorcisms.
ix. In all three miracle stories of C and in the second miracle story of A2 the miracle is performed by command (8:26, 32, 9:6, 29).

A fairly high number of parallels is to be expected for such large units; however, the number is still exceptional. The three miracle units have a total of 915 Greek words, that is, 305 words on average per unit. This is roughly three times the average size of an LUD unit (105 words). The total number of parallels between the three miracle units is 103 parallels, which is 26 parallels on average. This would be equivalent to nine parallels in the LUD, and consequently represents significant parallelism, because only 13% of the LUD pairs had this degree of parallelism. This high level of parallelism would indicate that the structure is by design.

That this is so seems to be confirmed by the many liberties Matthew takes with his source material. In each case clear parallelism is created. In fact, a good proportion of the parallels between the three sets of miracle stories would not be present except for these changes by Matthew. This is shown in the parallels between A1 and C where the parallels in italics show the parallels that are either due to changes made to Mark's text, or are different from Luke's text, in the case of Q material. The changes account for ten out of twenty-seven word parallels and six out of fourteen conceptual parallels. A further two parallels are due to "M" material (items in bold), and another two are structural parallels (the first two conceptual parallels) due to Matthew's arrangement of the material. Consequently, up to half of the parallels are due to Matthew's hand.

Two clear examples of changes are seen in the stories of the Gerasene demoniac (Mark 5:1–20, Luke 8:26–39) and blind Bartimaeus (Mark 10:46–52, Luke 18:35–43, Matt 20:29–34). Matthew changes the story of the Gerasene demoniac into the two Gadarene demoniacs. Except for this change, the story is clearly the same as the story of the Gerasene demoniac. The same is true for the story of the two blind men, which is clearly an adaption of the story of blind Bartimaeus.[438] These two changes create a parallel between two stories that are in the hinge positions in C and A2 sets of miracles respectively. Such changes as these, which seem to serve no other theological purpose, would indicate that the changes were made to strengthen the parallelism.

The purpose of the chiastic arrangement appears to be to stress the themes of the identity of Jesus and faith. In the centre miracle story of C (2 Gadarenes healed) Jesus is addressed as the "Son of God" (8:29), and in the centre miracle story of A2 (2 blind men

[438] Most commentators see this unit as a redactional creation on the part of Matthew based on the healing of Blind Bartimaeus; for example, Bultmann, *History*, 214; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:133; J. C. Fenton, *Saint Matthew* (London: SCM, 1977), 144; Gundry, *Matthew*, 176–77.

healed) he is addressed as the "Son of David" (9:27). There is not a parallel confession in the centre miracle of A1 (centurion's child healed), but the centurion does address Jesus twice as Lord (he does so only once in Luke at 7:6). Consequently, in the three centre stories there is a stress on Jesus being the LORD Messiah. Also, the miracles in the centre stories of A1 (centurion's child healed) and A2 (2 blind men healed) are both done according to the faith of the recipients (8:13, 8:29). In both cases this detail is a Matthean addition. There is thus also a stress on the miracles being done by faith. In fact the centurion's faith is the greatest Jesus has seen in Israel (8:10).

The theme of faith is strong throughout the miracles: the leper kneels before Jesus, addresses him as Lord, and believes that Jesus is able to heal him (8:2); Jesus sees the faith of those bringing the paralytic, heals the paralytic, and forgives his sins (9:2); Jairus kneels before Jesus and asks that Jesus raise his dead daughter (9:18); and the HW's faith makes her well (9:22). The faith seems to be not only that the recipient believes that Jesus can do the miracle, but also that Jesus is the Messiah. This is clear in the story of the two blind men, and implicit in the story of the centurion: the centurion sees Jesus as someone like himself, that is, a man of authority with people beneath him (8:9). This, along with the repeated address of Jesus as Lord, indicates that the centurion understands Jesus to be high up in the spiritual hierarchy. It is precisely after this comment that Jesus says the centurion's faith is the greatest he has seen in Israel.

However, though Jesus is addressed as Lord and Son of David, neither the centurion (hinge A1) nor the blind men (hinge A2) seem to fully grasp that Jesus is divine, that is, that he is the Son of God (hinge C). Only the demons in the centre miracle know this. This is reflected elsewhere in the miracle section. The disciples after Jesus stills the storm ask, "What sort of man is this, that even the winds and the sea obey him?" (8:27). "Man" is a Matthean addition to Mark. The answer is supplied in the next miracle by the demons: he is not a man; he is the Son of God. Likewise Matthew adds the line "they glorified God, who had given such authority to human beings" (9:8) to the story of the paralytic. Again, God has not given it to a man, but to his Son. Consequently, though everyone realizes that something completely extraordinary is at work in Jesus, which is highlighted by the crowd at the end of the miracle section when they say, "Never has anything like this been seen in Israel" (9:33), nobody fully grasps who Jesus is. However, those who come closest are deemed to have great faith, namely, the centurion and the two blind men. Consequently, Matthew in his arrangement of the miracles highlights what those present could not see. In this, Matthew is very similar to Mark, even though he uses a very different chiastic arrangement.[439]

To conclude, the high level of parallelism, especially because it is mostly due to Matthean changes, indicates that Matthew intended the chiastic arrangement. This conclusion is made more likely because it also highlights what seem to be the central themes in the miracle section, namely, that of the connection between faith and the miraculous. However, no-one fully grasps exactly who Jesus is, not even Jairus who makes the most extraordinary request of Jesus. The connection between faith and miracles consequently points to the other central theme of the miracle section, namely, that the miracles show that Jesus is the Son of God.

---

[439] See above on page 135 for Mark on faith.

Conclusion

This brings to the end of this chapter on the methodology of chiastic analysis. The purpose was twofold: the first was to create a new methodological approach to studying chiasms, and the second was to refute the most common complaints made by sceptics of chiastic analysis. Both goals were accomplished through an in-depth probability analysis of Mark 1:12–6:46. The analysis was able to give a quantifiable answer to the question of what can be considered good parallelism. This analysis in turn will allow for the better analysis of chiastic structures in other texts. The analysis also laid to rest the most frequent criticism laid at the feet of chiastic scholars, namely, that one can find valid parallels between any two units of text, and that therefore one could create chiasms at will from any text if one wanted to. This supposition was shown to be groundless.[440] This is not to say that all chiasms that have been proposed by scholars are good chiasms, but it does show that scholars of chiasm have in general been subject to overly sceptical criticism. The analysis also showed that viable three-, four-, and five-level chiastic structures were rare, even in a text where it was shown that the author used chiasm as his primary structuring device. Finally, a set of criteria based on the analysis were formulated, which will allow for the better judging of proposed chiastic structures.

In addition four other short studies were undertaken, namely, on the origin of the use of chiasm, how meaning is generated by chiasm, the purpose of chiasm, and Luke and Matthew's adaptation of Mark's chiastic structures. The first study showed that there is plenty of evidence to suggest that the use of chiasm as a structuring device is a very old ancient Near Eastern, more specifically, Mesopotamian technique. Clear examples have been found in Sumero-Akkadian, Canaanite, and Hebrew literature, which show the use of the device on both the macro- and micro- levels. The same cannot be said for Greco-Roman literature with the exception of Homer, who may well have learnt this ancient Semitic technique through the more materially advanced culture of the Phoenicians. The short study of the origins of chiasm laid to rest another criticism made by sceptics of chiastic studies, namely, that there is no evidence of the widespread use of chiasm in Greco-Roman literature, and that therefore an author writing in Greek could not have used chiasm as her or his primary structuring device, because there would be no one to teach it to them. Those who make this criticism forget that though the authors of the gospels are writing in Greek, and therefore one should expect elements of Greco-Roman literature in their writings, the authors also saw themselves as worshippers of the Jewish god. It is also highly likely that the gospel writers were all Jewish, and thus it should not be surprising that they used a very ancient Semitic structuring device, especially if this device was prevalent in their primary religious texts, namely, those found in what is now called the Hebrew Bible.

The second short study, namely, on how chiasms generate meaning, demonstrated how meaning is generated through juxtaposition. The chiastic structure allows for both a linear and concentric juxtaposition and development of ideas. This study also highlighted a central difference between modern texts and texts that use chiasm: modern texts place the climax of the text near the end of a text, and texts using chiasm place the climax in the centre of text. In other words, the central point of a text is fittingly found in the centre of the text. Also, the beginnings and ends of the chiasm (the wings) tend to introduce and provide the conclusion for the central theme found at the hinge. This study used Mark's macro-chiasm for Mark

[440] As far as I know, no sceptic of chiastic analysis has done any sort of analysis to show that one can find valid parallelism between any two units of text.

1:12–6:46 and the second power chiasm as examples to illustrate how meaning is generated through structure. The examination of these chiasms was in turn useful for understanding the importance of the miracles for Mark, in particular the story of JD. Mark seems to see the miracles as important because they help with the mission by showing who Jesus is. This is especially true of the most astounding miracles, such as the raising of JD from the dead. The last also seems to have been used as a foreshadowing of Jesus's own resurrection and death. As we shall see, this last theme is built upon by Mark through other chiastic structures involving JD.

The third short study addressed the issue of the purpose of structuring in text using chiasm. It was argued that there is a twofold purpose for the use of chiasm, namely, as a mnemonic device and to provide meaning. Exactly how a chiasm can aid memory was demonstrated using Mark's two layered macro-chiasm for 1:12–6:46: the first chiastic layer (the MLUD chiasm) provides a simple structure on which the more complex second chiastic layer can be developed (the MSUD chiasm), which in turn provides the structure for the individual units. It was also suggested that the individual units in turn have their own chiastic structures to aid in their memorization. The use of such micro-chiastic structures by all three synoptic authors will be shown for the raising-of-the-dead stories studied in the following chapters. It was then argued that only those who memorized the text could be expected to understand the meaning of the chiastic structures, because the chiastic structures are complex and not readily recognizable. This led to the conclusion that those who performed the text from memory also expounded on the meaning of the text; in other words, they were both performers and teachers of the gospel. Finally, it was argued that the popularity of the codex led to the knowledge of the chiastic structure of the gospels disappearing, because the texts no longer needed to be memorized and the meaning generated by the chiasm could be passed on without recourse to the chiasm. The arguments in this section also provide an answer to two further criticisms made by those sceptical of the use of chiasm by Christian authors, namely, that the proposed chiasms are too complex for the average person to grasp, and that if the gospels used chiastic structure to such an extent, the knowledge of the structures would have been maintained in the communities.

Finally, the fourth study showed how Luke and Matthew adapted Mark's material. The study of Luke was especially instructive, because it showed that Luke was fully aware of the chiastic structure for Mark's first double power and wisdom chiasm. This demonstrates that at least one person in the first century had a good understanding of Mark's use of chiasm. It is unlikely he was the only person. This study of Luke's adaptation of Mark's chiasm also showed how chiastic analysis can be a very useful tool for redaction criticism, because it highlights items that may have been added to the oral tradition to create the chiasms. The study of Luke and Matthew's chiastic structures involving JD also showed that they had a similar understanding of the miracle tradition to Mark, namely, that the primary purpose of the miracles was to help the mission and show that Jesus was the LORD Messiah.

This brings us to the end of the methodological section of the thesis, and we now turn to the historical analysis.

Chapter Three: Jairus's Daughter

Introduction

So far we have outlined the historical framework and one of the methodologies used to perform the historical analysis, namely chiastic analysis. The chiastic analysis has two primary goals. The first is to understand the theological meaning of the miracles of Jesus raising people from the dead for the author and by extension her or his community. The second is to highlight items in the story that may have been added to the oral tradition to form the chiastic structures. In other words, both goals serve the purpose of identifying items that the gospel author may have added to the oral tradition, that is, items due to the gospel author's redaction of the oral tradition. In this sense the chiastic analysis is a type of redaction analysis.

This analysis will in turn be useful in the performance of the oral analysis, which has the goal of identifying the shape of the oral tradition, and in the performance of the historical analysis, which has the goal of identifying which items in the oral tradition went back to an incident in Jesus's life. The oral analysis is a synoptic comparison of the three versions of the story found in Mark, Luke, and Matthew to determine those items which are essential to the tradition, the items that are repertorial, that is, are part of the tradition, but do not need to be included in every performance of the tradition, the items which are variable, that is, acceptable variations to the tradition, and the items which are allowable additions. Items which are found in all three gospels are candidates for the category "essential," and items that are only found in one or two of the traditions are candidates for the other categories. However, there may be items that have been added to the oral tradition by the gospel writers for theological or chiastic reasons that appear in one, two, or all three of the gospels. There may also be items in the oral tradition that may have been deleted from the oral tradition for theological reasons by a particular author. In the first case items that may seem essential may not be, and in the second case items that seem to be repertorial, additional, or variable may be essential. One purpose of the chiastic analysis is to highlight such items.

In this chapter we will be begin with a chiastic analysis of JD (JD) in Mark, then in Luke, and finally in Matthew. This order follows what in my view is the order of the composition of the three gospels.[441] Since the story of the HW (HW) is intercalated within the narrative in all three versions, this story will be analysed as well. The chiastic analysis will show that all three writers used a similar chiastic structure even though various elements

---

[441] I basically agree with the arguments put forth by Martin Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 98–99, 169–205, as to the relative dating of Luke and Matthew: Luke within the decade following the destruction of Jerusalem, and Matthew, in accordance with most scholars, towards the end of the first century (85 to 95 C.E.). This would mean it is highly likely that Matthew knew Luke. This would explain the minor agreements between Matthew and Luke on changes to Mark, which are especially prevalent in JD (see Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 40–41). It does not, however, mean that there was not a sayings gospel (Q). It is highly likely that there was such a document, and that it was originally associated with the name Matthew. This would explain the insistence of the ancient authors of the priority of Matthew and that it was written in Aramaic ("the language of the Hebrews") against the evidence that the Gospel of Matthew used Mark and was written in Greek. The disciple Matthew wrote down the sayings of Jesus in Aramaic, and this was then translated into Greek (perhaps by more than one person), and then the writer of Matthew, as Hengel suggests, when he combined Mark and this sayings gospel, kept the name of the sayings gospel to give prestige to his gospel (*Four Gospels*, 71, 177).

were changed. The chiastic analysis will be useful as it will show the theological importance of this story for showing Jesus is the LORD, in other words, it will build on the analysis of the previous chapter. New themes will also come to the fore, most importantly, that of faith in Jesus. The chiastic analysis will also show how the story was possibly redacted by the gospel authors to help make the chiasms they create.

Then an oral analysis will be done of the story as described above. This will have to take into account the substantial changes made by Matthew to the story in order to address the question of whether these changes were ones normally allowable in the oral telling of the story or were perhaps ones made for theological reasons. The combined chiastic and oral analysis will hopefully produce a plausible outline of the shape of the oral tradition. An historical analysis to determine the historicity of the oral tradition using conventional methods will then be performed. The goal of the historical analysis is to determine which items in the oral tradition are likely to have originated in the life of Jesus and which items are likely to have been added by the early Christian community.

Chiastic Analysis: Mark's Multiple Chiasms

Chiasm after John Dart[442]

The following chiasm is based on a chiasm proposed by John Dart. Before we outline the chiasm a number of remarks are in order. The first wing of the chiasm is unusual. It consists of the parable section comprising eight units, which is paired with the feeding of the five thousand (36.2–4). This may sound odd, but there are twenty-two parallels between these two wings. However, this figure has to be lowered, because there are 897 Greek words in the combined units, which means 449 words on average per unit. This means that the twenty-two parallels are equivalent to roughly five parallels in the LUD, where the average is 105 words per unit. This may not seem like a high number of parallels, but the low figure does not do justice to the immediate parallelism between the two units. First, despite the parable section consisting of eight separate units, it is actually one scene: Jesus is by the sea teaching the crowd parables from a boat. In the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus had arrived by boat to find a crowd and proceeds to teach them. Consequently, both scenes are of Jesus teaching a huge crowd by the sea. Also, in both scenes large numbers are repeated: the grain multiplies thirty-, sixty-, and a hundredfold (4:8, 20), and the five thousand sit in groups of hundreds and fifties (6:40). There is also the central theme of increase in grain or its product: in the seed parables grain increases from a small seed to large harvests or bushes, and in the feeding miracles two loaves are able to feed five thousand. Thus, though the two units only have the equivalent of five LUD parallels between them, the parallelism is clear and immediate.

The total number of words in the rest of the chiasm is 1283, which for the eight levels (the hinge of one sentence was ignored) produces an average of 107 words per unit, that is, roughly the same as for the LUD. Consequently, the LUD figures will be used for the calculation.

Another oddity of the chiasm is that two units which have not been previously divided are divided here. The first is the story of the HW (31), which is divided in the actual miracle (5:25–29), where the woman comes forward, touches Jesus, and his healed, and the aftermath of the miracle (5:30–34), where Jesus notices that power has gone forth, looks around, and

[442] John Dart, *Decoding Mark* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003), 161–63.

the woman comes forward. The story of the HW is thus divided at a natural turning point and division in the story. In fact, the first half could stand alone as a complete miracle story. The second unit that is divided is the story of Jesus in Nazareth (33). This unit is divided into the story of Jesus teaching in Nazareth along with the amazement of the audience (6:1–3a), and then the negative reaction of the Nazarenes and Jesus's inability to do miracles there (6:3b–6). Again, the division of a unit is into its two natural halves, and the first half could stand alone as a separate story.

The last oddity of the chiasm is the hinge, which is only one sentence. In this sentence Jesus tells the witnesses that no one should know what happened and that JD should be given something to eat. The oddity of these two items will be discussed in detail below. The first item is odd, because outside the house where JD is raised there is crowd of mourners who are convinced the girl is dead (they laugh at Jesus when he says that JD is alive [5:40]), and consequently unless Jairus and his wife pretend that the girl is not healed, everyone will know what has taken place, namely, that Jesus raised the girl. The second item is odd, because it just seems tacked on and has no point of reference. Neither item is necessary for the story; the story is quite complete without them. In fact, the story already ends with the usual ending of the witnesses' amazement (5:42).[443] The two items are thus strong candidates, as we shall see, for being Markan additions to the oral tradition.

The hinge, though short, has a strong parallel with the second wing, the feeding of the five thousand: in both people are given something to eat. This similarity has led some scholars to propose that the feeding of the five thousand followed immediately after the story of JD in one of Mark's sources.[444] There is also a strong parallel to the first wing, namely, both have the theme of secrecy. In the parable section the full meaning of the parables is a secret only the disciples know (4:10–13), and the wings stress that the public is taught only in parables, but the disciples have everything explained to them (4:2, 33–34). The importance of the concept of secrecy to the parable section is also found in the hinge parable of the lamps: all that is hidden or secret is meant later to be disclosed (4:22). Consequently, though the hinge is one sentence, it just happens to encapsulate the two central themes of the wings: only a few knowing a secret and people being fed. Is this simply a coincidence? A probability calculation will tell us the likelihood of this.

The chiasm runs as follows:[445]

---

[443] In a healing story there is often a confirmation that the person is healed. The girl being fed is confirmation that she is alive; so Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1–8:26* (WBC 34A; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989), 304; Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Bedeutung der Wundererzählungen für die Christologie des Markusevangeliums* (vol. 42; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975), 65–66; Theissen, *Miracle*, 152. JD is peculiar in that it has two such confirmations: first we are told that she is walking around, and second that she be given something to eat. Some have suggested that the eating is to show that the raised girl is not a ghost; for example, Rochais, *Récits*, 62. This, however, does not make sense, because the witnesses would have been able to see she was not a ghost: if the ghost were walking around, the body would have been lying on the bed. Theissen (Theissen, *Miracle*, 152) sees no problem with a double confirmation, since it is an extraordinary miracle, but sees a problem with the order (food then walking makes most sense). Also, the proof of confirmation comes before the reaction of the audience, and thus on two accounts the order for the girl to be fed is out of order.

[444] For example, Paul J. Achtemeier, *Jesus and the Miracle Tradition* (Eugene, Ore.: Cascade, 2008), 72.

[445] Dart's chiasm runs as follows: A1 4:13–34 (parable section less introduction and first parable), B1 4:35–41 (stilling of storm), C1 5:1–20 (Gerasene demoniac), D1 5:21–24 (Jairus's request), E1 5:25–34 (HW), F1 5:35–40 (Jairus's messengers, Jairus's mourners, and entrance to JD's room), G1 5:41–42 (Jesus commands girl to rise), H 5:43 (Jesus says to say nothing and give girl something to eat), G2 6:1–2 (Jesus teaches in Nazareth), F2 6:3–6 (Jesus rejected in Nazareth), E2 6:7–13 (Twelve instructed and sent out), D2 6:14–16 (Herod hears of

A1 Parable section (19–27): 22 //s = 5//s LUD
B1 Storm stilled (28): 9 //s
C1 Gerasene demoniac (29): 7 //s
D1 Jairus's request (30): 3 //s
E1 HW healed (31.1: 5:25–29): 4//s
F1 HW comes forward (31.2: 5:30–34): 4//s
G1 JD raised (32: 5:35–42): 9 //s
H Jesus says to give JD something to eat (5:43)
G2 Teaching in Nazareth (33.1: 6:1–4)
F2 Jesus rejected in Nazareth (6:5–6)
E2 Twelve instructed and sent out (34:2–3)
D2 Herod hears the news concerning Jesus (35.1)
C2 Death of John (35.2)
B2 Twelve return (36.1)
A2 Feeding of the 5000 (36.2–4)

The above sort of chiasm could occur nineteen times in the sample space, because it could begin anywhere from units 1 through 19. The probability for the above chiasm occurring is.371 4 x.128 6 x.222 2 x.596 8 x.477 8 x.477 8 x.128 6 x 19, which is.003 533, that is.3%, or 1 in 283. While this is not the lowest number produced in the calculations so far, it is still a very low number. This combined with the strong likelihood that the hinge is a Markan addition and has very strong parallels with the two wings, leads to the conclusion that the above chiasm was intended by Mark.

This brings us to the question of what meaning the chiasm likely held for Mark. The hinges and wings connect Jesus's teaching with being fed. In the previous chapter it was discussed how the feeding of the five thousand is symbolic of the eschatological banquet that will usher in the kingdom of God. The parables contain the secret of the kingdom of God, that is, the secret of how to enter the kingdom. Also, the parables are all about grain or seed that increases, and the primary product of grain is bread, which in turn increases in the feeding story. This would suggest the equation of Jesus's teaching with the bread. In addition, the feeding of the five thousand has strong eucharistic symbolism that equates the bread of the feeding with the bread of the eucharist. Such an equation is found elsewhere in first-century Christianity: in John's gospel Jesus's word is equated with the bread of the eucharist (6.22–65). It is unlikely a coincidence that John begins this discussion right after his recounting of the feeding of the five thousand (6:1–15), and makes direct reference to the bread of the feeding (6:22). It would seem that John was aware of the symbolic understanding of the bread of the feeding that Mark makes through chiasm. This interpretation would thus mean that when Jesus tells the parents to give their daughter something to eat in the hinge, Jesus is also saying that the girl should be taught.

In the unit next to the hinge (G1: JD raised) we are told that the girl is twelve years old. In the second wing, it is the twelve who help Jesus hand out the bread (6:41).[446] In addition twelve baskets of leftovers are gathered up after the feeding (6:42). It is well accepted that the twelve disciples and the twelve baskets are a symbolic reference to Israel. It would thus make sense that the girl who is to be given something to eat in the hinge and happens to be twelve years old is also symbolic of Israel. If so, this would mean that the raising of the twelve-year-old daughter is symbolic of the raising of Israel in G1. In the previous chapter, it

---

Jesus), C2 6:17–29 (death of John), B2 6:30–33a (Twelve return), A2 6:33b–46 (feeding of five thousand). For more details see Dart, *Decoding*, 161–3.

[446] The disciples mentioned are the twelve who have returned from their mission: 6:7, 30–32.

was discussed how the Nazarenes also seem to be symbolic of Israel. They just happen to be the subjects of G2 and F2. In these two units, the Nazarenes are first amazed at Jesus's teaching and deeds of power (G2, 6:2), just as the witnesses in G1 are amazed at the raising of JD (6:42), but the Nazarenes then reject Jesus and take offence (F2, 6:3). The reader is then pointedly told that Jesus could not do any deeds of power in Nazareth because of the Nazarenes' lack of faith (F2, 6:5). This is paralleled in F1 (HW comes forward), where the HW, who just happened to have suffered twelve years (E1, 5:25), is told that her faith has made her well (F1, 5:34). The word used for "made well" is an odd choice and has the sense of being saved from chastisement.[447] It would thus seem that the woman who suffered for twelve years also symbolizes Israel. This would create the message that the faithful in Israel, symbolized by the HW and JD, will be saved from chastisement on the day of the LORD and raised, whereas the unfaithful in Israel, symbolized by the Nazarenes, will not be.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the HW gives the correct response and kneels before Jesus (F1). This is in contrast to the Nazarenes who show a lack of faith (F2). It was also discussed in the previous chapter how the Gerasene gave the correct response by wishing to become a disciple and proclaim. In this chiasm the woman who has been haemorrhaging for twelve years (E1) is paired with the twelve being instructed and sent out (E2). The HW and the twelve represent the two sides of the correct response: worshiping and proclaiming. Jairus the synagogue leader also gives the correct response to Jesus in D1: like the HW, he also falls at the feet of Jesus (5:22). This is in comparison to another Jewish leader in D2, King Herod, who hears all that Jesus has done, yet does nothing: his only concern is that Jesus is John the Baptist, whom he had beheaded (6:16). Continuing the movement towards the hinge, the next unit (C2) shows the full extent of Herod's evil: he presides over an evil banquet which leads to John the Baptist, whom Herod knows is righteous and holy (6:20), being bound (6:17) and killed at his orders (6:27). Herod and his court are in sharp contrast to the actions of Jesus in C1: there Jesus frees the Gerasene who had been previously bound (5:4) from his affliction of possession. Jesus leads people out from death, represented by the Gerasene who lived in the tombs (5:2), and Herod leads people to death, represented by John who was laid in a tomb (8:29).

In the last level of units, the B level, there does not seem to be a clear reason for the juxtaposition of units, because the parallelism is restricted to Jesus suggesting in both that he and the disciples leave for a deserted place. In B1 this suggestion leads to the stilling of the storm and the disciples being afraid and wondering who Jesus is (4:41). In B2 the suggestion simply leads to Jesus and the twelve departing. However, there is a strong possibility that B2 is intended to point forward to Jesus walking on water (6:47–52). Jesus's suggestion to get away is thwarted by the crowd that follows and the resulting miracle of the five thousand of them being fed. At the end of the miracle Jesus sends the twelve off alone in the boat (6:45). In other words, the goal at the beginning of the feeding is resumed, which creates an inclusio around the feeding. This departure in a boat leads into the miracle of walking on water, which just happens to be very similar to the stilling of the storm: in both there is adverse weather which is stopped by Jesus, and in both the disciples are afraid, because they do not know who Jesus is.

If B2 is intended to point forward to the walking on water miracle, then this would fittingly add to the above chiasm the question of the identity of Jesus. The disciples would

---

[447] The noun "μάστις" has the basic meaning of whip or lash: Timothy Friberg, et al., *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* (Victoria, B.C.: Trafford, 2005); Liddell, et al., *LSJ*, s.v.

not be afraid if they knew that Jesus was the LORD, because the LORD could protect them from all evil, represented by the sea. Furthermore, even if they did die, there is still nothing to fear, because the LORD will be resurrecting the righteous on his day. This is foreshadowed by Jesus raising JD, who as argued above, represents Israel. This raising of the dead on the day of the LORD will lead to the final death of death and the eschatological feast where chaos monsters Leviathan and Behemoth, representing evil and death will be eaten. This final gathering of the twelve tribes is foreshadowed in the feeding of the five thousand where twelve baskets are gathered. Consequently, the disciples have nothing to fear on the B level because they represent the new Israel that will be gathered.

The above chiasm thus becomes a meditation on the day of the LORD and Jesus's role in it. Jesus has come to gather Israel into the kingdom through his teaching. This is shown in the wings: in A1 (the parable section) Jesus teaches the secret of the kingdom and in A2 the teaching leads to the eschatological kingdom (the feeding of the five thousand). This is also symbolized in the hinge by the young girl representing Israel being fed. Those who are faithful, represented by Jairus, the HW, and the twelve, will be part of the greatest deed of power, the banishing of evil and death on the day of the LORD. However, those who recognize that something holy and righteous is happening in Jesus, represented by the Nazarenes and Herod, yet reject Jesus, will not partake. Consequently, the righteous have nothing to fear, because the kingdom is theirs.

The above analysis shows the important role that the miracle of JD seems to have in Mark's theology. JD is representative of Israel who will be raised on the day of the Lord and will enter the kingdom. In return, her resurrection shows that Jesus is the LORD who will accomplish this action.[448] The miracle of JD is the culmination of a series of four miracles that show Jesus's power over all evil, and it points forward to the final and greatest miracle of this era, the resurrection of all the dead, which will be the death of death and will inaugurate the new era of the kingdom of God. We shall now look at the smaller chiastic structures to be found in the story of JD and the HW, and show how they build on the themes already discussed.

JD, HW, and Teaching in Nazareth Chiasm

This chiasm extends beyond the stories of JD (30, 32) and the HW (31) and includes the story of Jesus teaching in Nazareth (33). At first it may seem odd that Mark connects these three stories, until one recognizes the central theme of faith: the HW is healed because of her faith (5:34), Jairus is told to believe and all will be well (5:37), and Jesus cannot heal in Nazareth due to the lack of faith (6:5–6). The combined stories produce seven scenes: Jairus's request (5:21–23), the HW healed (5:24–29), Jesus noticing power going forth and the HW coming forward (5:30–34), Jairus's messengers (5:34–36), Jairus's mourners (5:37–40), JD raised (5:40–43), and Jesus teaching in Nazareth (6:1–6). Each scene has a structural similarity and can be divided into three parts. The first part in each scene involves movement, usually on the part of Jesus, or originating from Jesus (a). In the second part the main character besides Jesus is described (b), and in the third part the resulting action connected to the main character is described (c). These scenes can be laid out in the following chiastic pattern:

---

[448] Marcus (Marcus, *Mark*, 373) notes that Mark's readers would immediately grasp that the power shown here is the same power that will be exhibited when the dead are raised on the Day.

A1 Jairus's request (30) 6 //s
a Movement: Jesus arrives to crowd (5:21)
b Main character described: Jairus, a synagogue leader falls at Jesus's feet (5:22)
c Action relating to main character: Jairus asks Jesus to save his daughter from death (5:23)

B1 The HW healed (31.1) 8 //s
a Movement: Jesus goes with Jairus into crowd (5:24)
b Main character described: HW woman who has suffered twelve years (5:25–26)
c Action relating to main character: woman touches Jesus and is healed (5:27–29)

C1 Jesus asks who touched him (31.2) 1 //
a Movement: As power goes forth Jesus turns around and asks who touched him (5:30–32)
b Main character described: HW comes in fear and falls at Jesus's feet (5:33a)
c Action relating to main character: HW tells whole truth (5:33b)

D Jairus's messengers (32.1) 6 //s with A1, 8 //s with A2
a Movement: Jesus tells woman to go in peace because her faith has healed her (5:34)
b Main character described: messengers arrive from Jairus's house and say JD is dead (5:35)
c Action relating to main character: Jesus tells Jairus to believe (5:36)

C2 Jairus's mourners (32.2)
a Movement: Jesus leaves crowd with only Jairus and the three (5:37)
b Main character described: mourning crowd weeping and wailing (5:38)
c Action relating to main character: Jesus tells crowd JD is asleep (5:39)

B2 JD raised (32.3)
a Movement: Crowd laughs and Jesus puts them outside and goes into JD with only parents and three (5:40)
b Main character described: JD is lying down, walks, and is twelve years old (5:41)
c Action relating to main character: witnesses amazed, told not to tell, and to feed girl (5:41–43)

A2 Teaching in Nazareth (33)
a Movement Jesus goes with disciples to hometown synagogue (6:1)
b Main character described: Nazarenes amazed at teaching and reports of miracles, but take offence (6:2–3)
c Action relating to main character: Jesus cannot heal due to Nazarenes' lack of faith (6:4–6)

Each unit follows the natural breaks of the text except for D, which begins with the HW being told to go by Jesus, then describes the arrival of the messengers, and results in Jesus telling Jairus to believe. Though this unit crosses the natural boundaries of the text, it follows the pattern of the other units in terms of structure, and the three parts form an inclusio: Jesus commenting of faith—messengers announcing death—Jesus commenting on faith. This is the only unit to have an inclusio, which is fitting, because it is the hinge.

The parallelism between the levels and between the wings and hinge is very strong except for the C level, which only has one parallel, namely, both scenes involve a crowd.[449] However, even with the one parallel the probability figure for the chiasm is fairly good:.068 3 x.029 0 x.667 2 x 56, or.0740, which is 7 % or 1 in 14. When one takes into account the high parallelism between the hinge and the wings A1 and A2, six parallels and eight parallels respectively, then it is quite likely that this chiasm is due to Mark. This will be shown to be even more likely because the above chiasm can be expanded out into a triple chiasm with strong parallelism.

The chiasm also produces a coherent message on the theme of faith. In the hinge the HW is told that her faith has saved her and Jairus is told not to fear and only believe, with the implication that his daughter will be made well as requested in the first wing. The language

[449] There is also a more subtle parallel: both the disciples and the mourners are acting from the perspective of common sense. This parallel is pointed out by Moloney, *Mark*, 108–09. He also points out that the messengers work from the perspective of common sense. Faith consequently becomes opposed to common sense.

Jesus uses when speaking to the HW has strong salvific overtones; it could also be translated as follows: "Daughter, your faith has saved (σέσωκέν) you go into peace (εἰς εἰρήνην) and be healthy from your chastisement (μάστιγός)."[450] For the early Christian this sentence would carry the religious overtones of being saved from punishment on the Day and entering the peace of the kingdom.[451] This is paralleled in Jairus's request to Jesus in A1, which could be translated as "Come and lay your hands on her, so that she may be saved (σωθῇ), and live."[452] Again this can be read in an eschatological manner. Thus, when Jesus asks Jairus to believe and not to be afraid in the hinge, he is asking him to believe that his daughter, like the HW, will be saved. Jairus's faith is further shown in the first wing by his falling at Jesus's feet. The faith asked for in the wings is in stark contrast to the reaction of the Nazarenes, who unlike Jairus, who had obviously heard of Jesus's deeds and makes his request, take offence at Jesus. This lack of faith means that no deed of power could be done in Nazareth (6:6). A similar contrast is made on the C level where the faith of the HW in C1, shown by her falling at Jesus's feet, is contrasted with the lack of faith of the mourning crowd in C2.

The above interpretation fits with the interpretation of the previous chiasm. There it was suggested that JD and the HW represent Israel that will be saved on the day of the LORD, and the Nazarenes represent Israel that will not be saved on that day. The connection between the two females is made very strong in the above chiasm: in B1 the HW is healed from her affliction of twelve years, and in B2 the twelve-year-old daughter is raised. Both miracles point to the day of the LORD when Israel's affliction will end and she will be saved. The connection between the two females is also made in the hinge where the HW is referred to as "daughter" (5:34) by Jesus. In Hebrew scripture cities and countries are often spoken of as daughter, and hence, daughter Babylon, daughter Edom, daughter Judah, daughter Israel, and most often, daughter Jerusalem.[453] This is a further indication that the two daughters are meant to represent Israel.

---

[450] NRSV 5:34: "Daughter, your faith has made you well, go in peace, and be healed of your disease." The basic meaning of this verb is "to save," or "to preserve": in regards to health it means save from illness, that is heal; in regards to danger it means to save or rescue; of things, to keep them safe; with motion, to bring home safely or to escape. See Friberg, et al., *AnLex*; Liddell, et al., *LSJ*; s.v. "σῴζω." In a religious sense in early Christianity it means saved from divine retribution on the Day: "Much more surely then, now that we have been justified by his blood, will we be saved through him from the wrath of God" (Rom 5:9); "in order to make my own people jealous, and save some of them" (Rom 11:14); "Wife, for all you know, you might save your husband. Husband, for all you know, you might save your wife" (1 Cor 7:16); "For by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God" (Eph 2:8): "Therefore rid yourselves of all sordidness and rank growth of wickedness, and welcome with meekness the implanted word that has the power to save your souls" (Jas 1:21); "And baptism, which this prefigured, now saves you" (1 Pet 3:21). The noun "μάστις" has the basic meaning of whip or lash: Friberg, et al., *AnLex*; Liddell, et al., *LSJ*, s.v.

[451] Marcus, *Mark*, 368–69, also sees eschatological reference in this story. He sees the blood drying up as the power of God's new age that makes all clean, and the woman being told to go "into" (εἰς) peace as eschatological movement into the new age.

[452] NRSV 5:24: "Come and lay your hands on her, so that she may be made well, and live."

[453] For example: "O virgin Israel, return to these your cities. How long will you waver, O faithless daughter?" (Jer 31:20–22); "daughter Judah" (Lam 2:2, 5); "daughter Zion" (Isa 1:8, 10:32, 16:1, 37:22, 52:2, 62:11; Jer 6:23; Lam 1:6, 2:1, 4, 10, 13, 18, 4:22; Mic 1:13, 4:8; Zeph 3:14; Zech 2:10, 9:9); "daughter Jerusalem" (Isa 37:22; Lam 2:15, 4:8; Zeph 3:14); "daughter Gillim" (10:32); "daughter Babylon" (Isa 47:1, 5; Jer 50:42; Zech 2:7); "daughter Chaldea" (47:5); "daughter Egypt" (Jer 46:11, 19); "daughter Dibon" (48:18); "daughter Edom" (Lam 4:21, 22). Of all these daughters, Israel was the special portion of the LORD (Deut 32:8).

The clear thematic contrast and juxtaposition around the theme of faith created by the chiasm is further indication that the chiasm was the creation of Mark. The chiasm builds on the themes of the previous chiasm analysed. The raising of JD is not simply a tale of a girl brought back to life, but rather it is symbolic of Israel's future salvation and raising by her LORD. The faith shown by Jairus that Jesus can raise his daughter in the hinge becomes faith that Jesus is the LORD who will raise his people Israel.

We shall now look at how the above chiasm is expanded upon by Mark. The method Mark seems to apply is very similar to the expansion of the MLUD and MSUD chiasms described in the previous chapter.

Expansion of the Primary Chiasm

We shall refer to the previous chiasm as the primary chiasm. The primary chiasm had a repetitive structure within each unit of movement (a), main character (b), and resulting action (c). This pattern allows for the chiasm to be expanded into a triple and a half four-level chiasm as follows:

A1 (a) **Movement**: Jesus arrives by boat to a great crowd (5:21)
B1 (b) ***Faith***: Jairus comes to Jesus, falls at feet, and begs (5:22)
C1 (c) *Condition of JD*: near dead, healing requested (5:23)
D1 (a) **Movement**: Jesus leaves with Jairus and a large crowd (5:24)
C2 (b) *Condition of HW*: suffering for twelve years; has nothing (5:25–26)
B2 (c) ***Faith***: HW comes to Jesus, touches him, and is healed (5:27–29)
A2 (a) **Movement**: power goes forth from Jesus, Jesus turns around and asks who touched (5:30–32)
B3 (b) ***Faith***: HW knows what happened, comes to Jesus, and falls at feet (5:33)
C3 (c) *Condition of HW*: woman tells whole truth, that is, of sickness and healing (5:33)
D2 (a) **Movement**: HW told to go in peace since her faith has saved her (5:34)
C4 (b) *Condition of JD*: messengers say daughter is dead (5:35)
B4 (c) ***Faith***: Jesus tells Jairus to believe (5:36)
A3 (a) **Movement**: Jesus leaves crowd and goes with three and father (5:37)
B5 (b) ***Faith***: mourning crowd weeping and wailing (5:38)
C5 (c) *Condition of JD*: Jesus says daughter is asleep and not dead (5:39–40)
D3 (a) **Movement**: Jesus puts crowd outside and goes inside with three and parents (5:40)
C6 (b) *Condition of JD*: girl gets up, walks, and is twelve (5:41–42)
B6 (c) ***Faith***: witnesses amazed; Jesus says to tell no one and feed girl (5:43)
A4 (a) **Movement**: Jesus goes with disciples (6:1)
B7 (b) ***Faith***: Nazarenes amazed, but take offence (6:2–3)
C7 (c) *Condition of Nazarenes*: no change except for a few minor miracles (6:4–6a)
D4 (a) **Movement**: Jesus teaches in villages (6:6b)[454]

The above chiasm has many parallels across each level. The A and D levels focus on the crowd: in A1 a great crowd gathers round Jesus; in D1 a large crowd follows Jesus and presses in on him; in A2 the disciples point out the crowd pressing in on Jesus; in D2 the

[454] There is the strong possibility that the chiasm should continue as follows:
D4 (a) **Movement**: Jesus calls disciples to him (6:7)
C8 (b) *Condition of disciples*: not to take anything (6:8–9
B8 (c) ***Faith***: shake off dust at those who refuse to hear (6:10–11)
A5 (a) **Movement**: the twelve proclaim and heal (6:12–13)
There are the following parallels with the rest of the chiasm: C8 has a parallel with C2 in that both HW and the twelve have nothing; B8 has a parallel with B7 in that both talk about people refusing the gospel; and A5 has the twelve proclaiming like Jesus does in D4.

woman is told to go, that is, leave the crowd; in A3 Jesus leaves the crowd with only the father and the three; in D3 Jesus puts the laughing crowd outside and goes into girl with the father, the mother, and the three; in A4 Jesus leaves and goes to Nazareth, where he will teach; and in D4 Jesus goes and teaches among the villages. The wings and hinges are thus scenes of movement which join the intervening scenes together.

On the B level there is a common theme of faith, or lack thereof, in action: in B1 Jairus comes and falls at Jesus's feet to request a miracle; in B2 the woman comes forward thinking that if she touches Jesus's clothes she will be made well; in B3 the woman comes forward and falls at Jesus's feet; in B4 Jesus tells Jairus to believe, that is, continue the faith in Jesus to be able to heal his daughter that was exhibited in B1; in B5 the mourning crowd exhibits a lack of faith, because unlike Jairus in B4 they think there is no hope; in B6 the witnesses show faith by being amazed and feeding the daughter, which symbolically means they teach her the word; and in B7 the Nazarenes show a lack of faith by being amazed at Jesus's power and wisdom, but then they reject him.

On the C level in the first six units the condition of either the HW or JD is reported on: in C1 we are told that JD is almost dead and that Jairus therefore wishes Jesus to lay his hands on her; in C2 we are told how the HW suffered for twelve years and spent all she had; in C3 the HW tells the whole truth, that is, of her condition beforehand, how she touched Jesus, and was healed; in C4 we are told that JD has died; in C5 Jesus says that JD is not dead but sleeping; and in C6 we are told that Jesus takes the girl's hand, that she gets up, and that she is twelve years old. In the last unit the condition of the Nazarenes is reported, namely, that is unchanged, because Jesus could do no deed of power there, except lay his hands on a few people and heal them.

There are at least two to three word or conceptual parallels on average between each unit and its neighbouring unit on the same level. Since there are 504 Greek words in total and twenty-two units, this means there are 23 words on average per unit. The units are thus on average just over one third the size of the SUD units. Consequently, the number of parallels is the equivalent to at least six to nine parallels in the SUD. The chiasm is also very long. A triple four-level chiasm is equivalent to a ten-level chiasm, and the above chiasm is one half of a single four-level chiasm longer. A probability calculation for the above chiasm would thus produce an incredibly low figure. If one simply counted one parallel per level, which would be equivalent to three SUD parallels, and treated the above chiasm as a ten-level chiasm, then the probability would be.278 7 to the ninth power multiplied by 54, which is the number of ways the chiasm could occur in the SUD.[455] This figure is.000 547 8. If one counted two parallels per level, that is, the equivalent of six SUD parallels, the figure would become 1.747 e9. In other words, patterns such as that outlined in the above chiasm simply do not occur by chance.

The above chiastic structure puts the focus on the crowd and Jesus's control over it. It was discussed in the previous chapter how the crowd in the second power chiasm appears to represent evil. The growing negativity of the crowd in the second part of that chiasm occurs in the above material. At first the crowd is simply gathering around Jesus (A1), but then it is described as pressing in on Jesus (D1 and A2). Jesus, however, has no fear of it. Despite the seeming impossibility of finding someone in the crowd, Jesus determinedly looks around in A2, and in the following unit the person comes forward (B3). Then in A3 Jesus's control over the pressing crowd is shown by him allowing only Jairus and the three to come with

[455] The chiasm covers eight SUD units.

him. Likewise, in D3 Jesus is shown putting the crowd that laughs at him outside and going in with only the parents and the three. The word that is used here by Mark (ἐκβαλὼν) is the same word that is used for casting out demons (for example, 6:39). This word usage further highlights the crowd being a symbol for evil and Jesus's complete control over it.

If one excludes the Nazarene story, the exact centre of the material dealing with the HW and JD is D2 where Jesus tells the woman to go in peace because her faith has saved her from chastisement. The symbolic implications of this phrase were discussed above. The symbolism of the crowd as evil adds to the interpretation: the woman being told to go from the crowd, would symbolically mean that she is being told to leave evil. Thus, faithful Israel, represented by the HW, will on the day of the LORD leave behind evil, enter the peace of the new kingdom, and not receive chastisement. If one continues the symbolism of the HW and JD representing Israel, then the condition of Israel is highlighted on the C level: though she is near death (C1) and has suffered for a long time (C2), she will be healed (C3), and though those in Israel who have died appear dead (C4), they are sleeping (C5) and will be raised (C6). However, this will only happen if they have the right attitude toward Jesus, which is shown on the B level: they should worship Jesus (B1, B3), be full of hope (B1, B2, B4), not mourn (B5) but be amazed and happy (B6) and feed (teach/proclaim to) others (B6). Consequently, the above chiastic structure highlights themes and a theology that are consistent with the themes and theology of the other chiasms studied. JD is again shown to symbolize Israel, and her raising by Jesus again shows Jesus to be the LORD who will raise her.

The above triple chiasm based on the primary chiasm, like the MLUD and MSUD, has individual chiasms embedded within it that can be expanded out. We shall now look at these in detail as they not only give added meaning to the interconnected stories of the HW and JD, but they also show how Mark can create smaller chiasms by expanding larger chiasms.

The Expansion of the Triple Chiasm

We shall begin with the chiasm of the HW, which runs from D1 to D2 in the above chiasm:

A1 (a) **Movement**: Jesus leaves with Jairus and a large crowd (5:24)
  B1 (b) *Condition of HW*: suffering for twelve years (5:25–26)
    C1 (c) ***Faith***: HW comes to Jesus, touches him, and is healed (5:27–29)
      D (a) **Movement**: power goes forth from Jesus; Jesus turns around and asks who touched him (5:30–32)
    C2 (b) ***Faith***: HW knows what happened, comes to Jesus, and falls at feet (5:33)
  B2 (c) *Condition of HW*: woman tells whole truth, that is, of sickness and healing (5:33)
A2 (a) **Movement**: HW told to go in peace; faith has saved her (5:34)

This can be expanded as follows:

A1 Jesus leaves with large crowd (same)
5:24 So he went with him. And a large crowd followed him and pressed in on him.
B1 Condition of woman: suffering from haemorrhages and not helped by physicians (same)
5:25 Now there was a woman who had been suffering from haemorrhages for twelve years. 5:26 She had endured much under many physicians, and had spent all that she had; and she was no better, but rather grew worse.
C1 Woman heard of Jesus, comes to him, and touches him (first part of C1)
5:27 She had heard about Jesus, and came up behind him in the crowd and touched his cloak, 5:28 for she said, "If I but touch his clothes, I will be made well."
D1 Woman knows she is healed (second part of C1)
5:29 Immediately her haemorrhage stopped; and she felt in her body that she was healed of her disease.
E1 Jesus is aware power has gone (first part of D)
5:30 Immediately aware that power had gone forth from him, Jesus turned about in the crowd
F1 Jesus asked who touched clothes (second part of D)
and said, "Who touched my clothes?"
G Disciples point out crowd (third part of D)
5:31 And his disciples said to him, "You see the crowd pressing in on you;
F2 Disciples ask how can Jesus ask who touched him (fourth part of D)
how can you say, 'Who touched me?'"
E2 Jesus looks to see who had drawn power (fifth part of D)
5:32 He looked all around to see who had done it.
D2 Woman knows that Jesus's power healed her (first part of C2)
5:33 But the woman, knowing what had happened to her,
C2 Woman obeys Jesus, comes to Jesus, and tells what she had done (second part of C2 and all of B2)
came in fear and trembling, fell down before him, and told him the whole truth.
B2 Condition of Woman: Jesus says faith made woman well (first part of A2)
5:34 He said to her, "Daughter, your faith has made you well;
A2 Jesus tells woman to go in peace (second part of A2)
go in peace, and be healed of your disease."

The origin of each unit in regards to the original chiasm is given in parentheses. The opposition and juxtaposition of units by the above chiasm provides clear parallels: in A1 Jesus enters the crowd, and in A2 the woman is told the leave the crowd; in B1 physicians are unable to heal the HW, and in B2 faith has healed the HW; in C1 the woman comes up to Jesus and touches him, and in C2 the woman comes up to Jesus and tells him that she touched him; in D1 the woman feels in her body she is healed, and in D2 the woman knows she was healed; in both E1and E2 Jesus turns around to see who had drawn power; and in F1 Jesus asks who touched him, and in F2 the disciples repeat Jesus's question. Such clear conceptual parallelism simply does not occur by chance, especially when it is bolstered in many cases by word parallelism. When one takes into account that each unit is only a clause or two, the only conclusion is that this passage was carefully constructed by Mark to produce the pattern.

The hinge and wings, as was the case in the triple chiasm, highlight the crowd and its now inimical nature (it is described as pressing in A1 and G) and Jesus's control over it (A2). Beyond the theme of the crowd and Jesus's control over it, the chiasm does not supply much meaning through its juxtaposition of units, except to emphasize that spiritual healing is superior to physical healing (C level) and to emphasize that the woman knew inside herself that she was healed (D level).

The removal of the HW chiasm from the triple chiasm leaves a perfect double chiasm consisting of only JD, which can be expanded to the following chiasm:

A1 (a) **Movement**: Jesus arrives by boat to a great crowd (5:21)
B1 (b) ***Faith***: Jairus comes to Jesus, falls at feet, and begs (5:22)
C1 (c) *Condition of JD*: near dead, healing requested (5:23)
D1 (a) **Movement**: Jesus leaves with Jairus and a large crowd (5:24)
E1 (b) *Condition of JD*: messengers say daughter is dead (5:35)
F1 (c) ***Faith***: Jesus tells Jairus to believe (5:36)
G (a) **Movement**: Jesus leaves crowd and goes with three and father (5:37)
F2 (b) ***Faith***: mourning crowd weeping and wailing (5:38)
E2 (c) *Condition of JD*: Jesus says daughter is asleep not dead (5:39-40)
D2 (a) **Movement**: Jesus puts crowd outside and goes inside with three and parents (5:40)
C2 (b) *Condition of JD*: girl gets up, walks, and is twelve (5:41-42)
B2 (c) ***Faith***: parents and three amazed; Jesus says to tell no one and feed girl (5:43)
A2 (a) **Movement**: Jesus goes with disciples (6:1)

The removal of the HW lines from the triple chiasm not only produces a perfect chiasm, but also a complete story, as many commentators have noted.[456] In the above chiasm there are the following juxtapositions: in A1 Jesus arrives to crowd and in A2 Jesus leaves without the crowd; in B1 Jairus is distraught and in B2 he is amazed; in C1 Jairus requests that Jesus lay his hands on his daughter so she may live, and in C2 Jesus takes the daughter by the hand and she lives; in D1 Jesus leaves with Jairus and enters a crowd, and in D2 Jesus puts the crowd outside and enters with Jairus into the house; in E1 the messengers say that the daughter is dead, and in E2 Jesus says the daughter is not dead; and in F1 Jesus tells Jairus to believe the girl will be fine, that is, to still hope, and in F2 the mourners weep because they believe the girl is dead, that is, they have no hope. Again such conceptual parallelism often combined with word parallelism does not occur by chance. As with the HW chiasm, the hinges and wings along with the D level place the emphasis on Jesus and his control over the

[456] This adds weight to the majority argument that it was Mark who combined the two stories. Those who see the two stories as being together from the beginning include C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark: An Introduction and Commentary* (CGTC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 182; Gundry, *Mark*, 266–88; Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes* (London: Macmillan, 1952), 289. The majority observe that intercalation is a typical Markan style; for example, William L. Lane, *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 189; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:708. They also note that the two stories stand alone: the "while he was speaking" of 5:35 would then refer to Jairus speaking to Jesus and not Jesus speaking to the woman, so Meier, *Marginal*, 2:778; Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* (2 vols.; HTKNT 2; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1976), 1:306. Furthermore, the two stories have different styles (Guelich, *Mark 1–8:26*, 291–92): JD has shorter run-on clauses in the aorist whereas HW has longer sentences using the imperfect. This is usually argued to show not only that the two stories were independent, but that they also came from two different sources—at least one written—since it is unlikely that the same writer would use two different styles. However, Mark could use the two different styles for artistic and practical reasons. The two styles help differentiate the two stories, and the style of JD helps accentuate the urgency of the situation. The style of the HW is more languid, and one can imagine the harried Jairus worriedly standing by as Jesus stops and a discussion of who touched Jesus ensues. The different style adds to the tension, which culminates with messengers arriving to say that JD is dead.

crowd. Also like the HW chiasm, the above JD chiasm does not seem to supply any deep meaning, except to make the already aforementioned juxtapositions.[457]

The above two chiasms, the HW chiasm and the JD chiasms are not the only chiasms embedded in the triple chiasm. The two stories form an inclusio (Jairus's request—HW—JD raised), and there are also chiasms centred on the two wings of the inclusio. The first one, centred on Jairus's request runs as follows:

A1 Jesus arrives in boat to large crowd by sea (no change)
5:21 When Jesus had crossed again in the boat to the other side, a great crowd gathered around him; and he was by the sea.
B1 Jairus comes to Jesus and falls at Jesus's feet (no change)
5:22 Then one of the leaders of the synagogue named Jairus came and, when he saw him, fell at his feet
5:23 and begged him repeatedly,
C1 Daughter at point of death (first part of C1)
"My little daughter is at the point of death.
D1 Jairus asks Jesus to lay hands on daughter (second part of C1)
Come and lay your hands on her,
C2 Daughter will live (third part of C1)
so that she may be made well, and live."
B2 Jesus goes with Jairus (first part of D1)
5:24 So he went with him.
A2 Crowd presses in (second part of D1)
And a large crowd followed him and pressed in on him.

Again, the items in parentheses show the origin of the units in terms of the triple chiasm. In this case the chiasm is created through a simple division of C1 and D1. The oppositions created by the above chiasm are as follows: in A1 Jesus arrives and is surrounded by a great crowd, and in A2 Jesus leaves and a large crowd presses in on him; in B1 Jairus arrives and falls before Jesus, and in B2 Jairus presumably gets up and leaves with Jesus; in C1 we are told the girl is at the point of death, and in C2 we are told that the hope is that she will live. As with the other micro-chiasms, such conceptual parallelism combined with word parallelism in such short units does not occur by accident. The above chiasm emphasizes Jesus's healing hands and the story of JD as being a story that will move from death (C1) to life (C2). This is despite the evil (the crowd) that gathers round (A1) and presses in (A2).

The chiasm centred on the second part of Jairus's story runs as follows:

[457] It is perhaps of note that both chiasms are seven-level chiasms. In the previous chapter it was noted that both power and wisdom chiasms in the MSUD were exactly seven units, that there were seven power and wisdom sections, and that the number seven pointed symbolically to the new creation ushered in on the day of the LORD. The same symbolism could be at play here, especially since the HW and JD both represent Israel and both point to the Day.

A1 Jesus tells daughter to go in peace (same, D2)
go in peace, and be healed of your disease."

B1 Messengers tell Jairus his daughter is dead (same, C4)
5:35 While he was still speaking, some people came from the leader's house to say, "Your daughter is dead. Why trouble the teacher any further?"

C1 Jesus assures Jairus that girl will live (same, B4)
5:36 But overhearing what they said, Jesus said to the leader of the synagogue, "Do not fear, only believe."

D1 Only the three can go with Jesus and Jairus (same, A3)
5:37 He allowed no one to follow him except Peter, James, and John, the brother of James.

E1 Crowd mourns (same, B5)
5:38 When they came to the house of the leader of the synagogue,
he saw a commotion, people weeping and wailing loudly.

F Jesus says girl is not dead, but sleeping (same, C5)
5:39 When he had entered, he said to them, "Why do you make a commotion and weep? The child is not dead but sleeping."

E2 Crowd laughs (first part of D3)
5:40 And they laughed at him.

D2 Jesus puts them out; only parents and three can go in (second part of D3)
Then he put them all outside, and took the child's father and mother and those who were with him, and went in where the child was.

C2 Girl is alive (same, C6)
5:41 He took her by the hand and said to her, "Talitha cum," which means, "Little girl, get up!"
5:42 And immediately the girl got up and began to walk about (she was twelve years of age). At this they were overcome with amazement.

B2 Jesus tells witnesses not to tell (same, B6)
5:43 He strictly ordered them that no one should know this,
and told them to give her something to eat.

A2 Jesus leaves (same, A4)
6:1 He left that place and came to his hometown,
and his disciples followed him.

The above chiasm is created by simply dividing D3 from the triple chiasm into E2 and D2 in the above JD raised chiasm. The above chiasm produces the following juxtapositions: in A1 the HW is told to leave the crowd, and in A2 Jesus leaves without the crowd; in B1 the messengers say that the daughter is dead, and in B2 Jesus tells the witnesses not to say anything, that is, that the daughter was dead; in C1 Jesus assures Jairus that the girl will live, and in C2 the girl is shown being alive, that is, that Jesus was correct; in both D1 and D2 only the three and parents of the child are allowed to go with Jesus; and in E1 the crowd is mourning, and in E2 the crowd is laughing. As with the other chiasms, the conceptual parallelism is clear and speaks to the main action of the unit.

The focus of this chiasm is given by the hinge; it is the commotion made by the crowd and the statement that the girl is not dead, but only sleeping. The commotion mentioned in hinge F is opposite to the peace in hinge A1. We have already discussed how the peace refers to the peace of the perfect order of creation that will occur when the kingdom of God is inaugurated. The opposite of the perfect order of creation is chaos, that is, evil, and consequently by stressing the commotion made by the crowd, Mark is stressing the evilness of the crowd. The chaotic nature of the crowd is further illustrated on the E level where they are first weeping and wailing (E1) and then laughing (E2). Jesus, however, is shown as the master over evil (the crowd) on the D level: in D1 he makes the crowd stay behind, and in D2 he casts the crowd outside. As mentioned above, the language is that of casting out demons, and thus Jesus casts out evil. This is a foreshadowing of the day of the LORD when

all evil will be cast out and the peace of creation will reign supreme in the kingdom of God and only the faithful, here represented by the parents and the three in D1 and D2, will be allowed to enter. Consequently, only the faithful will be allowed to partake in the resurrection of Israel symbolized by the raising of the twelve year-old daughter. This is made clear on the C level: it is Jairus's belief that allows the event to take place (C1, C2).

Jesus's hinge statement that the girl is not dead, but sleeping, also has eschatological overtones: if the dead are to be raised on the day of the LORD, then death is not final but is like sleeping.[458] As argued above, the girl represents the faithful of Israel that will be raised on the day of the LORD and will enter the ingdom. Consequently, her death is not death, but sleep. Thus, when only the three and the parents are allowed to enter to be a part of the resurrection of the girl, they, as just argued, also represent faithful Israel who will partake in the final resurrection. Only allowing a few into the room to witness the miracle also creates an air of secrecy. This is augmented by the witnesses being told by Jesus not to tell what they have seen (B2). This is part of the well-documented "messianic secret" found in Mark.[459] The most important of such secrecy statements occurs just after Peter declares Jesus to be the Messiah: "Peter answered him, 'You are the Messiah.' And he sternly ordered (ἐπετίμησεν) them not to tell anyone about him." (8:29–30). Though different words are used, there is strong parallelism between the last sentence quoted and the one in JD: "He strictly ordered them (διεστείλ ατοαὐτοῖς πολλὰ) that no one should know this" (5:43). In other words, Mark seems to be saying the death and resurrection of JD, like Peter's statement, show Jesus to be the LORD Messiah,[460] and the purpose of the statement is to help keep this knowledge secret.[461]

---

[458] The statement can be taken either literally or symbolically. The scholarly community is divided on this issue. Those who take the comment literally include Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 1:312–14; Taylor, *Mark*, 285–86, 295. C. S. Mann (*Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 27; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1986), 282) notes that sleep as an euphemism for death is ruled out because it is paired with the statement saying the girl is not dead. Robert Gundry, *Mark*, 273, however, points out that in the story there is no hint of supernatural knowledge, or what Meier, *Marginal*, 2:843, n. 26, calls a secondary miracle. More importantly, as Meier, *Marginal*, 2:843, n. 26, says, Mark's whole story points to the fact that the girl is dead (girl at point of death, messengers saying she is dead, mourners), which would mean that Mark, and even more so Luke and Matthew for whom the girl is definitely dead (see below on pages 186 and 193), must have taken the statement metaphorically. However, despite this, Meier, *Marginal,* 2:843–44, agrees with Mann and points out that sleep and death are opposed. He concludes that the narrative does not allow for an understanding of the meaning of the statement for Jesus. I think here we must follow the gospel authors and take the phrase metaphorically. Sleep was a well known euphemism for death and is presented as such in the New Testament in light of the final resurrection; for example, Eph 5:14, 1 Thess 5:6, 10. Harris, "The Dead," 307, sees the phrase metaphorically and paraphrases it as follows "As far as I am concerned, this young girl did not die in any final sense but is temporarily in the sleep of death." This would mean as Marcus, *Mark*, 371, says that Jesus's statement is eschatological irony. It would also mean that Jesus was very confident that he could raise someone from the dead, or at least someone who had just died. Others decline any eschatological reference, arguing that the miracle is about the girl being dead now; for example, Cranfield, *Mark*, 188–89; Gundry, *Mark*, 273–74; Lane, *Mark*, 196–97; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:844, n. 26.

[459] On the messianic secret see Räisänen, *Messianic*; C. M. Tuckett ed. *The Messianic Secret* (Issues in Religion and Theology 1; London: SPCK, 1983).

[460] Two other scenes also show Jesus to be the Messiah: at the transfiguration Jesus is shown in his heavenly glory and God calls him his son, and in Gethsemane he prays to his Father and accepts the cup. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:778, refers to these two scenes and the raising of JD as the three secret epiphanies. Only the three are present, which is also true of the transfiguration and the garden at Gethsemane. Collins, *Mark,* after Rudolf Karl Bultmann (*The History of the Synoptic Tradition* [trans. John Marsh; New York,: Harper & Row, 1968)] 224) and Bernd Kollmann (*Jesus und die Christen als Wundertäter: Studien zu Magie, Medizin und*

The order for secrecy, however, creates a problem: how will the parents be able to keep it secret? The command for secrecy cannot be that no one should know that something miraculous has taken place, because it would be impossible to keep secret that the girl is now alive and well. Rather, the secrecy must be in regards to the type of miracle, namely, that it is a raising-of-the-dead miracle. In other words, the parents are to say that the girl was not dead, which is exactly what Jesus told the crowd. This in turn means that the crowd is to understand Jesus's statement literally, but those who are initiated into the secret are to understand the statement metaphorically.[462] This creates a division between those who are on the outside (the crowd) and those on the inside (those initiated into the mystery). This is the same division found in the parable section, where only the disciples are initiated into the mystery of the kingdom and have the parables explained, and the crowd is taught in parables. In the story of JD the disciples, represented by the three, are again those initiated into the mystery. However, now the mystery is the mystery of the true identity of Jesus as the LORD Messiah.

This brings us to an end of the chiastic analysis of JD and the HW. Time was spent in showing the chiastic structures and how they were developed for three reasons: first, the high level of scepticism towards chiasm in some parts of the scholarly community requires a strong defence of the proposed structures; second, the chiastic structures show us the importance of and meaning for Mark, and by extension the early Christian community, of JD; and third, the chiastic structures highlight items that Mark may have added to the tradition not only to make the structures, but also to supply the theological meaning supplied by the structures.

The chiasms analysed were all shown to have a degree of parallelism that would make the odds of the chiasms occurring by chance extremely low. In other words, the most reasonable conclusion is that they were consciously created by Mark. This is made even likelier when one considers that smaller chiastic structures are based on the larger structures. In the first chiasm, the primary chiasm, the text was divided into its primary scenes: Jairus's request (30), HW healed (31.1), HW coming forward (31.2), Jairus's messengers (32.1), Jairus's mourners (32.2), JD raised (32.3), and teaching in Nazareth (33). It was demonstrated that this chiasm produced a viable chiasm with a low probability figure. The units of this chiasm were then divided into their natural sub-scenes. It was noted that each scene began with movement either on the part of Jesus[463] or away from Jesus.[464] Each scene

---

Schamanismus in Antike und Christentum [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996], 263, 265) argues that the reason this miracle is done out of view is that it is not appropriate that divine power be seen at work. In other words, unlike the other miracles, this is a special exhibition of divine power, which indicates who Jesus is.

[461] Others have also argued that the statement is to avoid publicity; for example, Harris, "The Dead," 309.

[462] Many commentators see the statement demanding secrecy as making no sense whatsoever. This is stated most forcefully by Meier, *Marginal*, 2:779–80. Meier correctly sees the natural ending of the story after the people being astonished, because most miracles end with witness reaction. Besides not making sense, as Meier notes, there is tacked on feeling to this statement as well as the instruction to give the child something to eat. Meier refers to this as Mark's desire for his messianic secret getting in the way of common sense. Meier seems to diminish the secret to simply the fact that the girl is now alive, which would make no sense. However, if as argued here the secret is that the girl was dead, and not the fact that she is now alive and well, then the command makes sense. The parents need only say as Jesus said, that the girl was not dead, but asleep. This would also mean that Jesus is not asking the parents to give a direct lie, because from a metaphorical perspective, the girl was not dead, but only sleeping.

[463] Jesus arrives (30), Jesus leaves (31.1), Jesus turns around (31.2), Jesus goes to the house (32.2), Jesus goes into girl (32.3), and Jesus goes to Nazareth (33).

then described the main character besides Jesus in the scene.[465] Finally, there is the action relating to the description.[466] Then it was shown that the natural sub-scenes formed a triple chiasm, which in turn would produce a very low probability figure. This chiasm in turn could be divided and the sub-scenes expanded and other chiasms formed. Some may wish to argue that this is all just a coincidence. If it is a coincidence, then the odds of it occurring are infinitesimally small. It should be noted that the structures are not forced: in each case the units conform to the natural divisions of the text. Though there was not the space to show that if one moved the chiasms to the left or right the clear and strong parallelism between units disappears, a quick glance at the chiasms shows this to be the case: one simply needs to pair A1 with B2 (or B1 with A2), then B1 with C2 (or C1 with B2), and so on. It quickly becomes clear that viable chiastic structures can only be found that are centred on the larger units of Jairus's request (30), HW (31), and JD raised (32).

Then by focusing on the hinges and wings a central theme was produced. This theme was bolstered by the juxtaposition of the units on other levels, and a coherent symbolic message appeared. In addition the symbolic message of each chiasm strengthened and built upon the message of the other chiasms. Furthermore, this symbolic message is in line with the early Christian understanding of Jesus as LORD who will gather Israel on his Day. The likelihood of this happening by chance is low, and this adds to the growing certainty that the chiasms were the intentional product of Mark.

The symbolic meaning of the story of JD produced by the chiastic structures shows the importance and deep meaning of the story for Mark. To recapitulate, JD is one of a series of miracles that was used to show that Jesus is the LORD Messiah, the one who could conquer all evil. It is the culminating miracle because it shows Jesus's ultimate power, the power over death. This miracle so clearly shows that Jesus is the Messiah that it must be kept secret: only a few are allowed to witness it. For Mark, the knowledge of Jesus's true identity is only known by the spirit world. The exception is Peter, who declares Jesus to be the Messiah (8:29), and James and John who ask to sit at the right and left of Jesus in his glory (9:37). These three are also the only three to see Jesus in his heavenly glory before his resurrection (9:2–3). In other words, it is precisely the three who witnessed the miracle of JD who understand who Jesus truly is, and they are not to tell until after Jesus has risen from the dead (9:9).

The miracle of JD is thus the key miracle for understanding who Jesus is. Also, because JD shows Jesus to be the LORD Messiah, the miracle also foreshadows the coming day of the LORD, when Jesus will raise Israel. However, only the faithful of Israel will be raised, that is, those who are faithful to the LORD. For the believers, Jesus is the LORD, and thus faith becomes redefined as those who believe in and worship Jesus. This faith and worship is symbolized by Jairus and the HW who believe in Jesus and kneel before Jesus. They along with JD symbolize the new Israel that will be raised on the Day. The story of JD thus plays a key role in Mark's theological understanding of Jesus.

Understanding Mark's structuring of the story of JD and his theological message helps highlight items he may have added to the oral tradition, because it is unlikely that the oral

---

[464] Power goes forth from Jesus (31.2), HW told to go (32.1), and crowd put outside (32.3).

[465] Jairus falls before Jesus and begs (30), HW had suffered (31.1), HW comes forward and falls before Jesus (31.2), messengers arrive (32.1), the mourning crowd (32.2), JD (32.3), the Nazarenes (33).

[466] Jairus makes a request (30.1), HW is healed (31.1), HW tells the whole truth (31.2), Jesus tells Jairus to believe (32.1), Jesus says the girl is not dead (32.2), Jesus tells people to not tell (32.3), and Jesus cannot heal (33).

tradition contained all the elements Mark used to make his chiastic structures and theological points. The model of oral transmission adopted by this thesis allows for a great deal of flexibility in the minor details of a tradition as long as the main plot items and point of the story are maintained. It is this flexibility that would allow an author such as Mark to change the oral tradition to suit his structural and theological needs. A good example is the two feeding stories found in Mark (6:30–46, 8:1–10), which are clearly different versions of the same story. That these two stories are the same story would be obvious to people living in a society using the oral transmission adopted by this thesis. Details such as the precise number of people (5000 or 4000) or the number of loaves (5 or 7) or the number of fish (2 or a few) or how many baskets were gathered at the end (12 or 7) are not important, because the main point of the story is that a very large quantity of people were fed with a few loaves and fishes, and the amount of food produced was so great that several baskets of leftovers were collected. From such a perspective it does not make sense to ask precisely how many baskets were collected historically. Different numbers are used by Mark in each telling to make a different point: twelve indicates the gathering of Israel, and seven would indicate the gathering of the whole world. In this example, the numbers are clearly not viewed as an essential part of the tradition, because Mark is able to change them at will.

The elements that may have been added by Mark will simply be listed with the reason at this point and will be discussed in detail later. For Jairus's request (30) the suspect items are: the crowd at the beginning and end (chiastic parallel, symbol of evil, scene transitions), Jairus as leader of synagogue (chiastic parallel with Herod as leader), Jairus falling before Jesus (symbol of worship), and the opposition of death and life in his request (emphasizes resurrection). For Jairus's messengers (32.1) the suspect items are: "while he was still speaking" (5:35, scene transition) and Jesus telling Jairus to not fear and only believe (chiastic parallel, theme of faith leading to resurrection). For Jairus's mourners (32.2) the items are: only the three going with Jesus (chiastic parallel, messianic secret), people making a big commotion (highlights chaotic and thus evil nature of the crowd), and Jesus saying the child is not dead but sleeping (reference to the resurrection). For JD raised (32.3) the items are: the crowd being put outside (shows Jesus's control over evil), the crowd laughing (chiastic parallel, shows chaotic nature of crowd), Jesus going in with only the three and parents (chiastic parallel, messianic secret), Jesus telling the girl to get up (foreshadows the resurrection), the girl being twelve years old (symbol of Israel, chiastic parallel), witnesses being told not to say anything (messianic secret), and the girl being given something to eat (chiastic parallel, symbol of being taught word, symbol of Eucharist). It is to be remembered that many of these items may have been within the oral tradition, and it will only be through the oral and historical analysis that one will be able to better judge whether these items are likely to have originated with an incident in Jesus's life.

Chiastic Analysis: Luke's Triple Chiasm

Luke follows Mark's text fairly closely and does not make any significant changes until Jesus arrives at Jairus's house. Luke appears to be well aware of Mark's triple chiasm, and follows it. He does, however, make changes that prevent the chiasm from being expanded into the Jairus's request chiasm, the HW chiasm, or the JD raised chiasm. Because Luke follows Mark's triple chiasm so carefully a full chiastic analysis will not be performed. Instead, each chiasm of the triple chiasm will be looked at individually, and only the differences with Mark will be noted. This analysis will show that Luke was aware of Mark's

chiasm and its themes. However, Luke does not seem to have Mark's love of chiasms within chiasms. He consequently makes some changes so that parallels that were apparent only in the other chiasms can be seen in this chiasm. In the last chiasm, the changes appear to have been made to make it clear that JD was in fact dead.

The first chiasm of the triple chiasm is as follows:

A1 Movement: Jesus returns to the crowd
8:40 Now when Jesus returned, the crowd welcomed him, for they were all waiting for him.

B1 Faith: Jairus arrives, falls, and begs at Jesus's feet
8:41 Just then there came a man named Jairus, a leader of the synagogue. He fell at Jesus's feet and begged him to come to his house,

C1 Condition of JD: Jairus has twelve-year-old daughter dying
8:42 for he had an only daughter, about twelve years old, who was dying.

D1 Movement: Jesus goes; crowd presses in
As he went, the crowds pressed in on him.

C2 Condition of HW: suffered for twelve years
8:43 Now there was a woman who had been suffering from haemorrhages for twelve years; and though she had spent all she had on physicians, no one could cure her.

B2 Faith: HW comes to Jesus and touches his clothes
8:44 She came up behind him and touched the fringe of his clothes, and immediately her haemorrhage stopped.

A2 Movement: Jesus asks who touched him, because power went forth; Peter points out crowds
8:45 Then Jesus asked, "Who touched me?" When all denied it, Peter said, "Master, the crowds surround you and press in on you." 8:46 But Jesus said, "Someone touched me; for I noticed that power had gone out from me."

Luke makes three changes in this part of the chiasm that go beyond phrasing and word order. In A1 he eliminates mention of the boat, crossing to the other side, and being by the sea (Mark 5:21). As was shown earlier, mention of the sea was used by Mark as a unit divider in the power chiasm. The other change of note is that Luke moves up the mention of the girl being twelve years old from after JD is raised to Jairus's request (C1). This makes clearer the parallel with the HW whose twelve years of suffering is mentioned in C2. Luke omits "and live" (Mark 5:24), which created a chiastic parallel with "death" (Mark 5:22). Consequently, in Luke one is not able to make a chiasm using only the material involving Jairus's request. Luke also omits the remark that the woman felt in her body that she was healed (Mark 5:29), which was at the end of B2 in Mark. This last created a chiastic parallel in Mark's HW chiasm.

The second chiasm runs as follows:

A2 Movement: Jesus asks who touched him, because power went forth; Peter points out crowds
8:45 Then Jesus asked, "Who touched me?" When all denied it, Peter said, "Master, the crowds surround you and press in on you." 8:46 But Jesus said, "Someone touched me; for I noticed that power had gone out from me."

B3 Faith: HW comes forward and falls before Jesus
8:47 When the woman saw that she could not remain hidden, she came trembling; and falling down before him,

C3 Condition of HW: HW explains she was healed
she declared in the presence of all the people why she had touched him, and how she had been immediately healed.

D2 Movement: Jesus tells HW to go in peace
8:48 He said to her, "Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace."

C4 Condition of JD: Messenger comes and says daughter is dead
8:49 While he was still speaking, someone came from the leader's house to say, "Your daughter is dead; do not trouble the teacher any longer."

B4 Faith: Jesus tells Jairus to believe
8:50 When Jesus heard this, he replied, "Do not fear. Only believe, and she will be saved."

A3 Movement: Jesus enters house with only disciples and parents
8:51 When he came to the house, he did not allow anyone to enter with him, except Peter, John, and James, and the child's father and mother.

In parallel to the deletion of the woman recognizing she was healed, Luke omits the mention that the woman knew what had happened to her from the beginning of B3. Consequently a chiastic level in Mark's HW chiasm is eliminated. Luke also slightly rearranges A2. In Mark we are told that Jesus noticed that the power had gone from him at the beginning of A2 and at the end of A2 we are told he looked around to see who had drawn his power. Luke's rearrangement eliminates the chiastic structure of the unit in Mark. This change, along with the previous change, means that the HW chiasm cannot be expanded out into a longer chiasm.[467] Luke also makes an addition to Mark at C3. In Mark it just says that the woman "told him the whole truth" (5:33); Luke makes it clear that the "whole truth" (8:47) is why she had touched him and that she was healed. This makes the parallel to C2 clearer than it is in Mark.

The last chiasm runs as follows:

[467] This indicates a couple of possibilities: Luke was aware of Mark's expanded chiasm and was not interested in following suit, or both Luke and Mark were working from the same written source. Since Mark appears to be the source of the intercalation, the former seems more likely.

A3 Movement: Jesus enters house with only the three and parents
8:51 When he came to the house, he did not allow anyone to enter with him, except Peter, John, and James, and the child's father and mother.

B5 Faith: "they" mourn
8:52 They were all weeping and wailing for her;

C5 Condition of JD: "they" laugh at Jesus, because daughter is dead
8:53 but he said, "Do not weep; for she is not dead but sleeping." And they laughed at him, knowing that she was dead.

D3 Movement: Jesus commands daughter to get up; spirit returns
8:54 But he took her by the hand and called out, "Child, get up!" 8:55 Her spirit returned, and she got up at once.

C6 Condition of JD: Jesus says to feed her
Then he directed them to give her something to eat.

B6 Faith: parents are astounded, told not to tell.
8:56 Her parents were astounded; but he ordered them to tell no one what had happened.

A4 Movement: Jesus gathers the twelve and sends them out
9:1 Then Jesus called the twelve together and gave them power and authority over all demons and to cure diseases, 9:2 and he sent them out to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal.

Luke makes several changes to Mark's chiasm in this section, and yet he still keeps Mark's pattern of movement in the wings and hinges, faith in the B level, and condition of HW or JD in the C level. The first change Luke makes is a major change. In Mark, Jesus leaves the HW crowd and then meets the mourning crowd, who are then thrown out. In Luke, Jesus likewise leaves the HW crowd, but there is no mention of the mourning crowd being thrown out. In fact it is not clear that there is a mourning crowd, since Luke simply refers to an anonymous "they" as weeping. The immediate antecedents are the parents and the three; however, it does not make sense that they are the ones who weep and then laugh at Jesus. The "they" then has to be the crowd, because Luke refers to "all" (πάντες) and uses the imperfect for weeping (ἔκλαιον), which would indicate that Luke intends this action as taking place at the same time Jesus enters with the parents and the three. This construction is awkward, and it is only by already knowing another version of the story, that one can quickly understand that it is the crowd outside who is mourning and weeping.[468]

This change has the effect of combining Mark's HW and mourning crowds and consequently eliminates a level in Mark's JD raised chiasm. This change also creates the need for a new hinge at D3, which is most likely Luke's purpose. The new hinge describes the girl's spirit returning, which keeps the theme of movement in the wings and hinges. This new detail makes it very clear that the girl was dead, which is also made clear by an addition to C5, where Luke adds the phrase "knowing that she was dead" after the "they" laugh at him. The result is to dismiss any confusion over Jesus's statement that the girl is not dead.

In Mark the healing of the girl takes place at C6. Luke fills this gap by placing the command to give the girl something to eat here. Having this detail here creates the opposition of death and life with C5: in C5 the crowd knows the girl is dead and in C6 confirmation is given that the girl is alive. The final change is found in A4: instead of going

---

[468] This confusion is also noted by François Bovon, *Luke: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50* (trans. Christine M. Thomson; Her; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2002), 340; John Martin Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 124; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (2 vols.; AB 28–28A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981), 1:744; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 347.

to Nazareth, the twelve are called to Jesus and are sent out. Again, the theme of movement is kept in the hinges and wings.

As noted in the above comparison, many of Luke's changes prevent the expansion of the triple chiasm into other chiastic patterns. The changes to the final chiasm of the triple chiasm completely prevent Mark's JD raised chiasm. In the rest of the chiasm the changes are: the elimination of "and live" (Mark 5:23, B level of Jairus's request chiasm), the elimination of "went with him" (Mark 5:24, C level of Jairus's request chiasm), woman knowing she is healed (Mark 5:29 and 33, D level of HW chiasm), "done it" (Mark 5:32, E level of HW chiasm). These changes would indicate not only a desire on the part of Luke to keep things simple, but also that he was likely aware of Mark's expansion of the triple chiasm.

On the other hand, many of Luke's changes strengthen the above chiasm. For example, the mention of JD being twelve in C1 strengthens the parallelism with the HW in C2, and the addition of what the HW said makes clearer the parallel between C2 and C3. Another clear example is the addition of "Peter" to A2 to create a parallel with A3 where he is named as part of the three, which in turn has a parallel with the new A4 where the twelve are mentioned. These additions along with the deletions of the previous paragraph combine to make it very likely that Luke was fully aware of Mark's chiastic structures.

Much of the meaning for Mark's versions of the stories was created through the secondary chiastic structures that Luke eliminated. Luke, however, with his changes supplies added meaning to the triple chiasm. The new hinge at D3 with the girl's spirit returning puts the raising of JD in juxtaposition with the HW being told in D2 to go in peace because her faith has saved her. Thus, in D2 faithful Israel is saved from the punishment of the day of the LORD, and in D3 they are raised to new life. This is in contrast to the crowd who in A3 are left outside. The three and the parents in A3, however, are part of those on the inside. The mention of the twelve being sent out in A4 also makes it clear that they play a central role in the salvation of Israel described in D2, A3, and D3, because they are the ones that gather people into the future kingdom.

Luke's changes make a slight difference to the plot structure chiasm in Mark:

A1 Jairus's request (same [as Mark])
Movement: Jesus arrives (A1),
Main character described: Jairus arrives (B1),
Action: Jairus's request (C1)

B1 HW healed (same)
Movement: Jesus goes (D1),
Main character described: HW's condition (C2),
Action: woman healed (B2)

C1 HW comes forward (same)
Movement: power goes forth (A2)
Main character described: HW comes forward (B3),
Action: HW woman comes forward and tells story (C3)

D HW goes in peace, messengers arrive (same)
Movement: Jesus says go in peace (D2),
Main character described: messenger arrives (C4),
Action: Jesus says believe (B4)

C2 Crowd laughs (same)
Movement: Jesus leaves crowd and goes with three and parents (A3),
Main character described: mourners weep (B5)
Action: Jesus says girl is not dead and crowd laughs (C5)

B2 Girl healed (Jesus entering room with parents is not mentioned and the rest of items are rearranged)
Movement: girl's spirit returns and she gets up (D3)
Main character described: JD is to be given something to eat (C6),
Action: parents amazed and told not to tell (B6)

A2 Jesus sends out twelve (different)
Movement: the twelve are called together (A4)
Main character described: the twelve are given authority (A4)
Action: the twelve proclaim kingdom and heal (A4)

The major difference is the last element, A2: instead of Jesus going to Nazareth to find a lack of faith, Jesus sends out the twelve. This creates new contrasts and oppositions with the other wing A1 (Jairus's request) and hinge D (the arrival of messengers). The only parallel with A1 is the number twelve: the mention of the girl being twelve was moved here by Luke. This parallel makes it clearer that the girl, like the twelve, represent Israel. The movement of this detail thus serves double chiastic duty, since it creates a parallel with the HW in the triple chiasm. Consequently, Luke makes it clear that the twelve, JD, and the HW all represent faithful Israel. In regards to the hinge, there is now the parallel of messengers: the twelve preaching the kingdom are messengers of life, and Jairus's messengers are messengers of death. The messengers of death of JD, however, are not to be believed, but rather one must have faith. This may be a reference to the news of the catastrophic destruction of Jerusalem (Israel) by Rome. Luke would thus be saying that Israel is not dead, but sleeping, and that the twelve (A2) are gathering Israel for the soon to come Day and inauguration of the kingdom of God. However, it is only the faithful who enter the peace of the kingdom and avoid chastisement (D). Again, faith is defined by faith in Jesus as exhibited by the HW, Jairus, and the twelve. The twelve have a special status because they help Jesus in the gathering of Israel. Luke would also seem to be saying that faith is more than just worship (A1) and belief (D9), but also action (A2). This message is in accord with Luke's message in the larger chiasm, which has as its hinge the disciples being declared family because they "hear the

word of God and do it" (8:20).[469] Thus in both this chiasm and the larger chiasm there is an emphasis on not only worshiping Jesus and having faith in him as LORD, but also doing what he says.

As with the chiastic analysis of Mark, the above analysis highlights a couple of items in the story of JD that Luke may have added to the oral tradition. Foremost of these items is the girl's spirit returning in the hinge D3, which creates the theme of movement. This detail also makes it clear that JD was indeed dead, which in turn adds a theological reason for adding this line. This in turn makes the added emphasis of the condition of JD as dead in C5 also suspect as a Lukan addition. Finally, the movement of the detail that JD is twelve to make a clearer parallel with the twelve years the HW suffered confirms the symbolic importance of the detail.

The above analysis also confirms the likelihood that some of the items that Mark used to create chiasms or add to his theological message were due to his own hand, because Luke eliminates them. The items eliminated by Luke are: Jairus saying "and live" (Mark 5:23), Jairus departure ("went with him," Mark 5:24), one of the accounts of Jesus taking only the three with him (5:37), the crowd creating a commotion (5:38, 39), and Jesus "casting out" the crowd (5:40). We shall now turn to Matthew's changes to Mark's version of JD and the HW.

Chiastic Analysis: Matthew's Chiasms

Matthew, unlike Luke, makes radical changes to Mark's story, which shortens the story considerably: it is only 139 words. Matthew's version is thus very succinct. The major difference between Matthew's version and the other stories is that JD is dead from the beginning. Consequently, Jairus is not asking Jesus to heal his daughter, but to raise her from the dead. Because JD is already dead there is no need for the messengers. This means there are five scenes in the combined stories of JD and the HW: Jairus's request, HW touches Jesus, HW healed, Jairus's mourners, and JD raised. Naturally, these can be arranged in the following chiastic pattern:

A1 Jairus's request
Jairus arrives and kneels (a), Jairus makes request to lay hands (b), Jesus goes with Jairus (c)

B1 HW touches Jesus
Suffering for twelve years, HW touches Jesus, HW says to herself that if she touches cloak she will be well.

C HW healed
Jesus sees HW, says faith saved her, and HW is healed

B2 Mourning crowd
Jesus comes to house, crowd making commotion, Jesus says JD not dead, crowd laughs, crowd cast out

A2 JD raised
Jesus goes into house (c), Jesus takes hand of JD (b), JD gets up (a)

This is a very simple chiasm with clear parallelism. In the A level there is clear parallel of request for healing in A1 and healing performed in A2. There is also the following reversal of events: (a) Jairus kneels/JD gets up, (b) Jairus requests that Jesus lay his hand on

[469] Hinge section of the larger chiasm is A1 twelve and women proclaim with Jesus, B1 parable section, C family are those who obey God, that is, Jesus, B2 miracle section, A2 twelve sent out. This chiasm was discussed in chapter two; see above on page 148.

daughter/Jesus takes hand of JD, and (c) Jesus goes with Jairus/Jesus goes into house (presumably with Jairus). On the B level there is a contrast between the complete faith of the HW and the complete lack of faith of the mourning crowd. In each there is also a statement of faith. In B1 the HW is convinced that if she touches Jesus she will be healed, and in B2 Jesus shows his surety that he can raise JD by saying her death is only sleep. In the hinge (C) the HW is healed and in wing A2 JD is raised. In the hinge Jesus says her faith has healed her, and in wing A1 Jairus's faith is shown by his kneeling before Jesus and asking Jesus to raise his daughter from death. This is a quite a strong level of parallelism considering each unit is on average twenty-eight words, which is just under half the size of the SUD units, which were sixty-two words on average. The above chiasm, however, would produce a low probability figure, because it is only a three-level chiasm. That being said, the chiasm is likely intentional, because even viable three-level chiasms are rare, and the parallelism is clear and speaks to the main themes in each unit.

