JOHN J. R. LEE

Christological Rereading of the Shema (Deut 6.4) in Mark's Gospel

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
533

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

533

John J. R. Lee

Christological Rereading of the Shema (Deut 6.4) in Mark's Gospel

Mohr Siebeck

John J. R. Lee, born 1973; 2004 MDiv; 2010–2012 Appointed Assistant Professor of New Testament, Midwestern Seminary; 2011 Doctor of Philosophy in New Testament, Edinburgh University; 2012–2018 Assistant Professor of New Testament, Midwestern Seminary; since 2018 Associate Professor of New Testament, Midwestern Seminary.

ISBN 978-3-16-152807-1 / eISBN 978-3-16-159819-7
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-159819-7

ISSN 0340-9570 / eISSN 2568-7484
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen, and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

This book is a revised version of my 2011 Edinburgh thesis. I am exceedingly grateful for my supervisors who guided me throughout the writing of the original thesis. For Professor Paul Foster's many incisive comments, his availability to meet with students almost anytime, his prompt feedback on drafts, and his constant encouragement during my doctoral study and even beyond, I cannot thank him enough. I am also deeply thankful to the late Professor Larry Hurtado for his many constructive comments on various portions of the original thesis and, of course, his passion for Mark and New Testament Christology, which is the general subject matter of this book. He will be missed greatly. Additionally, I want to express my gratitude to Dr. Robert Stein, my mentor from Southern Seminary, and Professor Hermann Lichtenberger, host and advisor during my two-semester stay at the Institut für antikes Judentum und hellenistische Religionsgeschichte, Tübingen University, for insights on various parts of the original thesis and the encouragement they each provided.

My privileged study at Edinburgh and two-semester stay at Tübingen would have been impossible without the financial support of many. I am most grateful to Bundang Central Church; Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst; and the Sir Richard Stapley Educational Trust for their scholarship support. My warmest thanks also go to various family members and friends who supported my Ph.D. study financially, most especially my parents, S. S. Lee and M. S. Lim; and my in-laws, G. J. Lee and H. W. Shin.

I want to thank Professor Jörg Frey for accepting this thesis for publication in the WUNT II series. I also express my appreciation for Doctor Henning Ziebritzki and the team at Mohr Siebeck, most especially Tobias Stäbler and Ilse König for their guidance, expertise, and kindness.

The revision of the original thesis was carried out mostly during my sabbatical year in 2018–2019. I am tremendously grateful to President Jason Allen, Provost Jason Duesing, and the Board of Trustees at Midwestern Seminary for allowing me to have a full-year sabbatical leave and for providing an environment where research and scholarship are genuinely promoted and celebrated. During the revision of the original thesis and the preparation of this publication, Daniel Brueske, Jeff Flanagan, and David Dickenson helped me as my research assistants and implemented my requests so effectively. I am highly thankful to

each of them. Daniel Brueske, in particular, has served as my assistant throughout the revision process. I am truly appreciative of his enduring aid.

Many things in my life have changed between the original writing of my doctoral thesis and now. However, the most important things have stayed exactly the same. I am thankful to God for his unchanging love for me in and through his Son, Jesus Christ. I am also thankful to my dear family – my wife, Sunny, and our son, Josh – for their unwavering support, love, and encouragement. It is to them that I dedicate this publication as a small token of my adoration and appreciation.

Kansas City, 2020 John J. R. Lee

Table of Contents

Abbreviations, Citations, and Translations

This book follows the abbreviations in the first edition of *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999). However, in citing secondary sources in footnotes, I provided only the author's surname, a shortened title of the relevant work and the appropriate page number(s), except for the cases where further information is necessary for the reader to locate the pertinent items in the bibliography. For full citation information of secondary sources, please refer to the bibliography at the end of this book. Furthermore, this volume follows the conventions of the WUNT series where they differ from those of *The SBL Handbook of Style*.

Concerning the translation of primary sources, the following editions have been used, unless otherwise noted:

Aristotle: Aristotle. *Aristotle in 23 Volumes,* (trans. J. H. Freese; Medford, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926).

Babylonian Talmud: Jacob Neusner. *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2011.

Corpus Hermeticum: A.-J. Festugière, and A. D. Nock, trans. *Corpus Hermeticum*. Vol. 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1972.

Dead Sea Scrolls: Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1997).

Josephus: Josephus, *Josephus, with English Translation* (trans. H. Thackeray; 10 vols.; The Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958–61).

JPS1917: *JPS Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic Text: A New Translation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1917).

LXE: Lancelot C. L. Brenton, *The English Translation of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament*, (original ASCII edition; BibleWorks 8; DeFuniak Springs, Fla.: FABS International, 1988).

Mishnah: Neusner, Jacob. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1988.

NRSV: *The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments*: *New Revised Standard Version* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1989).

OT Pseudepigrapha: James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, (2 vols.; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983–85).

Philo: Philo, *Philo in Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes)*, (trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker; 12 vols.; The Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927–62).