This chiasm also has a clear message that is in line with the message found in Mark and Luke. The hinge places the emphasis on faith bringing about healing: the faith of the woman saves her. Faith is also shown in A1 by Jairus kneeling. The result of this kneeling before Jesus is his daughter being raised in A2. The implication is that his faith, like the faith of the HW, led to the miracle being performed. As in Mark and Luke, the woman is associated with the number twelve (B1), and consequently as in Mark and Luke she represents faithful Israel who will be saved (C). This is unlike the chaotic mourning crowd in B2, who are told to go away and are then cast out. This chaotic and thus evil crowd represent unfaithful Israel that will not be saved and will not partake in the resurrection. Matthew's chiasm though considerably shorter produces the same message as Mark's and Luke's longer chiasms.

The stories of JD and HW can also be arranged into a four-level triple chiasm, as in Mark and Luke. Since the chiasm only contains 139 words, the individual units are consequently very short; they are only 7 words per unit on average. Matthew's chiasm is different in that each main scene (Jairus's request, HW healed, and JD raised) consists of one complete chiasm. There is also a different plot sequence for each scene. Instead of dividing each scene into three parts like Mark and Luke (movement, description of main character, and action relating to main character) Matthew divides each scene into six parts. However, before these are discussed, the chiasm needs to be presented:

A1 New character: Jairus (not named in Matthew) arrives
9:18 While he was saying these things to them (the disciples),
suddenly a leader of the synagogue came in
B1 Action/movement: Jairus kneels
and knelt before him,
C1 Reason for action: daughter is dead
saying, "My daughter has just died;
D1 Action of Jesus: lay hands
but come and lay your hand on her,
C2 Miracle: daughter will live
and she will live."
B2 Fulfilment: Jesus gets up and leaves with Jairus
9:19 And Jesus got up and followed him, with his disciples.
A2 New character: HW
9:20 Then suddenly a woman who had been suffering from haemorrhages for twelve years
B3 Action/movement: HW comes up to Jesus and touches him
came up behind him and touched the fringe of his cloak,
C3 Reason for action/ request: she will be made well
9:21 for she said to herself, "If I only touch his cloak, I will be made well."
D2 Action of Jesus: turns and sees her
9:22 Jesus turned, and seeing her
C4 Miracle: Jesus confirms reason/request: faith made her well
he said, "Take heart, daughter; your faith has made you well."
B4 Fulfillment: request granted is granted and woman is healed
And instantly the woman was made well.
A3 New character: mourning crowd at Jairus's house
9:23 When Jesus came to the leader's house
and saw the flute players and the crowd making a commotion,
B5 Action/movement: Jesus says go away; JD is asleep and not dead
9:24 he said, "Go away; for the girl is not dead but sleeping."
C5 Scorn of request: crowd laughs at him
And they laughed at him.
D3 Jesus puts crowd outside and goes in
9:25 But when the crowd had been put outside, he went in
C6: Miracle: takes girl by hand
and took her by the hand,
B6 Fulfillment: request is granted and girl lives
and the girl got up.
A4 End: Report spread (by crowd)
9:26 And the report of this spread throughout that district.

As just mentioned, there are six parts to each scene. First, the new character is described: in A1 Jairus's arrival is described, in A2 the arrival of the HW is described, and in A3 Jesus's arrival to the mourning crowd is described. There is no new character in A4; the position of a new character is taken by the report that spreads. Second, there is movement of the main character in regards to Jesus: Jairus kneels before Jesus in B1, the HW comes up to Jesus in B3, and Jesus tells the mourning crowd to go in B5. Third, a reason for the action is supplied: JD has just died in C1, the HW hopes to be made well in C3, and the boisterousness and disrespect of the crowd is shown by their laughing in C5. Fourth, an action of Jesus is referred to: Jesus is to lay his hands on JD in D1, Jesus turns in D2, and Jesus goes inside in D3. Fifth, a reference is made to the actual miracle: JD is to live in C2, faith has healed the HW in C4, and Jesus lays his hands on JD in C6. Sixth, the completion of the main action is

given: Jesus gets up and goes with Jairus in B2, the HW is made well in B4, and JD gets up in B6.

The parallels for the A and D levels are the same as those just given in the description of the scene elements, and thus quite clear. The parallels for the B level are also quite clear. In B1 Jairus's kneeling before Jesus is opposed to Jesus's getting up and following Jairus in B2. This last detail in turn has a parallel in B3 where the HW comes up behind Jesus. In B4 the action started in B3 is completed: in B3 the woman touches Jesus's clothes to be healed, and in B4 she is healed. It is of note that B3 and B4 both combine to form a very similar sentence to one that is found in Luke ("She came up behind him and touched the fringe of his clothes and immediately her haemorrhage stopped" 9:44), and the sequence of events in the wordier Mark. Consequently, through chiasm Matthew has the touching and healing taking place at the same time. Finally, in B5 the girl is said not to be dead but sleeping, and this metaphorical understanding of death is shown to be true in B6, where the girl gets up.

The C level parallels and oppositions are very clear. In C1 JD is dead, and in C2 the hope is that she will be alive. C2 expresses the hopes for JD, and C3 expresses the hopes of the HW for herself. In C3 the woman hopes "I will be made well," and in C4 Jesus says "faith has made you well." C3 shows the faith of the HW, and the laughter of the crowd in C5 shows the crowds complete lack of faith in Jesus. Finally, C4 and C6 both give the action of Jesus that brings the miracle about: in C4 he says the woman is healed, and in C6 he lays his hands on JD.

Considering the shortness of each unit (seven words on average), the degree and clarity of the parallels is exceptional. This means that each unit is roughly one ninth the size of the average SUD unit, and one fifteenth the size of the average LUD unit. This would mean that even if one were to grant just one word or conceptual parallel for each level on average, an incredibly low probability figure would be produced. Consequently, as with the chiasms of Mark and Luke, it is virtually certain that this chiasm is by the design of the author.

As with Mark's triple chiasm, there is not a lot of meaning generated by the above chiasm. The first chiasm is virtually the same as Mark's chiasm for Jairus's request, which also generated little meaning. As with that chiasm, the emphasis is on Jesus's hands (D1) and the opposition of death and life (C level). This last is made stronger, because in Matthew the girl has already died. Consequently, the faith Jairus has in the power of Jesus's hands is greater. The second chiasm has Jesus turning around and immediately seeing who had touched him. This action is an odd choice for the hinge, except if one knew Mark's version. In contrast to Mark, Jesus knows immediately who had touched him. Matthew would thus seem to be stressing Jesus's all knowingness. However, this is diminished, because in Matthew there is no crowd pressing in to inhibit discovering who touched him. The C level of this chiasm emphasizes that it is the woman's faith that has made her well, but unlike Mark, Jesus grants the miracle, and the power does not leave Jesus on its own. The hinge of the third chiasm (D3), like the other hinges emphasizes Jesus's power: here he casts out the crowd making the commotion. Matthew also emphasizes the commotion of the crowd in the first wing of this chiasm (A3) by adding mention of musicians. Thus, besides the emphasis on Jesus's power and authority, there is little meaning gained from the chiastic structure, because unlike Mark there is no indication that JD represents Israel, nor is there any indication besides the commotion that the crowd represents evil.[470]

---

[470] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:124, note that Matthew in the HW and JD never prevents Jesus from leaving centre stage. Gundry, *Matthew*, 174, likewise notes that the changes to the HW keep Jesus's majesty intact;

This is not the only chiastic structure within this section. As with Mark, if one removes the HW chiasm a chiasm can be created by only using the JD material:

A1 Jairus comes in and kneels (9:18a)
B1 Jairus requests that Jesus lay his hand on his daughter (9:18b)
C1 Jesus goes with Jairus (9:19)
D1 Crowd is mourning and making commotion (9:23)
E Jesus says girl is not dead but sleeping (9:24a)
D2 Crowd laughs and is cast out (9:24b–25b)
C2 Jesus goes inside (9:25a)
B2 Jesus takes JD by hand (9:25b)
A2 JD gets up and report goes out (9:25c–26)

There is clear parallelism and opposition on each level: in A1 Jairus comes in and kneels and in A2 JD gets up; in B1 Jairus requests that Jesus lay his hand on JD so that she will live and in B2 Jesus does so; in C1 Jesus goes with Jairus, and in C2 Jesus goes into Jairus's house; in D1 the crowd is mourning, and in D2 the crowd is laughing; and in hinge E the girl's death is said to be like sleep, that is, temporary, and in A2 this is shown to be the case. Like the previous chiasm each unit is very short at 10 words each on average, which is one sixth the average SUD unit. This means that just one word or conceptual parallel would be significant parallelism. Since this is the case, the probability of the above chiasm occurring by chance is very low.

The emphasis is on Jesus's statement that the girl is not dead but sleeping. In Matthew, the girl is clearly dead from the beginning of the story, and thus the statement can only be taken metaphorically and as a reference to the resurrection. That this is the case is shown in wing A2 where the girl is resurrected. The opposition of Jairus kneeling and the girl getting up in the wings indicates that is through faith that the resurrection took place. Consequently, the message is clear: if one wishes death to be like sleep (E) and if one wishes to be resurrected (A2), then one should worship Jesus (A1). In other words, it is only if one has the faith shown by Jairus that one will experience the ultimate power of Jesus's hand shown in A2 and on the B level. However, if one does not have faith like the crowd on the D level then like them, one will be cast out of the kingdom of God. Thus, the same message is generated by the above chiasm as is found in the chiasms in Mark and Luke.

As with Mark and Luke the above chiastic analysis highlights details that may have been added to the oral tradition by Matthew to make the chiastic parallels. These details are: Jairus kneeling, the opposition of death and life in Jairus's request, Jairus asking Jesus to lay his hand on his daughter, the crowd making a commotion, the opposition of weeping and laughing, Jesus taking the girls hand, and the girl getting up. This list contains most of the story, and consequently, at this point the list does not tell us much. We shall now turn to Matthew's changes and look at them in detail.

Matthew's Changes

The following analysis of Matthew's changes will be useful in both the oral analysis and the historical analysis, because if there is good reason to think that Matthew made his changes on theological grounds, it would mean that he likely changed the oral tradition.

Matthew further adds Jesus's name at 9:19, 9:22, and 9:38, which likewise brings Jesus to the fore. The observations concerning the triple chiasm support this view.

Consequently, in the oral analysis his deletions will not have as much weight as they normally would have in determining the shape of the oral tradition.

Matthew's changes are substantial. The following is a list of all the changes Matthew makes to Mark's and Luke's versions of the story of JD. The numbers in parentheses reflect a consequent relationship with a previous change: [471]

1) The story does not begin with Jesus returning from across the sea to a large crowd.
2) JD is already dead, not dying.
3) Crowd does not press in. (1)
4) The HW is not said to have gone to various physicians and spent all her money.
5) The woman is not instantly cured.
6) Power does not go unchecked from Jesus. (5)
7) Jesus knows who touched him. (1)
8) There is no conversation with the disciples over who touched him. (1)
9) The woman does not come forward and kneel before Jesus. (1)
10) The woman does not tell her story.
11) It is Jesus's words to the woman that brings the healing. (5)
12) There are no messengers. (2)
13) Jairus is not told to believe. (2)
14) Jesus does not leave crowd and go on with just the three and Jairus (Mark). (1)
15) Jesus does not enter the room where the girl is with just the three and the parents.
16) Jesus does not tell the girl to get up.
17) We are not told spirit returns (Luke)
18) We are not told the girl is twelve years old.
19) Witnesses are not amazed.
20) Witnesses are not told not to tell.
21) Girl is not given something to eat.
22) The report spreads far and wide.

Why did Matthew change the story so radically? Was it for style: did he think the other versions too long and wordy? Or was it more for rhetorical or theological reasons? The first is possible, but as we shall see, there are plausible theological reasons for each change Matthew makes.

We will begin with the most striking change: in Matthew, JD is dead from the beginning. This makes the miracle most unusual: would someone actually ask a healer to raise someone from the dead? It has the effect of making Jairus's faith more than

[471] Since there is no crowd (1), it can not press in (3), Jesus is able to know who touched him (7), Jesus does not need to ask who touched him (8), and the woman does not need to come forward out of the crowd (9). In Matthew the woman is not instantly cured (5), which means that power does not go forth from Jesus (6), which in turn means that another means of healing is required (11). Finally, since JD is already dead, there is no need for messengers (12) or for Jairus's faith to be maintained (13). Most commentators (for example, Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 126; Gundry, *Matthew*, 172; Harris, "The Dead," 307) see the reverse: they argue that Matthew had to have Jairus say that the daughter was already dead, because he had eliminated the messengers. The reason for Matthew eliminating the messengers is then seen as stylistic: he wished to have a short story. This is a very weak reason for a change to the basic structure of the story. Since Luke changes Mark to make it clear that JD is dead, and Mark's story leaves open the possibility that JD is not dead, it is much more plausible that Matthew made his changes to make it clear that JD was dead.

extraordinary. This change shortens the story as there is no need for messengers or any need for Jairus's faith to be bolstered. This change also makes it clear that the story is a raising-of-the-dead story. We have already seen that Luke also made changes to Mark to make it clear that the story is a raising-of-the-dead story: he has the crowd know JD is dead and he tells us her spirit returned. It is notable that both Luke and Matthew see a need to make it clear that the story is a raising-of-the-dead story. While Mark intends the story to be understood as a resurrection miracle, the story itself in Mark admits the possibility that the girl is not dead.

The main problem with the story of JD as a raising-of-the-dead story is that Jesus says the girl is not dead, but sleeping. As such, one could interpret Jesus literally and argue he had spiritual insight into the girl's true condition, namely that she only appeared to be dead. In fact, it is possible to read the story of the raising of Lazarus in John as, in part, a comment on this problematic statement in Matthew. The relevant section of the story of Lazarus unfolds as follows:

A1 Jesus stays two days
he stayed two days longer in the place where he was.

B1 Jesus says to go to Judea
11:7 Then after this he said to the disciples, "Let us go to Judea again."

C1 Disciples worried Jesus will die
11:8 The disciples said to him, "Rabbi, the Jews were just now trying to stone you, and are you going there again?"

D1 Those who walk in light (believers) do not stumble
11:9 Jesus answered, "Are there not twelve hours of daylight? Those who walk during the day do not stumble, because they see the light of this world. 11:10 But those who walk at night stumble, because the light is not in them."

E1 Lazarus is asleep (dead)
11:11 After saying this, he told them, "Our friend Lazarus has fallen asleep, but I am going there to awaken him."

F1 Disciples think Jesus is talking of regular sleep
11:12 The disciples said to him, "Lord, if he has fallen asleep, he will be all right."

G Jesus was speaking about his death
11:13 Jesus, however, had been speaking about his death,

F2 Disciples think Jesus is talking of regular sleep
but they thought that he was referring merely to sleep.

E2 Lazarus is dead
11:14 Then Jesus told them plainly, "Lazarus is dead.

D2 Jesus says for their sake he is glad Lazarus died so disciples may believe
11:15 For your sake I am glad I was not there, so that you may believe. But let us go to him."

C2 Disciple suggests to other disciples that they go and die with Jesus
11:16 Thomas, who was called the Twin, said to his fellow disciples, "Let us also go, that we may die with him."

B2 Jesus arrives in Judea
B 11:17 When Jesus arrived,

A2 Lazarus in tomb for four days
he found that Lazarus had already been in the tomb four days.

The main parallelism of each unit is given in the headings. This chiasm hinges on what Jesus meant when he said that Lazarus was asleep and that he was going to waken him. John makes it clear that Jesus was using sleep as a euphemism for death and that Jesus is going to raise Lazarus from death. Also, the purpose of this miracle is so that the disciples will believe that Jesus is the LORD Messiah. We have already seen from the chiastic analysis of the larger sections of Mark, Luke, and Matthew that JD was also used to show that Jesus is the LORD Messiah. Also, Mark and Luke connect the raising of JD to Peter's statement that Jesus is the Messiah. From the model of frequent communication used in this thesis, it is highly likely that John knew the story of JD and knew that it was used to show Jesus was the Messiah. He would also have been aware that Jesus's statement that the girl was sleeping and not dead was problematic. It is thus likely that this passage is a commentary on the problematic statement and was written to address the issue. The disciples in John represent those who misunderstood the statement by taking it literally.

There are, thus, several indications that the reason for Matthew's moving JD's death to the beginning of the story is based on rhetorical concerns: like Luke he wishes to eliminate any question about whether this miracle is a raising-of-the-dead miracle. Why then did Matthew not eliminate Jesus's statement? The answer may well be that it was an established part of the oral tradition and could not be changed. This statement is also the word of the

LORD, and eliminating these words while keeping the story surrounding them, could have been seen as unacceptable. On top of this, the statement expressed the early church's understanding of death: if one believed in Jesus and obeyed him, then one would be raised, and death would become a sleep. To present the girl already being dead is not as large a change as eliminating Jesus's statement would have been: she was also dead in Mark and Luke before Jesus arrived. The change in Matthew does require him to eliminate the messengers, but they are not absolutely essential: the story is about Jesus raising someone, not about messengers coming with messages. Nonetheless, it will be argued below that the messenger scene was an essential part of the oral tradition.

Matthew's other changes also seem to have a theological basis. The next most significant change concerns the healing of the HW. In Matthew the woman is not instantly healed and Jesus knows immediately who had withdrawn the power. In Mark and Luke, the power seeps out from Jesus without his apparent control over it: all Jesus knows is that power has gone forth. The effect of this is to put Jesus fully in control of his power: the power does not flow and heal the HW until Jesus says so. Jesus becomes more fully the LORD Messiah, and not someone through whom the LORD Messiah's power flows. Matthew makes Jesus fully in control: the LORD Messiah knows exactly who touched him. Because of these changes, there is no real need for the crowd.

Matthew also eliminates the secrecy motive. We have already noted that Jesus's instruction to the witnesses that they not tell anyone is problematic. Not only is there the question of what exactly they are not to tell, but if they do tell, they will have disobeyed the LORD Messiah, and anyone who repeats the story would be partaking in this disobedience. As it stands, in Mark and Luke the statement does not place any restrictions on whom not to tell or on how long the secret is to be kept. In the discussion of the chiasm in Mark, it was argued that the focus of the statement was the excitable mourning crowd. Consequently, it is natural to assume that the other followers, especially the twelve, would have been excluded from the prohibition. With the elimination of this phrase, Matthew does not need to have only a select few go into the room with Jesus. Also, he is free to have the story spreading far and wide which would therefore account for how it had become well known.

The three main changes just discussed account for almost all of the changes except the amazement of the crowd and the girl being twelve years old. This last may well have been for stylistic reasons: if it were added, it would break the chiastic pattern and a parallel would have to be created. This would be necessary because each chiastic segment in Matthew is only a few words. The amazement of the crowd is replaced by Matthew telling us that the report of the miracle spread far and wide, which conveys the same idea—the miracle is amazing and therefore spread. Thus, almost all the changes made by Matthew can be plausibly explained on rhetorical or theological grounds.

The above analysis of Matthew's changes and the chiastic analyses will be useful in both the oral analysis and the historical analysis. Since there is good reason to think that Matthew made his changes on theological grounds, it would mean that he likely changed the oral tradition. Consequently, in the oral analysis his deletions will not have as much weight as they normally would have in determining the shape of the oral tradition. The chiastic analysis was useful in showing the importance and use that early Christianity put to the story of JD. The themes uncovered were also likely found in the oral tradition; however, the chiastic structuring is unlikely to have been. Chiastic structuring is useful for memorizing texts word for word and for expounding on them. It is unlikely that it was used in purely oral performance, because there would be no need: complex chiastic structures are not something

one can hear. One either needs a written text or to know the text by heart to appreciate them. Chiasm is also not suitable for pure oral performance—as opposed to the oral performance of a written text—because oral performance allows for change and variation. Chiastic analysis is consequently useful in that it highlights items that may have been added to the oral tradition in order for chiasms to be made. This will also be useful in the historical analysis that follows the oral analysis.

Oral Analysis

The purpose of this oral analysis is to see how the three writers treat the tradition: what items seem to be fixed, and where change is allowed. Through the course of the analysis it will be shown that the treatment of JD by the synoptic authors conforms very closely to Bailey's observations for informal controlled material. Very rarely do Luke and Matthew follow Mark word for word. They feel free to change verb forms and use synonyms. They also feel free to add or delete minor details that do not affect the plot or meaning of the story. This points to the synoptic authors working from the framework of a primarily oral society.

The analysis will produce the general shape of the oral version of JD. However, there is the danger that, in following Mark's structure, Luke and Matthew also adopted changes he made. This is where the chiastic analysis becomes useful: changes Mark may have made for chiastic, rhetorical, or theological reasons become suspect, as do such changes Luke and Matthew made to Mark. This is especially important in the case of Matthew, who makes substantial changes to the story: such substantial changes to the structure of the story are very different from the changes made by Luke and do not conform to the pattern of change observed by Dunn, who follows the model of oral tradition observed by Bailey.[472] A strong hermeneutic suspicion will thus be applied to Matthew's changes.

Oral analysis is a type of synoptic analysis. The different elements in the three versions will be analysed according to the following schema:

1) Essential: these elements have to be in the story.
2) Additional or repertorial: these are elements that can be added to the story, or are elements which are part of the tradition, but do not have to be included in a performance.
3) Variation allowed: this is the variation allowed to both essential and additional items

As we are only concerned with JD, it is not necessary to do this analysis on the HW. The story will be broken down into small sections beginning with the opening or transition scene:[473]

Mark	Luke	Matthew
A1 5:21 When **Jesus** had crossed again in the boat to the other side, a great **crowd** gathered around him; and he was by the sea.	A1 8:40 Now when **Jesus** returned, the **crowd** welcomed him, for they were all waiting for him.	A1 9:18 While he was saying these things to them,
5.21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ **Ἰησοῦ** [ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ] πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη **ὄχλος** πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν.	8.40 Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν **Ἰησοῦν** ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ **ὄχλος**· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν.	9.18 Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς

[472] Dunn, *Jesus*, 210–54.

[473] Bold items denote same words or words from the same root, and italics indicate synonyms.

This section serves as a transition from the previous story, which in Mark and Luke was the curing of the Gerasene demoniac and in Matthew, some sayings on discipleship. These passages thus serve the narrative structure of each gospel. Though some scholars have suggested that Mark used previously formed blocks of miracles or sayings, the structural analysis of his gospel shows that each story or pericope used by Mark becomes subservient to his structural chiastic design.[474] The most likely conclusion is that Mark is the one who arranged the elements of his gospel. For example, it was most likely Mark who took four individual miracle stories to form the sequence ending with JD and then took four other individual miracle stories to form a matching sequence at the beginning of the chiastic section 1:16–6:13.

Also, though it is likely that the individual miracle stories would at times have been told in groups as examples of Jesus's power, it is also likely that in the oral telling the grouping would be tailored to the needs and desires of a teller in a given situation. It is to be remembered that oral communication is the open property of the community, and anyone can tell a particular story. Thus, individual stories could be told alone or paired with others at will. The only exception would perhaps be if Jesus performed two miracles in quick succession and the two stories came to be regarded as one. Such a situation is presented in these three gospels with HW and JD. However, it is likely Mark who first drew these two stories together: the stories form two separate chiasms that seem to have been spliced together and the crowd of the HW has to be left behind in order for JD to continue.

Thus, it is unlikely that these opening sections were part of the oral tradition, but were composed to create a coherent written narrative. That being said, the oral story would have had to have begun somehow with a description of what Jesus was doing—teaching, walking along, arriving from someplace, or a simple "one day he was in . . .," etc. From the stories that we have, there is no way to tell if there was a standard opening to this story. Whatever the opening, it is unlikely that it was essential to the story, because Matthew's opening diverges from Mark's and Luke's opening.

The crowd, boat, and being by the sea are also suspect as they serve the chiastic structuring of Mark, which is then followed by Luke. Matthew with his different sequence does not have a crowd. Also, the crowd is more truly a part of the story of the HW: it is necessary for the question of who touched Jesus.[475] Matthew, as we have seen, eliminates this scene for what seems to be theological reasons and thus has no need of a crowd whatsoever. Also, both Mark and Luke leave the crowd behind for the actual miracle of JD. Consequently, it is unlikely that there was a crowd at the beginning of the oral version of JD.

The next section begins the story proper:

---

[474] See Paul J. Achtemeier, "Toward the Isolation of the Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae," *JBL* 89 (1970): 265–91. Achtemeier notes the doubling of miracles in Mark's gospels, and that the doubling follows a parallel order. However, an alternative solution is that the parallels serve a chiastic purpose.

[475] So Karl Kertelge, *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium: eine redaktions-geschichtliche Untersuchung* (München,: Kösel-Verlag, 1970), 111; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:778, 842, n.21.

Mark	Luke	Matthew
B1/*B1* 5:22 Then one of the **leaders** of the **synagogue named Jairus came**	B1 8:41 **Just then** there **came** a man **named Jairus**, a **leader** of the **synagogue.**	B1 (9:18) **suddenly** a **leader came** in
5.22 καὶ **ἔρχεται** εἷς τῶν **ἀρχισυναγώγων, ὀνόματι Ἰάϊ ρος,**	8.41 καὶ **ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν** ἀνὴρ ᾧ **ὄνομα Ἰάϊρος** καὶ οὗτος **ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς** ὑπῆ ρχεν,	**ἰδοὺ ἄρχων** εἷς **ἐλθὼν**
and, when he saw him, *fell at his* **feet** 5:23 and **begged him** repeatedly, **(saying)**	He *fell at Jesus's* **feet** and **begged him** to *come* to his house,	and *knelt before him*, **saying,**
καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν *πίπτει πρὸς* **τοὺς πόδας** *αὐτοῦ* 5.23 καὶ **παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν** πολλὰ **λέγων ὅτι**	καὶ *πεσὼν παρὰ* **τοὺς πόδας** [τοῦ] *Ἰησοῦ* **παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν** εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ,	*προσεκύνει* **αὐτῷ λέγων ὅτι**
C1/*C1* "My little **daughter** is at the *point of death.*	C1 8:42 for he had an only **daughter**, about **twelve years old**, who *was dying.*	C1 "My **daughter** has *just died*;
Τὸ **θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει,**	8.42 **ὅτι θυγάτηρ** μονογενὴς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς **ἐτῶν δώδεκα** καὶ αὐτὴ **ἀπέθνῃσκεν.**	**Ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν·**
D1 **Come and lay** *your* **hands on her**, *C2* so that she may be made well, and **live.**"		D1 but **come and lay** *your* **hand on her**, C2 and she will **live.**"
ἵνα **ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ** ἵνα σωθῇ **καὶ ζήσῃ.**		ἀλλὰ **ἐλθὼν ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά** *σου* **ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ ζήσεται.**

All three versions agree that the person making the request was a leader. Mark and Luke specify he is a leader of the synagogue, and in Matthew this is assumed.[476] Luke and Matthew agree he is an ἄρχων, who was in charge of the general direction of the synagogue, and in Mark an ἀρχισυναγώγος, who was in charge of worship meetings.[477] These are minor differences; that the person is a leader of the synagogue seems to be an absolutely essential item. This is probably because this person is the main character of the story and needs to be identified. Since he is identified by his job, the name is not necessary and Matthew does not use it. It would thus seem to be a repertorial element. There is much discussion in the literature about whether the name Jairus was likely to have been invented or not. The argument that the name Jairus ("he enlightens" or "awakens") is symbolic is very weak. If it was symbolically important then Mark would have translated it for his Greek

[476] So William Foxwell Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew* (AB 26; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971). For Matthew's audience a Jewish leader would be a leader in the synagogue.
[477] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:125.

audience.[478] Also, if Bauckham is correct in his theory that the reason that some people were named in the tradition is because they were eyewitnesses within the Christian community, then Jairus would have been a strong candidate to have become a member of the community: an astounding miracle had been performed on his daughter.[479]

The next common element is Jairus falling (Mark and Luke) or kneeling (Matthew) before Jesus. The words used to describe this action are different in all three gospels. The word used by Matthew, προσεκύνει, is used to show obeisance and worship;[480] for example, Mark (followed by Luke) uses this word for the Gerasene demoniac (Mark 5:6, Luke 8:28) and the HW (Mark 5:33, Luke 5:47). Mark (again, followed by Luke) creates a chiastic parallel between Jairus's falling and the HW's kneeling. Consequently, Jairus's falling symbolizes his reverence for Jesus in all three gospels. Though this act is symbolic, kneeling before someone was a common form of supplication. If it was added to one of the stories, then it is more likely that it was added to the HW because the scene is presented as taking place in the midst of a crowd, which is not a suitable place for kneeling. It is thus likely that Jairus's falling before Jesus is an essential element to the story that can be variously described: πίπτει (Mark), πεσὼν (Luke), and προσεκύνει (Matthew).

The next element common to all three is that the person to be healed is JD. It is unlikely that the key character would be changed; the person being healed is by definition a key element of a healing story, and only exceptional circumstances would allow for such a change. The healed person could have been a son and then changed to being a daughter to create the parallel with HW. However, it is more likely that the term "daughter" was added to the story of the HW, since it is unnecessary to Jesus's statement "Daughter, your faith has made you well." That the sick person was JD is thus highly likely to have been an essential item of the oral story.

In all three the exact nature of the girl's disease is not mentioned, only that she is at the point of death (Mark and Luke) or dead (Matthew). As discussed above, this difference was likely made by Matthew for theological reasons. Normally the nature of the disease or condition is mentioned, but the important point for the story is that the girl is at the point of death. The girl being at the point of death would thus be an essential item.

This brings us to the age of the girl. This item is suspect for a couple of reasons: it is not found in Matthew, the item seems tacked on in Mark, and it serves symbolic purposes. That the item is not found in Matthew means it is not an absolutely essential item; there does not seem to be any theological reason for him not to mention it. The most likely reason that Matthew does not mention it is that he uses a different chiastic structure. In both Mark and Luke the item is placed where it is for chiastic purposes. In Luke it makes a very clear

---

[478] So Gundry, *Mark*, 267. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:782–83, adds that if basic Aramaic had to be translated for Mark's audience (*talitha cum*), they would certainly need a translation of Jairus's name if Mark intended a symbolic meaning. I would also point out that Mark's audience was probably not that different from John's, who needed to have "rabbi" translated (1:38). The same point can be made concerning Luke: Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (2 vols.; 3; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1994), 1:792; Marshall, *Luke*, 343. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:782, points out that one could take any theophoric name in the Hebrew Bible and make some connection to the person. The examples he gives would also apply to the Jairus story; for example, Isaiah means "YHWH saves" (JD was saved), Ezekiel means "God strengthens" (Jesus strengthened Jairus), and John means "YHWH was gracious" (YHWH graciously saved JD). Those who support a symbolic interpretation for Jairus include Bovon, *Luke*, 337; Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 312–14.

[479] Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, ch. 3, on Jairus, 53. Gundry, *Mark*, 267, likewise suggests the name is mentioned because Jairus became a disciple.

[480] Liddell, et al., *LSJ*, s.v. προσεκυνέω.

parallel between JD and the HW. In Mark the parallel is not as clear because it is part of the plot chiasm.

In regards to the position of the mention of the girl's age, the position in Luke's story is more likely to be closer to the oral tradition: such details are usually told when a character is introduced. The awkwardness of Mark's position also favours this interpretation: "And immediately the girl got up and began to walk about (she was twelve years of age)" (5:42).[481] This is one of Mark's "γαρ" clauses: Mark uses the phrase as an explanation as to why she was able to walk about. Some have suggested that it was felt necessary because diminutives have been used to describe the girl up to this point; however, the explanation is entirely unnecessary since the fact she is walking itself demonstrates that she is old enough to walk.[482] Also, it does not really make any difference to the story whether she was two years old, ten years old, or fifteen years old. In addition, once one understands Mark's chiastic structure for JD and HW, its position here makes sense. It is highly unlikely that both the woman and the girl were associated with the same symbolic number. This item is thus suspect on several levels. At best it indicates that the description of the daughter could be expanded upon.

The final element in this section is the actual request: Jairus wishes Jesus to come with him. Here Luke diverges from both Mark and Matthew. Since Luke forgoes making this section into its own chiasm, he shortens the request by not having Jairus ask Jesus to lay his hands on the girl so that she may live. He then adds that the girl is twelve to make the clearer chiastic parallel to the HW. Luke's succinctness makes the first chiasm of his triple chiasm clearer than Mark's. The items he eliminates are unnecessary to the story: naturally Jairus wants Jesus to come to heal his daughter so she will live. The essential part of the request is that the girl is dying and that Jesus comes. That she is dying is essential because it is a raising-of-the-dead story.[483] Mark and Matthew, by contrast, both describe the manner of healing requested by Jairus (laying on of hands) and his wish that his daughter live. Mark also adds that Jairus wished his daughter to be made well. Though this is suspect because it brings overtones of salvation, it is conceivable that someone whose daughter was dying would ask the healer to come and save the daughter's life. Also, the terminology does not

---

[481] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:842, n. 24, refers to the position as both late and awkward.

[482] Gundry, *Mark*, 275.

[483] There are some scholars (Kertelge, *Wunder*, 113; Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 1:312–14; Rochais, *Récits*, 110–11) who think that JD was originally a healing story which became a raising-of-the-dead story. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:782–84, gives a review and critique of this position and concludes: "Behind all these individual objections stands the ultimate problem with the theory that the Jesus narrative was originally a story of healing that was transformed into one of raising the dead: there is not positive evidence for such a transformation in the text we have before us" (2:784). Rochais' argument is based on redaction criticism which assumes that Mark used primarily written sources. This approach is critiqued below on page on page 218. This assumption is characteristic, in part of all the scholars proposing that JD was originally a healing story. Kertelge's argument is also based on tenuous parallels with the story of the healing of the centurion's servant (parallels include such common words as "faith", "house", and "come"). On this see Meier, *Marginal*, 2:782, 847, n. 40. Pesch's argument is based on Jairus's name being symbolic, the claim that JD is the only story where the story begins as a healing story and ends as a raising, and the parallels with the stories of Elijah and Elisha are indirect and if the story had been a raising story from the beginning they would have been clear. On Jairus's name, see above n. 478 on page 200. As Meier, *Marginal*, 2:783, points out the story of Lazarus also begins as healing. In regards to Elijah and Elisha, this argument rests on the premise that Mark would wish to draw parallels with the Elijah and Elisha story, or that the story Mark was working from allowed for clear parallels to be made. There is no evidence for such premises (cf. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:783, 848, n.49).

change the meaning of the story: the main point is the girl is deathly sick and thus Jesus needs to come quickly. The point is essential, but it can be described variously.

The next section is a transition scene:

Mark	Luke	Matthew
D1/ *B1* 5:24 So *he went* with him. (*A1* And a large crowd *followed him* and *pressed in on him.*)	D As *he went,* (the crowds *pressed in on him*)	B2 9:19 And Jesus got up and *followed him*, with his disciples.
5.24 καὶ **ἀπῆλθεν** μετ' αὐτοῦ.	Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτὸν	9.19 καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.
. . .	. . .	. . .
C4/*B1* 5:35 **While he was still speaking, some people came from the leader's house to say, "Your daughter** *is dead. Why* **trouble the teacher any further***?"*	C4 8:49 **While he was still speaking, someone came from the leader's house to say, "Your daughter** *is dead; do not* **trouble the teacher any longer**. *"*	(A1 9:18 *While he was saying these things to them*, suddenly a *leader* of the synagogue came in)
5.35 **Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχονται** ἀπὸ **τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι** Η **θυγάτηρ σου** ἀπέθανεν· τί **ἔτι σκύλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον**	8.49 **Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἔρχεταί** τις παρὰ **τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου λέγων ὅτι** Τέθνηκεν ἡ **θυγάτηρ σου·** μηκέτι **σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον.**	
B4/*C1* 5:36 **But overhearing** *what they said,* **Jesus** *said* to the leader of the synagogue, "**Do not fear, only believe.**"	B4 1 *8:50* **When Jesus heard** *this, he replied, "***Do not fear.** **Only believe**, and she will be saved."	(9:19: with his disciples)
5.36 **ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς παρακούσας** τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ, **Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευε.**	8.50 **ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀκούσας** ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ, **Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον πίστευσον**, καὶ σωθήσεται.	
A3/*D1* 5:37 **He allowed** *no one to follow him* except **Peter, James, and John**, the brother of James. B5/*E1* 1 5:38 **When** they **came to the house of the leader** of the synagogue,	A3 8:51 **When** *he* **came to the house, he** *did not* **allow** *anyone to enter with him*, **except Peter, John, and James**, and **the child's father and mother**.	A3 9:23 **When** *Jesus* **came to** *the* **leader's house**
5.37 καὶ **οὐκ ἀφῆκεν** οὐδένα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθῆσαι **εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην** τὸν ἀδελφὸν **Ἰακώβου.** 5.38 **καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχι**συναγώγου	8.51 **ἐλθὼν** δὲ **εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν** **οὐκ ἀφῆκεν** εἰσελθεῖν τινα σὺν αὐτῷ **εἰ μὴ Πέτρον κα ὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον** καὶ **τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα.**	9.23 **Καὶ ἐλθὼν** ὁ Ἰησοῦς **εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἄρχοντος**

In this section we move from the initial location to Jairus's house. As argued above, it is unlikely that the two stories of JD and the HW were joined in the oral tradition. When then

did the messenger(s) arrive: at the initial location or on the way? Most commentators favour the first option: "while he was still speaking" flows naturally if it comes right after Jairus's request and makes a complete story of JD.

The first indication that this is correct is that most of the elements of the description of Jesus leaving are after Jairus's request (the crowd in Mark and Luke, and the disciples in Matthew) seem to be added to each story. The crowd in Mark and Luke serves not only a symbolic function, but it is also more truly a part of the story of the HW.[484] The crowd also gives chiastic ties to A1 and A2 in Mark and Luke. In Matthew the mention of the disciples relates to his previous scene, which was likely added by him to flow from the previous material. Also, Matthew's beginning of the story with Jairus interrupting Jesus speaking could possibly have been borrowed from the messenger sequence to start his version of the story; Matthew has no need for the messengers because the daughter is already dead. Since this seems to be done for theological reasons, Mark and Luke's version is likely to be closer to the oral version, and there was just a simple description of Jesus leaving.

Luke follows Mark almost word for word concerning the arrival of the messengers. There is only one minor change: in Mark more than one person comes and in Luke only one person comes. The number of messengers is irrelevant to the story. The rest of the information is essential to the story and is likely to have been in the oral version: a transition is needed for the arrival of the messengers (while he was speaking), and it is necessary to say who they are (messengers from the leader's house). True, if a storyteller wanted to be very short, she or he would not need to mention where the messenger came from: it would be assumed they came from where the daughter was. The arrival of the messengers would thus be an essential item.

The message of the messengers is also an essential item—there is no point of having messengers in a story without a message. Luke follows Mark's wording very closely: the message is the daughter is dead, and thus Jesus is not needed. Besides different words used for the daughter being dead (ἀπέθανεν Mark, τέθνηκεν Luke), the only variation is that Mark phrases the last as a question ("Why trouble the teacher any further?"), and Luke, as a command ("Do not trouble the teacher any further."). In both Jesus is referred to as "teacher."

Next is Jesus's response to the messengers. Jesus hears the message and assures Jairus that despite the news all will be well, telling him not to fear, only to believe. Luke adds to the words by stating the implied conclusion to the action: if Jairus believes his daughter will be saved. These words are suspect as they add to the symbolic dimension of the miracle, namely, that this miracle is not just about Jesus healing and raising a twelve-year-old daughter but is about the LORD raising the twelve tribes of daughter Israel and saving them on his Day. Luke needs to add this dimension becasue he does not have Jairus requesting Jesus to save his daughter.[485] Mark also explicitly states who Jesus is speaking to, namely, "the leader of the synagogue." Luke does not bother to mention this becasue it is clear that Jesus is speaking to Jairus. Again, this is the sort of element that is not necessary to the story. Mark uses this phrase to form a chiastic parallel with B5 where he again repeats the phrase.

---

[484] As the messengers arrive when Jairus is speaking to Jesus, the crowd's introduction is part of the inserted HW chiasm.

[485] 8:41–42: Jairus asks Jesus to come to his house because his daughter is dying.

The words that do not change are Jesus's instructions to Jairus, "Do not fear, only believe;" they would thus be absolutely essential.[486] This makes sense, since they are key words of the scene; they allow the story to continue. They are also the words of the LORD. This counteracts the fact that these words provide the key theological theme to the story: it is faith that heals. As will be argued below, in the section on historical plausibility, this theme is a common theme in the Jesus tradition, and likely goes back to Jesus.

If it is correct that in the original story the messengers arrived while Jairus was still speaking, then a transition scene would be needed. Consequently, it is at this point in the story we would be told that Jesus went with Jairus. Mark and Matthew both have Jesus following Jairus, which makes sense, since Jairus would know the way. All three writers agree that disciples went with the two of them; however, in Mark and Luke it is only the three disciples. This limitation, as many have pointed out, is suspect.[487] The restriction to the three also adds to Mark's messianic secret theme. There is also the possibility that Mark's limitation is trying to recall to his audience the Greek mysteries where people are removed from society and experience death and rebirth. We have already seen that Mark uses "mystery" language in the previous chapter. As Luke combines the leaving of the HW crowd and the mourners into one, he adds mention of the mother and father, which Mark recounts when the party leaves behind the mourners.

An essential part of the story is the arrival of Jesus to Jairus's house: if he does not arrive, then the miracle cannot take place. Luke just says "the house," and Mark and Matthew add qualifiers to make it clear it is Jairus's house. These are minor variations that do not affect the meaning of the story.

We now turn to the events at the house:

---

[486] There is only one very slight difference; in Mark "believe" is in the present tense and in Luke it is in the aorist: πίστευε (Mark), πίστευσον (Luke).

[487] So Meier, *Marginal*, 2:778. Gundry, *Mark*, 273, also notes that the three supply the requisite number of witnesses for evidence in Deut 19:15 ("Only on the evidence of two or three witnesses will a charge be sustained.") If this is the case then more weight is added to the argument that Mark was concerned about eyewitness. On the five witnesses Meier, *Marginal*, 2:779, says, "Obviously they are present as witnesses, not helpers." This will also be discussed further below.

Mark	Luke	Matthew
he *saw* **a commotion**, *people* **weeping** *and wailing loudly.*	B5 8:52 They were all **weeping** *and wailing* for her;	(9:23) and *saw* the flute players and the crowd **making a commotion**
καὶ *θεωρεῖ* **θόρυβον** καὶ **κλαίοντας** καὶ *ἀλαλάζοντας* πολλά,	8.52 **ἔκλαιον** δὲ πάντες καὶ *ἐκόπτοντο* αὐτήν.	καὶ *ἰδὼν* τοὺς αὐλητὰς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον **θορυβούμενον**
C5/*F* 5:39 When he had entered, **he said** to them, "Why do you make a commotion and weep? *The child is* **not dead but sleeping**."	but *he said*, "Do not weep; **for** *she is* **not dead but sleeping**."	B5 9:24 **he said**, "Go away; **for** *the girl is* **not dead but sleeping**."
5.39 καὶ εἰσελθὼν **λέγει** αὐτοῖς, Τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ **κλαίετε**; τὸ παιδίον **οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.**	ὁ δὲ *εἶπεν*, **Μὴ κλαίετε, οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει**	9.24 **ἔλεγεν**,' Αναχωρεῖτε, **οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν** τὸ κοράσιον **ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.**
E2 5:40 **And they laughed at him.**	C5 8:53 **And they laughed at him,** knowing that she was dead.	C5 **And they laughed at him.**
5.40 **καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.**	8.53 **καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ** εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν.	**καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ.**
Then *he* **put** *them all* **outside**, D3/*D2* and took **the child's father and mother** and *those who were with him*, and *went in* where the child was.	(A3 8:51 When he *came to the house*, he did not allow anyone to enter with him, except **Peter, John, and James**, and **the child's father and mother**.)	D3 9:25 But when *the crowd* **had been put outside**, he *went in*
αὐτὸς δὲ **ἐκβαλὼν** *πάντας* παραλαμβάνει **τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα** καὶ *τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ* καὶ *εἰσπορεύεται* ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον.	8.51 ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν **οἰκίαν οὐκ ἀφῆκεν εἰσελθεῖν** τινα σὺν αὐτῷ **εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ'Ιωάννην καὶ'Ιάκωβον** καὶ **τὸν πατέρ α τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα.**	9.25 ὅτε δὲ **ἐξεβλήθη** ὁ ὄχλος *εἰσελθὼν*

All three agree that there was a group of people mourning at the house; however, the description of the mourning varies. Mark and Luke say the people were weeping, and Mark and Matthew say they were making a commotion. Mark and Luke agree they were wailing but use different words to describe it. Mark uses ἀλαλάζοντας ("to wail loudly"), and Luke uses the slightly more subdued ἐκόπτοντο. Matthew adds that there were flute players. However, despite the variance, they all present essentially the same scene: though Luke does not mention it as being a commotion, it is indicated by saying they were not only weeping but wailing also, and though Matthew does not say they were weeping and wailing it is indicated by saying that there was a commotion. Matthew adds to the commotion by mentioning musicians, a common feature at funerals of the time.[488] In oral societies this is

[488] The mourners were most likely professional mourners: Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:131; Harris, "The Dead," 307; Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 43; Marcus, *Mark*, 307. For Marcus this is indicated by the fact that they are

the typical type of scene that allows a storyteller freedom: the goal is to show that people were vigorously mourning, and how it is described does not really matter. One storyteller may wish to be very succinct (e.g., Luke) and another would expand and add details (e.g., Matthew). It is noteworthy, however, that Matthew also calls this group of people a crowd, since he had eliminated the crowd so far in both JD and the HW. This mention of the crowd by Matthew creates a chiastic parallel with A4, the report being spread by the crowd, and D3, the crowd being put outside.

Mark then has Jesus enter the house and the mourners. In Luke, Jesus enters as soon as he arrives, and in Matthew, Jesus enters once the crowd has been put outside. Mark's version makes the most sense. It has already been discussed how Luke's changing of Mark causes problems in the story, and in Matthew, Jesus must be pictured as standing outside and speaking to the crowd inside. Meier argues for the priority of Mark's version due to the criteria of embarrassment: in Mark, Jesus could be seen as physically removing the crowd, and thus acting like a modern-day bouncer.[489] This would be unseemly behaviour for the LORD Messiah. Thus, in Luke, the mourners are either outside already or inside for the whole miracle and consequently there is no ejection by Jesus; in Matthew the passive tense (ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος, the crowd was thrown out) might suggest that someone other than Jesus removed the crowd.[490]

All three then agree that Jesus told the mourners to stop, saying that JD was asleep and not dead. This is variously described except for the key phrase by Jesus. It is clear that the essential elements are Jesus complaining about the noise and Jesus's statement that the girl is asleep and not dead. The nature of Jesus's complaint is voiced as a question in Mark ("Why do you make a commotion and weep?"), and a command in Luke ("Do not weep") and Matthew ("Go away"). Though all are quite different, they all express Jesus's unhappiness with the commotion. There is only a slight variation in the statement about the condition of the girl, namely, in how the girl is referred to: Mark ("the child"), Luke ("she"), and Matthew ("the girl"). These differences do not affect the meaning of the statement. Finally, the reaction of the mourners seems to be an essential item: in all three they laugh at Jesus. Luke adds the reason as to why they laugh, and in doing so, makes clear the state of the girl.

In Mark and Matthew the crowd are then put outside. If we discount Luke's awkward rearrangement of Mark into a different chiasm, this would appear to be an essential item. On the other hand, it does add to the messianic secret and "mystery" motif. This is balanced by Matthew, who abandons any secrecy motif and yet has the crowd being put outside. One can also read Luke's version as implying that the mourners are left outside. As just argued, Mark's sequence makes more sense than Matthew's: the mourners are inside, Jesus goes in and confronts them, and then throws them out. Mark and Luke both limit the people going in and Matthew just mentions that Jesus goes in. It makes sense that if Jesus puts out the crowd he is then not left with a large number of followers. In Mark, there is further movement into the room where the girl actually is. In Luke and Matthew, the impression is that the girl was in the area, presumably large, where the mourners were. The historical plausibility of this will be discussed later.

---

kicked out, and for Harris by the ease with which the wailing turns to laughter. Professional mourners are attested in Israel as early as Amos (5:16), who speaks of those skilled in mourning. Funerals also included singing and dirges (Jer 9:17–22, 2 Chr 35:25), and the later *m. ketub.* (4:4) states that even the poorest families should supply two flute players.

[489] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:787.

[490] So Meier, *Marginal*, 2:787.

We now turn to the healing itself:

Mark	Luke	Matthew
C6/*C2* 5:41 *He took her by the hand* and said to her, "Talitha cum," which means, *"Little girl, get up!"*	D3 8:54 But *he took her by the hand* and called out, *"Child, get up!"* 8:55	C6 and *took her by the hand,*
5.41 καὶ **κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς** *τοῦ παιδίου* **λέγει** αὐτῇ, Ταλιθα κουμ, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον *Τὸ κοράσιον*, σοὶ λέγω, **ἔγειρε**	8.54 αὐτὸς δὲ **κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς** ἐφώνησεν **λέγων**, *Ἡ παῖς*, **ἔγειρε**.	**ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς,**
5:42 And *immediately the girl got up* and began to walk about (*she was twelve years of age*).	Her spirit returned, and *she got up at once.*	B6 *and the girl got up.*
5.42 καὶ εὐθὺς **ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον** καὶ περιεπάτει· ἦν γὰρ **ἐτῶν δώδεκα**.	8.55 καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς καὶ **ἀνέστη** παραχρῆμα	καὶ *ἠγέρθη* **τὸ κοράσιον**.
B6/*B2* At this they were overcome with *amazement*. 5:43 He strictly *ordered them* that no one should know this, *and told them to give her something to eat.*	C6 *Then he directed them to give her something to eat.* B6 18:56 Her parents were *astounded*; but he *ordered them* to tell no one what had happened.	A6 9:26 And the report of this spread throughout that district.
καὶ ἐξέστησαν [εὐθὺς] ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ. 5.43 **καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς** πολλὰ ἵνα **μηδεὶς** γνοῖ τοῦτο, καὶ *εἶπεν* **δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν**	**καὶ διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν**. 8.56 **καὶ ἐξέστησαν** οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ *παρήγγειλεν* **αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ** εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.	9.26 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φήμη αὕτη εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην.

All three agree that Jesus took the girl by the hand in performing the miracle. This would appear to be an essential part of the story. Mark and Luke both agree that Jesus also issued a verbal command for the girl to get up, with Mark supplying the Aramaic, which puts more emphasis on the phrase. There is another, albeit slight, variation between Luke and Mark: Mark calls the daughter "little girl" and Luke calls her "child." Matthew does not mention this, which might be due to his having a shorter, more concise chiasm. The extra emphasis placed on the phrase is balanced out by Matthew's deletion of it. All three then agree that the girl then got up. In Mark and Luke there is thus a direct relationship between Jesus's words and the actions. Taking all into consideration, it seems likely that the command of Jesus was an essential item, especially since Matthew is so free in his changing of the story elsewhere. Luke adds the extra information that the girl's spirit returned: this makes it clear that the girl is dead and is added for rhetorical reasons. This change does not, however, change the nature of the story: all three clearly see this story as one where Jesus raises someone from the dead.

Mark also adds emphasis to the healing by saying the girl walked about and indicates the girl is completely healed. This confirmation includes the explanation of the age of the girl. The age is suspect because of its symbolic meaning and its odd placement by Mark. In addition there is a second confirmation: in both Mark and Luke, Jesus directs the parents to

give the girl something to eat. In Mark this statement seems awkward and its placement only makes sense because this is the hinge of a larger inner chiasm. Luke's placement of the statement, right after the healing, seems more logical. If the statement was added by Mark for chiastic purposes, it is odd that Luke retained it since he does not form the same chiasm. Though there is the theme of eating in Luke's larger chiasm (the sinful woman and the feeding of the five thousand), it is not a prominent theme throughout the chiasm. It is thus quite plausible that Mark added the girl not only stood up but walked about in order to bring in mention of the girl's age: the girl could walk because of her age. It is thus more likely that the order to feed the girl was in the oral tradition than the walking about. However, it is not an essential detail, since Matthew does not mention it.

All three agree there was amazement by the audience. Mark and Luke say so explicitly and Matthew implies it by saying that the news spread all over the district. Mark puts extra stress on the statement by saying they were "overcome with astonishment" or literally "amazed with great amazement." This is perhaps done to give stress to the miracle being a raising-of-the-dead miracle. The report of amazement is a typical item in miracle stories and was quite likely an essential part of the oral story.[491]

The final item is Jesus telling the witnesses not to tell anyone. This serves the messianic secret/"mystery" theme. It is thus suspect, especially since Matthew does away with the theme. The historical plausibility of this will be discussed below.

The following chart reviews the results:[492]

Item	Essential	Additional	Variation allowed
Initial setting	Jesus with disciples		Location?
New character	Leader	Name: Jairus Of synagogue	Exact type of leader (ἀρχι or ἄρχων)
Action of character	Prostration	Begging	Falling or kneeling
Request	Daughter close to death Jesus to come	Age of girl: twelve years? Action of Jesus: lay on hands Reason: daughter be well; daughter live	Dying or at point of death
New character	Messenger(s) from leader's house come while request being made		Some people came Someone came
Action	Message: "daughter is dead," (Teacher not needed)	(Teacher not needed)	Why trouble . . . ? Do not trouble . . .
Response of Jesus	Jesus hears message Jesus speaks "Do not fear, only believe"	And she will be saved	But overhearing what they said When Jesus heard this Jesus said to the leader of the synagogue He replied

[491] See Theissen, *Miracle*, 69–70.

[492] The items in parentheses could be in more than one category.

Item	Essential	Additional	Variation allowed
Initial location left	They leave	Who specifically goes: limitation of number of disciples	
Arrival at new location	They arrive at the house	Leader's house House of the leader of the synagogue	
New character	People mourning	Weeping, wailing, loudly, a commotion, flute players	Saw a commotion, making a commotion
Jesus's action	Jesus enters Jesus tells them to stop Jesus says daughter "is not dead but sleeping"		He went in When he had entered Why do you weep and make a commotion? Do not weep. Go away The child, the girl.
Response	"And they laughed at him."	Knowing that she was dead	
Jesus's action	Jesus puts them outside (Jesus goes to daughter)	(Jesus goes to daughter)	When the crowd had been put outside People who go with Jesus specified: those with him, names of those with him, child's mother and father
Healing	Jesus takes girl by the hand Girl gets up	Jesus commands girl to get up, original Aramaic words Spirit of girl returns Straight away Girl walks about Told to be given something to eat	Girl, child Immediately, at once
Reaction	Amazement (Jesus tells them to tell no one)	(Jesus tells them to tell no one)	Overcome with amazement, astounded, Report spread throughout district

From this analysis the essential story is as follows:

> Jesus was with his disciples when a leader of the synagogue came and fell at his feet. He asked Jesus to come as his daughter was dying. While he was speaking, some messengers from his house arrived. They said, "Your daughter is dead (do not trouble the teacher)." Jesus heard this and said, "Do not fear; only believe." They left and arrived at the leader's house where people were mourning. Jesus goes in and says, "Stop, she is not dead but sleeping." And they laughed at him. Jesus put them outside (and went to where the girl was). Jesus took the girl by the hand and she got up. They were amazed. (Jesus told them to tell no one.)

This is what one could call the bare bones of the story. It is about half the length of Mark's version and about the same length of Matthew's, which does not have the messenger scene. It is unlikely that the story would ever be told so succinctly, though Matthew's version comes close: he only elaborates on Jairus's request, the description of the crowd, and the reaction of the witnesses.

With such variability allowed around the base story, it is almost impossible to judge the nature of a particular version available to the gospel writers. This is, in fact, an inappropriate question: it comes from the perspective of the written transmission of tradition. In oral societies there is the base story, where different segments could be described variously and/or added to, depending on the storyteller and the situation. It would be impossible to trace the history of a story. For example, the story of JD could be introduced to a community by a particular storyteller. In the first telling she or he may not mention Jairus's name or the nature of the girl's disease. In a subsequent telling she or he may do so. These details would then become part of the details that could be drawn upon to tell the story. Another person who knows the story may know other details. This does not mean that details could be added at will: only particular elements could be changed or added, and others would have to stay the same. What was important was that the story would have to be clearly recognizable as the same story and make the same point. The "elders" of the community would ensure this.

The above chart shows what sort of variation was allowed in the story of JD. None of the changes or variations affects the basic outline or point of the story. Matthew's changes are suspect not only because of the theological reasons for them, but because they also change the basic outline of the story. Though quite a bit of variation is allowed, in JD there are four possible places where word for word repeating might be required in the telling of the story: the initial message of the messengers, Jesus's two key statements (do not fear, girl is not dead), and the response of the crowd. However, even here there is some very minor variation. Jesus's statement about the girl not being dead is likely to have been considered an absolutely essential item, that is, an item that could not be changed. This is based on the criterion of embarrassment: it is likely that if such a problematic statement could be left out or altered, it would be. Also, it is the word of the LORD. However, the phrase just before this one ("Why do you make a commotion and weep?;" "Do not weep;" "Go away") is variable and worded differently by all three writers. There is thus a difference of importance for the two sets of words. The difference is that the first set of words, Jesus telling the people to stop mourning, does not have any rhetorical or theological importance, whereas Jesus saying the girl is not dead but asleep does. If this is the reason, then it is likely that Jesus's statement "Do not fear, only believe" would also be inviolable. This would also mean that the message that the girl is dead could be worded variously, e.g., a euphemism for death could be used. The same would apply to the response of the crowd. Neither has rhetorical or theological importance, and both are spoken by unimportant personae.

From this analysis of the story found in the synoptic gospels, a plausible shape of the tradition of JD has been created. We will now turn to the historical plausibility of the story to see which elements are plausible for the Galilee of Jesus's time. This will help determine what parts of the story plausibly go back to an event in Jesus's life.

Historical Plausibility

We shall look at the individual items first, and then at the story as a whole.

1) Opening scene: It is highly plausible that in the opening scene Jesus was with his disciples: Jesus is almost always presented in the gospels as being with his disciples; the exceptions are when he goes into the desert to pray by himself (Mark 1:35 and par.), when

he sends out the twelve (Mark 6:7 and par.), and the scene where he walks on water (Mark 6:45–52 and par.).

2) Jairus
    a. The arguments for this name being symbolic are very weak. There is thus no reason for this name to be added to the tradition.
    b. There is also no real reason to doubt that he was a leader of a synagogue. At one time the evidence for the presence of synagogues in Palestine was inconclusive, but now the evidence indicates that they were present.[493] In general, the synoptic tradition presents Jesus in opposition to the authorities, which was used by early Christians to show rejection of Jesus by "the Jews." Since the presentation of Jairus as a leader goes against this tendency, it is unlikely to have been invented.[494] Mark does make a chiastic parallel in the "eating" chiasm between the story of Jairus and his daughter and Herod and his daughter, thus juxtaposing the two leaders. However, Luke and Matthew do not use this structure, and consequently there was no need for them to keep Jairus as a leader of the synagogue if this was not in the oral tradition.

3) Jairus's request
    a. Jesus was a well-known healer and attracted crowds for this reason. It is natural that Jairus would seek him out. Prostration was also a natural form of supplication. However, it was unusual for such a person of authority.[495] The urgency of the situation explains why Jairus does not carry himself more in keeping with his status. It would also explain why this action would become an essential part of the story: there is a contrast between Jairus's position and his actions—unusual items make a story interesting.
    b. Jairus's haste indicates that the disease, though not mentioned, was sudden. This, along with the age of the girl, may give an indication of the disease: twelve was the traditional age for the onset of puberty, and the daughter's first menstruation which may have turned in vaginal haemorrhaging.[496] This could be the reason why the story was initially tied to the HW: they were both suffering from the same disease. The symbolic dimension could then be played up by adding the number twelve to the story of the HW. It may also explain why the disease is not mentioned in the gospels: such a condition was seen as being ritually unclean. The nature of the condition was likely to have been part of the oral tradition. For example, Peter would have known what it was. There is thus a tension between the number being added for symbolic reasons to JD and the possibility that it did reflect the girl's age.
    c. Jairus is likely to have mentioned that his daughter was dying in order to convey the urgency of the situation. His request that Jesus lay his hands on the girl also fits with what we know about Jesus: this seems to be his usual method of healing, often used with a verbal command, and early Christians

---

[493] See the recent collection of papers in Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm eds. *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins till 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at the International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001* (ConBNT 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003).

[494] So Meier, *Marginal*, 2:785. Cf. Marcus, *Mark*, 365.

[495] Moloney, *Mark*, 107, notes that Jairus lowers himself from his dignified position.

[496] This is quite rare and usually occurs in conjunction with another condition. For a short overview see http://www.brooksidepress.org/Products/Military_OBGYN/Textbook/AbnormalBleeding/Bleeding.htm.

used the same method, presumably, passed on from Jesus.[497] Because Jairus had heard about Jesus, and thus went to him to request help, it would be natural that Jairus would know about Jesus's usual method of healing. Finally, Jesus using his hands in the healing does not add any theological symbolism: there is no evidence of the notion that the LORD will raise people on the Day using his hands.

d. Finally, Matthew's version is highly unlikely: it is unlikely that someone would request that Jesus come if the girl were already dead. It would be the only such example in the gospel tradition.[498] The unlikelihood is also shown by the comment of the messengers: since the girl is dead, Jesus would not be needed anymore.[499]

4) The messengers

a. That messengers would be sent when the girl had died makes sense: the general view at the time was that once someone was dead there was no hope.[500] Since there was no means to revive a dead person, the reason for their coming would be not only to inform Jairus, but also to say that a healer was no longer needed.

b. Jesus's statement shows his extraordinary belief in his own healing powers exhibited throughout the tradition.[501] This does not necessarily mean that Jesus thought he could raise the dead: he could have just as easily wanted to make sure she was dead.[502] After all, the girl had only just died. It is also natural that Jairus would need encouragement to continue to allow Jesus to go; the messengers had said Jesus was not needed. Jesus's words also fit with other traditions concerning Jesus's understanding about the relationship between faith and the performance of miracles, and also between fear, or the lack thereof, and faith.[503]

5) Going to Jairus's house

---

[497] Healing by the laying on of hands appears to be unique to Jesus and early Christianity: it is not found in the Hebrew Bible or in rabbinic material. In the Hebrew Bible it is used for blessing and for confirming someone in an office. On this see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:126; E Lohse, "χειρ," *TWNT* 9:417–424.

[498] So Meier, *Marginal*, 2:781. Meier notes that it consequently makes sense that the story starts out as a healing story and then transforms into a raising-of-the-dead story.

[499] Moloney, *Mark*, 108, refers to the attitude of the messengers as being "good sense," that is, it reflects common sense.

[500] For an analysis and references on this prevalent attitude in the Greek and Roman world see N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (vol. 3 of Christian Origins and the Question of God; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), ch. 2, esp. 32–38. In the Hebrew Bible there are the two rare occurrences of Elijah and Elisha raising someone (1 Kgs 17:8–24, 2 Kgs 4:8–37). These are more the exceptions that prove the point. These two stories are discussed in detail in the chapter on the WNS.

[501] Jesus never exhibits any doubt in any healing. This would seem to go against his theology concerning faith and healing: it is absolute faith that allows for his healings, which is just about to be discussed.

[502] There was the belief found as early as the Rabbinic literature that the soul remained with the body for three days before going to heaven (*Tanhuma Miketz* 4; *Tanhuma Pekudei* 13; *B. Sanhedrin* 90b–91a). See "Soul," *DJBP* 2:599–600. Evidence of this in the New Testament may be found in Jesus's statement that he would rise three days after his death. In any case, the Rabbinic evidence likely reflects a much earlier belief.

[503] For example, Mark 2:5 (healing of the paralytic), Luke 7:9/ Matt 8:13 (centurion), Luke 18:42 (Blind Bartimaeus), Luke 17:6/Matt 17:20 (faith the size of a mustard seed), and Mark 11:22/Matt 21:21 (faith can move mountains). There is also the negative example of Nazareth (Mark 6:5/Matt13:58).

a. Jesus seems to have quickly attracted a fairly large number of followers. There were enough that he could choose twelve as leaders. It is likely, then, that Jesus was with a substantial number of people, that is, more than the twelve. It is not likely that Jesus would want to take a whole troop of people with him to a dying, or recently dead person whom he was going to attempt to heal. The restriction of the number of people that are allowed to go is thus natural. Also, it is natural that he would choose his closest and most trusted disciples, namely, the three. The secrecy motif could thus very well be expanding upon what was already in the tradition.

6) The mourners

a. The description of the mourners fits with what we know of funeral rites. Mourning would begin straightaway and often professional mourners and musicians were hired. Though only a short time had passed, it was more than enough for professional mourners to arrive.[504] Professional mourners had to be available at a moment's notice and would most likely have been given advanced notice of the girl's condition. Also, it would have taken time for Jairus to find Jesus and the messengers subsequently to find the two of them.

b. Mourning was quite noisy and involved ululation.[505] Consequently, the description of the mourning as a commotion would be quite appropriate.

c. That Jesus would want them to stop is also quite understandable. We do not know what sort of state of mind he required for his healings, but it is likely that the noise would not be helpful. Also, if the girl were to be revived, one would not want her revived to the cacophonic sound of mourning.

d. Jesus's statement to the mourners that the daughter is not dead but only sleeping is highly plausible: the criterion of embarrassment would make it unlikely that it would be added to the tradition. Jesus may not actually be sure the girl was dead, or he may not wish to excite the crowd too much. It is impossible to know whether he really thought he could raise the dead. If he did, he did not advertise it. The reaction of the crowd would probably have been more intense if he said he were going to raise the girl from the dead. He would have not only have been considered to be deluded, but possibly also hubristic.

e. The reaction of the crowd is what one would expect: as shown by their mourning, they firmly believe the girl is dead. Also, being professional mourners, they would have been experts on death.[506] That Jesus would want to have a jeering crowd removed makes sense. Meier here applies the criterion of embarrassment: it is unseemly to have the LORD physically eject the crowd, and there may be some truth to this considering Luke's and Matthew's changes to Mark.[507] Meier also applies this criterion to the crowd laughing: this is the only place where the LORD is open to ridicule.[508]

7) Going to the girl

---

[504] So Harris, "The Dead," 306.

[505] Mark uses the word ἀλαλάζοντας (root *alalai*) which is onomatopoeic, that is, it imitates the sound the mourners would have made.

[506] So Harris, "The Dead," 309; Marcus, *Mark*, 371.

[507] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:787.

[508] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:787.

a. That only a few go in with Jesus to the girl makes sense for the same reasons that he would only take a few people with him into the house in the first place.
b. Mark's version pictures Jesus going into another room where the girl was. If Jairus was a prominent and wealthy member of the town, then one would expect him to have a larger house, that is, more than a one-room dwelling. A common feature of larger houses or multi-dwelling complexes was a courtyard with rooms off it.[509] The mourners would then be in the courtyard and the girl in one of the rooms. Even if it were a smaller complex without a courtyard, it is quite possible that the girl would be in a small room off from the main room since she was sick. Mark's version thus seems more plausible than that of Luke or Matthew.

8) The healing

a. Jesus is often reported as touching people and/or giving a command when healing. As mentioned above, the laying on of hands was perhaps his main style of healing. Jesus's command that the girl rise is suspect because it has connotations of the resurrection on the Day.[510] On the other hand, Jesus often commands during his miracles, and Mark supplies the Aramaic, which points to an Aramaic origin of the story.[511] This is in addition to other Semitisms detected in the Greek text.[512]
b. Mark's Aramaic is grammatically incorrect.[513] Meier argues that this indicates it is not some later addition by some scholarly scribe.[514] However, this would depend on how scholarly the scribe was and would mean that Mark made the error as a scribe. This itself creates a problem since if his source was Peter, then the phrase should have been grammatically correct, because Peter was a native speaker. It is possible that Mark added the phrase to give an air of authenticity.[515] Luke leaves out the Aramaic, and Matthew omits Jesus's command completely. Matthew's omission could be due to his severe shortening of the story; there is no chiastic reason for him to eliminate it.
c. The girl getting up is plausible depending on the illness and the degree of healing. The word used, ἀνέστη, means to stand up or raise up and implies she was not just sitting up in bed. This word recalls the resurrection on the

---

[509] In Palestine there would often have been several dwellings around an enclosed courtyard. See Richard A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1995), 192. For a diagram of this type of layout see the house that may have been Peter's in Capernaum in John McRay, *Archaeology and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1991), 81.

[510] 1 Thess 4:16: "For the Lord himself with a cry of command, with the archangels call and with the sound of God's trumpet, the dead in Christ will rise first."

[511] In Mark, there are the examples of the demoniac in Capernaum (1:25), the leper (1:41), the paralytic (2:11), the withered hand (3:5), the Gerasene demoniac (5:8), the deaf man (7:34), the possessed boy (9:25), and blind Bartimaeus (10:52).

[512] On these see Elliott C. Maloney, *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* (SBLDS 51; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981); Meier, *Marginal*, 2:786, 849, n.57; Rochais, *Récits*, 54–73, 104–12. Rochais detects six candidates, of which Maloney accepts three.

[513] See Meier, *Marginal*, 2:785. The correct form should be *talitha koumi* not *talitha koum*.

[514] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:785

[515] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:785, argues that this would be the only place in the synoptic gospels where this would be the case. He, however, limits his argument to Aramaic in narratives. Mark does add the Semitic "ephphatha" (7:34), "Eloi, Eloi, lema sabachthani" (15:34), "abba" (14:36), and "rabbi" (9:5, 11:21, 14:45), but "rabbi" is found four times in Matthew, and "amen" is found fifty-eight times in Luke and Matthew.

Day, which is suspect, along with Jesus's command, because of its eschatological symbolism. All of Jesus's healings imply a complete recovery, and there is no way of judging whether recovery was in fact complete. Mark's addition that the girl was walking around suggests that it was a full recovery. However, this statement is used as a vehicle to add that the girl is twelve and is thus suspect. It is also suspect because it is a second confirmation that the girl is alive. And it contradicts the other confirmation of the girl's healing—Jesus asking the parents to feed her—because this implies that she is still in a weakened state. However, the command of the parents to feed the girl is itself suspect since Mark uses it as the hinge of his "eating" chiasm. On the other hand, Luke keeps this item, but does not use that chiasm. Also, if the surmise above about the nature of her disease is correct, then she would have lost a lot of blood, and she would be very weak, and would not be able to get up unless Jesus's healing has also replaced the lost blood.

d. On the whole, the evidence does not allow for a conclusion.

9) The aftermath

a. That the witnesses would be amazed is to be expected: a remarkable healing has taken place.

b. Jesus telling them not to tell people fits with other reports in the tradition of him telling people not to say anything. On the other hand, this could be due to the "messianic secret" motif. However, it is quite possible that this motif was based on historical remembrance: Jesus is never reported as explicitly saying that he is the Messiah, and there would be a natural desire to avoid attracting crowds because of the suspicion with which authorities in the Roman Empire viewed the congregating of crowds except for official purposes. Jesus would also have in mind his mentor John the Baptist who was killed by the authorities. Jesus was spreading the same message as John and continuing his work, and the authorities seem to have been looking for him. Jesus may well have told people not to tell about their healings to try and contain the excitement about him.

c. As argued previously, there is a question as to what exactly people are not to tell. If they are not to tell that the girl was dead, but was actually just sleeping, then this would fit with Jesus's earlier statement. In other words, no raising of the dead took place because the girl only seemed to be dead and recovered on her own. As noted above, the chiasm in Mark seems to support this interpretation. The crowd is to understand the statement literally, and the believers are to understand it metaphorically. The reason for the secrecy could very well be that Jesus did not want to excite the crowd and the populous in general.

Most of the items fit with the situation in Galilee and thus are historically plausible. Even the symbolic items concerning the girl's age and secrecy could have been gone back to historical circumstance. However, possibility does not equal plausibility: it is also possible that someone who knew the situation in Palestine and the Jesus tradition very well could have invented the story. Therefore, we shall now look at the general plausibility of the story being invented.

One possibility that has been suggested is that the story was originally a healing story that was then transformed into a raising-of-the-dead story. However, this would mean a radical changing of the story: there would be no messengers, no mourners, no statement by Jesus, no mocking by the crowd, and perhaps no need for secrecy. However, if this were originally a healing story, why would someone make additions to form such a questionable story? The central problem of the story is Jesus's statement that the girl is asleep but not dead. Such a statement only raises questions as to the nature of the miracle. It also ties it to other well-known stories in the Greco-Roman world where a healer, being more perceptive, notices that the person is not really dead and then heals them.[516]

The statement that the girl is not dead, but asleep is also completely unnecessary to the story: the story could just as well move from Jesus seeing the crowd and asking them to be removed while he sees the girl. The most plausible explanation is that this statement was made by Jesus, and furthermore was viewed as such an essential part of the tradition that it could not be deleted or changed. If this is so, then the story must have from the beginning been a raising-of-the-dead story. The same reasoning just presented is also valid for the possibility that the story was completely invented.

This application of the criterion of embarrassment makes it quite plausible that the basic outline of the story goes back to historical events. The model of the transmission of oral traditions adopted by this study makes it even more plausible: it was extremely difficult to make radical changes to the cherished traditions of the community. The oral analysis of the story above supports this theory: the changes made only affected how things were described. True, Matthew does radically change the story, but each change can be explained by theological concerns, primarily, the concern that Jesus be shown to be a raiser of the dead, the central point of the story.

Harris points to the wealth of detail in Mark as evidence that the story recalls an actual event.[517] However, it is the details in oral traditions that are most suspect, because the reciter has the most leeway with the details. Any good reciter could provide details at will. This analysis, instead, has shown that the main elements of JD are highly plausible and for the most part essential to the story: Jesus with disciples, arrival of Jairus, his request, the messengers with their message, Jesus's response, the mourners, their reaction, Jesus's response, the healing, the response of the witnesses, and even the command to silence. Many of the details are also plausible: Jairus's name, his position, falling at Jesus's feet, laying on of hands, the details of the message, Jesus's reply, what he says to the mourners, how he heals. Only a few details are questionable: the age of the girl, Jesus's command to the girl to rise, and the girl walking about. However, these details do not change the overall sense of the story. All in all, the story most likely does go back to an event in Jesus's life.

The following is a summary of the historical plausibility of each item:

---

[516] For example, Apollonius, discussed below in the chapter on the WNS. Another example was the story of Asclepiades and someone being taken out to be buried (Apuleius *Florida* 19), which was known in the time of Tiberius, since it is mentioned by Celsus (*On Medicine* 2.6.15). On this story see Collins, *Mark*, 277–78, who gives the text and translation.

[517] Harris, "The Dead," 787.

Item	Plausible	Reason
1) Jesus arriving to crowd by the sea (Mark and Luke)	No	Provides link to previous story of the Gerasene demoniac
2) Jesus speaking to disciples (Matthew)	No	Provides link to previous story about fasting
3) Jesus with disciples	Yes	Jesus always with disciples
4) Jairus rushes in	Yes	Daughter close to dying
5) Jairus's name	Yes	No reason to invent; possible known eyewitness
6) Jairus leader of synagogue	Yes	No reason to invent; goes against trend where leaders oppose Jesus
7) Jairus falls/kneels before Jesus	Yes	Kneeling common form of supplication; daughter dying would override natural decorum of position as leader
8) Sick person is daughter	Yes	Such a key element would be difficult to change
9) Daughter dying (Mark and Luke)	Yes	Integral part of story; fits with problematic statement (PS) that daughter not dead, but asleep
10) Daughter dead (Matthew)	No	Changed to counteract PS
11) Daughter only daughter (Luke)	Yes	No reason to invent
12) Daughter twelve (Mark and Luke)	Possible	Against: the number is highly symbolic For: possibility age connected to disease (onset of puberty); this would supply link to HW
13) Jairus wants daughter healed	Yes	Jesus was a known healer
14) Jairus wants daughter to live	Yes	Purpose of Jairus coming to Jesus
15) Jairus wants Jesus to lay his hands on daughter	Yes	An unusual technique Jesus commonly used to heal
16) Jesus leaves with Jairus and crowd	No	This is part of HW story, which was originally separate
17) Messengers arrive	Yes	No reason to add; it is a reasonable thing for Jairus's household to do when daughter died
18) Message: daughter is dead	Yes	It is reason they were sent
19) Messengers saying not to bother Jesus	Yes	Healer not needed once daughter is dead
20) Jesus's response: to believe and not fear	Yes	For Jesus faith can move mountains; Jesus often opposes fear with faith
21) Jesus's response: daughter will be saved	Yes	This is the reason Jesus tells Jairus to believe
22) Jesus restricts amount of people going to house	Yes	Reasonable that Jesus would not want to take a whole crowd of people to a sick little girl
23) Jesus takes the three	Yes	If he was going to take anyone, Jesus would take his most trusted disciples
24) Mourners at house	Yes	Customary practice
25) Mourners making a noise wailing and weeping	Yes	Customary practice
26) Flute players present	Yes	Customary practice
27) Jesus tells the mourners to stop weeping	Yes	Reasonable that Jesus would not want noise at healing; size of the room likely small
28) Jesus tells mourners to go away	Yes	Fits purpose of wanting them to stop mourning
29) Jesus says girl is sleeping, not dead	Yes	Criterion of embarrassment; fits pattern of Jesus not wishing to excite populous in regards to himself
30) Crowd laughs at him	Yes	Mourners are experts on death; criterion of embarrassment
31) Crowd knows girl is dead	Yes	Mourners are experts on death; it is reason they laugh
32) Jesus puts crowd out	Yes	Reasonable Jesus would not want noise; criterion of embarrassment
33) Jesus only takes a few people into girl	Yes	Reasonable that Jesus would not want a lot of people present
34) Jesus only takes three	Yes	If Jesus were to take anyone it would be the three
35) Jesus takes girl by hand	Yes	Known method Jesus used in healing

Item	Plausible	Reason
36) Jesus commands girl to get up	Possible	For: known method Jesus used for healing Against: fits eschatological symbolism
37) Girl's spirit returns	Yes	This is another way of saying girl returned to life; this is a raising-of-the-dead story
38) Girl stands/gets up	Possible	For: people in tradition always make complete recovery Against: is partially contradicted by Jesus ordering that food be given to her, which implies she is weak; fits eschatological symbolism
39) Girl walks around	No	Appears to be means for Mark to mention age; fits eschatological symbolism
40) People amazed	Yes	Natural reaction to a miracle
41) Jesus tells people not to say anything	Yes	Fits pattern of Jesus not wishing to attract crowds
42) Report spreads	Yes	Miracle would be hard to keep secret: mourners would be amazed to see girl alive

Conclusion

Despite Mark's reworking of the oral tradition to fit his chiastic and theological agenda, most of the elements in his version of JD are historically plausible. The same applies to Luke, who closely follows Mark, and even Matthew, who departs from Mark's version. The reason for this is the nature of narrative transmission in predominantly oral societies. What is important in these societies is that the main story line be kept, but the details may be described variously, sometimes expanded and sometimes deleted.

The aim of preserving traditions and retelling them was not to describe in detail events as they precisely transpired. Consequently, the precise words are not important, unless they are spoken by someone important and/or were considered key to the story. For example, it does not matter whether Jairus actually said "healed" or "saved" because these words mean the same thing, and the key point of the story is that Jairus wanted help. Each writer was thus free to tell this story as he wished; however, despite the three different ways this was told, they still managed to say the same thing. Jesus's words concerning faith and the girl's condition, on the other hand, are key to the story: his words on faith to Jairus not only allow the miracle to take place, but also explain why it could take place. Moreover, without Jesus's words concerning the daughter, there would be no ridicule by the crowd. Also, the response of the crowd, despite the content of the words, emphasizes that the girl is dead. Consequently, these two instances are the closest one comes to word-for-word agreement between the gospels.

The approach taken here is quite different from that taken when the sources are viewed primarily as written. In this more traditional approach of redaction criticism, specific words are analysed to see if they are more likely to have come from the gospel author or from the written source. However, such a methodology does not work in an oral society: each teller of the story is for the most part free to use synonyms. Each author is likely to have heard many different oral performances of JD, and each one would have been different, just as the three versions we have are different. There is no way to know if a certain word used by Mark, for example, was found in the oral tradition or not. The same would apply to any written source or sources he may have used.

In addition to this, redaction criticism, when used in historical analysis, was often used to identify elements that fit the theological agenda of a gospel author and remove them in order to identify what was likely in the source. This only works from the perspective of a society using only written sources. However, even then this method does not identify what

was replaced in the source. In addition, the theological elements may not be additions, because the source text may have had a similar theological agenda. In an oral society the details on which such redaction criticism has traditionally focused were variable and would change with each performance. From such a perspective, trying to trace the history of a tradition is impossible. The best one can do is to try and determine the basic shape of the tradition as done here.

This does not mean that redaction criticism is not valuable; after all, chiastic analysis is a type of redaction criticism. Chiastic analysis, like redaction criticism, has as one of its goals the identification of an author's theological agenda. Consequently, chiastic analysis, like traditional redaction analysis, helps identify elements that are historically suspect. Then, one can perform an oral analysis in an attempt to determine what sort of element the historically suspect elements were in the tradition, that is, essential, additional/reportorial, or variable. One then has to look at the historical situation to assess the plausibility of the element going back to an incident in Jesus's life.

The results can sometimes be surprising, as with Jesus's command to silence. This element was traditionally suspect on two grounds: it did not make sense in the story, and it fitted Mark's theme of the messianic secret. However, chiastic analysis makes sense of this statement: the people are not to be told that the girl was not made well (wing), but rather that she was not dead in the first place (hinge), that is, precisely what Jesus said to the mourners. In other words, they are to believe Jesus's words literally and not metaphorically. The purpose, then, of the statement was to discourage popular excitement around Jesus. This in turn makes sense because Jesus's mentor, John the Baptist, was killed by the authorities for doing the same work Jesus was doing. Also, the authorities in Palestine were leery of people attracting large crowds in the explosive atmosphere of the time. Consequently, even though the secrecy element is clearly part of Mark's theological agenda, it is quite plausible that it is based on historical reality.

The chiastic analysis done on JD, along with the chiastic analysis done in the previous chapter, shows the importance of the story for the early Christian community. It was not only a story about Jesus raising to life a girl who had just died, it is also a story that showed Jesus to be the LORD Messiah who would raise Israel on his Day. The story consequently took on a metaphorical meaning where the girl represented Israel, and death, the sleep of the believer until the day of resurrection.

The chiastic analysis also highlighted the changes made by Luke and Matthew to Mark. Luke changed the hinge from Jesus's problematic statement concerning the condition of the girl to the statement that the girl's spirit returned. The emphasis is now not on the girl not being dead, but on her definitely being dead and then brought back to life. This in turn makes Matthew's changes more understandable: like Luke he made sure the audience knew that the girl was dead.

The chiastic analysis also pointed out the problematic nature of Jesus's statement that the girl is not dead, but asleep, and consequently of the whole story as a raising-of-the-dead story. Why would Mark, followed by Luke, use such a problematic story in such a key position to show Jesus to be the LORD Messiah?[518] The first thing opponents to the idea that

[518] As Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:125, point out, in Matthew the story is buried. They wonder why it is not placed last in his miracle section (a key position) instead of first in the last set of three miracles. They propose that it is because Matthew perhaps wished to end with a reference to the Beelzebul controversy (after the healing of the mute demoniac the Pharisees accuse Jesus of healing via the prince of demons, 9:34). However,

Jesus was the LORD would point out is that Jesus himself says the girl is not dead. Also, because the girl had only just died, how could one be sure that she was dead? Would it not have been better to use the raising of the WNS, since it is a much better raising-of-the-dead story, because the victim is being taken out to be buried? Is it because this story was not available for Mark? Or if he knew of it, did he perhaps think it was not suitable for some reason? These questions will be pursued further when we come to these stories. As it stands, the fact that Mark did not use them and instead used such a weak story is cause for a hermeneutic of suspicion.

Finally, some may wish to argue that nothing really new has been gained by the preceding analysis, because the general conclusion that the basic story of JD was based on historical events has been made by other scholars using different techniques. The same could be said about the conclusions for many of the different details of the story. However, as mentioned in the introduction, the goal of this thesis is not so much to reach a specific conclusion, but to make sure that the conclusion is reached by the proper methodology. The example given there was of someone convicted on false evidence and a new trial being held based on new evidence. Even if the new trial produces the same result, it does not make the result of the previous trial any less invalid. Likewise, if a scientific experiment is performed and the measurements used were found to be faulty, then the experiment and the results are useless even if the same results are produced using proper measurements. These two examples highlight the principle that the method is as important as the results.

The historical analysis of any event is determined by the historical framework one works from. In this thesis it was argued that the historical framework that was previously used to judge the Jesus traditions was incorrect. This framework included the following: that Christian communities grew primarily in isolation from each other and were not in frequent contact with each other; that there was not a strong concern for unity from the very beginning of the community; that there were no control mechanisms in place for the oral traditions concerning Jesus's deeds and teaching within the community from the beginning; that there was not a leadership hierarchy in place in the community from the beginning; and that a high Christology was not in place from the beginning. In addition to this there are those items that were not included within the previous historical framework: that the early Christian gospel writers were writing from the perspective of a primarily oral society; and that gospel writers were using chiasm as their primary structuring device. The goal of this thesis is to do a historical analysis from what this author sees as a more correct historical framework. No such analysis has been undertaken before, and the newness that this thesis brings is not to be found in the conclusion, but in the way the conclusion is reached. After all, a conclusion is only as valid as the method used to achieve it.

Naturally, not everyone will agree with the historical framework laid out in this paper. Much of the framework is based on recent developments in the field, or ideas that have up until now not achieved widespread scholarly agreement. This is especially true on the subject of the gospel authors using chiasm as a primary structuring device. Furthermore, I do not expect every reader to agree with the historical framework used in this thesis. There is an ongoing rigorous debate on each of the items of the historical framework used in this thesis. In fact,. it is unlikely that one could find an appreciable number of scholars of early Christianity that would be in full agreement on all of the items listed. However, this does not

---

the reason may be that the story was too problematic, and by the time Matthew wrote it its importance for showing who Jesus was had diminished.

mean that historical analysis should cease until consensus is reached. The expansion of knowledge using the scientific method does not work in this manner. One has to choose a framework that one sees as consistent and coherent to work from, and then conduct the experiment to see what happens. The best one can hope for is a result that is consistent with the initial framework. If contradiction arises then something is either wrong with the framework or with the conducting of the experiment. One then does further research and changes either the initial framework or the experiment to achieve consistency. Some may argue that this process is circular, and it is, in that it is part of the hermeneutic circle that is the scientific method and as some would argue part of all reasoning. Naturally, I think that the above analysis of JD and the following analyses of the PB and the WNS produce a highly plausible conclusion, that is, a result that is coherent and consistent with a larger historical framework which in turn is coherent and consistent with the historical data.

Chapter Four: The Possessed Boy

Introduction

We now turn to the story of the possessed boy (PB), which can only be considered a raising-of-the-dead story in Mark. In Mark the spirit convulses the boy terribly, "and the boy was like a corpse, so that the multitude (τοὺς πολλοὺς)[519] said, 'He is dead.' But Jesus took his hand and raised him, and he stood up" (9:26–27).[520] In this account there is clear resurrection imagery: the boy looks like a corpse, the crowd says he is dead, and Jesus raises him. There are also strong echoes of JD where the crowd says that JD is dead, and Jesus takes her by the hand, and she gets up.[521] The parallelism is very clear in the Greek. In JD it is καὶ *κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς* τοῦ παιδίου . . . σοὶ λέγω, *ἔγειρε. καὶ* εὐθὺς *ἀνέστη*: "and *having grasped the hand* of the child . . . I say to you *rise* and immediately she *stood up*" (5:41–42).[522] In the PB it is Ἰησοῦς *κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς* αὐτοῦ *ἤγειρεν* αὐτόν, *καὶ ἀνέστη*: "Jesus *having grasped the hand* of him *raised* him, and he *stood up*" (9:27). This implies that even if the boy did not actually die, Mark is treating it as a raising-of-the-dead story.[523] Consequently, though it is not clear whether the boy is dead or not, Mark makes it clear that the story is to be viewed as Jesus raising the boy and that he intends it be treated as a raising-of-the-dead story. This is quite different from Luke or Matthew, who eliminate any reference from the story in regards to the boy being dead and Jesus raising him. This raises an interesting question: was this story considered a raising-of-the-dead story in the oral tradition? One of the main goals of this chapter is to answer this question by doing a chiastic analysis of the story followed by an oral analysis. The resulting oral tradition will then be subject to a historical analysis. In other words, the same process will be performed on the PB as was performed on JD in the last chapter.

Chiastic Analysis

Mark's Transfiguration Chiasm

In all three gospels the story of the PB is part of a larger chiastic structure which contains the transfiguration as the hinge and Jesus's first and second predictions concerning his death and resurrection as the wings. The two predictions provide a very clear inclusio and are related to the hinge in that the hinge shows Jesus in his resurrected form as the Son of

---

[519] The NRSV translates this term as "most of them" (9:26). While this is possible, the direct translation would be "all the people" said he was dead; see Cranfield, *Mark*, 304; Culpepper, *Mark*, 306.

[520] My translation.

[521] Culpepper, *Mark*, 302, also notes that in both stories the focus is on the father's belief (5:36, 9:24), and in both the healing is delayed (in JD by the HW, and in PB by the failure of the disciples). There is also ambiguity in both stories as to whether the child is dead.

[522] My translation following the Greek word order; italics indicate same words.

[523] Lane, *Mark*, 334, notes an "accumulation of the vocabulary of death and resurrection in vv. 26–27." So also Culpepper , *Mark*, 307, who observes that the verb translated as "raise" or "lift up" (ἐγείρω) also means to resurrect: it is used when Herod wonders whether Jesus is John brought back to life (6:14, 16), in the Sadducees' question about the resurrection (12:26), and in reference to Jesus's resurrection (14:28, 16:6). Though Moloney, *Mark*, 185, thinks that the boy being dead is a false impression—this despite there being no indication in the text either way—he also says that the language of resurrection rings out. So too Hooker, *Mark*, 225. The reason that this story is not seen as a raising-of-the-dead story is that this would create theological problems. On this see below on page 251.

Man, that is, as the LORD Messiah. We shall begin with the chiasm in Mark and then look at the minor changes that Luke and Matthew make. Then we shall look at the PB in all three gospels.

The transfiguration chiasm in Mark has clear central thematic parallelism on each level: Jesus predicting his death and resurrection in the A level, the theme of losing life and being resurrected in the B level, and the contrast of the future coming of the Son of Man and the present coming of the Son of Man and Elijah in the C level. First, a probability analysis will be performed, and then the meaning of the chiasm will be discussed. The chiasm runs as follows:

A1 Prediction: Jesus will die and be raised (8:31–32a) 12 //s
B1 Peter rebuked, those who lose life for gospel will save their life (8:32b–37) 10 //s
C1 Prediction: some will not taste death and see coming of the Son of Man (8:38–9:1) 10 //s
D The transfiguration (9:2–8) 4 //s with A1 and 6 //s with A2
C2 Prediction: not to tell until after Son of Man has risen; Elijah will come first (9:9–13)
B2 Father and spirit rebuked and PB brought back to life (9:14–29)
A2 Prediction: Jesus will die and be raised (9:30–32)

Parallels

1) A level: 12 parallels
   a. 7 word parallels: to teach (8:31, 9:31), Son (8:31, 9:31), Man (8:31, 9:31), to be killed (8:31, 9:31), three (8:31, 9:31), days (8:31, 9:31), to rise (8:31, 9:31).
   b. 5 conceptual parallels:
      i. Both units contain predictions (8:31, 9:31).
      ii. Both units refer to the Son of Man (8:31, 9:31).
      iii. Both units are predictions about the Son of Man's death and resurrection (8:31, 9:31).
      iv. In both the prediction is presented as a teaching (8:31, 9:31).
      v. There is the opposition of the teaching being told in public in A1 (8:32) and being told in private in A2 (9:30).
2) B Level: 10 parallels
   a. 5 word parallels: to rebuke (8:32, 33; 9:25), to see (8:33; 9:2, 25), disciples (8:33, 34; 9:14, 18, 28), crowd (8:34; 9:14, 15, 17, 25), to lose/destroy (8:35, 9:22).
   b. 5 conceptual parallels:
      i. In both units Jesus speaks privately with at least one disciple: in B1 Peter takes Jesus aside to say something in private (8:32), and in B2 the disciples ask Jesus something when in the privacy of the house (9:28).
      ii. In both units Jesus rebukes someone: in B1 Jesus rebukes Peter (8:32), and in B2 Jesus rebukes the father and the spirit (9:19, 23, 25).
      iii. In both units an evil spirit is mentioned: Satan in B1 (8:33), and an unclean spirit in B2 (9:17, 20, 25).
      iv. In both units life is lost and regained: in B1 those who lose their life will regain it, and in B2 the boy is like a corpse, many say he is dead, and then Jesus takes him by the hand and raises him (9:26).

v. Both scenes take place in the midst of a crowd: in B1 Jesus calls the crowd to him (8:34), and in B2 a crowd runs forward to greet Jesus (9:16).

3) C level: 10 parallels
   a. 6 word parallels: word (8:38, 9:10), Son (8:38, 9:10), Man (8:38, 9:10), to come (8:39; 9:1, 11, 12, 13, 14), to be (9:1, 10), to see (9:1, 9).
   b. 4 conceptual parallels:
      i. Both refer to the Son of Man (8:38, 9:10).
      ii. Both refer to the Son of Man after he has risen (8:38, 9:10).
      iii. Both contain a prediction: in C1 Jesus predicts that the Son of Man will be ashamed of those who are ashamed of him when he comes in glory (8:38) and that some of those present will not taste death until the kingdom comes in power (9:1), and in C2 Jesus says that Elijah will come to restore all things (9:12); in C2 Jesus also makes an indirect prediction when he refers to the Son of Man rising from the dead in the future (9:9).
      iv. In both the Son of Man is treated negatively: in C1 Jesus speaks of those who are ashamed of him (8:38), and in C2 the Son of Man is treated with contempt (9:12).

4) A1–D: 4 parallels
   a. 3 word parallels: Son (8:31, 9:12), three (8:31, 9:31), days (8:31, 9:2).
   b. 1 conceptual parallels:
      i. In A2 Jesus speaks of his resurrection (8:31), and in D Jesus is shown in his resurrected form (9:2).

5) D–A2: 6 parallels
   a. 3 word parallels: days (9:2, 31), three (9:5, 31), Son (9:7, 31).
   b. 3 conceptual parallels:
      i. In D Jesus is shown in his resurrected form (9:2), and in A2 Jesus speaks of his resurrection (9:31).
      ii. In both the disciples are afraid: in D the three are terrified (9:6), and in A2 the disciples are afraid to ask Jesus what he means when he says that the Son of Man will die and be raised (9:32).
      iii. In both fear inhibits communication: in D Peter does not know what to say because of his fear (9:6), and in A2 fear prevents the disciples from asking a question (9:32).

6) A level and C level parallelism
   a. In all four there is a prediction concerning the Son of Man as being raised or in his resurrected form.
   b. In A1 and C1 there is the theme of rejection: in A1 Jesus is rejected by the religious leaders and in C1 the people and Jesus are ashamed of each other.
   c. In C2 and A2 the disciples are confused when Jesus says the Son of Man will die and be raised.
   d. In both C2 and A2 there is a theme of secrecy.

There are 730 Greek words, which is 104 words on average per unit. This is equivalent in size to the LUD (105 words per unit). Using the LUD figures for such a chiasm, the probability would be.057 1 x.095 2 x.095 2 x 30, which is.015 52, or 2 %, which is a 1 in 64

chance of occurring. This is a good figure especially considering the hinge parallelism is not taken into account. There is as noted under number six above also quite strong parallelism between the A level and C level: in all four units there is a prediction, and the prediction concerns the Son of Man being raised, or in his resurrected form. This has the effect of creating a triple inclusio pattern: prediction—B1—prediction—D—prediction—B2—prediction. As will be shown this will provide added meaning to that provided by the main chiasm.

The hinge puts the focus on Jesus as the Son of Man, that is, Jesus in his heavenly form as the LORD Messiah. Jesus will not assume this form until after his death and resurrection, which just happens to be the subject of the wings A1 and A2. The message is clear: after Jesus's death and resurrection he will assume his heavenly glory. This in turn supplies a causal relationship: Jesus's heavenly state appears to be due to his death and resurrection. This theme is found elsewhere in early Christianity, most notably in an early Christian hymn quoted by Paul: "And being found in human form, he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death—even death on a cross. *Therefore* (διό) God also highly exalted him and gave him the name that is above every name" (2:7–9, italics mine). As argued in the first chapter, the name above every name is YHWH.

The level next to the hinge, the C level, also juxtaposes Jesus in his heavenly form and Jesus in his earthly form. In C1 the coming of the kingdom is spoken of along with Jesus coming in power and glory with the holy angels, and in C2 Jesus speaks of how the Son of Man will go through many sufferings, be treated with contempt, die, and be raised. In other words, the same contrast is presented as is presented between the wings and hinge. However, on the C level there is the element of revenge: in C1 those who are ashamed of Jesus and his word, Jesus will be ashamed of when he comes in power. In other words, those who reject Jesus and his teaching will be rejected by Jesus when he comes on the day of the LORD, which means they will not be resurrected to partake in the kingdom of God. Consequently, those who treat Jesus with contempt and cause him suffering in C2 will suffer the same fate.

This is made clear on the B level: in B1 the followers of Jesus who are not willing to give complete commitment and be willing to die will not be raised on the Day by Jesus, whereas those who lose their life will be resurrected, just as the PB is resurrected by Jesus in B2. Jesus in B2 consequently shows the power to do what is promised in B1. The juxtaposition of the two units also has the effect of equating the PB with those who take up the cross and suffer. In other words, the PB with his long suffering, death, and resurrection becomes symbolic of those who suffer for the mission and die. The story of the PB, however, softens the demand for absolute faith: the father does not have complete faith and cries out, "I believe; help my unbelief" (9:24). This would imply that the desire to believe is enough for those who do not take the commitment to help Jesus on his mission.

The triple inclusio builds on the above themes. The inclusio around B1 implies that just as Jesus will die and be raised (A1) to glory (C1) so will those who like Jesus take up the cross (B1). This is shown in the second inclusio with John the Baptist. In C2, Jesus says that Elijah had already come and been treated like the Son of Man will be treated (9:12–13) and that Elijah will indeed come in the future to restore all things (9:12). This is paralleled in C1 where Jesus says the Son of Man will come in power and glory. The implication is that John the Baptist as Elijah will share in Jesus's glory, which is in fact shown in the transfiguration (D). The final inclusio around B2 implies that just as the PB is raised to life and wholeness after long suffering in B2, so will Jesus be raised from suffering in C2 and A2.

The combined effect of the chiastic structure is to collapse the death of the believer and the death of Jesus into one another: just as Jesus is raised, so will the believer be raised. There is even the implication that the believer will share in Jesus's glory like John the Baptist. This idea is found elsewhere in early Christian tradition. Paul says we are "seeing the glory of the LORD as though reflected in a mirror," and "are being transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another . . ." (2 Cor 3:18). He later speaks of the believers' need to carry the death of Jesus within them (2 Cor 4:8–12). In both Mark and Paul believers are to have the same faith as Jesus, and in both this faith will lead to partaking in Jesus's glory. Also, believers are not to fear, because they, like Jesus, will be raised to glory even if they are arrested, undergo great suffering, and die.

The story of the PB has a central role in this equation and promise. First, the PB foreshadows the death and resurrection of the believer, and the PB thus becomes a symbol of faithful Israel that will be raised on the Day. Second, the PB also foreshadows the death and resurrection of Jesus. The story of the PB shows Jesus's power over death and consequently that Jesus is the LORD Messiah. In short, the story of the PB has a very similar function as the story of JD, which as noted in the introduction of this chapter has strong parallels with the story of the PB: in both the crowd declares the child to be dead, in both Jesus takes the child by the hand, and in both Jesus raises the child.

This brings us to the items of the story that may have been added by Mark to help create the parallelism. These are the following: the crowd, the evil spirit trying to destroy and then succeeding to destroy the boy, Jesus rebuking the spirit, and the boy dying and being raised. We shall now turn to the transfiguration chiasms in Luke and Matthew.

Matthew's Transfiguration Chiasm

We shall begin with Matthew, because, besides Matthew's radical changes to the story of the PB, he follows Mark quite closely throughout the rest of the chiasm and only makes minor changes that help clarify the text. For example, he adds that the disciples understood that Jesus was talking about John the Baptist when he spoke of Elijah (17:13) and says that the Son of Man "will repay everyone" instead of the Son of Man "will be ashamed" of those who were ashamed of him (16:27). Matthew's change of the story of the PB from a raising-of-the-dead story to a simple exorcism naturally prevents the PB from being an example that those who lose their life for the mission will receive it back. Matthew instead adds a new element to the story: the reason for the disciples' inability to heal is their little faith. This has the effect of making the disciples look like those who are unwilling to take up the cross in B1, which in turn foreshadows their running away when Jesus is arrested.

That this is Matthew's intention is indicated by an addition he makes to the hinge story of the transfiguration. Matthew heightens the fear of the disciples by adding that they were overcome with fear and fell down when God spoke (17:6). Jesus then tells them to rise and to not be afraid (17:7). This creates a parallel with Jesus's second prediction of his death in Matthew where Jesus says he will rise and in response the disciples are greatly distressed (17:23): in both there is reference to rising and strong negative emotion. Matthew by this juxtaposition seems to say that disciples do not understand what is taking place: they neither understand who Jesus is (the hinge), nor why Jesus must die (A2). This causes fear and anxiety. This, however, shows a lack of faith as indicated by the B level: in B1, Peter is rebuked for saying that Jesus must not die and suffer, and then Jesus says that one must put aside fear and take up the cross and not value this life. The disciples do not realize that Jesus

will be resurrected (A1, A2) as the LORD Messiah (hinge) and that they do not need to fear because Jesus will raise them, which is foreshadowed in the hinge by Jesus lifting them up. It is only after Jesus's death that they will understand who Jesus is and have the faith not to be afraid. However, right now they do not even have faith the size of a mustard seed (17:20, B2).

These changes made by Matthew ultimately do not change the meaning supplied by the transfiguration chiasm. However, they radically change the meaning supplied by the story of the PB. The focus of the PB becomes solely that of faith. Consequently, those items that highlight this theme are suspect as Matthean additions, specifically, those items that place the blame for the failed exorcism on the disciples. We shall now turn to Luke.

Luke's Transfiguration Chiasm

Luke, unlike Matthew, changes the structure of the transfiguration chiasm. He does this by not recounting C2, in which Jesus speaks of the coming of Elijah. Consequently, the transfiguration is immediately followed by the story of the PB. This has the effect of eliminating the C level of the chiasm and then C1 simply becomes part of B1. This is not a problem, because C1 is the second part of the dialogue begun in B1. Besides this major change and a complete reworking of the story of the PB, Luke makes only two other significant changes to Mark.

The first significant change Luke makes is to eliminate Peter rebuking Jesus, and Jesus consequently rebuking Peter. This in turn reduces the parallelism between B1 and B2. This and the change of the story of the PB to a simple exorcism reduces the parallelism between B1 and B2 to three word parallels (son, father, God), and one conceptual parallel (in B1 Jesus will be ashamed of those who were ashamed of him, and in B2 Jesus seems to be ashamed of this generation when he asks how much longer he must be with them).

The second significant change occurs in the transfiguration where Luke adds that Jesus was talking with Moses and Elijah about his departure and what he was about to accomplish in Jerusalem (9:31). In other words, the topic of conversation is Jesus's death and resurrection. This addition consequently strengthens the parallelism between the wings A1 and A2 and the hinge, which is now C, because the original C level has been eliminated. There is now the following pattern: Jesus predicts his death and resurrection (A1), B1 (on losing life), Jesus meets with Moses and Elijah to discuss his death and resurrection (C), B2 (PB), and Jesus predicts his death and resurrection (A2). It is the strength of the relationship between the hinge and the wings that keep the chiasm viable.

The chiastic structure makes it clear that Luke sees some sort of connection between the story of the PB and Jesus's teaching about willing to give up one's life for the gospel; however, his changes to the story of the PB mean that there are no strong conceptual parallels to create a coherent message. That being said, if one looks at the larger chiastic structure in Luke, then a similar message to Mark emerges. It was noted in the second chapter that the story of the PB in Luke is directly opposite the story of the WNS and that there is a very high degree of parallelism between the two stories:

1) 9 word parallels: *next day (7:11, 9:37)*, great (7:11, 12; 9:37), crowd (7:11, 12; 9:37), disciples (7:11, 9:40), *only (7:12, 9:38)*, son (7:12; 9:38, 41), *to give (7:15, 9:42)*, to seize (7:16, 39), *God (7:16, 9:43)*.
2) 7 conceptual parallels:

i. Both are miracles
ii. In both there is a large amount of people (7:11, 12; 9:37).
iii. A family relationship is referred to (7:12, 9:38).
iv. In both the person healed is an only son (7:12, 9:38).
v. The healed person is given back to the parent (7:15,; 9:42).
vi. People are amazed (7:16, 9:43).
vii. Reference is made to God in describing the reaction of the crowd: (7:16, 9:43).

Half of the sixteen parallels (items in italics) are due to items that are not found in Mark's version. There are also a couple of parallels that are not readily obvious. First, the WNS, like the PB, is not a miracle of faith, but one of compassion.[524] In the PB despite the faithlessness of this generation (9:41), Jesus still cures the boy, and in the WNS Jesus looks at the widow and is filled with compassion (7:13). Second, the PB traditionally took place at the foot of Mt. Hermon and the WNS took place in Nain, which is at the foot of "the little Hermon."[525] This level of parallelism between the two stories is very unusual. The total number of Greek words for the two stories is 310 words, which is 155 per unit, or roughly 1.5 times larger than the average LUD unit. This means that the sixteen parallels are equivalent to roughly eleven parallels in the LUD. Only 7% of the 630 LUD unit pairs had that degree of parallelism. This degree of parallelism, combined with the near certainty that Luke created the larger chiastic structure, means that Luke wished to make a clear connection between these two stories. Through this juxtaposition through chiasm, the story of the PB vicariously partakes in being a raising-of-the-dead story. This would be doubly so, if the PB was a raising-of-the-dead story in the oral tradition. It is also of note that Luke makes a change to his version of the story of JD: he adds the detail that JD is Jairus's only daughter. It is extremely unlikely that this degree of parallelism between the PB and the WNS is simply a coincidence, especially considering that the PB is also a raising-of-the-dead story in Mark.

The above analysis highlights many items in the story of the PB in Luke that may have been added by Luke to the oral tradition: the son is an only son, and the people are amazed and praise God. The above analysis also raises the question of why Luke would change Mark's story of the PB from a raising-of-the-dead story to a simple exorcism, yet at the same time make multiple changes to connect the story to the raising of the WNS, and add the detail to both the PB and JD that the children were only children to connect those two stories.

---

[524] So Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:807.

[525] Luke does not actually give the location of the Mountain. However, in Mark and Matthew, Jesus is in Caesarea Philippi just before the transfiguration. Caesarea Philippi is at the foot of Mt. Hermon, the highest peak in the whole region of Palestine and was an extremely holy site. On Mt. Hermon see Rami Arav, "Hermon, Mount," *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* 3: 158–60. On Nain being at the foot of the little Hermon see William Arndt, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Saint Louis: Concordia, 1956), 24. It is not known if the hill of Moreh was known as little Hermon in the time of Jesus. The earliest known reference is in the medieval period where the hill of Moreh was mistaken for Mt. Hermon. This mistake is usually seen due to the close proximity of Mt. Tabor, which is paired with Mt. Hermon in Pss 42:6 and 89:12 (So Bovon, *Luke*, 270, n.30), to the hill of Moreh. The name "Little Hermon" is attributed to the hill of Moreh because of the similarities between its profile and that of Mt. Hermon (for a picture of Moreh with Nain see http://www.jerusalemperspective.com/default.aspx?tabid=51&photoid=19 and for Mt. Hermon from the south, see http://dqhall59.com/mt.hermon.htm). Since the basic shape of the hill is unlikely to have changed over the centuries, it is possible this nickname is ancient. The reason for the medieval confusion was not only that Moreh was close to Tabor, but also that it was called "Little Hermon."

Is he being true to the oral tradition in not having the story of the PB a raising-of-the-dead story? Or does he see something theologically problematic in Mark's story and perhaps also the story in the oral tradition? These two questions also apply to Matthew, and will be addressed after an initial oral analysis. However, first we need to look at the story of the PB in more detail and perform a chiastic analysis on the three quite different versions.

The Possessed Boy in Mark

The story of the PB in Mark is long and repetitious in comparison to the stories in Luke and Matthew. This, as we shall see, has led some scholars to propose that the PB was constructed from different stories. However, the repetitious nature of the story can be adequately explained by Mark's use of chiasm. This is a complex structure containing a chiasm of six smaller chiasms. Three of the hinges (C2, C3, and C4) contain a description of the boy's symptoms, which in turn are caused by an evil spirit. These three hinges along with the hinges on either side (C1 and C2) in turn form another chiasm (the hinge or C-level chiasm). As with the story of JD, this story again demonstrates Mark's love for interweaving chiastic structures. Also as with the stories of JD and the HW, the story of the PB is divided according to its sub-scenes. Each chiasm for the most part contains one scene except for the last two: in the opening scene (A1 to A2) Jesus arrives to the crowd arguing with his disciples, in the second scene (A2 to A3) a father describes the nature of the dispute, in the third scene (A3 to A4) the boy is brought to Jesus, in the fourth scene (A4 to C5) Jesus asks about the boy and the father asks for help, and in the fifth scene (C5 to C6) the boy is healed, and in the final scene (C6 to A7) the disciples ask about the miracle in private. The chiasm runs as follows:

A1 Jesus and three see great crowd around disciples
9 14 When they came to the disciples, they saw a great crowd around them,
B1 Scribes and disciples arguing
and some scribes arguing with them
C1 Crowd sees Jesus and is overcome with awe
9 15 When the whole crowd saw him, they were immediately overcome with awe, and they ran forward to greet him
B2 Jesus asks the scribes why they argue with the disciples
9 16 He asked them, "What are you arguing about with them?"
A2 Person in crowd answers
9 17 Someone from the crowd answered him,
B3 Person had brought son to Jesus
"Teacher, I brought you my son,
C2 Boy has spirit that convulses him
he has a spirit that makes him unable to speak, 9 18 and whenever it seizes him, it dashes him down, and he foams and grinds his teeth and becomes rigid,
B4 Person asked disciples to cast spirit out of son
and I asked your disciples to cast it out, but they could not do so "
A3 Jesus on faith: how long must Jesus be with them
9 19 He answered them, "You faithless generation, how much longer must I be among you? How much longer must I put up with you?
B5 Son is brought to Jesus
Bring him to me " 9 20 And they brought the boy to him
C3 Spirit sees Jesus and convulses boy
When the spirit saw him, immediately it convulsed the boy, and he fell on the ground and rolled about, foaming at the mouth
B6 Jesus asks father
9 21 Jesus asked the father,
A4 Jesus asks how long the child has been ill
"How long has this been happening to him?"
B7 Father says from childhood
And he said, "From childhood
C4 Description of spirit convulsing boy
9 22 It has often cast him into the fire and into the water, to destroy him,
B8 Father asks if Jesus is able to help
but if you are able to do anything, have pity on us and help us "
A5 Jesus on faith: miracles through belief
9 23 Jesus said to him, "If you are able! –All things can be done for the one who believes "
B9 father asks for help with faith
9 24 Immediately the father of the child cried out, "I believe, help my unbelief!"
C5 Crowd converges on Jesus
9 25 When Jesus saw that a crowd came running together,
B10 Jesus casts out the spirit
he rebuked the unclean spirit, saying to it, "You spirit that keeps this boy from speaking and hearing, I command you, come out of him, and never enter him again!" 9 26 After crying out and convulsing him terribly, it came out,
A6 Crowd says boy is dead
and the boy was like a corpse, so that most of them said, "He is dead "
B11 Jesus raises the boy
9 27 But Jesus took him by the hand and lifted him up, and he was able to stand
C6 Jesus leaves the crowd
9 28 When he had entered the house,
B12 Disciples ask why they could not cure boy: prayer is needed
his disciples asked him privately, "Why could we not cast it out?" 9 29 He said to them, "This kind can come out only through prayer "
A7 Jesus and disciples leave the town
9 30 They went from there and passed through Galilee

Each unit consists of a clause or a sentence at most except for B10, which is three sentences. There are 266 Greek words and twenty-five units, which works out to roughly 10.5 words per unit on average. Each unit is thus roughly one sixth the average length of an SUD unit.

We shall now look at the parallels between the units. Rather than look at the parallelism in each unit, the parallelism across the levels will be briefly listed.

On the A level the focus is on Jesus and the crowd. In regards to Jesus: Jesus arrives in A1, someone answers him in A2, Jesus responds to the person in A3, Jesus asks a question in A4, Jesus responds to questions in A5, and Jesus leaves in A7. In regards to the crowd: in A1 Jesus sees the crowd, in A2 someone answers from the crowd, in A3 Jesus calls the crowd faithless,[526] and in A6 the crowd says that the boy is dead. In A3 and A5 Jesus makes pronouncements on faith: this generation is faithless (A3) and everything is possible for those who believe (A5). On top of this the A levels form their own very clear chiasm:

A1 Jesus arrives to the town (A1)
    B1 Someone from the crowd speaks (A2)
        C1 Jesus makes a pronouncement on faith (A3)
            D Jesus asks how long boy suffered (A4)
        C2 Jesus makes a pronouncement on faith (A5)
    B2 The crowd speaks (A6)
A2 Jesus leaves the town (A7)

There is no immediate meaning produced by the chiasm, except that emphasis is placed on Jesus's compassion, which is shown by him enquiring after the boy.

Returning the sextuple chiasm, the B level focuses on the disciples, the father, and the son. In regards to the disciples, B1 and B2 both mention the scribes arguing with the disciples, in B4 the disciples cannot heal the son, and in B12 the disciples ask Jesus why they could not heal the boy. In regards to the father: in B6 the father is asked a question by Jesus, in B7 the father responds, in B8 the father asks if Jesus can help, and in B9 the father asks

---

[526] There is some debate as to whom exactly Jesus is addressing his remarks: the father to whom he is speaking, the disciples because they could not perform the exorcism, or the crowd because they best fit the term "generation." In regards to this the arguments of Gundry, *Mark*, 488-89, 497, are convincing. He notes that the crowd runs toward Jesus, which implies that the disciples were left behind; they then disappear from the story until the end (so also Sharyn Echols Dowd, *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22–25 in the Context of Markan Theology* [SBLDS 105; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1988], 117, n. 109). The disciples are thus probably not the object of Jesus's remarks. When the crowd arrives, Jesus asks "them" why "they" were arguing with "them." (9:16) This question (B2) refers back to the statement (B1) where we are told that the scribes were arguing with the disciples. Jesus is consequently asking the crowd, which includes the scribes, why they were arguing with his disciples. Then a man from the crowd answers: this man represents the crowd. Since Jesus is speaking to this man, who is representing the crowd, it would make sense that the faithless generation is the crowd and its representative, the father. This agrees with the general use of the term "generation," which applies to the nation as a whole. Also, if the remarks are directed to the disciples, it is the only time such harsh language is directed at them in the gospel tradition. Others (Heinz Eduard Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965], 171) see the crowd as being undeserving of the criticism, since they have not had the opportunity to believe or disbelieve. However, they forget that the disciples, Jesus's co-missionaries were in the crowd, and the scribes who are part of the crowd were arguing with them (Gundry, *Mark*, 497). Others (for example, Koch, *Bedeutung*, 122) think that it can not be the father since he showed faith by bringing the child. However, in Nazareth, Jesus was unable to perform miracles because of the general disbelief of the people (Gundry, *Mark*, 497). Those who think the statement is directed at the disciples because they are the last people mentioned include Moloney, *Mark*, 183–84, who sees the disciples becoming too enmeshed in the world, represented by the crowd (but Jesus also argues with people within a crowd elsewhere); Cranfield, *Mark*, 301; Koch, *Bedeutung*, 122; Lane, *Mark*, 332; Lührmann, *Markusevangelium*, 161. Those who think the statement is directed at the crowd include: Joachim Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus* (2 vols.; EKK 2: 1–2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978), 2:47; Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:19–20. Some think the statement is directed at both the crowd and the disciples; for example, Hooker, *Mark*, 223–24.

for help with his lack of belief. In regards to the son, in B3 he is brought to Jesus, in B4 the disciples cannot exorcise the demon from him, in B5 he is brought again to Jesus, in B10 Jesus casts the demon out of the boy, and in B11 Jesus raises the boy. The parallelism on this level is not necessarily found on the B level within each individual chiasm, but across the whole chiastic structure; for example, the disciples cannot cure in B4 and ask why in B10, the boy is brought to Jesus in B3 and B5, the disciples fail to exorcise in B4 and Jesus is able to in B10 and B11. The B level is also the level of conflict: the scribes are arguing with the disciples in B1 and B2, the son is brought to the disciples who cannot exorcise him in B3 and B4,[527] the father begs for help in B8 and B9, Jesus casts out the spirit and raises the boy in B10 and B11, and the disciples ask why they could not exorcise the spirit in B12.

The C level focuses on the spirit and the crowd. In regards to the spirit, in C2, C3, and C4 a description of the spirit is given. In regards to the crowd, in C1 and C5 the crowd is described as coming towards Jesus, and in C6 Jesus leaves the crowd. The crowd is consequently a feature of both the A and C levels. There is also a very clear chiastic structure formed by the first five C units:

A1 Crowd runs towards Jesus (C1)
    B1 Father describes condition of son (C2)
        C Spirit convulses the boy (C3)
    B2 Father describes condition of son (C4)
A2 Crowd runs towards Jesus (C5)

In this simple chiasm the only meaning generated is that the action of the crowd (wings) is equated with the action of the evil spirit (hinge). This picks up on the association of the crowd with evil found in the stories of JD and the HW.

There is in the sextuple chiasm clear parallelism across the levels and each level has a primary focus: the wings focus on Jesus, the hinges focus on the spirit, and the B level focuses on the other characters and conflict. Considering the shortness of each unit and the length of the chiasm (a sextuple chiasm is equivalent to 1three-level single chiasm), the level of parallelism is remarkable, because just one parallel in the above chiasm is equivalent of six parallels in the SUD. If one only allowed one parallel per level, an incredibly low probability figure would be produced. The parallelism, however, is much greater than this: besides the conceptual parallels listed above there are several instances of word parallels: "crowd" (A1, C1, A2, C5), "arguing with them" (B2, B3), "how long" (A3, A4), "brought" (B3, B5), "cast out" (B4, B12). The high degree of parallelism, short length of the units, the length of the chiasm, and the clear chiasms produced by the A and C units, all produce a very high degree of certainty that the chiasm was created by Mark.

The chiasm juxtaposes Jesus in the wings against the evil spirit in the hinges, and consequently highlights the opposition between the two. The crowd wanders between the wings and hinges but is clearly to be considered evil: it shares the hinge units with the evil spirit, and the hinge unit chiasm connects the actions of the crowd with the actions of the spirit. The evil nature of the crowd is also expressed in A3 where Jesus calls the crowd faithless. The crowd is further associated with the demonic in A4. In A4 Jesus asks how long the boy has been possessed, which parallels his question in A3 asking how long he must be with the crowd. An equation is consequently set up between the crowd and the possessed boy. The father is also associated with the crowd: he speaks out from the crowd in A2, and in

[527] In B3 the boy is brought to Jesus, but Jesus was not there, which means he was brought to the disciples.

A3 Jesus calls the crowd faithless. Also, his lack of faith is further pointed out by Jesus in A5: Jesus repeats the father's statement "If you are able," which points out that the father does not have faith that Jesus can cast out the demon. Ironically, this lack of faith places the father on the same side as the evil spirit.

The B level, as mentioned above, is the level where the conflict takes place. The conflict begins with the scribes arguing with the disciples in B1. Jesus then asks the scribes what they were arguing about with the disciples in B2.[528] The scribes, because they are in the centre of the crowd, are associated with evil. This is in accord with the presentation of the scribes thus far in the gospel: they are either the opponents of Jesus or are contrasted unfavourably with him (1:22, 2:6, 2:16, 3:22, 7:1).[529] Here they are the opponents of Jesus's disciples. The opposition between good and evil is consequently expanded: Jesus and the disciples on one side, and the evil spirit, the crowd, the scribes, and the father on the other.[530]

The precise nature of the conflict with the scribes is not discussed.[531] However, the argument is apparently about the inability of the disciples to heal, because in B1 the arguing is described, in B2 Jesus asks what it is about, in B3 the man answers the question by saying he brought his son to the disciples, and in B4 he says that they could not heal the boy. The first four B units would seem to supply the answer to the nature of the conflict: it is about the disciples' inability to perform the exorcism. Jesus's response would indicate that the conflict has to do with faith and the performance of miracles, because he complains about the lack of faithfulness of the crowd. He is thus taking the blame away from the disciples and placing it on the crowd. A common theme in the Jesus tradition is the connection between successful healing and the faith of either the petitioner or the patient. This was made clear in the story of the HW and JD. The argument over why the disciples could not heal the boy would likely have centred on the disciples maintaining the theology of their teacher and placing the blame on the father. Jesus's response to the crowd, attributing the failure to their faithlessness, exonerates the disciples. Later the disciples are told that prayer is needed in this sort of case. Throughout the story there is thus no hint of blame from Jesus against the disciples.[532]

The conflict reaches a turning point in B8 and B9. In B8 the father asks Jesus to have pity and to heal the boy if he is able. As noted above, this statement shows his lack of faith in Jesus's abilities, which Jesus points out in A5. This creates the plea in B9 by the father, who

---

[528] There is debate also as to whom Jesus is directing his question: the scribes, the disciples, or both. It is not both since he is asking one group why they are arguing with the other. Since B1 says the scribes are arguing with the disciples, it would make sense that in B2 Jesus is directing the question at the scribes who came toward him as part of the crowd. He would then be protective of his students. See also above n. 526 on page 231.

[529] So Thomas L. Budesheim, "Jesus and the Disciples in Conflict with Judaism," 62 (1971): 206–7. Gundry, *Mark*, 495, does not see a parallel being made as the nature of the dispute is not given. However, since the scribes are always in opposition (except for an individual scribe in 12:28–34) and presented so negatively, it is likely that they are meant to be an indication of negativity here. Another instance is in Mark 11:27–33. Collins, *Mark*, 436, says the scribes may be inserted here to prepare for the exclamation against the faithless generation. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:669, n. 34, sees a possible reference to the Beelzebul dispute where the scribes accuse Jesus of exorcizing via Satan.

[530] So Gundry, *Mark*, 487, 490. Koch, *Bedeutung*, 123, asserts that the disputation puts the disciples in a bad light. There is no evidence in the text that this is so.

[531] The question of what precisely was being argued about has long confused commentators. Many simply flatly state that no indication of its nature is given; for example, Gundry, *Mark*, 495; Moloney, *Mark*, 183, n. 51. Gundry, *Mark*, 495, however, argues here that it is likely over the healing, and the father answers because his role is central in the disputation.

[532] As Gundry, *Mark*, 489, notes if the disciples were faithless, it would have been mentioned when they asked why they could not heal.

says he believes and to help his unbelief. Then in B10 and B11 the demon is cast out and the boy is raised to health. The ambiguous faith exhibited by the father in B8 and B9 would thus seem to be enough for the healing to take place in B10 and B11. In B12 the disciples ask why they (unlike Jesus) could not exorcise the demon. The answer that Jesus gives is that this type of spirit can only come out through prayer. Jesus's reply is unusual, since prayer does not appear to play a role in the healing.[533] However, in B9 the father cries out to Jesus for help with his lack of faith. Since Jesus is the LORD Messiah, the man is supplicating God, and a supplication to a God is otherwise known as a prayer.[534] If this is correct, then Mark would seem to be saying that only a small amount of belief supplemented by prayer can work miracles, or that prayer on the part of the supplicant creates belief.

The B level consequently supplies the nature of the conflict and its solution. The scribes were arguing with the disciples (B1 and B2) over the disciples' inability to heal the boy (B3 and B4). The disciples, following the theology of their teacher, were likely arguing that their inability to heal the boy was due to the lack of faith of the father. This seems to be confirmed by Jesus's response to the father that this generation is faithless (A3). The father's lack of faith is then demonstrated in B8 and B9, but in B9 he expresses faith and prays for help with his belief. This in turn allows the healing to take place in B10 and B11. Then in B12 Jesus explains to the disciples that the reason the boy could be healed was due to the prayer of the father, which in turn implies that their inability to heal was not due to their lack of faith. As we shall see, Matthew takes the opposite view.

Since the father is the voice of the crowd (A2), there appears to be some hope for the crowd's redemption. It was argued above that both the possessed boy and the father seem to represent the crowd. The crowd, like the father is mostly presented in a negative light through chiasm. However, like the father there is a certain ambiguity in regards to their faith. This is shown by their reaction to Jesus in C1: they run towards Jesus in awe. However, in C5 the running towards him takes on the sense of closing in. The verb used in C5 (ἐπισυντρέχω) is odd and is the only example of it given in *LSJ* and *BAGD*.[535] The verb consists of the preposition ἐπί (upon) and the verb συντρέχω (to run together, to gather, or come together). The meaning of the verb ἐπισυντρέχω is given as "to run together," that is, the same as that for συντρέχω.[536] However, the force of ἐπι is then lost, and "to run together upon" would be more accurate. The meaning would then be "gather/come together upon" in the sense of closing in. The choice of this verb here by Mark was likely so that a

---

[533] This reply's lack of clear sense has long been noted (Collins, *Mark*, 438; Gundry, *Mark*, 492–93). Most commentators see this as a Markan addition reflecting a later situation in the church where prayer was used in healings. This is discussed in detail below on page 252.

[534] Collins, *Mark*, 438, also suggests the possibility that the father's plea is a prayer. Collins also notes that both prayer and calling on the name of Jesus were seen as a powerful healing technique: the father here calls on Jesus directly. In regards to prayer Collins points to Mark 11:23–24, Jas. 5:15, and Acts 9.40, and in regards to calling on the name of Jesus, she points to Mark 9:38–39, Matt 7:22, Luke 10:17, Acts 3:6. Others come close to asserting this plea as a prayer: Dowd, *Prayer*, 111–14; Christopher D. Marshall, *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative* (SNTSMS 64; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 21.

[535] Walter Bauer, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979); Liddell, et al., *LSJ*; s.v. "ἐπισυντρέχω."

[536] See *LSJ* and *BAGD*; s.v. "συντρέχω."

parallel could be made with C1 (the crowd initially running to Jesus).[537] The effect also indicates a movement in the crowd from positive (C1) to negative (C5).

This is the reverse of the movement of the father from negative to positive. At first he seems very ungracious in his complaining about the disciples' inability to heal in B4. This in turn produces a defensive outburst from Jesus who puts the blame on the father's lack of faith (A3). Jesus, however, is still willing to heal the boy and asks for him to be brought forward (B5), and meanwhile asks the father about the condition of the boy (B6, A4). Sympathy is generated as we hear more about the boy's suffering (C4, C5), but the father makes a mistake in his wording for help in B8. This produces another outburst from Jesus on faith (A5), and the father's desperate plea for help on faith. The father comes across as a very sympathetic character, and at the same time Jesus becomes less so in his harsh judgemental pronouncements. This would explain why the crowd would close in. Mark is perhaps aware of this, because at the exact centre of the story (A4) and inbetween Jesus's two judgemental pronouncements (A3 and A5) Jesus asks about the boy's condition. In other words, Jesus shows his compassion and concern for the boy. Jesus's compassion is further shown by the fact he performs the exorcism and brings the boy back to life.

Since the father and the boy represent the crowd, Jesus's compassion for them is also compassion for the crowd. The story would also imply that there is hope for the faithless crowd, and thus, faithless Israel. Like the HW who also represented Israel, the son has been long suffering. However, unlike the HW whose faithfulness saved her, the son is saved despite faithlessness of the crowd. There is a corresponding difference in the way the two are healed: the HW is instantly cured, and the PB is cured in stages. At first, though the exorcism is successful, it appears to be a failure, because the boy is dead. This in turn leads to Jesus having to raise the boy later. This implies that the faithlessness of Israel will not necessarily lead to ultimate destruction, but rather, like the PB, Israel will ultimately be raised.

Returning to the larger chiastic structure, the transfiguration chiasm, a contrast is set up between the absolute faith demanded by Jesus for those helping spread the gospel and those whose faith is less than absolute. Mark, it would seem, is not willing to turn God's back on those who turn from God in the face of persecution and suffering. Such a view would be very understandable from someone who had lived through the horrendous suffering of the Christian community in Rome under Nero. If the above interpretation of Mark's chiastic structure is correct, then Mark sees Jesus's compassionate side as being stronger than Jesus's judgemental side. This in turn reflects Jesus's teaching, which likewise stresses compassion and forgiveness over judgement.[538]

---

[537] The lack of sense provided by the translation "running together" has been noted by other scholars, since the crowd has already come running towards Jesus in C1. This has been used as evidence that Mark joined together two separate stories. On this, see below n. 555 on page 246. Gundry, *Mark*, 491, 493, suggests that since the verb to run towards in v. 15 (προστρέχοντες) is a participle and the verb to run together in v. 25 (ἐπισυντρέχει) is the main verb, one should think of the running as taking place the whole time. In other words, the crowd is still congealing around Jesus. This does not quite make sense, because the crowd had reached Jesus and Jesus then has a lengthy back and forth with the father. Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:93, argues that the father's shout motivates renewed running by the crowd. This would mean that not all the crowd had come over. As Grundy, *Mark*, 500, points out, there is no indication of this in the text. Pesch, however, is on the right track: the father's desperate plea does motivate the crowd to close in. Collins, *Mark*, 438, suggests that it could be because of the attack that the crowd moves in, and that it is only mentioned here in order to return to the main story. Again, there is no evidence in the text that this is so, and as Collins says (ibid), the running together appears unmotivated. The crowd running together is discussed further below on page 254.

[538] For example see Mark 3:28–29; 11:25; Luke 6:37; 11:4; 12:10; Matt 5:7; 6:12–15; 12:7, 31; 18:21, 35.

The above chiastic analysis shows that what at first may appear to be a rambling repetitive story is in fact a highly structured story full of symbolic meaning. Jesus again confronts evil and handily defeats it. He enters the noisy chaotic crowd and departs in silence—with such careful construction one can only assume that it is quite intentional that no reaction is given to the miracle. Again the beneficiary of the miracle represents Israel, but this time it is neither a completely faithless Israel nor a faithful Israel, but an Israel somewhere inbetween. Mark suggests that despite Jesus's harsh judgemental statements there is hope.

The above analysis also highlights several items that Mark may have added to the oral tradition to create his complicated structure. These include the crowd running to Jesus in awe (C1) and the crowd closing in on Jesus (C2); the crowd in general; the repetitive descriptions of the spirit (C3, C4, C5); Jesus's two statements on faith (A3, A5); the father's two pleas (B8, B9); the disciples' question (B12); and Jesus's hinge question into the boy's condition (A4). Naturally, many of these items may have already been in the tradition and simply rearranged or expanded by Mark. As with the previous chapter, the oral and historical analyses will try to determine which is which.

Luke's Possessed Boy Chiasm

Luke presents a much shorter version of the story of the PB: he does not recount the dispute between the disciples and the scribes, Jesus's conversation with the father regarding faith, and any mention of the boy being dead. One element that Luke does keep is the spirit convulsing the boy on the hinge levels. The result is a shorter double chiasm where each chiasm focuses on a single scene, namely, the request and the healing. The chiasm could be directly expanded into a single chiasm with Jesus's rebuke of "this generation" (A2) as its hinge. The chiasm runs as follows:

A1 Jesus comes down from mountain to a great crowd
9:37 On the next day, when they had come down from the mountain, a great crowd met him.

> **B1 Man from crowd begs Jesus to look at son**
> 9:38 Just then a man from the crowd shouted, "Teacher, I beg you to look at my son; he is my only child.
>
> > **C1 Spirit convulses boy**
> > 9:39 Suddenly a spirit seizes him, and all at once he shrieks. It convulses him until he foams at the mouth; it mauls him and will scarcely leave him.
>
> **B2 Man had brought son to disciples and begged them to cast it out**
> 9:40 I begged your disciples to cast it out, but they could not."

A2 Jesus on faith
9:41 Jesus answered, "You faithless and perverse generation, how much longer must I be with you and bear with you?

> **B3 Jesus asks son to be brought forward**
> Bring your son here."
>
> > **C2 Spirit convulses boy and Jesus exorcises it**
> > 9:42 While he was coming, the demon dashed him to the ground in convulsions. But Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, healed the boy,
>
> **B4 Jesus gives boy to father**
> and gave him back to his father.

A3 Crowd is astounded at the greatness of God
9:43 And all were astounded at the greatness of God.[539]

---

[539] Bovon, *Luke*, 383, suggests a similar chiastic structure: A1 approach of crowd, B1 Father's call for son, C1 description of attack, D1 disciples failed, D2 critique of faithless generation, B2 command to father, C2

The unit division follows the natural divisions of the text, and each unit focuses on a single action in the story. There are 124 Greek words and nine units, which is roughly 14 words per unit. This is.23 of the average SUD unit, which means that one SUD unit is equivalent to four-and-a-half of the units in the above chiasm. The parallels are quite clear: A1, A2, and A3 all mention the crowd; in B1 the man begs Jesus and in B2 describes how he had begged the disciples; in B3 the son is brought to Jesus and in B4 the son is returned to the father; and in C1 and C2 the spirit is described convulsing the boy. This conceptual parallelism is supported by word parallelism on the B and C levels. If one allowed the equivalent of five parallels on average per level, the probability would be.1055 to the 4th power times 60 (the number of ways the chiasm could occur; it is roughly the equivalent of two SUD units), which is.007 433, or.7%. In other words it is highly likely that the above arrangement was the conscious design of Luke.

The centre of the whole chiasm is Jesus's statement on faith, and this is consequently the central theme.[540] As with Mark, Luke connects the crowd (wings) with the action of the evil spirit (hinges). Also, as in Mark the father is the voice of the crowd, and since Jesus's central statement is in response to the father, it is directed at both the father and the crowd. However, despite this Jesus still performs the miracle, and Jesus's compassion is emphasized just as it is in Mark. However, instead of the lack of reaction in Mark, Luke describes the crowd as being astounded by the greatness of God, and thus turning towards God. In Mark this is indicated before the miracle by the father crying out for help with his faith. Consequently, in Luke, there is no need for either faith or prayer for the miracle to take place.

The only item, besides the items listed at the end of analysis of Luke's transfiguration chiasm, that Luke may have added to the story is the repeated description of the spirit convulsing the boy.

Matthew's Possessed Boy Chiasm

Matthew's version of the PB at 136 Greek words is a little longer than Luke's version. However, the actual miracle part of the story is shorter, because he expands Mark's conversation between Jesus and the disciples. Also like Luke, Matthew creates a double chiasm based on two scenes: the first chiasm covers the miracle, and the second chiasm covers the conversation. As such, there are nine chiastic units at roughly fifteen words per unit, which is roughly one quarter the length of the average SUD unit. Matthew's version of the story is quite a different recounting than that of Luke's or Mark's, and runs as follows:

---

resistance of spirit, B3 healing, A2 amazement of crowd. For Bovon D1 and D2 are not essential to the story. Bovon, however, fails to notice the parallelism between D1 and B1, and D2 and the wings A1 and A2.

[540] This is in contrast to Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 807, who argues that the miracle is not one of faith, but one of compassion. The central placement of Jesus's condemnation would argue against faith not being the central theme. However, as will be pointed out, Fitzmyer is correct that Jesus's compassion comes to the fore: despite the lack of faith Jesus still performs the miracle. Bovon, *Luke*, 384, likewise does not see faith as the central concern, but divine power. The last is true in that Jesus does not need the faith of those present to perform and the crowd comments on the greatness of God. Bovon sees the condemnation directed at the disciples, since in his chiastic structure the condemnation is D2 and the disciples are mentioned in D1 (see above n. 539 on page 236). But Bovon's structure fails to notice the parallels between B1 and B2 (his D1) and between A2 (his D2) and A1 and A3. Bovon, *Luke*, 386, is, however, correct in saying that Luke is not interested in the disciples' failure: Luke only mentions it and does not discuss it.

A1 Man kneels before Jesus and asks "Lord" to have mercy on his son: faith
17:14 When they came to the crowd, a man came to him, knelt before him, 17:15 and said, "Lord, have mercy on my son, for he is an epileptic and he suffers terribly; he often falls into the fire and often into the water.

B1 Boy brought to disciples, but they could not cure him
17:16 And I brought him to your disciples, but they could not cure him."

C1 Jesus calls this generation faithless
17:17 Jesus answered, "You faithless and perverse generation, how much longer must I be with you? How much longer must I put up with you?

B2 Boy brought to Jesus who cures him
Bring him here to me." 17:18 And Jesus rebuked the demon, and it came out of him, and the boy was cured instantly.

A2 Disciples speak to Jesus privately
17:19 Then the disciples came to Jesus privately

B3 Disciples ask why they could not cure boy
and said, "Why could we not cast it out?"

C2 Jesus says disciples have little faith
17:20 He said to them, "Because of your little faith. For truly I tell you, if you have faith the size of a mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, 'Move from here to there,' and it will move;

B4 Jesus explains how they could have cured boys
and nothing will be impossible for you."

A3 Jesus and disciples gather
17:22 As they were gathering in Galilee

Like Luke's chiasm this is a simple chiasm with clear parallelism. In A1 Jesus and the disciples arrive, in A2 Jesus and the disciples meet in private, and in A3 Jesus and the disciples gather in Galilee. In B1 the boy is brought to the disciples who are unable to cure him, and in B2 the boy is brought to Jesus who cures him; in B3 the disciples ask why they could not cure the boy, which creates a parallel with B1, and in B4 Jesus explains that nothing would be impossible for them, which implies they too would be able to cure effortlessly like Jesus does in B2. In both C1 and C2 Jesus comments on faithlessness. The conceptual parallelism just listed is complimented by many word parallels: brought/bring and cured (B1, B2), faithlessness/faith (C1, C2). The parallelism is thus comparable to Luke's chiasm, and thus it is also likely the conscious creation of the author.

In Matthew's chiasm the two hinges connect the faithlessness of "this generation" (C1) with the faithlessness of the disciples (C2). This is further shown on the B level where the disciples could not cure the boy (B1) and ask why they could not (B3), which leads to the response in C2. If they had even the tiniest amount of faith, all things would be possible for them (B4), just as they are for Jesus who effortlessly cured the boy in B2. The failure of the miracle is consequently placed squarely on the disciples' shoulders. The father meanwhile is presented as the ideal supplicant: he shows his faith by kneeling before Jesus and calling him Lord (A1).[541] The crowd would also appear to be exonerated as they are associated with the father in A1. On the other hand, "generation" applies to the population as a whole, and the crowd would have to be included since they are part of the "generation." [542] However, the

[541] Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 407, notes that Matthew recalls the solemn style of the psalms where the mercy of the LORD is invoked; for example, Pss. 25:6; 40:11; 119:77, 56; 123:2–3. Gundry, *Matthew*, 409, also sees "Lord" as emphasizing Jesus's deity.

[542] Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 408, reluctantly comes to the same conclusion, even though the crowd has done nothing to warrant the condemnation. Luz agrees that the statement does not respond to the father and that the context says it is directed at the disciples. However, he also notes that nowhere else are the disciples referred to as "generation." He also sees a difference between the faithlessness of the generation and the little faith of the disciples. This is a minor difference, since the saying implies that the disciples do not even have faith the size of

disciples appear to be the main part of the generation that Jesus is referring to and whose company he can barely put up with.

Matthew consequently has acompletely different interpretation of the story than Mark, and to a degree, Luke. We shall now turn to the oral analysis and analyse in more detail the differences between the three versions of this story.

Oral Analysis[543]

We shall begin with an initial synoptic comparison to determines more precisely the nature of the differences between the three stories. We shall then look at the possible reasons that Mark may have had for adding items to the oral tradition or that Luke and Matthew may have had for deleting items from the oral tradition. Then the same will be done in regards for Mark's and Matthew's endings to the story. Finally, the likely shape of the oral tradition will be discussed.

Initial Oral Analysis

The oral analysis will simply focus on the parallel sections to discover the essential, variable, and additional items. A separate analysis will treat the multiple descriptions of the spirit. This will lead to an initial proposal on the shape of the oral tradition.

We shall begin with the opening sequence:[544]

Mark	**Luke**	**Matthew**
9:14 When *they came* to the disciples, they saw **a great crowd** around them	9:37 On the next day, when *they had come* down from the mountain, **a great crowd** met him.	17:14 When *they came to* the **crowd**
9.14 Καὶ **ἐλθόντες** πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶδον **ὄχλον πολὺν** περὶ αὐτοὺς	9:37 Ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ **κατελθόντων** αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους συνήντησεν αὐτῷ **ὄχλος πολύς**.	17:14 **Καὶ ἐλθόντων πρὸς** τὸν **ὄχλον**

All three writers have Jesus and the three returning to a crowd. Though this scene connects the story of the PB with the transfiguration, the fact that Jesus was away is an essential part of the story for all three gospel writers, because the remaining disciples could not cast out the spirit. The crowd would also seem to be an essential item. There is also an important textual variation in Mark. Some important witnesses read "he came" (ἐλθὼν) and "he saw"

---

as grain of mustard. Luz (ibid., 409) is also unhappy with the saying applied to the disciples and argues it is not so much the size of faith, but diminished or discouraged faith. The text does not support this interpretation: the context is little faith and the mustard seed is elsewhere used as an example of something extremely small (Matt 13:32). Gundry, *Matthew*, 349, and Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 2:724, also see Matthew putting the stress on the little faith of the disciples and here conflates the crowd and the disciples. Others maintain that it is just the disciples who are referred to; for example, Heinz Joachim Held, "Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten," in *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verl., 1970).

[543] A very short oral analysis is to be found in Dunn, *Jesus*, 219–20.

[544] As before, items in bold indicate that the same word, whatever its grammatical form, is found in two or more versions, and items in italics indicate synonyms.

(εἶδεν).[545] Since it is more likely that later copyists would change the singular to the plural rather than the other way around, the singular is the preferred reading for Mark.[546] It is also the preferred reading for the oral tradition, since the transfiguration was probably not connected with the story of the PB.[547]

The next item of commonality is that a man from the crowd speaks up:

Mark	**Luke**	**Matthew**
9:17 *Someone from* **the crowd** answered **him**, "**Teacher**, I brought **you my son**; 9:22 but if you are able to do anything, *have pity* on us and help us	9:38 Just then *a man from* **the crowd** shouted, and said, "**Teacher**, *I beg you* to look at **my son**; he is my only child.	*a man* came to him, knelt before **him**, 17:15 "Lord, *have mercy* on **my son**,
9.17 **καὶ** ἀπεκρίθη **αὐτῷ** *εἷς ἐκ* **τοῦ ὄχλου, Διδάσκαλε,** ἤνεγκα **τὸν υἱόν μου** πρὸς σέ, 9:22 ἀλλ᾽ εἴ τι δύνῃ, βοήθησον ἡμῖν *σπλαγχνισθεὶς* ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς.	9.38 **καὶ** ἰδοὺ *ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ* **τοῦ ὄχλου** ἐβόησεν λέγων, **Διδάσκαλε,** *δέομαί* σου ἐπιβλέψαι ἐπὶ **τὸν υἱόν μου,** ὅτι μονογενής μοί ἐστιν,	προσῆλθεν **αὐτῷ** *ἄνθρωπος* γ ονυπετῶν αὐτὸν 17.15 καὶ λέ γων, Κύριε, *ἐλέησόν* **μου τ ὸν υἱόν,**

All three agree that a man from the crowd speaks to Jesus concerning his son who is apparently ill. This would thus appear to be an essential item to the story. In Mark the disciples were arguing with the crowd and the scribes, and the man speaks up in response to Jesus's question concerning the argument. In Luke and Matthew the man comes on his own initiative. Mark and Luke both have the man speaking from the crowd, whereas in Matthew he comes up to Jesus and kneels before speaking. In Mark and Luke the man addresses Jesus

---

[545] For the list of texts see Barbara Aland, et al., *The Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2000), 154, note to v.14.

[546] Gundry, *Mark*, 494, unconvincingly tries to argue that the plural is to be preferred, because the singular is the easier and smoother reading and therefore less likely. This, however, is contra Gundry's view that the story of the PB was connected with the transfiguration: if it was connected, then the plural is smoother since Jesus is returning with the three. It should be pointed out that the singular does not necessarily exclude the three being with Jesus: Mark often goes from plural to singular in a sentence; see Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 156–64. Bauckham argues the "they . . . he" perhaps reflects an original "we . . . he" which is a more natural usage.

[547] Mark places the transfiguration in the region of Caesarea Philippi (8:27), which was in Gentile territory. This city is at the foot of the highest peak in the region, Mt. Hermon, which at the time was considered a very holy mountain. On this see Arav, "Hermon," 158–60. Gundry, *Mark*, 494, argues that the transfiguration is not necessarily in the region of Caesarea Philippi. However, though Jesus and the three may have travelled some distance in the six days, the impression given is that location has not changed. The purpose of this trip would most likely be a rest from the crowds and the authorities. Thus, it is unlikely that there would be crowds and/or scribes in the region (see, for example, Achtemeier, "Miracles," 121–22). In regards to the scribes, Arndt, *Luke*, 265, argues that there were many Jews who lived in the neighbourhood of Mt. Hermon, and consequently the presence of scribes should not be astonishing. In addition to this there is a textual variant that has the verbs "to come" and "to see" in v. 14 in the third person singular in some manuscripts. As Achtemeier, "Miracles," 122, points out, it is unlikely that later copyists would change a plural to the singular. This would mean that originally the verb was in the singular and that Jesus was without the three. But, Mark is not attempting to present a historically linear narrative; rather, he is arranging pericopes in chiastic patterns to make theological points.

as teacher, and in Matthew as Lord. All three introduce the son differently ("I brought you," "I beg you to look at," "have mercy"), but all express supplication. In Mark the request is implied; he supplies it later: "but if you are able to do anything, have pity on us and help us" (9:22). The sentiment of the request is like that in Luke and Matthew. Luke adds that the son was an only son. Matthew's variations are suspect because they have a christological emphasis: the man kneels and addresses Jesus as Lord.[548] This is quite different from the almost disrespectful shouting out from the crowd of Mark and Luke. However, both of these details in Matthew are allowable variations: kneeling was a common form of supplication, and "Lord" was an acceptable term of respect. On the other hand, if the oral tradition viewed the man negatively, which, as we shall see, is likely to have been the case, then such variation would have been unusual.[549]

The next three items are very similar in all three accounts:

Mark	Luke	Matthew
and *I asked* **your disciples to cast it out, but** *they could* **not** do so."	9:40 *I begged* **your disciples to cast it out, but they could not**."	17:16 **And** *I brought* him to **your disciples, but they could not** cure him."
καὶ *εἶπα* **τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσιν, καὶ οὐκ** ἴσχυσαν.	9.40 **καὶ** *ἐδεήθην* **τῶν μαθητῶν σου ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν αὐτό, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν.**	17.16 **καὶ** *προσήνεγκα* αὐτὸν **τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν** αὐτὸν θεραπεῦσαι.
9:19 *He* **answered** them, "**You faithless generation, how much longer must I be among you? How much longer must I put up with you?**	9:41 **Jesus answered, "You faithless and perverse generation, how much longer must I be with you** and **bear with you?**	C1 17:17 **Jesus answered, "You faithless and perverse generation, how much longer must I be** *with* **you? How much longer must I put up with you?**
9.19 **ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς** αὐτοῖς *λέγει*, **Ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος, ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι; ἕως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν;**	9.41 **ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς** *καὶ* **ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν;**	17.17 **ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε** μεθ' **ὑμῶν ἔσομαι; ἕως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν;**
Bring him *to* **me**." 9.20 *And they brought the boy to him*	*Bring your son* **here**." *While he was coming*	**Bring him here** to **me**."
φέρετε αὐτὸν πρός **με.** 9.20 καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν	*προσάγαγε* **ὧδε** τὸν υἱόν σου. 9.42 ἔτι δὲ προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ	**φέρετέ μοι αὐτὸν ὧδε.**

All three gospel writers have a description of the demon from the father before this scene. The strong similarity in all three stories points to these three items being essential items. All three gospels are very close, there is just slight variation in wording. What changes there are, are very minor: Luke shortens Jesus's two questions into one double question, and Matthew does not describe the boy being brought forward, which is simply implied by Jesus rebuking the spirit in the next sentence. In Mark and Luke this scene is followed by a description of

[548] See above n. 541 on page 238.
[549] See below on page 253–254.

the spirit convulsing the boy. As with Jesus's theological pronouncements in JD and the HW, his words here have minimal variation.

The next scene in common is the exorcism:

Mark	Luke	Matthew
(9:25) *he* **rebuked the unclean spirit** (saying to it, "You spirit that keeps the boy from speaking and hearing, I command you, come out of him, and never enter him again!" After convulsing him terribly,) *it* **came out**	(9:42) But **Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit**, *healed the boy*, (and gave him back to the father. 9:43 And all were astounded at the greatness of God.)	17:18 And **Jesus rebuked** *the demon*, and *it* **came out** of him, *and the boy was* instantly *cured.*
ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ . . . ἐξῆλθεν	**ἐπετίμησεν** δὲ **ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ** *ἰάσατο τὸν παῖδα*	17.18 καὶ **ἐπετίμησεν** *αὐτῷ* **ὁ Ἰησοῦς** καὶ **ἐξῆλθεν** ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον **καὶ** *ἐθεραπεύθη* ὁ *παῖς* ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.

All three authors agree that Jesus rebuked the spirit and it came out. These two items are thus essential items. Mark and Luke add that it is unclean and Matthew uses the synonym "demon." Luke does not say the spirit came out but the coming out is implied—the rebuking causes the boy to be healed. Luke also adds that the crowd was astounded. Matthew states that the demon came out and that the boy was healed. He uses different words for describing the boy being healed. Mark simply says the demon came out, but then he describes how the boy looked dead and that Jesus raised him. Mark also describes what Jesus said. Luke and Matthew present a very different picture than Mark: in both the boy is immediately and completely healed. Matthew stresses this by adding he was cured from that moment onward.

The final scene is only found in Mark and Matthew:

Mark	Matthew
9:28 When he had entered the house, **his disciples** *asked him* **privately**, "*Why* **could we not cast it out**?" 9:29 *He said to* **them**, "This kind can only come out through prayer." 9.28 καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον **οἱ μαθηταὶ** *αὐτοῦ* **κατ' ἰδίαν** ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν, *Ὅτι* **ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό**; 9.29 *καὶ εἶπεν* **αὐτοῖς**, Τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελθεῖν εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ.	17:19 Then **the disciples** came to *Jesus* **privately** *and said*, "*Why* **could we no cast it out**?" *He said to* **them**, "Because of your little faith. (Parable of faith the size of a mustard seed.) 17.19 Τότε προσελθόντες **οἱ μαθηταὶ** *τῷ Ἰησοῦ* **κατ' ἰδίαν** *εἶπον, Διὰ* **τί ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό**; 17.20 *ὁ δὲ λέγει* **αὐτοῖς**, Διὰ τὴν ὀλιγοπιστίαν ὑμῶν

Both Mark and Matthew have the disciples ask Jesus privately why they could not cast out the demon. Mark adds that this was done in a house. The two writers, however, give two very different and opposing answers: Mark removes blame from the disciples, and Matthew blames the disciples. It is unlikely that two such opposing viewpoints were both in the oral tradition. As will be discussed below, the parable of faith the size of a mustard seed seems to be added to the story by Matthew.[550] This calls into question the first part of the reply, which

[550] See below on page 253.

the parable explains. On the other hand, the criterion of embarrassment works here in Matthew's favour, since the criticism puts the disciples in a bad light. Jesus's comment at Matthew 17:17 must also apply to the disciples, who would have known that it was directed at them, and not the father, who is shown faithfully kneeling and calling Jesus "Lord." The disciples' question makes better sense in Mark: the disciples do not include themselves in Jesus's comment on faithlessness and consequently they need to ask why they could not heal the boy.

We shall now compare the various descriptions of the boy's symptoms caused by the spirit.[551]

[551] Items in bold and italics refer to items found in other descriptions by the same author.

Mark	Luke	Matthew
(9:17) he has **a spirit** that makes him ***unable to speak***; 9:18 and whenever it seizes him, it **dashes him down**; and he **foams** and grinds his teeth and becomes rigid;	9:39 Suddenly **a spirit** *seizes him*, and all at once ***he shrieks***. It *convulses him* until he **foams at the mouth**; it mauls him and will scarcely leave him.	(17:15) for he is an *epileptic* and he suffers **terribly**; he **often** *falls* **into the fire** and **often into the water**.
ἔχοντα **πνεῦμα *ἄλαλον*** 9.18 καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν αὐτὸν *καταλάβῃ* **ῥήσσει** αὐτόν, καὶ **ἀφρίζει** καὶ τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόν τας καὶ ξηραίνεται·	9.39 καὶ ἰδοὺ **πνεῦμα** *λαμβάνει* αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξαίφνης **κράζει** καὶ **σπαράσσει** αὐτὸν μετὰ **ἀφροῦ** καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ συντρῖβον αὐτόν·	ὅτι *σελῃνιάζεται* καὶ κακῶς πάσχει· **πολλάκις** γὰρ *πίπτει* **εἰς τὸ πῦρ** καὶ **πολλάκις εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ**.
(9:20) When the spirit saw him, immediately it **convulsed** the boy, and he *fell* on *the ground* and rolled about, **foaming at the mouth**.	(9:42) the *demon* **dashed him to** *the ground* in **convulsions**.	
καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν τὸ **πνεῦμα** εὐθὺς **συνεσπάραξεν** αὐτόν, καὶ *πεσὼν* ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκυλίετο **ἀφρίζων**.	9.42 *ἔρρηξεν* αὐτὸν τὸ *δαιμόνιον* καὶ **συνεσπάραξεν** .	
9:22 It has **often** *cast* him **into the fire** and **into the water**, to destroy him;		
καὶ **πολλάκις καὶ εἰς πῦρ** αὐτὸν *ἔβαλεν* **καὶ εἰς ὕδατα** ἵνα ἀπολέσῃ αὐτόν·		
9:25 "You spirit that keeps this boy ***from speaking*** and hearing"		
Τὸ **ἄλαλον** καὶ κωφὸν **πνεῦμα**,		
9:26 After **crying out** and **convulsing** him **terribly**,		
καὶ **κράξας** καὶ πολλὰ **σπαράξας**		

The above chart shows the freedom allowed in describing the condition of the boy. However, though the descriptions vary, they all say the same thing: the boy suffered from epileptic-like seizures. The cause can be referred to as either a spirit (Mark, Luke), or a demon (Luke, Matthew). The act of the boy going down is described variously as falling (Mark, Matthew), dashing (Mark, Luke), and casting (Mark). He can fall either on the ground (Luke, implied in Mark) or into water and fire (Mark, Matthew). The demon causes him to convulse (Mark,

Luke), roll on the ground (Mark), and go rigid (Mark).[552] Though a deaf mute, the demon can cause him to shriek or cry out.[553] All of these are the various symptoms of epilepsy, and it appears the storyteller can draw upon those that best suit her or his purposes.

The following chart reviews the results:[554]

Item	Essential	Additional	Variation allowed
Initial setting	Jesus with a couple of disciples return to a crowd after some time away	Crowd is a great crowd Disciples are arguing with scribes in the midst of a crowd	
Main character besides Jesus	Someone from the crowd		Person is specifically a man
Character makes a request	Person speaks to Jesus using formal title and makes a request concerning his son	Person comes forward and kneels "If you are able"	Title used in address: teacher or lord Terms used in request: I beg you, have mercy or pity
Nature of problem of son is described	Son is an epileptic		Can be described in a multitude of ways including possession by a spirit
Father then recounts that the boy was brought to the disciples	Son brought to disciples, but they could not cure him		Father begged disciples Disciples could not cast out spirit
Jesus responds with comment on faith	Jesus answered, "You faithless generation, how much longer must I be with you and put up with you?"	and perverse	Two sentences can be joined: How much longer must I be with you and put up with you? Put up with you/ bear with you
Jesus asks for boy to be brought forward	Bring him to me	Here	
Boy is brought		The boy is brought As they were bringing the boy	
Spirit convulses boy		Can be described in various ways	
Jesus converses with father		As found in Mark	

[552] This is not contradictory: epileptics can at times convulse and then go into a rigid straining.

[553] Again this is not a contradiction: deaf mutes can often make strained sounds. The ancients probably did not distinguish between mutes who could not speak and those who could not make a sound. Collins, *Mark*, 370, notes that in the ancient world deafness and muteness were closely related; for example Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 10.192) believed that all people born deaf were also mute. This is also conveyed in the ambiguity of the words Mark uses: κωφός can mean deaf, mute, or both (BAGD, s.v.), and μογιλάλος can mean either impeded speech or the inability to articulate (BAGD, s.v.).

[554] The items in brackets could be in more than one category.

Item	Essential	Additional	Variation allowed
Jesus exorcises the spirit	Jesus rebukes the spirit and it comes out	Spirit is unclean Words Jesus uses to perform exorcism The spirit convulses the boy Boy appears dead and Jesus raises the boy	Spirit/demon
Condition of boy	He is cured	Boy is given back to his father	Cured/healed Able to stand
Aftermath		Disciples ask Jesus in private why they could not cure the boy	

The above analysis produces a very short essential story:

> Jesus was away with a couple of disciples and they came to a crowd. Someone said, "Teacher, I have a son. He has a spirit that causes epilepsy. I asked your disciples for help, but they could not." Jesus answered, "You faithless generation, how much longer must I be with you? How much longer must I put up with you? Bring the boy." Jesus rebuked the spirit and it came out.

This is very similar to Matthew's version, because it is the shortest version. However, there is a strong possibility that Luke's and Matthew's versions have deleted what were essential elements in the oral tradition. We shall now look at the major differences between the three versions in more detail.

Lukan and Matthean Omissions or Markan Additions?

Luke and Matthew omit quite a large amount of material from Mark. The question is whether Mark is here adding to the oral tradition, or Luke and Matthew are deleting from the oral tradition. Some of this material can be attributed to Mark having five descriptions of the boy's condition. From the perspective of oral tradition, these are allowable additions because they do not change the plot line. However, it is unlikely that the average performance of the tradition would have included so many. Consequently, the fact that Luke has only two descriptions and Matthew only one does not really count as omissions just as Mark's extra descriptions are not really additions to the oral tradition.

Other deletions involve items that are repeated in Mark: there are two pronouncements on faith in Mark, the crowd runs twice, and there are two modes of healing (rebuke and being lifted up by the hand). Many have proposed that Mark has combined two stories, or that two stories were already combined in the tradition.[555] However, the differences go beyond

---

[555] The repetitive nature of Mark's account has prompted several scholars to propose that Mark has joined together two different stories. However, these authors did not entertain the possibility that Mark was using chiastic structuring. This in itself explains the repetitive nature of his story. Without insight into this method of structuring stories, it is not surprising that this story has been referred to as rambling and incoherent in its presentation (Meier, *Marginal*, 2:653). The best proposal is that of Achtemeier, who points out seven problems with the Markan version ("Miracles," 123); my counter arguments are in parentheses:

1) Two descriptions by the father of the condition. (This creates a chiastic parallel between the second and fourth chiasms. Achtemeier neglects to note that though there are only two descriptions by the father, there are actually five descriptions of what the demon does in Mark.)

repeated items, and the two-story theory does not explain why Luke and Matthew decided not to include this material in their gospels, especially as part of it includes a theological pronouncement by the LORD.[556] We shall now look at the three substantial omissions/additions: the disciples arguing with the scribes, Jesus's conversation with the father over faith, and the boy appearing to be dead.

We shall begin with the disciples arguing with the scribes, since this scene sets the tone for the rest of the story. There does not seem to be any particular reason for Mark to add this

---

2) Crowd is present and later assembles. (This creates a chiastic parallel between the first and fifth chiasms. The second coming of the crowd is best translated as the crowd closing in.)
3) Disciples have a key role at the beginning, but are then ignored until the end. (This creates a parallel between the first and fifth chiasms; it also creates a frame for the whole story. The disciples are also mentioned later by the father. Besides this, there is no particular reason why they should be mentioned in Jesus's conversation with the father and during the healing.)
4) Dumb spirit is later deaf and dumb. (This is adequately explained by the variety allowed in describing events in oral societies.)
5) There are two motifs for healing: help for father's belief and the crowd assembling. (One does not contradict the other. The crowd assembling creates a chiastic parallel between the first and fifth chiasms.)
6) Symptoms of illness have nothing to do with dumbness. (As mentioned above, dumbness and deafness were closely associated in the ancient world. A quick "Google" of deafness and epilepsy shows that deafness and epilepsy can be related. A protein has even been isolated that causes both: http://www.newsrx.com/article.php?articleID=853689).
7) The first description of the father (9:18) uses different vocabulary than the description of when the boy is brought forward (9:20). (This is adequately explained by the variety allowed in describing events in oral societies. There is also no record of a rule that says an individual author should always describe similar things with the same words.)

From these observations, Achtemeier proposes two original stories: 9:14–20 and 9:21–27. The main theme of the first would be the contrast of apprentices and master, and of the second, the paradox of unbelieving faith (124). Achtemeier then gives examples where Mark has elsewhere combined stories, but in each case Mark keeps the identity of each story separate (they are all Markan sandwiches). He concludes that the stories were thus likely combined before Mark received them. Achtemeier then proceeds to further disentangle the stories (126–27). Others who have proposed that Mark's version is based on two stories include Günther Bornkamm, "Pneuma Alalon," in *Gesammelte Aufsätze, Band V: Geschichte und Glaube, Zweiter Teil* (BEvT 53; München: Kaiser, 1971), 21–36; Bultmann, *History*, 211; Held, "Matthäus,"; Koch, *Bedeutung*, 115–21; René Latourelle, *The Miracles of Jesus and the Theology of Miracles* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 151. As with Achtemeier these scholars base their arguments on the repetitive nature of Mark's account. However, the repetitiveness is adequately explained by Mark's use of chiasm and Mark expanding out the tradition to create his sextuple chiasm.

[556] Some have proposed that Luke and Matthew are following a separate source, perhaps even a Q version. To begin there are several minor agreements: (κατ)ελθόντων (Luke 9:37, Matt 17:14), ἀνήρ/ἄνθρωπος (Luke 9:38, Matt 17:14), λέγων (Luke 9:38, Matt 17:15), ὅτι (Luke 9:38, Matt 17:15), ἠδυνήσθησαν/ὅτι ἠδυνάσθησαν (Luke 9:40, Matt 17:16) ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν (Luke 9:41, Matt 17:17), και διεστρμμένη (Luke 9:41, Matt 17:17), ὧδε (Luke 9:41, Matt 17:17), παῖς (Luke 9:42, Matt 17:18). It is hard to gauge the import of these agreements because on the one hand they are numerous, and on the other they are minor. According to the model used in this thesis of frequent communication it is likely that Matthew (the later gospel) knew Luke. There is still though the possibility that Luke and Matthew used a different oral tradition from Mark. However, there are still strong differences between the two stories. Besides the minor difference of Luke having two descriptions of what the spirit does and Matthew having one, the point of the two stories is different. In Matthew the emphasis is on the lack of faith of the disciples, and in Luke it is the lack of faith of the crowd and the greatness of God (cf. Achtemeier, "Miracles," 121). Also, the redactional tendencies of the two authors account for many of the differences between them and Mark (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 719). Matthew has a habit of drastically shortening Mark's stories, and Luke tends to omit doublets (Achtemeier, "Miracles," 121).

scene or for Luke and Matthew to delete it. Also, as will be discussed below, though a negative portrayal of the scribes is a common feature in Mark's gospel, such portrayals are also found in Luke and Matthew. From one perspective, the scene is not that necessary: the scribes quickly disappear from view and are subsumed into the crowd, and the precise nature of the argument is not fully explained, although the chiastic structure does give an indication of the nature of the argument. Consequently, Mark's story is not substantially changed without the scene.

The scene, however, does explain Jesus's negative attitude towards the crowd: Jesus is angry, because the crowd is being critical of his disciples.[557] In Luke and Matthew, Jesus's sudden anger does not really make sense. This is especially the case in Matthew, where Jesus's sharp rebuke comes after the man very respectfully requests a healing. It would appear that the rebuke is directed at the disciples. However, they do not realize that they are the subject of Jesus's invective and ask him why they could not perform the exorcism. It seems very unlike Jesus to suddenly turn on the disciples and call them faithless and perverse. But if Jesus viewed the crowd as not accepting his disciples, who are his envoys and consequently the envoys of God, then his anger makes sense. Consequently, it seems likely that this scene was in the oral tradition because both Luke and Matthew treat Jesus's condemnatory rebuke as an essential element.

Turning to the details of the scene, there are two suspect elements in this scene: the presence of the scribes and the crowd being overcome with extreme awe and running towards Jesus when they see him. To begin with the scribes, many scholars see their mention as suspect since arguments between Jesus and the scribes arguing with Jesus are common in Mark. Mark 9:14, the verse that mentions the scribes, is almost universally accepted as Markan redaction.[558] This is based not just on studies of Mark's style, but also on the historical likelihood of the situation as described by Mark. If the scribes are historically implausible, they were added to the tradition later, but not necessarily by Mark. However, if they are historically plausible, then it is unlikely that they are a later addition. As argued above, the scribes were local experts on the Torah and the interpretation of scripture. This would make them also authorities in regards to theology. If the discussion was over the theological reasons as to why the disciples could not exorcise the spirit, then it is plausible that the local scribes would be involved. Consequently the scribes arguing here and elsewhere in Mark could reflect a theme based on historical circumstance. While it is possible that Mark did add them here to give a negative tone to his telling of the story, it is also possible that they had a greater role in the oral tradition. For example, the oral tradition may have gone into detail as to what the argument was about. As it is, they are mentioned in an off-handed manor and become subsumed into the crowd, and it is only through chiasm and the father's reply that the nature of the dispute is implied.[559] In short, there is no strong

---

[557] Though the word Mark uses (συζητοῦντας) can simply mean to discuss or inquire together, it can also mean to dispute. With the crowd surrounding them, the impression is that the scribes were arguing rather than calmly dialoguing.

[558] So Moloney, *Mark*, 183.

[559] Gundry, *Mark*, 495, goes so far to say that Mark is not trying to set up a parallel with the other scenes in the gospel where Jesus is disputing with the scribes since he does not mention what the scribes said. While it is true Mark does not show any real interest in the scribes in this story, this conclusion does not follow. If the scribes were not originally in the tradition, then Mark's addition of them would be to make a parallel. Otherwise, why would he bother? If they were in the tradition, and Mark decided to keep this one mention of them, then it is also likely he is trying to make a parallel: if he did not want to make a parallel, he would not have mentioned

evidence to suggest either that Mark introduced them or that they were already in the tradition.

The crowd's reaction is not explained by their simply happening to see Jesus. [560] The only explanation is that there is something odd about Jesus's appearance. This points to the transfiguration, where not only did Jesus himself shine, but his clothes also became white. Mark could thus be indicating there was some sort of aftereffect.[561] If this is the case, then Mark is making a parallel with Moses coming down the mountain.[562] It is highly likely that it was Mark who joined the story of the PB to the transfiguration.[563] Consequently, this aspect of the story was unlikely to have been in the oral tradition. Also, the crowd is depicted by Mark as running towards Jesus, which is unexplained. Mark uses this to create a chiastic parallel with the crowd running together later in the story. It is more likely that the running was inserted here, rather than later, since there is no reason, besides the possibility that there was something strange about his appearance, for the crowd to run towards Jesus. To conclude, this scene was likely a part of the oral tradition (except for the awe and the running) since it explains Jesus's harsh reaction; however, it was not considered an essential element of the tradition.

The question remains as to why Luke and Matthew would not wish to use this scene. One reason could be that the scene is not an essential part of the story: the story is about Jesus healing a particularly difficult sickness via exorcism. It is also possible that they did not wish to portray the disciples negatively by having them cause a public disturbance. However, the disturbance is small, and Matthew makes the disciples almost completely faithless: they do not even have faith the size of a grain of mustard. In Matthew the deletion makes sense since it removes the negativity away from the crowd, so that it can be focused on the disciples. Luke, like Matthew, also makes the father more sympathetic: he adds that the boy is an only child. This along with his omission of the opening scene makes the situation less confrontational than in Mark. It also makes Jesus's sudden outburst incomprehensible. It thus remains unclear at this point why Luke and Matthew would wish to diminish the confrontation.

---

them at all. Because the structural style he uses is based on setting up parallels, he would remove parallels where they are not wanted. In other words, whether or not they were in the tradition, Mark would be well aware of the effect the mention of them would have, considering their portrayal elsewhere in his carefully crafted gospel. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:669, n. 34, argues that since the scribes are not mentioned again they were not likely part of the earliest tradition. However, they may have had a greater role in the tradition, and Mark may have kept the one reference in order to put the focus on faith and healing rather than opposition from the local authorities. That they are only mentioned here indicates that they are not important to Mark in regards to the point of the story. Since they are not important, there is not a strong argument for Mark adding them to the tradition.

[560] Mark uses the word ἐξεθαμβήθησαν. This word implies extreme awe (BAGD, s.v.; Culpepper, *Mark*, 302; Gundry, *Mark*, 487).

[561] So Gundry, *Mark*, 487, 495.

[562] So Culpepper, *Mark*, 302; Gnilka, *Markus*, 2:46; Grundmann, *Markus*, 188; Hooker, *Mark*, 222–23. Moloney, *Mark*, 183, n. 52, sees this reading as difficult, since in 9:8 nothing is mentioned about his appearance, which is also admitted by Hooker *Mark*, 222—23; cf. Lane, *Mark*, 330, n. 48. However, this argument from silence is not strong because a mention of his appearance still having a residue of glory would weaken the transfiguration chiasm: A1 Jesus and three go up mountain; B1 Jesus transfigured; C1 Elijah, Moses, Jesus; D1 Peter suggests making dwellings for the three; C2 for Jesus, Moses, Elijah (chiastic reversal of names); B2 voice from cloud; A2 three alone with Jesus and they go down mountain. 9:8 is part of A2, and glory is part of the B level theme.

[563] See above n. 547 on page 240.

The next omission/addition is the scene of Jesus's conversation with the father, which includes Jesus's statement that all is possible for those who believe and the father's plea for help. On the surface there is nothing objectionable about this scene: it affirms the common connection between faith and healing. However, this theme can become problematic if the healing is dependent on the faith of the petitioner and not on the will of Jesus: the power of the LORD Messiah is not shown to be absolute. Both Luke and Matthew seem to be aware of this problem. For example, in Mark we are told that in Nazareth, Jesus "could do no deed of power there" (6:5).[564] Here Jesus the LORD Messiah is *not able* to do any deeds of power because of the lack of faith. Matthew corrects this to "he did not do many deeds of power there, because of their unbelief" (13:58).[565] Here Jesus chooses not to do any deed of power. Luke's version is similar to Matthew in that Jesus implies he will not perform any miracles in Nazareth by giving the example of Elijah and Elisha who did none in Israel (4:24–27). Again, there is the impression that Jesus could perform a miracle if he wanted to.

In the PB Mark also gives the impression that it is up to the believer and not Jesus as to whether a deed of power can be done. Jesus responds, "If you are able! All things can be done for the one who believes." Jesus in the first sentence is repeating the father. The "you" is actually Jesus, and Jesus is thus saying "If I am able!" which in turn implies that the miracle's success has nothing to do with Jesus, but solely with the father and his level of belief: all things can be done for the father, if he believes.[566] Consequently, the father shouts out, "I believe; help my unbelief!" This statement also introduces a new problem because the father at the same time asserts belief and unbelief: it is unclear if he is deserving of a miracle. The second part of the father's statement is perhaps understood better not as the father saying he is totally without belief, but that he fears his belief is not great enough for the miracle occur. To some the question remains as to whether the father's faith "ultimately arose above its ambiguity."[567] However, the father still does affirm that he does believe, and the miracle is performed for him.[568]

By not recounting the scene, Luke and Matthew avoid these problems. In regards to the last, Matthew makes it very clear at the beginning of the miracle that the father believes by having him kneel and address Jesus as Lord. In the analysis of the HW and JD, we saw that Matthew is not adverse to changing or deleting theologically problematic scenes: the HW is not healed until Jesus says so, and the scene where Jesus does not know who touched him is deleted. Matthew also avoided Jesus's statement to Jairus to not fear and believe. In Matthew, Jesus is in complete control, and healings occur solely because he chooses to perform them. Naturally, he only performs them for those who believe. Consequently, there would be a strong desire on Matthew's part to delete this scene.

---

[564] καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἐκεῖ ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν.

[565] καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλὰς διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.

[566] So Collins, *Mark*, 438; Gundry, *Mark*, 490, 498–99; Gerd Petzke, "Die historische Frage nach den Wundertaten Jesus, dargestellt am Bespiel des Exorcismus Mark IX, 14–29," 22 (1975-76): 192; Roloff, *Kerygma*, 150–51. Some wish to argue that Jesus is the one who believes and for whom all things are possible (for example, Achtemeier, "Miracles," 128; Gerhard Barth, "Glaube und Zweifel in den Synoptischen Evangelien," 72 [1975]: 278–82; Kertelge, *Wunder*, 178; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:670, n. 37; Moloney, *Mark*, 184; Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:92). Barth and Pesch argue that since the father had just referred to Jesus's ability, then the ability must be Jesus's. However, this ignores Jesus's negative repetition of the father's statement; the father understands the statement to refer to him. As Gundry, *Mark*, 499, points out, if the statement refers to Jesus's faith, then the father's faith is unimportant.