Quintilian: Quintilian, *Quintilian: With an English Translation*, (ed. H. E. Butler; Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1922).

For the reference to 11QMelch (11Q13), I followed the column and verse divisions reflected in Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg, Jr., and Edward M. Cook, trans., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (New York: HarperOne, 2005).

Concerning the original language text of the Bible, quotations are drawn from the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland text of the Greek New Testament (NA27), from the 5th revised edition of *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), and from Ralphs' edition of *Septuaginta*. These and other original language primary sources are listed in the bibliography according to alphabetical order.

Chapter 1

Introduction

In his short yet influential 1975 essay, Nils A. Dahl identified theology proper as a "neglected factor" in New Testament studies.[1] He was followed by John Donahue, in a 1982 article, who applied Dahl's charge to Markan scholarship specifically.[2] Nearly four decades after Donahue's call, this neglected area still requires attention.[3] Although a few studies have explored Mark's[4] understanding of God,[5] this subject is still neglected compared to other topics within Markan research.[6] There is, in fact, one particularly overlooked motif in research on Markan theology proper, namely, the oneness/uniqueness of God. The neglect of this specific motif is common in Synoptic studies, yet Mark's Gospel appears to be an especially crucial place to explore the issue, not merely because it is the earliest gospel account we possess but also because the Markan Evangelist appears more interested in the "oneness of God" motif than the other

[1] Dahl, "The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology," in idem, *Jesus the Christ*, 153–63. Dahl explains that this neglect originates from the fact that the New Testament at large lacks thematic formulations about God and that most "God" references appear indirectly in the context of addressing other issues – Jesus, the Jews, the Church, salvation, conduct, threats, etc.

[2] Donahue, "Neglected Factor," 563–94. Donahue provides a survey of θεός language in Mark's Gospel, focusing on the "theological" section of Mark 12.13–34, which he regards as suggestive for Mark's view of Christology and of discipleship.

[3] Cf. Smith, "The Theology of the Gospel of Mark," 1–5.

[4] "Mark" will be used as a designation for the Second Gospel or its author, depending on context.

[5] See Smith, "The Theology of the Gospel of Mark"; Danove, *The Rhetoric of the Characterization of God, Jesus, and Jesus' Disciples in the Gospel of Mark*; "The Narrative Function of Mark's Characterization of God," 12–30; Neyrey, *Render to God*, 1–43; Driggers, *Following God through Mark*; Guttenberger, *Gottesvorstellung*. Refer also to the works mentioned in Hurtado, *God in New Testament Theology*, 18–20. These studies illustrate the necessity for the present volume; while offering an investigation into Mark's theology proper, they spend little time considering the question of the function and significance of the one-God language in the gospel and its relation to the portrait of Jesus, as attempted in this book.

[6] For a bibliography of Markan studies, see Telford, *Writing on the Gospel of Mark*. For a recent literature review of Markan studies, see Breytenbach, "Current Research on the Gospel according to Mark." For a survey of Jesus' identity in Markan studies, see Johansson, "The Identity of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark."

Synoptists.[7] He alone records the "monotheistic" declaration of the Shema,[8] with Mark 12.29 (cf. v. 32) as the only place throughout the entire New Testament that explicitly quotes the "one-God" call of Deut 6.4.[9]

Although different Markan commentaries have offered some insights on the one-God motif, a coherent, integrated study on the topic is surprisingly lacking. Donahue and his small group of "followers" in Markan scholarship have not probed this topic despite their commitment to studying the "God" of Mark's Gospel. This phenomenon is rather strange considering the central place that allegiance to the God of Israel maintained within Second Temple Judaism and, particularly for our discussion, within first-century Judaism, which served as a crucial background for Mark's Gospel.[10] A number of studies, including those of Bauckham, Hurtado, and Dunn, have been undertaken on the nature of "monotheism" in the Second Temple era, especially in relation to Christian origins.[11] Nevertheless, none of these studies focus on the one-God language in the Synoptic Gospels nor, as regards our particular interest, in Mark's Gospel.[12] There are, however, a few other studies more closely related to the

[7] I follow the scholarly near consensus of Markan priority in this study. Additionally, I oppose the idea that the Gospel of Thomas was written earlier than the canonical gospels. On the latter point, see, e.g., the helpful discussion in Evans, *Mark*, xxx–xliii.

[8] Concerning the definition of the term "monotheism" or its adjectival form "monotheistic," see my discussion in chap. 2.

[9] Marcus argues that the Shema is implicit in 2.7 and 10.18 based on the use of εἷς (not μόνος as in Luke 5.21, which is more natural) with ὁ θεός, corresponding to the same combination in Deut 6.4 (LXX). The Matthean parallel (9.3) lacks the explicit one-God language. See Marcus, "Authority," 196–211 (197–98). Refer also to Gnilka, "Zum Gottesgedanken in der Jesusüberlieferung," 151; Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2:138–39; Guttenberger, *Gottesvorstellung*, 311.