[567] Achtemeier, "Miracles," 128. Achtemeier does not think the text indicates that he does.

[568] Gundry, *Mark*, 499.

It is unlikely that Mark or any other leader in the church would invent such a problematic scene in order to demonstrate the relationship between faith and healing, especially since the father's last line ("help my unbelief!") contradicts this relationship. If Mark were inventing the scene, he could easily have had the father say something along the lines of "I believe! Please help me!" Since Mark was a very astute theologian and teacher, he would have been very aware of the scene's problematic nature. There is thus good reason to think that Luke and Matthew deleted this scene for theological reasons. Also, by deleting these two scenes, they further reduce the confrontation found in Mark.

The final scene to discuss is the boy appearing to be dead. This scene in Mark is perhaps the most theologically problematic. It appears as if the boy died and was then raised by Jesus. This would mean that Jesus had failed in his battle with the demon: the demon is exorcised, but as it leaves it finally succeeds in destroying the boy; consequently it defeats Jesus. True, Mark leaves open the option that the boy was not dead: he is only *like* (ὡσει) a corpse. Though the people say that he is dead, this is not confirmed. However, this is counteracted by Mark's clear resurrection language and parallels to JD. At best Mark has left open the possibility that the boy is not dead. It is no wonder that Luke and Matthew would delete such a problematic scene. Matthew even goes so far to state that the boy was cured as soon as Jesus uttered the rebuke: "And Jesus rebuked the demon, and it came out of him, and the boy was cured instantly." Matthew does not even allow for the possibility of Mark's version.

It is possible that Mark invented this scene. But why would he invent such a problematic scene? If he was going to be so free with the tradition, he could have had the disciples fail at the exorcism and have had the demon kill the boy then. Jesus could then arrive and raise the boy. One could still have the discussion about faith. Consequently, according to the criterion of embarrassment it is highly probable that this scene was in the oral tradition. If anything, it is more likely that Mark downplayed the raising-of-the-dead aspect by saying the boy only looked like a corpse.

The conclusions drawn here would indicate that on the whole, Mark's version is most likely closer to the standard oral tradition than Luke's or Matthew's version. Luke's and Matthew's versions reduce confrontation and eliminate theologically problematic scenes. In the conclusion to this section where possible oral versions are reconstructed it will be argued that in the original oral version the confrontational aspect was stronger, which in turn would create another theological problem.[569]

Mark's and Matthew's Endings

The two endings provided by Mark and Matthew are quite different. In Mark the disciples are exonerated: it is not because of their lack of faith that they could not exorcise the demon, but rather because this exorcism also required prayer. In Matthew the blame is placed squarely on the shoulders of the disciples: it is their lack of faith that prevented the exorcism. In other words, in Mark the fault is with the petitioner, and in Matthew it is with the healer. There are consequently two opposed interpretations of the miracle.

Most commentators think that each ending was added to the tradition by its respective author. Some note in regards to Mark's ending, that Mark often has Jesus instructing the disciples in private. However, the question is not whether the theme is common in Mark, but whether it was common in the tradition he knew, and ultimately, in the life of Jesus. As

[569] See below on page 254.

Gundry points out, there is no evidence that Jesus and the disciples never engaged in private conversation or that they never stayed in people's houses.[570] In fact, the opposite is more plausible. It is likely that supporters who had houses would offer places to stay, as would people and the families of people who had been healed. It is also highly likely that Jesus, like most teachers, would also have instructed his students in private at times. This is even more likely in regards to his teaching on healing and exorcism.[571] As Jesus was instructing the disciples about exorcism, it is also likely that the disciples would enquire of him when they were unsuccessful. Consequently, it is highly likely that such items would be in the oral tradition and especially in a story where the disciples had failed to perform an exorcism. This is because the bearers and guardians of the tradition were initially the very disciples who had failed in the exorcism. Thus Mark's ending is not merely a literary device.

It is also argued that prayer does not seem to have a role in the story. However, as argued above, the father's calling out to Jesus to help with his faith can be seen as a prayer. That Jesus would teach the disciples that prayer was required here is also in accord with the rest of the tradition. Jesus is shown in prayer, and he speaks of concentrating the mind in prayer so that one imagines that the miracle has actually taken place (Mark 11:23–24). This focusing of the mind is a common technique in faith healers.[572] Prayer would thus also be a type of meditation where one focuses the mind. Jesus's comments on believing that the miracle has actually taken place also relate prayer to faith and explain the authority with which he heals: he speaks with such conviction since he believes the miracle has already taken place. Jesus would thus be saying that he relates his ability to heal with his ability to concentrate his mind. For those that have not yet learned to enter such a state of recollection at will, meditative prayer would be the answer. The use of prayer in the early church would consequently go back to Jesus.[573] There is thus no real reason to look for reasons as to why Mark might have added this ending: the item was in the tradition as it plausibly fits the original scenario of the story.[574]

---

[570] Gundry, *Mark*, 500–501.

[571] Since Jesus was training his disciples to help with his mission of preaching and healing (Mark 3:15, 6:7 and par.), one must assume his teaching included both aspects of the job. Naturally, the preaching/message part of this teaching dominates the tradition.

[572] For example, see Jess Byron Hollenback, *Mysticism: Experience, Response, and Empowerment* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996). Hollenback notes that recollection ("the procedure wherein the mystic learns to focus one-pointedly his or her mind, will, imagination, and emotions on some goal" [95]), is a key element common to all mystics, and that this produces an empowerment of the mind which is associated with paranormal manifestations (189–95; the focus of the whole book is about the relationship between recollection and empowerment). The mention of prayer at the end of the PB and in Mark 11:23–24 is probably best thought of in terms of recollection or concentrated meditation. Instruction in these types of techniques is best done in private.

[573] See above n. 534 on page 234.

[574] Commentators (for example, Meier, *Marginal*, 2:670, n. 41; Ludger Schenke, *Die Wundererzählungen des Markusevangeliums* [SBB 5; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974), 330–31] argue that Mark's ending seems tacked on and has no anchor or context in the story proper: there is no particular reason for the ending being in the story; Mark added it because he wished to further his theme of secret teaching to the disciples. This argument is based partly on the lack of prayer in the rest of the story and partly on the assumption that private teaching is something that Mark added to the tradition and was not in the tradition all along. Achtemeier, "Miracles," 122, argues that this ending was added so the story would fit the theme of instruction in the section 8:27–10:45. This is a more reasonable proposition; however, it is still working from the assumption that the Markan theme of Jesus alone with disciples is a Markan addition (ibid.). If Mark wished to change the story to focus on instruction, then why did he not add this theme throughout the story? There is no real reason to look for motives for Mark adding the ending because all three gospels present the disciples as failing in the

The same cannot be said for Matthew's ending which seems to be borrowed from elsewhere in Mark. The saying about faith moving mountains, without mention of the mustard seed, is found in Mark 11:23–24 and Matthew 21:21–22 in the story of the fig tree. In Luke yet another version is found, this time not with the mustard seed, but with a mulberry tree moved instead of a mountain (17:6). The mountain referred to in Mark is the Temple Mount, and the story of the fig tree sandwiches the cleansing of the temple: the temple will be destroyed just as the fig tree is destroyed. The saying continues this theme. Consequently, the Lukan version would appear to be the more original, and it is likely Mark has adapted it for his use in this particular place in his gospel. Matthew follows Mark and keeps the sequence of the cleansing and the fig tree. He consequently follows Mark's version of the saying. He then seems to have combined it with the Q version of the saying found in Luke and added it to the end of his version of the PB.[575]

Matthew, in moving the saying, subtly changes its focus. In the story of the fig tree, the saying is an example of what can be accomplished with faith. It is thus very positive. The same is true in Luke, where it comes right after the disciples ask Jesus to increase their faith, and Jesus says, "If you have faith like a mustard seed you would have said to this mulberry tree, 'be uprooted and be planted in the sea' and it would have obeyed you."[576] Jesus does not seem to be saying that the disciples do not even have faith the size of a mustard seed, but rather that they do not need more faith, since the faith they have, small as it may be, is enough to uproot trees. Consequently, they do not need more faith. However, in Matthew the phrase becomes condemnatory: if they had faith even the size of a mustard seed, they would have been able to cure the boy.[577] The saying in Matthew would thus seem to have been moved to deflect blame away from the father and the crowd for the failed healing, and put it on the disciples.

The Probable Shape of the Oral Tradition

According to initial oral analysis, the minimal essential story is as follows:

> Jesus was away and he came to a crowd. Someone said, "Teacher, I have a son. He has a spirit that causes epilepsy. I asked your disciples for help, but they could not." Jesus answered, "You faithless generation, how much longer must I be with you? How much longer must I put up with you? Bring the boy." Jesus rebuked the spirit and it came out.

Such an abrupt version was probably hardly ever recounted in the oral tradition. Even the minimalist Matthew adds a few details. This bare essential story also assumes that all of the Markan material omitted by Luke and Matthew was not considered essential in the usual oral

---

exorcism, and as just argued, it would be natural that they would ask their teacher in exorcism why they failed. Jesus suggesting that prayer is necessary is consistent with his discussion of prayer elsewhere in the gospel. The context for this ending is found within the story.

[575] So Achtemeier, "Miracles," 120; Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 407. Luz, ibid, n. 17, notes that to "move mountains" was a proverbial saying of the time. Q scholars likewise favour Luke's version over Matthew's and see Matthew combining Q and Mark; see, for example, Robinson, et al., *Q*, 496–97.

[576] Translation following Greek word order. Greek is:
Εἰ ἔχετε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐλέγετε
ἂν τῇ συκαμίνῳ [ταύτῃ], Ἐκριζώθητι καὶ φυτεύθητι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· καὶ ὑπήκουσεν ἂν ὑμῖν.

[577] Davies and Allison, *Matthew,* similarly note that the saying by itself is a call for faith, that is, not a condemnation.

performance of the story. This is unlikely to have been the case. However, it is also unlikely that an oral performance would have been quite as drawn out and repetitive as that presented by Mark. The normal oral telling would have likely been somewhere in between.

To create his sis chiasm structure Mark likely had to divide and spread out the tradition. One place where this seems likely is the conversation with the father. In this scene Jesus asks the father how long the boy has been suffering. This line is likely a Markan addition since it creates a parallel with Jesus's "How long must I be with you?" It is also unusual as this is the only time in the tradition that Jesus makes such an enquiry.[578] The father's reply to Jesus's question—his second description of the boy's illness—brings the number of descriptions of the illness to three. However, unlike the previous two descriptions the third one is quite different. The father proceeds to ask Jesus if he can help him. In Luke and Matthew the request of the father is earlier in the story; it accompanies the first description of the illness.

Mark could have divided the initial description and request into two. The father begins his request, "If you are able," because he had already said that the disciples were unable to help. The combined scenes without Jesus's question, would then have run as follows, using Mark's language and the NRSV translation:

> 9:17 Someone from the crowd answered him, "Teacher, I brought you my son; he has a spirit that makes him unable to speak; 9:18 and whenever it seizes him, it dashes him down; and he foams and grinds his teeth and becomes rigid; 9:22 *It has often cast him into the fire and into the water, to destroy him* 9:18 (cont) and I asked your disciples to cast it out, but they could not do so." 9:22 (cont) *But if you are able to do anything, have pity on us and help us."*

The material falls into place without any repetition or necessary change. The result also adds to the confrontational nature of the scene: the father is clearly challenging Jesus. This arrangement consequently makes Jesus's reaction to the father more understandable.

This leaves Jesus's two rebukes concerning faith. Jesus's response, "If you are able," would have to follow the father's challenging request. On the other hand, the remainder of this statement ("All things can be done for the one who believes") naturally precedes the father's, "I believe." This would mean this rebuke would have to be divided. The result would be:

> 9:23 *Jesus said to him, "If you are able!* 9:19 You faithless generation, how much longer must I be among you? How much longer must I put up with you? 9:23 (cont) *All things can be done for the one who believes."* 9:24 *Immediately the father of the child cried out, "I believe; help my unbelief!"*

Again the material falls into place seamlessly without any repetition or necessary changes. As with the father's speech, the confrontational nature of material is stronger.

One item, though, has been omitted. In Mark and Luke Jesus asks for the boy to be brought forward. This would occur after the above exchange. Also, there is still the problem of Mark's statement, "When he saw that a crowd came running together . . ." As argued above, this is better translated as, "When he saw the crowd closing in . . ." No matter which translation, a causal relationship is made between Jesus seeing the crowd and the following action. There is a sense of Jesus responding to intimidation that is not becoming of the LORD Messiah. The criterion of embarrassment consequently would indicate that this was in

[578] Collins, *Mark*, 438, notes that the question is anticlimactic.

the original version: it is unlikely that Mark would invent such a problematic situation. It is more likely, if anything, that Mark is downplaying the intimidation aspect by his odd choice of words. The odd choice of words also allows greater freedom in creating a chiastic parallel when Jesus first arrives to the crowd: Mark could then add that the crowd ran toward Jesus there.[579] This would mean that the story would then proceed, "When Jesus saw the crowd closing in, he said, 'Bring him to me.'" At this point the boy would be brought forward, with perhaps a description of the demon convulsing the boy. Jesus would then perform the exorcism, which would result in the boy seeming dead, and then Jesus would revive him.[580]

This still leaves the question as to why the crowd would close in, and why Mark with his spreading out of the material, and Luke and Matthew by their omitting material, would wish to downplay the confrontational aspect of the story. It is likely that the theology of relating the faith of the victim with the outcome of the miracle was becoming problematic, not only because it seemed to limit Jesus's power, but also because it blamed the victim. This "blame the victim" theology would also explain the antagonistic attitude of the crowd. For example, by following their teacher's theology of relating the faith of the victim with the success of the healing, the disciples would have said that the unsuccessful exorcism was not their fault, but the fault of the father and his lack of faith. This would most likely not have been well received by the father, especially if he viewed himself as an upright observer of the Torah, that is, a man of faith. One can also imagine that the onlookers would not be pleased with the point of view of the disciples either. Jesus then arrives, and the father relates the terrible suffering of his son and asks politely (though challengingly) for Jesus to help if he is able. Jesus then severely upbraids the man for his lack of faith. The crowd aggressively closing in would then be quite understandable.

The "blame the victim" theology can only continue if the faith of the victim can successfully be questioned. In Mark's version this is successfully done: the faith of the father is ambiguous, and it is only by pleading to Jesus for help with his faith that it seems to rise to the needed level. This theology would not work in the early church unless every faithful person was successfully healed. This does not seem to have been the case. Rather, the focus would move to the ability of the healer, which we find in Matthew.[581] The explanation as to why healers could not perform is that their faith is not good enough, or rather, that their faith is not like the perfect faith of LORD Messiah on earth.

In short, this theology would become an embarrassment for the church, and this would explain why Luke and Matthew almost completely eliminate this aspect of Mark's story and at the same time make the story less confrontational. However, in doing so, they make Jesus's outburst less understandable. In Luke it is not clear at all against whom it is directed, and in Matthew it becomes directed at the disciples. Consequently, using the criterion of embarrassment, it is likely that the extra Markan material was part of the oral version, and because it is essential to the story making sense, it was likely a core element of the oral tradition.

---

[579] It was argued above that the crowd being overcome with awe and running towards Jesus was likely the product of Mark. See above on page 249.

[580] On the boy being dead being in the tradition see above on page 251.

[581] The scenario of this saying is also attributed to the inability of the Matthean communities to always perform miracles by Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 409; Jean Zumstein, *La condition du croyant dans l'évangile selon Matthieu* (OBO 16; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 439. They point out that the response of Jesus in Mark gives a similar impression: if prayer is required then it implies that not all healings are successful.

The following chart summarizes the conclusions from the oral analysis. The items in parentheses (excluding those that indicate author) could be either essential or additional. As discussed above, much of the omitted Markan material was likely in the oral tradition. It was most likely considered essential since it makes the story more understandable. This material also includes theological statements by Jesus. Finally, the raising-of-the-dead aspect of the story was also likely a key element: it showed Jesus performing the function of the LORD Messiah.

Item	Essential	Additional	Word Variations
1) Initial circumstances	Jesus was returning	With three	
2) Arrival Mark 9:14–16 Luke 9:37 Matt 17:14a	When he came to a crowd arguing with disciples Jesus asked them why they were arguing with them	On the next day (Luke) Great (crowd) (Mark and Luke) Crowd comes to Jesus (Mark and Luke) Crowd overcome with awe when they see Jesus (Mark) Scribes arguing (Mark)[582]	When they came Runs (Mark) Met (Luke)
3) Someone speaks from the crowd Mark 9.17a Luke 9:38a Matt 17:14b–17:15a	Someone said	From the crowd (Mark and Luke) A man comes and kneels before Jesus (Matt)	Answered him (Mark) Shouted (Luke)
4) Person's initial words Mark 9:17b Luke 9:38b–c Matt 17:15a	Teacher I have a son	He is my only child (Luke)	Lord (Matt) I brought you (Mark) I beg you to look at (Luke) have mercy on (Matt)
5) Condition described[583] Mark 9:17c–18c Luke 9:39 Matt 17:15b–c	He has a spirit that convulses him		Seizes him, shrieks, cries out, throws him to the ground, falls, dashes him, rolls around, mauls him, on ground, on fire, into water, foams, grinds teeth, mute, deaf, epileptic.[584]
6) Father says he had asked disciples for help Mark 9:18d Luke 9:40 Matt 17:16	I asked your disciples to cast it out, but they could not.	Cure him (Matt)	I begged (Luke) I brought him to your disciples (Matt)

[582] This item may have been in most performances; it is hard to tell without other versions to compare with.
[583] See above on page 243 for a chart that compares all the descriptions of the condition caused by the spirit.
[584] This material can be considered both variable and/or additional.

Item	Essential	Additional	Word Variations
7) Father asks Jesus for help Mark 9:22b (Luke 9:38b) (Matt 17:15a)	But if you are able to do anything have pity		have pity on us and help us. (Mark) I beg you to look at my son (Luke) Lord, have mercy on my son (Matt)
8) Jesus' response Mark 9:19, 23 Luke 9:41 Matt 17:17	Jesus answered, "If you are able! You faithless generation, how much longer must I be with you? How much longer must I put up with you? All things can be done for the one who believes."	And perverse (Luke and Matt)	He answered (Mark) And bear with you? (Luke)
9) Father's response Mark 9:24 Luke and Matt: not present	The father of the child cried out, "I believe; Help my unbelief!"	Immediately[585]	
10) Jesus sees crowd closing in Mark 9:25		Jesus saw that the crowd was closing in	
11) Arrival of Son Mark 9:19–20 Luke 9:42 Matt: 17:16, actual arrival is assumed	Jesus said, "Bring him to me." They brought the boy.	When, description of an attack (see number five above)	Here (Luke and Matt) to him (Mark) When the spirit saw him, (Mark) While he was coming (Luke)
12) Jesus rebukes the spirit Mark 9:25 Luke 9:42 Matt 17:18a See also chart on description of what spirit does.	Jesus rebuked the spirit	Unclean (Mark, Luke) . . . saying to it, "You spirit that (description of what the spirit does: see number five above), I command you, come out of him, and never enter him again!" (Mark)	Demon (Matt)
13) Result Mark 9:26–27 Luke 9:42 Matt 17:18	The boy was like a corpse so that most of them said, "He is dead." But Jesus lifted him up and the boy was cured	And it came out Description of what the spirit does (see number 5 above) Of him (Matt) And gave him back to the father (Luke)	Healed the boy (Luke) And he was able to stand (Mark) The boy was cured instantly (Matt)

[585] "Immediately" is typically Markan.

Item	Essential	Additional	Word Variations
14) Reaction to healing Luke 9:43		And all were astounded at the greatness of God	
15) Disciples ask Jesus why they could not heal boy Mark 9:28 Matt 17:19	(The disciples said to Jesus privately, "Why could we not cast it out?") (Mark and Matt)[586]	(The disciples said to Jesus privately, "Why could we not cast it out?") (Mark and Matt) When he had entered the house (Mark) came to Jesus (Matt)	asked him (Mark)
19. Jesus's reply to the disciples Mark 9:29 Matt 17:20	(He said to them,) (Mark and Matt) ("This kind can only come out through prayer") (Mark)[587]	(He said to them,) (Mark and Matt) ("This kind can only come out through prayer") (Mark) "Because of your little faith. For truly I tell you, if you have the faith the size of a mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, 'Move from here to there,' and it will move; and nothing will be impossible for you." (Matt)	

There were likely other additional elements in the oral version. For example, the oral version may have explained where Jesus was, the nature of the argument with the crowd, and what, in detail, Jesus said to the disciples afterwards.

If it is correct that the theme of confrontation was considered an essential theme in the oral tradition and the story was used as a raising-of-the-dead story, then the essential story may have gone as follows:

> Jesus was returning, when he saw a crowd arguing with the disciples. Jesus asked why they were arguing with them. A man answered, "I have a son who has a spirit that causes him to (description of various items), and I brought him to your disciples, but they could not heal him. If you are able, have pity on us. Jesus replied, "If you are able! You faithless generation, how much longer must I be with you? How much longer must I put up with you? All things are possible for the one who believes." The father cried out, "I believe; help my unbelief!" The crowd started to close in, and Jesus said, "Bring the boy to me." The boy was brought. Jesus rebuked the spirit, and the spirit came out. The boy was like a corpse and the people said he was dead. But Jesus took him by the hand and lifted him up, and the boy was cured.

This is a much more substantial story than the one without the confrontational and the raising-of-the-dead elements. It is also much closer to Mark's version.

The approach taken here, namely, looking at the gospel traditions as primarily oral in nature, is quite different from the approach of historical criticism based on redaction criticism. The traditional approach tends to view the base traditions as written, and

[586] This item could be either essential or additional.
[587] This item could be either essential or additional.

consequently repetition is seen as the product of using two written sources.[588] In oral criticism, repetition can be seen as allowable variation. Instead of using two different written versions, Mark in this story can be seen as expanding on the oral tradition in an allowable manner. In doing so he was able to create a sextuple chiasm structure for his version. The approach taken here is also more in keeping with the model of a predominantly oral society where important traditions to the community are tightly controlled. The traditional approach, on the other hand, works from a perspective where the gospel authors could change a story at will or combine two different stories into one story, that is, where little control is exerted over the tradition.

It is true that Luke and Matthew radically change the story. However, they keep the central elements: in an oral society omitting elements is more acceptable than adding elements, especially ones that change the nature of the story. Matthew, by adding the saying of the mustard seed, was most likely coming close to doing something unacceptable. Luke and Matthew both come close to presenting versions which give the absolute minimum required for the story. Mark, on the other hand expands the tradition, but in an allowable manner. In the first part of the story there is actually not a lot of difference between Mark's version and the other two. His arrival is more descriptive, and he tells us that people were arguing with the disciples. This last can be looked as expanding on the theme of their failure, an item found in both Luke and Matthew. As mentioned above, the oral tradition most likely contained the exact reason for the dispute. Mark's multiple descriptions of what the demon does do not change the story in any way: they simply supply more details on the nature of the problem. The description of the boy's problem was likely one area where the storyteller had complete freedom. Finally, the discussion with the father about faith is part of Jesus's criticisms of those present. It is only in the part where the boy appears dead that there is a major difference between Mark and the other two authors. This item changes the focus of the story: it is not just about an extraordinary healer, but about someone who can also raise people from the dead. This supplies another reason why it is unlikely that this element was added to the tradition by Mark.

To conclude, Matthew and Luke gave minimal versions of the story to avoid the theological complications of the full version: the performance of miracles being dependent on the faith of the sick person or the petitioner, Jesus performing the miracle because the crowd closed in, and the demon succeeding by killing the boy. These eliminations are not without problems themselves. By eliminating reference to the miracle being dependent on the father's and the crowd's faith, Jesus's outburst becomes unexplained. Matthew, aware of this directs the statement towards the disciples, which creates a situation unique in the gospels. By eliminating reference to the boy dying, the transfiguration chiasm is weakened, and Jesus is not shown to be able to give the promised life to those who lose life.

Mark, on the other hand, seems to both expand and contract the tradition. He expands by providing multiple descriptions of the spirit and by dividing up Jesus's comments on faith; he contracts by only implying the substance of the crowd's argument with the disciples. He also seems to have reduced the sense of confrontation between the disciples and Jesus on the one hand, and the father and the crowd on the other. These only become clear through his chiastic structuring of the story.

We shall now turn to the historical analysis.

---

[588] For example, Achtemeier, "Miracles," 123–25; Held, "Matthäus," 177.

Historical Analysis

We shall now look at the historical plausibility of each of the elements of the reconstructed oral version.

1) The initial circumstances: Jesus is away.
    a. Jesus's absence from the disciples is an integral part of the story: since he was away, the father had to ask the disciples to cure his boy. Jesus is often presented as taking breaks from his missionary activity, though this is usually with the disciples.[589] On a couple of occasions, however, he is presented as spending time by himself: he goes to pray by himself outside of Capernaum (Mark 1:35, Luke 4:42), he sends the twelve off to preach on their own (Mark 6:12, Luke 9:6), and he sends the disciples ahead by boat (Mark 6:45, Matt 14:22). Jesus's absence is, thus, consistent with the rest of the Jesus tradition.
    b. That he was away with the three is also highly plausible. Since the three were his closest disciples, if Jesus were to take anyone, it would likely be these three. However, the textual variants, which present the action in the singular rather than the plural number, point to Jesus being away by himself.[590]
    c. It is unlikely that the events of the transfiguration precede the events of the PB.[591] The presence of crowds who knew Jesus, of scribes, and of the disciples waiting at some base (the house) all point to Galilee.[592]
2) Jesus and the three return to a crowd arguing with the disciples, and the crowd comes toward Jesus.
    a. That a crowd gathered with the waiting disciples makes sense, since Jesus was a known healer and a reputed man of God. Sickness was prevalent in the ancient world, and successful cures hard to find. Consequently, people would seek Jesus out, and if he were away they would rightly conclude that he would return to where his disciples were. This detail may be evidence that the location was one of Jesus's known bases of operation such as, for example, Capernaum.[593]
    b. If the dispute was about the relationship between the success of a healing and the faith of the victim or petitioner, then confrontation is plausible.[594] Since this would be a theological matter, it is also plausible that the local scribes would get involved. This would agree with other evidence that scribes regularly engaged Jesus in discussion.[595]

---

[589] For example, he goes to Syrophoenicia (Mark 7:24, Matt 15:21), the country of the Gerasenes (Mark 5:21, Luke 8:26), and to deserted places (Mark, 9:2 and par., Mark 6:31).
[590] See above n. 546 on page 240.
[591] See above n. 547 on page 240.
[592] So, for example, Achtemeier, "Miracles," 121–22.
[593] It is of note that though Capernaum appears to be Jesus's hometown at the beginning of the mission and is compared favourably with Nazareth, later the town does not seem as responsive to Jesus and his message: "And you, Capernaum will you be exalted to heaven? No you will be brought down to Hades. For if the deeds of power done in you had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day." (Matt 11:20, first part par. to Luke 10:15). This Q tradition speaks of a an initially successful mission (the multiple deeds of power) becoming unsuccessful in Capernaum. It is possible that the PB gives an example of the mission becoming unsuccessful.
[594] See above on page 254.
[595] See above on page 233.

c. That the crowd would go to Jesus when they saw him is also plausible: they had gathered there to meet him. However, that they were struck with awe and ran towards him seems to be a Markan addition.[596]

3) Jesus asks about the argument and the father replies.
   a. Jesus would naturally be curious as to why people were arguing with his disciples. His interest would be twofold: protection of his protégés and concern that his students were not doing anything wrong.
   b. If the dispute were over the failed healing, then it is appropriate that the father would respond, and not the scribes, since it concerned his son.[597] Also, if it were over the reason for why the healing failed, it would be the father's faith that was being questioned.
   c. The father responding from the crowd (Mark and Luke) makes sense, because he would have initially been in the centre of the crowd when Jesus arrived. In Luke a distance is implied, since the father shouts. Matthew's description of the father coming forward and kneeling and calling Jesus "Lord" speaks of a later christological understanding.[598]

4) The father's response.
   a. It is natural that the father would bring his sick son to a known healer and ask the disciples of Jesus if they could do something when he found Jesus absent, especially since the disciples are presented in the gospels as going out and healing (Mark 6:6–13, and par.).
   b. The various descriptions of the boy's condition in all three gospels are consistent with epilepsy and the way it was understood in the ancient world.[599] This condition serves no theological purpose. The one suspect element is the mention of spirit throwing the boy into fire and waters, since this detail recalls the fires of Gehenna and the judgement on the Day. Luke also adds that the son is an only son (9:38). This is likely a Lukan addition to the story, because it connects this story to JD (8:42) and the WNS (7:12).[600] That Jairus only has one daughter is also unique to Luke.
   c. Mark's "if you are able" in the father's request for healing makes sense in the context of the story: the disciples were not able to cure the boy, so the father wonders if Jesus would be able. It is possible that this was added to the tradition to make the father seem undeserving of the healing because of his lack of faith. However, the indication is that the tradition moved away from blaming the father and to exonerating the father as in Matthew. Also, this statement makes Jesus's response understandable. If this statement were added, it would imply that the whole faith sequence was also a later addition. Because the faith theme is central to the story—it is the basis for the dispute, the reason for disciples' failure, Jesus's response, and the negative attitude of the crowd—the addition of this statement to the father's request would mean that almost all of the story was invented.

---

[596] See above on page 249.
[597] So Gundry, *Mark*, 496.
[598] See above on page 241, and n. 541 on page 238.
[599] See above on page 244.
[600] See above on page 227.

d. On the other hand, the lack of faith in Jesus's abilities would mean that the father is not deserving of any healing according to the theological perspective of Jesus as presented in the gospel tradition. Since the boy is eventually healed, this aspect of the story is unlikely to have been invented.

5) Jesus's response.
   a. As argued above, Jesus's harsh response makes sense in the confrontational atmosphere presented by Mark. This aspect of confrontation was likely stronger in the oral tradition.[601]
   b. Jesus's words are consistent with his theology as presented elsewhere in the gospels.[602]
   c. Some have argued that Jesus's statement about how long he must be with the crowd and put up with them is a Markan addition because it has christological implications.[603] However, this phrase was a regular open-ended question expressing exasperation.[604] Consequently, the statement may not have issued from a christological perspective even though Christians could read it as such.[605]
   d. Jesus's comments on the generation being faithless and perverse may echo Deuteronomy 32:20:[606] "I will hide my face from them, I will see what their end will be; for they are a perverse generation, children in whom there is no faithfulness." However, in Mark the parallel is very weak: in Mark it is just a "faithless generation," whereas the passage in Deuteronomy is about idolatry. It is likely the variant "and perverse" was added to the tradition to make the connection.

6) The father's cry for help.
   a. The father's plea expresses both belief and unbelief. This goes against the tradition where only the faithful are deserving of healing. Consequently it is unlikely to have been invented.
   b. That the father would blurt this out also makes sense from a psychological perspective: the father realizes that his slightly antagonistic, or perhaps even fully antagonistic, attitude is not working, and he is about to lose his opportunity to have the healer cure his son. He thus desperately shouts out that he believes, but in his desperation uses a very poor choice of words to ask for help with his faith.

---

[601] See above on page 254.

[602] Jesus referring to the people as a "generation" in condemnatory sense is found at Mark 8:12/Matt 16:4, Mark 8:38, Luke 7:31/Matt 11:17, Luke 11:29–32/Matt 12:39–45, Luke 11:50–51/Matt 18:35–36, Luke 17:22, and Luke 20:51/Matt 23:36. The term is used with condemnation at Mark 13:30/Luke 21:35/Matt 24:34.

[603] For example, Koch, *Bedeutung*, 122.

[604] So Gundry, *Mark*, 497. Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:90, supplies the following list of references: 1 Sam 1:14, 16:1; 2 Sam 2:26; 1 Kgs 18:21; Job 9:2, Pss 4:3, 6:4, 74:10, 79:5, 80:5, 82:2, 89:47, 94:3; Prov 1:22; Jer 4:14, 21, 12:4, 23:26, 31:2.

[605] Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 408, points out that in Matthew the theme of Jesus being with the people of God is particularly strong: at the beginning (1:23) Jesus is associated with the prophecy concerning Immanuel because Immanuel means god with us (Μεθ' ἡῶν), and at the end (28:20) Jesus says he will always be with his followers (μεθ' ὑμῶν). Jesus's threat of withdrawal would then be identical with God's. So also Hubert Frankemölle, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi: Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte des Evangeliums nach Matthäus* (NTAp 10; Münster: Aschendorff, 1974), 26.

[606] Other suggestions are Deut 32:5: "a perverse and crooked generation." On this see Collins, *Mark*, 437.

7) The crowd closing in and Jesus asking for the child to be brought forward.
    a. The crowd closing in is plausible if the dispute were over the faith of the victim, which seems likely. It is also makes sense that the crowd would be upset at being called faithless and perhaps perverse. The scenario is consequently highly plausible in regards to human nature.
    b. Jesus, perhaps responding to the father's desperate plea or because the crowd closing in, decides to perform the miracle. Either option makes sense: Jesus is generally presented as being highly sympathetic to the downtrodden, and he is likely to have been aware of the dangers of a crowd. Fear of the crowd would also be supported by the criterion of embarrassment.[607]
8) The son arrives and has a convulsion.
    a. When the son is brought forward in Mark and Luke, he has an attack. This is plausible since epileptic attacks can be brought on by stress, and being brought forward in the midst of a likely angry throng to a famous teacher would be stressful.[608]
9) Jesus rebukes the spirit.
    a. In his performance of miracles Jesus is often presented as either commanding authoritatively or rebuking.[609] Thus, this item is consistent with the rest of the tradition. While this aspect of the story may be due to the desire to show Jesus as the LORD Messiah who commands and it is so, it is likely based on the manner of the historical Jesus.[610]
    b. In Mark, Jesus's command to the spirit includes a description of its action. This is suspect because it creates a chiastic parallel. On the other hand, Jesus is hereby naming the spirit, and in the ancient world to name something was to gain power over it. Also, Jesus commanding the spirit not to re-enter is similar to an account in Josephus regarding an exorcism by a certain Eleazar.[611] This passage in Mark may thus give an example of precisely how Jesus rebuked demons.[612]
    c. Mark then gives further description of the spirit convulsing the boy. This is most likely for dramatic effect and to create a chiastic parallel, since the boy was already convulsing when he was brought forward. The impression given in Mark that this is a new attack does not quite make sense.
10) The boy appears dead.

---

[607] See above on page 254.

[608] On stress causing attacks in epileptics see http://www.epilepsy.org.uk/info/stress.html. Doing a web search with "epilepsy stress" produces a variety of web pages on the subject.

[609] Rebuking: Mark 1:23/Luke 4:35 (demoniac in Capernaum Synagogue), Luke 4:41 (general description of exorcism, cf. Mark 3:11), Mark 4:39/Luke 8:24/Matt 8:26 (rebuking sea and wind). Speaking with authority: Mark 1:27/Luke 4:36 (comments of crowd after healing demoniac in Capernaum), Mark 1:42/Luke 5:13/Matt 8:3 (commanding leprosy be gone), Mark 2:11/Luke 5:24/Matt 9:6 (commanding paralytic to stand)

[610] This is in accordance with his comments on prayer and healing: "whatever you ask for in prayer, believe that you have received it, and it will be yours" (Mark 11:24). This implies that Jesus imagined that what he desired actually happened when he performed his miracles, which in turn implies that he did his miracles in utter confidence. Jesus's authority is linked to his theology on the connection between faith and miracles.

[611] *Ant.* 8.2.5, ch. 47. On this see Collins, *Mark*, 439.

[612] The only other instance where we have Jesus's words in rebuking a demon are: "Be silent, and come out of him!" (Mark 1:25/Luke 4:36: demoniac in Capernaum). In his rebuking of the sea and wind Jesus's words are also given: "Peace! Be Still!" (Mark 4:39).

a. As already discussed, this item presents serious theological problems.[613] The criterion of embarrassment makes it very unlikely that this would be invented as it implies the spirit finally succeeds in destroying the boy.
b. The crowd's response is natural if the boy appeared dead: they would comment on it.

11) Jesus raises the boy.
a. Though this element has resurrection symbolism, it is likely that Jesus, the healer, would look at the boy to make sure he was alright. If he was, then it is not unlikely that he would have lifted him off the ground.
b. This action in Mark implies that the boy was healed, which is stated explicitly in Luke and Matthew. There is no way of judging whether the boy was actually healed; however, if he was not perceived to have been healed, the story is unlikely to have entered or remained in the oral tradition.
c. Luke adds that Jesus gave the boy back to the father, which is highly plausible: it is unlikely that Jesus kept the boy. This handing over adds to the impression that Jesus physically had hold of the boy.

12) Reaction of the crowd to the healing.
a. This is found only in Luke. It is typical of healing stories to have those present be amazed at the healing. This could be secondary stereotyping,[614] but it is also the natural reaction of people in the presence of something perceived to be out of the ordinary. Such an element is likely to have been part of the oral tradition. Mark likely omitted it because it did not fit his chiastic agenda.[615]

13) The disciples ask why they could not heal the boy.
a. This is highly plausible.[616]

14) The disciples talk to Jesus in private.
a. As discussed, it is plausible that the disciples talked to Jesus in private in a house.[617]
b. It could be argued that at this point in the story one would expect an acclamation scene and that Mark has replaced such a scene with his ending. While acclamation scenes are common, they are not found in all miracle stories.[618] It should also be remembered that the characteristics of miracle stories documented by scholars such as Theissen[619] are descriptive and should not be seen as a prescriptive recipe that was used by storytellers.

15) The response of Jesus.
a. The responses in Matthew and Mark are different and have already been discussed.[620] Mark's version is to be preferred. It concurs with other

---

[613] See above on page 251.
[614] So Gundry, *Mark*, 501.
[615] Also, Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:94, points out that in Mark the crowd's saying that the boy is dead parodies the usual acclamation one would find at that place in a miracle story. Mark would then be playing with the audiences expectations by providing the opposite: instead of the usual success, there is apparent failure.
[616] See above on page 252.
[617] See above on page 252.
[618] So Gundry, *Mark*, 501.
[619] Theissen, *Miracle*.
[620] See above on page 251.

> statements from Jesus about prayer and miracles; for example: "So I tell you, whatever you ask for in prayer, believe that you have received it, and it will be yours" (Mark 11:24 and par.).

In addition, there are various Semitisms in the Markan version that point to an Aramaic original.[621] These are fairly numerous, and though they are concentrated in 17:18 and 17:24–26, they add to the plausibility that the story was initially a historical event.

To conclude, the criterion of embarrassment makes it highly unlikely that anyone would invent such a theologically problematic story. The criterion of embarrassment also makes it highly likely that the raising-of-the-dead aspect was in the story from the beginning as well. This supplies the reason why Mark places it here in his gospel: it gives an example of Jesus's ability to give life to those who have taken up the cross and lost their life.

Conclusion

Unlike the story of JD, the results produced in this chapter are quite different from other historical analyses. The principle difference is that this analysis took seriously Mark's presentation of the story as a raising-of-the-dead story. Most scholars either pass over this detail in Mark,[622] or simply note the parallels with the story of JD,[623] and do not discuss why Luke and Matthew would omit this detail. The assumption in general is that the item is a Markan addition. Also most scholars view Mark's story as a poorly constructed and overly repetitive story that is likely the combining of two separate accounts. The chiastic and oral analyses performed showed that this is not the case. Consequently, in this case not only is the methodology different from the standard redaction-type criticism, but the results are different as well.

The chiastic analysis showed again that chiasm seems to be the main structuring device used by all three writers. The chiastic analysis gave insight to the meaning of the story for the gospel authors. This was found to be especially the case in Mark where the chiastic analysis gave insight into the nature of the dispute and made clear that the crowd was to be understood negatively. The chiastic analysis also supplied a reason as to why Mark's version is highly repetitive. The analysis showed that Mark, far from carelessly combining two different stories or versions of the same story into an incoherent and rambling account, had in fact created a highly complex structure that supplied deeper levels of meaning. Mark as shown in both this chapter and the previous chapter is a master of this style and is able to weave chiasms into chiasms; for example, the two chiasms made of the hinges and wings from his sextuple PB chiasm. Luke and Matthew, on the other hand, take a simpler approach to chiasm.

---

[621] So Meier, *Marginal*, 2:656. The following list of items is taken from Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:95, n. 38. The first is the paratactic style of narrative found especially in 9:18 ("and" is used six times). This is also noted by Klaus Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 145, 196; Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts with an Appendix on The Son of Man* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 58, 105, 107. Then there is the plural "waters" (ὕδατα) in 9:22 (see also Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, 91). Finally, there are the phrases "unclean spirit" (τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ) in 9:25 and "many" (πολλοὺς) in 9:26.

[622] For example, Meier, *Marginal*, 2:655, simply notes that the story in Mark is a mixture "with perhaps a touch of a story of raising the dead."

[623] For example, Collins, *Mark*, 439.

The oral analysis of this story was quite complicated since we are dealing with two very different types of presentations: a much longer one by Mark and much shorter ones by Luke and Matthew. This difference is especially interesting since we know that Luke and Matthew used Mark. The question then arises, "Why did they choose to present such drastically different stories?" A careful analysis of the theological implications of the story presented by Mark revealed that these implications would have caused difficulties for the early church. There were two main difficulties. The first was that the "blame the victim" theology would be contradicted by the experience of the early church: there would have been failed healings of faithful, and thus blameless, victims. The second was that if the boy died and was then raised from the dead, it would mean that Jesus had failed in the exorcism. Thus, though the miracle would show Jesus to be the one who can resurrect the dead, it would mean that he had been initially defeated by the forces of evil represented by the demon.

There are thus two very powerful reasons why Luke and Matthew would wish to so drastically shorten the story. Eliminating the "blame the victim" aspects would eliminate the confrontational aspects of the story: without this theology there is no reason for conflict in the story. It would also allow them to omit Mark's problematic impression that Jesus decided to perform the miracle because the crowd was closing in. This would go against the teaching of the church to not act out of fear and to be strong in the face of persecution.

These difficulties with the Markan version also mean that the criterion of embarrassment can be applied to his version. It is highly improbable that an astute theologian such as Mark would be unaware of these problems. The proposed structure of the oral version shows that the confrontational aspect of the story was likely much stronger in the oral version. By splitting up the material and not fully explaining the nature of the dispute, Mark reduced the confrontational aspect of the story. Mark would thus seem to be aware of these problems.

The criterion of embarrassment can also be applied to the oral tradition: the leaders of the church would not have allowed a tradition to have been expanded in such a problematic way. This is because the leaders were not only the guardians of the tradition, but also the principal teachers and theologians of the church. Since the story is compatible with human nature and what we know of Jesus's theology and the situation in Palestine, it is highly likely that Mark's version represents a historical event. This does not mean to say that his story is a "video replay." As Meier points out, "To take the present version of Marcan form as a videotape replay of some original event would be the height of naïveté."[624] This is true of any event presented in the gospels: the style in oral tradition is not concerned with the precise rendition of events in chronological order, but rather in being true to the historical events in a more general manner.

In their radical reductions of Mark and the oral tradition, Luke and Matthew are probably at the limit of what was permissible, because they not only omit key elements, but in doing so also change the point of the story. It is no longer a raising-of-the-dead story, but simply an exorcism story, and it is no longer a story of how the questionable faith of the father inhibited a cure. In Matthew the changes become more severe: the cause for the failure becomes the fault of the disciples. This is the exact opposite of Mark and the oral tradition. To be able to make such changes, Luke and Matthew would have needed the support of the leadership in their communities. This was probably helped not only by the problematic nature of the deletions, but also by their status as teachers in the community.

---

[624] Meier, *Marginal*, 654.

It is interesting that despite their deletions, Luke and Matthew keep the transfiguration chiasm of Mark. The only real difference is in Luke, who eliminates the discussion on the way down the mountain concerning the coming of Elijah and the Son of Man. In Mark the story of the PB (B2) supplies concrete evidence that Jesus can do as he promised in (B1). With the removal of the raising-of-the-dead elements the chiasm is weakened. It is possible that Luke and Matthew expected their audiences to know the oral version and supply the missing link. This seems to be the case with Luke. As noted above, Luke makes several links between the PB and his story of the raising of the widow of Nain's son (WNS). There are also parallels between these two stories and JD. The most telling is the addition to JD and the PB of "only child," a detail which is also found in the WNS. Such a commonality between three raising-of-the-dead stories cannot be a coincidence. Consequently, though Luke removes the raising-of-the-dead scene in the PB he connects the story to other raising-of-the-dead stories, which in turn shows his awareness of the chiastic purpose of the PB in the transfiguration chiasm.

In this analysis, as in the analysis of JD, Mark is shown to use a very questionable raising-of-the-dead story in a key place in his gospel. JD is the final and most spectacular of a series of miracles showing Jesus to be the LORD Messiah. The PB is used to show the believer that Jesus's promise of resurrection for those who lose their life in the cause can actually take place. The promise is valid, because Jesus, the one making the promise, is the LORD Messiah who will be raising people on his Day. The death and resurrection of the believer will parallel the death and resurrection of Jesus himself. Consequently, the believer, like Jesus, will be raised to glory. This is also shown by the figure of John the Baptist/Elijah, who had recently died, but is displayed in glory with Jesus at the transfiguration.

We are left then, with the question of why Mark would use such questionable stories to show Jesus as the raiser of the dead at such key places in his gospel if there were a better raising-of-the-dead story available. Or to put the problem another way, we must regard the WNS with a hermeneutic of suspicion, since it is not used by Mark. We shall now turn to this story.

Chapter Five: Widow of Nain's Son

Introduction

The stories of JD and the PB, as we have seen, are not without problems as raising-of-the-dead miracles. In both stories there is a question as to whether the raised person was in fact dead. This is not the case with the remaining story we shall look at: in the WNS the person is being carried out to be buried. The story of the WNS would thus seem to be the ideal story to attest to Jesus's power and consequently that he is the LORD Messiah. However, as was concluded in the previous story, the very fact that this story is so ideal is grounds for a hermeneutic of suspicion towards it: if it is so ideal, why did Mark not use this story and instead use two questionable raising-of-the-dead stories? [625]

The grounds for suspicion become greater when one considers that in the WNS we are told that news of the story spread far and wide. There would then be no possibility of this remarkable story not being well known, especially since the disciples are reported as being present at the miracle. The story would thus have been well known throughout the early church. For example, it would have been known in all the major centres that Peter travelled to from Antioch to Rome. According to the model of frequent communication used in this thesis, it is unlikely that such a miracle could have been kept secret.[626]

In this chapter it will be shown that the grounds for suspicion increase because of the close similarity of the WNS to the stories of Elijah raising a widow's son and Apollonius, a pagan contemporary of Jesus, meeting a funeral cortege and reviving a young girl. Though allusion in and of itself does not mean something is unhistorical, there are additional grounds for suspicion. The story fits almost two well in Luke's theological agenda for this section, and the story also creates parallels with the other raising-of-the-dead stories looked at so far, namely, JD and the PB. Once one takes away the parallels and allusions to other biblical stories, there is very little left to the story. Also, if a plausible argument can be made that the story of Apollonius is based on a historical event and that Luke would have reason to refer to it, then there is nothing left to the story that is not historically suspicious. The accumulative weight of doubt, it will be argued, makes it highly unlikely that the WNS was based on a historical event.

The analysis of this story will proceed as with the previous two. However, since there is only one version of the story, we cannot conduct an oral analysis. Instead we will compare it to the stories of Elijah and Apollonius. As with the other stories, we shall begin with a chiastic analysis to better understand what this story meant for Luke. Then the place of the story in Luke from a linear perspective will be discussed before turning to the stories of Elijah and Apollonius. Finally a historical analysis will be performed. At each stage it will be shown that the grounds of suspicion increase and that for every detail in the story there are several grounds for suspicion. It will also be argued that there were good grounds for Luke

---

[625] While it could be argued that Mark thought that JD and the PB better suited his theological purposes in those parts of his gospel, a central part of his theological agenda was to show Jesus to be a raiser of the dead, which JD and PB do not do very well. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:655, proposes that Luke, unlike Mark, was not content with one raising-of-the-dead story. This assumes that Mark was content with JD (and the PB). There is no evidence that he was.

[626] Arndt, *Luke*, 203, in a similar vein thinks it would be too rash to conclude that Mark and Matthew did not know the WNS. Bovon, *Luke*, 266, on the other hand thinks that if Matthew had known the WNS he would have used it.

wishing to create a story such as the WNS. The final conclusion will be that the weight of the evidence against the story, along with good motive for creating the story, all point to the story being Luke's creation.

Chiastic Analysis

We shall begin by reviewing the place of the WNS in the larger chiastic structure shown below. In the macro-structure the WNS is B1 in wing A1 (A1.B1 in bold and italics). A1 is a three-level chiasm whose hinge is the question from John's disciples asking Jesus if he is the one to come. We shall call this chiasm the one-to-come chiasm. The parallel chiasm (A2) is the transfiguration chiasm, which was analysed in the previous chapter. It is interesting, as noted in the second chapter, that the WNS (A1.B1) holds the mirror image position of the PB (A2.B2), which it was argued was a raising-of-the-dead story in oral tradition. Also, JD holds a similar position in the hinge chiasm (C), though there it is one of four miracles. As argued in chapter two, the purpose of this macro-chiasm is to show that Jesus is the one of power and wisdom. The wing A1 plays a key role in the chiasm because it shows Jesus to be the one to come.

A1 Jesus is the one to come: more than a prophet
A1 A centurion shows great faith: Jesus one with authority (7:1)
B1 Jesus raises a widow's son and is declared a great prophet (like Elijah implied) (7:11)
C Disciples from John ask if Jesus is the one to come (7:18)
B2 John is more than a prophet (Jesus more than John implied) (7:24)
A2 Tax collector's show faith; Pharisees and current generation do not (7:29)
B1 Dinner with the Pharisees: Jesus anointed, who is this who forgives sins?
C Jesus is teacher and controller of evil
A1 Jesus, 12, and 3 women, and other women proclaim (8:1)
B1 Parables: secrets of kingdom
C Jesus's true family are those who do the will of God (8:19)
B2 Miracles showing Jesus's power including JD raised
A2 The twelve are sent out (9:1)
B2 Feeding of the 5000: Who is Jesus?
A2 Transfiguration: Jesus is the Son and Chosen of God
A1 First prediction of death (9:21)
B1 Followers must be willing to lose life (9:23)
C The transfiguration: "This is my Son, my Chosen" (9:28)
B2 Jesus cures a possessed (epileptic) boy (9:37)
A2 Second Prediction of Jesus Death (9:43)

As noted in chapter two there are a remarkable sixteen parallels between the WNS and the PB. To recall they are as follows:

1) 9 word parallels: next day (7:11; 9:37), great (7:11, 12; 9:37), crowd (7:11, 12; 9:37), disciples (7:11, 9:40), only (7:12; 9:38), son (7:12; 9:38, 41), to give (7:15, 9:42), to seize (7:16; 7:39), God (7:16, 9:43).
2) 7 conceptual parallels:
    i. Both are miracles
    ii. In both there is a large amount of people (7:11, 12; 9:37).
    iii. A family relationship is referred to (7:12; 9:38).
    iv. In both the person healed is an only son (7:12; 9:38).
    v. The healed person is given back to the parent (7:15; 9:42).

vi. People are amazed (7:16; 9:43).
vii. Reference is made to God in describing the reaction of the crowd: (7:16; 9:43).

To this list can be added that both miracles are not miracles of faith, but rather of compassion: in the PB despite the faithlessness of the generation, Jesus still performs the miracle, and in the WNS Jesus looks at the widow and is filled with compassion (7:13) and then proceeds with the miracle.[627] In addition in Mark and Matthew the PB takes place at the foot of Mt. Hermon, and the WNS takes place in Nain, which is at the foot of "the little Hermon."[628] Though Luke deletes this detail from Mark, it would have been known by his audience. Many of these parallels have been noted by other scholars.[629] It would thus seem that Luke has made an effort to draw parallelism between the stories. Consequently, the above items are suspect as Lukan additions to the story of the WNS in the possible oral tradition.

It was also noted in the study of the PB that Luke adds the detail to the story of JD that JD was an only child. It was also noted that Mark drew comparison with JD, but Luke eliminates any reference to the boy dying, and thus eliminates these parallels. There are, however, many parallels between the story of the WNS and JD in Luke. These are as follows:

1) Luke adds to JD that the daughter is the only daughter (8:42). There is consequently a clear link made by Luke between the WNS, JD, and the PB, who are all only children.
2) The command of Jesus to the WNS and JD is very similar. In JD (8:54) it is "Child, get up!" (῾Η παῖς, ἔγειρε.) and in WNS (7:14) it is "Young man, I say to you, rise!" (Νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθητι.)[630] It is interesting that the Greek of Mark's version is actually closer to Luke's: "Little girl, I say to you, rise!" (Τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειρέ.)[631]
3) Jesus takes JD by the hand (8:54), which parallels his touching the bier in WNS (7:14).[632]
4) Luke in JD (8:52) changes Mark's wording in regards to mourners from "Why do you make a commotion and weep?" to "Do not weep" (Μὴ κλαίετε), which parallels the WNS (7:13): "Do not weep" (Μὴ κλαῖε).[633]
5) Finally, JD follows the HW where the woman is healed solely through her faith. Likewise, the WNS follows the healing of the centurion's servant, who likewise is

---

[627] So Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:807. As Fitzmyer notes, ibid. 1:658, it is an important element of the story that the miracle is done purely on compassion, and has nothing to do with the faith of the widow; the same is true for the PB: the performance of the miracle has nothing to do with the faith of the father.
[628] See above n. 525 on page 228.
[629] On both sons being only sons see Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:658; Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20; Cambridge, Mass.: Scholars, 1974), 39, 43. On both stories ending with the crowds praising God see Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:655.
[630] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:792.
[631] My translation. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:855, n. 81. This may indicate that Luke changed the wording in JD after he worked on the WNS to make the parallels to JD.
[632] This also creates a parallel with Mark's version of the PB (9:27).
[633] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:855, n. 80.

healed solely through his faith.[634] In both the healing comes about through no action of Jesus.

These parallels make it very clear that Luke wished to connect the WNS and JD, especially since many of the parallels are due to Lukan changes to Mark. It is quite possible that Luke worked on the WNS before completing his changes to JD. This would explain the strong word parallelism between Mark's version of JD and the WNS in item two above. In addition, in the Markan version of JD the people are overcome with great amazement, and in WNS the people are overcome with fear: both imply great awe.[635]Be that as it may, there seems to be a strong desire on the part of Luke to connect the WNS to both JD and the PB.

The reasons for Luke wishing to do this can only be surmised. In the case of the PB the strong parallelism seems to be at odds with his deleting any reference to the story being a raising-of-the-dead story. However, by doing so he manages to keep the function of the PB in the transfiguration chiasm intact: the allusions to the WNS in the PB allow the story of the PB to point to Jesus's ability to raise the dead. Also, according to the model of frequent communication used in this thesis, Luke's audience would be well aware of Mark's version of the PB, which, as argued in the previous chapter, was also closer to the oral tradition. Consequently, though Luke eliminates any reference to the PB being dead, he is still aware that his audience would know other versions where the boy died. In pointing to the WNS in his recounting of the PB, Luke seems to be saying that he knows that PB can be considered a raising-of-the-dead story, but that it is a poor one, and tha the hearer-reader should look instead to the story of the WNS.

The crucial difference between the WNS and Mark's version of the PB, which was likely based on oral tradition, is that in the WNS there is no uncertainty that the dead person is actually dead. The same is true in regards to the WNS in comparison to JD. Consequently, when the hearer-reader of Luke's work comes to the stories of JD and the PB, they are reminded of the WNS, and consequently this crucial difference. In this the stories of JD and PB keep their functions of showing Jesus to be a raiser of the dead intact by borrowing from the story of the WNS.

Whether or not this proposition is accurate, it is clear that Luke wishes to draw parallels with both JD and the PB, and consequently those items that create the parallelism in the WNS are suspect as Lukan additions.

We shall now do an analysis of the Jesus-is-the-one-to-come chiasm (A1 of the above chiasm). This will highlight further elements that Luke may have added for theological or chiastic reasons.

Jesus-Is-the-One-to-Come Chiasm

This chiasm, like Luke's transfiguration chiasm, is a simple three-level chiasm. The first two units are miracles: the healing of the centurion's slave (A1) and the WNS (B1). The last three all focus on John: in the third unit John sends people with a question for Jesus (C), in the fourth unit Jesus gives praise to John (B2), and in the fifth unit Jesus speaks about how both he and John have been rejected by "this generation." We shall begin by listing the parallels for each level including the wings and hinge, and then perform a probability analysis. Then we shall look at the meaning generated by the chiasm.

---

[634] Meier, *Marginal*, 854, n. 79; Talbert, *Literary*, 39, 43.

[635] Arndt, *Luke*, 205, says that "fear" in the WNS 7:16 should be understood as holy awe.

A1 A centurion shows great faith: Jesus one with authority (7:1–10) 10 //s
B1 Jesus raises a widow's son and is declared a great prophet (like Elijah implied) (7:11–17) 9 //s
C Disciples from John ask if Jesus is the one to come (7:18–24) 13 //s (A1), 7 //s (A2)
B2 John is more than a prophet (Jesus more than John implied) (7:24–28)
A2 Tax collector's show faith; Pharisees and current generation do not (7:28–35)

The parallels for each level are as follows:

1) A level: 10 parallels
   a. 5 word parallels: all (7:1, 29, 30), people (7:1, 29), to hear (7:3, 29), friend (7:6, 34), man (7:8, 31, 34).
   b. 5 conceptual parallels:
      i. Both have a central theme of faith: in A1 the faith of the centurion is commended (7:9), and in A2 the faith of this generation is condemned (7:7:31–34).
      ii. Both speak of the faith of Israel: in A1 the centurion's faith is the greatest Jesus has found in Israel (7:9), and in A2 the faith of this generation (Israel) is condemned (7:31–34).
      iii. Both sections begin with an introduction referring to what was said in the previous unit: "After Jesus had finished all his sayings in the hearing of the people" (7:1, A1); "And all the people who heard this" (7:29, A2).
      iv. Both send messages back and forth: in A1 the centurion sends messengers to Jesus (7:6, 10) who report back, and in A2 the children in the market shout messages back and forth to each other.
      v. In both units Jesus's mission is referred to as coming from God. In A1 the centurion acknowledges that Jesus is under authority as he is under authority (7:8). In the centurion's case, he is under the authority of his commander and ultimately the emperor, and in the case of Jesus, he is ultimately under the authority of God. Consequently, the centurion carries the authority of the emperor and can thus tell people what to do (7:8), and Jesus carries the authority of God and can thus control the spiritual world and heal from a distance (7:8).[636] In A2 the tax collectors and others are said to have acknowledged the justice of God (7:29) by accepting John's baptism, and the lawyers and Pharisees are said to have rejected God's purpose by rejecting John's baptism (7:30). Jesus then goes on to condemn this generation for rejecting both John and himself, which shows that he understands that he and John are part of the same mission from God. Consequently, in both A1 and A2 Jesus is under the command of God.
2) B Level: 9 parallels
   a. 6 word parallels: crowd (7:11, 12, 17), to see (7:12, 13, 25, 27), began (7:15, 24), God (7:16, 28), prophet (7:16, 26 twice), great (7:16, 7:28).

[636] Bovon, *Luke*, 262, argues that the centurion's statement is an incomplete argument of the type "how much more" instead of a strict analogical syllogism as argued here. However, the centurion's words ("For I also am a man set under authority" [καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν]) indicate a direct analogy is intended.

b. 3 conceptual parallels:
    i. Both refer to someone being an exceptional prophet: In B1 the crowd declares Jesus to be a great prophet (7:16), and in B2 John is said to be a prophet and more than a prophet (7:26).
    ii. Both units indirectly refer to Elijah: in B1, as will be shown, there are clear allusions to Elijah's miracles, and in B2 Jesus indirectly refers to John the Baptist as Elijah, when he says that John is the one sent to prepare the way ahead of the messiah (7:27). Jesus is here referencing Malachi 3:1, 4:5.
    iii. Both units take place amongst multiple crowds: in B1 Jesus is with a large crowd (7:11), and they meet a second large crowd (7:13); in B2 Jesus is speaking to the crowds in the plural (7:24).

3) A1–C: 14 parallels
    a. 10 word parallels: all (7:1, 18), who (7:2, 18), to hear (7:1, 3, 22), about (7:3, 18, 24), to arrive (7:4, 20), to travel/journey (7:6, 8, 22), to send (7:6, 10, 19), Lord (7:6, 19), another (7:8, 19, 20), crowd (7:9, 24).
    b. 4 conceptual parallels:
        i. The sending of messengers to Jesus: in A1 the centurion sends messengers to Jesus to ask him to heal his slave (7:3, 6), and in C John the Baptist sends messengers to Jesus concerning Jesus's identity (7:19).
        ii. In both cases the messengers are sent in regard to reports the sender had heard concerning Jesus: in A1 the centurion had heard about Jesus (7:3), and in C John's disciples had reported "these things" to John (7:18).
        iii. Both concern miracles: in A1 the centurion's slave is healed, and in C Jesus's miracles answer John's question.
        iv. The significance of the miracles in regards to Jesus's identity: in A1 the centurion understands that Jesus's ability to do miracles shows him to be under the authority of God, that is, the miracles say something about who Jesus is (7:8); in A2 Jesus points to his miracles in reply to John's question concerning his identity (7:22).

4) C–A2: 7 parallels:
    a. 4 word parallels: all (7:18, 29, 35), to hear (7:22, 29), John (7:18 twice, 20, 22, 24, 28, 29), who (7:24, 25, 31).
    b. 3 conceptual parallels:
        i. Theme of not accepting Jesus: in C Jesus says that those who do not take offence at Jesus are blessed, which implies that those that do are not blessed; in A2 Jesus speaks of how he is not accepted because he associates with tax collectors and sinners.
        ii. Messages going back and forth: in C John sends messengers who return with a message (7:19, 22), and in A2 the children shout messages back and forth to each other (7:32).
        iii. The receiving of blessings by those at the bottom of the social hierarchy: in C people are healed, lepers are cleansed, and the poor have good news brought to them, and in A2 sinners and tax collectors

> receive John's baptism of the forgiveness of sins, which is a central part of the good news.

There are a total of 652 words and five units which means that there are 124 words per unit, which is 1.18 the size of the average LUD unit. This means the parallels in terms of LUD units are roughly nine parallels for the A level, eight parallels for the B level, elven for A1–C, and six for C–A2, which on average is a significant level of parallelism. However, this in only a three-level chiasm and thus the probability figure is quite low:.171 4 x 128 6 x 31,[637] or.683 3, which means there is a roughly a 70% chance of such a chiasm occurring by chance. This figure, though, does not take into account that there is also very good parallelism between the hinges and wings, nor does it take into account that the chiasm has very good parallelism with the transfiguration chiasm and is part of larger chiastic structure with an incredibly low probability figure. All in all, it is highly likely that the above chiasm was the conscious intention of Luke.

This conclusion is made likelier, because the chiasm produces a very clear message. The hinge supplies the central theme of the nature of Jesus's identity. John sends messengers asking if Jesus is the one to come, and Jesus answers by pointing out all the miracles he has accomplished (7:16–22). Though Jesus does not answer with a definite yes, the Christian hearer of the story would automatically supply it, which would mean that the miracles show that Jesus is the one to come, that is, Jesus is the LORD Messiah.[638] This also means that Jesus is sent by God and has God's authority to cure and bring the good news of the forgiveness of sins in preparation for the soon to arrive day of the LORD and the kingdom of God. Those who accept Jesus, that is, take no offence at him, will be blessed (7:23), because they will enter the kingdom of God.

It has already been shown that faithfulness in the synoptic gospels is defined by the willingness to accept that Jesus is sent by God. The epitome of this faithfulness is found in A1: Jesus says that the centurion shows the most faith of anyone he has encountered in Israel (7:9). The centurion shows his faith by saying that he believes that Jesus like him is one under authority and can therefore heal from a distance (7:7–8). The centurion is under the authority of the emperor, and can thus command people at a word to do things. The implication is that the centurion understands Jesus to be under a similar authority, namely God, and thus has command of the spiritual domain and can therefore heal from a distance. The Godlike ability is further stressed by the centurion saying "only speak the word, and let my servant be healed" (7:7). The centurion consequently believes that Jesus can simply speak and, as with God, it will be so. It is not only because the centurion believes in Jesus's powers that makes him so full of faith, it is also because he believes that Jesus is from God.

Consequently the central theme of both wing A1 and hinge C is that Jesus is from God and that therefore Jesus has such great powers. The hinge takes the conclusion a step further by identifying Jesus as the one to come. The theme of being from God is taken up in the second wing, A2. The section begins with Luke describing how the audience including the tax collectors had acknowledged the justice of God, because they had accepted John's baptism. In other words, they accept that Jesus's mentor John is from God. Jesus then

---

[637] The five units are equivalent to about six LUD units.

[638] On how the miracles show Jesus to be the one to come see Achtemeier, *Jesus*, ch. 2. This chapter is a reprint of Paul J. Achtemeier, "The Lucan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch," *JBL* 94 (1975): 547–62.

compares "this generation" with children who do not respond to each other no matter if the message is sent with mourning or dancing. People call John a demon when the message from God is brought with fasting and abstinence from wine (7:33), and they call the Son of Man a drunkard and a friend of tax collectors and sinners when he brings God's message with eating and drinking (7:34). It is a Gentile centurion (A1), sinners, and tax collectors (A2) who understand that Jesus is from God, and because they do not take offence at Jesus, they receive blessings in the form of healing and the forgiveness of sins (C). This is in contrast to the Pharisees and lawyers who in rejecting John and Jesus reject God's purpose for themselves (7:30).

In the list of miracles that Jesus gives in response to John's disciples, the raising of the dead culminates the list. The position indicates its prime importance: it is the finale so to speak. It just happens that the unit preceding the hinge contains the only example of this remarkable ability so far in the gospel, namely the raising of the WNS (B1). The hinge unit begins by the disciples of John reporting "all these things to him" (7:18). "All these things" refer to the recounting of Jesus's ministry so far: Luke's adaptation of Mark's first power and wisdom section, the sermon on the plain, and the two healings of the centurion and the WNS. Again, the story of the WNS culminates the list of things that Jesus has done. This shows the story's key importance for indicating Jesus's identity. This will be further shown in the following chiastic analysis of the story.

In the current chiasm the WNS (B1) is opposite Jesus talking about John the Baptist (B2). At first there does not seem to be any meaning generated by the opposition of these two units through chiasm. However, the conclusion voiced by the crowd of the raising of the WNS is that a great prophet has risen amongst them (7:16), and the conclusion to Jesus's comments on John the Baptist is that John is not only a prophet, but more than a prophet, and that no one born of woman is greater than he (7:28). The effect is to equate Jesus and John: they are both great prophets. Jesus's comments would seem to place John higher than Jesus, until one looks at them more closely. Jesus, in talking about how great a prophet John is, quotes the book of Malachi in reference to John: "See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way before you" (7:28). In the actual text from the book of Malachi YHWH is speaking and the text says: "See, I am sending my messenger to prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly appear in the temple" (3:1). Later in the text the messenger is identified as Elijah (5:5). Consequently, Jesus identifies John with Elijah, one of the greatest of prophets and the harbinger of the day of the LORD and the kingdom of God. However, in the way that Jesus quotes the text it is as if God is speaking to Jesus: John is thus preparing the way for Jesus.

John's question to Jesus in the hinge and Jesus's comments on John in B2 have to be taken in the context of what Luke has told us previously about John. In Luke, John appears as the voice in the wilderness preparing the way (3:4), saying "the one who is more powerful than I is coming; I am not worthy to untie the thong of his sandals" (3:16). In light of Jesus's reference to Malachi, John is Elijah who is speaking about the coming of the LORD. Thus, if he is preparing Jesus's way, then Jesus is the LORD, which would mean that he is more than any prophet. As will be shown, the story of the WNS (B2) draws many allusions to the story of Elijah raising a widow's son, and the juxtaposition thus made between the two stories shows the ease with which Jesus raises someone in comparison to Elijah. Jesus is thus more than Elijah/John (B1) and consequently more than any prophet (B2), which as the "one to come" (C) he is. However, only the reader-hearer understands the full implication of Jesus's miracles, the epitome of which is the WNS. Jesus's contemporaries do not understand; the

person who comes the closest is John the Baptist, the greatest person ever born (B2). He, like the centurion in A1 who has the greatest faith in Israel, understands that the miracles say something important about Jesus. Faith and greatness is thus based on understanding who Jesus is.

The chiastic structure ties together what at first would seem to be unrelated accounts of incidents in Jesus's life and forms a coherent message and meditation on the identity of Jesus. That one can do this by focusing on the hinge, then the wings in relation to the hinge, and finally the remaining B level provide further indication that the chiasm was the conscious intention of Luke.

The items that Luke may have added to make his chiastic structure or theological point are the crowd declaring a great prophet has arisen and the presence of two crowds. The allusions to Elijah discussed below are also suspect. We shall now turn to the story of the WNS and the internal chiastic pattern.

The WNS Chiasm

This chiasm is a double chiasm with the first chiasm describing the meeting of Jesus's entourage with the funeral and the second chiasm describing the miracle and the healing. We now turn to the WNS. The chiasm is 126 Greek words long and has nine chiastic units, which is 14 words on average per unit. One SUD unit is thus roughly equal to four-and-a-half of the units of this chiasm. The exact centre of the chiasm is the Lord looking on the woman with compassion in A2. The chiasm runs as follows:

A1 Jesus goes to Nain
7:11 Soon afterwards he went to a town called Nain,
B1 Jesus is with disciples and large crowd
and his disciples and a large crowd went with him.
C1 A dead man is being carried out: he is a widow's only son
7:12 As he approached the gate of the town, a man who had died was being carried out.
He was his mother's only son, and she was a widow;
B2 Widow is with a large crowd
and with her was a large crowd from the town.
A2 The Lord has compassion, tells widow not to weep and stops bier
7:13 When the Lord saw her, he had compassion for her and said to her, "Do not weep."
7:14 Then he came forward and touched the bier, and the bearers stood still.
B3 Jesus commands man to rise
And he said, "Young man, I say to you, rise!"
C2 Man rises and Jesus gives him to his mother
7:15 The dead man sat up and began to speak, and Jesus gave him to his mother.
B4 Crowd is afraid and glorifies saying a prophet has arisen
7:16 Fear seized all of them; and they glorified God, saying, "A great prophet has risen among us!"
A3 Word spreads throughout Judea
and "God has looked favourably on his people!"
7:17 This word about him spread throughout Judea and all the surrounding country.

Each unit focuses on a single action. The parallels are immediate and clear: both A1 and A3 refer to geographic locations (Nain and Judea); in A2 the Lord looks on the woman with compassion, and in A3 the crowd says that God has looked favourably on his people;[639] in

[639] The verb used here (ἐπισκέπτομαι) can be used in the sense of "looked favourably upon" as in "looked after," but more often has the meaning of "to visit." See ALGNT, s.v. Luke likely means both senses of the

B1 Jesus is described as being with a large crowd, and in B2 the widow is described as being with a large crowd; in B3 the young man is told to rise, and in B4 the crowd says a great prophet has arisen; B2, B3, and B4 all describe crowds; in C1 the dead son is described, and in C2 the dead man's being alive is described; and in C1 the man is described as being carried out, and in A2 Jesus stops those carrying the man. The above conceptual parallelism is supported by word parallelism: "crowd" (B1 and B2); to rise (B3, B4); and "mother" (C1, C2). If one were to allow one-and-a-half parallels on average, this would be the equivalent of roughly seven SUD parallels. A double three-level chiasm is equivalent to a single five-level chiasm, and the probability of the above chiasm occurring would be roughly:.042 1 x.042 1 x.042 1 x.042 1 x 60,[640] that is,.000 188 4, or.02%, which is 1 in 5 305. In other words, it is highly likely that the above chiasm is the conscious design of Luke.

The exact centre of the chiasm is A2, where Jesus looks upon the woman with compassion.[641] Here Jesus is for the first time referred to as "the Lord" by Luke in a narrative section.[642] This is paralleled in A3 with the crowd saying that God has looked favourably upon his people. The word Luke uses for God looking on his people also has the sense of God visiting his people, which is probably the better translation.[643] This creates the equation of Jesus as the Lord and God, and Jesus is thus the LORD manifestation of God who has visited his people and shown them compassion. The hinge in-between, C2, shows the result

---

word: one for the crowd, who do not understand that Jesus is God visiting, and one for the hearer-reader who does understand this.

[640] The whole chiasm is equivalent to roughly two SUD units and could thus occur sixty times in the SUD sample space.

[641] The centrality of compassion to the miracle is noted by most commentators; for example, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:658; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:788. It is also noted that faith plays no role in this miracle, since the miracle is completely unsolicited. This is brought into focus by the previous miracle, since in the healing of the centurion's boy faith was at the centre of the miracle.

[642] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:659. Jesus previously is referred to as "lord" without the definite article (though one is usually supplied in translation). See also Arndt, *Luke*, 205. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:796, argues that Luke uses the term "the Lord" here for the first time to make it clear that Jesus is more than a prophet. So also Ulrich Busse, *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus: die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas* (vol. 24; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977), 171; Rochais, *Récits*, 25; Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (2 vols.; HTKNT 3; Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 1:403. Against this being the redactional hand of Luke see Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 39; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 98, n. 3.

[643] See ALGNT, s.v. ἐπισκέπτομαι. The word is used in the sense of "visiting" by Luke at 19:44 in the lament over Jerusalem, where Jesus predicts its destruction because it did not recognize its time of "visitation." Luke also uses this word at 1:68 and 1:78 in Zechariah's prophecy concerning his son John preparing the way of (the) Lord. The NRSV translation again does not translate the word in its basic meaning of visiting. In 1:68 the translation given is: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel for *he has looked favourably* on his people and redeemed them." A more literal translation would be: "Blessed is the Lord God of Israel because he has visited and accomplished redemption for his people." (Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ). Likewise in 1:78 the NRSV translation is, "By the tender mercy of our God the dawn from on high has *broken upon* us." A more literal translation would be, "Through the tender mercy of our God, by which has visited us the rising sun from heaven" (διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέψεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους). Translating the verb in the base sense of visiting is more in accord with the LXX, where the word describes "the act, in which the Lord in a special incursion into the course of the life of individuals or of people" (Hermann W. Beyer, "επισκεπτομαι," *TDNT* 2:602). The concept of God visiting is unique to Luke (Meier, *Marginal*, 2:789; 851, n.62), and all the references are found in the special Lukan material.

of Jesus's compassion: Jesus returns the risen son back to his mother. It is this act of power and compassion that shows Jesus to be the LORD.

This is shown further on the B level in between. In B3 Jesus commands the boy to rise. His command is a foreshadowing of the day of the LORD, when he will raise all the dead. The crowd, however, do not fully realize the significance of what Jesus has done and declare that a great prophet has arisen in B4.[644] Thus, when they go on to say that God has visited them in A3, they do not mean God has literally visited them in the form of Jesus, but that God has worked through Jesus and "looked favourably on his people" (A3, 7:16). The crowd consequently almost grasps the import of what they have just seen. This is also shown by the crowd saying "a great prophet has arisen among us" (7:16) in B4. This echoes the future post-Easter confession of "the Lord has arisen indeed, and he has appeared to Simon!" (Luke 24:34).[645] It will not be until Jesus has been resurrected that the messianic secret will be over and that the identity of Jesus will be truly understood.

In the first chiasm, the B level also foreshadows the future. As many commentators have pointed out, there is a meeting of a "parade of life," that is, Jesus and his large crowd (B1); and a "parade of death," that is, the crowd accompanying the funeral (B2).[646] This foreshadows the future joining of the righteous living (B1) and the righteous dead (B2), who will come together through the resurrection (B3: the Lord saying rise) and celebrate the triumph of the LORD over death and all evil at the final visitation (B4: God is glorified). The intermediate chiasm C1–A2–C2 shows that the act of resurrection (C2: the boy rising) is one of compassion (A2: the Lord looking on the widow), which will reunite the dead with the living (C1, C2: the separated widow and son in C1 are reunited in C2). This will take place with the final visitation of the LORD, which is pointed to by the crowd saying that God has visited them in A3.

The above analysis highlights several items that Luke may have added to a possible oral tradition. These are the following: the two crowds (B1 and B2), Jesus as LORD looking at the widow, and the crowd saying God has looked favourably on (visited) his people (A2 and A3), and Jesus commanding the boy to arise, and the crowd saying a great prophet has arisen (B3 and B4).

The above chiastic analyses show the central role that the WNS seems to play for Luke in showing that Jesus is the LORD Messiah. The aptness of this story for Luke's theological agenda has been noted by other scholars.[647] So far we have been focusing on Luke's chiastic structuring of his gospel and have only briefly touched on the placement of the story from the linear structure of the gospel. We shall now briefly do that before discussing the parallels

---

[644] It has long been noted that in the people's acclamation there is no definite article: the people are not saying that *the* great prophet, that is, Elijah, has arisen, but rather a prohet (Bovon, *Luke*, 273; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:660). As Meier, *Marginal*, 2:853, n. 74, points out, in Luke "prophet" is one of Jesus's christological titles (Acts 3:22–23, 7:37). This is contra Jack Dean Kingsbury (*Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991], 50–53), who sees prophet as a false title based on the confession by the crowd. The two positions are, however, not contradictory: Jesus as LORD is a prophet, but he is also much more than prophet. The crowd are thus correct when they say that Jesus is a prophet, but they are incorrect, because they do not understand him to be more than a prophet, that is, the LORD. The crowd seems to come close to this, because they are seized with great fear, which is close to holy awe as argued by Arndt, *Luke*, 205.

[645] So Bovon, *Luke*, 273.

[646] This has long been noticed by commentators; see, for example, Bovon, *Luke*, 267; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THKNT 3; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), 159.

[647] For example, Meier, *Marginal*, 2:788–89.

between the WNS and the stories of Elijah raising a widow's son and Apollonius stopping a funeral procession and possibly raising someone.

WNS in Luke from a Linear Perspective

So far we have been studying Luke from the perspective of his use of chiasm to structure his gospel. Chiasm is primarily a concentric pattern, but as previously noted, it is also a linear pattern: a chiasm moves in a linear fashion from the first wing to the hinge, and then again from the hinge to the second wing. The concentricity is produced by the second linear sequence reversing the first linear sequence. Also, though a composer of a story may use a concentric device to structure her or his composition, she or he, like any composer, has to keep in mind the linear sequence of events for the story to make sense. We shall now look at the linear sequence of events that lead up to the story of the WNS in Luke. This will demonstrate the importance of the WNS for Luke's theological agenda from a different perspective.

After his introduction (1:1–4), Luke begins his gospel with his infancy story (1:5–2:52) and then moves to describe the coming of John (3:1–21). These two sections prepare the reader for the main part of the gospel: the ministry of Jesus. The ministry begins with Jesus receiving the Spirit, being tempted in Jordan, and then going to Galilee (4:1–14). Jesus is rejected in Nazareth and has a mixed reception around Capernaum, where he gathers his disciples (4:16–6:16). In this section Jesus is introduced as a miracle worker: he heals a demoniac, Simon's mother-in-law of fever, a leper, a paralytic, and a man with a withered hand—Luke here follows Mark's basic structure in presenting Jesus as the one of power over all types of diseases. This is followed by the controversy stories to form his version of Mark's first power and wisdom chiasm. This is followed by the Sermon on the Plain (6:17–6:49), where Jesus's good news to the poor is presented.

This brings us to the section containing the WNS. In one sense, Jesus's entire ministry so far leads up to the answer to John's question.[648] This is because there is now a secure foundation for Jesus's reply:

> Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised, and the poor have good news brought to them, and blessed is anyone who takes not offence at me (7:22–23).

Though the "seen and heard" refers back to a summary of miracles just performed (7:21), the reply also refers to all the reader-hearer of the gospel has seen and heard through Luke to this point: the blind receiving sight (7:21), the lame walking (paralytic healed, 5:17–26), lepers cleansed (leper healed, 5:12–16), dead raised (WNS, 7:11–17), and the poor having good news brought to them (the Sermon on the Plain, which begins, "Blessed are you who are poor for yours is the kingdom of God" 6:20). Consequently, Jesus's ministry so far describes almost every item in Jesus's list, and thus that Jesus is the "one to come." This is further clarified in Jesus's discussion about John: John is Elijah the greatest prophet returned, who has prepared the way for Jesus, the LORD.

Jesus is consequently God visiting his people (7:16). This is a unique theme in Luke and begins in the infancy narrative,[649] where Jesus is spoken of as (the) Lord visiting his

---

[648] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:851, n. 63; Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 78.

[649] For references and further discussion see above n. 643 on page 277. In regards to the WNS see especially Meier, *Marginal*, 789, 850, n. 62.

people (1:68, 78). The theme is further developed when Isaiah is quoted to describe John the Baptist as preparing the way of the Lord (3:4). However, it is not until the reply to John's question is put to Jesus that it has been fully demonstrated that Jesus is the LORD. The culmination of the list of the miracles that show Jesus to be the one to come, and the one immediately before the question, is the miracle of raising someone from the dead, which has been clearly demonstrated in the WNS.[650]

Chapter seven adds another important theme that is developing in the gospel. This is the rejection of Jesus by some elements within Israelite society, especially the authorities. In the first group of healings there is a mixture of support (crowds coming to be healed) and rejection (the controversy stories). Jesus says the centurion exhibits more faith than anyone in Israel, and there is consequently an implicit rebuke of Israel here. The WNS continues this theme: "This word about him spread throughout Judea and all the surrounding country" (7:17). As many commentators have noted, "Judea" is best understood as the "land of the Jews" in the sense of Palestine or Israel.[651] Consequently the news reaches John across the Jordan (the surrounding country) where he was imprisoned (7:18). Luke to describe the news uses "word" (ὁ λόγος). This has evangelistic overtones: the word about Jesus had spread to non-Jewish lands. This is exactly what will happen in the second half of Luke's double work.

The stories of the centurion and WNS thus foreshadow the later spread of the gospel to the Gentiles. This is also connected with Jesus visiting his people and being rejected by them.[652] Jerusalem will be destroyed because it did not recognize its visitation from God (19:44), and the rejection of Jesus via the nascent church in Jerusalem will cause people to flee to Antioch, where the Gentiles will receive the Spirit (Acts 11:19–21). The implication is that the message went to the Gentiles because it was rejected by the authorities in Israel. In fact, just after the story of the WNS, Jesus speaks about the religious authorities rejecting John and Jesus, and consequently "God's purpose for themselves" (7:30, Luke's added editorial comment to Q).

As Meier points out, the WNS accords a little too well with Luke's agenda: "Once we realize how well the Nain story fits Luke's literary and theological purposes, the question naturally arises: Did he create the story himself?"[653] This is shown by both Luke's linear and chiastic structuring of his gospel. This leads to solid ground for a very strong hermeneutic of suspicion against the WNS being historical. However, this is not the full extent of the grounds for suspicion: Luke also seems to deliberately draw parallels between the story of the WNS and two other stories, namely, Elijah raising a widow's son and Apollonius possibly raising a young bride being carried out to be buried. We shall now look at the degree of parallelism between the WNS and these two stories and endeavour to determine if it was intentional.

---

[650] The placement of the WNS by Luke right before Jesus's reply has long been noted; see, for example, Bovon, *Luke*, 266; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:655. Unlike JD, in the WNS there is no hint of doubt that the son is anything but dead. The man is referred to as "a man who had died" (7:12) and "the dead man" (7:15).

[651] Busse, *Wunder*, 165, 172, 175; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:790, 852, n.72; Rochais, *Récits*, 28; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 1:29, n.12.

[652] As Meier, *Marginal*, 2:790, notes, the failure of Israel is balanced by the potential of the Gentiles.

[653] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:790.

Elijah and Apollonius as Problems for Luke's Argument

As just noted, the story of the WNS fits almost too well with Luke's theological agenda. In both the linear and chiastic analyses the WNS is clearly used to show that Jesus is the LORD Messiah. At the same time the miracle points to the future raising-of-the-dead by the LORD on his Day. The theological purpose of the story is thus very similar to that found in the analyses of JD and the PB. This is very understandable; raising someone from the dead is the most remarkable of miracles, especially in the culture of the time, because it was well accepted in both the Semitic and Greco-Roman cultures that people simply did not come back from the dead.[654] In Jewish culture the ability to resurrect the dead was reserved for God, and even he will not be doing it until the end of the era. Consequently, the ability of someone to raise another from the dead would point not only to that person being God, but also to the final resurrection.

The argument that Jesus was the LORD because he performed many miracles and even raised someone from the dead was not foolproof, however, because there were other reports of people performing miracles and raising people from the dead. The most notable in Jewish culture was Elijah and his protégé Elisha, and in the Greco-Roman culture of the time there was Apollonius of Tyana. In regards to the first case it would have been argued that Jesus was not necessarily the LORD, because he could have been simply a great prophet. In the synoptic gospels this response is given by the crowd, which is repeated in regards to questioning by Herod and Jesus.[655] The response of the crowd points to another possibility, namely, that not only was Jesus a great prophet, but the great prophet who was to come just before the Day, namely, Elijah. The Christians, however, argued that Jesus was not Elijah, because John the Baptist was clearly Elijah: he proclaimed in the wilderness and offered a baptism of forgiveness for those wanting to return to God. As we have seen, the Jesus-is-the-one-to-come chiasm, which contains the WNS, deals with this specific question: John is Elijah (B2), and Jesus's miracles, especially his ability to raise people from the dead (WNS, B1) show that he is more than Elijah, the greatest person ever born of woman (B2, 7:28). As we shall see the question of Jesus being Elijah is further addressed in the WNS by clear allusions to Elijah's raising of a widow's son.

This leaves the question the prime example of someone in the Greco-Roman world that performed miracles, and perhaps even raised someone from the dead, namely, Apollonius of Tyana. As will be shown Apollonius was a well-known figure who travelled and founded shrines. His students and followers are reported to be in existence in the second century long after his death, and bibliographies were written about him in both the second and third centuries. The last bibliography, which contains the account of Apollonius possibly raising someone from the dead, became extremely popular.

We shall now look at Elijah and Apollonius in more detail to determine the likelihood that Luke alluded to them in the story of the WNS.

---

[654] As shown, for example, in the stories of Orestes and Gilgamesh. The exception is the gods; for example, Persephone and Baal.

[655] In Luke Herod is perplexed "because it was said that John had been raised from the dead, by some that Elijah appeared, and by others that one of the ancient prophets had arisen" (Luke 9:7–8, cf. Mark 6:15–16), and in response to Jesus asking what the people say, the disciples respond, "John the Baptist; but others, Elijah; and still others, that one of the ancient prophets has arisen" (Luke 9:19, cf. Mark 8:28, Matt 16:14).

Elijah Raises a Widow's Son

The story of Elijah raising a widow's son was well known, not only because it was found in Hebrew scripture but also because Elijah was a popular figure who was supposed to return just before the Day. It has long been noted that there are several parallels to Jesus raising a widow's son in Nain.[656] The Elijah story is found in 1Kings 17:8–17. The main miracle runs as follows:

A1 Son is dead
17:17 After this the son of the woman, the mistress of the house, became ill; his illness was so severe that there was no breath left in him. 17:18 She then said to Elijah, "What have you against me, O man of God? You have come to me to bring my sin to remembrance, and to cause the death of my son!"

B1 Elijah takes son from mother
17:19 But he said to her, "Give me your son."

C1 Elijah carries son to upper chamber
He took him from her bosom, carried him up into the upper chamber where he was lodging, and laid him on his own bed.

D1 Elijah says the LORD killed son
17:20 He cried out to the LORD, "O LORD my God, have you brought calamity even upon the widow with whom I am staying, by killing her son?"

E Elijah stretches out three times and asks LORD to revive child
17:21 Then he stretched himself upon the child three times, and cried out to the LORD, "O LORD my God, let this child's life come into him again."

D2 LORD gives life back to son
17:22 The LORD listened to the voice of Elijah; the life of the child came into him again, and he revived.

C2 Elijah brings son down from upper chamber
17:23 Elijah took the child, brought him down from the upper chamber into the house,

B2 Elijah gives son to mother
and gave him to his mother;

A2 Son is alive
then Elijah said, "See, your son is alive." 17:24 So the woman said to Elijah, "Now I know that you are a man of God, and that the word of the LORD in your mouth is truth."

The material is arranged in a chiastic pattern, because the chiasm is very clear. The chiasm is made up of the following oppositions: the son is declared dead in A1 and alive in A2; the son is taken from the mother in B1 and returned to the mother in B2; the son is brought upstairs in C1 and then brought down in C2; and, finally, in D1 Elijah complains to God about the death of the son, and in D2 the LORD restores the life of the boy. The centre of the chiasm (D1, E, D2) shows that it is "the LORD" who gave life to the son. The clarity of the chiasm makes it unlikely that the structure would go unnoticed by another author who used chiastic structuring. Consequently, Luke is likely to have recognized the structure, and it is unlikely that it is a coincidence that at the centre of his chiasm Jesus is referred to as "the Lord."

The main parallelism with the WNS concerns the basic nature of the two stories: both concern a widow's son being brought back to life, who is then given back to his mother. Both stories also end with the miracle worker being recognized as being from God. There are also some parallels to the beginning of the Elijah story: Elijah first met the widow outside the

---

[656] See, for example, Bovon, *Luke*, 268; Thomas L. Brodie, "Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament. Luke 7.11–17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17.17–24," 32 (1986): 247–67; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:656; Harris, "The Dead," 299–300; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:791.

gate of Zarephath a walled town between Tyre and Sidon (17:8), and the son is an only son (17:12). There are also certain verbal parallels between Luke and the LXX:[657]

1 Kgs 17:8–10:	**καὶ ἐγένετο**... **ἐπορεύθη εἰς** Σαρεπτα εἰς **τὸν πυλῶνα τῆς πόλεως,**
Luke 7:11–12:	**καὶ ἐγένετο**... **ἐπορεύθη εἰς** πόλιν καλουμένην Ναΐν... **τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως**
1 Kgs 17:23:	**καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ**
Luke 7:15:	**καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ**

The clearest parallel is the last one where there is a sequence of six words which are exactly the same grammatically.[658]

It is clear that Luke wishes to allude to this story. In fact, Luke had already drawn attention to this story at the beginning of Jesus's ministry. In Nazareth, Jesus says, "But the truth is, there were many widows in Israel in the time of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, and there was a severe famine in all the land; yet Elijah, was sent to none of them except to a widow at Zarephath in Sidon." (4:25–26). Here again we have Luke's theme of the mission going to the Gentiles, which in turn creates another subtle parallel between the two texts. Also, the following triple inclusio is formed: A1 Jesus begins his mission (4:14a), B1 report of Jesus spreads (4:14b), C1 Jesus in Nazareth speaks of Elijah going to a widow (4:16–30), C2 an account of Jesus in Nain which alludes to Elijah and said widow (7:11–17), B2 report of Jesus spreads and is heard by John (7:18–20), and A2 Jesus speaks of his mission so far (7:21–23).[659]

Luke by alluding to the Elijah story at the same time alludes to a story of Elisha raising a son from the dead (2 Kings 4:32–37), because it is well established that there is very clear parallelism between the two miracles.[660] There are also a couple of minor parallels between the WNS and the Elisha story: Shunem, where the Elisha raising takes place, and Nain are on the hill of Moreh in Galilee (Nain is on the north side and Shunem is on the south side), and both stories focus on a mother and her only son. Consequently the recalling of the Elijah story will also recall the Elisha story. Luke accomplishes this by focusing on creating

---

[657] Harris, "The Dead," 300; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:854, n. 76; Rochais, *Récits*, 24.

[658] This parallel has been especially noted by commentators; for example, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 658.

[659] The following chiasm is produced between this triple chiasm: A1 Nazarenes try and kill Jesus (Jesus rejected by Israel; 4:28–30)), B1 Power and Wisdom (healings and controversies; 4:31–5:11), C Twelve appointed (6:12–16), B2 Power and Wisdom (Jesus heals many before the Sermon on the Plain; 6:17–49), A2 Centurion's faith (Jesus accepted by Gentiles; 7:1–10). The twelve represent the new Israel that will be founded on those who hear and act (parable of two foundations that ends the Sermon; 6:46–49). Luke indicates that he sees this new Israel as consisting primarily of Gentiles, who are represented by the centurion whose faith is greater than any found in Israel.

[660] It is well established that Luke draws heavily on the Elijah and Elisha cycle of stories; see especially: Thomas L. Brodie, *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings* (NTM 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2004), Part III; Thomas L. Brodie, "Luke the Literary Interpreter: Luke-Acts as a Systematic Rewriting and Updating of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative" (PhD diss., Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas, 1981). See also Jean-Daniel Dubois, "La figure d'Elie dans la perspective lucianienne," 53 (1973): 155–76; Barnabas Lindars, "Elijah, Elisha, and the Gospel Miracles," in *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and History* (London: Cambridge Univesity Press, 1965), 63–79.

parallels with the Elijah story and by having only a couple of direct parallels to the Elisha story.[661]

Luke's purpose seems to be not only to show that Jesus is a great prophet like Elijah and Elisha, but that he is more than Elijah and Elisha. When one compares the WNS with these two raisings of the dead, one difference becomes very clear: the ease with which Jesus raises the WNS. Jesus simply says, "Young man, I say to you arise," and immediately the young man rises. Elijah, however, has to first berate the LORD God and then lie on the boy three times and pray to the LORD before the LORD hears him. Likewise, Elisha has to pray to the LORD and lay on the boy until the flesh begins to warm. Both Elijah and Elisha are intermediaries for the power of the LORD, and the story of Elijah makes it very clear that it is the LORD who revived the child: "The LORD listened to the voice of Elijah; the life of the child came into him again, and he revived" (7:22). Jesus, however, is clearly not an intermediary: he simply speaks and it is so. In short, Jesus is shown to be greater than Elijah and Elisha.[662]

As noted above, the first objection someone from a Jewish background would make to the argument that Jesus is LORD because he performed miracles and raised people from the dead, would be to point to Elijah and Elisha. Luke very effectively counters this objection through the story of the WNS. Luke seems to say that Elijah and Elisha may have performed miracles and raised people from the dead, but they had to call on the LORD to perform their miracles and are clearly intermediaries. Jesus, on the other hand, does not need to call on the LORD; he simply speaks and it is so.[663] In the story of the WNS and elsewhere, Jesus clearly has an authority that Elijah and Elisha do not have, which would make sense if he were the LORD Messiah. In short, for the Christian argument to work, they would have had to show that Jesus's miracles and power went beyond those of perhaps the two greatest miracle workers in Hebrew scripture. This is precisely what Luke does in the WNS.

The above arguments using Elijah and Elisha would come from Christian opponents with a Jewish background; however, a similar sort of argument could be made by those from a Greco-Roman background using the example of Apollonius of Tyana. We shall now turn to this figure.

Apollonius of Tyana

Just as reference to the Elijah story has been noted by scholars, similarities have also been noted to a miracle performed by a contemporary of Jesus and Luke, Apollonius of Tyana. Tyana was north of Tarsus and on the route between Tarsus (the home of Paul) and the churches founded by Paul in Derbe and Lystra. Consequently, Tyana is right in the centre of the area where Paul's mission to the Gentiles began. Apollonius of Tyana also spent a lot

---

[661] Many scholars point to the differences between the WNS and other stories such as the Elijah story and argue that WNS is not based on these stories, because there are differences between the stories. For example, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:656; Harris, "The Dead," 300; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:792–93. This, however, is missing the point of allusion. Allusion is used to allude to a story and recall the other story. This can be done to show similarities as well as differences. This is the case here: the similarities recall the story and show Jesus to be like Elijah, but the differences show him to be superior. Differences only become important if there is no explanation for them, as in, for example, the location of the miracle in Nain. On this see below on page 295.

[662] On this point see Augustin George, "Le miracle dans l'oeuvre de Luc," in *Les Miracles de Jésus selon le Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977), 252–53; Félix Gils, *Jésus Prophéte d'aprés les Évangiles synoptiques* (OBI 2; Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1957), 26–27; Meier, *Marginal*, 2:790.

[663] Except for the rare cases, this is true for all of Jesus's miracles in the gospels.

of time in Rome, which was also a centre of the Christian mission to the Gentiles. Consequently, it is quite likely that both early Christians and their audiences would have known of Apollonius. It is thus a safe assumption that Gentile opponents of Christianity, and consequently the argument that Jesus was God on earth because of the miracles he performed, would point to Apollonius. Also, if they had known of the story of Apollonius apparently raising someone from the dead, they would have certainly used this. The story runs as follows:

> Apollonius performed another miracle. There was a girl who appeared to have died just at the time of the wedding. The betrothed followed the bier, with all the lamentations of an unconsummated marriage, and Rome mourned with him, since the girl belonged to a consular family. Meeting with this scene of sorrow, Apollonius said, "Put the bier down, for I will end your crying over the girl." At the same time he asked her name, which made most people think he was going to declaim a speech of the kind delivered at funerals to raise lamentation. But Apollonius after merely touching and saying something secretly, woke the bride from her apparent death. The girl spoke, and went back to her father's house like Alcestis brought back to life by Hercules. Her kinsman wanted to give Apollonius a hundred and fifty thousand drachmas, but he said he gave it as an extra dowry for the girl. He may have seen a spark of life in her which the doctors had not noticed, since apparently the sky was drizzling and steam was coming from her face; or he may have revived and restored here life when it was extinguished; but the explanation of this has proved unfathomable, not just to me but to the bystanders. (4.45)[664]

The central question is whether the early Christians and their opponents would have known this story. While the historicity of Apollonius is not questioned, there is huge debate concerning the story of Apollonius raising a girl from death. There are two main problems that need to be addressed in making an argument that the story of the raising of the girl is based on an actual incident. The first is the unreliability of the source, Philostratus's *Life of Apollonius* (henceforth, *Life*), and the second is that any similarities to the WNS can be explained by the Apollonius story being based on the WNS. However, if a strong argument can be made that the raising-of-the-dead story presented by Philostratus plausibly came from a reliable source and that the story is not based on the WNS, then a case can be made that the WNS is alluding to the Apollonius story. First we will address the issue of sources and argue that raising-of-the-dead story does not seem to come from Philostratus's main source, which is rightly considered to be completely unreliable, but from oral tradition. The similarities between the WNS and the Philostratus's story will then be analysed, and finally the question of whether the Philostratus's story is based on the WNS will be discussed.

Philostratus's Sources

Apollonius was a contemporary of Jesus and the first generation of Christians, and the healing with parallels to the WNS purportedly took place in Rome during the time of Nero. The story is found in Philostratus's *Life of Apollonius*. Philostratus lived around the turn of the third century, and thus our historical record of this event is many years after it occurred. Not only this, but Philostratus's principle source is considered by many to be a fabrication, or at best completely unreliable. However, this does not necessarily mean that all of Philostratus's work is unreliable. It will be argued here that this healing could well go back to a historical event.

---

[664] Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (trans. Christopher P. Jones; 2 vols.; LCL 16–17; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), 419.

Philostratus's main source was the notebooks of a certain Damis who was purportedly a student of Apollonius. Consequently, on the surface the document appears to satisfy the requirements of autopsy, that is, eyewitness. Philostratus states that he received these notebooks from his patron the Empress Julia Domna, who in turn had been given them from a relative of Damis (1.3). Julia then commissioned Philostratus to write a biography of Apollonius. Though the authenticity of the notebooks are in doubt, this part of their history is likely correct. This is because Philostratus was part of a "salon" of philosophers and literary men set up by Julia. It would be hard for Philostratus to invent this part of the story, because there would still be eyewitnesses to it.[665] Julia herself is believed to have died before the book was published, because, though the book was commissioned by her, it was not dedicated to her.[666]

There are several reasons for scepticism concerning the historicity of the notebooks:[667]

1) At several places where the historical record can be consulted, the notebooks are wrong.[668] Basic chronology and order of events seem to be confused that go beyond possible sloppiness on the part of either Damis or Philostratus.
2) There is also no other record of Damis or fragment of his work.[669]
3) At times when Philostratus is using the Damis source the picture of Apollonius is contradictory and a little negative.[670]
4) At other times when using the Damis source *Life* presents details that are completely fantastical; for example, descriptions of the phoenix (3.49) and the martichoras (a tigerlike animal with a human head, 3.45).[671] These details occur during Apollonius's

---

[665] So, for example, Johannes Göttsching, *Apollonius von Tyana* (Leipzig: M. Hoffmann, 1889), 71; W. Speyer, "Zum Bild des Apollonius von Tyana bei Heiden und Christen," *JAC* 17 (1974): 49. This does not mean that the notebooks are genuine. Ewen Lyall Bowie ("Apllonius of Tyana," *ANRW* 16.2:1663–67) on the other hand thinks that the notebooks were a fabrication, and that it would have been patent to every Greek reader. This is because he thinks Philostratus's work was meant to be considered more a novel than a historical work. He points to the novelistic tone of the work throughout the biography. While it is true that there is this populist tone throughout the work, it is also balanced with a desire to present Apollonius as a philosopher. Also, as will be discussed, Philostratus goes to some pains to make clear that his work is based on autopsy. The novelistic elements can be explained by Philostratus perhaps wishing to have a wider audience. He may also have been playing to the tastes of his patroness. Bowie's argument is also weakened by the fact that later readers took the work seriously, since it was used to show that Apollonius was as great a sage and miracle worker as Jesus. For example, Hierocles, a provincial governor at the turn of the fourth century used Philostratus's work in his *Philalethes* to this end (Everett Ferguson, "Apollonius of Tyana," *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*: 81; Meier, *Marginal*, 578). Hierocles's work prompted a reply by Eusebius (*Against the Life of Apollonius of Tyana Written by Philostratus*). This does not mean that Philostratus meant that every detail in his work was meant to be taken seriously by the educated reader. This is especially true of the more fantastical elements. See 4) below.

[666] Erkki Koskenniemi, "The Function of the Miracle Stories in Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii Tyanenesis*," in *Wonders Never Cease: The Purpose of Narrating Miracle Stories in the New Testament and its Religious Environment* (ESCO/LNTS 288; London: T & T Clark, 2006), 71. Most scholars date it to around 220 C.E.; for example, Christopher P. Jones, "Introduction," in *Life of Apollonius* (vol. 16; LCL 16–17; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), 3; Koskenniemi, "Function," 71.

[667] For a fuller and more detailed list see Erkki Koskenniemi, *Der philostrateische Apollonios* (CHL 94; Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1991), 9–14.

[668] On this see Bowie, "Apollonius,"1655–62; Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 11–12.

[669] Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 10–11. While this alone does not point to fabrication, in combination with the other items the level of suspicion reaches a point that goes beyond mere doubt.

[670] Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 11.

[671] Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 11–12.

trips to India and Ethiopia, which are sections based on the Damis source and contain many such fantastical details and events. This suggests that Philostratus did not expect everything in his work to be taken seriously.[672]

5) The Damis sections of *Life* present themes and a philosophy that are very similar to those of Philostratus.[673] Damis also functions as a student asking questions that allow this philosophy to be presented. The questions also elicit answers the reader may have about the events taking place.[674]
6) Philostratus constantly quotes and mentions his source; this has no parallel in other ancient sources.[675] In other words, Philostratus is trying too hard to make his story seem historically authentic. In addition, Philostratus was well aware of the method of a found ancient text supplying authority: in *Life* Apollonius also finds an old book (8.19).

These points would indicate that the notebooks brought to the empress were a fabrication and that Philostratus was involved.[676] The reason for this ruse could have been monetary: the supposed relative would surely have been reimbursed for bringing them to the attention of the empress, as would Philostratus in being commissioned to rewrite them in proper form. However, we are now moving into the area of pure speculation; and the essential point is that whatever the history of the notebooks, they are extremely unreliable.

There were additional sources also used by Philostratus, or which he could have had at his disposal. There were collections of letters by Apollonius that Philostratus claims to have used. However, the letters that have survived are a mixture of forgeries and genuine letters. It also seems likely that some of the letters Philostratus quotes are his creations.[677] There were also works written by Apollonius; for example, four books on planetary prophecy, which Philostratus says are mentioned by Moeragenes (3.41.1), and "On Sacrifice," which Philostratus says he had found "in many sanctuaries, many cities, and the homes of many wise men" (3.41.2).[678] Philostratus also mentions Apollonius's will (1.3.2).

In addition, there were a couple of biographies of Apollonius. One was a biography of Apollonius's youth in the Cilician cities of the Aegae by Maximus of Aegae. Maximus's biography seems to indicate that Apollonius's interest in healing, cultic matters, and philosophy started early in his life.[679] Since this work concentrates solely on Apollonius's youth, it is thought to be a supplement to an existing biography, most likely that of Moeragenes, which is described next.[680] Philostratus specifically says he does not use Moeragenes' work since Moeragenes "was greatly ignorant about the master" (1.3.2), which

---

[672] Bowie, "Apollonius,"1663–65; Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 13–14. As Bowie points out, this adds to the novelistic tone of the work in these places. On the function of such accounts in *Life* and other Greco-Roman works see Koskenniemi, "Function," 73–74.

[673] Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 11.

[674] Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 12.

[675] Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 12

[676] Speyer, "Zum Bild," 49–52, suggests it was a forgery of neo-Pythagorean admirers of Apollonius. However, the closeness of the Damis sections to Philostratus's own philosophical views points to the involvement of Philostratus.

[677] Erkki Koskenniemi, *Apollonios von Tyana in der neutestamentlichen Exegese: Forschungsbericht und Weiterführung der Diskussion* (WUNT 2:61; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994), 4.

[678] On Moeragenes see below 3.b. All quotations are from Philostratus, *Life*. Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* 4.13.1) also quotes "On Sacrifice," and as Koskenniemi, "Function," 78, notes, there is no reason to doubt the authenticity.

[679] On this source being authentic see F. Graf, "Maximos von Aigai: Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferung über Apollonios von Tyana," *JAC* 27–28 (1984–85): 65–73; Koskenniemi, "Function," 78.

[680] So Bowie, "Apollonius,"1684–85.

has led some scholars to conclude it did not present Apollonius in a positive light.[681] However, the title calls Apollonius a "magician and a philosopher," and consequently the work does not seem to have presented Apollonius in a completely negative light, because the negative term "magician" is balanced by the positive term "philosopher."[682] The reason Philostratus would wish to disparage this work is that it presented Apollonius as a magician, while Philostratus wished to show the opposite. Philostratus may also have disparaged Moeragenes's biography because he was hoping to replace Moeragenes's biography as the standard authority on Apollonius.[683]

Finally, Philostratus claims to have gone to the cities and shrines associated with Apollonius to gather oral traditions himself (1.2.3).[684]

There is no way of gauging the reliability of both he oral and written traditions that Philostratus used and precisely how he adapted them to his own uses. What is clear, however, is that Philostratus wished to present himself as properly researching Apollonius. All the sources he mentions satisfy the requirements of autopsy. The letters and the will were supposedly from Apollonius himself, and the notebooks of Damis were supposedly from one of his students. Furthermore, Maximus was from the region of Apollonius's youth where he would have had access to local tradition. Finally, Philostratus himself went to the places associated with Apollonius to gather local tradition. Consequently, while Philostratus at times adopts a novelistic style, he also presents himself as doing the proper historical groundwork.

This tension runs throughout *Life*. On the one hand Philostratus wishes to present a historical account of a "master" who values the philosophical over the magical. At the same time Philostratus wishes to provide an entertaining novelistic account of someone connected with the magical and fantastical. He seems to wish *Life* to be both serious and entertaining at the same time and to have as wide an audience as possible.[685] There is a similar tension in that Philostratus wishes to make it clear that Apollonius is not a magician and at the same time show Apollonius performing miracles.[686]

The question remains as to whether one should view the entire work as historically unreliable. This would probably be a mistake: Philostratus would most likely not have had complete freedom. He would have been restrained to a degree by the extant historical record. This would have included the two biographies, the letters, and the oral tradition. It is telling

---

[681] For example, Graham Anderson, *Philostratus, Biography and Belles Lettres in the Second Century A.D.* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), 299–300; E. Meyer, "Apollonius von Tyana und die Biographie des Philostratus," *Her* 52 (1917): 393; F. Solmsen, "Philostratus (8–12)," *PRE* 20, no. 1 (1941): 141–43.

[682] So Koskenniemi, "Function," 79.

[683] So Bowie, "Apollonius,"1673. For a discussion on what Moeragenes's biography may have contained, see Bowie, "Apollonius,"1673–79; Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, ch.4. It would appear that Moeragenes presented Apollonius as both a philosopher and a magician. It is the last that seems to have offended Philostratus.

[684] Apollonius taught in various cities. In the second century Lucian (*Alex.* 5) mocks followers of Apollonius. Whether such followers of Apollonius's teaching were still around in Philostratus's time is unknown. Traditions about him may have been maintained in neo-Pythagorean circles. Apollonius is also presented as a cultic reformer. There would thus also be traditions about him at temples and shrines with which he was associated. On the subject of oral traditions at Apollonius's disposal see Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 17–18.

[685] On this tension see Koskenniemi, "Function," 73.

[686] On this tension see J.-J. Flinterman, *Power, Paidea and Pythagoreanism: Greek Identity, Conceptions of the Relationship between Philosophers and Monarchs and Political Ideas in Philostratus's Life of Apollonius* (DMAHA 13; Amsterdam: Gieben, 1995), 232; Koskenniemi, "Function," 75–76.

that Philostratus gives himself the freest reign with events that took place farthest away, namely, in India and Ethiopia.[687] He may have also felt a certain freedom with precise sequences and chronologies that would be difficult to check up on. He would have had the least amount of freedom with events found in the extant record.

This would probably be especially true of the oral traditions. As Koskenniemi notes, there is no reason to doubt that Philostratus collected oral traditions.[688] It would be odd to collect such traditions and then not respect them. Oral traditions would have been kept by those who respected Apollonius and his teaching. These would include those in neo-Pythagorean circles who traced part of their philosophical lineage back to Apollonius, as well as people at the temples and shrines with whom he was associated.[689] If one of Philostratus's goals was to create a popular work on Apollonius, he would not wish to offend those who respected the memory of Apollonius. Such people would be a key part of his intended audience, and they would be the first to complain if he misrepresented their traditions.

However, this still leaves the question as to whether the story of Apollonius saving a bride from death in Rome is likely to have been based on oral tradition and respected by Philostratus. There are two items which speak to this story being based on authentic tradition. The first is its location. The girl is reported as being from an unnamed wealthy and important family in Rome (4.45.1). It is consequently quite possible that descendants of this consular family were still present and perhaps of certain prominence within Rome at the time of Philostratus. If so, then this tradition would be part of the treasured oral tradition of that family.[690] Also, since the event took place in Rome, the story would also likely be part of the oral tradition of shrines and temples associated with Apollonius in Rome. This is quite likely because Philostratus presents Apollonius as a reformer and founder of various shrines and temples and as staying in various sanctuaries when in Rome (4.40.4). Though Apollonius's involvement in cultic reform is exaggerated on Philostratus's part, it seems to be based on solid historical foundation.[691]

Since both Philostratus and an important part of his intended audience were based in Rome, he is least likely to have tampered with traditions from there. Also, since this event took place in Rome, one would expect this to have been one of the better known stories about Apollonius, and consequently, if it did take place, it would most likely also have been in the written tradition. If this is the case, then Philostratus would have had less freedom to

---

[687] This is especially found in the trip to India; see Koskenniemi, "Function,"

[688] Koskenniemi, *Philostrateische*, 17–18. Flinterman, *Power*, 67–68, also thinks that Philostratus took part of his material from local traditions.

[689] Though it is unknown what sort of followers there were of Apollonius's philosophical teaching at the time of Philostratus, they were sufficiently known in the second century for Lucian to refer to and make fun of them (*Alex.*, 5). In Lucian's time there were probably circles of followers, and when these disbanded the members would most likely join circles which presented a similar philosophical outlook, namely, fellow neo-Pythagoreans.

[690] This is probably unlikely, since the name of the family is not mentioned in the tradition.

[691] For example, the work by Maximus shows this interest: see Bowie, "Apollonius,"1684–85. This interest is also indicated by his work "On Sacrifice," and many of his letters. On this see Koskenniemi, "Function," 78–79. Apollonius's interest in cultic matters would also explain Philostratus's interest in Apollonius: Philostratus was himself involved in cultic matters (Koskenniemi, "Function," 71). This would also explain Julia's interest in Apollonius: she was the daughter of a priest and had an ecumenical interest in philosophy and religion (Meier, *Marginal*, 2:577). In addition, Philostratus, a Sophist, had little interest in and shows no enthusiasm for neo-Pythagoreanism in his other works (Bowie, "Apollonius,"1672; Koskenniemi, "Function," 77).

tamper with it. Finally, if the event was not based on historical events, Philostratus would have had to explain why such a remarkable event that took place in Rome was not found elsewhere in the tradition, either oral or written.

The second aspect that points to authenticity is the matter-of-fact way in which the story is recounted, which is in stark contrast to the miraculous events of the Damis material that take place in India and Ethiopia. The story comes right after an account of Apollonius's problems with Nero and his instructor Tigellinus, a section in which Philostratus has allowed himself some freedom in recreating conversations between Apollonius and Tigellinus. The miracle itself seems tacked on at the end of one these conversations and is introduced with the sudden "Apollonius performed another miracle" (4.45.1). The miracle is given. Philostratus then returns to the subject of Nero's tyranny: "It was at that time that Musonius was confined in Nero's prisons" (4.46.1). The story continues to describe how Apollonius and Musonius contrived to converse with each other by letter. The chapter ends soon after that with Apollonius going off to the west, the subject of book five. The story does not appear to serve any purpose in regard to the surrounding material; its position appears to be a matter of convenience.

As just mentioned, the miracle itself is presented in a matter-of-fact way.[692] This lack of sensationalism is particularly evident at the end: the event is not presented so much as a miracle, but rather as the observation that the girl was actually still alive (steam was rising from her face in the rain). The only miraculous occurrence is Apollonius waking the girl from her coma-like condition. This reticence on the part of Philostratus could be used to argue for the inauthenticity of the story: it accords with the Philostratus's presentation of Apollonius as a philosopher and not a sorcerer. However, the way that Apollonius performs the miracle points to sorcery and magic, because Apollonius whispers something secret into the girl's ear and she revives. This secret whispering would have been perceived as some sort of magical formula. The story consequently both plays down the miraculousness and shows Apollonius acting like a sorcerer, both of which go against the tendency of Philostratus.[693]

One item that speaks against historical plausibility is that the story seems to follow a certain form for these types of stories in Greco-Roman literature: a famous healer comes across a funeral procession, notices something, stops the procession, and then reports the person is not dead, and/or heals the person. It is thus possible that Philostratus based the story on a well-known literary motif. [694] On the other hand, this motif or form may be the

---

[692] So also Gerd Petzke, *Die Traditionen über Apollonius von Tyana und das Neue Testament* (SCHNT 1; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), 130.

[693] Petzke, *Traditionen*, 129–30, thinks this story is one of the clearest examples of Philostratus using older traditions. He also thinks that Philostratus lessened the miraculous nature of his source. Though there is a tension between presenting Apollonius as a philosopher and showing him performing miracles, Philostratus still does not shy away from showing Apollonius performing miraculous events. As Koskenniemi, *Apollonios*, 193, points out, if the story was so problematic for Philostratus, why did he not simply leave it out? The answer to this would be that the tradition was too well known to leave out, which would also mean that Philostratus would have less leeway in tampering with it. Consequently, it is likely that both possibilities concerning the girl's condition were in the story from the beginning.

[694] So Bovon, *Luke*, 269–70; Bowie, "Apollonius,"1665; Rochais, *Récits*, 20–21. Ancient examples can be found in Iamblichus *Babyloniaca* 6, *Historia Apollonii regis Tyrii* 26, Apuleius *Florida* 19, Pliny *Naturalis Historia* 26.13, Asclepius in an Epidauros inscription (*CIG* 4.299; woman not dead, but carried on a stretcher), and Artemidorus *Onirociticus* 4.82. This was a fairly common motif in novels: the heroine is saved from death by burial or cremation at the last minute. Meier, *Marginal*, 2:856, n. 88, unlike Rochais, does not think one can

invention of modern scholars. As with healing stories in general, certain elements of a story are set by the very nature of the genre: one needs a healer, a patient, a means by which the two meet, and the healing itself. This is not a literary form, but rather the basic nature of any healing. If the healing is remarkable, one would also expect those present to remark upon it. The same is true of stories about people misdiagnosed of death. Such stories require a seemingly dead person and someone to give the correct diagnosis. The person who offers the diagnosis and the dead person also have to meet. This would have to take place at either the actual burial or cremation, on the way to it, or before the person is taken to it.[695] Finally, the person would have to notice something amiss. Any event like this that took place would fit into this pattern. Consequently, to say that such a story fits this form is to say nothing regarding historicity. That such events did actually occur is highly likely: the ancient world did not have access to our diagnostic tools.[696]

To conclude, there are fairly good grounds to think that this event described by Philostratus is based on a historical event. If this is the case, then the Christian community in Rome and elsewhere would have heard the story. Apollonius appears to have been a well-known figure who travelled extensively, founded shrines, and collected disciples. Not only this, he was originally from a region that was one of the earliest areas of Christian activity, and he spent time in Rome, which seems to have become the main centre of Christian activity (both Peter and Paul worked from there). The story of Apollonius saving the bride is sensational, to say the least, and this remarkable story would have quickly spread. At first the dissemination would have been uncontrolled, but the story is very likely to have reached a stable form within the family of the bride, because it would be a valued and cherished tradition. The story would also have reached a stable form among Apollonius's followers. These versions over time would correct and exert control over the more fabulous versions produced by the uncontrolled dissemination first in Rome, and later, elsewhere. This event combined with the other miraculous events surrounding Apollonius would add to his fame. One thing that is quite historically certain is that Apollonius was a well-known figure who was associated with miracles.[697] If only one story was told about Apollonius, it would likely have been the empathic story of his raising a bride who had died at her wedding and was being carried to her funeral.

---

speak of a distinct literary genre, since the sources are so disparate in nature and the stories are quite different from each other. In this he is correct; it is better to speak of a literary motif, as Bovon does.

[695] For example, the story of JD takes place before JD is taken to be buried, and Asclepiades in Apuleius, *Florida* 19, notices that a man on a funeral pyre showed vital signs.

[696] Even today one hears accounts of people declared dead coming back to life.

[697] Some scholars see a contradiction between Apollonius as miracle worker/magician and Apollonius as cultic reformer and philosopher, because the category "magician" in the negative sense of sorcerer was a criminal category and the temples and shrines were part of official religion. However, the application of the category "magician" to Apollonius is one that most likely grew after his death. Apollonius from an early age is presented associated with temples, especially the temple of Asclepius. It was there that he gained a reputation as a healer (*Life* 1.8.2). This would explain both the connection with cultic matters and healing. Graf "Maximos," 37 and Koskenniemi, "Function," 79, conclude that Apollonius was not presented or referred to as a magician in Maximus's biography. It is easy to imagine the movement from extraordinary healings to miracles to the category "magician," especially by those who opposed his views on cultic matters. In Moeragenes's title for his biography one finds Apollonius as both magician and philosopher.

The Similarities between Philostratus's and Luke's Stories and the Question of Dependency

We shall now do a detailed comparison between the two stories. To recall, Philostratus's story runs as follows:

> Apollonius performed another miracle. There was a girl who appeared to have died just at the time of the wedding. The betrothed followed the bier, with all the lamentations of an unconsummated marriage, and Rome mourned with him, since the girl belonged to a consular family. Meeting with this scene of sorrow, Apollonius said, "Put the bier down, for I will end your crying over the girl." At the same time he asked her name, which made most people think he was going to declaim a speech of the kind delivered at funerals to raise lamentation. But Apollonius after merely touching and saying something secretly, woke the bride from her apparent death. The girl spoke, and went back to her father's house like Alcestis brought back to life by Hercules. Her kinsman wanted to give Apollonius a hundred and fifty thousand drachmas, but he said he gave it as an extra dowry for the girl. He may have seen a spark of life in her which the doctors had not noticed, since apparently the sky was drizzling and steam was coming from her face; or he may have revived and restored here life when it was extinguished; but the explanation of this has proved unfathomable, not just to me but to the bystanders. (4.45)[698]

And the WNS runs as follows:

A1 Jesus goes to Nain
7:11 Soon afterwards he went to a town called Nain,
B1 Jesus is with disciples and large crowd
and his disciples and a large crowd went with him.
C1 A dead man is being carried out: he is a widow's only son
7:12 As he approached the gate of the town, a man who had died was being carried out.
He was his mother's only son, and she was a widow;
B2 Widow is with a large crowd
and with her was a large crowd from the town.
A2 The Lord has compassion, tells widow not to weep and stops bier
7:13 When the Lord saw her, he had compassion for her and said to her, "Do not weep."
7:14 Then he came forward and touched the bier, and the bearers stood still.
B3 Jesus commands man to rise
And he said, "Young man, I say to you, rise!"
C2 Man rises and Jesus gives him to his mother
7:15 The dead man sat up and began to speak, and Jesus gave him to his mother.
B4 Crowd is afraid and glorifies saying a prophet has arisen
7:16 Fear seized all of them; and they glorified God, saying, "A great prophet has risen among us!"
A3 Word spreads throughout Judea
and "God has looked favourably on his people!"
7:17 This word about him spread throughout Judea and all the surrounding country.

Although there is no discernible chiastic pattern in the Apollonius story, the essential elements of the two stories are very similar: the healer comes across a funeral procession, he stops the procession, he shows compassion, he does something, and the person wakes from death. Consequently, on one level the stories are the same story: only the details differ. However, this would be true of any story where a person was discovered not to be dead on the way to being buried or cremated.

---

[698] Philostratus, *Life*, 419.

The overlap of essential elements would not be enough to indicate dependency; there would also have to be an overlap in the details between the two stories, which is indeed the case:

1) In both the body seems to be the first item in the funeral procession followed by the principal mourner: *Life*, "There was a girl who appeared to have died just at the time of her wedding. The betrothed followed the bier;" WNS 7:12, "As he approached the gate of the town, a man who had died was being carried out. He was his mother's only son, and she was a widow; and with her was a large crowd from town. When Jesus saw her."[699]
2) In both there is a sizeable entourage from the dead person's city: *Life*, "Rome mourned with him;" WNS 7:11, "with her was a large crowd from the town." The word translated as town in Luke is *polis*, that is, a city.
3) In both the healer is shown as being compassionate and wishing to stop the crying: *Life*, "I will end your crying over the girl;" WNS 7:13, "he had compassion for her, and said, 'Do not weep.'"
4) In both the bier is mentioned as being halted by the healer: *Life*, "Put the bier down;" WNS 7:14, "Then he came forward and touched the bier, and the bearers stood still."
5) Both healers are mentioned as touching the body or almost touching the body: *Life*, "Apollonius after merely touching;" WNS 7:14, "The he came forward and touched the bier."
6) Both healers say something which causes the awakening: *Life*, "saying something secretly;" WNS 7:14, "And he said, 'Young man, I say to you, rise!'"
7) In both the awakened speak: *Life*, "The girl spoke;" WNS 7:15, "The dead man sat up and began to speak."
8) In both the awakened are given back to a parent: *Life*, "and went back to her father's house;" WNS 7:15, "and Jesus gave him to his mother."

These parallels are numerous and have long been noted.[700] Just as someone well versed in Hebrew scripture would have noticed the strong parallelism between the story of Elijah and the story of the WNS, anyone who knew the story of Apollonius would have noticed the even stronger parallelism between it and the story of the WNS. Luke, the associate of Paul, who travelled widely, would most certainly have heard the story of Apollonius raising a bride, and would have been well aware of the parallelism.[701] In fact, because Luke used chiasm extensively in the writing of his gospel, and was thus very conscious of the

---

[699] Contra Harris, "The Dead," 296, 298. Harris argues that the mother is in front because Jesus sees the mother (7:13) and then approaches the bier (7:14). This part of the text does not indicate any order in the funeral procession. On the other hand, the funeral bier is mentioned as the first thing being carried out: Jesus's entourage meets the man being carried out of the city gate (7:12), and after that Jesus sees the widow "When the Lord saw her . . ." (7:13). The widow is also mentioned right after the son and the rest of the entourage after that in 7:12. There would thus seem to be the same order in *Life* and WNS: body being carried, principal mourner, other mourners from town.

[700] See for example, Koskenniemi, *Apollonios*, 194–95; Petzke, *Traditionen*, 130; Rochais, *Récits*, 20–21.

[701] Luke does not seem to have been a stay-at-home type, and he seems to have quite quickly devoted himself to the gospel. Like his mentor Paul, he was likely a travelling overseer. Also, in his introduction to his gospel, he claims to have investigated "everything very carefully for a long time" (1:3), and refers to eyewitness traditions. Luke is thus claiming to have done the proper historical research, which would have involved travelling to the places where events took place.

parallelism between the chiastic units, one can only conclude that the parallelism between the WNS and the Apollonius story was deliberate.

This raises the question of why Luke would wish to allude to the Apollonius story. The reason would likely be the same as for alluding to the Elijah story: Luke would wish to show that Jesus was superior to Apollonius, who was a well-known healer and possibly raised someone from the dead. This would be necessary for the Christians, since they were arguing that Jesus was God on earth because he performed so many remarkable healings and especially because he raised people from the dead. All a sceptical non-Christian Gentile would have to do would be to point to Apollonius, which surely would have happened. This makes it very likely that the early Christian community was well aware of Apollonius and his miracles.

The early Christian community would need to counter this argument, or their argument for Jesus being the LORD Messiah would fail. The WNS does this by recalling the miracle of Apollonius and at the same time drawing a contrast. In other words, the story functions just like the story from Elijah. This is where the differences become important. There are two important contrasts:

1) In *Life* Apollonius awakes the girl by whispering something secret, and in WNS Jesus in a loud voice commands the son to resurrect.
2) In *Life* it is strongly implied that the girl was not actually dead: it is stated as a fact that steam was rising from her body. However, at the same time the possibility that the girl could have been dead is left open: her awaking and return to her parents is compared to Hercules bringing someone back to life. This duality is emphasized at the end of the story where Philostratus says whether the girl was healed or raised from the dead is a mystery to him, as it was to the witnesses. In contrast, in the WNS the young man is clearly dead: he is first referred to as "the man who had died," and when he is brought back to life he is referred to as the "dead man."

The first difference emphasizes the commanding manner in which Jesus conducts his miracles, which is found elsewhere in the tradition: Jesus is presented, like God, speaking and his word becoming manifest. The second difference shows that Jesus definitely raised someone from the dead: Luke's story leaves no room for doubt.

The close parallelism between the Apollonius story and the WNS has led some commentators to propose that the Apollonius story is based on WNS, and consequently that Philostratus is trying to present a pagan Christ figure.[702] This last idea has been shown to be extremely unlikely: nowhere in *Life* does Philostratus refer to Jesus or show any interest in Christianity.[703] This would consequently make it unlikely that he is trying to allude to the

---

[702] Most recently John Ferguson, *The Religions of the Roman Empire* (AGRL; London: Thames & Hudson, 1970), 181–82; Vincent Mary Scramuzza and Paul Lachlan MacKendrick, *The Ancient World* (New York: Holt, 1958), 693. Even Ferguson admits that the resemblances have been greatly exaggerated.

[703] The comparison between Apollonius belongs to a later age when paganism and Christianity were competing with each other (G. W. Bowersock, "Introduction," in *Life of Apollonius: Translated by C. P. Jones: Edited, Abridged, and Introduced by G. W. Bowersock* [Hamondsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1970], 13–14). The first person to have compared the two seems to have been Hierocles, governor of Bithynia, who wished to show Apollonius to be Christ's equal (Bowersock, "Introduction," 13; Ferguson, "Apollonius," 81; Jones, "Introduction," 19). Hierocles drew heavily on Philostratus's *Life*, and, as Bowersock points out, it was Philostratus's work that led to the fourth-century interest in Apollonius. See also F. C. Conybeare, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana, the*

Christian miracle. It is possible that Philostratus knew Luke's gospel and based this miracle on the WNS. However, this would be the only instance where he seems to have done so, and the question is then raised as to why he would do so and then change the miracle from a raising-of-the-dead story to a healing.[704] Philostratus does not shy away from sensationalism elsewhere. If a story were copied, it is more likely that the WNS copied the Apollonius story, since it shows a greater healer at work.

To conclude, the Apollonius story does not seem to originate with Philostratus; it seems to come from some earlier tradition, perhaps even from oral tradition in Rome. It is unlikely that Philostratus borrowed the story from Luke or that the high degree of parallelism between the two stories is due to chance. This leaves the strong possibility that Luke referred to the Apollonius story, which would mean that Luke and the early Christians knew of Apollonius and this incident in Rome. Since Rome was one of the early church's main centres, this is very likely. In addition, the Aegae and Apollonius's birth place, Tarsus, were also areas of early Christian concentration. Consequently, it is highly likely that the early Christians woul have heard of Apollonius and his miracles. Since the miracle of the young bride to be is a highly sensational one, the report of it would have travelled far. Knowing of Apollonius and his miracles, the early church would need to show Jesus to be a far superior healer in order to sustain their argument that Jesus's miracles show him to be God on earth.

On the other hand, it is always possible that even though the evidence so far points to it being highly implausible that Jesus did meet a funeral procession and heal or raise a person, and that Luke changed the details to refer to the Apollonius story. This would have been perfectly acceptable in an orally centred society. However, this possibility is unlikely.

Historical Analysis

A historical analysis of each element of the WNS will now be done to determine if Luke adapted an actual story of Jesus or composed the story from his own imagination. If it can be shown that every element is historically suspect, then it would be more likely that the latter is the case. There would, however, remain the possibility that Luke had taken an actual incident and so changed it to his purposes that only the essential elements of Jesus raising someone being taken out to be buried remained.

1) 7:11 "Soon afterwards"
    a. This is Lukan, because it connects WNS with the previous story of the centurion. It is also typical Lukan phrasing.[705]
2) "He went to a town called Nain"
    a. There are certain verbal parallels to the Elijah story.
    b. Nain was a walled town just like Zarephath. The walled nature of Nain is discussed further below under item 4.b.
    c. Nain is on the slopes of the hill of Moreh, which is the same hill upon which Shunem is found. Shunem is where Elisha performed his miracle of raising a boy which has strong parallels to the Elijah story.[706]

Epistles of Apollonius and the Treatise of Eusebius (London: W. Heinemann, 1912), xv. There are perhaps a few verbal reminiscences scattered throughout *Life*, but none are significant; they are likely due to chance. See John Swinnerton Phillimore, *In Honour of Apollonius of Tyana* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), 1:lxxvi.

[704] So Harris, "The Dead," 303.

[705] See Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:658.

d. The hill of Moreh was later referred to in the Middle Ages as "little Hermon," because its outline is similar to that of Mt. Hermon. It is unknown how early the connection between the two features dates. However, it is likely that the similarity would have been noticed well before then, and, considering the length of human inhabitation before the time of Jesus, it would surely have been noted by that time. If this is so, then an additional minor parallel is made to the story of the PB, which traditionally took place at the foot of Mt. Hermon.
e. Though neither of these last three items offer any certainty as to why Luke would choose Nain, they do show that the view that there are no reasons as to why Luke would choose it is false.[707]

3) "and his disciples and a large crowd went with him."
a. Disciples and crowds are a common feature in many of the Jesus stories. However, with the mention of the large entourage, Luke makes it clear that there were many witnesses to the event. This is discussed in detail below under item 22.
b. The large crowd matches the crowd with the funeral train and creates a chiastic parallel between the two.
c. There is the possibility that the two crowds symbolically represent the living and dead that will meet on the Day and enter the kingdom.

4) 7:12 "As he approached the gate of the town"
a. This creates a parallel with the Elijah story: there are verbal echoes with the Elijah story, and Elijah met a widow at the gate of Zarephath.
b. The word for town is *polis*, a city, but Nain was more like a village and certainly not a city. By calling Nain a town Luke is better able to make a parallel to the Elijah story which took place in Zarephath, a city-state, and to the Apollonius story, which took place in Rome. Nain was one of the few walled towns in Galilee at the time of Jesus, and Luke may have chosen this location for his miracle in order to draw a parallel with Zarephath and its gate. However, this can only be possible if Luke knew that this obscure town in Galilee was walled. Some scholars think this unlikely since Luke elsewhere shows a certain ignorance of Palestinian geography. Like similar claims with Mark, such an accusation does not hold up under scrutiny: neither Luke nor Mark arranged their traditions in a historical linear manner, and consequently events that took place in geographically disparate places at times would be placed next to each other. Also, Luke claims to have investigated "everything very carefully for a long time" (1:3) and also refers to eyewitness traditions.

---

[706] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:656, sees this connection as tenuous. However, the connection is less tenuous in view of the close parallelism between the Elijah and Elisha stories: anyone knowing the location of the two towns on Moreh would make the connection. Fitzmyer also argues that Jesus in Luke is Elijah resurrected and not Elisha resurrected. There is thus no reason for Luke to refer to the Elisha story as well. However, Luke does not regard Jesus as Elijah resurrected, but refers to the Elijah story to show that Jesus is more than Elijah. Luke would also have tow show that Jesus is more than Elisha, as Elisha, like Elijah, also performed miracles and raised people from the dead. In addition, in Luke John is Elijah resurrected, not Jesus.

[707] For example, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:656; Meier, *Marginal*, 797. Meier sees Nain as one of the most serious arguments in favour of historicity. So also Rochais, *Récits*, 30–31. Rochais, however, concludes that the miracle is not historical.

Luke is consequently claiming to have done the proper historical research of the time. This would have meant travelling to the places where events took place. Going to Palestine would also be needed to give authenticity to some of the uniquely Lukan material, like, for example, the infancy narratives and the story of Jesus's youth. Luke was also a travelling companion of Paul and visited Jerusalem with him. All in all, it is quite reasonable to think that Luke had travelled at least once to Palestine to do his research. He would not only have been interested in the sights and places where Jesus had conducted his mission, but also in the prominent places mentioned in Hebrew scripture, with which he was well versed. Even if he did not travel to Palestine, he could have heard that Nain was walled.

5) "a man who had died was being carried out."
   a. The parallels with the Apollonius story now begin. Jesus, like Apollonius, meets a funeral procession where the dead person is being carried out on a bier. In both processions the bier would appear to be the first item in the procession, followed by the principle mourner, and then the rest of the mourners.
   b. This, however, is the wrong order for a funeral procession in Galilee. In Galilee the order should be: principal female mourner (the mother), other female mourners, the body, and then the male mourners. Whereas in Judah the women would come after the bier.[708]
6) "He was his mother's only son,"
   a. This creates a parallel with not only the Elijah story, but also JD and the PB.
   b. The death of an only child was a stock image of ultimate tragedy in Hebrew literature.[709] Luke could be building up pathos to explain not only why Jesus raised the man, but also to show his compassion.
7) "and she was a widow;"
   a. This creates a parallel with the Elijah story.
   b. The tragedy is made even greater by the man being the only son of a widow: see 6.b above.[710]
   c. Women and especially widows are a favourite of Luke's.[711]
8) "And with her was a large crowd from the town."
   a. This supplies many witnesses for the miracle (see above 3.a and below 22).
   b. This shows the tragic nature of the incident: most of the city has come out to support her.
   c. Nain was actually a village and not a city, and the large crowd from the *polis* parallels the large crowd in Rome in the Apollonius story.
   d. This creates a chiastic parallel with the crowd accompanying Jesus.

---

[708] Alfred Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (repr.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1971), 555–56; Harris, "The Dead," 298.

[709] Bovon, *Luke*, 271, n. 40. See for example Amos 8:10 ("I will make it like mourning for an only son"), Jer 6:26 ("make mourning as for an only child").

[710] Bovon, *Luke*, 271; Robert F. O'Toole, *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts* (GNS 9; Wilmington, Del.: M. Glazier, 1984), 35.

[711] See Meier, *Marginal*, 2:852, n. 69; O'Toole, *Unity*, 126. In the Lukan material there is the WNS and the parable of the widow and the judge (18:1–8). Luke also has Jesus speak of Elijah not going to the widows of Israel, but to the widow in Zarephath (4:25–26).

e. There is the possibility that the two crowds represent the eschatological crowds of the living and the resurrected that will join and enter the kingdom.

9) 7:13 "When the Lord saw her,"
   a. The first use of this title in a narrative sequence in Luke makes it clear that this miracle points to the nature of who Jesus is.
   b. This also creates a chiastic parallel with the crowd saying that God has visited them.

10) "he had compassion for her"
   a. This makes it clear that the story is based on compassion and not faith. This provides a parallel to the PB, where in Luke the miracle also does not seem to be based on the faith of the father and when Jesus performs the miracle despite his comment on the lack of faith of those present.
   b. The compassion of the Lord is a favourite theme of Luke.[712]
   c. Apollonius was also moved with pity.

11) "and said to her, 'Do not weep.'"
   a. Apollonius says he will stop the mourners' weeping.
   b. This creates a parallel with JD.

12) 7:14 "Then he came forward and touched the bier"
   a. Apollonius also came forward and is mentioned as touching the girl.
   b. This creates a parallel to JD, where Jesus took the girl by the hand, and a possible parallel to PB.

13) "and the bearers stood still"
   a. Apollonius likewise stopped the procession. The only difference is the order: Apollonius stopped the bier and then touched the girl, while Jesus touched the bier and then the bier stops.

14) "And he said, 'Young man, I say to you, rise!'"
   a. This creates a parallel with JD and echoes Mark's version of JD.
   b. Apollonius also speaks to the girl to awaken her.
   c. Since the word used for "arise" also means to resurrect, this phrase looks forward to the resurrection by the LORD.

15) 7:15 "The dead man sat up"
   a. This parallels the getting up of JD. The next line also implies that the man stood up.
   b. By referring to the man as the "dead man," Luke emphasizes that the man was indeed dead, unlike the stories of JD, PB, and Apollonius.
   c. The ease with which Jesus performs the miracle is in sharp contrast to the Elijah and Elisha miracles.

---

[712] So Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. Bertram Lee Woolf and Martin Dibelius; London: I. Nicholson and Watson, 1934), 75. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:656, on the other hand notes that Luke often omits feelings from his sources; for example, Mark's "Moved with pity" (1:41) in 5:13. However, compassion is a strong element in the special Lukan material. Besides this story, there is the parable of the good Samaritan (10:29–37), Martha and Mary (10:38–42), the friend at midnight (11:5–8), the slave who will get a light beating (12:47–48), the fig tree that is given an extra year to bear fruit (13:1–9), the healing of the crippled woman (13:10–17), the healing of the man with dropsy (14:1–6), and the story of the prodigal son (15:11–32). As Dibelius notes there is also a predilection in the Lukan material towards women. Luke specifically mentions the women helpers (8:1–3) and Mary studying (10:38–42). Also, in the healing of the crippled woman (13.10–17), the woman like the widow does not ask for help: Jesus helps on his own initiative.

16) "and began to speak"
    a. This creates a parallel with both JD and the Apollonius stories.
17) "and Jesus gave him back to his mother."
    a. This is a word-for-word parallel with the Elijah story.
    b. In Luke the PB is given back to his father.
    c. Apollonius gave the girl back to her father.
18) 7:16 "Fear seized all of them;"
    a. This emphasizes that the man was truly believed to have been dead right up to the moment Jesus spoke his command to rise.
    b. In JD the witnesses were also astounded by the miracle. Again there is a closer parallel to the Markan version where the amazement is great (9:42).
19) "and they glorified God,"
    a. This creates a parallel with both the Elijah story and the PB.
    b. This along with the rest of 7:16–17 is a typical ending of Luke to miracles.[713]
20) "saying, 'A great prophet has risen among us!'"
    a. This sounds like a post-Easter confession of faith.
    b. This recalls Elijah, considered a great prophet.
    c. This also creates a chiastic parallel with Jesus speaking about John being a prophet and the greatest person ever born.
21) "and, 'God has looked favourably on his people!'"
    a. This creates a chiastic parallel with the Lord seeing the widow.
    b. Jesus presented as God visiting (looked favourably on) his people is a theme peculiar to Luke.
22) "This word about him spread throughout Judea and all the surrounding country."
    a. This adds to the Lukan theme of the gospel spreading beyond Israel.
    b. The news spreading also allows Luke to link the story to the following story where John across the Jordan hears about Jesus and asks his question.[714]
    c. The news spreading also counters the problematic notion of the witnesses not telling anyone about the raising of JD: if at the command of Jesus no one was to tell, how did anyone know about the miracle. Furthermore, if it was to be a secret, why was Mark telling it. Matthew eliminates this problem by ending the story by saying, "And the report of this spread throughout that district" (9:26). This is very similar to Luke's ending here.[715] This would fit with the premise of Matthew knowing Luke. Even if there is no dependence, this indicates that both Luke, who refers to JD, and Matthew correct a problem concerning Jesus raising people from the dead.
    d. On the other hand, Luke's claim that the news spread far and wide could be used to argue that the story is historical: would someone create a story with the problem of having to explain why this story was not previously known? One would need to create a scenario to explain why the story was not known.

---

[713] Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:656. See, for example, Luke 8:43 ("And all were astounded at the greatness of God."), 13:10 ("and the entire crowd was rejoicing at al the wonderful things he was doing"), 17:15 ("When he saw that he was healed, turned back, praising God"), 19:43 ("and all the people, when they saw it praised God"). All have no parallels in Mark or Matthew.

[714] Bovon, *Luke*, 273.

[715] Luke: **καὶ ἐξῆλθεν** ὁ λόγος **οὗτος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ** Ἰουδαίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ. Matthew: **καὶ ἐξῆλθεν** ἡ φήμη **αὕτη εἰς ὅλην τὴν** γῆν ἐκείνην.

> This usually involves secrecy of some sort: there were only a few witnesses who were sworn to secrecy and not allowed to reveal the story until later. However, this in itself creates suspicion and is probably one of the reasons why Matthew changed Mark's ending of JD. Also, WNS does not allow for such a scenario: Jesus halts a funeral procession. Rather than create some complicated scenario that would explain why the story was not known, it is probably better to present the story as originally being well known and simply not offer any explanation as to why it was not told in the tradition.

The above list shows that there are multiple grounds for suspicion about the historicity of every element of the WNS. Suspicion is raised first of all by parallelism with the other raising-of-the-dead miracles. While the parallels could be due to coincidence, the number of them with each story makes this extremely unlikely. The same is true for the connections in the story to themes central to Luke's theology: Jesus visiting his people, the word going beyond Israel, Jesus's compassion, and his predilection for widows and unfortunate women. Furthermore, the story in general fits too well into Luke's structure, both chiastically and linearly. All in all, the most plausible explanation is that Luke composed this story from his own imagination to fit his theological purposes.

In addition to the above listed grounds for suspicion, Mark and Matthew did not use this story. According to Luke it was a very well-known story: there were many witnesses, and the news concerning it spread far and wide. Mark, Peter's scribe, would surely have known of it, and yet he chose two vastly inferior raising-of-the-dead stories to show Jesus to be the LORD Messiah. This, combined with the suspicion associated with every element of the WNS makes it highly plausible that Luke did indeed invent the WNS.[716]

Meier sees this as being unlikely:

> We would have to imagine Luke at his writing table with the texts of 3 Kingdoms, 4 Kingdoms, and Mark's gospel spread out before him . . . We would further have to imagine Luke proceeding in a strange and eclectic manner, plucking one detail from one story and another detail from a second story, all the while leaving the substance and major circumstances of each story behind and creating a story that was actually like none of the models he used.[717]

---

[716] Rochais, *Récits*, 29–30, comes to a similar conclusion. He sees the story as a christological elaboration of the Elijah miracle, which was then adapted by Luke. He argues for a Semitic background. First, there is perhaps the overuse of "and" to indicate a paratactic style. However, Luke could also be imitating the style of the Septuagint (Meier, *Marginal*, 2:795). This is likely since he is wishing to draw attention to the Elijah story and quotes the Septuagint at 7:15. Second, "the only son" agrees with the Masoretic text and not the Septuagint. This assumes that the scholar Luke did not know Hebrew; there is no evidence for this. Third, the clause "and she was a widow" (7:12) corresponds to a circumstantial clause in Hebrew. However, this could be due to Luke trying to imitate the paratactic style. He may also wish to draw attention to this fact by tacking it on at the end of the sentence. Fourth and last is "this word spread throughout Judea" (7:17). The Greek word for spreading out (ἐξῆλθεν) usually means "went out," but the corresponding word in Hebrew can also mean "spread out." However, this usage is also found in the Septuagint, and Paul also uses the verb in this sense in quoting Ps 18:5 (Meier, *Marginal*, 2:795). In addition, Luke is trying to make an analogy to the gospel going out to the Gentiles (see above on page 280). All in all the examples are quite weak, and though the argument is possible, it is not likely (Meier, *Marginal*, 2:796). Rochais, *Récits*, 20–21, also sees the possibility of influence of a "literary genre" in pagan literature. Against this idea, see above on page 290.

[717] Meier, *Marginal*, 2:794.

This, however, is not as unimaginable as Meier makes it sound. Meier is clearly arguing from the perspective of Luke using primarily written sources: Luke is cutting and pasting bits from one story and then another to form the WNS. However, if one sees Luke as composing the story like an oral storyteller, then the process is quite different. Luke could simply have created his story by following the basic outline of the story of Apollonius, and then simply changed and added details to create parallels with the other stories. This is very similar to what an oral storyteller does, except that Luke is changing key elements as well. The choice of the Apollonius story as his base story would be fitting for the author of the "gospel to the Gentiles." Luke is then likely to have changed the dead person and the location to create parallels with the Elijah and Elisha stories.[718] Finally, he changed and added other minor details both in this new story and in JD and PB to make parallels with them according to his own theology and agenda. The process is actually quite simple, and not so strange to imagine as Meier would make it out to be.[719]

Meier's proposal also sounds unusual because a motive is not supplied. The motive would be that one of the main arguments used to show that Jesus was the LORD Messiah was under threat. This would be a serious problem for the Christian community, especially over time, since their opponents, both Jewish and pagan, would build and strengthen their arguments against the Christians. They would point out that it is not clear that JD and the PB were indeed dead, and even if they were dead, those with a Jewish background could point to Elijah and Elisha, and those with a pagan background could point to the famous Apollonius. Consequently, if Luke were to invent a raising-of-the-dead story these other stories would be close to mind. He would wish to counteract them.

Ancient Truth versus Modern Truth

This conclusion will be unpalatable to many devout Christians. For such Christians the gospel writers are literally saints who would not do anything untruthful and would certainly not deliberately create a story and present it as fact. For such readers it is important that the gospel stories be accurate history, because they see this as the foundation of their faith. However, I think this is misjudging the intent and purpose of the gospels, because it is reading these biographies and histories of Jesus as one would read modern biographies and histories. In the modern world we like to have a strict line drawn between fact and fiction, and between history and story. However, in the ancient world, as Byrskog points out in his *Story as History – History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History*, the line between history and story was not clear and was not expected to be.[720] Ancient historians were free to create speeches and put them in the mouths of their subjects and supply details that they could not possibly know. For the ancient historian the specific details of history were not as important as the overall meaning of the history. History was as much story as it was history.

The same is true for the storyteller in the model of oral society adopted by this thesis. For such storytellers, whether it was history or story, what was important was the main point or thrust of a story. The details of a story could be manipulated to make different points. A good example in the gospel tradition is the two feeding stories. From a modern perspective

---

[718] So also Reginald Horace Fuller, *Interpreting the Miracles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 64.

[719] Similar conclusions have been reached by others; for example, Fuller, *Interpreting*, 64, who sees the WNS as a popular tale Christianized by traits drawn from the Elijah story.

[720] Byrskog, *Story*.

they would have to be two different stories, because the details are different. However, from the model adopted by this thesis, they are clearly the same story but told differently to make different points. From the perspective of such a model it is meaningless to ask whether there were actually five thousand or four-thousand people present at the original event, or whether there were actually twelve or seven baskets collected, because the main point of the story was that a great number of people were fed by very little and that there was so much food provided there was plenty left over. The number details simply supply added meaning.

This indicates a different understanding of truth in the ancient world. The truth of an event was not to be found in the details, but in the general shape of the story. This is quite different from our modern understanding of truth based on the scientific method, where the details provide the truth. The modern understanding of truth does not allow for the invention of details, but the ancient understanding of truth does. It is this ancient understanding of truth, I think, that allowed Luke to create the story of the WNS. For the gospel writers the most important truth was that Jesus was the LORD Messiah, and the important truth about the miracles was that they showed that Jesus was the LORD Messiah. This truth was shown not only by the quantity, scope, and difficulty of the miracles, but also by the ease by which they were performed. The most difficult of these miracles were those where Jesus raised someone from the dead. However, the truth that Jesus was the LORD would be threatened by the argument that the miracles were nothing special, because others had performed similar miracles. The truth that Jesus was the LORD would also be threatened by the fact that miracles of JD and the PB were very poor raising-of-the-dead stories, because in both stories there it is questionable as to whether the person was actually dead.

The creation of the story of the WNS from the Elijah and Apollonius stories would then serve the purpose of preserving a higher truth and allowing more people to be saved on the coming day of the LORD. From such a perspective, the story of the WNS would act like a parable, because parables, though fictions, are intended to tell a truth. From this perspective the WNS is telling the truth, because it shows the ease with which Jesus healed as compared with both Gentile and Jewish healers such as Apollonius and Elijah. The story also showed that Jesus was different from Jewish healers in that he did not need to ask God for help. Consequently, the story would be truthful in spirit if not in fact.

The same is true to a degree of the other stories studied in this thesis. It was argued that the stories of JD, the HW, and the PB were all heavily symbolic and pointed to greater truths. These stories were not simply recounting of the plain facts of events in Jesus's life, but rather were embedded with meaning by the gospel writers to point to deeper truths. In this sense these stories are also parabolic in nature. Naturally, there is a big difference between changing or adding details such as how long the HW suffered or the age of JD, and completely creating a new story; however, the difference is only in degree.

It is also quite possible that some of the Christian hearers of the WNS were originally expected to understand the story metaphorically, and that only outsiders were meant to understand the story literally. There is evidence for such a division between outsiders and insiders in Mark's parable section, which is then taken up by Luke and Matthew. In this section Mark makes it clear that only Jesus's disciples were given the full meaning of the parables and that the public was left to understand the parables as best they could. There is thus a division between the disciples as insiders and the general public as outsiders. Furthermore, the knowledge given to the disciples was not meant to remain hidden, but was meant to be passed on: they were to be lampstands for the knowledge they received. A similar division between outsiders and insiders was also found in the story of JD where the

public were to literally understand that JD was not dead but sleeping, but the three and the parents were to understand this statement symbolically. In this case the hearer of the story is on the inside and knows the full truth of what happened.

In the time of the gospel writers the division would not be between disciples and the public, but between Christians and the public. There was also a further division between those in leadership positions who helped spread the gospel, and those who accepted the gospel but did not devote their whole lives to the spreading the message. The Christian hearers of the gospel stories would have had the meaning explained to them. In the chapter on the methodology of chiastic analysis it was argued that chiasm was a mnemonic device to aid the performers of the gospel not only in reciting the gospel, but also in expounding it. In such a scenario the performer-teachers would explain the meaning of the gospels to their audience. They would thus explain the parables and the meaning embedded in the miracle stories. In regards to the miracle stories they would explain that the miracles showed Jesus to be the LORD messiah. They would also explain such things as the symbolic meaning of the number of disciples, the age of JD, and the numbers in the feeding miracles. In the story of the WNS the allusions in the story to Elijah, Apollonius, and the stories of JD and the PB would be made clear. However, it is unlikely that the deeper meaning of the gospels would be explicated to all, and certainly not the public. This is because the language used by Mark indicates that the Christians understood themselves as being similar to the mystery religions. Such language is also very common to the letters of Paul.[721] By being baptised, the new Christians would have taken the first step into the mystery of the kingdom of God. They would have had the meaning of the miracles and Jesus's teaching explained to them. What is not known is whether any teaching was reserved for those in leadership positions.

Consequently, it is quite possible that the WNS was not intended to be understood by all of Luke's Christian audience to have literally taken place. Also, if the reason for creating the story was to defend the argument that Jesus was the Messiah because he could raise people from the dead, then the public would have to understand the story literally. It is thus likely that most Christians were also to understand the miracle as having actually taken place, because it would be hard to keep secret the true nature of the story. They would have had the metaphorical meaning explaind to them, but only those initiated into the deeper teaching of the mystery of the kingdom of God would know the full truth. This would include those in leadership positions.

The presentation of the story of the WNS as history would likely only be seen as a partial deception, because the story pointed to a higher truth about the nature of Jesus. It would be similar to Jesus telling the mourning crowd in the story of JD that JD was not dead, but only sleeping, which he asked the witnesses to repeat. In both cases the outsiders would only understand a partial truth, but the insiders would understand the full truth. It is this understanding of truth that would allow Luke to add the story of the WNS to the Jesus tradition within the Christian tradition. Naturally, to be able to do so Luke would have needed the support of other "insiders" within the community, namely, those in leadership positions. In regards to those outside the Christian community, there would by the time of Luke be little they could do to disprove the story, because a couple of generations had passed since the death of Jesus, and Palestine was in state of upheaval due to the war. Consequently,

---

[721] See for example Rom 1:25, 16:25; 1 Cor 2:1, 4:1, 13:2, 14:2, 15:1; Eph 1:9; 3:3, 4, 5, 9, 5:32; 6:19; Col 1:26, 27; 2.2; 4:3; and 2 Thes 2:7.

it would be quite easy for the Christian community to present the parabolic story of the WNS as an event in Jesus's life.

How Luke Could Have Inserted the Story of the WNS into the Tradition

There is still a problem, however: if Luke invented this story, how was he able to insert it into his gospel and have it accepted by all Christians? According to the historical framework and the model of oral tradition adopted by this thesis it would be difficult for someone to add items to the oral tradition. If items were added, there would surely be some complaint, and hopefully, some mention of it in the historical record.

In fact there does seem to be a mention. In his letter to the Philadelphians, Ignatius of Antioch says the following:

> For I heard some people say, "If I do not find it in the archives, I do not believe it in the gospel," And when I said to them, "It is written," they answered me, "That is precisely the question." But for me the archives are Jesus Christ, the inviolable archives are his cross and death and his resurrection and the faith which comes through him; by these things I want, through your prayers, to be justified.[722]

Ignatius is here referring to a complaint of some people that some of the items found in the gospel are not to be found in the archives (ἀρχειά). The subject here is clearly written tradition, because Ignatius responded to this complaint by saying, "It is written," and those complaining reply, "That is precisely the question." For us, the question is what precisely is Ignatius referring to when he uses the term "archives." Most scholars argue that this term refers to the Hebrew Bible. [723] There are two reasons for this. First, a couple of paragraphs before the quoted passage, Ignatius speaks of people expounding Judaism, and just after the quoted passage further reference is made to the Hebrew Bible. Second, Josephus and Philo both refer to the Hebrew scripture as "records."[724]

This argument, however, is not totally convincing. Ignatius's primary concern is division within the community. The exact nature of the division is not explained. Ignatius makes continual appeals for unity and respect for the authority of the bishop together with the presbytery and the deacons. In doing so Ignatius stresses that all should participate in one Eucharist (4.1). The division would thus seem to be an internal Christian division: some are participating in separate Eucharist. Ignatius after speaking of how he is in chains for Christ and declaring his love of the gospel of the flesh of Jesus Christ (5.1) speaks of how he also loves the prophets because they anticipated the gospel (5.2). It is here that he speaks about what to do if someone expounds Judaism (6.1). He says, "Do not listen to him. For it is better to hear about Christianity from a man who is circumcised than about Judaism from one who is not. But if either of them fail to talk about Jesus Christ, I look upon them as tombstones . . ." (6.1). These people thus seem to be trying to convert Christians to Judaism, because they are failing to talk about Jesus Christ. In other words, they do not seem to be Jewish Christians, because they are not talking about Jesus, but rather non-Christian Jews trying to

---

[722] 8.2; Translation from Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1999), 181.

[723] For example, William R. Schoedel ("Ignatius and the Archives," *HTR* 71 [1978]: 97–106; William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* [Her; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985], 291) and most scholars (for example, Robert McQueen Grant, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary* [6 vols.; New York: Nelson, 1964], 4:106).

[724] Josephus (Con. Ap. 1.29) and Philo (Praem 1–2).

convert Christians to Judaism. If this is so, then these people could not be the cause of the internal Christian division. Ignatius then continues to urge unity (7.1 – 8.1), and says, "Moreover, I urge you to do nothing in a spirit of contentiousness, but in accordance with the teaching of Christ" (8.2) The quoted passage referring to the archives then begins, "For I heard some people say . . ." Ignatius seems to be starting a new topic concerning division in 8.2, and seems to have moved on from the earlier topic of people expounding Judaism.

The argument regarding Philo's and Josephus's use of the term "records" is also not convincing. First, they use a different word; there is thus no record of Hebrew scripture being referred to as "archives." Second, even if it were the same word, this does not rule out the possibility that the archives referred to a community's records. Consequently, the straightforward reading of the term points to community archives, which would likely have been kept in the community book cupboard. Such a cupboard would be necessary to store the community's copies of Hebrew scripture, the letters of Paul and others, and the gospels themselves. That there were various collections of the words and deeds of Jesus, that is, gospels, is indicted by Luke's prologue: "Since many have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the events that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed on to us from the beginning" (1:1–2).[725]

The argument that the Ignatius passage puts Hebrew scripture and the written gospels in opposition also fails since all three synoptic gospels seem to go out of their way to show that their presentations of Jesus's mission and death are prefigured in the Hebrew Bible. It would thus be odd that people would be saying that they do not believe what is in the written gospels because it is not found in the Hebrew Bible. Also, no one would expect every word and deed of Jesus to be foreordained in the Hebrew Bible, but rather his general mission, death, and resurrection.

To conclude, it makes better sense if Ignatius's opponents are saying that they do not believe specific items found in the gospels, because there is no record of them in the archives which contained collections of Jesus's words and deeds. Ignatius replies that the "invioble archives" are Jesus Christ, his death and resurrection, and the faith which comes through them (8.2). In other words, the exact details of physical written records (both those in the archives and the gospels) are not as important as the faith in Jesus Christ and the salvation that comes through Jesus's death. For Ignatius, Jesus himself is the door to the Father (9.1), and Jesus is thus the true gospel, "the imperishable finished work" (9.2). Ignatius, rather than answering the question directly, points to what he sees as being more important, namely, salvation through Jesus Christ. It is exactly this type of reasoning that would justify the creation of the story of the WNS in the first place.

By the time Ignatius was writing, all four gospels are likely to have been written. The last gospel to be written, that by John, also contains what seems to be a defence of new stories:

> This is the disciple who is testifying to these things and has written them, and we know that his testimony is true. But there were many other things that Jesus did; if every one of them were written down, I suppose the world itself could not contain the books that would be written (John 21:24–25).

The defensive nature of this passage is quite clear. One can read the passage as the author defending the fact that John's gospel does not contain all the Jesus tradition that is found in

[725] On the necessity for a Christian book cupboard see Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 116–20.

the other gospels, or as defending the fact that John's gospel contains items that are not found in the other gospels. It is likely that both readings are intended, because there are items in the other gospels not found in John and items in John that are not found in the other gospels. John would have been well aware of the differences between his gospel and the other gospels, because, according to the model of frequent communication between the Christian communities adopted in this thesis, he would have known them.

The opening of the gospel of Luke could also partially be a defence against the charge of introducing new items:

> Since many have undertaken to set down an orderly account of the event that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed on to us by those who from the very beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word, I too decided after much investigating everything carefully from the very first, to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, so that you may know the truth concerning the things about which you have been instructed (Luke 1:1–4).

Luke begins by mentioning that many have undertaken the task of setting down the Jesus tradition handed down from the beginning of the movement in an orderly fashion. It is not precisely clear if he means that many have written gospels such as the four we now possess or simply that many communities had undertaken to write down the oral tradition in some sort of organized form. Luke could consequently be referring to the community archives mentioned in Ignatius's letter to the Philadelphians.

Luke then goes on to stress that he has investigated everything carefully from the beginning. While this statement is not in itself defensive in nature, it nevertheless acts as a justification for the authenticity for what follows. As noted in the first chapter, Luke is presenting himself here as a proper historian of the time, and the investigation would have involved not only collecting the traditions handed down from eyewitnesses, but also travelling to the place where the events took place. Luke could consequently counter any claim that items found in his gospel that are not found in the community record, either oral or written, are due to his widespread and thorough investigation. In other words, Luke's opening statement could partially have had the intent of forestalling criticism of some of the items found in his gospel, such as his infancy narrative, which many scholars do not think is based on historical fact. If the conclusion of the analysis of the WNS in the previous chapter is correct, and there is strong evidence that it is, then the story of the WNS would be one such item. It would also be the type of item referred to in the dispute found in Ignatius's letter to the Philadelphians.

Ignatius's letter indicates that the written gospels were disputed in regards to their content, and the passages from the gospels of John and Luke can be taken as defences of their content. The three passages also indicate how disputed content was or could be defended. In the case of Ignatius, the importance of the higher truth was stressed; in the case of John, it was stressed that it would be impossible to list all of Jesus's teaching and deeds, and therefore there will be many that are not known; and in the case of Luke, that he did thorough investigation which uncovered things not known before.

However, none of these arguments would work without the support of those in leadership positions. From the historical framework used in this thesis, the only way new tradition could have been introduced would be with the blessing of those with authority. In other words, it was only those with the charge of overseeing the passing on of the Jesus tradition who could have introduced new tradition. By the time of Ignatius at the turn of the

era, a mere thirty to forty years after the deaths of Peter and Paul, there appears to be a strong hierarchical structure in place consisting of bishops, deacons, and presbyters in the churches between Antioch and Rome. Ignatius constantly exhorts the communities he addresses to listen to and obey their bishops, whom he saw as being appointed by God and as taking the place of God. For example, in the letter to the Magnesians, he says that the bishops preside in the place of God and the presbyters are in place of the council of apostles and deacons.[726] He bases this on the principle that one must welcome the servants the master of the house sends just as one would welcome the master, and consequently the bishop is in the place of the Lord, that is, Jesus Christ.[727] This reasoning is based on the view that Jesus (LORD and manifestation of God) appointed the twelve, who in turn appointed others, including Paul, who in turn appointed others, some of whom may still have been alive by the time of Ignatius, and many would have been alive in the generation before Ignatius. Consequently, his readers were to be subject to the bishop and presbyters just as they would have been to the apostles of Jesus Christ.[728] The most important apostles for the Gentile churches would have been Peter and Paul.

To our ears, the authority claimed by Ignatius for himself and the other bishops may seem exaggerated, but it is to be remembered that Peter and Paul had only died thirty to forty years previously. For us at the beginning of the twenty-first century this would be the same as someone dying in the 1960's, such as, for example, Martin Luther King Jr. In other words, it was in the very near past. Also, it was argued in the first chapter that Paul's letters and Acts show control and authority structures being in place from the beginning of the movement, and in the second chapter it was shown that Mark and the other synoptic authors stressed that the twelve were personally chosen by the LORD for leadership, and were taught "everything." Consequently, there is strong evidence for a strong system of hierachical leadership from the beginnings of the movement through to Ignatius. Such a system would not only help safeguard the oral Jesus tradition, but also, ironically, allow for new traditions to be introduced.

The leadership not only had oversight over the Jesus tradition but were also, in the words of Ignatius, "deacons of the mysteries of Jesus Christ."[729] Here Ignatius uses the same language of mystery and initiation as found in the letters of Paul and the Gospel of Mark. Thus, the leaders being the guardians of the mysteries of the kingdom would also be able to introduce new tradition by saying that they are revealing what up to now had remained secret. However, they would retain the ultimate secret, namely, that though stories such as that of the WNS revealed symbolic truth about Jesus, the story was not based on historical fact.

For the leadership, those in charge of the mysteries of Jesus Christ, the story would be understood as mythical truth, because they would have known it was invented. Whether all in leadership positions knew this cannot be known. Also, it is certain that non-Christians were to understand the story as history, because it was created to show that Jesus did actually raise people from the dead. However, it is uncertain to what degree precisely most Christians would have understood the story metaphorically or historically. Ignatius's letter to the Philadelphians would indicate that most Christians were to understand the story as history.

---

[726] Mag. 6:1, cf. Tral. 3:3.
[727] Eph. 6:1.
[728] Tral. 3:1.
[729] Tral. 2:3.

However, when the story was performed the metaphorical meanings would be stressed. The audience over time would be expected to understand the significance of the parallels with JD and the PB, Elijah, and Apollonius. They would also understand according to the model of oral tradition used in this thesis, that not every detail occurred historically as described, because storytellers had freedom to change these details. Consequently, the story would be presented and understood as a combination of myth and history, just as the story of JD would be. The more astute would notice that the majority of the details were used to draw parallels with the other stories and would thus understand that the story contained a strong mythic element. The understanding of the story would thus range from purely mythic for those high up in the Christian leadership to purely historic for non-Christians.

Many may find this discussion of truthfulness in regard to what they see as holy scripture highly unpalatable. However, it is to be remembered that such a response comes from a modern perspective that draws a sharp line between history and story. This line was not sharply drawn in the ancient world, and texts could contain elements of both. The line between these two categories had long been blurred in Hebrew scripture, and this can be seen in the gospels as well. For example, the story of JD takes on a symbolic meaning that is revealed through the chiastic analysis. Another example is the two feedings miracles, which would be two tellings of the same story, but each from a slightly different mythic or symbolic perspective. This blurring of myth and history was present in all ancient history, as discussed in chapter one with reference to Byrskog's *Story as History—History as Story*.[730] For the ancient person, what actually happened was not as important as the meaning of what happened. This does not diminish truth: truth is found not only in events but also in meaning. This in turn means that myth can be as truthful as plain history. From this perspective the story of the WNS is not fraud, and nor are the other "pious" frauds found in Hebrew scripture.[731] They are true, because they contain what the authors would see as a higher truth. In this sense they are more truthful than plain history.

Conclusion

The study of the story of the WNS started under an hermeneutic of suspicion: why did Mark not use this story, but use two poor raising-of-the-dead stories instead to make key theological points in his gospel? Luke's placement of the story of the WNS within his larger chiastic structure indicates that he was aware of the weakness of the stories of JD and PB. The story of the PB takes the mirror position in the larger structure, and the story of JD a similar mirror image in the hinge section of the chiasm. Luke makes several changes to these two stories that create strong parallelism between all three stories. Thus, when the hearer-reader comes to these two stories, she or he is reminded of the story of the WNS.

The analysis of the story of the WNS then turned to the more immediate chiastic structure, the Jesus-is-the-one-to-come chiasm. The central question of this chiasm is the identity of Jesus: is he the one to come? John clearly suspects that Jesus is the one (C), and the centurion (A1) and the sinners and tax-collectors (A2) recognize that Jesus is from God, but they do not fully understand who Jesus is. The question of Jesus's identity along with that of John the Baptist is the focus of the B level. In the story of the WNS (B1) Jesus is declared to be a great prophet, and Jesus declares John to the be more than a prophet and the

---

[730] Byrskog, *Story*.

[731] The Book of Deuteronomy and all the pseudepigraphic works such as Second and Third Isaiah, Daniel, and Enoch are considered clear examples by many scholars.

greatest person ever born (B2). The juxtaposition of these two units points to Jesus being the one that John/Elijah is preparing the way for: Jesus is the LORD who will raise the dead on his Day, and is consequently God visiting his people. The study of the WNS chiasm shows that God visiting his people was an act of compassion. The chiastic structure points to Jesus raising the WNS as being symbolic of both the raising of the dead on the day of the LORD and Jesus's own resurrection. Jesus the only Son will be raised, and Jesus will be shown to be more than a great prophet arisen. The witnesses to the miracle, like the centurion, sinners, and tax-collectors, are aware that something truly wondrous is occurring, but do not fully understand the significance of what is happening. The significance will not be revealed until after Jesus is raised.

The chiastic analysis not only highlighted the theological significance of the story for Luke, but also those items that he may have composed to form the chiastic parallels. The theological significance of the story revealed is in accord with the central themes of Luke's gospel. The usefulness of the story of the WNS for Luke's theological agenda was further shown in the analysis of the placement of the story in Luke's linear structure to this point. The gospel so far can be seen as leading up to John's question and Jesus's reply, which occurs right after the story of the WNS. Jesus is the one to come, God coming to visit his people in compassion. With the chiastic and linear analyses, the grounds for a hermeneutic of suspicion deepen.

The parallelism between the story of the WNS and the stories of Elijah and Apollonius were then looked at. It is well established in the scholarly community that Luke draws upon and creates parallels with Elijah, and it is also well established that there is parallelism between the stories of Apollonius and the WNS, but the significance of this parallelism is debated. The study of Apollonius from the perspective of how history was conducted in a primarily oral society, such as that of the Greco-Roman world, led to the conclusion that the story of Apollonius reviving a young bride was likely based on oral tradition from Rome. Also, unlike the elements of Philostratus's *Life* which are clearly the author's creation, the story of the bride is strangely lacking in elements of the miraculous, and in fact the account even questions whether anything miraculous actually occurred. This led to the conclusion that the story was based on an actual historical incident, which Luke and the general society of the time would have been aware of.

An analysis of the parallelism between the stories of the bride and the WNS led to the conclusion that it could not be by accident, but rather by the conscious design of Luke. The high degree of elements in the story that are used to create chiastic parallelism and parallelism with the raising-of-the-dead stories of JD, the PB, Elijah, and Apollonius, along with the deep hermeneutic of suspicion, led to the conclusion that the WNS was not based on a historical incident in the life of Jesus.

This conclusion, however, created a problem, because it goes against the general historical framework laid out in this thesis. This led to a discussion of how a new tradition could be introduced to the community, and it was argued, ironically, that one of the elements that allowed for the securing of the oral tradition about Jesus would also allow new traditions to be introduced. However, this would still not be easy, and it was shown that there is direct evidence of complaint that traditions found in the gospels were not part of the tradition in Ignatius's letter to the Philadelphians, and indirect evidence of a similar complaint in the Gospel of John.

The question of the difference between our modern understanding of historical truth and the ancient understanding of it was also briefly discussed along with why Luke and the

leadership of the time would feel the need to invent such a story. In the ancient world the details of a story could often be changed to add meaning to the story. History in the ancient world was consequently a mixture of history and story. However, in creating the story of the WNS to respond to the stories of Apollonius raising a bride and Elijah raising a widow's Luke moved out of the realm of history into that of story. At best, the story can be seen as a type of *midrash* on the way Jesus historically performed his miracles in comparison with other healers, both pagan and Jewish.

It is the differences in this comparison that indicate the need for creating the story. Jesus in comparison to other healers does not need recourse to prayer or magical phrases when conducting his miracles: he simply speaks and it is so. This in turn points to him being a manifestation of God. In the chiastic analysis in chapter two it was shown how Mark, and consequently the other synoptic authors, arranged material to show that Jesus was the LORD Messiah: Jesus was the LORD Messiah because he had complete control over all manner of evil. Jesus's ability to raise people from the dead was a key element in this argument. However, the two miracles that showed this ability, namely the stories of JD and the PB, did not demonstrate it very well, and left open the question as to whether or not Jesus did actually raise anyone from the dead. Also, opponents could simply argue that others had also performed similar events, hence the need for a story such as that of the WNS, which not only showed that Jesus definitively raised someone from the dead, but did so in a manner unheard of for a mere human.

Thesis Conclusion

This brings us to an end of our analysis of the three raising-the-dead miracles found in the synoptic tradition. The goal of the thesis could be simply stated as a historical analysis of these three miracles to determine (1) which elements of the stories may have originated with an incident in Jesus's life, (2) the shape of the oral tradition, and (3) which elements may have been added by the gospel writers to the oral tradition. While the goal of the thesis is simple, the method by which one reaches the desired conclusions is not.

As with all such historical inquiries, one is not dealing with certainty, but with plausibility, and as with any historical analysis that which is deemed plausible is determined by the historical framework from which one works. Consequently, it is important to clearly delineate the historical framework that one is using. This was done in chapter one. The framework used is different from that used in previous historical analyses of these gospel stories in three ways. This thesis works from the premise that, first, the early Christian society was primarily an oral society; second, that there was a strong sense of unity between early Christian communities, frequent communication, and hierarchical control and authority structures; and third, that there was a high Christology within early Christianity from the beginning.

The first difference leads to a different understanding of how the traditions about Jesus were treated by the early Christians. Previous analyses have worked from the premise that the gospel authors were primarily using written traditions in the composition of their gospels. In other words, the gospel writers were writing their accounts of Jesus's ministry much as a modern writer would do. Earlier scholarship also had a mistrust of the oral transmission of tradition, because it viewed the transmission as similar to how oral tradition is treated in our modern society. However, as was noted, numerous studies have shown that such societies treat their oral traditions quite differently than our modern society does, which depends on writing to preserve traditions. Various models for the transmission of oral traditions were looked at, and the model chosen for the early Christians in regards to the traditions concerning Jesus was that observed by Bailey. In this model, the main point or thrust of a tradition cannot be changed, but there is freedom in how one may describe the details. This model has been shown by a few studies to fit remarkably well the Jesus traditions found in the synoptic gospels. The analysis of the stories of JD and the PB also supports this model, even though Matthew gives a quite different version of JD, and Mark gives a quite different version of the PB. In both cases, the stories are clearly the same in all three gospels, even though some of the details vary considerably. Such changes are for the most part acceptable within the model proposed by Bailey. The one exception is perhaps Matthew's change in regards to JD, namely, that in his version JD is dead from the beginning. However, this does not change the story that much: the daughter simply dies sooner than in Mark's and Luke's versions; instead of being at the point of dying and then dying, the daughter has just died.

Despite the remarkable fit between Bailey's model and the differences between the Jesus traditions in the synoptic gospels, some may still wish to argue that it is inappropriate to use a model based on accounts of how traditions are passed on in early twentieth-century rural Egypt, because it is far removed in time and place from first-century early Christians who lived in urban centres within the Roman Empire. However, it was argued that rural Egypt was largely pre-industrial in the early twentieth-century and quite different from industrial Europe at that time and that society in early twentieth-century rural Egypt would be more similar to life in Egypt when it was part of the Roman Empire. Consequently it is

not as distant in time and place as one would first imagine. Also, it was pointed out that other studies of social life within the Mediterranean basin have proven very useful in helping to understand life twenty centuries ago. One example is the understanding of how honour-shame societies work.

This left the question of whether there were control mechanisms within the early Christian community similar to the village elders in rural Egypt. It was demonstrated that there is strong evidence that there were such control mechanisms in place. All the evidence indicates that Jesus set up a hierarchy with the twelve, and that three within the twelve had special authority. This hierarchy continued after Jesus's death, as shown by the letters of Paul and the book of Acts. The letters of Paul and other early Christians up to the time of Ignatius also display frequent communication, a knowledge of what is happening in other Christian communities by the authors, a strong sense of unity, and a desire for all to be working from the same values and beliefs. These letters and the Book of Acts also provide evidence of a hierarchical structure with authority figures. These figures include the twelve and the three in Palestine, Peter and Paul in the Roman Empire outside Palestine, and those appointed by them. By the time of Ignatius, a mere thirty to forty years after the death of Peter and Paul, there seems to be a well-organized hierarchy with bishops, deacons, and presbyters in the communities between Antioch and Rome.

Some may wish to argue that all the early letters, with their desire to promote unity, are evidence of disunity as much as they are evidence of unity, because the letters are addressing points of disagreement. However, not all disagreements lead to disunity, and the overwhelming evidence points not only to a strong sense of community within early Christianity, but also a desire to maintain unity. True, some disagreements did lead to division. The first such issue appears to be the conflict over the Torah. However, even here a strong desire for unity is evidenced both by Paul and by his opponents who went into Galatia to tell Paul's Gentile converts that they must follow the Torah. Furthermore, an agreement on this issue seems to have been reached according to both the letters of Paul and the Book of Acts. True, this agreement did not come easily, but all indications point to an agreement between Paul and the leaders in Jerusalem. This is not to say that all were in full agreement with this decision, nor that all continued to abide by the agreement, but it seems to have been accepted by the majority. Thus, even though there were strong opinions on this topic that could have easily led to a divide between the churches founded by Paul and the church in Jerusalem, unity was maintained. This is shown in the letters of Paul, who although he at one point walked out on Peter in Antioch over the issue, continued to stress the importance of unity, that he and other apostles including Peter all preached the same gospel and that the churches he founded should give monetary support to the church in Jerusalem.

The next major divisive issue within the early Christian community appears to be that of Docetism, which led to Gnosticism. Though the church would later divide on this issue, the fact that ninety-nine percent of the Gnostic groups trace their lineage back to the twelve or those closely associated with them, and that the vast majority of the literature is assigned to the twelve or those closely associated with them, indicates that these groups broke away from the main body of Christians who respected the authority of the twelve in Jerusalem. It would thus seem that the desired unity held, despite disagreements, for the most part in the first century. All the evidence suggests that the early Christian community saw itself as one community, and that within this community there was a hierarchy with designated authority figures. Within such a community there would be the necessary control structures in place that would allow for the preservation of traditions deemed important to the community.

This led to the question of how important the traditions about Jesus would be to the early Christians. Following the work of Hurtado and Fee, it was argued that it appears that a very high Christology was in place from the beginnings of Christianity. Shortly after his death, Jesus's main followers seem to have had visions where they saw Jesus as a manifestation of God; more precisely, as what I have referred elsewhere to as the YHWH manifestation of God, who was referred to by the title Son of Man. Jesus was thus not simply a prophet; he was much more than a prophet; he was the LORD, the heavenly Messiah who was to come on his day, defeat evil and death, and be given kingship of the ensuing perfect kingdom of God. It was argued that the early Christians would have highly valued traditions about both Jesus's miraculous actions and teaching, and would have preserved them with the utmost care.

The primary guardians of the Jesus tradition and those whose eyewitness would supply the tradition with authenticity were the twelve. The chiastic analysis in chapter two confirmed the special place of the disciples and the twelve in the synoptic gospel tradition. The disciple units formed their own chiastic structure within the larger structure:

A1 Four called in pairs to be fishers of men (3)
A2 Levi called (10.1)
    B1 Twelve appointed (16)
    B2 Disciples declared family (18.2)
A3 Disciples taught everything (27.2)
A4 Twelve appointed to be sent out in pairs and instructed (34.2)

At the centre of this chiastic arrangement, the twelve are appointed by the LORD on a mountain, and the disciples who helped Jesus are declared to be the LORD's true family. The double hinge puts equal emphasis on authority and unity. The chiastic analysis also showed the special place the disciples had in disseminating Jesus's message. They were the ones to whom Jesus had explained everything and given the secret or mystery of the kingdom of God. Not only this, the disciples, especially the three, are presented as having been with Jesus since the beginning of Jesus's ministry as his constant companions. They are consequently presented as being the ideal eyewitnesses.

Chapter two turned to the structure of the gospels to see what it could tell us about the meaning of the stories for the gospel writers. It was proposed that the gospel writers used a device known as chiasm to structure their material. The structural analysis began with a statistical analysis of a large section of Mark to see if the main criticism against those who propose large-scale chiastic structures—namely that one could find valid parallelism between any two units of text if one desired—was valid. The analysis began by dividing the text into its natural units. These units were then examined for the type of material they contained. It was noted that the units fell into four types of material: units concerning Jesus and his mission to or his relationship with the general public, units concerning Jesus and his disciples, units concerning Jesus and the miraculous, and units concerning Jesus's wisdom. This typology was then used to create a second set of smaller units. This created two sets of units. For each set, the parallelism, both word and conceptual, between any one unit and all the other units within its set was noted. This in turn produced statistical data of the likelihood of any unit having a certain amount of parallels with any other unit.

The data showed that the main reason for scepticism against proposed chiastic structures, namely, the belief that one could find valid parallelism between any two units of text, was unfounded. It simply was not the case. For the larger units there was no valid

parallelism whatsoever between any two units roughly one seventh of the time, and for the smaller units, one third of the time. If one were to speak of meaningful parallelism rather than valid parallelism, then the numbers are much higher. The data was also used to analyse all possible three-, four-, and five-level chiasms. This countered a second reason for scepticism levelled against proposed chiastic structures, namely, that one could find chiastic structures wherever one desired. The analysis showed that viable structures were in fact quite rare and that "good" chiastic structures were even rarer. Furthermore, the analysis showed that the viable chiastic structures were centred on or at the division between the natural, larger structural units of the text.

The data was also used to analyse specific chiastic structures, and it was proposed that within Mark 1:12–6:46 there were two interrelated chiastic structures that spanned the whole text, one based on larger units (MLUD chiasm) and one based on smaller units (MSLUD chiasm). It was argued that Mark most likely created the MLUD chiasm first, and then expanded it into the MSLUD chiasm, because this shows a development from the simple to the complex. A similar movement from the simple to the complex was found in Mark's chiastic structures for the stories of JD, the HW, and Jesus teaching in Nazareth in chapter three. This section forms a chiastic structure with seven scenes, and this chiastic structure is then expanded to form a triple chiasm, which in turn was expanded to form three further chiasms. Here it was shown that by arranging the material into a simple repetitive pattern—namely, by having each scene follow the pattern of movement, description of main character, and action of main character—one could create more complex patterns by making minor adjustments. In this case, Mark simply made either the description of the main character or the action of the main character focus on either faith or the condition of JD, the HW, or the Nazarenes. This arrangement in turn allowed for more complex chiastic structures to be formed, with the result of there being several chiastic structures embedded within this section of text. The analysis in both these chapters demonstrated that complex chiastic structures can easily be created from simple repetitive structures.

It was proposed that the purpose of this complex construction was twofold. First, it would enable the easy memorization for those performing the text. The larger and more simple structures would aid the memorization of the overall framework of the text, and the smaller structures would aid the memorization of the specifics of the text. Second, these structures were able to provide meaning to the text for the performers of the text, who, it was argued, would also likely be the teachers of the text.

Speaking of the intended meaning of a text by the author of a text is controversial in this postmodern era, because there is always the danger of imposing one's own interpretation on the text. This danger, however, is somewhat diminished in the case of texts where the author employs chiasm to structure the text, because chiastic structures seem to have been used to embed meaning into a text. It has long been noted by those who study chiasm that the hinge of a chiasm often occurs at the climax of a text or is congruent with the central theme of the text. This makes sense, because the hinge occurs at the structural centre of the text. It has also been noted that the wings often contain the same theme as the hinge. The hinge and wings would thus seem to be used as a guide to the central theme of texts where the author uses chiasm as a structuring device. The chiastic structure also allows the author to juxtapose units of text in order to draw comparison and contrast. Consequently, by focusing on the hinge and the wings to supply the central theme of the chiasm and then by analyzing how the other units relate to this theme through juxtaposition with units on the same chiastic level and on neighbouring levels, the danger of the chiastic scholar imposing her or his own meaning

on the text should be lessened. The danger will be further reduced if the scholar also does her or his best to understand the text from what is known of the worldview of the author.

Naturally, one will never know with certainty that the extrapolated meaning is congruent with that of the author, but this does not mean that a plausible argument for congruency is not possible. The devout postmodernist would argue that one can never really step outside of one's own worldview and enter another's worldview, and thatone can only speak of one's own interpretation of a text, or for that matter, language in general. This view is based on a highly sceptical epistemology where one can never know if our understanding of the world corresponds with the outside world, because we are always embedded in our own subjective constructions of reality. As discussed in the introduction, this thesis is not working from this type of epistemology, but is working from one, using the language of Gadamer, where a fusion of horizons is possible and meaning can be transmitted from one to another even across the divide of time, language, and culture.

The resulting analyses of the possible meaning provided by the chiastic structures in this thesis are congruent with what we know of the worldview of the early Christians, and it is argued that there is a strong degree of probability that the proposed meanings are congruent with that intended by the authors of the gospels. For example, within the framework of a very early high Christology, it is highly plausible that the early Christians would be focused on defending their claim that Jesus was a manifestation of God. The chiastic analysis of Mark 1:12 to 6:46 indicates that one way this was done was by pointing to Jesus's power and wisdom. The hinge unit, the Beelzebul controversy, presents the argument that Jesus's power must come from God and that the power is that of one who is able to defeat and bind Satan. From a Jewish worldview, the only being able to bind Satan is God. This hinge is balanced on both sides by two panels showing Jesus's power and wisdom. The final power panel shows the extent of Jesus's power: he can control the chaotic sea, legions of demons, and death, and the mere touch of his clothes banishes sickness. Jesus's possession of this power over evil shows him to be the one who can bind Satan, the representative of evil, and thus these miracles show Jesus to be YHWH. Consequently, the resulting argument revealed by the chiastic analysis is in line with the type of argument a first-century Christian would make.

As was noted in chapter two, the first and last miracles, Jesus stilling the storm and the story of JD, especially show Jesus's power over evil. In ancient Semitic culture evil was primarily represented by two figures, one representing the chaotic sea and the other representing death. Jesus's power over death takes the important final position in this collection of miracles; it is the finale, so to speak. The chiastic analysis of this miracle in chapter three further showed the importance of this miracle for Mark. The daughter takes on symbolic significance as the representative of Israel who will be raised on the day of YHWH, which becomes for the early Christians the day of the Lord Jesus Christ. The miracle consequently points forward to the future return of Jesus on his Day when he will raise the righteous to the new kingdom of God. The girl consequently represents righteous Israel. "Righteousness," however, is redefined by Mark; it is not simply doing good and doing the will of God, but also having faith in Jesus. In the final miracle panel the proclaiming Gerasene and Jairus epitomize those having faith in Jesus, which is shown by their position in the double hinge. They both understand that Jesus's power points to something remarkable about Jesus. The same is true of the HW, whose faith is commended in the hinge of the triple chiasm consisting of the double story of JD and the HW.

It was also argued that it is doubtful that Mark intended the hearer-reader of his gospel to understand that the faith that the Gerasene, Jairus, and the HW had in Jesus was that Jesus was the LORD Messiah; however, they were very close to this realization. The legion of demons that possessed the Gerasene clearly knew who Jesus was and gave the correct response: Legion kneeled before Jesus, hailed him as the Son of God, and made a request. The Gerasene after his healing also made the correct response: he asked to become a disciple and then obeyed Jesus and proclaimed the word in the Decapolis. Jairus and the HW both kneeled before Jesus, which recalls the response of Legion. This act also looks forward to the future veneration of Jesus by the early Christians. Also, both Jairus and the HW by exhibiting faith that through Jesus the most astounding of miracles could take place show that they understood Jesus to be much more than an ordinary healer, and, though it is not explicitly said that they believed that his powers are from God, this is implied by their kneeling.

The hinge of the JD chiasm focused on Jesus's statement that the girl is not dead but only sleeping. The crowd outside understood this statement literally rather than metaphorically. This is in contrast to those inside with Jesus, and by extension the hearer-readers of the gospel. Here the story takes on the overtones of the Greek mysteries, whose theme was also that of death and rebirth, where death is shown not to be a final end, but only a transition. Only the parents and the three are allowed to go inside and witness the mystery. These insiders are also the only ones who are to know the truth of what happened: those on the outside are to understand that the girl was literally not dead, but only sleeping. Those on the inside see the mystery, which points forward to the final miracle of the era, the destruction of death where all the righteous will be raised to life. By pointing forward to the resurrection of the dead, Mark implies that the miracle also shows that Jesus is the LORD, because it is Jesus as LORD who will resurrect the dead on his Day. Again it is doubtful that Mark intended the hearer-reader to understand that the witnesses fully understood the significance of what they experienced: for Mark, like the rest of the gospel writers, the full understanding of the mystery of Jesus would not occur until after Jesus was resurrected and appeared to his followers.

After JD is raised, Jesus then tells the witnesses to give the girl something to eat. This was shown to be the hinge of a chiasm running from the parables of the kingdom through to the feeding of the five thousand. The girl being fed (hinge) is consequently connected to the Eucharist through the feeding of the five thousand (wing A2) and to being given the secret of the kingdom through the parable section (wing A1). The implication is that Mark sees the Eucharist as symbolic of being initiated into the mystery of the kingdom of God, and that this initiation is a death and rebirth symbolized by the raised JD being giving something to eat. The death and rebirth of JD consequently becomes symbolic of a person becoming a Christian. This interpretation of having faith in Jesus is also found in our earliest Christian documents, namely, the letters of Paul: Paul speaks of becoming a Christian as dying and rebirth, and also as entering a mystery.[732]

Consequently, in Mark the story of JD takes on a hidden symbolic and metaphorical meaning that is revealed through Mark's chiastic structuring of the gospel from 1:12 though 6:46. Such an inner and outer meaning of this text is in accord with what Mark presents of

---

[732] Dying: Rom 6:1–10; 1 Cor 15:31, 15:51; 2 Cor 6:9; Phil 1:21; Col 2:20, 3:3. Mystery language: Rom 16:25; 1 Cor 2:1, 4:1, 15:51 (here the mystery is that the Christian will not die); Eph 1:9, 3:3–5, 3:9, 5:32, 6:19; Col 1:26–27; 2:2, 4:3; 2 Thess 2:7.

Jesus's teaching in his parable section, where only those initiated into the mysteries of the kingdom of God are given the full explanation of Jesus's teaching. After Jesus's death and the coming of the Spirit, the twelve would become fully initiated, and they would become the lamps that will bring to light what was once hidden. However, though the mystery becomes available to all, to be inducted into the mystery one must first be willing to accept Jesus as the LORD Messiah, that is, to become a Christian.

The analysis of how Luke and Matthew adapt Mark's material made it clear that they were aware of Mark's chiastic structuring. This is especially shown by Luke, who, though he changes the structures, also strengthens Mark's chiasms. The re-arrangements by Luke and Matthew cause a slightly different interpretation and emphasis, but for the most part a similar meaning is generated. However, it is quite clear that Luke and Matthew do not share Mark's love of layering chiastic patterns and creating chiasms within and across chiasms: their structuring is simpler and plainer. This simpler and plainer structuring should not be seen as a rejection of the meaning generated by Mark's more complex structuring: in combining Mark with Q and other material, many of Mark's chiasms by necessity would have to have been broken and arranged into different structures. It is quite likely that Luke and Matthew were well aware of Mark's interpretation of this material, because it is safe to assume that they, like Mark, were respected teachers and leaders within the early Christian community and would have been initiated into the deeper meaning of Mark's gospel. Also, the incorporation of most of Mark's gospel into their gospels shows the high respect Luke and Matthew held for Mark.

The chiastic analysis of JD highlighted elements in the story that the gospel writers may have added to the oral tradition to create the structures and the meaning generated by them. An oral analysis was then performed on JD to determine which items were essential and which were variable. With the possible exception of Matthew's changing of the time of JD's death, the differences between the three stories conformed to what Bailey observed, namely, the essential outline of the story and plot must be maintained, but the details could be changed. The one exception to the latter are the words of Jesus, which were virtually the same in the three gospels. This exception is quite understandable, because these words were seen as the words of the LORD. The permissibility of changing details allowed storytellers to place their own interpretation on the story. In the case of the gospel writers it allowed them to create their chiastic structures and to add symbolic meaning to the story.

The final step of the process was to do a historical analysis of the individual elements of the story and the story as a whole. It was concluded that the story was likely based on a historical incident in the life of Jesus and that the majority of the individual elements plausibly originated with this incident. The central criterion employed to reach the conclusion that the story as a whole likely originated from an incident in the life of Jesus was the criterion of embarrassment. To put it simply, the story of JD is not a very good raising-of-the-dead story, because the girl had only just died and Jesus says that the girl is not dead. There is consequently doubt placed on whether the girl was actually dead. This weakness of the story seems to be well understood by both Luke and Matthew, who both make it clear that the girl is dead; Luke adds that the girl's spirit returned, and Matthew has the girl being dead from the beginning of the story. The poorness of this story as a raising-of-the-dead story led to the question of why Mark would have used this particular raising-of-the-dead story at such a key point in his structural argument that Jesus is the LORD Messiah.

The story of the PB presented many problems, the least of which was the question of whether or not it is truly a raising-of-the-dead story. One can only argue that it is a raising-

of-the-dead story in Mark, but even in his version there is some question as to whether the boy actually died. However, Mark's presentation of the story and the language used clearly points to it being used as a raising-of-the-dead story. This appears to be confirmed by Luke, who, even though he eliminates any reference to the boy dying, draws strong parallels between his version of the story and the stories of JD and the WNS. Luke also makes a chiastic connection with the WNS: the two stories are on the same chiastic level in his larger chiastic structure. Luke consequently seems to have been aware that the story of the PB was used as a raising-of-the-dead story.

That Mark saw the PB as a raising-of-the-dead story is also shown by his placement of the story in his transfiguration chiasm. The story of the PB is placed directly opposite Jesus saying that those who wish to become a disciple must be willing to take up the cross and that those who lose their life for the cause will gain life. The story of the PB shows that Jesus has the ability to keep this promise. The PB consequently, like JD, becomes a symbol of the righteous who will be raised on the future day of the LORD Jesus Christ. However, the righteousness demanded in the story of the PB is tempered from the complete faithfulness demanded in the unit where Jesus says that those who follow him must take up the cross. The righteousness that allows the PB to be raised is ambiguous at best: the father says he believes, but cries out for help with his disbelief. It is this prayer that leads to the boy being healed, and the implication is that wanting to believe is as good as actually believing. The contrast in the faith demanded should not be seen as a contradiction, because one kind of faith is demanded of those who wish to follow Jesus and help spread the message, and the other is demanded of someone receiving the message. Consequently, more is demanded from the disciples than from those who simply accept Jesus and his message. A distinction is thus created between the average believer and those who help with the mission and will later be in charge of the mission.

It is interesting that though both Luke and Matthew do not present the story of the PB as a raising-of-the-dead story, they both keep Mark's transfiguration chiasm. As just noted, Luke keeps the raising-of-the-dead connection by creating parallels between the story of the PB and the stories of JD and the WNS and by connecting PB with the WNS through chiasm. It was argued that it was highly likely that Mark's version was truer to the oral version of the story. Luke and Matthew by keeping the transfiguration chiasm could thus expect their audience to supply the raising-of-the-dead connection from the oral tradition despite their disapproval of this version of the story.

The chiastic analysis of the story of the PB in Mark revealed that, contrary to the opinion of some scholars, Mark's version was not haphazardly created by combining different versions, but was rather a carefully constructed sextuple chiasm. The repetitiveness was not due to poor story telling, but rather to the construction of this chiasm. At the centre of this chiasm Jesus shows his concern for the boy, and this compassion in the end overrides his judgemental statements concerning the father and his generation. The chiasm presents Jesus battling evil, represented by the demon and the crowd, and though it appears as if the crowd is about to overwhelm him and that the demon has won by killing the boy, the final victory belongs to Jesus, who simply takes the boy by the hand and raises him.

The meaning generated by Mark's chiastic structure, including the connection between the father's plea and prayer, is lost by Luke's and Matthew's reworking of the story. They seem to have two problems with Mark's version: first, the demon succeeds in killing the boy and thus wins the conflict with Jesus, and second Mark's version seem to "blame the victim." In regards to the last, both Luke and Matthew present the father sympathetically and

blameless. They also present a softer image of Jesus, because even though in both versions Jesus condemns the generation as perverse and faithless, he immediately cures the boy. The changes to Mark's story, however, make the reason for Jesus's outburst incomprehensible: is he condemning the father, the audience, or the disciples, and for what reason? In Luke no answer is supplied, but in Matthew the blame is placed on the disciples.

The differences between Mark's version, on the one hand, and Luke's and Matthew's, on the other, complicated the oral analysis. It was argued that it was more likely that Luke and Matthew shortened and changed the oral tradition rather than that Mark expanded it. This led to a proposed essential oral outline that included the conflict between Jesus and the father and the boy dying. The essential oral story was still shorter than Mark's version, but Mark's expansion would have been allowable from the perspective of the oral model used in the thesis. He simply added more descriptions of the spirit convulsing the boy and expanded the conversation between Jesus and the father.

The historical analysis of the essential oral story concluded that the story likely originated with an event in Jesus's life. As with JD the application of the criterion of embarrassment made it unlikely that the raising-of-the-dead elements were added to the story. The weakness of the story as a raising-of-the-dead story also raised the question of why Mark would use this story to show that Jesus would indeed be able to keep his promise that those who lost their life for the cause would be able to gain life if indeed there were better raising-of-the-dead stories available to Mark. This in turn places an hermeneutic of suspicion over the remaining story looked at, the WNS.

The chiastic analysis of the WNS in both chapters two and five highlighted many elements that Luke may have added to the story. Both the chiastic analysis and the linear structural analysis demonstrated the importance of this story for Luke. From a linear perspective the gospel to that point leads up to the question from John and Jesus's reply. The story of the WNS supplies evidence of the ultimate miracle in Jesus's reply, namely, the dead being raised. The unit of John's question and Jesus's reply was also the hinge of a smaller chiastic structure whose subject is the identity of Jesus in comparison with John and, by extension, other prophets. The purpose of this chiasm seems to be to show that Jesus is greater than John and much more than a prophet. This interpretation is confirmed by Luke's clear allusions to the Elijah and Elisha raising-of-the-dead miracles in the WNS. The reference to these miracles draws a sharp contrast between these two great miracle-working prophets and Jesus. While Elijah and Elisha have to pray to God and perform rituals, Jesus simply commands the WNS to rise. Again, Jesus is shown to be more than a great prophet.

The chiastic structure and allusions to Elijah and Elisha answer a possible objection to the argument that the miracles show that Jesus was the LORD Messiah visiting his people, namely, that other people had performed remarkable miracles, including raising people from the dead. Christian opponents from a Jewish background would naturally point to Elijah and Elisha, and opponents from a pagan background would point to pagan miracle workers and healers such as Apollonius.

This brought us to the question of Apollonius. Apollonius is a controversial figure historically primarily because of the fantastical nature of the sole surviving biography, namely, Philostratus's *Life*. It is well accepted that Philostratus's main source, the notebooks of Damis, were a complete fabrication. However, it was argued that these were not the only source used by Philostratus and that Philostratus seems to have used the Damis fabrication to insert the highly fantastical elements that occur on Apollonius's journeys to the east outside the Roman Empire. Consequently, these events also occur in an area where checking up on

their validity was not possible. Philostratus would have to be more careful with events occurring within the Roman Empire, because oral tradition concerning Apollonius's notable events would have been passed on within the communities where they occurred. This would be especially true at shrines dedicated to Apollonius, within philosophical groups who traced their heritage back to Apollonius, and within families who had someone cured by Apollonius. Such traditions were likely to have been found in the larger centres, and most certainly in Rome. The remarkable story of Apollonius and the young bride would be a good candidate for such a tradition that would be passed on. In addition, it was pointed out that the miracle of the young bride in contrast to the Damis sections is strangely lacking in the miraculous, and that within the story the question is raised as to whether or not a miracle took place.

This led to the conclusion that this particular story was likely based on a historical incident. If it was, then it would be precisely the type of event to which opponents would point to counter the Christian argument that Jesus's miracles demonstrated that he was God on earth. There is no reason that the story of Apollonius raising a young bride would not be well known when Luke was writing his gospel. Apollonius, a contemporary of Luke was a well known philosopher and healer; shrines were dedicated to him, and he collected disciples who continued his philosophical legacy. The sentimental story of a young bride who had died and was then revived on the way to her funeral would have spread far and wide.

A comparison between the stories of the WNS and the young bride demonstrated a very high and unusual level of parallelism. The degree of parallelism indicates that it is highly likely that the two stories are connected. Some may still wish to argue that Philostratus based his story on Luke. However, while this is possible, it is unlikely, because Philostratus shows absolutely no interest in Christianity elsewhere in his *Life*. Also, those connected with Apollonius's legacy in Rome would wonder why they had not heard of the story. The lack of interest by Philostratus in Jesus also puts to rest the old thesis that Philostratus presented Apollonius as a pagan Jesus figure. Such a presentation was not made in pagan circles until much later. The most likely scenario is that Luke wished to draw parallels with the Apollonius story and not that Philostratus wished to draw parallels with the Lukan story.

The parallels between the story of the WNS and not only the stories of JD, the PB, Elijah story (and by extension the Elisha story), and Apollonius, but also Jesus's words on John being more than a prophet, leaves very little that could be original to an event in Jesus's life. Such a level of parallelism, in conjunction with the degree to which the story fits Luke's theological and literary purposes, adds further suspicion about the story. This suspicion is increased by the fact that Mark did not use this much better raising-of-the-dead story in his gospel. The weight of the evidence leads to the conclusion that the story was not based on oral tradition, but was rather the invention of Luke.

The story appears to be a response to the argument presented in Mark that the miracles Jesus performed demonstrated that he was the LORD Messiah. The series of four miracles that showed Jesus's complete mastery over all evil ended with the story of JD and his conquering of death. However, the story left open the question as to whether JD was actually dead: she had only just died and Jesus says that she is not dead, but sleeping. Matthew seems to be aware of the first problem, and consequently moves the death to the beginning of the story. Awareness of the problematic nature of Jesus's statement in the Christian community is shown by John's discussion of it. The story of JD is thus not an ideal raising-of-the-dead story. The same is true of the other raising-of-the-dead story found in Mark, the PB. Luke

seems to be well aware of the problems of these two stories, because he changes these stories and creates strong parallelism between them and his story of the WNS: when the hearer-reader comes to the stories of JD and the PB, she or he is reminded of the story of the WNS where the person is clearly dead. Since Luke for the most part keeps Mark's chiastic structure in the sections containing JD and the PB, the points Mark makes through chiasm are strengthend in Luke, because a much stronger raising-of-the-dead story is pointed to.

The story of the WNS answers another problem with the argument that Jesus's miracles demonstrate that he is the LORD Messiah, namely, that other people have performed miraculous events and even revived the dead. Those from a Jewish background would point to Elijah and Elisha, and those from a Greco-Roman background would point to Apollonius. In his crafting of the story of the WNS, Luke shows Jesus to be a superior miracle worker than Elijah, Elisha, or Apollonius: Jesus, like God, simply speaks, and it is so. The historical analysis of Jesus's raising-of-the-dead miracles thus reveals a lively debate between Christians and both Jews and pagans over the Christians most startling claim, namely, that Jesus was the LORD Messiah, God come down to earth, who died and was himself raised from the dead.

Appendix A: Parallel List

Word Parallels

1) Spirit/spirit
   (1) The temptation (1): πνεῦμα, "Spirit" (1:12)
   (2) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): πνεύματι, "spirit" (1:23), πνεύμασι, "spirits" (1:27).
   (3) Paralytic healed (9.2): πνεύματι, "spirit" (2:8).
   (4) Healing by a boat (15): πνεύματα, "spirits" (3:11).
   (5) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): πνεῦμα "Spirit" (3:29), Πνεῦμα, "spirit" (3:29).
   (6) Gerasene healed (29.1): πνεύματι/πνεῦμα, "spirit" (5:2, 8), "spirits" (5:13).
   (7) Twelve instructed (34.2): πνεύματα, "spirits" (6:7).
2) to drive, cast, or put out
   (1) The temptation (1): ἐκβάλλει, "drove" (1:12).
   (2) Healing at Simon's (6): ἐξέβαλεν, "cast out" (1:34).
   (3) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): ἐκβάλλων, "cast out" (1:39).
   (4) Leper healed (8.1): ἐξέβαλεν, "sent away" (1:43).
   (5) Twelve appointed (16): ἐκβάλλειν, "cast out" (3:15).
   (6) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): ἐκβάλλει/ἐκβάλλειν, "cast out" (3:22, 23)
   (7) JD raised (32.3): ἐκβαλὼν, "put outside" (5:40).
   (8) Twelve proclaim (34.3): ἐξέβαλλον, "cast out" (6:13).
3) wilderness/desert
   (1) The temptation (1): ἔρημον/ἐρήμῳ, "wilderness" (1:12, 13).
   (2) Jesus and 4 in desert (7.1): ἔρημον, "deserted" (1:35).
   (3) Leper proclaims (8.2): ἐρήμοις, "country" (1:45).
   (4) Twelve return (36.1): ἔρημον/ἔρημον, "deserted" (6:31, 32).
   (5) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): Ἔρημός, "deserted" (6:35).
4) day
   (1) The temptation (1): ἡμέρας, "days" (1:13).
   (2) Teaching at home (9.1): ἡμερῶν, "days" (2:1).
   (3) Fasting controversy (12.1): ἡμέρᾳ, "days" (2:20).
   (4) Seed in secret (25): ἡμέραν, "day" (4:27).
   (5) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): ἡμέρᾳ, "day" (4:35).
   (6) Gerasene healed (29.1): ἡμέρας, "day" (5:5).
   (7) Death of John (35.2): ἡμέρας, "opportunity" (6:21).
5) Satan
   (1) The temptation (1): Σατανα, "Satan" (1:13).
   (2) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): Σατανᾶς/Σατανᾶν/Σατανᾶς, "Satan" (3:23 twice, 3:26).
   (3) Parable explained (22): Σατανᾶς, "Satan" (4:15).

6) to wait on, serve
    (1) The temptation (1): διηκόνουν, "waited on" (1:13).
    (2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): διηκόνει, "serve them" (1:31).
7) to arrest, betray
    (1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): παραδοθῆναι, "arrested" (1:14).
    (2) Twelve appointed (16): παρέδωκεν, "betrayed" (3:19).
    (3) Seed in secret (25): παραδοι, "ripe" (4:29).
8) John
    (1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): Ἰωάννην, "John" (1:14).
    (2) Four called (3): Ἰωάννην, "John" (1:19).
    (3) Simon's mother-in-law (5): Ἰωάννου, "John" (1:29).
    (4) Fasting controversy (12.1): Ἰωάννου, "John's" (2:18).
    (5) Twelve appointed (16): Ἰωάννην, "John" (3:17).
    (6) Jairus's messengers (32.1): Ἰωάννην, "John" (5:37).
    (7) Herod hears the news (35.1): Ἰωάννης/Ἰωάννην, "John" (6:14, 16).
    (8) Death of John (35.2): Ἰωάννην/Ἰωάννης/Ἰωάννην/Ἰωάννου/Ἰωάννου, "John" (6:17, 18, 20, 24, 25).
9) Galilee
    (1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): Γαλιλαίαν, "Galilee" (1:14).
    (2) Four called (3): Γαλιλαίας, "Galilee" (1:16).
    (3) News spreads in Galilee (4.3): Γαλιλαίας, "Galilee" (1:28).
    (4) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): Γαλιλαίαν, "Galilee" (1:39).
    (5) Healing by a boat (15): Γαλιλαίας, "Galilee" (3:7).
    (6) Death of John (35.2): Γαλιλαίας, "Galilee" (6:21).
10) to proclaim
    (1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): κηρύσσων, "proclaim" (1:14).
    (2) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): κηρύξω·, "proclaim the message" (1:38).
    (3) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): κηρύσσων, "proclaiming the message" (1:39).
    (4) Leper proclaims (8.2): κηρύσσειν, "proclaim" (1:45).
    (5) Twelve appointed (16): κηρύσσειν, "proclaim the message" (3:14).
    (6) Gerasene proclaims (29.4): κηρύσσειν, "proclaim" (5:20).
    (7) Twelve proclaim (34.3): ἐκήρυξαν, "proclaimed" (6:12).
11) God
    (1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): θεου, "God" (1:14, 15).
    (2) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): θεου, "God" (1:24).
    (3) Paralytic healed (9.2): θεός/θεὸν, "God" (2:7, 12).
    (4) Plucking controversy (13): θεου, "God" (2:26).
    (5) Healing by a boat (15): θεοῦ, "God" (3:11).
    (6) Disciples declared family (18.2): θεου, "God" (3:35).
    (7) Why teaching in parables (21): θεοῦ·, "God" (4:11).
    (8) Seed in secret (25): θεου, "God" (4:26).
    (9) Mustard seed (26): θεοῦ, "God (4:30).

(10) Gerasene healed (29.1): θεου/θεόν "God" (5:7 twice).

12) kingdom
- (1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): βασιλεία, "kingdom" (1:15).
- (2) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): βασιλεία, "kingdom" (3:24 twice).
- (3) Why teaching in parables (21): βασιλείας, "kingdom" (4:11).
- (4) Seed in secret (25): βασιλεία, "kingdom" (4:26).
- (5) Mustard seed (26): βασιλείαν, "kingdom" (4:30).
- (6) Death of John (35.2): βασιλείας, "kingdom" (6:23).

13) to repent
- (1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): μετανοεῖτε, "repent" (1:15).
- (2) Twelve proclaim (34.3): μετανοῶσιν, "repent" (6:12).

14) to believe, have faith
- (1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): πιστεύετε, "believe" (1:15).
- (2) Paralytic healed (9.2): πίστιν, "faith" (2:5).
- (3) Stilling of Storm (28.2): πίστιν, "faith" (4:40).
- (4) HW (31): πίστις, "faith" (5:34).
- (5) Jairus's messengers (32.1): πίστευε, "believe" (5:36).
- (6) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἀπιστίαν, "unbelief" (6:6).

15) to pass, walk along
- (1) Four called (3): παράγων, "passed" (1:16).
- (2) Levi called (10.2): παράγων, "walking along" (2:14).

16) sea
- (1) Four called (3): θάλασσαν/θαλάσσῃ, "sea" (1:16 twice).
- (2) Teaching by sea (10.1): θάλασσαν, "sea" (2:13).
- (3) Healing by boat (15): θάλασσαν, "sea" (3:7).
- (4) Teaching from boat (19): θάλασσαν/θαλάσσῃ, "sea" (4:1 thrice).
- (5) Stilling of storm (28.2): θαλάσσῃ/θάλασσα, "sea" (4:39, 41).
- (6) Gerasene healed (29.1): θαλάσσης/θάλασσαν/θαλάσσῃ, "sea" (5:1, 13 twice).
- (7) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): θάλασσαν, "sea" (5:21).

17) to see
- (1) Four called (3): εἶδεν, "saw" (1:16, 19)
- (2) Paralytic healed (9.2): ἰδὼν/εἴδομεν, "saw " (2:5), "seen" (2:12).
- (3) Levi called (10.2): εἶδεν, "saw" (2:14).
- (4) Sinners controversy (11.2): ἰδόντες, "saw" (2:16).
- (5) Why teaching in parables (21): ἴδωσιν, "perceive" (4:12).
- (6) Gerasene healed (29.1): ἰδὼν, "saw" (5:6).
- (7) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): ἰδεῖν/ἰδόντες "see" (5:14), "seen" (5:16).
- (8) Jairus's request (30.2): ἰδὼν, "saw" (5:22).
- (9) HW (31): ἰδεῖν, "to see" (5:32).
- (10) Teaching following crowd (36.2): εἶδον/εἶδεν, "saw" (6:33, 34).
- (11) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἴδετε, "see" (6:38).

18) Simon

(1) Four called (3): Σίμωνα, Σίμωνος, "Simon" (1:16 twice).
(2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): Σίμωνος, "Simon" (1:29), "Simon's" (1:30).
(3) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): Σίμων, "Simon" (1:36)
(4) Twelve appointed (16): Σίμωνι/ Πέτρον, "Simon" (3:16), "Peter" (3:16).
(5) Jairus's messengers (32.1): Πέτρον, "Peter" (5:37).
(6) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Σίμωνος, "Simon" (6:3).

19) Andrew
(1) Four called (3): Ανδρέαν, "Andrew" (1:16).
(2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): Ανδρέου, "Andrew" (1:29).
(3) Twelve appointed (16): Ανδρέαν, "Andrew" (3:18).

20) brother
(1) Four called (3): ἀδελφὸν, "brother" (1:16, 19)
(2) Twelve appointed (16): ἀδελφὸν, "brother" (3:17).
(3) Jesus's family part two (18.1): ἀδελφοι, "brothers" (3:31, 32, 33)
(4) Disciples declared family (18.2): ἀδελφοι/ἀδελφός, "brother" (3:34, 35)
(5) Jairus's messengers (32.1): ἀδελφὸν, "brother" (5:37).
(6) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἀδελφὸς, "brother" (6:3).
(7) Death of John (35.2): ἀδελφου, "brother" (6:17), "brother's" (6:18).

21) to follow, go away
(1) Four called (3): Δεῦτε, "follow" (1:17).
(2) Twelve return (36.1): Δεῦτε, "come away" (6:31).

22) man
(1) Four called (3): ἀνθρώπων, "men" (1:17).
(2) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): ἄνθρωπος, "man" (1:23).
(3) Paralytic healed (9.2): ἀνθρώπου, "Man" (2:10).
(4) Plucking controversy (13): ἄνθρωπον/ ἄνθρωπος/ ἀνθρώπου, "humankind" (2:27 twice), "Man" (2:28).
(5) Healing controversy (14): ἄνθρωπος, "man" (3:1).
(6) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): ἀνθρώπων, "people" (3:28).
(7) Seed in secret (25): ἄνθρωπος, "someone" (4:26).
(8) Gerasene healed (29.1): ἄνθρωπος/ἀνθρώπου, "man" (5:2, 8).

23) to leave, permit, forgive
(1) Four called (3): ἀφέντες, "left" (1:18, 20).
(2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): ἀφῆκεν, "left" (1:31).
(3) Healing at Simon's (6): ἤφιεν, "permit" (1:34).
(4) Paralytic healed (9.2): ἀφίενται/ἀφιέναι/Αφίενται, "forgiven" (2:5, 9), "forgive" (2:7, 10).
(5) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): ἀφεθήσεται, "forgiven" (3:28).
(6) Why teaching in parables (21): ἀφεθῃ, "forgiven" (4:12).
(7) Leaving crowd in boat (28.1): ἀφέντες, leaving" (4:36).
(8) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): ἀφῆκεν, "refused" (5:19).
(9) Jairus's messengers (32.1): ἀφῆκεν, "allowed" (5:37).

24) to follow

(1) Four called (3): ἠκολούθησαν, "follow" (1:18).
(2) Levi called (10.2): Ακολούθει/ἠκολούθησεν, "follow" (2:14), "followed" (2:14).
(3) Many eat with Jesus (11.1): ἠκολούθουν "followed" (2:15).
(4) Healing by boat (15): ἠκολούθησεν, "followed" (3:7).
(5) Jairus's request (30.2): ἠκολούθει, "followed (5:24).
(6) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἀκολουθοῦσιν, "followed" (6:1).

25) little, few, while
(1) Four called (3): ὀλίγον, "little" (1:19).
(2) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ὀλίγοις, "few" (6:5).
(3) Twelve return (36.1): ὀλίγον, "while" (6:31).

26) James
(1) Four called (3): Ἰάκωβον, "James" (1:19).
(2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): Ιακώβου, "James" (1:29).
(3) Twelve appointed (16): Ἰάκωβον/Ιακώβου, "James" (3:17 twice, 18).
(4) Jairus's messengers (32.1): Ἰάκωβον/Ιακώβου, "James" (5:37 twice).
(5) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Ιακώβου, "James" (6:3).

27) Zebedee
(1) Four called (3): Ζεβεδαίου, "Zebedee" (1:19, 20).
(2) Twelve appointed (16): Ζεβεδαίου, "Zebedee" (3:17).

28) boat
(1) Four called (3): πλοίῳ, "boat" (1:19, 20).
(2) Healing by a boat (15): πλοιάριον, "boat" (3:9).
(3) Teaching from boat (19): πλοῖον "boat" (4:1).
(4) Leaving by boat (28.1): πλοίῳ/πλοῖα, "boat" (4:36), "boats" (4:36).
(5) Stilling the storm (28:2): πλοῖον, "boat" (4:37), "boat" (4:37).
(6) Gerasene healed (29.1): πλοίου, "boat" (5:2).
(7) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): πλοῖον, "boat" (5:18).
(8) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): πλοίῳ, "boat" (5:21).
(9) Twelve return (36.1): πλοίῳ, "boat" (6:32).
(10) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): πλοῖον, "boat" (6:45).

29) to call
(1) Four called (3): ἐκάλεσεν, "called" (1:20).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2): καλέσαι, "to call" (2:17).
(3) Twelve appointed (16): προσκαλεῖται, "called" (3:13).
(4) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): προσκαλεσάμενος, "called" (3:23).
(5) Jesus's family part two (18:1): καλοῦντες, "called" (3:31).
(6) Twelve instructed (34.2): προσκαλεῖται, "called" (6:7).

30) father
(1) Four called (3): πατέρα, "father" (1:20).
(2) JD raised (32.3): πατέρα, "father" (5:40).

31) to come, to go
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): εἰσπορεύονται, "went" (1:21).

(2) Parable explained (22): εἰσπορευόμεναι, "coming" (4:19).
(3) JD raised (32.3): εἰσπορεύεται, "went" (5:40).

32) Capernaum
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): Καφαρναούμ, "Capernaum" (1:21).
(2) Teaching at home (9.1): Καφαρναοὺμ, "Capernaum" (2:1).

33) Sabbath
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): σάββασιν, "Sabbath" (1:21).
(2) Plucking controversy (13): σάββασιν/ σάββατον/ σαββάτου, "Sabbath" (2:23, 24, 27 twice, 28)
(3) Healing controversy (14): σάββασιν, "Sabbath" (3:2, 4)
(4) Teaching in Nazareth (33): σαββάτου, "Sabbath" (6:2).

34) synagogue
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): συναγωγὴν, "synagogue" (1:21).
(2) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): συναγωγῇ, "synagogue" (1:23).
(3) Simon's mother-in-law (5): συναγωγῆς, "synagogue" (1:29).
(4) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): συναγωγὰς, "synagogues" (1:39).
(5) Healing controversy (14): συναγωγήν, "synagogue" (3:1).
(6) Teaching in Nazareth (33): συναγωγῇ, "synagogue" (6:2).

35) to teach
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): ἐδίδασκεν/διδάσκων/διδαχῇ, "taught" (1:21, 22 twice).
(2) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): διδαχη, "teaching" (1:27).
(3) Teaching by sea (10.1): ἐδίδασκεν, "taught" (2:13).
(4) Teaching from boat (19): διδάσκειν/ἐδίδασκεν/διδαχῇ, "to teach" (4:1, 2), "teaching" (4:2).
(5) Teaching in Nazareth (33): διδάσκειν, "to teach" (6:2).
(6) Teaching in villages (34.1): "teaching" (6:6).
(7) Twelve return (36.1): διδάσκων, "taught" (6:30).
(8) Teaching following crowd (36.2): διδάσκειν "to teach" (6:34).

36) to be astounded
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): ἐξεπλήσσοντο, "astounded" (1:22).
(2) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἐξεπλήσσοντο, "astounded" (6:2).

37) authority
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): ἐξουσίαν, "authority" (1:22).
(2) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): ἐξουσίαν, "authority" (1:27).
(3) Paralytic healed (9.2): ἐξουσίαν, "authority" (2:10).
(4) Twelve appointed (16): ἐξουσίαν, "authority" (3:15).
(5) Twelve instructed (34.2): ἐξουσίαν, "authority" (6:7).

38) scribe
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): γραμματεῖς, "scribes" (1:22).
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): γραμματέων, "scribes" (2:6).
(3) Sinners controversy (11.2): γραμματεῖς, "scribes" (2:16).
(4) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): γραμματεῖς, "scribes" (3:22).

39) clean, unclean
- (1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): ἀκαθάρτῳ/ἀκάθαρτον/ἀκαθάρτοις "unclean" (1:23, 26, 27).
- (2) Leper healed (8.1): καθαρίσαι/καθαρίσθητι, "clean" (1:40, 41).
- (3) Healing by boat (15): ἀκάθαρτα, "unclean" (3:11).
- (4) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): ἀκάθαρτον, "unclean" (3:29).
- (5) Gerasene healed (29.1): ἀκαθάρτῳ/ἀκάθαρτον/ἀκάθαρτα, "unclean" (5:2, 8, 13)
- (6) Twelve instructed (34.2): ἀκαθάρτων, "unclean" (6:7).

40) to destroy, to be lost, to perish
- (1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): ἀπολέσαι "destroy" (1:24).
- (2) New wine (12.3): ἀπόλλυται, "lost" (2:22).
- (3) Healing controversy (14): ἀπολέσωσιν, "destroy" (3:6).
- (4) Stilling of storm (28.2): ἀπολλύμεθα, "perishing" (4:38).

41) to know, to understand
- (1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): οἶδα "know" (1:24).
- (2) Healing at Simon's (6): ᾔδεισαν, "knew" (1:34).
- (3) Paralytic healed (9.2): εἰδῆτε, "know" (2:10).
- (4) Why teaching in parables (21): οἴδατε "understand" (4:13).
- (5) Seed in secret (25): οἶδεν, "know" (4:27).
- (6) HW (31): εἰδυῖα, "knowing" (5:33).
- (7) Death of John (35.2): εἰδὼς, "knowing" (6:20).

42) holy
- (1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): ἅγιος "holy" (1:24).
- (2) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): ἅγιον, "Holy" (3:29).
- (3) Death of John (35.2): ἅγιον, "holy" (6:20).

43) to rebuke, to order
- (1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): ἐπετίμησεν, "rebuked" (1:25).
- (2) Healing by boat (15): ἐπετίμα, "ordered" (3:12).
- (3) Stilling of storm (28.2): ἐπετίμησεν, "rebuked" (4:39).

44) to be silent, to be still
- (1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): Φιμώθητι "be silent" (1:25).
- (2) Stilling of storm (28.2): πεφίμωσο, "be still" (4:39).

45) voice
- (1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): φωνῇ, "voice" (1:26).
- (2) Gerasene healed (29.1): φωνῃ, "voice" (5:7).

46) great
- (1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): μεγάλῃ, "loud" (1:26).
- (2) Mustard seed (26): μεῖζον/μεγάλους, "greatest" (4:32), "large" (4:32).
- (3) Stilling of Storm (28.2): μεγάλη/μέγαν, "great" (4:37), "dead" (4:39), "great" (4:41).
- (4) Gerasene healed (29.1): μεγάλῃ/μεγάλη, "top" (5:7), "great" (5:11).
- (5) Jairus daughter raised (32.3): μεγάλῃ, not translated: great (5:42).

47) new

(1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): καινη, "new" (1:27).
(2) New cloth (12.2): καινὸν, "new" (2:21).
(3) New wine (12.3): νέον/καινούς, "new" (2:22 twice).

48) to command, to order
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): ἐπιτάσσει, "commands" (1:27).
(2) Death of John (35.2): ἐπέταξεν, "orders" (6:27).
(3) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἐπέταξεν, "ordered" (6:39).

49) to obey
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): ὑπακούουσιν, "obey" (1:27).
(2) Stilling of the storm (28.2): ὑπακούει, "obey" (4:41).

50) throughout, whole
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4:2): ὅλην, "throughout" (1:28).
(2) Healing at Simon's (6): ὅλη, "whole" (1:33).
(3) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): ὅλην, "throughout" (1:39).

51) house, home
(1) Simon's mother-in-law (5): οἰκίαν, "house" (1:29).
(2) Teaching at home (9.1): οἴκῳ, "home" (2:1).
(3) Paralytic healed (9.2): οἶκόν, "home" (2:11).
(4) Eating at Levi's (11.1): οἰκίᾳ, "house" (2:15).
(5) Plucking controversy (13): οἶκον, "house" (2:26).
(6) Jesus's family part one (17.1): οἶκον, "home" (3:20).
(7) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): οἰκία/οἰκίαν, "house" (3:25 twice, 3:27 twice).
(8) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): οἶκόν, "home" (5:19).
(9) Jairus's mourners (32.2): οἶκον, "house" (5:38).
(10) Teaching in Nazareth (33): οἰκίᾳ, "house" (6:4).
(11) Twelve instructed (34.2): οἰκίαν, "house" (6:10).

52) to recline, to lie down
(1) Simon's mother-in-law (5): κατέκειτο, "in bed" (1:30).
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): κατέκειτο, "lay" (2:4).
(3) Many eat with Jesus (11.1): κατακεῖσθαι, "sat" (2:15).

53) to rise, to get up
(1) Simon's mother-in-law (5): ἤγειρεν, "lifted up" (1:31).
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): Εγειρε/ἔγειρε/ἠγέρθη, "stand up" (2:9, 11), "stood up" (2:12).
(3) Healing controversy (14): Εγειρε, come forward" (3:3).
(4) Seed in secret (25): ἐγείρηται, "rise" (4:27).
(5) Stilling of storm (28.2): ἐγείρουσιν, "woke up" (4:38).
(6) JD raised (32.3): ἔγειρε, "get up" (5:41).
(7) Herod hears the news (35.1): ἐγήγερται/ἠγέρθη. "raised" (6:14, 16).

54) to take, to arrest
(1) Simon's mother-in-law (5): κρατήσας, "took" (1:31).
(2) Jesus's family part one (17.1): κρατῆσαι, "restrain" (3:21).

(3) JD raised (32.3): κρατήσας, "took" (5:41).
(4) Death of John (35.2): ἐκράτησεν, "arrested" (6:17).

55) hand
(1) Simon's mother-in-law (5): χειρός, "hand" (1:31).
(2) Leper healed (8.1): χεῖρα, "hand" (1:41).
(3) Healing controversy (14): χεῖρα/χεὶρ, "hand" (3:1, 3, 5)
(4) Jairus's request (30.2): χεῖρας, "hands" (5:23).
(5) JD raised (32.3): χειρὸς, "hand" (5:41).
(6) Teaching in Nazareth (33): χειρῶν/χεῖρας, "hands" (6:2, 5).

56) evening
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): Ὀψίας "evening" (1:32).
(2) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): ὀψίας, "evening" (4:35).

57) sun
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): ἥλιος, "sun" (1:32).
(2) Seed on ground (20): ἥλιος, "sun" (4:6).

58) to bring
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): ἔφερον, "brought" (1:32).
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): φέροντες, "bringing" (2:3).
(3) Seed on ground (20): ἔφερεν, "brought" (4:8).
(4) Death of John (35.2): ἐνέγκαι/ἤνεγκεν, "bring" (6:27), "brought" (6:28).

59) sick
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): κακῶς "sick" (1:32, 34).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2): κακῶς, "sick" (2:17).

60) demoniac
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): δαιμονιζομένους "possessed with demons" (1:32).
(2) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): δαιμονιζόμενον/δαιμονιζομένῳ, "demoniac" (5:15, 16).
(3) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): δαιμονισθεὶς, "possessed by demons" (5:18).

61) city, town
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): πόλις "city" (1:33).
(2) Leper proclaims (8.2): πόλιν, "town" (1:45).
(3) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): πόλιν, "city" (5:14).
(4) Teaching following crowd (36.2): πόλεων, "towns" (6:33).

62) door
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): θύραν, "door" (1:33).
(2) Teaching at home (9.1): θύραν, "door" (2:2).

63) to cure
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): ἐθεράπευσεν, "cured" (1:34).
(2) Healing controversy (14): θεραπεύσει, "cure" (3:2).
(3) Healing by boat (15): ἐθεράπευσεν, "cured" (3:10).
(4) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἐθεράπευσεν, "cured" (6:5).
(5) Twelve proclaim (34.3): ἐθεράπευον, "cured" (6:13).

64) demon
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): δαιμόνια, "demons" (1:34 twice).
(2) Jesus and 4 proclaim (7:2): δαιμόνια, "demons" (1:39).
(3) Twelve appointed (16): δαιμόνια, "demons" (3:15).
(4) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): δαιμονίων/δαιμόνια, "demons" (3:22 twice).
(5) Twelve proclaim (34.3): δαιμόνια, "demons" (6:13).

65) to speak
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): λαλεῖν, "speak" (1:34).
(2) Teaching at home (9.1): ἐλάλει, "speaking" (2:2).
(3) Paralytic healed (9.2): λαλεῖ, "speak" (2:7).
(4) Jesus taught in parables (27.1): ἐλάλει, "spoke" (4:33), "speak" (4:34).
(5) Jairus's messengers (32.1): λαλοῦντος/λαλούμενον, "speaking" (5:35), "said" (5:36).

66) to rise, to get up
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): ἀναστὰς, "got up" (1:35).
(2) Levi called (10.2): ἀναστὰς, "got up" (2:14).
(3) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): ἀνέστη, "risen up" (3:26).
(4) JD raised (32.3): ἀνέστη, "got up" (5:42).

67) place
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): τόπον, "place" (1:35).
(2) Leper proclaims (8.2): τόποις, "country" (1:45).
(3) Twelve instructed (34.2): τόπος, "place" (6:11).
(4) Twelve return (36.1): τόπον, "place" (6:31, 32).
(5) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): τόπος, "place" (6:35).

68) to pray
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): προσηύχετο, "prayed" (1:35).
(2) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): προσεύξασθαι, "pray" (6:46).

69) to ask for, to look for
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): ζητοῦσίν, "searching" (1:37).
(2) Jesus's family part two (18.1): ζητοῦσίν, "asking" (3:32).

70) to beg
(1) Leper healed (8.1): παρακαλῶν, "begging" (1:40).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.1): παρεκάλει/παρεκάλεσαν, "begged" (5:10, 12).
(3) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): παρακαλεῖν, "beg" (5:17).
(4) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): παρεκάλει, "begged" (5:18).
(5) Jairus's request (30.2): παρακαλει, "begged" (5:23).

71) to want
(1) Leper healed (8.1): θέλῃς/θέλω, "choose" (1:40, 42).
(2) Twelve appointed (16): ἤθελεν, "wanted" (3:13).
(3) Death of John (35.2): ἤθελεν/θέλῃς/Θέλω/ἠθέλησεν, "wanted" (6:19), "wish" (6:22), "want" (6:25, 26).

72) to have compassion
(1) Leper healed (8.1): σπλαγχνισθεὶς, "moved with pity" (1:41).

(2) Teaching following crowd (36.2): ἐσπλαγχνίσθη, "compassion" (6:34).

73) to stretch
- (1) Leper healed (8.1): ἐκτείνας, "stretched out" (1:41).
- (2) Healing controversy (14): Ἔκτεινον/ἐξέτεινεν, "stretch" (3:5), "stretched (3:5).

74) to touch
- (1) Leper healed (8.1): ἥψατο "touched" (1:41).
- (2) Healing by a boat (15): ἅψωνται, "touch" (3:10).
- (3) HW (31): ἥψατο/ἅψωμαι, "touched" (5:27), "touch" (5:28), "touched" (5:30, 31).

75) none, nothing
- (1) Leper healed (8.1): μηδενι/μηδὲν "no-one" (1:44), "nothing (1:44).
- (2) HW (31): μηδὲν, "no" (5:26).
- (3) JD raised (32.3): μηδεὶς, "no-one" (5:43).
- (4) Twelve instructed (34.2): μηδὲν, "nothing" (6:8).

76) to go
- (1) Leper healed (8.1): ὕπαγε, "go" (1:44).
- (2) Paralytic healed (9.2): ὕπαγε, "go" (2:11).
- (3) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): Ὕπαγε, "go" (5:19).
- (4) HW (31): ὕπαγε, "go" (5:34).
- (5) Twelve return (36.1): ὑπάγοντες, "going" (6:31).
- (6) Teaching following crowd (36.2): ὑπάγοντας, "going" (6:33).
- (7) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ὑπάγετε, "go" (6:38).

77) priest,
- (1) Leper healed (8.1): ἱερει, "priest" (1:44).
- (2) Plucking controversy (13): ἱερεῖς, "priests" (2:26).

78) to offer, to bring
- (1) Leper healed (8.1): προσένεγκε, "offer" (1:44).
- (2) Paralytic healed (9.2): προσενέγκαι, "bring" (2:4).

79) testimony
- (1) Leper healed (8.1): μαρτύριον, "testimony" (1:44).
- (2) Twelve instructed (34.2): μαρτύριον, "testimony" (6:11).

80) to begin
- (1) Leper proclaims (8.2): ἤρξατο "began" (1:45).
- (2) Plucking controversy (13): ἤρξαντο, "began" (2:23).
- (3) Teaching from boat (19): ἤρξατο, "began" (4:1).
- (4) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): ἤρξαντο, "began" (5:17).
- (5) Gerasene proclaims (29.4): ἤρξατο, "began" (5:20).
- (6) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἤρξατο, "began" (6:2).
- (7) Twelve instructed (34.2): ἤρξατο, "began" (6:7).
- (8) Teaching following crowd (36.2): ἤρξατο, "began" (6:34).

81) word
- (1) Leper proclaims (8.2): λόγον, "word" (1:45).
- (2) Teaching at home (9.1): λόγον, "word" (2:2).

(3) Parable explained (22): λόγον/λόγος, "word" (4:14, 15 twice, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20)
(4) Jesus taught in parables (27.1): λόγον, "word" (4:33).
(5) Jairus's messengers (32.1): λόγον, "word" (5:36).

82) no longer
(1) Leper proclaims (8.2): μηκέτι, "no longer" (1:45).
(2) Teaching at home (9.1): μηκέτι "no longer" (2:2).

83) out, outside
(1) Leper proclaims (8.2): ἔξω "out" (1:45).
(2) Jesus's family part two (18:1): ἔξω, "outside" (3:31, 32)
(3) Why taught in parables (21): ἔξω, "outside" (4:11).
(4) Gerasene healed (29.1): ἔξω, "out" (5:10).

84) again
(1) Teaching at home (9.1): πάλιν, "returned" (2.1).
(2) Teaching by sea (10.1): πάλιν, "again" (2:13).
(3) Healing controversy (14): πάλιν, "again" (3:1).
(4) Jesus's family part one (17.1): πάλιν, "again" (3:20).
(5) Teaching from boat (19): πάλιν, "again" (4:1).
(6) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): πάλιν, "again" (5:21).

85) to hear
(1) Teaching at home (9.1): ἠκούσθη, "reported" (2.1).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2): ἀκούσας, "heard" (2:17).
(3) Healing by a boat (15): ἀκούοντες, "hearing" (3:8).
(4) Jesus's family part one (17.1): ἀκούσαντες, "heard" (3:21).
(5) Seed on ground (20): Ἀκούετε/ἀκούειν/ἀκουέτω, "listen" (4:3, 9), "hear" (4:9).
(6) Why teaching in parables (21): ἀκούοντες/ἀκούωσιν, "listen" (4:12), "understand" (4:12).
(7) Parable explained (22): ἀκούσωσιν/ἀκούσαντες/ἀκούουσιν, "hear" (4:15, 16, 18, 20).
(8) Lamps (23): ἀκούειν/ἀκουέτω, "hear" (4:23), "listen" (4:23).
(9) Measure (24): ἀκούετε, "hear" (4:24).
(10) Jesus taught in parables (27.1): ἀκούειν, "hear" (4:33).
(11) HW (31): ἀκούσασα, "heard" (5:27).
(12) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἀκούοντες, "heard" (6:2).
(13) Twelve instructed (34.2): ἀκούσωσιν, "hear" (6:11).
(14) Herod hears news (35.1): ἤκουσεν/ἀκούσας, "heard" (6:14, 16)
(15) Death of John (35.2): ἀκούσας/ἤκουεν/ἀκούσαντες, "heard" (6:20, 29), "listen" (6:20).

86) to gather
(1) Teaching at home (9.1): συνήχθησαν, "gathered" (2:2).
(2) Teaching from boat (19): συνάγεται, "gathered" (4:1).
(3) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): συνήχθη, "gathered" (5:21).
(4) Twelve return (36.1): συνάγονται, "gathered" (6:30).

87) to take
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): αἰρόμενον/ἆρον, "carried" (2:3), "take" (2:9).
(2) New cloth (12.2): αἴρει, "pulls" (2:21).
(3) Parable explained (22): αἴρει, "takes" (4:15).
(4) Measure (24): ἀρθήσεται, "taken" (4:25).
(5) Twelve instructed (34.2): αἴρωσιν, "take" (6:8).
(6) Death of John (35.2): ἦραν, "took" (6:29).
(7) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἦραν, "took up" (6:43).

88) crowd
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): ὄχλον, "crowd" (2:4).
(2) Teaching by sea (10.1): ὄχλος, "crowd" (2:13).
(3) Healing by a boat (15): ὄχλον, "crowd" (3:9).
(4) Jesus's family part one (17.1): ὄχλος, "crowd" (3:20).
(5) Jesus's family part two (18.1): ὄχλος, "crowd" (3:32).
(6) Teaching from boat (19): ὄχλος, "crowd" (4:1 twice).
(7) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): ὄχλον, "crowd" (4:36).
(8) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): ὄχλος, "crowd" (5:21).
(9) Jairus's request (30.2): ὄχλος, "crowd" (5:24).
(10) HW (31): ὄχλῳ/ὄχλον, "crowd" (5:27, 30, 31).
(11) Teaching following crowd (36.2): ὄχλον, "crowd" (6:34).
(12) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): ὄχλον, "crowd" (6:45).

89) sin, sinner
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): ἁμαρτίαι/ἁμαρτίας, "sins" (2:5, 9, 10).
(2) Many eat with Jesus (11.1): ἁμαρτωλοι, "sinners" (2:15).
(3) Sinners controversy (11.2): ἁμαρτωλῶν/ἁμαρτωλούς, "sinners" (2:16 twice, 2:17)
(4) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): ἁμαρτήματα/ἁμαρτήματος, "sins" (3:28), "sin" (3:29).

90) to sit
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): καθήμενοι "sitting" (2:6).
(2) Levi called (10.2): καθήμενον, "sitting" (2:14).
(3) Jesus's family part two (18.1): ἐκάθητο, "sitting" (3:32).
(4) Disciples declared family (18.2): καθημένους, "sat" (3:34).
(5) Teaching from boat (19): καθῆσθαι, "sat" (4:1).
(6) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): καθήμενον, "sitting" (5:15).

91) heart
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): καρδίαις, "hearts" (2.6, 8).
(2) Healing controversy (14): καρδίας, "heart" (3:5).

92) in this way, like this
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): οὕτως, "in this way" (2:7), not translated (2:8), "like this" (2:12).
(2) Seed in secret (25): Οὕτως, not translated: in this way (4:26).

93) blasphemy

(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): βλασφημεῖ, "blasphemy" (2:7).
(2) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): βλασφημίαι/βλασφημήσωσιν/βλασφημήσῃ, "blasphemies" (3:28 twice, 29).

94) to recognize, to be aware, to perceive
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): ἐπιγνοὺς, "perceived" (2:8).
(2) HW (31): ἐπιγνοὺς, "aware" (5:30).
(3) Teaching following crowd (36.2): ἐπέγνωσαν, "recognized" (6:33).

95) to walk
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): περιπάτει, "walk" (2:9).
(2) JD raised (32.3): περιεπάτει, "walk" (5:42).

96) son
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): υἱὸς, "son" (2:10).
(2) Fasting controversy (12.1): υἱοι, "guests" (2:19).
(3) Plucking controversy (13): υἱὸς, "Son" (2:28).
(4) Healing by a boat (15): υἱὸς, "Son" (3:11).
(5) Twelve appointed (16): Υἱοὶ, "sons" (3:17).
(6) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): υἱοῖς, "people" (3:28).
(7) Gerasene healed (29.1): υἱε, "Son" (5:7).
(8) Teaching in Nazareth (33): υἱὸς, "son" (6:3).

97) earth
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): γῆς, "earth" (2:10).
(2) Teaching from boat (19): γῆς, "land" (4:1).
(3) Seed on ground (20): γῆν/γῆς, "soil" (4:5 twice, 8)
(4) Parable explained (22): γῆν, "soil" (4:20).
(5) Seed in secret (25): γῆς/γη, "ground" (4:26), "earth" (4:28).
(6) Mustard seed (26): γῆς, "ground" (4:31), "earth" (4:31).

98) to be amazed, to beside oneself, to be mad
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): ἐξίστασθαι "amazed" (2:12).
(2) Jesus's family part one (17.1): ἐξέστη, "out of his mind" (3:21).
(3) JD raised (32.3): ἐξέστησαν/ἐκστάσει, "amazement" (5:42 twice).

99) never
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): οὐδέποτε, "never" (2:12).
(2) Plucking controversy (13): Οὐδέποτε, "never" (2:25).

100) Alphaeus
(1) Levi called (10.2): Ἀλφαίου, "Alphaeus" (2:14).
(2) Twelve appointed (16): Ἀλφαίου, "Alphaeus" (3:18).

101) tax collector
(1) Many eat with Jesus (11.1): τελῶναι, tax collector (2:15).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2): τελωνῶν, "tax collectors" (2:16 twice).

102) to recline
(1) Many eat with Jesus (11.1): συνανέκειντο, sitting (2:15).
(2) Death of John (35.2): συνανακειμένοις, "guests" (6:22).

103) Pharisee
(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): Φαρισαίων, "Pharisees" (2:16).

(2) Fasting controversy (12.1): Φαρισαῖοι/Φαρισαίων, "Pharisees" (2:18 twice).
(3) Plucking controversy (13): Φαρισαῖοι, "Pharisees" (2:24).
(4) Healing controversy (14): Φαρισαῖοι, "Pharisees" (3:6).

104) to eat
(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): ἐσθίει, "eating" (2:16 twice).
(2) Plucking controversy (13): ἔφαγεν/φαγεῖν, "ate" (2:26), "to eat" (2:26).
(3) Jesus's family part one (17.1): φαγεῖν, "eat" (3.20)
(4) JD raised (32.3): φαγεῖν, "eat" (5:43).
(5) Twelve return (36.1): φαγεῖν, "eat" (6:31).
(6) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): φάγωσιν/φαγεῖν, "eat" (6:36, 37 twice).

105) need
(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): χρείαν, "need" (2:17).
(2) Plucking controversy (13): χρείαν, "need" (2:25).

106) strong
(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): ἰσχύοντες, "well" (2:17).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.1): ἴσχυεν, "strength" (5:4).

107) physician
(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): ἰατρου, "physician" (2:17).
(2) HW (31): ἰατρῶν, "physicians" (5:26).

108) righteous
(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): δικαίους, "righteous" (2:17).
(2) Death of John (35.2): δίκαιον, "righteous" (6:22).

109) as long as, how much
(1) Fasting controversy (12.1): ὅσο, "as long as" (2:19).
(2) Healing by a boat (15): ὅσα/ὅσοι, "all" (3:8), "so that" (3:10).
(3) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): ὅσα, "whatever" (3:28).
(4) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): ὅσα, "how much" (5:19).
(5) Gerasene proclaims (29.4): ὅσα, "how much" (5:20).
(6) Twelve return (36.1): ὅσα, "that" (6:30 twice: contracted to one in NRSV).

110) when
(1) Fasting controversy (12.1): ὅταν, "when" (2:20).
(2) Healing by a boat (15): ὅταν, "whenever" (3:11).
(3) Parable explained (22): ὅταν, "when" (4:15, 16).
(4) Seed in secret (25): ὅταν, "when" (4:29).
(5) Mustard seed (26): ὅταν, "when" (4:31, 32).

111) garment
(1) New cloth (12.2): ἱμάτιον, "cloak" (2:21).
(2) HW (31): ἱματίου/ἱματίων, "cloak" (5:27), "clothes" (5:28, 30).

112) old
(1) New cloth (12.2): παλαιόν/παλαιοῦ "old" (2:21 twice).
(2) New wine (12.3): παλαιούς, "old" (2:22).

113) patch
(1) New cloth (12.2): πλήρωμα, "patch" (2:21).

(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): πληρώματα, "full" (6:43).

114) worse
(1) New cloth (12.2): χεῖρον, "worse" (2:21).
(2) HW (31): χεῖρον, "worse" (5:26).

115) to throw
(1) New wine (12.3): βάλλει, "puts" (2:22).
(2) Seed in secret (25): βάλῃ, "scatter" (4:26).

116) way, path
(1) Plucking controversy (13): ὁδὸν, "way" (2:23).
(2) Seed on ground (20): ὁδόν, "path" (4:4).
(3) Parable explained (22): ὁδόν, "path" (4:15).
(4) Twelve instructed (34.2): ὁδὸν, "journey" (6:8).

117) grain
(1) Plucking controversy (13): στάχυας, "grain" (2:23).
(2) Seed in secret (25): στάχυν/στάχυϊ, "head" (4:28 twice).

118) lawful
(1) Plucking controversy (13): ἔξεστιν, "lawful" (2:24, 26).
(2) Healing controversy (14): Ἔξεστιν, "lawful" (3:4).
(3) Death of John (35.2): ἔξεστίν "lawful" (6:18).

119) bread
(1) Plucking controversy (13): ἄρτους, "bread" (2:26).
(2) Jesus's family part one (17.1): ἄρτον, not translated—"eat" (3:20): "eat bread"
(3) Twelve instructed (34.2): ἄρτον, "bread" (6:8).
(4) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἄρτους, "bread" (6:37, 38, 41 twice, 44).

120) to give
(1) Plucking controversy (13): ἔδωκεν, "gave" (2:26).
(2) Healing controversy (14): ἐδίδουν, not translated—"conspired" (3:6): gave consultation.
(3) Seed on ground (20): ἔδωκεν/ἐδίδου, "yielded" (4:7, 8)
(4) Why taught in parables (21): δέδοται, "given" (4.11)
(5) Measure (24): δοθήσεται, "given" (4:25).
(6) JD raised (32.3): δοθῆναι, "give" (5:43).
(7) Teaching in Nazareth (33): δοθεῖσα, "given" (6:2).
(8) Twelve instructed (34.2): ἐδίδου, "gave" (6:7).
(9) Death of John (35.2): δώσω/δῷς/ἔδωκεν, "give" (6:22, 23, 25), "gave" (6:28 twice).
(10) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): Δότε/δώσομεν/ἐδίδου, "give" (6:37 twice), "gave" (6:41).

121) lord
(1) Plucking controversy (13): κύριός, "lord" (2:28).
(2) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): κύριός, "Lord" (5:19).

122) withered, dried up
(1) Healing controversy (14): ἐξηραμμένην/ξηρὰν, "withered" (3:1, 3)

(2) Seed on ground (20): ἐξηράνθη, "withered" (4:6).
(3) HW (31): ἐξηράνθη, "stopped" (5:29).

123) to save
(1) Healing controversy (14): σῶσαι, "save" (3:4).
(2) Jairus's request (30.2): σωθῇ, "cured" (5:23).
(3) HW (31): σωθήσομαι/σέσωκέν, "well" (5:28, 34).

124) to kill
(1) Healing controversy (14): ἀποκτεῖναι, "kill" (3:4).
(2) Death of John (35.2): ἀποκτεῖναι, "kill" (6:19).

125) to be silent
(1) Healing controversy (14): ἐσιώπων, "silent" (3:4).
(2) Stilling of the storm (28.2): Σιώπα, "peace" (4:39).

126) to look (around, up)
(1) Healing controversy (14): περιβλεψάμενος, "looked around" (3:5).
(2) Disciples declared family (18.2): περιβλεψάμενος, "looking" (3:34).
(3) Why taught in parables (21): βλέποντες/βλέπωσιν, "look" (4:12 twice).
(4) Measure (24): Βλέπετε, "pay attention" (4:24).
(5) HW (31): Βλέπεις/περιεβλέπετο, "see" (5:31), "looked all around" (5:32).
(6) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἀναβλέψας, "looked up" (6:41)

127) Jerusalem
(1) Healing by boat (15): Ἱεροσολύμων "Jerusalem" (3:8).
(2) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): Ἱεροσολύμων, "Jerusalem" (3:22).

128) other side
(1) Healing by boat (15): πέραν "beyond" (3:9).
(2) Jesus leaves crowd (28:1): πέραν, "other side" (4:35).
(3) Gerasene healed (29.1): πέραν, "other side" (5:1).
(4) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): πέραν, "other side" (5:21).
(5) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): πέραν, "other side" (6:45).

129) to fall down
(1) Healing by boat (15): ἐπιπίπτειν/προσέπιπτον, "pressed upon" (3:10), "fell down" (3:11).
(2) HW (31): προσέπεσεν, "fell down" (5:33).

130) disease
(1) Healing by boat (15): μάστιγας "diseases" (3:10).
(2) HW (31): μάστιγος, "disease" (5:29, 34).

131) to see
(1) Healing by boat (15): ἐθεώρουν "saw" (3:11).
(2) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): θεωροῦσιν, "saw" (5:15).
(3) Jairus's mourners (32.2): θεωρει, "saw" (5:38).

132) to shout
(1) Healing by boat (15): ἔκραζον "shouted" (3:11).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.2): κράζων/κράξας, "howled" (5:5), "shouted" (5:7).

133) to be revealed

(1) Healing by boat (15): φανερὸν, "known" (3:12).
(2) Lamps (23): φανερωθῇ/φανερόν, "light" (4:22 twice).
(3) Herod hears news (35.1): φανερὸν, "known" (6:14).

134) to go up, to grow up
(1) Twelve appointed (16): ἀναβαίνει "went up" (3:13).
(2) Seed on ground (20): ἀνέβησαν/ἀναβαίνοντα "grew up" (4:7), "growing up" (4:8).
(3) Mustard seed (26): ἀναβαίνει, "grows up" (4:32).

135) mountain
(1) Twelve appointed (16): ὄρος, "mountain" (3:13).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.1): ὄρεσιν/ὄρει, "mountains" (5:5), "hillside" (5:11).
(3) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): ὄρος, "mountain" (6:46).

136) twelve
(1) Twelve appointed (16): δώδεκα, "twelve" (3:14).
(2) Why taught in parables (21): δώδεκα, "twelve" (4:10).
(3) HW (31): δώδεκα, "twelve" (5:25).
(4) JD raised (32.3): δώδεκα, "twelve" (5:42).
(5) Twelve instructed (34.2): δώδεκα, "twelve" (6:7).
(6) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): δώδεκα, "twelve" (6:43).

137) apostle
(1) Twelve appointed (16): ἀποστόλους, "apostles" (3:14).
(2) Twelve return (36.1): ἀπόστολοι "apostles" (6:30).

138) to send
(1) Twelve appointed (16): ἀποστέλλῃ, "sent out" (3:14).
(2) Jesus's family part two (18:1): ἀπέστειλαν, "sent in" (3:31).
(3) Seed in secret (25): ἀποστείλῃ, "goes in" (4:29).
(4) Gerasene healed (29.1): "send out" (5:10).
(5) Twelve instructed (34.2): ἀποστέλλειν, "send out" (6:7).
(6) Death of John (35.2): ἀποστείλας, "sent" (6:17, 27).

139) to lay
(1) Twelve appointed (16): ἐπέθηκεν, "gave" (3:16, 17).
(2) Jairus's request (30.2): ἐπιθῇς, "lay" (5:23).
(3) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἐπιθεὶς, "laid" (6:5).

140) name
(1) Twelve appointed (16): ὄνομα/ὀνόμα[τα] "name" (3:16, 17).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.1): ὄνομα, "name" (5:9 twice).
(3) Jairus's request (30.2): ὀνόματι, "named" (5:22).
(4) Herod hears news (35.1): ὄνομα, "name" (6:14).

141) Philip
(1) Twelve appointed (16): Φίλιππον "Philip" (3:18).
(2) Death of John (35.2): Φιλίππου, "Philip's" (6:17).

142) Judas
(1) Twelve appointed (16): Ἰούδαν, "Judas" (3:19).
(2) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Ἰούδα, "Judas" (6:3).

143) parable
   (1) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): παραβολαῖς, "parables" (3:23).
   (2) Teaching from boat (19): παραβολαῖς, "parables" (4:2).
   (3) Why taught in parables (21): παραβολάς/παραβολαῖς/παραβολὴν, "parables" (4:10, 11, 13), "parable" (4:13).
   (4) Mustard seed (26): παραβολῇ, "parable" (4:30).
   (5) Jeus taught public in parables (27:1): παραβολαῖς/παραβολῆς, "parables" (4:33, 34).

144) to divide
   (1) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): μερισθῇ/ἐμερίσθη, "divided" (3:24, 25, 26).
   (2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἐμέρισεν, "divided" (6:41).

145) first
   (1) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): πρῶτον, "first" (3:27).
   (2) Seed in secret (25): πρῶτον, "first" (4:28).
   (3) Death of John (35.2): πρώτοις, "leaders" (6:21).

146) to bind, to tie up
   (1) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): δήσῃ, "tying up" (3:27).
   (2) Gerasene healed (29.1): δῆσαι/δεδέσθαι, "restrain" (5:3), "restrained" (5:4).
   (3) Death of John (35.2): ἔδησεν, "bound" (6:17).

147) eternal
   (1) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): αἰῶνα/αἰωνίου "never" (3:29), "eternal" (3:29).
   (2) Parable explained (22): αἰῶνος, "world" (4:19).

148) mother
   (1) Jesus's family part two (18.1): μήτηρ, "mother" (3:31, 32, 33).
   (2) Disciples declared family (18.2): μήτηρ, "mother" (3:34, 35)
   (3) JD raised (32.3): μητέρα, "mother" (5:40).
   (4) Death of John (35.2): μητρι/μητρι, "mother" (6:24, 28).

149) listen, behold
   (1) Jesus's family part two (18.1): Ἰδοὺ, not translated: behold/listen (3:32).
   (2) Disciples declared family (18.2): Ἰδου, not translated: behold/listen (3:34).
   (3) Seed on ground (20): ἰδου, "listen" (4:3).

150) sister
   (1) Jesus's family part two (18.1): ἀδελφαι, "sisters" (3:32).
   (2) Disciples declared family (18.2): ἀδελφη, "sisters" (3:35).
   (3) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἀδελφαι, "sisters" (6:3).

151) to answer
   (1) Jesus's family part two (18.1): ἀποκριθεὶς, "replied" (3:33).
   (2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἀποκριθεὶς, "answered" (6:37).

152) circle
   (1) Disciples declared family (18.2): κύκλῳ, not translated: circle (3:34).
   (2) Teaching in villages (34.1): κύκλῳ, not translated: "circuit" (6:6).
   (3) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): κύκλῳ, "surrounding" (6:36).

153) to get into
   (1) Teaching from boat (19): ἐμβάντα, "got into" (4:1).
   (2) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): ἐμβαίνοντος, "getting into" (5:18).
   (3) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): ἐμβῆναι, "get into" (6:45).
154) to sow
   (1) Seed on ground (20): σπείρων/σπεῖραι/σπείρειν, "sower"(4:2), "sow"(4:3), "sowed" (4:4).
   (2) Parable explained (22): σπείρων/σπείρει/σπείρεται/ἐσπαρμένον/ σπειρόμενοι/εἰσπορευόμεναι,"sower" (4:14), "sows" (4:14), "sown" (4:15 twice, 16, 18, 19).
   (3) Mustard seed (26): σπαρῇ, "sown" (4:31, 32).
155) to fall
   (1) Seed on ground (20): ἔπεσεν, "fell" (4:4, 5, 7, 8).
   (2) Jairus's request (30.2): πίπτει, "fell" (5:22).
156) bird
   (1) Seed on ground (20): πετεινα, "birds" (4:4).
   (2) Mustard seed (26): πετεινα, "birds" (4:32).
157) rocky
   (1) Seed on ground (20): πετρῶδες, rocky, (4:5).
   (2) Parable explained (22): πετρώδη "rocky" (4:16).
158) root
   (1) Seed on ground (20): ῥίζαν, "root" (4:6).
   (2) Parable explained (22): ῥίζαν "root" (4:17).
159) thorn
   (1) Seed on ground (20): ἀκάνθας/ἄκανθαι,"thorns" (4:7 twice).
   (2) Parable explained (22): ἀκάνθας, "thorns" (4:18).
160) to choke
   (1) Seed on ground (20): συνέπνιξαν, "choked" (4:7).
   (2) Parable explained (22): συμπνίγουσιν, "choked" (4:19).
161) grain
   (1) Seed on ground (20): καρπὸν, "grain" (4:7, 8).
   (2) Seed in secret (25): καρπός, "grain" (4:29).
162) good
   (1) Seed on ground (20): καλὴν, "good" (4:8).
   (2) Parable explained (22): καλὴν, "good" (4:20).
163) thirty
   (1) Seed on ground (20): τριάκοντα, "thirty" (4:8).
   (2) Parable explained (22): τριάκοντα, "thirty" (4:20).
164) sixty
   (1) Seed on ground (20): ἑξήκοντα, "sixty" (4:8).
   (2) Parable explained (22): ἑξήκοντα, "sixty" (4:20).
165) hundred
   (1) Seed on ground (20): ἑκατόν, "hundredfold" (4:8).

(2) Parable explained (22): ἑκατόν, "hundredfold" (4:20).
(3) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἑκατὸν, "hundreds" (6:40).

166) ear
(1) Seed on ground (20): ὦτα, "ears" (4:9).
(2) Lamps for lampstands (25): ὦτα, "ears" (4:23).

167) only
(1) Why teaching in parables (21): μόνας, "alone" (4:10).
(2) Jairus's messengers (32.1): μόνον, "only" (5:36).
(3) Twelve instructed (34.2): μόνον, not translated: only (6:8).

168) to turn
(1) Why teaching in parables (21): ἐπιστρέψωσιν, "turn again" (4:12).
(2) HW (31): ἐπιστραφεὶς "turned about" (5:30).

169) to know
(1) Why teaching in parables (21): γνώσεσθε, "understand" (4:13).
(2) HW (31): ἔγνω, "felt" (5:29).
(3) JD healed (32.3): γνοι, "know" (5:43).
(4) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): γνόντες, "had found out" (6:38).

170) to receive
(1) Parable explained (22): λαμβάνουσιν, "receive" (4:16).
(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): λαβὼν, "taking" (6:41).

171) to fall away
(1) Parable explained (22): σκανδαλίζονται, "fall away" (4:17).
(2) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἐσκανδαλίζοντο, "offence" (6:3).

172) to produce
(1) Parable explained (22): καρποφοροῦσιν, "bear fruit" (4:20).
(2) Seed in secret (25): καρποφορεῖ, "produces" (4:28).

173) to present
(1) Lamps (23): τεθῇ, "put" (4:21 twice).
(2) Mustard seed (26): θῶμεν, "use" (4:30).
(3) Death of John (35.2): ἔθηκαν, "laid" (6:29).

174) to sleep
(1) Seed in secret (25): καθεύδῃ, "sleep" (4:27).
(2) Stilling of Storm (28.2): καθεύδων, "asleep" (4:38).
(3) Jairus's mourners (32.2): καθεύδει, "sleeping" (5:39).

175) night
(1) Seed in secret (25): νύκτα, "night" (4:27).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.1): νυκτὸς, "night" (5:5).

176) grass
(1) Seed in secret (25): χόρτον, "stalk" (4:28).
(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): χόρτῳ, "grass" (6:39).

177) heaven
(1) Mustard seed (26): οὐρανου, "air" (4:32).
(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): οὐρανὸν, "heaven" (6:41).

178) such
   (1) Public taught in parables (27.1): τοιαύταις, "such" (4:33).
   (2) Teaching in Nazareth (33): τοιαῦται, "what" (6:2).
179) on one's own
   (1) Public taught in parables (27.1): ἰδίαν/ἰδίοις, "in private" (4:34), not translated: one's own (4:34).
   (2) Twelve return (36.1): ἰδίαν, "all by yourselves" (6:31), "by themselves" (6:32).
180) to take
   (1) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): παραλαμβάνουσιν, "took" (4:36).
   (2) JD raised (32.3): παραλαμβάνει, "took" (5:40).
181) teacher
   (1) Stilling of storm (28.2): Διδάσκαλε, "teacher" (4:38).
   (2) Jairus's messengers (32.1): διδάσκαλον, "teacher" (5:35).
182) to be afraid, fear
   (1) Stilling of storm (28.2): ἐφοβήθησαν/φόβον, "great awe" (4:41 twice).
   (2) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): ἐφοβήθησαν, "afraid" (5:15).
   (3) HW (31): φοβηθεῖσα, "fear" (5.33)
   (4) Jairus's messengers (32.1): φοβοῦ, "fear" (5:36).
   (5) Death of John (35.2): ἐφοβεῖτο, "feared" (6.20).
183) tomb
   (1) Gerasene healed: μνημείων/μνήμασιν "tombs" (5:2, 3, 5).
   (2) Death of John (35.2): μνημείῳ, "tomb" (6:29).
184) legion
   (1) Gerasene healed: Λεγιὼν, "Legion" (5:9).
   (2) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): λεγιῶνα, "legion" (5:15).
185) swine
   (1) Gerasene healed: χοίρων/χοίρους, "swine" (5:11, 12, 13).
   (2) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): χοίρων. "swine" (5:16).
186) to feed
   (1) Gerasene healed: βοσκομένη "feeding" (5:11).
   (2) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): βόσκοντες, "swineherds" (5:14).
187) to tell
   (1) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): ἀπήγγειλαν, "told" (5:14).
   (2) Gerasene disciple (29:3): ἀπάγγειλον, "tell" (5:19).
   (3) Twelve return (36.1): ἀπήγγειλαν, "told" (6:30).
188) country
   (1) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): ἀγρούς, "country" (5:14).
   (2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἀγροὺς, "country" (6:36).
189) to be amazed
   (1) Gerasene proclaims: ἐθαύμαζον, "amazed" (5:20).
   (2) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἐθαύμαζεν, "amazed" (6:6).
190) synagogue-leader

(1) Jairus's request (30.2): ἀρχισυναγώγων, "one of the leaders of the synagogue" (5:22).
(2) Jairus's messengers (32.1): ἀρχισυναγώγου/ἀρχισυναγώγῳ, "leader's" (5:35), "leader of the synagogue" (5:36).
(3) Jairus's mourners (32.2): ἀρχισυναγώγου, "leader of the synagogue" (5:38).

191) foot
(1) Jairus's request (30.2): πόδας, "feet" (5:22).
(2) Twelve instructed (34.2): ποδῶν, "feet" (6:11).

192) daughter
(1) Jairus's request (30.2): θυγάτριόν, "little daughter" (5:23).
(2) HW (31): Θυγάτηρ, "daughter" (5:34).
(3) Jairus's messengers (32.1): θυγάτηρ, "daughter (5:35).
(4) Death of John (35.2): θυγατρὸς, "daughter" (6:22).

193) to press in
(1) Jairus's request (30.2): συνέθλιβον, "pressed in" (5:24).
(2) HW (31): συνθλίβοντά, "pressing in" (5:31).

194) woman
(1) HW (31): γυνὴ, "woman" (5:25, 33).
(2) Death of John (35.2): γυναῖκα, "wife" (6:17, 18).

195) year
(1) HW (31): ἔτη, "years" (5:25).
(2) JD raised (32.3): ἐτῶν, "years" (5:42).

196) power
(1) HW (31): δύναμιν, "power" (5:30).
(2) Teaching in Nazareth (33): δυνάμεις/δύναμιν, "power" (6:2,5)
(3) Herod hears news (35.1): δυνάμεις, "powers" (6:14).

197) to die
(1) Jairus's messengers: ἀπέθανεν, "dead" (5:35).
(2) Jairus's mourners (32.2): ἀπέθανεν, "dead" (5:39).

198) child
(1) Jairus's mourners (32.2): παιδίον, "child" (5:39).
(2) JD raised (32.3): παιδίου/παιδίον, "child" (5:40 twice), "her" (5:41).

199) little girl/girl
(1) JD raised (32.3): κοράσιον, "little girl" (5:41), "girl" (5:42).
(2) Death of John (35.2): κορασίῳ/κοράσιον, "girl" (6:22, 28 twice).

200) prophet
(1) Teaching in Nazareth (33): προφήτης, "prophets" (6:4).
(2) Herod hears news (15.1): προφήτης/προφητῶν "prophet" (6:15)/"prophets" (6:15).

201) sick person
(1) Teaching in Nazareth (33): ἀρρώστοις, "sick people" (6:5).

(2) Twelve proclaim (34.3): ἀρρώστους "sick" (6:13).

202) village
(1) Teaching in villages (34.1): κώμας, "villages" (6:6).
(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): "villages" (6: 36).

203) two
(1) Twelve instructed (34.2): δύο, "two" (6:7 twice, 6:9).
(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): δύο, "two" (6:38, 41 twice).

204) king
(1) Herod hears the news (35.1): βασιλεὺς, "king" (6:14).
(2) Death of John (35.2): βασιλεὺς/βασιλέα, "king" (6:22, 25, 26, 27).

205) Herod
(1) Herod hears the news (35.1): Ἡρῴδης, "Herod" (6:14, 16).
(2) Death of John (35.2): Ἡρῴδης/Ἡρῴδῃ, "Herod" (6:17, 18, 20, 21, 22).

206) baptizer
(1) Herod hears the news (35.1): βαπτίζων, "baptizer" (6:14).
(2) Death of John (35.2): βαπτίζοντος/βαπτιστου, "baptizer" (6:24, 25).

207) man
(1) Death of John (35.2): ἄνδρα, man (6:20).
(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἄνδρες "men" (6:44).

208) to send away, dismiss
(1) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): ἀπόλυσον, send away (6:36).
(2) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): ἀπολύει, "dismissed" (6:45).

Conceptual Parallels

1) Location: the wilderness
    (1) The temptation (1): Spirit drives Jesus into wilderness (1:12).
    (2) Jesus and the four in desert (7:1): Jesus goes to pray in wilderness and 4 join him (1:35).
    (3) Twelve appointed (16): Jesus goes up a mountain and calls the twelve to him (3:13).
    (4) Twelve return (36.1): Jesus and the twelve go to a deserted place (6:32).
    (5) Teaching following crowd (36.2): the crowd follows Jesus to the wilderness (6:33).
    (6) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): this takes place in the wilderness mentioned at 36.2.
    (7) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): this takes place in the wilderness mentioned at 36.2.
2) Content: Jesus is alone (as in not with other humans) in the wilderness
    (1) The temptation (1): the Spirit drives Jesus into the wilderness (1:12)
    (2) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): Jesus goes into desert to pray alone (1:35).
    (3) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): Jesus goes up mountain alone (6:46).
3) Content: Satan is described as being defeated
    (1) The temptation (1): it is understood that Jesus resisted the temptations (1:13)
    (2) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): Jesus is the one who can bind Satan (implied in 4:27).
4) Content: Jesus is possessed by the Holy Spirit
    (1) The temptation (1): the Spirit is described as driving Jesus out into the wilderness (1:12), and the Greek word used to describe this is the same word as for casting out demons (see word parallel ii above). By using this odd language to describe the Spirit's actions, Mark introduces the idea of possession. However, instead of an unclean spirit, here it is the Holy Spirit that has possessed and is controlling Jesus.
    (2) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): Jesus is accused of being possessed by Beelzebul/Satan, that is, by an unclean spirit (3.22, 28). Mark specifically says that this accusation is an accusation against the Holy Spirit (3:28). The implication is that Jesus is not possessed by an unclean spirit (3:28), but by the Holy Spirit, and it is by the Holy Spirit, not Satan, that Jesus casts out demons (cf. Luke 17:20, Matt 12:28).
5) Content: people are served
    (1) The temptation (1): angels wait on Jesus (1:13).
    (2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): Simon's mother-in-law serves Jesus and the four (1:31).
    (3) Plucking controversy (13): David serves his companions the bread of the presence (3:26).
    (4) JD raised (32.3): JD is to be given food (5:43).
    (5) Death of John (35.2): Herod's daughter is served John the Baptist's head (6:28).
    (6) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): the five thousand are served bread and fish (6:41).
6) Content: people are eating

(1) The temptation (1): Jesus is waited on by angels (1:13); though it is not said what sort of service is supplied by the angels, one must assume it is physical needs, such as supplying food, even if this contradicts other traditions concerning Jesus's temptation (Luke 4:2, Matt 4:2).
(2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): Simon's mother-in-law serves Jesus and the four, presumably food (1:31).
(3) Many eat with Jesus (11.1): Jesus reclines with many at Levi's house (1:15).
(4) Sinners controversy (11.2): scribes see Jesus eating with sinners (1:16).
(5) Fasting controversy (12.1): Jesus's disciples are not fasting (2:18).
(6) Plucking controversy (13): the disciples are plucking grain and presumably eating it (2:23); David gives the bread of the presence to his companions to eat (2:26).
(7) JD raised (32.3): JD is to be given something to eat (5:43).
(8) Death of John (35.2): Herod gives a banquet (6:21).
(9) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): the five thousand are fed (5:41).

7) Form: general public story (a story about Jesus and his ministry to the general public):
(1) Jesus proclaims to public in Galilee (1:14).
(2) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): Jesus teaches public in Capernaum synagogue (1:21).
(3) News spreads in Galilee (4.3): the public spreads the news about Jesus (1:28).
(4) Healing at Simon's (6): whole town gathers to be healed (1:32-33)
(5) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): Jesus and 4 proclaim throughout Galilee (1:39).
(6) Leper proclaims (8.2): news spreads due to Leper (1:45).
(7) Teaching at home (9.1): many come to Simon's to hear Jesus (2:1–2).
(8) Teaching by sea (10.1): Jesus teaches public by the sea (2:13).
(9) Many eat with Jesus (11.1): Jesus eats with many sinners (2:15).
(10) Healing by boat (15): news spreads to surrounding regions and many come to Jesus (3:7–8).
(11) Jesus's family part one (17.1): crowd prevents Jesus from eating, and people are saying Jesus is mad (1:21).
(12) Jesus's family part two (18.1): a crowd is sitting around Jesus (1:32).
(13) Teaching from boat (19): Jesus teaches large crowd from boat (4:1–2).
(14) Jesus taught public in parables (27.1): Jesus only spoke to public in parables (4:33–34).
(15) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): Jesus goes to other side to escape crowd (4:35–36).
(16) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): the Gerasenes ask Jesus to leave (5:17).
(17) Gerasene proclaims (29.4): the ex-demoniac spreads news of Jesus in the Decapolis (5:20).
(18) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): Jesus returns and a great crowd gathers (5:21).
(19) Jairus's mourners (32.2): the mourning crowd laughs at Jesus (32.2).
(20) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus teaches public in Nazareth (6:1–2).
(21) Teaching in villages (34.1): Jesus teaches in villages around Nazareth (6.6b).

(22) Twelve proclaim (34.3): disciples proclaim to and heal public (6:12-13).
(23) Herod hears the news (35.1): news reaches Herod, and public's opinion of Jesus is given (6:14–15).
(24) Twelve return (36.1): disciples and Jesus cannot eat, so they leave for the wilderness (6:31–32).
(25) Teaching following crowd (36.2): a great crowd follows Jesus and he teaches them (6:32-34).

8) Content: Action begun completed:
(1) We are told John is arrested, but given no further information (1:14).
(2) Death of John (35.2): the reasons for John's arrest and the result of the arrest are given (6:17–29).

9) Content: John's death or arrest is mentioned:
(1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): Jesus proclaims after John is arrested (1:14).
(2) Herod hears the news (35.1): Herod thinks Jesus is John, whom Herod had beheaded (35.2).
(3) Death of John (35.2): John's arrest and death is described (6:17–29).

10) Content: teaching or proclaiming to public:
(1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): Jesus proclaims in Galilee (1:14).
(2) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): Jesus teaches in the synagogue (1:21).
(3) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): Jesus and 4 proclaim in Galilee (1:39).
(4) Leper proclaims (8.2): the Leper proclaims the word (1:45).
(5) Teaching at home (9.1): Jesus speaks the word (2:2).
(6) Teaching by sea (10.1): Jesus teaches by the sea in Capernaum (2:13).
(7) Teaching from boat (19): Jesus teaches from a boat (4:1).
(8) Jesus taught in parables (27.1): Jesus teaches public in parables (4:33).
(9) Gerasene proclaims (29.4): the healed Gerasene proclaims Jesus (5:20).
(10) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus teaches in the synagogue (6:2).
(11) Teaching in villages (34.1): Jesus teaches in villages (6:6).
(12) Twelve proclaim (34.3): the twelve proclaim (6:12).
(13) Teaching following crowd (36.2): Jesus teaches crowd that follows (6:34).

11) Content: Jesus is described working in a general region:
(1) Proclaiming in Galilee (2): Jesus proclaims in Galilee (1:14).
(2) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): Jesus and 4 proclaim throughout Galilee (1:39).
(3) Teaching in villages (34.1): Jesus teaches among villages (6:6b).

12) Form: a disciple story (one on the relationship between Jesus and his disciples):
(1) Four called (3): Jesus calls the four (1:16–20).
(2) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): the four search for Jesus (1:35–38).
(3) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): Jesus takes the four proclaiming (1:39).
(4) Levi called (10.2): Jesus calls Levi (2:14).
(5) Twelve appointed (16): Jesus appoints the twelve (3:13–19).
(6) Disciples declared family (18.2): those sitting around him, that is, his disciples, are declared his family (3:34).
(7) Why teaching in parables (21): Jesus gives secret of the kingdom to the disciples (4:10–11).

(8) Disciples taught everything (27.2): Jesus explained everything to his disciples (4:34a).
(9) Jesus leaves in the boat (28.1): Jesus and disciples go to the other side (4:35–36).
(10) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): the Gerasene not accepted as a disciple (5:18–19).
(11) Twelve instructed (34.2): Jesus instructs the twelve on proclaiming (6:7–11).
(12) Twelve proclaim (34.3): the disciples are sent out proclaiming (6:12–13).
(13) Twelve return (36.1): the twelve return and go with Jesus to a deserted place (6:30–32).
(14) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): Jesus sends the twelve ahead (6:45).

13) Structural: Jesus is walking along by the sea, sees someone working, and calls them, person gets up from what they are doing, and follows Jesus:
(1) Four called (3): this occurs first to Simon and Andrew who are casting a net (1:16–18), and then to James and John who were mending nets (1:19–20).
(2) Call of Levi (10.2): this occurs to Levi who is sitting at his tax booth (2:14).

14) Content: Jesus calls someone to be a disciple:
(1) Four called (3): Jesus calls the four (1:17, 19).
(2) Levi called (10.2): Jesus calls Levi (2:14).
(3) Twelve appointed (16): Jesus calls the twelve to be apostles, that is, a special type of disciple (3:13).
(4) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): opposite: healed demoniac is not accepted as a disciple (5:18–19).

15) Content: disciples named:
(1) Four called (3): Simon, Andrew, James and John are named (1:16, 19).
(2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): Simon, Andrew, James, and John are named (1:29).
(3) Levi called (10.2): Levi is named (2:14).
(4) Many eat with Jesus (11:1): Levi is named (2:15).
(5) Twelve appointed (16): the twelve are named (3:16–19).
(6) Jairus's messengers (32.1): Simon, James, and John are named (5:37).

16) Content: only the four are named:
(1) Four called (3): the four are named (1:16, 19).
(2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): the four are named (1:29).

17) Content: familial relationship is referred to:
(1) Four called (3): Simon and Andrew are brothers, and James and John are the sons of Zebedee (1:16, 19).
(2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): Jesus heals Simon's mother-in-law (1:30–31).
(3) Levi called (10.2): Levi is son of Alphaeus (1:14).
(4) Twelve appointed (16): among those appointed are James and John the sons of Zebedee, and James the son of Alphaeus (3:17–18).
(5) Jesus's family part one (17.1): Jesus's family hears Jesus is mad (3:21).
(6) Jesus's family part two (18.1): Jesus's mother, brothers, and sisters arrive (3:31–32).

(7) Disciples declared family (18.2): those who do the will of God are declared Jesus's mother, brother, and sister (3:34–35).
(8) Jairus's request (30.2): JD is sick (5:23).
(9) Jairus's messengers (32.1): JD is dead (5:35).
(10) JD raised (32.3): the mother and father go with Jesus into their daughter's room (5:40).
(11) Teaching in Nazareth (33): the Nazarenes refer to Jesus's father, mother, brothers, and sisters (6:3).
(12) Death of John (35.2): Herod marries his brother's wife, and Herod's daughter asks for John's head at the behest of her mother (6:17, 24).

18) Content: disciples in pairs:
(1) Four called (3): the disciples are called in two pairs (1:16, 19).
(2) Twelve instructed (34.2): the twelve are sent out in pairs (6:7).

19) Action begun is completed:
(1) Four called (3): Jesus calls the four to be fishers of people (1:17).
(2) Twelve proclaim (34.3): the twelve, including the four, go and proclaim (6:12).

20) Content: people are sitting:
(1) Four called (3): James and John are in their boat mending nets (1:19); net mending is most often done sitting down.
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): the scribes are sitting (2:6).
(3) Levi called (10.2): Levi is sitting (2:14).
(4) Many eat with Jesus (11.1): Jesus is reclining with sinners (2:15).
(5) Sinners controversy (11:2): scribes see Jesus eating (2:16).
(6) Healing controversy (14): Jesus tells man to get up (3:3).
(7) Jesus's family part two (18.1): a crowd is sitting around Jesus (3:32).
(8) Teaching from boat (19): Jesus sits in the boat (4:1).
(9) Leaving by boat (28.1): disciples take Jesus just as he was, that is, sitting, in the boat (4:36).
(10) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): public see ex-demoniac sitting in his right mind (5:15).
(11) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): the five thousand are sat in groups of hundreds and fifties (6:40).

21) Content: fish or fishermen are mentioned:
(1) Four called (3): the four are fishermen, and Jesus says they will be fishers of people (1:16, 19).
(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): disciples have two fish, which are divided amongst the five thousand (6:38, 40–41).

22) Location: synagogue:
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): Jesus enters the synagogue (1:21).
(2) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): takes place in the synagogue mentioned in 1:21
(3) Healing controversy (14): Jesus "again" enters the synagogue (3:1).
(4) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus teaches in the synagogue (6:2).

23) Content: Jesus has authority:
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): Jesus teaches with authority (1:22).
(2) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): Jesus teaches with authority and commands unclean spirits, and they obey him (1:27).

(3) Paralytic healed (9.2): to show Son of Man has authority, Jesus heals paralytic (2:10–11).
(4) Stilling of storm (28.2): the wind and sea obey Jesus (4:41).

24) Content: public astounded or amazed:
(1) Teaching in Capernaum (4.1): witnesses are astounded at teaching (1:22).
(2) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): witnesses are amazed at teaching and healing (1:27).
(3) Paralytic healed (9.2): witnesses are amazed (2:12).
(4) Stilling of storm (28.2): witnesses are filled with great awe (4:41).
(5) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): people see demoniac in his right mind and are afraid (5:15).
(6) Gerasene proclaims (29.4): everyone was amazed at Gerasene proclaiming (5:20).
(7) JD raised (32.3): witnesses are overcome with amazement (5:42).
(8) Teaching in Nazareth (33): witnesses are astounded at teaching and healing (6:2).

25) Form: specific miracle:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): demoniac is healed (1:26).
(2) Simon's mother-in-law (5): Simon's mother-in-law is healed (1:31).
(3) Leper healed (8.1): leper is healed (1:42).
(4) Paralytic healed (9.2): paralytic is healed (2:12).
(5) Healing controversy (14): man with withered hand is healed (6:3).
(6) Stilling of storm (28.2): storm is stilled (4:39).
(7) Gerasene healed (29.1): demoniac is healed (5:13).
(8) HW (31): woman is healed (5:29).
(9) JD raised (32.3): daughter is raised (5:42).
(10) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): five thousand are fed from five loaves and two fishes (6:41–42).

26) Form: specific exorcism described:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): unclean spirit exorcised from a Capernaum man (1:26).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.1): legion of demons exorcised from a Gerasene man (5:13).

27) Content: Demon speaks with loud voice:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): spirit cries out in loud voice (1:24, 26).
(2) Healing by boat (15): spirits shout (3:11).
(3) Gerasene healed (29.1): demoniac shouts at the top of his voice (5:7).

28) Content: demon(s) know who Jesus is:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): spirit knows Jesus is the Holy One of God (1:24).
(2) Healing at Simon's (6): demons know Jesus (1:34).
(3) Healing by boat (15): spirits say Jesus is the Son of God (3:11).
(4) Gerasene healed (29.1): demoniac calls Jesus the Son of the Most High God (5:7).

29) Content: Jesus is referred to by a christological title:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): demon calls Jesus the Holy One of God (1:25).
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus refers to himself as the Son of Man (2:10).
(3) Fasting controversy (12.1): Jesus refers to himself as the bridegroom (2:18).

(4) Plucking controversy (13): Jesus refers to himself as the Son of Man (2:28).
(5) Healing by boat (15): demons call Jesus the Son of God (3:11).
(6) Gerasene healed (29.1): Legion calls Jesus the Son of the Most High God (5:7).

30) Content: Jesus tells demon(s) to be quiet:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): Jesus tells spirit to be silent (1:25).
(2) Healing at Simon's (6): Jesus does not permit demons to speak (1:34).
(3) Healing by boat (15): Jesus tells spirits not to make him known (3:12).

31) Content: miracle involves command from Jesus:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): Jesus commands spirit to come out (1:25).
(2) Leper healed (8.1): Jesus commands leper to be made clean (1:41).
(3) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus commands paralytic to stand up (2:11).
(4) Healing controversy (14): Jesus commands man to stretch out hand (3:5).
(5) Stilling of storm (28.2): Jesus commands sea to be still (4:39).
(6) HW (31): Jesus commands woman to be healed of her disease (5:34).
(7) JD raised (32.3): Jesus commands girl to get up (5:41).

32) Content: miracle performed by command alone:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): Jesus commands unclean spirit out (1:25).
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus commands paralytic to stand (2:11).
(3) Healing controversy (14): Jesus commands man to stretch out withered hand (3:5).
(4) Stilling of storm (28.2): Jesus commands sea to be still (4:39).

33) Content: Jesus commands a demon to come out:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): Jesus commands the unclean spirit to come out of the man (1:25).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.1): Jesus commands Legion to come out of the Gerasene (5:8).

34) Content: Jesus rebukes in performance of a miracle:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): Jesus rebukes the unclean spirit (1:25).
(2) Stilling of storm (28.2): Jesus rebukes the wind (4:39).

35) Content: Jesus tells someone to be quiet concerning him:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): Jesus tells spirit to be silent (1:25).
(2) Healing at Simon's (6): Jesus does not permit demons to speak (1:34).
(3) Leper healed (8.1): Jesus tells leper not to tell anyone what Jesus has done (1:43).
(4) Healing by boat (15): Jesus tells demons not to make him known (3:12).
(5) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): opposite: Jesus tells ex-demoniac to spread news in the Decapolis (5:19).
(6) JD raised (32.3): Jesus tells witnesses not to say anything (5:43).

36) Content: exorcism performed or discussed:
(1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): unclean spirit came out (1:26).
(2) Healing at Simon's (6): Jesus cast out many demons (1:34).
(3) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): Jesus cast out demons (1:39).
(4) Healing by boat (15): mentioned demons presumably cast out (3.11)
(5) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): Jesus is accused of exorcising through Beelzebul (3:22).
(6) Gerasene healed (29.1): legion of demons sent into swine (5:13).

(7) Twelve proclaim (34.3): the twelve cast out many demons (6:13).

37) Content: the miraculous nature of Jesus is commented upon:
- (1) Capernaum demoniac (4.2): public comments on Jesus's command over unclean spirits (1:27).
- (2) Paralytic healed (9.2): people have never seen anything like healing of the paralytic (2:12).
- (3) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): scribes say Jesus casts out demons by Beelzebul (3:22).
- (4) Stilling of the storm (28.2): disciples wonder at sea and wind obeying Jesus (4:41).
- (5) Teaching in Nazareth (33): people comment on deeds of power done by Jesus (6:2).
- (6) Heard hears of Jesus (35.1): Herod thinks Jesus's powers are due to him being John raised (6:14).

38) Content: news spreads:
- (1) News spreads in Galilee (4.3): news of Jesus spreads throughout Galilee (1:28).
- (2) Leper proclaims (8.2): Leper spreads news to town and country (1:45).
- (3) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): swineherds spread news in town and country (5:14).
- (4) Gerasene proclaims (29.4): Gerasene spreads news throughout Decapolis (5:20).
- (5) Herod hears the news (35.1): Herod hears news of Jesus's activity (6:14).

39) Content: a request is made:
- (1) Simon's mother-in-law healed (5): the four tell Jesus that Simon's mother-in-law is sick (1:30); the request is implied.
- (2) Leper healed (8.1): the leper asks to be made clean (1:40).
- (3) Jesus's family part two (18.1): Jesus's family ask for him (3:31).
- (4) Stilling of Storm (28.2): the disciples ask Jesus whether he cares that they are perishing (4:38). This is an indirect request: the disciples by asking this question are saying to Jesus that he should be doing something instead of sleeping.
- (5) Gerasene healed (29.1): Legion asks Jesus to send them into the herd of swine (5:12).
- (6) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): the Gerasenes ask Jesus to leave (5:17).
- (7) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): the ex-demoniac asks to be with Jesus (5:18).
- (8) Jairus's request (30.2): Jairus asks Jesus to lay his hands on his daughter (5:23).
- (9) Death of John (35.2): Herod's daughter asks for John's head on a platter (6:25).
- (10) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): disciples ask Jesus to send away the crowd (6:35–36).

40) Location: Simon's house:
- (1) Simon's mother-in-law healed (5): they enter the house of Simon and Andrew (1:29).
- (2) Healing at Simon's (6): healing activity takes place at door of Simon's (1:32).

(3) Teaching at home (9.1): Jesus is reported to be at home (2:1); the only home mentioned so far is that of Simon and Andrew.
(4) Paralytic healed (9:2): same location as 9.1 (2:1).
(5) Jesus's family part one (17.1): Jesus went home (3:19).
(6) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): same location as mentioned in 17.1 (3:19).
(7) Jesus's family part two (18.1): same location as mentioned in 17.1 (3:19).
(8) Disciples declared family (18.2): same location as mentioned in 17.1 (3:19).

41) Content: healing involves touch by or to hand:
(1) Simon's mother-in-law healed (5): Jesus takes mother-in-law by hand (1:30).
(2) Leper healed (8.1): Jesus stretches out hand and touches the leper (1:41).
(3) HW (31): woman touches Jesus's cloak, presumably with her hand(s) (5:27).
(4) JD raised (32.3): Jesus takes girl by hand (5:41).

42) Content: sick person is lying down and then stands when healed:
(1) Simon's mother-in-law healed (5): mother-in-law is in bed (1:30), Jesus lifts her up, and she serves them (1:31).
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): paralytic was lying on mat (2:4, 11), and he stood up and took mat (2:12).
(3) JD raised (32.3): girl is dead (5:35), presumably lying down, and she gets up and walks around (5:41).

43) Content: a large quantity of people is mentioned:
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): the whole city gathers (1:33).
(2) Leper proclaims (8.2): people come from every quarter (1:45).
(3) Teaching at home (9.1): so many gather there is no longer room (2:2).
(4) Paralytic healed (9.2): paralytic cannot be brought to Jesus because of crowd (2:4).
(5) Teaching by sea (10.1): the whole crowd gathers (2:13).
(6) Many eat with Jesus (11.1): many tax collectors and sinners recline with Jesus (2:15).
(7) Healing by boat (15): people from region of Palestine and beyond come (3:7).
(8) Jesus's family part one (17.1): so many people gather Jesus and disciples cannot eat (3:20).
(9) Jesus's family part two (18.1): a crowd is sitting around Jesus (3:31).
(10) Teaching from boat (19): a very large crowd gathers (4:1).
(11) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): Jesus leaves crowd (4:36).
(12) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): a great crowd gathers (5:21).
(13) Jairus's request (30.2): a large crowd follows (5:24).
(14) HW (31): disciples point out the crowd (5:31).
(15) Jairus's mourners (32.2): people are making a commotion weeping (5:38).
(16) Twelve return (36.1): so many are coming and going Jesus and the disciples cannot eat (6:30).
(17) Teaching following crowd (36.2): a great crowd follows Jesus, and Jesus teaches them (6:33–34).
(18) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): five thousand are fed (6:44).
(19) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): Jesus dismisses the crowd (6:45).

44) Time: time of day is mentioned:
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): it is evening at sundown (1:32).

(2) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): it is morning while still dark (1:35).
(3) Seed in secret (25): the sower sleeps and rises night and day (4:27).
(4) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): it is evening (4:35).
(5) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): it was getting late (6:35).

45) Content: general healing of public mentioned:
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): many sick healed, and many demons cast out (1:34).
(2) Jesus and the four proclaim (7.2): Jesus casts out demons in synagogues (1:39).
(3) Healing by boat (15): many sick healed, and many spirits cast out (implied) (3:11).
(4) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus laid his hands on a few people and cured them (6:5).
(5) Twelve proclaim (34.3): twelve cast out many demons and cure many (6:13).

46) Content: crowd is described as coming from all of surrounding area:
(1) Healing at Simon's (6): the whole city gathers (1:32).
(2) Leper proclaims (8.2): people come from every quarter to Jesus (1:45).
(3) Healing by boat (15): people come from Galilee, and all the surrounding regions (3:8).
(4) Teaching following crowd (36.2): people come from all the towns (6:33).

47) Content: Jesus prays alone in the desert:
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): Jesus goes into desert to pray alone (1:35).
(2) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): Jesus goes up mountain to pray alone (6:46).

48) Content: Jesus is alone with disciples:
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): Jesus is alone with four in the wilderness (1:35–36).
(2) Twelve appointed (16): Jesus goes up a mountain and calls the twelve (3:13).
(3) Why teaching in parables (21): Jesus is alone with disciples and twelve (4:10).
(4) Parable explained (22): Jesus is still alone with disciples (see (4:10).
(5) Disciples taught everything (27.2): Jesus explained everything in private to disciples (4:34).
(6) Stilling of storm (28.2): Jesus and disciples are alone in boat (4:36).[733]
(7) JD raised (32.3): Jesus is alone with the three, the girl, and her parents (5:40).[734]
(8) Twelve instructed (34.2): Jesus calls the twelve to him and instructs them (6:7–11).[735]
(9) Twelve return (36.1): Jesus and disciples go to a deserted place (6:32).

49) Content: someone is asleep and then wakes:
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): Jesus gets up early and goes into wilderness (1:35).

---

[733] Though other boats are said to be with them, and thus potential witnesses to the miracle, only the disciples are said to be in the boat with Jesus.

[734] Though the parents are present, Mark twice emphasizes that only the three are with Jesus (5:37, 40). The parents in this scene are not so much members of the public, but rather become insiders: only they and the three are to know what transpired in the room (5:43). Cf. Bauckham who suggests that Jairus is named because he became a member of the community, and thus a Christian witness.

[735] Though it is not explicitly stated that they are alone, no others are mentioned, and the instruction is just for the twelve. There is thus a strong probability that it is to be understood that Jesus is alone with the twelve.

(2) Seed in secret (25): the sower would sleep and rise every day (4:27).
(3) Stilling of storm (28.2): Jesus is woken by the disciples (4:38).

50) Content: Jesus speaks of his mission:
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): Jesus says he has come to proclaim message (1:38).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2): Jesus says he has come to call sinners (2:17).

51) Content: Jesus makes a suggestion to disciples to go to deserted place:
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): Jesus suggests they leave deserted place and go and proclaim (1:38).
(2) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): Jesus suggests they go across to the other side (4:35).—the idea seems to be to get away from crowd (4:36). since he does not proclaim in the Decapolis (5:17–18).
(3) Twelve return (36.1). Jesus suggests they leave crowd for a deserted place (6:31).

52) Content: action begun completed:
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): Jesus suggests that he and the four go proclaiming (1:38).
(2) Jesus and the 4 proclaim (7.2): Jesus and four proclaim (1:39).

53) Content: Jesus indirectly refers to himself with a Messianic reference:
(1) Jesus and the four in desert (7.1): Jesus says he has come (from heaven) to proclaim (1:38).
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus forgives sins and then later says that the Son of Man has authority to gives sins (2:5, 10–11).
(3) Sinners controversy (11.2): Jesus has come (from heaven) to call sinners (2:17).
(4) Fasting controversy (12.1): Jesus refers to himself as the bridegroom (2:19–20), a traditional title for YHWH in regards to his relationship with Israel.
(5) Plucking controversy (13): Jesus compares himself and disciples to David and his followers (2:25–26), and Jesus then says the Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath (2:28).

54) Content: prostrating before Jesus:
(1) Leper healed (8.1): leper kneels before Jesus (1:40).
(2) Healing by boat (15): demons prostrate before Jesus (3:11).
(3) Gerasene healed (29.1): leper bows down before Jesus (5:6).
(4) Jairus's request (30.2): Jairus falls at Jesus's feet (5:22).
(5) HW (31): woman falls down before Jesus (5:33).

55) Content: a hand is stretched out:
(1) Leper healed (8.1): Jesus stretches out his hand (1:41).
(2) Healing controversy (14): man stretches out his withered hand (3:5).

56) Content: Jesus commands someone be well:
(1) Leper healed (8.1): Jesus commands leper to be made clean (1:41).
(2) HW (31): Jesus commands woman to be healed (5:34).

57) Content: Jesus sternly tells beneficiaries of healing to be quiet:
(1) Leper healed (8.1): Jesus sternly warns leper not to say anything (1:43).
(2) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): opposite: Jesus tells Gerasene to go and tell how much the Lord has done for him (5:19).

(3) JD raised (32.3): Jesus strictly orders witnesses that no one is to know about miracle (5:43).

58) Content: Jesus tells healed person to go:
(1) Leper healed (8.1): Jesus tell leper to show himself to priest (1.43).
(2) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus tells paralytic to go home (2:11).
(3) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): Jesus tells ex-demoniac to go home (5:19).
(4) HW (31): Jesus tells woman to go in peace (5:34).

59) Content: an offering is spoken of:
(1) Leper healed (8.1): Jesus tells leper to make offering for his healing (1:44).
(2) Plucking controversy (13): Jesus tells how bread of the presence was given to David's companions (2:26).

60) Content: healed person proclaims on their own:
(1) Leper proclaims (8.2): leper proclaims word (1:45).
(2) Gerasene proclaims (29.4): healed Gerasene proclaims Jesus (5:20).

61) Content: there is a crowd around Jesus in Simon's house and people cannot get in:
(1) Teaching at home (9:1): paralytic and friends cannot enter house due to crowd (2:1).
(2) Jesus's family part two (18.1): Jesus's family cannot enter house due to crowd (3:31–32).

62) Form: there is a specific example of Jesus's wisdom:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus shows he has authority to forgive sins by healing paralytic (2:8–12).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2): comparison of Jesus to physician (2:17).
(3) Fasting controversy (12.1): comparison of disciples to wedding guests (2:19–20).
(4) New cloth (12.2): parable of new cloth (2:21).
(5) New wine (12.3): parable of new wine (2:22).
(6) Plucking controversy (13): comparison of disciples to companions of David (2:25–26).
(7) Healing controversy (14): Jesus argues that one is allowed to do good on Sabbath (3:4).
(8) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): parables of kingdom divided and strong man (3:23–26).
(9) Disciples declared family (18.2): saying on family being those who will of God (3:34).
(10) Seed on ground (20): parable of seed on ground (4:2–9).
(11) Why teaching in parables (21): Jesus explains why he teaches in parables to disciples (4:11–12).
(12) Parable explained (22): parable of seed on ground explained (4:13–20).
(13) Lamps (23): parable of lamp (4:21–22).
(14) Measure (24): parable measure for measure (4:24–25).
(15) Seed in secret (25): parable of seed growing in secret (4:26–29).
(16) Mustard seed (26): parable of mustard seed (4:30–32).
(17) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus explains why he is rejected with saying (6:3–4).

63) Form: controversy story:

(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): controversy over forgiving sins (2:5–12).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2).
(3) Fasting controversy (12.1).
(4) Plucking controversy (13).
(5) Healing controversy (14).
(6) Beelzebul controversy (17.2).
(7) Teaching in Nazareth (33): controversy over Jesus's social status (6:3–4).

64) Form: story both controversy story and healing story:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): paralytic healed (2:11–12) and controversy over forgiving sins (2:5–6).
(2) Healing controversy (13): controversy over healing on Sabbath (3:4–5), and man with withered hand healed (3:5).
(3) Teaching in Nazareth (33): controversy over Jesus being a carpenter and related to ordinary people (6:3–4), and a few people are cured (6:5).

65) Structural sequence: Jesus speaks to healed person, Jesus then responds to unspoken criticism, Jesus speaks to healed person, the person is healed, and reaction of audience is given:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus tells paralytic his sins are forgiven (2:5), the scribes criticize in their hearts and Jesus responds (2:6–10), Jesus tells the paralytic to get up (2:10–11), the paralytic gets up (2:12), and the people are astounded (2:12).
(2) Healing controversy (14): Jesus tells the man to come forward (3:3), Jesus responds to the unspoken criticism of healing on the Sabbath (3:4), Jesus tells the man to stretch out his hand (3:5), the hand is restored (3:5), and the Pharisees then conspire to kill Jesus (3:6).

66) Content: questionable means due to crowd are used to receive healing from Jesus:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): paralytic's friends dig through roof to get to Jesus because of crowd (2:4).
(2) HW (31): woman surreptitiously touches Jesus in crowd (5:27).

67) Content: Jesus's view on someone's faith is given:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus sees faith of paralytic and people carrying him (2:4).
(2) Stilling of storm (28.2): Jesus asks if witnesses have no faith (4:40).
(3) HW (31): Jesus says woman's faith healed her (5:34).
(4) Jairus's messengers (32.1): Jesus tells Jairus to believe (5:36).
(5) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus is amazed at the lack of belief (6.6a).

68) Content: controversy involves action of Jesus:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus is forgiving sins (2:5).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2): Jesus is eating with sinners and tax-collectors (2:16).
(3) Healing controversy (14): Jesus is healing on the Sabbath (3:2).
(4) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): Jesus is accused of healing through Beelzebul (3:22).

69) Content: forgiveness of sins discussed:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus forgives sins of paralytic, which causes controversy (2:5–6).

(2) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): all sins will be discussed except blasphemy against spirit (3:28–29).

70) Content: people act negatively towards Jesus:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): scribes accuse Jesus of blasphemy (2:7).
(2) Sinners' controversy (11.2): scribes complain he is eating with sinners and tax collectors (2:15).
(3) Plucking controversy (13): Pharisees complain Jesus's disciples are working on the Sabbath (2:24).
(4) Healing controversy (14): Pharisees and Herodians conspire to destroy Jesus (3:6).
(5) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): scribes accuse Jesus of being in league with Beelzebul (3:22).
(6) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): Gerasenes ask Jesus to leave (5:17).
(7) Jairus's mourners (32.2): mourners laugh at Jesus (5:40).
(8) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Nazarenes take offence at Jesus (6:3).

71) Content: controversy opponents are scribes:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): scribes are questioning in their hearts (2:6).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2): scribes of the Pharisees ask question (2:16).
(3) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): scribes from Jerusalem make accusation (3:22).

72) Content: the inner thoughts of someone are given:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): in their hearts the scribes question Jesus forgiving sins (2:6–7).
(2) HW (31): the woman said (to herself) that if she touched Jesus's clothes, she would be made well (5:28).

73) Content: criticism of Jesus is not actually voiced, but Jesus is aware of it:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus perceives in his spirit the questions of the scribes (2:8).
(2) Healing controversy (14): Jesus asks question that is not answered and sees the hardness of opponents' hearts (3:4–5).

74) Content: Jesus responds to something not spoken directly to him:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): Jesus responds to inner thoughts of scribes (2:8).
(2) Sinners controversy (11.2): scribes ask disciples question, and Jesus responds (2:16–17).
(3) Healing controversy (14): Pharisees watch to see if Jesus heals, and Jesus responds (3:2–3).
(4) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): scribes voice criticism and Jesus calls them to him and responds (3:22–23).
(5) Jairus's messengers (32.1): messengers report to Jairus and Jesus responds (5:35–36).
(6) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Nazarenes comment on Jesus and he responds (6:6:3–4).

75) Content: Jesus commands someone to stand up:
(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): paralytic is commanded to stand up (2:11).
(2) Healing controversy (14): man is told to stand up (3:3).
(3) JD raised (32.3): daughter is commanded to stand up (5:41).

76) Content: Jesus commands person to stand up and when they do they are healed:

(1) Paralytic healed (9.2): paralytic is commanded to stand up and is healed (2:11–12).
(2) JD raised (32.3): daughter is commanded to stand up and is healed (5:41–42).

77) Content: unit involves a son of Alphaeus:
(1) Levi Called (10.2): Levi is the son of Alphaeus (1:14).
(2) Twelve appointed (16): one of the twelve is James son of Alphaeus (3:18).

78) Structural sequence: people are eating, the eating is questioned, Jesus gives an illustrative comparison, and Jesus makes a messianic reference to himself:
(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): Jesus is eating with sinners (2:15), the scribes of the Pharisees question this (2:16), Jesus compares himself to a physician (2:17), and then Jesus says, "I have come," with an implied "from heaven" (2:17).[736]
(2) Fasting controversy (12.1): Jesus's disciples are not fasting, that is, eating (2:18), people question this (2:18), Jesus compares the situation to a wedding (2:19), and Jesus then refers to himself as the bridegroom (2:20).
(3) Plucking controversy (13): Jesus's disciples are plucking grain, which implies they are eating it (2:23), the Pharisees question this (2:24), Jesus compares the situation to David (2:25), Jesus then says the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath (2:28).

79) Content: unit contains a parable (in the ancient sense of illustrative comparison):
(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): Jesus compares his actions to those of a physician (2:17).
(2) Fasting controversy (12.1): Jesus compares the situation of the disciples to that of wedding guests (2:19).
(3) New cloth (12.2): Jesus compares the situation to sewing new cloth onto old cloth (2:21).
(4) New wine (12.3): Jesus compares the situation to putting new wine into old wine skins (2:22).
(5) Plucking controversy (13): Jesus compares the situation to David and his companions (2:25–26).
(6) Healing controversy (14): Jesus compares his situation to doing good and saving life (3:4).
(7) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): Jesus compares his exorcisms to a kingdom divided and to stealing from a strong man (3:24–27).
(8) Seed on ground (20): Jesus compares the kingdom to sowing seed on different types of ground (4:3–9).
(9) Parable explained (22): Jesus explains comparison to seed sown on different types of ground (4:13–20).
(10) Lamps (23): Jesus compares the kingdom to the placement of lamps (4:21–22).
(11) Measure (24): Jesus compares the kingdom to trading measures (4:24–25).
(12) Seed in secret (25): Jesus compares the kingdom to earth producing of itself (4:26–29).

---

[736] See Simon Gathercole.

(13) Mustard seed (26): Jesus compares the kingdom to a mustard seed (4:30–32).

(14) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus compares his situation to that of prophets in general (6:4).

80) Content: controversy involves eating:

(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): Jesus is eating with sinners and tax collectors (2:16).

(2) Fasting controversy (12.1): Jesus's disciples are eating while others are fasting (2:18).

(3) Plucking controversy (13): Jesus's disciples are plucking grain to eat on the Sabbath (2:23).

81) Content: the complaint is made by Pharisees:

(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): scribes who are Pharisees complain Jesus is eating with sinners (2:16).

(2) Plucking controversy (13): the Pharisees complain that Jesus's disciples are plucking grain on the Sabbath (3:24).

(3) Healing controversy (14): it is implied that the Pharisees are the complainants as they leave the synagogue and conspire to kill Jesus (3:6).

82) Content: complaint is directly voiced:

(1) Sinners controversy (11.2): scribes of the Pharisees ask disciples a question (2:16).

(2) Fasting controversy (12.1): "they" ask Jesus a question (2:18).

(3) Plucking controversy (13): the Pharisees ask Jesus a question (2:24).

(4) Beelzebul controversy (17.2): scribes from Jerusalem make accusation (3:22).

(5) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Nazarenes complain of Jesus's social status (6:3).

83) Content: complaint involves action of the disciples:

(1) Fasting controversy (12.1): "they" ask why Jesus's disciples are not fasting (2:18).

(2) Plucking controversy (13): Pharisees complain disciples are plucking grain on Sabbath (2:24).

84) Content: not being able to eat or having no food is mentioned:

(1) Fasting controversy (12.1): disciples do not fast as they are with the bridegroom (2:18–19).

(2) Plucking controversy (13): disciples like David's companions are hungry (2:23–25).

(3) Jesus's family part one (17:1): Jesus and disciples cannot eat bread because of the crowd (3:19–20).

(4) Twelve instructed (34.2): disciples are not to take bread when proclaiming (6:8).

(5) Twelve return (36.1): Jesus and disciples cannot eat because of the crowd (6:31).

(6) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): there are only five loaves and two fish for the 5000 to eat (6:38).

85) Content: Jesus's death is foreshadowed:

(1) Fasting controversy (12.1): Jesus says his disciples will fast on the day that the bridegroom (himself) is taken away (2:18).

(2) Healing controversy (14): The Pharisees conspire with the Herodians on how to destroy Jesus (3:6).
(3) Twelve appointed (16): Judas Iscariot is named as Jesus's betrayer (3:19).

86) Content: a comparison is made between Jesus and John the Baptist:
(1) Fasting controversy (12.1): the actions of Jesus's disciples are compared with the actions of John's disciples (2:18).
(2) Herod hears news (35.1): people think Jesus is John raised because of Jesus's activity (6:14).

87) Form: unit is a parable:
(1) New cloth (12.2): parable of new cloth.
(2) New wine (12.3): parable of new wine.
(3) Seed on ground (20): parable of seed on ground.
(4) Parable explained (22): parable of seed explained.
(5) Lamps for Lampstands (23): parable of lamps.
(6) Measure (24): parable of measures.
(7) Seed in secret (25): parable of seed growing in secret.
(8) Mustard seed (26): parable of mustard seed.

88) Content and structure: parable compares the interaction of something new with something old, and then the new item causes a problem:
(1) New cloth (12.2): new cloth is sewn onto an old cloak, and a worse tear is made (2:21).
(2) New wind (12.3): new wine is put into old wine skins, and the wine skins burst (2:22).

89) Content: theme of harvesting heads of grain:
(1) Plucking controversy (13): disciples harvest heads of grain by hand (2:23).
(2) Seed in secret (25): sower goes to harvest ripe heads of grain (2:29).

90) Content: grain or seed is centre of discussion:
(1) Plucking controversy (13): controversy is about disciples pluck grain.
(2) Seed on ground (20): parable is about seed being sown on ground and whether or not it produces grain.
(3) Parable explained (22): parable is about seed being sown on ground and whether or not it produces grain.
(4) Seed in secret (25): parable is about seed being planted and harvested.
(5) Mustard seed (26): parable is about a small seed growing into a big bush.

91) Content: controversy involves breaking the Sabbath:
(1) Plucking controversy (13): disciples are plucking grain on the Sabbath (2:23).
(2) Healing controversy (14): Jesus heals on the Sabbath (3:4–5).

92) Content: Jesus is in or by boat:
(1) Healing by boat (15): Jesus has boat ready (3:9).
(2) Teaching from boat (19): Jesus teaches from boat (4:1).
(3) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): Jesus leaves in boat he taught from (4:36).
(4) Stilling of storm (28.2): scene takes place in boat of 4:36.
(5) Gerasene healed (29.1): Jesus steps out of boat (5:2).
(6) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): Jesus is getting into boat (5:18).
(7) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): Jesus crosses again in boat (5:21).
(8) Twelve return (36.1): Jesus and disciples go in boat to a deserted place (6:32).

93) Content: Jesus uses boat because of the crowd:

(1) Healing by boat (15): Jesus tells disciples to have boat ready because of the crowd (3:9).
(2) Teaching from boat (19): Jesus teaches from boat because of the crowd (4:1).

94) Content: touching Jesus to be healed is mentioned:
(1) Healing by boat (15): people with diseases press upon Jesus to touch him (3:7).
(2) HW (31): woman touches Jesus to be cured (5:27).

95) Content: Jesus goes up a mountain:
(1) Twelve appointed (16): Jesus goes up the mountain and calls the twelve to him (3:13).
(2) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): Jesus goes up the mountain to pray (6:46).

96) Content: Jesus calls the twelve to him:
(1) Twelve appointed (16): Jesus calls the twelve up the mountain (3:13).
(2) Twelve instructed (34.2): Jesus calls the twelve to be instructed (6:7), and (opposite) sends them out (6:7).
(3) Twelve proclaim (34.3): opposite: the twelve are sent out to proclaim (6:12).
(4) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): opposite: the twelve sent off to the other side (6:45).

97) Content: the twelve are mentioned:
(1) Twelve appointed (16): the twelve are appointed (3:13–19).
(2) Why teaching in parables (21): the twelve are among those taught secret of kingdom (4:10).
(3) Twelve instructed (34.2): the twelve are instructed (6:7–11).
(4) Twelve proclaim (34.3): the twelve proclaim (6:12–13).
(5) Twelve return (36.1): the twelve return and depart with Jesus (6:30–32).
(6) Teaching following crowd (36.2): crowd follows Jesus and the twelve (6:33).
(7) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): the disciples (the twelve, cf. 6:7, 12, 30, 33) ask Jesus to dismiss crowd (6:35).
(8) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): Jesus sends the disciples (the twelve, cf. 6:7, 12, 30, 33, 35) off in a boat (6:45).

98) Action begun is completed:
(1) Twelve appointed (16): Jesus calls the twelve to be sent out, proclaim, and have authority over demons (3:14–15).
(2) Twelve instructed (34.2): Jesus calls the twelve to send them out with authority over demons, and instruct them on proclaiming (6:7–11).
(3) Twelve proclaim (34.3): the twelve go out, proclaim, and cast out demons (6:12–13).

99) Content: Jesus commissions someone to proclaim:
(1) Twelve appointed (16): the twelve are commissioned to proclaim (3:14).
(2) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): the ex-demoniac is told to go home and proclaim (5:19).
(3) Twelve instructed (34.2): the twelve are sent out proclaiming (6:7).

100) Content: Jesus gives special status to someone:
(1) Twelve appointed (16): the twelve are chosen to be sent out as apostles, and to be given authority over demons (3:14–15).
(2) Disciples declared family (18.2): those sitting around him, who are doing the will of God, presumably his disciples, are declared Jesus's family (3:34).

(3) Why teaching in parables (21): those around him, presumably the disciples, have been given the secret of the kingdom of God (4:10).
(4) Twelve instructed (34.2): the twelve are called to be sent out to proclaim and have authority over demons (6:7).

101) Content: Jesus's family is mentioned:
(1) Jesus's family part one (17.1): Jesus's family hear Jesus is mad (3:21).
(2) Jesus's family part two (18.1): Jesus's family want to see Jesus (3:31–32).
(3) Teaching in Nazareth (33): crowd mentions Jesus's mother and siblings (6:3).

102) Content: the crowd is so great Jesus and the disciples cannot eat:
(1) Jesus's family part one (17.1): crowd comes together so they could not eat (3:20).
(2) Twelve return (36.1): so many people are coming and going they cannot eat (6:31).

103) Content: Jesus teaching public only in parables:
(1) Teaching from boat (19): Jesus is said to have taught crowd many things in parables (4:2). Though it does not say he taught only in parables, the implication is that this is so. This is confirmed later in the text (4:11, 34).
(2) Why teaching in parables (21): Jesus says everything comes to those outside (non-followers), that is, the public, in parables (4:11).
(3) Jesus taught public in parables (27.1): we are told that Jesus only spoke to them (the crowd) in parables (4:33). Done

104) Story begun completed:
(1) Seed on ground (20): parable of seed on ground is given.
(2) Parable explained (22): parable of seed on ground is explained.

105) Content: parable where comparison is made with seed growing and producing plentifully:
(1) Seed on ground (20): seed on good soil produces thirty to a hundredfold (4:8).
(2) Parable explained (22): seed on good soil are those who accept word and bear fruit thirty to a hundredfold (4:20).
(3) Seed in secret (25): seed sown produces full heads of grain (4:28).
(4) Mustard seed (26): small seed becomes a big bush (4:32).

106) Structure: parable begins with exhortation to pay attention:
(1) Seed on ground (20): parable begins with "Listen!" (4:3).
(2) Measure (24): parable begins with "Pay attention to what you hear" (4:24).

107) Content: parable ends with Jesus saying, "Let anyone with ears to hear listen!":
(1) Seed on ground (20): occurs at 4:9.
(2) Lamps (23): occurs at 4:23.

108) Content: large figures are mentioned:
(1) Seed on ground (20): grain yields thirty, sixty, and a hundredfold (4:8).
(2) Parable explained (22): people bear fruit thirty, sixty, and a hundredfold (4:20).
(3) Gerasene healed (29.1): the herd of swine numbers two thousand (5:13).
(4) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): disciples say it will cost two hundred denarii to feed the crowd (6:37); the crowd of five thousand sits in groups of fifties and hundreds (6:40, 44).

109) Content: theme of increase:
(1) Seed on ground (20): seed on good soil increases a hundredfold (4:8).

(2) Parable explained (22): seed on good soil bears fruit a hundredfold (4:20).
(3) Measure (24): those who have will be given more (4:25).
(4) Seed in secret (25): earth produces a full heads of grain (4:28).
(5) Mustard seed (26): small seed produces the greatest of bushes (4:32).
(6) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): five loaves and two fishes produce food for five thousand (6:41–44).

110) Content: Jesus is teaching disciples:
(1) Why teaching in parables (21): Jesus explains to disciples why he teaches in parables (4:11–12).
(2) Parable explained (22): Jesus explains parable to the disciples (1:13–20).
(3) Disciples taught everything (27.2): Jesus explained everything to the disciples (1:34).
(4) Twelve instructed (34.2): Jesus instructs twelve on proclaiming (6:7–11).

111) Content: Jesus explains parables to disciples:
(1) Why teaching in parables (21): Jesus says the disciples have been given the secret to the kingdom of God, but that the public are taught in parables (4:11). The implication is that the kingdom is taught in parables, and the disciples are consequently taught the explanation of the parables.
(2) Parable explained (22): Jesus is explaining parable of seed on ground to disciples (4:13).
(3) Disciples taught everything (27.2): Jesus explained parables to disciples (4:34).

112) Content: secrecy in regards to the kingdom of God:
(1) Why teaching in parables (21): the disciples have been given the secret of the kingdom of God (4:11).
(2) Lamps are for lampstands (23): Jesus says that nothing is made secret, except to come to light (4:21). Since this saying is placed in the centre of the parable section, it is to be assumed that the reference is to Jesus's teaching in this section, that is, his teaching on the kingdom.
(3) Seed in secret (25): the kingdom is compared to seed sown on the ground that grows, but the knowledge of how it grows is not known to the sower (4:26–27). In other words, how the seed/kingdom grows is a mystery or secret.

113) Content: the explication of something is discussed:
(1) Why teaching in parables (21): Jesus tells the disciples that they are to be given the secret of the kingdom of God, but that others are taught in parables (4:4:10–11). This implies that the secret is the explication of the parables.
(2) Lamps are for lampstands (23): Jesus says that that which is hidden will be disclosed (4:21). Though it is not explicitly stated what exactly is hidden, in the context of the positioning of this parable in the midst of Jesus's teaching in parables, the logical conclusion is that it is Jesus's teaching. This is especially likely, since this parable comes after the explanation of the parable of the seed on ground. Jesus just before this explanation tells the disciples they have been given the secret of the kingdom, but others are taught in parables: it is to be assumed that such explanation is part of the secret. Consequently, that which is hidden and will be revealed is Jesus's teaching to the disciples.

(3) Disciples taught everything (27.2): Jesus explained everything to the disciples (4:34b).

114) Content: the fear of followers is commented on:
(1) Parable Explained (22): seed on rock are those who receive word, but then reject it due to persecution (4:16–17).
(2) Stilling of storm (28.2): Jesus asks why disciples are afraid when storm is stilled (4:40).
(3) Parable Explained (22): seed on rock are those who turn from word due to persecution (4:16–17).
(4) Stilling of storm (28.2): witnesses are afraid after seeing stilling of storm (4:40).
(5) News spreads in Gerasa (29.2): Gerasenes are afraid when they see demoniac in his right mind (5:15).
(6) HW (31): woman comes in fear to Jesus (5:33).

115) Structure: comparison is made, and then further explication is given:
(1) Lamps for Lampstands (23): comparison is made to lamps (4:21), and then it is explained why this is so (4:22, "For . . .").
(2) Measure (24): comparison is made to giving out measures (4:24), and then it is explained why this is so (4:25, "For . . .").

116) Content: theme of losing everything/having nothing:
(1) Measure (24): those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away (4:25).
(2) HW (31): the woman had spent all she had (5:26).
(3) Twelve instructed (34.2): twelve are only to take the clothes they are wearing, sandals, and a staff (6:8–9), that is, nothing (cf. 10:28).

117) Content: Jesus or disciples begin or complete the process of crossing the sea in a boat:
(1) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): Jesus suggests crossing over to other side, and disciples take him with them in a boat (4:35–36).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.1): Jesus arrives to the other side and steps out of boat (5:1–2).
(3) Jesus returns in boat (30.1): Jesus crosses again in boat to the other side (5:21).
(4) Twelve return (36.1): Jesus and disciples leave in boat for a deserted place (6:32).
(5) Teaching following crowd (36.2): Jesus goes ashore to a crowd (6:34).
(6) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): disciples get into boat to go to the other side (6:45).

118) Content: Jesus leaves crowd:
(1) Jesus leaves in boat (28.1): Jesus leaves crowd behind in a boat (4:36).
(2) Jairus's messengers (32.1): Jesus does not allow crowd to follow him (5:37).
(3) JD raised (32.3): Jesus puts the mourning crowd outside (5:40).
(4) Twelve return (36.1): Jesus and twelve leave crowd for a deserted place (6:32).
(5) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): Jesus dismisses the fed crowd and goes up a mountain (6:34).

119) Content: the disciples question Jesus:

(1) Stilling of storm (28.2): disciples ask Jesus whether he cares that they are perishing (4:38).
(2) HW (31): disciples ask Jesus how he can ask, "Who touched me?" (5:31).
(3) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): disciples ask Jesus how they are to feed so many people (6:37).

120) Content: drowning is referred to:
(1) Stilling of storm (28.2): the disciples are afraid they will perish in storm on sea (4:38).
(2) Gerasene healed (29.1): the swine run into the sea and drown (5:13).

121) Content: background is given on the person healed:
(1) Gerasene healed (29.1): Gerasene lived among tombs and no-one could restrain him (5:3–5).
(2) HW (31): woman had suffered for twelve years and spent all she had on physicians (5:25–26).

122) Content: Jesus has a passive role in the miracle:
(1) Gerasene healed (29.1): the legion of demons asks permission to leave and enter herd of swine, Jesus grants permission, and the legion leaves (5:12–13).
(2) HW (31): the woman touches Jesus's cloak and is healed (5:27–29).

123) Content: military terms used:
(1) Gerasene healed (29.1): the demons name is Legion (5:9).
(2) Death of John (35.2): Herod invites officers (χιλιάρχοις: "commander of a thousand") to his feast (6:21).

124) Content: farm animals are mentioned:
(1) Gerasene healed (29.1): Legion enters a herd of swine (5:13).
(2) Teaching following crowd (36.2): the crowd is compared to sheep (6:34).

125) Content: action begun completed:
(1) Gerasene not accepted (29.3): Gerasene is told by Jesus to proclaim (5:19).
(2) Gerasene proclaims (29.4): Gerasene goes and proclaims (5:20).

126) Content: action begun or completed:
(1) Jairus's request (30.2): request is completed in 32.1–3 (Jairus's messengers, Jairus's mourners, JD raised).
(2) Jairus's messengers (32.1): action begun in 30.2 (Jairus's request) is continued.
(3) Jairus's mourners (32.2): action begun in 30.2 (Jairus's request) is continued.
(4) JD is raised (32.3): action begun in 30.2 (Jairus's request) is continued.

127) Content: story involves a Jewish leader:
(1) Jairus's request (30.2): Jairus is a leader of the synagogue (5:21).
(2) Jairus's messengers (32.1): messengers come from leader's house (5:35).
(3) Jairus's mourners (32.2): mourners are at leader's house (5:38).
(4) JD raised (32.3): Jairus is leader of the synagogue (see 5:21).
(5) Herod hears the news (35.1): Herod is a king (6:14).
(6) Death of John (35.2): Herod is a king (see 6:14).

128) Content: story involves a father and daughter:
(1) Jairus's request (30.2): Jairus asks Jesus to heal his daughter (5:23).
(2) Jairus's messengers (32.1): messengers tell Jairus his daughter is dead (5:35).
(3) Jairus's mourners (32.2): at Jairus's house the mourners laugh when Jesus says JD is not dead (5:38–40).

(4) JD raised (32.3): JD is raised (5:41-42).
(5) Death of John (35.2): Herod's daughter dances for her father and asks for John's head (6:22–24).

129) Content: laying on of hands is spoken of:
(1) Jairus's request (30.2): Jairus asks Jesus to lay his hands on his daughter (5:23).
(2) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus laid his hands on a few sick people and cured them (6:5).

130) Content: Jesus using his hands so JD will live:
(1) Jairus's request (30.2): Jairus asks Jesus to lay his hands on his daughter so that she will live (5:23).
(2) JD raised (32.3): Jesus takes the daughter by the hand and causes her live (5:41–42).

131) Content: person healed is associated with the number twelve:
(1) HW (31): woman had suffered for twelve years (5:25).
(2) JD raised (32.3): the girl is twelve years old (5:42).

132) Content: a connection between faith and miracles is made:
(1) HW (31): Jesus says woman's faith healed her (5:34).
(2) Jairus's messengers (32.1): Jesus tells Jairus to believe, which implies belief will raise his daughter (5:36).
(3) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus can do no deed of power due to the Nazarenes lack of faith (6:5).

133) Content: a Jewish leader's daughter is intimately connected with death:
(1) Jairus's messengers (32.1): messengers announce JD is dead (5:35).
(2) Jairus's mourners (32.2): mourners are mourning death of JD (5:38).
(3) JD raised (32.3): JD is raised from death (5:41–42).
(4) Death of John ((35.2): Herod's daughter asks for and receives John's head (6:25–28).

134) Content: the three are singled out to accompany Jesus:
(1) Jairus's messengers (32.1): Jesus only takes the three with him and Jairus to Jairus's house (5:37).
(2) JD raised (32.3): Jesus only takes those that with him, that is, the three, with him and the parents into the daughter's room (5:40).

135) Content: Jesus tells someone to feed someone else:
(1) JD raised (32.3): Jesus tells parents to give daughter something to eat (5:43).
(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): Jesus tells disciples to feed 5000 (6:36).

136) Content: Jesus is compared to the prophets:
(1) Teaching in Nazareth (33): Jesus compares himself to the prophets (6:4).
(2) Herod hears the news (35.1): public compares Jesus to the prophets of old (6:16).

137) Content: a feast is described:
(1) Death of John (35.2): Herod holds a birthday banquet for himself (6:21).
(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): Jesus feeds the five thousand (6:41–42).

138) Content: underlings are ordered to do something:
(1) Death of John (35.2): Herod had sent men to arrest John (6:17) and then sends a soldier to behead John and bring his head on a platter (6:27–28).

(2) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): Jesus orders the disciples to have the five thousand sit in groups of hundreds and fifties, and then to pass out the bread and fish (6:39–40).

139) Content: mention of dismissing crowd is made:

(1) Feeding of the 5000 (36.3): disciples ask Jesus to send crowd away (6:36).

(2) Twelve sent ahead (36.4): Jesus dismisses the crowd (6:45).

Appendix B: Parallel Result Charts

Shorter Unit Parallel Chart

The first number indicates the word parallels, the second number the conceptual parallels, and the third number the total parallels.

	1 Temptat	2 Pro Gal	3 4 called	4.1 T in C	4.2 C dem	4.3 N in G
1 Temp	———				1+0=1	
2 Pro Gal		———	2+0=2	0+2=2	1+0=1	1+1=2
3 4 called		2+0=2	———		1+0=1	1+0=1
4.1 T in C		0+2=2		———	3+3=6	0+1=1
4.2 C dem	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+0=1	3+3=6	———	
4.3 N in G		1+1=2	1+0=1	0+1=1		———
5 S's m-in-l	1+2=3	1+0=1	5+3=8	1+0=1	1+1=2	
6 H at S's	1+0=1	0+1=1	1+0=1	0+1=1	1+4=5	1+1=2
7.1 J4 in d	1+2=3	1+0=1	1+1=2			
7.2 J4 pro	1+0=1	2+3=5	1+1=2	1+2=3	1+1=2	2+1=3
8.1 Lep h	1+0=1				1+3=4	
8.2 Lep pro	1+0=1	1+2=3		0+2=2		0+2=2
9.1 T at home	1+0=1	0+2=2		1+2=3		0+1=1
9.2 Para h	1+0=1	2+0=2	3+1=4	2+2=4	6+7=13	
10.1 T by sea		0+2=2	1+0=1	1+2=3	1+0=1	0+1=1
10.2 L called			3+6=9			
11.1 Eating	0+1 =1	0+1=1	1+2=3	0+1=1		0+1=1
11.2 Sinners	0+1=1		2+1=3	1+0=1		
12.1 Fasting	1+1=2	1+0=1	1+0=1		0+1=1	
12.2 Cloth					1+0=1	
12.3 Wine					2+0=2	
13 Plucking	0+2=2	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+0=1	2+1=3	
14 H con			1+1=2	2+1=3	3+4=7	
15 H by bo	1+0=1	2+1=3	4+0=4	0+1=1	4+6=10	1+1=2
16 12 app	1+1=2	3+0=3	7+4=11	1+0=1	1+0=1	
17.1 JF1		0+1=1	0+1=1	0+1=1		0+1=1
17.2 Beelz	3+2=5	1+0=1	3+0=3	1+0=1	4+2=6	
18.1 JF2		0+1=1	2+2=4	0+1=1		0+1=1
18.2 D fam		1+0=1	1+2=3		1+0=1	

	1 Temp	2 Pro Gal	3 4 called	4.1 T in C	4.2 C dem	4.3 N in G
19 T from bo		0+2=2	2+1=3	1+2=3	1+0=1	0+1=1
20 S on gr						
21 Why par		2+0=2	2+1=3		2+0=2	
22 Par exp	1+0=1			1+0=1		
23 Lamp						
24 Measure						
25 S in sec	1+0=1	3+0=3	1+0=1		3+0=3	
26 Mustard		2+0=2			2+0=2	
27.1 Pub par		0+2=2		0+2=2		0+1=1
27.2 D all			0+1=1			
28.1 J leav	1+0=1	0+1=1	2+2=4	0+1=1		0+1=1
28.2 Storm		1+0=1	2+0=2	0+2=2	5+7=12	
29.1 Ge De	2+0=2	1+0=1	4+0=4		6+7=13	
29.2 N in Ge		0+1=1	1+1=2	0+2=2	0+1=1	0+2=2
29.3 Ge not			2+2=4		0+1=1	
29.4 Ge pro		1+2=3		0+3=3	0+1=1	0+2=2
30.1 J ret		0+1=1	2+0=2	0+1=1		0+1=1
30.2 Jai req			2+1=3			
31 HW		1+0=1	1+0=1		1+2=3	
32.1 Ja mes		2+0=2	5+2=7			
32.2 Ja mo		0+1=1		0+1=1		0+1=1
32.3 JD	1+2=3		1+1=2	1+1=2	1+4=5	
33 T in Naz		1+2=3	5+1=6	4+4=8	2+3=5	0+1=1
34.1 T in Vil		0+3=3		1+2=3	1+0=1	0+1=1
34.2 12 ins	1+0=1		1+2=3	1+0=1	3+0=3	
34.3 12 pro	1+0=1	2+2=4	0+2=2	0+2=2	0+1=1	0+1=1
35.1 Herod		1+2=3	1+0=1	0+1=1	0+1=1	0+2=2
35.2 John	1+2=3	3+2=5	3+1=4		3+0=3	1+0=1
36.1 12 ret	1+1=2	0+1=1	3+1=4	1+1=2	1+0=1	0+1=1
36.2 T foll	0+1=1	0+2=2	1+0=1	1+2=3	1+0=1	0+1=1
36.3 5000	1+3=4		1+2=3		1+1=2	
36.4 12 sent	0+2=2		1+1=2			

	5 S's m-in-l	6 H at S's	7.1 J4 des	7.2 J4 pro	8.1 Lep h	8.2 Lep pro
1 Temp	1+2=3	1+0=1	1+2=3	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+0=1
2 Pro Gal	1+0=1	0+1=1	1+0=1	2+3=5		1+2=3
3 4 called	5+3=8	1+0=1	1+1=2	1+1=2		
4.1 T in C	1+0=1	0+1=1		1+2=3		0+2=2
4.2 C dem	1+1=2	1+4=5		1+1=2	1+3=4	
4.3 N in G		1+1=2		2+1=3		0+2=2
5 S's m-in-l	———	1+1=2	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+3=4	
6 H at S's	1+1=2	———	0+1=1	3+3=6	1+1=2	1+3=4
7.1 J4 in d	1+0=1	0+1=1	———	1+2=3		3+0=3
7.2 J4 pro	1+0=1	3+3=6	1+2=3	———	1+0=1	1+2=3
8.1 Lep h	1+3=4	1+1=2		1+0=1	———	
8.2 Lep pro		1+3=4	3+0=3	1+2=3		———
9.1 T at home	1+1=2	2+3=5		0+2=2		2+3=5
9.2 Para h	4+3=7	4+2=6	0+1=1		2+3=5	0+1=1
10.1 T by sea		0+2=2		0+2=2		0+3=3
10.2 L called	0+2=2		1+1=2	0+1=1		
11.1 Eating	2+2=4	0+2=2		0+1=1		0+2=2
11.2 Sinners	0+1=1	1+0=1	0+2=2			
12.1 Fasting	1+1=2		0+1=1			
12.2 Cloth						
12.3 Wine						
13 Plucking	1+2=3		0+1=1		1+1=2	1+0=1
14 H con	3+1=4	1+0=1		1+0=1	2+3=5	
15 H by bo		1+8=9		1+3=4	2+2=4	0+3=3
16 12 app	4+2=6	2+0=2	2+3=5	3+1=4	2+0=2	1+0=1
17.1 JF1	2+2=4	0+3=3		0+1=1		0+2=2
17.2 Beelz	2+1=3	3+2=5	1+0=1	2+1=3	2+0=2	
18.1 JF2	0+3=3	0+3=3	1+0=1	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+2=3
18.2 D fam	0+2=2	0+1=1	0+1=1	0+1=1		

	5 S's m-in-l	6 H at S's	7.1 J4 des	7.2 J4 pro	8.1 Lep h	8.2 Lep pro
19 T from bo		0+2=2		0+2=2		1+3=4
20 S on gr		2+0=2				
21 Why par	1+0=1	2+0=2	0+2=2	0+1=1		1+0=1
22 Par exp			0+1=1			1+0=1
23 Lamp						
24 Measure						
25 S in sec	1+0=1	1+1=2	0+2=2			
26 Mustard						
27.1 Pub par		1+1=2		0+2=2		1+2=3
27.2 D all			0+2=2	0+1=1		
28.1 J leav	1+0=1	2+3=5	0+3=3	0+2=2		0+2=2
28.2 Storm	1+2=3		0+2=2		0+3=3	
29.1 Ge De	0+2=2	0+2=2		0+1=1	2+3=5	1+0=1
29.2 N in Ge	0+1=1	2+1=3		0+1=1	1+1=2	2+2=4
29.3 Ge not	2+1=3	2+1=3	0+1=1	0+1=1	2+4=6	
29.4 Ge pro		0+1=1	1+0=1	1+2=3		2+4=6
30.1 J ret		0+2=2		0+1=1		0+2=2
30.2 Jai req	1+2=3	0+1=1			2+2=4	0+1=1
31 HW	0+2=2	1+1=2			3+6=9	0+1=1
32.1 Ja mes	4+2=6	2+0=2	1+0=1			1+0=1
32.2 Ja mo	1+0=1	0+2=2		0+1=1		0+2=2
32.3 JD	3+6=9	1+1=2	1+1=2	1+0=1	3+5=8	
33 T in Naz	5+1=6	1+2=3	1+0=1	1+3=4	1+0=1	1+2=3
34.1 T in Vil		0+1=1		0+3=3		0+2=2
34.2 12 ins	1+0=1		1+3=4	0+1=1	3+0=3	2+0=2
34.3 12 pro		3+3=6	1+2=3	3+5=8	1+0=1	1+2=3
35.1 Herod	2+0=2	0+1=1		0+1=1		0+2=2
35.2 John	2+4=6	2+0=2		1+0=1	1+1=2	
36.1 12 ret		0+2=2	2+5=7	0+2=2	1+0=1	2+2=4
36.2 T foll		1+3=4	0+1=1	0+2=2	2+0=2	2+4=6
36.3 5000	0+4=4	0+2=2	2+2=4		1+2=3	2+1=3
36.4 12 sent		0+1=1	1+5=6	0+1=1		0+1=1

	9.1 T at ho	9.2 Para h	10.1 T by S	10.2 L called	11.1 Eating	11.2 Sinners
1 Temp	1+0=1	1+0=1			0+1=1	0+1=1
2 Pro Gal	0+2=2	2+0=2	0+2=2		0+1=1	
3 4 called		3+1=4	1+0=1	3+6=9	1+2=3	2+1=3
4.1 T in C	1+2=3	2+2=4	1+2=3		0+1=1	1+0=1
4.2 C dem		6+7=13	1+0=1			
4.3 N in G	0+1=1		0+1=1		0+1=1	
5 S's m-in-l	1+1=2	4+3=7		0+2=2	2+2=4	0+1=1
6 H at S's	2+3=5	4+2=6	0+2=2		0+2=2	1+0=1
7.1 J4 in d		0+1=1		1+1=2		0+2=2
7.2 J4 pro	0+2=2		0+2=2	0+1=1	0+1=1	
8.1 Lep h		2+3=5				
8.2 Lep pro	2+3=5	0+1=1	0+3=3		0+2=2	
9.1 T at home	———	2+2=4	1+3=4		1+2=3	1+0=1
9.2 Para h	2+2=4	———	1+1=2	2+1=3	3+2=5	3+8=11
10.1 T by sea	1+3=4	1+1=2	———		0+2=2	
10.2 L called		2+1=3		———	1+2=3	1+1=2
11.1 Eating	1+2=3	3+2=5	0+2=2	1+2=3	———	2+2=4
11.2 Sinners	1+0=1	3+8=11		1+1=2	2+2=4	———
12.1 Fasting	1+0=1	1+4=5			0+1=1	1+8=9
12.2 Cloth		1+1=2				0+2=2
12.3 Wine		0+1=1				0+2=2
13 Plucking	1+0=1	5+5=10			1+1=2	3+10=13
14 H con	1+0=1	3+13=16	1+0=1	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+8=9
15 H by bo	1+2=3	4+2=6	2+2=4	1+0=1	1+2=3	1+0=1
16 12 app		2+0=2		1+5=6	0+1=1	1+0=1
17.1 JF1	3+3=6	3+2=5	2+2=4	0+1=1	1+2=3	2+0=2
17.2 Beelz	1+1=2	8+9=17		1+0=1	2+0=2	3+8=11
18.1 JF2	0+4=4	2+3=5	1+2=3	1+2=3	0+3=3	1+1=2
18.2 D fam	0+1=1	2+2=4		1+2=3		0+1=1

	9.1 T at ho	9.2 Para h	10.1 T by S	10.2 Lev c	11.1 Eating	11.2 Sinners
19 T from bo	2+3=5	3+2=5	4+3=7	1+1=2	0+3=3	0+1=1
20 S on gr	1+0=1	2+1=3				1+2=3
21 Why par	1+0=1	3+1=4		1+1=2		2+1=3
22 Par exp	2+0=2	2+1=3				1+2=3
23 Lamp	1+0=1	0+1=1				1+2=3
24 Measure	1+0=1	1+1=2				1+2=3
25 S in sec	1+0=1	6+1=7				0+2=2
26 Mustard		2+1=3				0+2=2
27.1 Pub par	3+2=5	1+0=1	0+2=2		0+1=1	1+0=1
27.2 D all				0+1=1		
28.1 J leav	1+2=3	2+2=4	1+2=3	0+2=2	0+3=3	0+1=1
28.2 Storm		2+7=9	1+0=1			
29.1 Ge De	1+0=1	5+2=7	1+0=1	1+0=1		2+0=2
29.2 N in Ge	0+1=1	2+3=5	0+1=1	2+1=3	0+2=2	1+2=3
29.3 Ge not	1+0=1	3+1=4		0+2=2	1+0=1	
29.4 Ge pro	0+2=2	0+1=1	0+2=2		0+1=1	
30.1 J ret	2+2=4	1+1=2	3+2=5		0+2=2	
30.2 Jai req	0+1=1	2+1=3	1+1=2	2+1=3	1+1= 2	1+0=1
31 HW	1+1=2	6+7=13	1+1=2	1+0=1	0+1=1	3+0=3
32.1 Ja mes	2+0=2	3+2=5		0+2=2	0+1=1	0+1=1
32.2 Ja mo	1+2=3	1+2=3	0+2=2		1+2=3	0+1=1
32.3 JD		3+6=9		1+1=2	0+1=1	1+1=2
33 T in Naz	2+2=4	3+8=11	1+2=3	1+1=2	2+1=3	1+6=7
34.1 T in Vil	0+2=2		1+2=3		0+1=1	
34.2 12 ins	2+0=2	4+0=4		0+1=1	1+0=1	2+0=2
34.3 12 pro	0+2=2		0+2=2	0+1=1	0+1=1	
35.1 Herod	1+1=2	1+1=2	0+1=1		0+1=1	1+0=1
35.2 John	2+0=2	3+0=3		0+1=1	1+1=2	2+1=3
36.1 12 ret	1+2=3	1+1=2	1+2=3	0+1=1	0+2=2	1+0=1
36.2 T foll	0+3=3	4+1=5	2+3=5	1+0=1	0+2=2	1+0=1
36.3 5000	0+1=1	3+3=6	0+1=1	1+1=2	0+3=3	2+2=4
36.4 12 sent	0+1=1	1+1=2	1+1=2	0+1=1	0+1=1	

	12.1 Fasting	12.2 Cloth	12.3 Wine	13 Pluck	14 H con	15 H by bo
1 Temp	1+1=2			0+2=2		1+0=1
2 Pro Gal	1+0=1			1+0=1		2+1=3
3 4 called	1+0=1			1+0=1	1+1=2	4+0=4
4.1 T in C				1+0=1	2+1=3	0+1=1
4.2 C dem	0+1=1	1+0=1	2+0=2	2+1=3	3+4=7	4+6=10
4.3 N in G						1+1=2
5 S's m-in-l	1+1=2			1+2=3	3+1=4	
6 H at S's					1+0=1	1+8=9
7.1 J4 in d	0+1=1			0+1=1		
7.2 J4 pro					1+0=1	1+3=4
8.1 Lep h				1+1=2	2+3=5	2+2=4
8.2 Lep pro				1+0=1		0+3=3
9.1 T at home	1+0=1			1+0=1	1+0=1	1+2=3
9.2 Para h	1+4=5	1+1=2	0+1=1	5+5=10	3+13=16	4+2=6
10.1 T by sea					1+0=1	2+2=4
10.2 L called					0+1=1	1+0=1
11.1 Eating	0+1=1			1+1=2	0+1=1	1+2=3
11.2 Sinners	1+8=9	0+2=2	0+2=2	3+10=13	1+8=9	1+0=1
12.1 Fasting	———	0+2=2	0+2=2	2+11=13	1+4=5	3+1=4
12.2 Cloth	0+2=2	———	2+4=6	0+2=2	0+2=2	
12.3 Wine	0+2=2	2+4=6	———	0+2=2	1+2=3	
13 Plucking	2+11=13	0+2=2	0+2=2	———	5+6=11	2+1=3
14 H con	1+4=5	0+2=2	1+2=3	5+6=11	———	1+0=1
15 H by bo	3+1=4			2+1=3	1+0=1	———
16 12 app	2+1=3			1+0=1	0+1=1	1+0=1
17.1 JF1	0+1=1			3+1=4	1+0=1	2+2=4
17.2 Beelz	2+4=6	0+2=2	0+2=2	3+5=8	1+6=7	5+1=6
18.1 JF2					0+1=1	1+2=3
18.2 D fam	0+1=1	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+1=2	1+1=2	1+0=1

	12.1 Fasting	12.2 Cloth	12.3 Wine	13 Pluck	14 H con	15 H by bo
19 T from bo				1+0=1	1+1=2	3+4=7
20 S on gr	0+2=2	0+3=3	0+3=3	2+3=5	2+2=4	1+0=1
21 Why par	0+1=1	0+1=1	0+1=1	2+1=3	2+1=3	2+0=2
22 Par exp	1+2=3	1+3=4	0+3=3	1+3=4	0+2=2	2+0=2
23 Lamp	0+2=2	0+3=3	0+3=3	0+2=2	0+2=2	2+0=2
24 Measure	0+2=2	1+3=4	0+3=3	1+2=3	2+2=4	1+0=1
25 S in sec	2+2=4	0+3=3	1+3=4	3+4=7	3+2=5	2+0=2
26 Mustard	1+2=3	0+3=3	0+3=3	1+3=4	0+2=2	2+0=2
27.1 Pub par						1+1=2
27.2 D all						
28.1 J leav	1+0=1				0+1=1	3+3=6
28.2 Storm			1+0=1		2+3=5	3+1=4
29.1 Ge De	2+1=3			3+1=4	1+1=2	8+6=14
29.2 N in Ge				1+1=2	0+2=2	1+1=2
29.3 Ge not	1+0=1			2+0=2		2+2=4
29.4 Ge pro	1+0=1			1+0=1		1+1=2
30.1 J ret					1+0=1	4+3=7
30.2 Jai req					2+0=2	2+2=4
31 HW		2+0=2			3+2=5	5+3=8
32.1 Ja mes	1+0=1				0+1=1	
32.2 Ja mo				1+1=2	0+1=1	1+2=3
32.3 JD	0+1=1			2+2=4	3+3=6	0+1=1
33 T in Naz	1+4=5	0+2=2	0+2=2	5+5=10	4+7=11	4+2=6
34.1 T in Vil						0+1=1
34.2 12 ins	0+1=1	1+0=1		5+1=6	1+0=1	3+0=3
34.3 12 pro					1+0=1	1+3=4
35.1 Herod	1+1=2				1+0=1	2+1=3
35.2 John	2+1=3	1+0=1		2+2=4	3+0=3	2+0=2
36.1 12 ret	1+1=2			1+1=2		2+3=5
36.2 T foll				1+0=1		1+3=4
36.3 5000	0+2=2	2+0=2		3+3=6	2+2=4	0+1=1
36.4 12 sent						3+1=4

	16 12 app	17.1 JFP1	17.2 Beelz	18.1 JFP2	18.2 D fam	19 T from b
1 Temp	1+1=2		3+2=5			
2 Pro Gal	3+0=3	0+1=1	1+0=1	0+1=1	1+0=1	0+2=2
3 4 called	7+4=11	0+1=1	3+0=3	2+2=4	1+2=3	2+1=3
4.1 T in C	1+0=1	0+1=1	1+0=1	0+1=1		1+2=3
4.2 C dem	1+0=1		4+2=6		1+0=1	1+0=1
4.3 N in G		0+1=1		0+1=1		0+1=1
5 S's m-in-l	4+2=6	2+2=4	2+1=3	0+3=3	0+2=2	
6 H at S's	2+0=2	0+3=3	3+2=5	0+3=3	0+1=1	0+2=2
7.1 J4 in d	2+3=5		1+0=1	1+0=1	0+1=1	
7.2 J4 pro	3+1=4	0+1=1	2+1=3	0+1=1	0+1=1	0+2=2
8.1 Lep h	2+0=2		2+0=2	0+1=1		
8.2 Lep pro	1+0=1	0+2=2		1+2=3		1+3=4
9.1 T at home		3+3=6	1+1=2	0+4=4	0+1=1	2+3=5
9.2 Para h	2+0=2	3+2=5	8+9=17	2+3=5	2+2=4	3+2=5
10.1 T by sea		2+2=4		1+2=3		4+3=7
10.2 L called	1+5=6	0+1=1	1+0=1	1+2=3	1+2=3	1+1=2
11.1 Eating	0+1=1	1+2=3	2+0=2	0+3=3		0+3=3
11.2 Sinners	1+0=1	2+0=2	3+8=11	1+1=2	0+1=1	0+1=1
12.1 Fasting	2+1=3	0+1=1	2+4=6		0+1=1	
12.2 Cloth			0+2=2		0+1=1	
12.3 Wine			0+2=2		0+1=1	
13 Plucking	1+0=1	3+1=4	3+5=8		1+1=2	1+0=1
14 H con	0+1=1	1+0=1	1+6=7	0+1=1	1+1=2	1+1=2
15 H by bo	1+0=1	2+2=4	5+1=6	1+2=3	1+0=1	3+4=7
16 12 app	———	0+1=1	4+0=4	3+1=4	1+3=4	
17.1 JF1	0+1=1	———	1+1=2	1+5=6	0+2=2	2+2=4
17.2 Beelz	4+0=4	1+1=2	———	1+1=2	0+2=2	1+0=1
18.1 JF2	2+1=3	1+5=6	1+1=2	———	5+2=7	2+3=5
18.2 D fam	1+3=4	0+2=2	0+2=2	5+2=7	———	1+0=1

	16 12 app	17.1 JFP1	17.2 Beelz	18.1 JFP2	18.2 D fam	19 T from b
19 T from bo		2+2=4	1+0=1	2+3=5	1+0=1	———
20 S on gr	1+0=1	1+0=1	0+2=2	1+0=1	1+1=2	1+0=1
21 Why par	1+4=5	1+0=1	3+1=4	1+0=1	2+3=5	1+1=2
22 Par exp	0+1=1	1+0=1	2+2=4		0+1=1	1+0=1
23 Lamp		1+0=1	0+2=2		0+1=1	
24 Measure		1+0=1	0+2=2		1+1=2	
25 S in sec	2+0=2		3+2=5	1+0=1	2+1=3	1+0=1
26 Mustard	1+0=1		2+2=4		1+1=2	2+0=2
27.1 Pub par		1+1=2	1+0=1	0+1=1		1+3=4
27.2 D all	0+2=2				0+1=1	
28.1 J leav	0+1=1	1+2=3	1+0=1	1+3=4	0+1=1	2+4=6
28.2 Storm	0+1=1		0+1=1	0+1=1		2+1=3
29.1 Ge De	4+0=4		5+1=6	2+1=3	1+0=1	2+1=3
29.2 N in Ge		0+1=1	0+1=1	1+3=4	1+0=1	2+2=4
29.3 Ge not	0+3=3	1+0=1	3+0=3	0+1=1	0+1=1	2+1=3
29.4 Ge pro	1+0=1	0+1=1	1+0=1	0+1=1		1+2=3
30.1 J ret		2+2=4		1+2=3		5+3=8
30.2 Jai req	2+1=3	1+2=3		1+3=4	0+1=1	1+1=2
31 HW	1+0=1	2+1=3		1+1=2	1+0=1	1+1=2
32.1 Ja mes	4+2=6	0+1=1	1+1=2	1+1=2	1+1=2	
32.2 Ja mo		1+2=3	1+1=2	0+2=2		0+1=1
32.3 JD	2+2=4	3+1=4	2+0=2	1+1=2	1+1=2	
33 T in Naz	6+1=7	2+3=5	2+7=9	2+3=5	2+2=4	2+2=4
34.1 T in Vil		0+1=1		0+1=1	1+0=1	1+2=3
34.2 12 ins	4+7=11	3+1=4	4+0=4	2+0=2	0+2=2	1+0=1
34.3 12 pro	3+4=7	0+1=1	2+1=3	0+1=1	0+1=1	0+2=2
35.1 Herod	2+0=2	1+1=2	0+1=1	0+1=1		0+1=1
35.2 John	5+1=6	2+1=3	4+0=4	3+2=5	2+1=3	
36.1 12 ret	1+4=5	1+4=5	1+0=1	0+2=2	0+1=1	3+3=6
36.2 T foll	0+2=2	1+2=3		1+2=3		3+3=6
36.3 5000	1+2=3	2+2=4	1+0=1	1+3=4	2+0=2	0+2=2
36.4 12 sent	1+5=6	1+1=2		1+1=2	0+1=1	3+1=4

	20 S on gr	21 Why par	22 Par exp	23 Lamp	24 Measure	25 S in sec
1 Temp			1+0=1			1+0=1
2 Pro Gal		2+0=2				3+0=3
3 4 called		2+1=3				1+0=1
4.1 T in C			1+0=1			
4.2 C dem		2+0=2				3+0=3
4.3 N in G						
5 S's m-in-l		1+0=1				1+0=1
6 H at S's	2+0=2	2+0=2				1+1=2
7.1 J4 in d		0+2=2	0+1=1			0+2=2
7.2 J4 pro		0+1=1				
8.1 Lep h						
8.2 Lep pro		1+0=1	1+0=1			
9.1 T at home	1+0=1	1+0=1	2+0=2	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+0=1
9.2 Para h	2+1=3	3+1=4	2+1=3	0+1=1	1+1=2	6+1=7
10.1 T by sea						
10.2 L called		1+1=2				
11.1 Eating						
11.2 Sinners	1+2=3	2+1=3	1+2=3	1+2=3	1+2=3	0+2=2
12.1 Fasting	0+2=2	0+1=1	1+2=3	0+2=2	0+2=2	2+2=4
12.2 Cloth	0+3=3	0+1=1	1+3=4	0+3=3	1+3=4	0+3=3
12.3 Wine	0+3=3	0+1=1	0+3=3	0+3=3	0+3=3	1+3=4
13 Plucking	2+3=5	2+1=3	1+3=4	0+2=2	1+2=3	3+4=7
14 H con	2+2=4	2+1=3	0+2=2	0+2=2	2+2=4	2+2=4
15 H by bo	1+0=1	2+0=2	2+0=2	2+0=2	1+0=1	2+0=2
16 12 app	1+0=1	1+4=5	0+1=1			2+0=2
17.1 JF1	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+0=1	
17.2 Beelz	0+2=2	3+1=4	2+2=4	0+2=2	0+2=2	3+2=5
18.1 JF2	1+0=1	1+0=1				1+0=1
18.2 D fam	1+1=2	2+3=5	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+1=2	2+1=3

	20 S on gr	21 Why par	22 Par exp	23 Lamp	24 Measure	25 S in sec
19T from bo	1+0=1	1+1=2	1+0=1			1+0=1
20 S on gr	————	2+1=3	12+8=20	2+4=6	2+5=7	2+6=8
21 Why par	2+1=3	————	1+4=5	1+3=4	3+1=4	3+2=5
22 Par exp	12+8=20	1+4=5	————	1+3=4	2+4=6	3+6=9
23 Lamp	2+4=6	1+3=4	1+3=4	————	1+4=5	0+4=4
24 Measure	2+5=7	3+1=4	2+4=6	1+4=5	————	0+4=4
25 S in sec	2+6=8	3+2=5	3+6=9	0+4=4	0+4=4	————
26 Mustard	4+6=10	3+1=4	3+6=9	1+3=4	0+4=4	4+7=11
27.1 Pub par	1+0=1	2+1=3	2+0=2	1+0=1	1+0=1	
27.2 D all		0+5=5	0+3=3	0+1=1		
28.1 J leav		1+1=2				1+1=2
28.2 Storm		0+1=1	0+3=3			1+1=2
29.1 Ge De	0+1=1	3+0=3	0+1=1			5+0=5
29.2 N in Ge		1+0=1	0+1=1			
29.3 Ge not		1+1=2				
29.4 Ge pro						
30.1 J ret						
30.2 Jai req	1+0=1	1+0=1				
31 HW	2+0=2	7+0=7	1+1=2	1+0=1	2+1=3	1+0=1
32.1 Ja mes		2+0=2	1+0=1			
32.2 Ja mo						1+0=1
32.3 JD	1+0=1	3+1=4	1+1=2		1+0=1	1+0=1
33 T in Naz	2+2=4	2+1=3	2+2=4	1+2=3	2+2=4	0+2=2
34.1 T in Vil						
34.2 12 ins	3+0=3	4+5=9	3+2=5	1+0=1	3+1=4	1+0=1
34.3 12 pro		0+2=2				
35.1 Herod	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+0=1	2+0=2	1+0=1	1+0=1
35.2 John	3+0=3	4+0=4	2+0=2	2+0=2	3+0=3	5+0=5
36.1 12 ret		0+3=3	0+1=1			
36.2 T foll		1+1=2				
36.3 5000	2+2=4	5+1=6	3+2=5		3+1=4	1+2=3
36.4 12 sent		0+2=2				

	26 Mustard	27.1 Pub par	27.2 D all	28.1 J leaves	28.2 Storm	29.1 Ge dem
1 Temp				1+0=1		2+0=2
2 Pro Gal	2+0=2	0+2=2		0+1=1	1+0=1	1+0=1
3 4 called			0+1=1	2+2=4	2+0=2	4+0=4
4.1 T in C		0+2=2		0+1=1	0+2=2	
4.2 C dem	2+0=2				5+7=12	6+7=13
4.3 N in G		0+1=1		0+1=1		
5 S's m-in-l				1+0=1	1+2=3	0+2=2
6 H at S's		1+1=2		2+3=5		0+2=2
7.1 J4 in d			0+2=2	0+3=3	0+2=2	
7.2 J4 pro		0+2=2	0+1=1	0+2=2		0+1=1
8.1 Lep h					0+3=3	2+3=5
8.2 Lep pro		1+2=3		0+2=2		1+0=1
9.1 T at home		3+2=5		1+2=3		1+0=1
9.2 Para h	2+1=3	1+0=1		2+2=4	2+7=9	5+2=7
10.1 T by sea		0+2=2		1+2=3	1+0=1	1+0=1
10.2 L called			0+1=1	0+2=2		1+0=1
11.1 Eating		0+1=1		0+3=3		
11.2 Sinners	0+2=2	1+0=1		0+1=1		2+0=2
12.1 Fasting	1+2=3			1+0=1		2+1=3
12.2 Cloth	0+3=3					
12.3 Wine	0+3=3				1+0=1	
13 Plucking	1+3=4					3+1=4
14 H con	0+2=2			0+1=1	2+3=5	1+1=2
15 H by bo	2+0=2	1+1=2		3+3=6	3+1=4	8+6=14
16 12 app	1+0=1		0+2=2	0+1=1	0+1=1	4+0=4
17.1 JF1		1+1=2		1+2=3		
17.2 Beelz	2+2=4	1+0=1		1+0=1	0+1=1	5+1=6
18.1 JF2		0+1=1		1+3=4	0+1=1	2+1=3
18.2 D fam	1+1=2		0+1=1	0+1=1		1+0=1

	26 Mustard	27.1 J pub	27.2 J disc	28.1 J leaves	28.2 Storm	29.1 Ge dem
19 T from bo	2+0=2	1+3=4		2+4=6	2+1=3	2+1=3
20 S on gr	4+6=10	1+0=1				0+1=1
21 Why par	3+1=4	2+1=3	0+5=5	1+1=2	0+1=1	3+0=3
22 Par exp	3+6=9	2+0=2	0+3=3		0+3=3	0+1=1
23 Lamp	1+3=4	1+0=1	0+1=1			
24 Measure	0+4=4	1+0=1				
25 S in sec	4+7=11			1+1=2	1+1=2	5+0=5
26 Mustard	———	1+0=1			1+0=1	2+0=2
27.1 Pub par	1+0=1	———		0+1=1		
27.2 D all			———	0+1=1	0+1=1	
28.1 J leav		0+1=1	0+1=1	———	1+1=2	3+2=5
28.2 Storm	1+0=1		0+1=1	1+1=2	———	3+4=7
29.1 Ge De	2+0=2			3+2=5	3+4=7	———
29.2 N in Ge		0+1=1		0+2=2	1+3=4	5+1=6
29.3 Ge not			0+1=1	2+2=4	1+2=3	2+2=4
29.4 Ge pro		0+2=2		0+1=1	0+1=1	
30.1 J ret		0+1=1		3+4=7	2+1=3	3+2=5
30.2 Jai req				1+1=2	0+1=1	3+2=5
31 HW		1+0=1		1+1=2	2+5=7	1+4=5
32.1 Ja mes		2+0=2		1+1=2	3+1=4	
32.2 Ja mo		0+1=1		0+2=2	1+0=1	
32.3 JD	1+0=1		0+1=1	1+1=2	2+4=6	1+1=2
33 T in Naz	0+2=2	2+2=4		0+1=1	1+3=4	1+0=1
34.1 T in Vil		0+2=2		0+1=1		
34.2 12 ins		1+0=1	0+3=3	0+1=1	0+1=1	3+0=3
34.3 12 pro		0+2=2	0+1=1	0+2=2		0+1=1
35.1 Herod		1+1=2		0+1=1	1+1=2	1+0=1
35.2 John	2+0=2	1+0=1		1+0=1	1+1=2	4+2=6
36.1 12 ret		0+1=1	1+2=3	1+7=8	1+2=3	1+2=3
36.2 T foll		0+2=2		1+3=4		1+2=3
36.3 5000	1+1=2			0+3=3	1+3=4	1+3=4
36.4 12 sent			0+1=1	3+4=7	1+0=1	3+1=4

	29.2 N in Ge	29.3 Ge not	29.4 Ge pro	30.1 J ret	30.2 Ja req	31 HW
1 Temp						
2 Pro Gal	0+1=1		1+2=3	0+1=1		1+0=1
3 4 called	1+1=2	2+2=4		2+0=2	2+1=3	1+0=1
4.1 T in C	0+2=2		0+3=3	0+1=1		
4.2 C dem	0+1=1	0+1=1	0+1=1			1+2=3
4.3 N in G	0+2=2		0+2=2	0+1=1		
5 S's m-in-l	0+1=1	2+1=3			1+2=3	0+2=2
6 H at S's	2+1=3	2+1=3	0+1=1	0+2=2	0+1=1	1+1=2
7.1 J4 in d		0+1=1	1+0=1			
7.2 J4 pro	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+2=3	0+1=1		
8.1 Lep h	1+1=2	2+4=6			2+2=4	3+6=9
8.2 Lep pro	2+2=4		2+4=6	0+2=2	0+1=1	0+1=1
9.1 T at home	0+1=1	1+0=1	0+2=2	2+2=4	0+1=1	1+1=2
9.2 Para h	2+3=5	3+1=4	0+1=1	1+1=2	2+1=3	6+7=13
10.1 T by sea	0+1=1		0+2=2	3+2=5	1+1=2	1+1=2
10.2 L called	2+1=3	0+2=2			2+1=3	1+0=1
11.1 Eating	0+2=2	1+0=1	0+1=1	0+2=2	1+1=2	0+1=1
11.2 Sinners	1+2=3				1+0=1	3+0=3
12.1 Fasting		1+0=1	1+0=1			
12.2 Cloth						2+0=2
12.3 Wine						
13 Plucking	1+1=2	2+0=2	1+0=1			
14 H con	0+2=2			1+0=1	2+0=2	3+2=5
15 H by bo	1+1=2	2+2=4	1+1=2	4+3=7	2+2=4	5+3=8
16 12 app		0+3=3	1+0=1		2+1=3	1+0=1
17.1 JF1	0+1=1	1+0=1	0+1=1	2+2=4	1+2=3	2+1=3
17.2 Beelz	0+1=1	3+0=3	1+0=1			
18.1 JF2	1+3=4	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+2=3	1+3=4	1+1=2
18.2 D fam	1+0=1	0+1=1			0+1=1	1+0=1

	29.2 N in Ge	29.3 Ge not	29.4 Ge pro	30.1 J ret	30.2 Ja req	31 HW
19 T from bo	2+2=4	2+1=3	1+2=3	5+3=8	1+1=2	1+1=2
20 S on gr					1+0=1	2+0=2
21 Why par	1+0=1	1+1=2			1+0=1	7+0=7
22 Par exp	0+1=1					1+1=2
23 Lamp						1+0=1
24 Measure						2+1=3
25 S in sec						1+0=1
26 Mustard						
27.1 Pub par	0+1=1		0+2=2	0+1=1		1+0=1
27.2 D all		0+1=1				
28.1 J leav	0+2=2	2+2=4	0+1=1	3+4=7	1+1=2	1+1=2
28.2 Storm	1+3=4	1+2=3	0+1=1	2+1=3	0+1=1	2+5=7
29.1 Ge De	5+1=6	2+2=4		3+2=5	3+2=5	1+4=5
29.2 N in Ge	———	3+1=4	1+3=4	0+1=1	2+1=3	2+1=3
29.3 Ge not	3+1=4	———	1+1=2	1+1=2	1+1=2	1+1=2
29.4 Ge pro	1+3=4	1+1=2	———	0+1=1		
30.1 J ret	0+1=1	1+1=2	0+1=1	———	1+1=2	1+1=2
30.2 Jai req	2+1=3	1+1=2		1+1=2	———	4+2=6
31 HW	2+1=3	1+1=2		1+1=2	4+2=6	———
32.1 Ja mes	1+0=1	1+0=1			2+4=6	3+2=5
32.2 Ja mo	1+2=3	1+0=1	0+1=1	0+2=2	1+4=5	0+1=1
32.3 JD	0+1=1	0+2=2	0+1=1		1+5=6	4+4=8
33 T in Naz	1+3=4	1+0=1	2+3=5	0+1=1	3+2=5	3+2=5
34.1 T in Vil	0+1=1		0+2=2	0+1=1		
34.2 12 ins	1+0=1	1+2=3	1+0=1		1+0=1	3+1=4
34.3 12 pro	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+2=3	0+1=1		
35.1 Herod	0+2=2		0+2=2	0+1=1	1+1=2	2+0=2
35.2 John	1+1=2	0+1=1			1+4=5	5+0=5
36.1 12 ret	1+1=2	4+2=6	1+1=2	2+4=6	0+1=1	1+1=2
36.2 T foll	3+1=4	1+0=1	1+2=3	1+3=4	2+1=3	4+1=5
36.3 5000	2+2=4	1+1=2		0+1=1	1+2=3	5+3=8
36.4 12 sent		2+1=3		3+2=5	1+1=2	1+1=2

	32.1 Ja mes	32.2 Ja mo	32.3 JD	33 T in Naz	34.1 T in vi	34.2 12 inst
1 Temp			1+2=3			1+0=1
2 Pro Gal	2+0=2	0+1=1		1+2=3	0+3=3	
3 4 called	5+2=7		1+1=2	5+1=6		1+2=3
4.1 T in C		0+1=1	1+1=2	4+4=8	1+2=3	1+0=1
4.2 C dem			1+4=5	2+3=5	1+0=1	3+0=3
4.3 N in G		0+1=1		0+1=1	0+1=1	
5 S's m-in-l	4+2=6	1+0=1	3+6=9	5+1=6		1+0=1
6 H at S's	2+0=2	0+2=2	1+1=2	1+2=3	0+1=1	
7.1 J4 in d	1+0=1		1+1=2	1+0=1		1+3=4
7.2 J4 pro		0+1=1	1+0=1	1+3=4	0+3=3	0+1=1
8.1 Lep h			3+5=8	1+0=1		3+0=3
8.2 Lep pro	1+0=1	0+2=2		1+2=3	0+2=2	2+0=2
9.1 T at home	2+0=2	1+2=3		2+2=4	0+2=2	2+0=2
9.2 Para h	3+2=5	1+2=3	3+6=9	3+8=11		4+0=4
10.1 T by sea		0+2=2		1+2=3	1+2=3	
10.2 L called	0+2=2		1+1=2	1+1=2		0+1=1
11.1 Eating	0+1=1	1+2=3	0+1=1	2+1=3	0+1=1	1+0=1
11.2 Sinners	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+1=2	1+6=7		2+0=2
12.1 Fasting	1+0=1		0+1=1	1+4=5		0+1=1
12.2 Cloth				0+2=2		1+0=1
12.3 Wine				0+2=2		
13 Plucking		1+1=2	2+2=4	5+5=10		5+1=6
14 H con	0+1=1	0+1=1	3+3=6	4+7=11		1+0=1
15 H by bo		1+2=3	0+1=1	4+2=6	0+1=1	3+0=3
16 12 app	4+2=6		2+2=4	6+1=7		4+7=11
17.1 JF1	0+1=1	1+2=3	3+1=4	2+3=5	0+1=1	3+1=4
17.2 Beelz	1+1=2	1+1=2	2+0=2	2+7=9		4+0=4
18.1 JF2	1+1=2	0+2=2	1+1=2	2+3=5	0+1=1	2+0=2
18.2 D fam	1+1=2		1+1=2	2+2=4	1+0=1	0+2=2

	32.1 Ja mes	32.2 Ja mo	32.3 JD	33 T in Naz	34.1 T in vi	34.2 12 inst
19 T from bo		0+1=1		2+2=4	1+2=3	1+0=1
20 S on gr			1+0=1	2+2=4		3+0=3
21 Why par	2+0=2		3+1=4	2+1=3		4+5=9
22 Par exp	1+0=1		1+1=2	2+2=4		3+2=5
23 Lamp				1+2=3		1+0=1
24 Measure			1+0=1	2+2=4		3+1=4
25 S in sec		1+0=1	1+0=1	0+2=2		1+0=1
26 Mustard			1+0=1	0+2=2		
27.1 Pub par	2+0=2	0+1=1		2+2=4	0+2=2	1+0=1
27.2 D all			0+1=1			0+3=3
28.1 J leav	1+1=2	0+2=2	1+1=2	0+1=1	0+1=1	0+1=1
28.2 Storm	3+1=4	1+0=1	2+4=6	1+3=4		0+1=1
29.1 Ge De			1+1=2	1+0=1		3+0=3
29.2 N in Ge	1+0=1	1+2=3	0+1=1	1+3=4	0+1=1	1+0=1
29.3 Ge not	1+0=1	1+0=1	0+2=2	1+0=1		1+2=3
29.4 Ge pro		0+1=1	0+1=1	2+3=5	0+2=2	1+0=1
30.1 J ret		0+2=2		0+1=1	0+1=1	
30.2 Jai req	2+4=6	1+4=5	1+5=6	3+2=5		1+0=1
31 HW	3+2=5	0+1=1	4+4=8	3+2=5		3+1=4
32.1 Ja mes	———	2+4=6	0+7=7	4+4=8		1+0=1
32.2 Ja mo	2+4=6	———	1+4=5	1+2=3	0+1=1	1+0=1
32.3 JD	0+7=7	1+4=5	———	2+2=4		3+1=4
33 T in Naz	4+4=8	1+2=3	2+2=4	———	1+2=3	4+0=4
34.1 T in Vil		0+1=1		1+2=3	———	
34.2 12 ins	1+0=1	1+0=1	3+1=4	4+0=4		———
34.3 12 pro		0+1=1	1+0=1	2+3=5	0+2=2	0+5=5
35.1 Herod	1+1=2	0+2=2	1+1=2	3+3=6	0+1=1	1+0=1
35.2 John	4+4=8	0+3=3	3+6=9	3+1=4		4+0=4
36.1 12 ret	0+1=1	0+2=2	1+2=3	2+1=3	1+1=2	1+5=6
36.2 T foll		0+2=2		2+2=4	1+2=3	1+1=2
36.3 5000		0+1=1	4+4=8	1+0=1	2+0=2	6+2=8
36.4 12 sent	0+1=1	0+1=1	0+1=1			0+4=4

	34.3 12 pro	35.1 Herod	35.2 John	36.1 12 ret	36.2 T foll	36.3 5000	36.4 12 sent
1 Temp	1+0=1		1+2=3	1+1=2	0+1=1	1+3=4	0+2=2
2 Pro Gal	2+2=4	1+2=3	3+2=5	0+1=1	0+2=2		
3 4 called	0+2=2	1+0=1	3+1=4	3+1=4	1+0=1	1+2=3	1+1=2
4.1 T in C	0+2=2	0+1=1		1+1=2	1+2=3		
4.2 C dem	0+1=1	0+1=1	3+0=3	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+1=2	
4.3 N in G	0+1=1	0+2=2	1+0=1	0+1=1	0+1=1		
5 S's m-in-l		2+0=2	2+4=6			0+4=4	
6 H at S's	3+3=6	0+1=1	2+0=2	0+2=2	1+3=4	0+2=2	0+1=1
7.1 J4 in d	1+2=3			2+5=7	0+1=1	2+2=4	1+5=6
7.2 J4 pro	3+5=8	0+1=1	1+0=1	0+2=2	0+2=2		0+1=1
8.1 Lep h	1+0=1		1+1=2	1+0=1	2+0=2	1+2=3	
8.2 Lep pro	1+2=3	0+2=2		2+2=4	2+4=6	2+1=3	0+1=1
9.1 T at home	0+2=2	1+1=2	2+0=2	1+2=3	0+3=3	0+1=1	0+1=1
9.2 Para h		1+1=2	3+0=3	1+1=2	4+1=5	3+3=6	1+1=2
10.1 T by sea	0+2=2	0+1=1		1+2=3	2+3=5	0+1=1	1+1=2
10.2 L called	0+1=1		0+1=1	0+1=1	1+0=1	1+1=2	0+1=1
11.1 Eating	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+1=2	0+2=2	0+2=2	0+3=3	0+1=1
11.2 Sinners		1+0=1	2+1=3	1+0=1	1+0=1	2+2=4	
12.1 Fasting		1+1=2	2+1=3	1+1=2		0+2=2	
12.2 Cloth			1+0=1			2+0=2	
12.3 Wine							
13 Plucking			2+2=4	1+1=2	1+0=1	3+3=6	
14 H con	1+0=1	1+0=1	3+0=3			2+2=4	
15 H by bo	1+3=4	2+1=3	2+0=2	2+3=5	1+3=4	0+1=1	3+1=4
16 12 app	3+4=7	2+0=2	5+1=6	1+4=5	0+2=2	1+2=3	1+5=6
17.1 JF1	0+1=1	1+1=2	2+1=3	1+4=5	1+2=3	2+2=4	1+1=2
17.2 Beelz	2+1=3	0+1=1	4+0=4	1+0=1		1+0=1	
18.1 JF2	0+1=1	0+1=1	3+2=5	0+2=2	1+2=3	1+3=4	1+1=2
18.2 D fam	0+1=1		2+1=3	0+1=1		2+0=2	0+1=1

	34.3 12 pro	35.1 Herod	35.2 John	36.1 12 ret	36.2 T foll	36.3 5000	36.4 12 sent
19Tfrom bo	0+2=2	0+1=1		3+3=6	3+3=6	0+2=2	3+1=4
20 S on gr		2+0=2	3+0=3			2+2=4	
21 Why par	0+2=2	1+0=1	4+0=4	0+3=3	1+1=2	5+1=6	0+2=2
22 Par exp		1+0=1	2+0=2	0+1=1		3+2=5	
23 Lamp		2+0=2	2+0=2				
24 Measure		1+0=1	3+0=3			3+1=4	
25 S in sec		1+0=1	5+0=5			1+2=3	
26 Mustard			2+0=2			1+1=2	
27.1Pub par	0+2=2	1+1=2	1+0=1	0+1=1	0+2=2		
27.2 D all	0+1=1			1+2=3			0+1=1
28.1 J leav	0+2=2	0+1=1	1+0=1	1+7=8	1+3=4	0+3=3	3+4=7
28.2 Storm		1+1=2	1+1=2	1+2=3		1+3=4	1+0=1
29.1 Ge De	0+1=1	1+0=1	4+2=6	1+2=3	1+2=3	1+3=4	3+1=4
29.2N in Ge	0+1=1	0+2=2	1+1=2	1+1=2	3+1=4	2+2=4	
29.3 Ge not	0+1=1		0+1=1	4+2=6	1+0=1	1+1=2	2+1=3
29.4 Ge pro	1+2=3	0+2=2		1+1=2	1+2=3		
30.1 J ret	0+1=1	0+1=1		2+4=6	1+3=4	0+1=1	3+2=5
30.2 Jai req		1+1=2	1+4=5	0+1=1	2+1=3	1+2=3	1+1=2
31 HW		2+0=2	5+0=5	1+1=2	4+1=5	5+3=8	1+1=2
32.1 Ja mes		1+1=2	4+4=8	0+1=1			0+1=1
32.2 Ja mo	0+1=1	0+2=2	0+3=3	0+2=2	0+2=2	0+1=1	0+1=1
32.3 JD	1+0=1	1+1=2	3+6=9	1+2=3		4+4=8	0+1=1
33 T in Naz	2+3=5	3+3=6	3+1=4	2+1=3	2+2=4	1+0=1	
34.1T in Vil	0+2=2	0+1=1		1+1=2	1+2=3	2+0=2	
34.2 12 ins	0+5=5	1+0=1	4+0=4	1+5=6	1+1=2	6+2=8	0+4=4
34.3 12 pro	———	0+1=1		0+3=3	0+3=3	0+1=1	0+4=4
35.1 Herod	0+1=1	———	5+2=7	0+1=1	0+1=1		
35.2 John		5+2=7	———			4+5=9	
36.1 12 ret	0+4=4	0+1=1		———	2+5=7	4+4=8	1+7=8
36.2 T foll	0+3=3	0+1=1		2+5=7	———	2+3=5	1+4=5
36.3 5000	0+1=1		4+5=9	4+4=8	2+3=5	———	1+4=5
36.4 12 sent	0+4=4			1+7=8	1+4=5	1+4=5	———

Shorter Unit Result Chart

Number of parallels	*0*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*16*	*17*	*20*
22 Par exp	22	13	7	6	5	3	1			2								1
23 Lamps	35	8	7	4	4	1	1											
24 Measure	34	6	4	5	8	1	1	1										
25 S in sec	22	11	8	5	5	4		2	1	1		1						
26 Mustard	33	4	11	4	5					1	1	1						
27.1 J pub	23	18	14	2	2	1												
27.2 J disc	43	11	2	3	1													
28.1 J leav	10	19	13	6	5	2	2	2	1									
28.2 Storm	21	14	7	7	5	1	1	2		1			1					
29.1 Ge De	15	12	7	7	6	6	3	2						1	1			
29.2 Ge Pu	13	18	12	6	9	1	1											
29.3 G not	19	16	9	8	6		2											
29.4 G pro	25	17	9	6	1	1	1											
30.1 J ret	26	13	9	2	3	3	1	2	1									
30.2 Jai req	22	10	9	9	3	4	3											
31 Haem	14	11	15	5	1	6	1	2	3	1				1				
32.1 Ja mes	25	13	10		2	2	4	2	2									
32.2 Ja mo	19	19	11	8		2	1											
32.3 JD rai	13	13	14	2	6	2	3	1	3	3								
33 T in Na	3	8	5	10	14	8	4	2	2	1	1	2						
34.1 T in V	33	13	7	7														
34.2 12 ins	8	21	6	8	10	2	2		1	1		1						
34.3 12 pro	18	19	9	5	4	2	1	1	1									
35.1 Herod	13	24	19	2			1	1										
35.2 Death	14	7	10	11	6	5	3	1	1	2								
36.1 12 ret	10	13	14	9	2	3	4	2	3									
36.2 T foll	18	10	9	9	6	5	2	1										
36.3 5000	11	8	10	8	12	3	3		4	1								
36.4 12 lea	26	12	9	1	5	3	2	1	1									
Total number of parallels	1218	830	590	372	262	136	96	48	34	28	8	16	2	10	2	2	2	2
Number of unit pairs with parallels	609	416	295	186	131	68	48	24	17	14	4	8	1	5	1	1	1	1
Number of parallels greater than or equal to	1830	1221	805	510	324	193	125	77	53	36	22	18	10	9	4	3	2	1
% greater than or equal to	100	66.72	43.99	27.87	17.70	10.55	6.83	4.21	2.90	1.97	1.20	.98	.55	.49	.22	.16	.11	.05
Number of parallels	*0*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*16*	*17*	*20*

Result Charts for All Possible Three-, Four-, and Five-level Chiasms

N stands for "non-viable," and means the chiasm has at least one level with no parallels.
L stands for "likely," and means the chiasm has a probability figure greater than 1.
V stands for "viable," and means the chiasm has probability figure between.1 and 1.
G stands for "good," and means the chiasm has a probability figure less than.1.

Three-level Chiasms

Unit chiasm begins at	1	2	3	4.1	4.2	4.3	5	6	7.1	7.2	8.1	8.2	9.1	9.2	10.1	10.2	11.1	11.2	12.1	12.2	12.3
A	1	2	8	1	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	13	5	0	0
B	2	1	1	2	2	1	6	0	3	0	1	4	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	3
Rating	L	L	L	L	N	L	V	N	N	N	N	N	L	V	N	N	N	V	L	N	N

Unit chiasm begins at	13	14	15	16	17.1	17.2	18.1	18.2	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27.1	27.2	28.1	28.2
A	4	7	3	4	4	2	1	1	0	7	5	9	1	0	2	1	0	0	4	1
B	1	4	4	6	2	5	2	2	20	4	6	4	4	0	0	1	1	5	4	4
Rating	L	V	L	V	L	L	L	L	N	V	V	V	L	N	N	L	N	N	L	L

Unit chiasm begins at	29.1	29.2	29.3	29.4	30.1	30.2	31	32.1	32.2	32.3	33	34.1	34.2	34.3	35.1	35.2
A	5	3	2	0	2	6	5	0	1	1	6	0	6	3	0	0
B	4	2	0	2	6	1	7	3	0	4	2	1	0	1	0	8
Rating	V	L	N	N	L	L	V	N	N	L	L	N	N	L	N	N

The results are: N-24, L-23, V-10
Since as the a three-level chiasm can occur fifty-seven times, if there is one parallel on one of the levels, and the probability for one parallel is.667 2, and 57 x.667 2 is 38.030, then one would need a probability of less than.026 29 (1 / 38.030) for the remaining level for the total probability to be less than 1, and the chiasm to be unlikely. Since the first probability figure less than.026 29 is for 9 parallels, one would need at least 9 parallels for the other level. The following chart shows this for the number of parallels up to 9.

# of //s	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
P	.6672	.4399	.2787	.1770	.1055	.0683	.0421	.0290	.0197
x 57	38.030	25.074	15.886	10.089	6.014	3.893	2.400	1.653	1.123
1/	.0263	.0399	.0629	.0991	.1663	.2569	.4167	.6050	.8906
# needed to be viable	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
# needed to be good	14	14	12	11	10	9	8	7	6

Four-level Chiasms

Unit chiasm begins at	1	2	3	4.1	4.2	4.3	5	6	7.1	7.2	8.1	8.2	9.1	9.2	10.1	10.2	11.1	11.2	12.1	12.2
A	3	1	2	3	4	2	2	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	0
B	2	8	1	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	13	5	0	0
C	1	1	2	2	1	6	0	3	0	1	4	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	3
Rating	L	L	L	N	L	V	N	N	N	N	N	N	V	N	N	N	G	L	N	N

Unit chiasm begins at	12.3	13	14	15	16	17.1	17.2	18.1	18.2	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27.1	27.2
A	2	0	2	7	1	1	4	0	2	1	10	3	3	0	0	5	0	0	0
B	4	7	3	4	4	2	1	1	0	7	5	9	1	0	2	1	0	0	4
C	1	4	4	6	2	5	2	2	20	4	6	4	4	0	0	1	1	5	4
Rating	L	N	L	G	L	L	L	N	N	V	G	G	L	N	N	L	N	N	N

Unit chiasm begins at	28.1	28.2	29.1	29.2	29.3	29.4	30.1	30.2	31	32.1	32.2	32.3	33	34.1	34.2	34.3
A	7	1	5	1	1	1	1	0	4	0	2	9	3	3	8	4
B	1	5	3	2	0	2	6	5	0	1	1	6	0	6	3	0
C	4	4	2	0	2	6	1	7	3	0	4	2	1	0	1	0
Rating	L	V	V	N	N	L	L	N	N	N	L	G	N	N	V	N

Results: N-28, L-16, V-6, G-5

As the a four-level chiasm can occur fifty-five times, if there is one parallel on one of the levels, and the probability for one parallel is.667 2, and 55 x.667 2 is 35.362, then one would need a probability of less than.028 28 (1 / 35.362) for the remaining two levels for the total probability to to be less than 1, and the chiasm to be unlikely. If the one of the remaining levels had one parallel (probability.667 2), then one still need a probability figure less than.040 8 (.028 28 /.667 2) for the remaining level, and thus seven parallels. This is shown in the following chart:

# of //s for two units	1, 1	1,2	1,3	1,4	1,5	1,6	1,7	2,3	2,4	2,6
P with this # of //s	24.484	16.143	10.227	6.495	3.871	2.506	1.545	6.743	4.282	1.652
# needed to be less than 1	.040 8	.061 9	.097 8	.154 0	.258 3	.399 0	.647 3	.148	.233 5	.605 1
//s needed to be viable	7	7	6	5	4	2	1	5	4	2
//s needed to be good	14	12	11	10	9	7	7	10	9	7

Five-level Chiasms

Unit chiasm begins at	1	2	3	4.1	4.2	4.3	5	6	7.1	7.2	8.1	8.2	9.1	9.2	10.1	10.2	11.1	11.2	12.1
A	3	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	1	1	2	6
B	1	2	3	4	2	2	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	3	0
C	8	1	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	13	5	0	0
D	1	2	2	1	6	0	3	0	1	4	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	3	3
Rating	V	V	N	V	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	G	L	N	N
P	.19	.72		.77												.05	1.1		

Unit chiasm begins at	12.2	12.3	13	14	15	16	17.1	17.2	18.1	18.2	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
A	0	1	1	4	2	1	1	2	1	2	4	0	2	3	0	0	0	0
B	2	0	2	7	1	1	4	0	2	1	10	3	3	0	0	5	0	0
C	4	7	3	4	4	2	1	1	0	7	5	9	1	0	2	1	0	0
D	1	4	4	6	2	5	2	2	20	4	6	4	4	0	0	1	1	5
Rating	N	N	V	G	L	L	L	N	N	V	G	N	V	N	N	N	N	N
P			.77	.005	1.2	1.1	1.8			.12	.0008		.77					

Unit chiasm begins at	26	27.1	27.2	28.1	28.2	29.1	29.2	29.3	29.4	30.1	30.2	31	32.1	32.2	32.3	33	34.1
A	0	1	0	2	4	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	8	2	0	1	0
B	0	0	7	1	5	1	1	1	1	0	4	0	2	9	3	3	8
C	0	4	1	5	3	2	0	2	6	5	0	1	1	6	0	6	3
D	5	4	4	4	2	0	2	6	1	7	3	0	4	2	1	0	1
Rating	N	N	N	V	V	N	N	V	V	N	N	N	G	G	N	N	N
P				.29	.12			.71	.71				.08	.02			

Results: N-34, L-4, V-10, G-5

Five-level Chiasms with First Unit Doubled

Ratings in italics indicate as change in ratings

Unit chiasm begins at	**2**	3	4.1	**4.2**	4.3	5	6	7.1	7.2	8.1	8.2	9.1	9.2	10.1	**10.2**	**11.1**	11.2	12.1
A-1	**1**	0	0	**3**	13	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	1	16	**4**	**6**	3	11
A	**5**	0	2	**0**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	**1**	**1**	2	6
AA	**6**	-	-	**3**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**5**	**7**	-	-
B	**2**	3	4	**2**	2	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	**1**	**1**	3	0
C	**1**	0	3	**4**	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	**13**	**5**	0	0
D	**2**	2	1	**6**	0	3	0	1	4	3	2	2	1	2	**2**	**2**	3	3
Rating	**V**	N	V	**N**	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	**G**	***G***	N	N
P	**.45**		.76												**.008**	**.07**		
P before	**.72**		.77												**.05**	**1.1**		

Unit chiasm begins at	12.2	12.3	13	**14**	**15**	**16**	17.1	17.2	18.1	18.2	19	20	21	22	23	**24**	25	26
A-1	0	1	0	**5**	**3**	**2**	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	**1**	0	0
A	0	1	1	**4**	**2**	**1**	1	2	1	2	4	0	2	3	0	**0**	0	0
AA	-	-	-	**9**	**5**	**3**	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	**1**	-	-
B	2	0	2	**7**	**1**	**1**	4	0	2	1	10	3	3	0	0	**5**	0	0
C	4	7	3	**4**	**4**	**2**	1	1	0	7	5	9	1	0	2	**1**	0	0
D	1	4	4	**6**	**2**	**5**	2	2	20	4	6	4	4	0	0	**1**	1	5
Rating	N	N	V	**G**	***V***	***V***	L	N	N	V	G	N	V	N	N	***L***	N	N
			.76	**.0005**	**.28**	**.49**	1.8			.12	.0008		.76			**N**		
P before			.77	**.005**	**1.2**	**1.1**	1.8			.12	.0008		.77			**1.6**		

Unit chiasm begins at	27.1	27.2	28.1	28.2	29.1	29.2	**29.3**	**29.4**	30.1	30.2	31	**32.1**	**32.2**	32.3	33	**34.1**
A-1	0	0	0	0	2	1	**2**	**4**	0	1	1	**2**	**5**	1	2	**8**
A	1	0	2	4	0	1	**1**	**2**	0	0	2	**8**	**2**	0	1	**0**
AA	-	-	-	-	-	-	**3**	**6**	-	-	-	**10**	**7**	-	-	**8**
B	0	7	1	5	1	1	**1**	**1**	0	4	0	**2**	**9**	3	3	**8**
C	4	1	5	3	2	0	**2**	**6**	5	0	1	**1**	**6**	0	6	**3**
D	4	4	4	2	0	2	**6**	**1**	7	3	0	**4**	**2**	1	0	**1**
Rating	N	N	V	V	N	N	**V**	**V**	N	N	N	**G**	**G**	N	N	**N**
			.28	.12			**.29**	**.11**				**.03**	**.001**			
P before			.29	.12			**.71**	**.71**				**.08**	**.02**			

Longer Unit Parallel Chart

	1 Temp	2 Pro Gal	3 4 called	4 C dem	5 S's m-in-l	6 H at S's
1 Temp	————			1+0=1	1+2=3	1+0=1
2 Pro Gal		————	2+0=2	2+2=4	1+0=1	0+1=1
3 4 called		2+0=2	————	2+0=2	5+3=8	1+0=1
4 C dem	1+0=1	2+2=4	2+0=2	————	1+1=2	2+5=7
5 S's m-in-l	1+2=3	1+0=1	5+3=8	1+1=2	————	1+1=2
6 H at S's	1+0=1	0+1=1	1+0=1	2+5=7	1+1=2	————
7 J4 in d	2+2=4	2+3=5	2+1=3	3+3=6	2+0=2	3+4=7
8 Leper h	2+0=2	1+2=3		1+6=7	1+3=4	2+4=6
9 Para h	2+0=2	2+2=4	3+1=4	7+9=16	4+3=7	5+3=8
10 L called		0+2=2	4+6=10	1+2=3	0+2=2	0+2=2
11 Sinners	0+1=1	0+1=1	3+2=5	1+1=2	2+2=4	1+2=3
12 Fasting	1+1=2	1+0=1	1+0=1	2+1=3	1+1=2	
13 Plucking	0+2=2	1+0=1	1+0=1	3+1=4	1+2=3	
14 H con			1+1=2	4+4=8	3+1=4	1+0=1
15 H by bo	1+0=1	2+1=3	4+0=4	5+7=12		1+8=9
16 12 app	1+1=2	3+0=3	7+4=11	1+0=1	4+2=6	2+0=2
17 Beelz	3+2=5	1+1=2	3+1=4	5+3=8	3+2=5	3+4=7
18 D fam		1+1=2	2+3=5	1+1=2	0+3=3	0+3=3
19 T from bo		0+2=2	2+1=3	1+2=3		0+2=2
20 S on gr						2+0=2
21 Why par		2+0=2	2+1=3	2+0=2	1+0=1	2+0=2
22 Par exp	1+0=1			1+0=1		
23 Lamp						
24 Measure						
25 S in sec	1+0=1	3+0=3	1+0=1	3+0=3	1+0=1	1+1=2
26 Mustard		3+0=3		1+0=1		
27 Par con		0+2=2	0+1=1	0+2=2		1+1=2
28 Storm	1+0=1	1+1=2	3+2=5	5+8=13	2+2=4	2+3=5
29 Ge dem	2+0=2	2+2=4	5+3=8	6+12=18	2+2=4	3+4=7
30 Ja req		0+1=1	4+1=5	0+1=1	1+2=3	0+2=2
31 HW		1+0=1	1+0=1	1+2=3	0+2=2	1+1=2
32 JD	1+2=3	2+1=3	7+2=9	1+5=6	8+7=15	3+3=6
33 T in Naz		1+2=3	5+1=6	4+5=9	5+1=6	1+2=3
34 12 ins	2+0=2	2+3=5	1+3=4	4+3=7	1+0=1	3+3=6
35 John	1+2=3	3+3=6	3+1=4	4+3=7	3+4=7	2+1=3
36 5000	1+4=5	0+2=2	4+3=7	2+3=5	0+4=4	1+4=5

	7 J4 in d	8 Leper h	9 Para h	10 L called	11 Sinners	12 Fasting
1 Temp	2+2=4	2+0=2	2+0=2		0+1=1	1+1=2
2 Pro Gal	2+3=5	1+2=3	2+2=4	0+2=2	0+1=1	1+0=1
3 4 called	2+1=3		3+1=4	4+6=10	3+2=5	1+0=1
4 C dem	3+3=6	1+6=7	7+9=16	1+2=3	1+1=2	2+1=3
5 S's m-in-l	2+0=2	1+3=4	4+3=7	0+2=2	2+2=4	1+1=2
6 H at S's	3+4=7	2+4=6	5+3=8	0+2=2	1+2=3	
7 J4 in d	———	3+2=5	0+3=3	1+3=4	0+3=3	0+1=1
8 Leper h	3+2=5	———	4+6=10	0+3=3	0+2=2	
9 Para h	0+3=3	4+6=10	———	4+4=8	5+10=15	3+4=7
10 L called	1+3=4	0+3=3	4+4=8	———	3+4=7	
11 Sinners	0+3=3	0+2=2	5+10=15	3+4=7	———	1+8=9
12 Fasting	0+1=1		3+4=7		1+8=9	———
13 Plucking	0+1=1	2+1=3	5+5=10		4+10=14	2+11=13
14 H con	1+0=1	2+3=5	4+12=16	1+1=2	1+8=9	2+4=6
15 H by bo	1+3=4	2+5=7	5+3=8	3+2=5	2+2=4	3+1=4
16 12 app	4+3=7	3+0=3	2+0=2	1+5=6	1+1=2	2+1=3
17 Beelz	3+2=5	2+2=4	12+11=23	3+3=6	6+10=16	2+5=7
18 D fam	1+2=3	1+3=4	3+6=9	2+5=7	1+4=5	0+1=1
19 T from bo	0+2=2	1+3=4	5+4=9	5+4=9	0+3=3	
20 S on gr			3+1=4		1+2=3	0+2=2
21 Why par	0+2=2	1+0=1	5+1=6	1+1=2	2+1=3	0+1=1
22 Par exp	0+1=1	1+0=1	4+1=5		1+2=3	2+2=4
23 Lamp			1+1=2		1+2=3	0+2=2
24 Measure			2+1=3		1+2=3	1+2=3
25 S in sec	0+2=2		7+1=8		0+2=2	3+2=5
26 Mustard			2+1=3		0+2=2	1+2=3
27 Par con	0+4=4	1+2=3	3+2=5	0+3=3	1+1=2	
28 Storm	0+6=6	0+5=5	5+10=15	2+4=6	0+3=3	2+0=2
29 Ge dem	1+5=6	7+9=16	10+8=18	3+5=8	3+3=6	3+1=4
30 Ja req	0+1=1	2+4=6	4+2=6	5+3=8	2+2=4	
31 HW		3+7=10	6+7=13	2+1=3	3+1=4	2+0=2
32 JD	3+2=5	4+7=11	8+11=19	1+4=5	2+6=8	1+1=2
33 T in Naz	2+3=5	2+2=4	4+10=14	2+3=5	3+7=10	1+4=5
34 12 ins	4+9=13	7+2=9	5+2=7	1+3=4	3+1=4	1+1=2
35 John	1+1=2	1+3=4	6+2=8	0+2=2	3+2=5	3+2=5
36 5000	2+10=12	6+6=12	6+5=11	3+5=8	2+4=6	3+2=5

	13 Plucking	14 H con	15 H by bo	16 12 app	17 Beelz	18 D fam
1 Temp	0+2=2		1+0=1	1+1=2	3+2=5	
2 Pro Gal	1+0=1		2+1=3	3+0=3	1+1=2	1+1=2
3 4 called	1+0=1	1+1=2	4+0=4	7+4=11	3+1=4	2+3=5
4 C dem	3+1=4	4+4=8	5+7=12	1+0=1	5+3=8	1+1=2
5 S's m-in-l	1+2=3	3+1=4		4+2=6	3+2=5	0+3=3
6 H at S's		1+0=1	1+8=9	2+0=2	3+4=7	0+3=3
7 J4 in d	0+1=1	1+0=1	1+3=4	4+3=7	3+2=5	1+2=3
8 Leper h	2+1=3	2+3=5	2+5=7	3+0=3	2+2=4	1+3=4
9 Para h	5+5=10	4+12=16	5+3=8	2+0=2	12+11=23	6+3=9
10 L called		1+1=2	3+2=5	1+5=6	3+3=6	2+5=7
11 Sinners	4+10=14	1+8=9	2+2=4	1+1=2	6+10=16	1+4=5
12 Fasting	2+11=13	2+4=6	3+1=4	2+1=3	2+5=7	0+1=1
13 Plucking	————	5+6=11	2+1=3	1+0=1	5+6=11	1+1=2
14 H con	5+6=11	————	1+0=1	0+1=1	2+6=8	1+2=3
15 H by bo	2+1=3	1+0=1	————	1+0=1	7+3=10	2+2=4
16 12 app	1+0=1	0+1=1	1+0=1	————	4+1=5	3+3=6
17 Beelz	5+6=11	2+6=8	7+3=10	4+1=5	————	2+6=8
18 D fam	1+1=2	1+2=3	2+2=4	3+3=6	2+6=8	————
19 T from bo	1+0=1	1+1=2	3+3=6		3+2=5	2+3=5
20 S on gr	2+3=5	2+2=4	1+0=1	1+0=1	1+2=3	1+1=2
21 Why par	2+1=3	2+1=3	2+0=2	1+4=5	4+1=5	3+3=6
22 Par exp	1+3=4	0+2=2	2+0=2	0+1=1	2+2=4	0+1=1
23 Lamp	0+2=2	0+2=2	2+0=2		1+2=3	0+1=1
24 Measure	1+2=3	2+2=4	1+0=1		1+2=3	1+1=2
25 S in sec	3+4=7	2+2=4	2+0=2	2+0=2	3+2=5	2+1=3
26 Mustard	1+3=4	0+2=2	2+0=2	1+0=1	2+2=4	1+1=2
27 Par con			1+1=2	0+2=2	2+1=3	0+2=2
28 Storm		3+4=7	5+2=7	0+2=2	2+3=5	1+5=6
29 Ge dem	6+2=8	1+3=4	10+7=17	5+3=8	8+3=11	4+4=8
30 Ja req		3+0=3	5+3=8	2+1=3	2+3=5	1+4=5
31 HW		3+2=5	5+3=8	1+0=1	2+1=3	2+1=3
32 JD	3+3=6	3+5=8	1+3=4	6+3=9	7+5=12	2+3=5
33 T in Naz	5+5=10	5+7=12	4+2=6	6+1=7	3+10=13	2+4=6
34 12 ins	5+1=6	2+0=2	4+3=7	7+7=14	8+3=11	3+3=6
35 John	2+2=4	4+0=4	3+1=4	6+1=7	6+3=9	3+3=6
36 5000	4+3=7	2+2=4	4+3=7	3+6=9	5+4=9	4+5=9

	19 T from bo	20 S on gr	21 Why pa	22 Par exp	23 Lamp	24 Measure
1 Temp				1+0=1		
2 Pro Gal	0+2=2		2+0=2			
3 4 called	2+1=3		2+1=3			
4 C dem	1+2=3		2+0=2	1+0=1		
5 S's m-in-l			1+0=1			
6 H at S's	0+2=2	2+0=2	2+0=2			
7 J4 in d	0+2=2		0+2=2	0+1=1		
8 Leper h	1+3=4		1+0=1	1+0=1		
9 Para h	5+4=9	3+1=4	5+1=6	4+1=5	1+1=2	2+1=3
10 L called	5+4=9		1+1=2			
11 Sinners	0+3=3	1+2=3	2+1=3	1+2=3	1+2=3	1+2=3
12 Fasting		0+2=2	0+1=1	2+2=4	0+2=2	1+2=3
13 Plucking	1+0=1	2+3=5	2+1=3	1+3=4	0+2=2	1+2=3
14 H con	1+1=2	1+2=4	2+1=3	0+2=2	0+2=2	2+2=4
15 H by bo	3+3=6	1+0=1	2+0=2	2+0=2	2+0=2	1+0=1
16 12 app		1+0=1	1+4=5	0+1=1		
17 Beelz	3+2=5	1+2=3	4+1=5	2+2=4	1+2=3	1+2=3
18 D fam	2+3=5	1+0=1	3+3=6	0+1=1	0+1=1	1+1=2
19 T from bo	———	1+0=1	1+1=2	1+0=1		
20 S on gr	1+0=1	———	2+1=3	12+8=20	1+4=5	2+5=7
21 Why par	1+1=2	2+1=3	———	1+4=5	1+3=4	3+1=4
22 Par exp	1+0=1	12+8=20	1+4=5	———	1+3=4	2+4=6
23 Lamp		1+4=5	1+3=4	1+3=4	———	1+4=5
24 Measure		2+5=7	3+1=4	2+4=6	1+4=5	———
25 S in sec	1+0=1	3+6=9	3+2=5	3+6=9	0+4=4	0+4=4
26 Mustard	2+0=2	4+6=10	3+1=4	3+6=9	1+4=5	0+4=4
27 Par con	1+3=4	1+0=1	2+5=7	2+5=7	1+1=2	1+0=1
28 Storm	3+3=6		1+2=3	0+3=3		
29 Ge dem	5+3=8	0+1=1	4+1=5	0+2=2		
30 Ja req	5+2=7	1+0=1	1+0=1			
31 HW	1+1=2	2+0=2	7+0=7	1+1=2	1+0=1	2+1=3
32 JD	0+2=2	1+0=1	5+1=6	2+1=3		1+0=1
33 T in Naz	2+2=4	2+2=4	2+1=3	2+2=4	1+2=3	2+2=4
34 12 ins	2+2=4	3+0=3	4+5=9	3+2=5	1+0=1	3+1=4
35 John	0+1=1	3+0=3	4+0=4	2+0=2	3+0=3	3+0=3
36 5000	6+4=10	2+2=4	5+3=8	3+3=6		3+1=4

	25 S in sec	26 Mustard	27 Par con	28 Storm	29 Ge dem	30 Ja req
1 Temp	1+0=1			1+0=1	2+0=2	
2 Pro Gal	3+0=3	3+0=3	0+2=2	1+1=2	2+2=4	1+1=2
3 4 called	1+0=1		0+1=1	3+2=5	5+3=8	4+1=5
4 C dem	3+0=3	1+0=1	0+2=2	5+8=13	6+12=18	0+1=1
5 S's m-in-l	1+0=1			2+2=4	2+2=4	1+2=3
6 H at S's	1+1=2		1+1=2	2+3=5	3+4=7	0+2=2
7 J4 in d	0+2=2		0+4=4	0+6=6	1+5=6	0+1=1
8 Leper h			1+2=3	0+5=5	7+9=16	2+4=6
9 Para h	7+1=8	2+1=3	3+2=5	5+10=15	10+8=18	4+2=6
10 L called			0+3=3	2+4=6	3+5=8	5+3=8
11 Sinners	0+2=2	0+2=2	1+1=2	0+3=3	3+3=6	2+2=4
12 Fasting	3+2=5	1+2=3		2+0=2	3+1=4	
13 Plucking	3+4=7	1+3=4			6+2=8	
14 H con	2+2=4	0+2=2		3+4=7	1+3=4	3+0=3
15 H by bo	2+0=2	2+0=2	1+1=2	5+2=7	10+7=17	5+3=8
16 12 app	2+0=2	1+0=1	0+2=2	0+2=2	5+3=8	2+1=3
17 Beelz	3+2=5	2+2=4	2+1=3	2+3=5	8+3=11	2+3=5
18 D fam	2+1=3	1+1=2	0+2=2	1+5=6	4+4=8	1+4=5
19 T from bo	1+0=1	2+0=2	1+3=4	3+3=6	5+3=8	5+2=7
20 S on gr	3+6=9	4+6=10	1+0=1		0+1=1	1+0=1
21 Why par	3+2=5	3+1=4	2+5=7	1+2=3	4+1=5	1+0=1
22 Par exp	3+6=9	3+6=9	2+5=7	0+3=3	0+2=2	
23 Lamp	0+4=4	1+4=5	1+1=2			
24 Measure	0+4=4	0+4=4	1+0=1			
25 S in sec	———	4+7=11		3+2=5	5+0=5	
26 Mustard	4+7=11	———	1+0=1	1+0=1	2+0=2	
27 Par con		1+0=1	———	0+3=3	0+3=3	0+1=1
28 Storm	3+2=5	1+0=1	0+3=3	———	7+9=16	4+4=8
29 Ge dem	5+0=5	2+0=2	0+3=3	7+9=16	———	6+4=10
30 Ja req			0+1=1	4+4=8	6+4=10	———
31 HW	1+0=1		1+0=1	3+6=9	3+6=9	5+2=7
32 JD	2+0=2	1+0=1	2+2=4	8+8=16	5+6=11	3+7=10
33 T in Naz	0+2=2	0+2=2	2+2=4	1+4=5	4+4=8	3+3=6
34 12 ins	1+0=1		1+5=6	0+3=3	6+7=13	1+1=2
35 John	6+0=6	2+0=2	1+1=2	3+3=6	6+4=10	2+5=7
36 5000	1+2=3	1+1=2	1+4=5	4+12=16	11+10=21	5+4=9

	31 HW	32 JD	33 T in Naz	34 12 ins	35 John	36 5000
1 Temp		1+2=3		2+0=2	1+2=3	1+4=5
2 Pro Gal	1+0=1	2+1=3	1+2=3	2+3=5	3+3=6	0+2=2
3 4 called	1+0=1	7+2=9	5+1=6	1+3=4	3+1=4	4+3=7
4 C dem	1+2=3	1+5=6	4+5=9	4+3=7	4+3=7	2+3=5
5 S's m-in-l	0+2=2	8+7=15	5+1=6	1+0=1	3+4=7	0+4=4
6 H at S's	1+1=2	3+3=6	1+2=3	3+3=6	2+1=3	1+4=5
7 J4 in d		3+2=5	2+3=5	4+9=13	1+1=2	2+10=12
8 Leper h	3+7=10	4+7=11	2+2=4	7+2=9	1+3=4	6+6=12
9 Para h	6+7=13	8+11=19	4+10=14	5+2=7	6+2=8	6+5=11
10 L called	2+1=3	1+4=5	2+3=5	1+3=4	0+2=2	3+5=8
11 Sinners	3+1=4	2+6=8	3+7=10	3+1=4	3+2=5	2+4=6
12 Fasting	2+0=2	1+1=2	1+4=5	1+1=2	3+2=5	3+2=5
13 Plucking		3+3=6	5+5=10	5+1=6	2+2=4	4+3=7
14 H con	3+2=5	3+5=8	5+7=12	2+0=2	4+0=4	2+2=4
15 H by bo	5+3=8	1+3=4	4+2=6	4+3=7	3+1=4	4+3=7
16 12 app	1+0=1	6+3=9	6+1=7	7+7=14	6+1=7	3+6=9
17 Beelz	2+1=3	7+5=12	3+10=13	8+3=11	6+3=9	5+4=9
18 D fam	2+1=3	2+3=5	2+4=6	3+3=6	3+3=6	4+5=9
19 T from bo	1+1=2	0+2=2	2+2=4	2+2=4	0+1=1	6+4=10
20 S on gr	2+0=2	1+0=1	2+2=4	3+0=3	3+0=3	2+2=4
21 Why par	7+0=7	5+1=6	2+1=3	4+5=9	4+0=4	5+3=8
22 Par exp	1+1=2	2+1=3	2+2=4	3+2=5	2+0=2	3+3=6
23 Lamp	1+0=1		1+2=3	1+0=1	3+0=3	
24 Measure	2+1=3	1+0=1	2+2=4	3+1=4	3+0=3	3+1=4
25 S in sec	1+0=1	2+0=2	0+2=2	1+0=1	6+0=6	1+2=3
26 Mustard		1+0=1	0+2=2		2+0=2	1+1=2
27 Par con	1+0=1	2+2=4	2+2=4	1+5=6	1+1=2	1+4=5
28 Storm	3+6=9	8+8=16	1+4=5	0+3=3	3+3=6	4+12=16
29 Ge dem	3+6=9	5+6=11	4+4=8	6+7=13	6+4=10	11+10=21
30 Ja req	4+2=6	3+7=10	4+3=7	1+1=2	2+5=7	5+4=9
31 HW	———	7+7=14	3+2=5	3+1=4	6+0=6	7+3=10
32 JD	7+7=14	———	7+7=14	6+2=8	9+7=16	4+8=12
33 T in Naz	3+2=5	7+7=14	———	7+3=10	4+4=8	4+2=6
34 12 ins	3+1=4	6+2=8	7+3=10	———	4+1=5	10+8=18
35 John	6+0=6	9+7=16	4+4=8	4+1=5	———	4+6=10
36 5000	7+3=10	4+8=12	4+2=6	10+8=18	4+6=10	———

Longer Unit Result Chart

Longer Unit Result Chart

# //s Unit	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1	15	7	7	3	1	2																		
2	6	7	9	7	3	2	1																	
3	7	6	3	3	5	4	1	1	2	1	1	1												
4	3	5	6	5	2	1	2	4	2	1			1	1			1		1					
5	8	4	6	4	6	1	2	2	1							1								
6	6	4	10	4		2	3	4	1	1														
7	5	5	5	4	4	5	3	2					1	1										
8	7	2	2	5	6	3	2	2		1	2	1	1				1							
9			3	3	3	2	2	3	5	2	2	1		1	1	2	2		1	1				1
10	9		6	4	2	3	3	2	4	1	1													
11		2	6	9	5	3	2	1	1	2	1				1	1	1							
12	6	5	8	4	3	4	1	2		1				1										
13	6	5	3	5	4	1	2	2	1		2	2		1	1									
14	3	4	7	3	7	2	1	1	3	1		1	1				1							
15	1	5	6	2	7	1	2	4	3	1	1		1					1						
16	3	8	7	4		2	3	3	1	2		1			1									
17			1	5	4	9	1	2	3	2	1	3	1	1			1							1
18	1	3	7	6	2	5	6	1	2	2														
19	6	5	8	3	4	2	2	1	1	2	1													
20	9	8	3	5	4	2		1		1	1										1			
21	1	4	7	7	4	5	3	2	1	1														
22	6	7	5	3	5	3	2	1		2											1			
23	16	3	6	4	3	3																		
24	14	3	1	7	7	1	1	1																
25	4	6	7	4	3	5	1	1	1	2		1												
26	10	5	9	3	4	1				1	1	1												
27	6	6	9	5	4	2	1	2																
28	4	2	3	5	1	6	5	2	1	1				1		1	3							
29	2	1	3	1	4	2	2	1	7	1	2	2		1			2	1	2			1		
30	8	5	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	1	2													

# //s Unit	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
31	4	6	6	5	2	2	2	1	1	2	2			1	1									
32	1	3	3	3	2	3	4		3	2	1	2	2		2	1	2			1				
33	1		2	4	6	5	5	2	2	1	3		1	1	2									
34	1	3	4	2	6	3	4	3	1	2	1	1		2	1				1					
35		1	5	5	6	3	5	4	2	1	2						1							
36	1		2	1	4	5	3	3	2	4	3	1	3				1		1			1		
Total	180	140	188	150	134	108	80	64	54	42	30	18	12	12	10	6	16	2	6	2	2	2		2
Unit pairs	90	70	94	75	67	54	40	32	27	21	15	9	6	6	5	3	8	1	3	1	1	1		1
≥	630	540	470	376	301	234	180	140	108	81	60	45	36	30	24	19	16	8	7	4	3	2		1
% ≥	100	85 .71	74 .60	59 .68	47 .78	37 .14	28 .57	22 .22	17 .14	12 .86	9 .52	7 .14	5 .71	4 .76	3 .81	3 .02	2 .54	1 .27	1 .11	.63	.48	.32		.16
# //	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23

Bibliography

"Soul." Pages 599--600 in vol. 2 of *Dictionary of Judaism in the Biblical Period: 450 B.C.E. to 600 C. E.* Edited by William Scott Green and Jacob Neusner. 2 vols. New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1996.

Achtemeier, Paul J., *Jesus and the Miracle Tradition*. Eugene, Ore.: Cascade, 2008.

Achtemeier, Paul J. "The Lucan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 547--62.

Achtemeier, Paul J. "Miracles and the Historical Jesus: A Study of Mark 9:14--29." Pages 117--40 in *Jesus and the Miracle Tradition*. Eugene, Ore.: Cascade, 2008. Repr. from Catholic Bible Quarterly 37 (1975): 471--91.

Achtemeier, Paul J. "Toward the Isolation of the Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89 (1970): 265--91.

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, *The Greek New Testament*. 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2000.

Albright, William Foxwell and C. S. Mann, *Matthew*. The Anchor Bible 26. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971.

Alexander, Loveday. "Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels." Pages 71--105 in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.

Alexander, Patrick H., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999.

Allison, Dale C. "The Structure of the Sermon on the Mount." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 423--45.

Amodio, Mark, *Writing the Oral Tradition: Oral Poetics and Literate Culture in Medieval England*. Poetics of Orality and Literacy. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2004.

Anderson, Graham, *Philostratus, Biography and Belles Lettres in the Second Century A.D.* London: Croom Helm, 1986.

Arav, Rami. "Hermon, Mount." Pages 158--60 in vol. 3 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday. 1992.

Arndt, William, *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. Saint Louis: Concordia, 1956.

Astour, Michael C. "Melchizedek (Person)." Pages 684--86 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Aus, Roger David. "Three *Pillars* and Three Patriarchs: A Proposal Concerning Gal 2:9." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70 (1979): 252--61.

Bailey, K. E. "Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels." *Asia Journal of Theology* 5 (1991): 34--54.

Bailey, K. E. "Middle Eastern Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels." *Expository Times* 106 (1995): 563--67.

Bain, Lee J. and Max Engelhardt, *Introduction to Probability and Mathematical Statistics*. Boston: Duxbury, 1987.

Barclay, C. R. "Schematization of Autobiographical Memory." Pages 82--99 in *Autobiographical Memory*. Edited by David C. Rubin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Barrett, C. K., *The Acts of the Apostles: A Shorter Commentary*. London: T & T Clark, 2002.

Barry, Peter, *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Barth, Gerhard. "Glaube und Zweifel in den Synoptischen Evangelien." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 72 (1975): 269-92.

Barton, John. "Form Criticism: Old Testament." Pages 838--41 in vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Bassett, Samuel Eliot, *The Poetry of Homer*. Sather Classical Lectures 15. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1938.

Bauckham, Richard ed. *The Gospels for all Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.

Bauckham, Richard, *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage*. New Testament Readings. London: Routledge, 1999.

Bauckham, Richard, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006.

Bauer, Walter, William Arndt, Frederick W. Danker, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Baumann, R. and C. L. Briggs. "Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Culture." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19 (1990): 59--88.

Beare, Francis Wright, *The Gospel According to Matthew: Translation, Introduction, and Commentary*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1981.

Best, Ernest, *Disciples and Discipleship: Studies in the Gospel According to Mark*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986.

Best, Ernest, *Mark: The Gospel as Story*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1983.

Betz, Hans Dieter, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "Paul." Pages 186--201 in vol. 5 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

Beyer, Hermann W. "επισκεπτομαι." Pages 599--602 in vol. 2 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Beyer, Klaus, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Black, Matthew, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts with an Appendix on The Son of Man*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

Blank, Reiner, *Analyse und Kritik der formgeschichtlichen Arbeiten von Martin Dibelius und Rudolf Bultmann*. Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1981.

Blomberg, Craig. "The Structure of 2 Corinthians 1--7." *Criswell Theological Review* 4 (1989): 3--20.

Bluman, Allan G., *Probability Demystified*. Demystified Series. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2005.

Bock, Darrell L., *Luke*. 2 vols. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 3. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1994.

Boobyer, G. H. "The Eucharistic Interpretation of the Miracles of the Loaves in St. Mark's Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 3 (1952): 161--71.

Bornkamm, Günther. "Pneuma Alalon." Pages 6--34 in *Gesammelte Aufsätze, Band V: Geschichte und Glaube, Zweiter Teil*. Edited by Günther Bornkamm. Beiträge zur

evangelischen Theologie; theologische AbhandlungenBeiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 53. München: Kaiser, 1971.

Bousset, Wilhelm, *Kyrios Christos: A history of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970.

Bovon, François, *Luke: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1--9:50*. Translated by Christine M. Thomson. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2002.

Bowersock, G. W. "Introduction." Pages 9--22 in *Life of Apollonius: Translated by C. P. Jones: Edited, Abridged, and Introduced by G. W. Bowersock*. Penguin Classics. Hamondsworth, Eng.: Penguin, 1970.

Bowie, Ewen Lyall. "Apllonius of Tyana." Pages 1653--99 in vol. 16.2 of *Aufstieg und Niedergan der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kulture Roms im Spiegel der neureren Forschung*. Part 2, *Principat*. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.

Bowman, John, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah*. Volume 8. Studia post-biblica. Leiden: Brill, 1965.

Brodie, Thomas L., *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings*. New Testament Monographs 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2004.

Brodie, Thomas L. "Luke the Literary Interpreter: Luke-Acts as a Systematic Rewriting and Updating of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative." PhD diss., Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas, 1981.

Brodie, Thomas L. "Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament. Luke 7.11--17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17.17--24." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 247-67.

Brooke, George J. "Melchizedek (11QMelch)." Pages 687--88 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Bruce, F. F., *Men and Movements in the Primitive Church: Studies in Early non-Pauline Christianity*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1979.

Budesheim, Thomas L. "Jesus and the Disciples in Conflict with Judaism." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 62 (1971): 190--209.

Bultmann, Rudolf Karl, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Rev. ed. New York,: Harper & Row, 1968.

Bultmann, Rudolf Karl, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Burridge, Richard A., *What are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Burtchaell, James Tunstead, *From Synagogue to Church: Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Buss, Martin J., *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 274. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Busse, Ulrich, *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus: die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas*. Volume 24. Forschung zur Bibel. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977.

Byrskog, Samuel. "A New Perspective on the Jesus Tradition: Reflections on James D. G. Dunn's *Jesus Remembered*." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (2004): 459--71.

Byrskog, Samuel, *Story as History - History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 123. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Casey, Maurice. "*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in the Earliest Church*." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27, no. 1 (2004): 83--96.

Casson, Lionel, *Travel in the Ancient World*. Toronto: Hakkert, 1974.

Chung, Kai Lai, *Elementary Probability Theory with Stochastic Processes*. 3d ed. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. New York: Springer, 1979.

Clark, David J. "Criteria for Identifying Chiasm." *Linguistica Biblica* 35 (1975): 63--72.

Clements, R. E., *Ezekiel*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

Collins, Adela Yarbro, *The Beginning of the Gospel: Probings of Mark in Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Collins, Adela Yarbro, *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Conybeare, F. C., *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana, the Epistles of Apollonius and the Treatise of Eusebius*. London: W. Heinemann, 1912.

Conzelmann, Hans, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Conzelmann, Hans, *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James A. Limburg, Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Cranfield, C. E. B., *The Gospel According to Saint Mark: An Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Creed, John Martin, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: Macmillan, 1930.

Cross, Frank Moore, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Crossan, John Dominic, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately after the Execution of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999.

Crossley, James G. "*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 56 (2005): 118--20.

Culpepper, R. Alan, *Mark*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary 20. Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2007.

Dart, John, *Decoding Mark*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003.

Davids, P. "The Gospels and Jewish Traditions: Twenty Years after Gerhardsson." Pages 75--99 in *Gospel Perspectives*. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels 1. Sheffield: JSOT, 1980.

Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.

Day, John, *God's Conflict with the Dragon and the Sea: Echoes of a Canaanite Myth in the Old Testament*. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Day, John. "Leviathan." Pages 295--96 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Day, John, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*. Volume 265. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Deppe, Dean B. "Jesus Remembered." *Calvin Theological Journal* 40 (2005): 335--36.

Descartes, René, *The Essential Descartes*.Edited by Margaret Dauler Wilson. New York: New American Library, 1969.

Dewey, Joanna. "The Gospel of Mark as an Oral-Aural Event: Implications for Interpretation." Pages 145--163 in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Edited by Edgar V. McKnight and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1994.

Dewey, Joanna. "The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2:1--3:6." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 394--401.

Dewey, Joanna, *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1--3:6*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1979.

Dibelius, Martin, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. 2nd rev. ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1933.

Dibelius, Martin, *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf and Martin Dibelius. London: I. Nicholson and Watson, 1934.

Dideberg, D. and P Mourlon Beernaert. "Jésus vint en Galilée." *La nouvelle revue théologique* 98 (1976): 306--23.

Dodd, Brian J. and Ralph P. Martin, *Where Christology Began: Essays on Philippians 2*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

Dodd, C. H., *The Parables of the Kingdom*. Rev. ed. New York: Scribner, 1961.

Dowd, Sharyn Echols, *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22--25 in the Context of Markan Theology*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 105. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1988.

Dubois, Jean-Daniel. "La figure d'Elie dans la perspective lucianienne." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 53 (1973): 167--73.

Dunn, James D. G., *The Acts of the Apostles*. Narrative Commentaries. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996.

Dunn, James D. G. "Altering the Default Setting: Re-Envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 139--75.

Dunn, James D. G., *Jesus Remembered*. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003.

Dunn, James D. G. "The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem According to Galatians 1 and 2." *New Testament Studies* 28 (1982): 461--78.

Easton, Burton Scott, *The Gospel before the Gospels*. New York: Scribner, 1928.

Eddy, Paul R. and Gregory A. Boyd, *The Jesus Legend: A Case for the Historical Reliability of the Synoptic Jesus Tradition*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2007.

Edersheim, Alfred, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Repr. Repr. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1971.

Ellis, E. Earle, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays*. Paperback ed. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 18. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans, 1978.

Ellis, E. Earle. "The Synoptic Gospels and History." Pages 49--57 in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. New Testament Tools and Studies 28.2. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Ernst, Josef, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Regensburger Neues Testament 2. Regensburg: Pustet, 1981.

Evans, Michael and Jeffrey Seth Rosenthal, *Probability and Statistics: the Science of Uncertainty*. New York: W. H. Freeman, 2004.

Fay, G. "Introduction to Incomprehension: The Literary Structure of Mark 4:1--34." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 65--72.

Fee, Gordon D., *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007.

Fenton, J. C., *Saint Matthew*. London: SCM, 1977.

Fentress, James and Chris Wickham, *Social Memory*. New Perspectives on the Past. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Ferguson, Everett. "Apollonius of Tyana." Page 81 of *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Edited by Everett Ferguson. 2d ed. New York: Garland. 1999.

Ferguson, John, *The Religions of the Roman Empire*. Aspects of Greek and Roman Life. London: Thames & Hudson, 1970.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *The Acts of the Apostles*. The Anchor Bible 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. 2 vols. The Anchor Bible 28--28A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Flinterman, J.-J., *Power, Paidea and Pythagoreanism: Greek Identity, Conceptions of the Relationship between Philosophers and Monarchs and Political Ideas in Philostratus's Life of Apollonius* Dutch Monographs on Ancient History and Archaeology 13. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1995.

Foley, John Miles. "What's in a Sign." Pages 1--27 in *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. Edited by E. Anne Mackay. Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava Supplementum 188. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Fowler, Robert M., *Loaves and Fishes: The Feeding Stories in the Gospel of Mark*. Volume 54. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1981.

Fox, Michael V. "The Rhetoric of Ezekiel's Vision of the Valley of the Bones." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 51 (1980): 1--15.

Fraenkel, Jonah. "Chiasmus in Talmudic-Aggadic Narrative." Pages 183--97 in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*. Edited by John W. Welch. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981. Repr. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999.

Frankemölle, Hubert, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi: Studien zur Form- und Traditionsgeschichte des Evangeliums nach Matthäus*. Neutestamentliche Apokryphen 10. Münster: Aschendorff, 1974.

Friberg, Timothy, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller, *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Victoria, B.C.: Trafford, 2005.

Fuller, Reginald Horace. "The choice of Matthias." *Studia evangelica: Texte und Untersuchungen* 6: 112 (1973): 140--46.

Fuller, Reginald Horace, *Interpreting the Miracles*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Furnish, Victor Paul, *2 Corinthians*. The Anchor Bible 32A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984.

Gadamer, Hans Georg, *Truth and Historicity*. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1972.

Gathercole, Simon J., *The Pre-Existent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006.

George, Augustin. "Le miracle dans l'oeuvre de Luc." Pages 249--68 in *Les Miracles de Jésus selon le Nouveau Testament*. Edited by Xavier Léon-Dufour. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977.

Gerhardsson, Birger, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961.

Gerhardsson, Birger, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity; With, Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. The Biblical Resource Series. 1961, 1964. Repr. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.

Gerhardsson, Birger, *The Reliability of the Gospel Tradition*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001.

Gillman, John. "Silas." Pages 22--23 in vol. 6 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

Gils, Félix, *Jésus Prophéte d'aprés les Évangiles synoptiques*. Orientalia et biblica lovaniensia 2. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1957.

Gnilka, Joachim, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. 2 vols. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. 2: 1--2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.

Göttsching, Johannes, *Apollonius von Tyana*. Leipzig: M. Hoffmann, 1889.

Graf, F. "Maximos von Aigai: Ein Beitrag zur Überlieferung über Apollonios von Tyana." 27--28 (1984--85).

Grant, Robert McQueen, *The Apostolic Fathers: A New Translation and Commentary*. 6 vols. New York: Nelson, 1964.

Greenberg, Moshe, *Ezekiel 21--37: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 22A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Grundmann, Walter, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 2d ed. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.

Grundmann, Walter, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 2. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962.

Guelich, Robert A., *Mark 1--8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary 34A. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989.

Gundry, Robert Horton, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993.

Gundry, Robert Horton, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994.

Haenchen, Ernst, *The Acts of the Apostles, A Commentary*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Halbwachs, Maurice, *The Collective Memory*. Translated by Francis J. Ditter and Vida Yazdi Ditter. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.

Halbwachs, Maurice, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1952.

Halbwachs, Maurice, *On Collective Memory*. Translated by Lewis A. Coser. Heritage of Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Halpern, Baruch. "The Ritual Background of Zechariah's Temple Song." *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 40 (1978): 167--90.

Harris, Murray J. "'The Dead Are Restored to Life': Miracles of Revivification in the Gospels." Pages 295--326 in *The Miracles of Jesus*. Edited by David Wenham and Craig Blomberg. Gospel Perspectives 6. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Press, 1986.

Hatfield, Gary C., *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Descartes and the Meditations*. Routledge Philosophy Guidebooks. London: Routledge, 2003.

Head, Peter M. "The Role of Eyewitnesses in the Formation of the Gospel Tradition: A Review Article of Samuel Byrskog, Story as History---History as Story." *Tyndale Bulletin* 52, no. 2 (2001): 275--94.

Held, Heinz Joachim. "Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten." Pages 171--192 in *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*. 6 ed. Edited by Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament I. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verl., 1970.

Hengel, Martin, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM, 2000.

Hengel, Martin, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

Hengel, Martin, *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995.

Hengel, Martin and Anna Maria Schwemer, *Paul between Damascus and Antioch: The Unknown Years*. Translated by John Bowden. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Hill, Craig C. "Acts 6:1--8:4." Pages 129--53 in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Hill, Craig C., *Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Hollenback, Jess Byron, *Mysticism: Experience, Response, and Empowerment*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.

Holmes, Michael W., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1999.

Hooker, Morna Dorothy, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.

Horbury, William. "*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*." *Journal of Theological Studies* 56 (2005): 531--39.

Horsley, Richard A., *Galilee: History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity, 1995.

Hurtado, Larry W. "Devotion to Jesus and Historical Investigation: A Grateful, Clarifying, and Critical Response to Professor Casey." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27, no. 1 (2004): 97--104.

Hurtado, Larry W., *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006.

Hurtado, Larry W. "First Century Jewish Monotheism." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 71 (1998): 3--26.

Hurtado, Larry W., *How on Earth did Jesus Become a God?: Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005.

Hurtado, Larry W., *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003.

Hurtado, Larry W., *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Incigneri, Brian J., *The Gospel to the Romans: The Setting and Rhetoric of Mark's Gospel*. Biblical Interpretation Series 65. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Jaffee, Martin S., *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE-400 CE*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Jeremias, Joachim, *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by S. H. Hooke. Rev. ed. New Testament Library. London: SCM, 1963.

Jeremias, Joachim, *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by S. H. Hooke. 3rd rev. ed. London: SCM, 1972.

Jewett, Robert, *A Chronology of Paul's Life*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Johnson, Brian D. "Story as History, History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History." *Evangelical Quarterly* 76 (2004): 75--77.

Johnson, Luke Timothy, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 39. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.

Jones, Christopher P. "Introduction." Pages 1--30 in volume 16 of *Life of Apollonius*. Edited by Christopher P. Jones. Loeb Classical Library 16--17. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Kelber, Werner H. "The Case of the Gospels: Memory's Desire and the Limits of Historical Criticism." *Oral Tradition* 17 (2002): 55--86.

Kelber, Werner H., *The Oral and the Written Gospel: the Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Kelber, Werner H. "Story as History, History as Story: the Gospel Tradition of Ancient Oral History." *Journal of Religion* 82, no. 2 (2002): 270--74.

Kertelge, Karl, *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium: eine redaktions-geschichtliche Untersuchung*. München,: Kösel-Verlag, 1970.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean, *Conflict in Mark: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Kittel, G. "Die stellung des Jakobus zum Judentum und Heidenchristentum." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 31 (1931): 145--57.

Klein, Günter, *Die zwölf Apostel: Ursprung und Gehalt einer Idee*. Göttingen,: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.

Klostermann, Erich, *Das Matthäusevangelium*. 2d completely rev. ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 4. Tübingen: Mohr, 1927.

Koch, Dietrich-Alex, *Die Bedeutung der Wundererzählungen für die Christologie des Markusevangeliums*. Volume 42. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975.

Kollmann, Bernd, *Jesus und die Christen als Wundertäter: Studien zu Magie, Medizin und Schamanismus in Antike und Christentum*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 170. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Koskenniemi, Erkki, *Apollonios von Tyana in der neutestamentlichen Exegese: Forschungsbericht und Weiterführung der Diskussion*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2:61. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994.

Koskenniemi, Erkki, *Der philostrateische Apollonios*. Commentationes humanarum litterarum 94. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1991.

Koskenniemi, Erkki. "The Function of the Miracle Stories in Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii Tyanenesis*." in *Wonders Never Cease: The Purpose of Narrating Miracle Stories in the New Testament and its Religious Environment*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte. European Studies on Christian Origins/Library of New Testament Studies 288. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

Kosmala, Hans. "Form and Structure in Ancient Hebrew Poetry." *Vetus Testamentum* 14 (1966): 423--445.

Kramer, Samuel Noah, *Sumerian Mythology: A study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B.C.* Rev. ed. New York: Harper, 1961.

Kümmel, Werner Georg, *Introduction to the New Testament*. 14th rev. ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.

Lambrecht, Jan. "De vijf parables van Mc. 4. Structuur en theologie van de parabelrede." *Bijdragen* 29 (1968): 45--48.

Lambrecht, Jan, *Once More Astonished: The Parables of Jesus*. New York: Crossroad, 1981.

Lambrecht, Jan. "Redaction and Theology in Mk. IV." Pages 303--304 in *L'Évangile selon Marc: Tradtion et rédaction*. Edited by M. Sabbe. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Iovaniensium. Leuven: Leuven University, 1969.

Lampe, Peter, *Die stadtrömische Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderte*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 18. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.

Lane, William L., *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Latourelle, René, *The Miracles of Jesus and the Theology of Miracles*. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Lindars, Barnabas. "Elijah, Elisha, and the Gospel Miracles." Pages 63--79 in *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and History*. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. London: Cambridge Univesity Press, 1965.

Lohse, E. "χειρ." Pages 413--27 in vol. 9 of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. 10 vols. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1973.

Lord, Albert Bates, *The Singer of Tales*. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 24. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Lührmann, Dieter, *Das Markusevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 3. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.

Lührmann, Dieter, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle: Anhang: Zur weiteren überlieferung der Logienquelle*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 33. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.

Lund, Nils Wilhelm, *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in Formgeschichte*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.

Luz, Ulrich, *Matthew 8--20*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

Luz, Ulrich, *Matthew: A Commentary*. 3 vols. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.

Malina, Bruce J. and Jerome H. Neyrey. "Honour and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediteraranean World." Pages 25--65 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.

Maloney, Elliott C., *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 51. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981.

Mann, C. S., *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 27. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1986.

Marcus, Joel, *Mark 1--8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 27A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

Marshall, Christopher D., *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Marshall, I. Howard, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978.

Martyn, J. Louis, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Matthews, Christopher R. "Story as History, History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121 (2002): 175--77.

McRay, John, *Archaeology and the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1991.

Meier, John P. "The Circle of Twelve: Did it Exist During Jesus' Public Ministry?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997): 635--72.

Meier, John P., *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. 3 vols. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1991--2001.

Meyer, Ben F., *Critical Realism and the New Testament*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 17. Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick, 1989.

Meyer, E. "Apollonius von Tyana und die Biographie des Philostratus." *Hermes* 52 (1917): 370--424.

Misztal, Barbara A., *Theories of Social Remembering*. Theorizing Society. Maidenhead, Eng.: Open University Press, 2003.

Moloney, Francis J., *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.

Moore, G. E., *Philosophical Papers*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1959.

Murphy-O'Connor, J., *Paul: A Critical Life*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Myers, Ched, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988.

Naluparayil, Jacob Chacko, *The Identity of Jesus in Mark: An Essay on Narrative Christology*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2000.

Norwood, Gilbert. "Vergil, *Georgics* IV: 453--527." *The Classical Journal* 36 (1941): 354--55??

O'Toole, Robert F., *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts*. Good News Studies 9. Wilmington, Del.: M. Glazier, 1984.

Olsson, Birger and Magnus Zetterholm eds. *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins till 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at the International Conference at Lund University, October 14--17, 2001*. ConBNT 39. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003.

Orr, William F. and James Arthur Walther, *I Corinthians: A New Translation*. Anchor Bible 32. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976.

Pesch, Rudolf, *Das Markusevangelium*. 2 vols. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 2. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1976.

Petzke, Gerd. "Die historische Frage nach den Wundertaten Jesus, dargestellt am Bespiel des Exorcismus Mark IX, 14--29." *New Testament Studies* 22 (1975-76): 180--204.

Petzke, Gerd, *Die Traditionen über Apollonius von Tyana und das Neue Testament*. Studia ad corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

Phillimore, John Swinnerton, *In Honour of Apollonius of Tyana*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1912.

Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Translated by Christopher P. Jones. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library 16--17. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Porter, Stanley E. and Jeffrey T. Reed. "Philippians as a Macro-Chiasm and its Exegetical Significance." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 213--31.

Pryke, E. J., *Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel: A study of Syntax and Vocabulary as Guides to Redaction in Mark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Radday, Yehuda T. "Chiasmus in Hebrew Biblical Hebrew Poetry." Pages 50--117 in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures Analyses, Exegesis*. Edited by John W. Welch. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981. Repr. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999.

Räisänen, Heikki, *The "Messianic Secret" in Mark*. Translated by Christopher Tuckett. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1990.

Riesenfeld, Harald, *The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings: A Study in the Limits of "Formgeschichte."*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1961.

Riesenfeld, Harald, *The Gospel Tradition: Essays*. Translated by E. Margaret Rowley and Robert A. Kraft. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.

Riesner, Rainer, *Jesus als Lehrer: eine Untersuchungen zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 7. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (P. Siebeck), 1981.

Ringgren, Helmer, *Religions of the Ancient Near East*. Translated by John Sturdy. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973.

Robbins, Vernon K. "Form Criticism: New Testament." Pages 841--44 in vol. 2 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Robinson, J. A. "Perspective, Meaning, and Remembering." Pages 199--217 in *Remembering our Past: Studies in Autobiographical Memory*. Edited by David C. Rubin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Robinson, James McConkey, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Hermeneia---A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2000.

Rochais, Gérard, *Les récits de résurrection des morts dans le Nouveau Testament*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Roloff, Jürgen, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus: Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.

Ross, Sheldon M., *A First Course in Probability*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006.

Sanders, E. P., *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Saussure, Ferdinand de, *Writings in General Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Schenke, Ludger, *Die Wundererzählungen des Markusevangeliums*. Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge 5. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesus-überlieferung*. 1919. Repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.

Schoedel, William R. "Ignatius and the Archives." *Harvard Theological Review* 71 (1978): 97--106.

Schoedel, William R., *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

Schoeps, Hans Joachim, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1949.

Schröter, Jens, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte: Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 76. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1997.

Schürmann, Heinz, *Das Lukasevangelium*. 2 vols. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth, *Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation*. New York: Continuum, 2000.

Scott, Steven Richard. "The Binitarian Nature of the *Book of Similtudes*." *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha* 18 (2008): 55--78.

Scramuzza, Vincent Mary and Paul Lachlan MacKendrick, *The Ancient World*. New York: Holt, 1958.

Shiner, Whitney Taylor, *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 2003.

Smith, Robert F. "Chiasm in Sumero-Akkadian." Pages 17--35 in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegisis*. Edited by John W. Welch. Hildersheim: Gerstenberg, 1981. Repr. Provo, Utah: Reseach Press, 1999.

Solmsen, F. "Philostratus (8--12)." 20, no. 1 (1941): 124--77.

Speyer, W. "Zum Bild des Apollonius von Tyana bei Heiden und Christen." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 17 (1974): 47--63.

Spiegel, Gabrielle M., *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 2005.

Standaert, Benoit, *L'Évangile selon Marc: composition et genre littéraire*. Nijmegen: Stichting Studentenpers Nijmegen, 1978.

Stanton, G. N. "Form Criticism Revisited." Pages 13--27 in *What about the New Testament?: Essays in Honour of Christopher Evans*. Edited by Colin Hickling and Morna Dorothy Hooker. London: SCM, 1975.

Stanton, G. N., *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 27. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

Stenger, Werner. "'Die Grundlegung des Evangeliums von Jesus Christus': Zur kompostionellen Struktur des Markusevangeliums." *Linguistica Biblica* 61 (1988): 7--56.

Steudel, Annette. "Melchizedek." Pages 535--37 in vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Stock, Augustine, *Call to Discipleship: A Literary Study of Mark's Gospel*. Good News Studies 1. Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1982.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "'Angels' and 'God': exploring the limits of early Jewish monotheism." Pages 45--70 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. Sproston North. Early Christianity in Context 1/ Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 263. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.

Talbert, Charles H., *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 20. Cambridge, Mass.: Scholars, 1974.

Talbert, Charles H., *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.

Talmon, S. "Oral Transmission and Written Transmission, or the Heard and the Seen Word in Judaism and the Second Temple Periods." Pages 121--158 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Edited by Henry Wansbrough. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 64. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.

Taylor, Vincent, *The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indexes*. London: Macmillan, 1952.

Theissen, Gerd, *The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Theissen, Gerd, *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*. Translated by Francis McDonagh. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Theissen, Gerd and Annette Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.

Theissen, Gerd and Dagmar Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

Thompson, Michael B. "The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation." Pages 49--70 in *The Gospels for all Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998.

Thompson, Willie, *Postmodernism and History*. Theory and History. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Thomson, Ian H., *Chiasmus in the Pauline Letters*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 111. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Tödt, Heinz Eduard, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. New Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.

Travis, S. H. "From Criticism." Pages 153--64 in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

Tuckett, C. M. ed. *The Messianic Secret*. Issues in Religion and Theology 1. London: SPCK, 1983.

van Iersel, B. M. F. "Concentric Structures in Mark 1:14--3:35 (4:1): With Some Observations on Method." *Biblical Interpretation* 3 (1995): 75--98.

van Iersel, B. M. F. "Die wunderbare Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition." *Novum Testamentum* 7 (1964): 167--194.

Vansina, Jan, *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Wachowski, Andy and Larry Wachowski. *The Matrix*. Produced by Joel Silver. United States and Australia: Warner Brothers Pictures, 1999.

Walton, John H., *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2006.

Watson, Wilfred G. E. "Chiastic Patterns in Biblical Hebrew Poetry." Pages 118--168 in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*. Edited by John W. Welch. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981. Repr. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999.

Welch, John W. "Chiasmus in Ancient Greek and Latin Literatures." Pages 250--68 in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*. Edited by John W. Welch. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981.

Welch, John W. ed. *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981.

Welch, John W. "Chiasmus in Ugaritic." Pages 36--49 in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegisis*. Edited by John W. Welch. Hildeshwim: Gerstenberg, 1981. Repr. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999.

Welch, John W. and Daniel B. McKinlay eds. *Chiasmus Bibliography*. Provo, Utah: Research Press, 1999.

Wenham, David, *Paul, Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995.

Whitman, Cedric Hubbell, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig, G. E. M. Anscombe, and G. H. von Wright, *On Certainty*. New York: Harper, 1972.

Wright, N. T., *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. 3 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992--2003.

Wright, N. T., *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Volume 3 of Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Ziesler, *The Epistle to the Galatians*. London: Epworth, 1992.

Zumstein, Jean, *La condition du croyant dans l'évangile selon Matthieu*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 16. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.