[10] For the prominence of monotheistic concerns in Second Temple Judaism, see my discussion in chap. 2.

[11] See Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, chap. 1; Hurtado, *One God, One Lord*; *Lord Jesus Christ*; *Ancient Jewish Monotheism and Early Christian Jesus-Devotion*; Dunn, *Christology in the Making*; Stuckenbruck and North (eds.), *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*; Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology*; Newman, Davila, and Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*; Wright, *New Testament and the People of God*, esp. 244–79. For more works on the issue, see my discussion in chapter 2.

The use of the terms (a) "Christians" (cf. Acts 11.26), (b) "(early) Christianity," and (c) the adjective "Christian" presents the risk of anachronism. These terms are used in this study simply in reference to (a) the believers of Jesus, (b) their devotion to Jesus, which combines their religious beliefs and acts, and (c) their characteristics – without necessarily assuming that Jews and Christians were already two clearly distinct groups by the time of the composition of Mark's Gospel.

[12] For a treatment of the theme in John's Gospel, see Appold, *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. For that in Paul, see Calvert-Koyzis, *Paul, Monotheism and the People of God*; Rainbow, "Monotheism and Christology"; Waaler, *The Shema and the First Com-*

motif of God's oneness/uniqueness in Mark's Gospel, which I will discuss in the following section of literature review.

1.1 History of Research

1.1.1 J. P. McIlhone, "'The Lord Your God Is One': A Redaction Critical Analysis of Mark 12:28–34" (1987)

McIlhone, in his unpublished Ph.D. dissertation from Marquette University, "'The Lord Your God Is One'" (1987), explores Mark's emphasis on the oneness of God in 12.28–34 by combining redactional methods and computer-based analysis of "linguistic density plots."[13] He argues that the Evangelist composed 12.28–34 specifically to highlight monotheism. Against Jewish skepticism, the Evangelist defended his community's understanding of Jesus' divinity by employing the Shema (12.28–34) and by presenting Jesus on par with the God of the Shema (2.5b–10; 10.17–27).

While McIlhone's dissertation includes fine exegetical comments on some of the arguments presented here (e.g., the importance of the Shema at 2.1–12; 10.17–22; 12.28–34), he leaves untouched significant exegetical breakthroughs that are crucial for more fully appreciating Mark's Shema. McIlhone does not give serious attention to the connectivity between 12.28–34 and 12.35–37.[14] An integrated reading of 12.28–34 and 12.35–37 is fitting due to the way these passages collocate two important texts for early Christian circles (Deut 6.4 [cf. Mark 12.29] and Ps 110 [Mark 12.36]). The deliberate collocation of these texts redefines monotheism. By contrast, McIlhone views 12.35–37 as a separate section from 12.28–34.[15]

Additionally, McIlhone does not closely examine the relationship between Mark's "monotheistic" language and his overall christological portrait as is investigated in chapter 5 of this study. Due to McIlhone's limited treatment in this regard, his discussion of the Markan Shema remains fragmentary and does not integrate other elements contained in the Evangelist's christologically-oriented narrative.[16]

---

mandment; Bruno, *'God is One'*. Cf. Staudt, *Der eine und einzige Gott*, which discusses monotheistic rhetoric in the New Testament (chap. 7) and in the apostolic fathers (chap. 8).

[13] McIlhone, "'The Lord Your God Is One'," 75. For the discussion of linguistic density plots, see 75–78, 96–108.

[14] For the inseparable connectivity between Mark 12.28–34 and vv. 35–37, see chapter 3 (esp. sections 3.3 and 3.4) below.

[15] McIlhone, "The Lord Your God Is One," 228–29.

[16] The christological orientation of Mark's Gospel is evidenced, for example, in 1.1. Note also the inclusio between 1.10–11 and 15.38–39, which reveals Jesus' true identity by coupling the apocalyptic σχίζω language with the explicit mention of Jesus' divine sonship. For

Moreover, McIlhone's engagement with other scholarly works is limited and, in general, his treatment of the selected monotheistic passages in Mark does not go beyond the general treatments found in commentaries. Furthermore, his dissertation does not reflect the recent developments in studies of "monotheism" in the Second Temple period in relation to early Christianity and its writings, especially the New Testament.[17] Surprisingly, the discussion of Second Temple Jewish monotheism, which provides a primary background for Mark's use of the Shema, is largely lacking. McIlhone includes only a short discussion of some rabbinic sources (see 157–62 of McIlhone's dissertation). From a methodological point of view, McIlhone's dissertation follows traditional redaction-critical analysis, and is overly confident his ability to discern the Evangelist's redactional activities from his traditions. Similarly, his work reflects only a very restricted degree of narrative-critical analysis of Mark's Gospel, an approach that would have helped facilitate a more integrative and holistic reading of Mark's Shema, in particular, and Mark's Gospel, in general.

In view of all these facts, it is difficult to regard McIlhone's 1987 study as a sufficient investigation of the one-God language in the Second Gospel.

1.1.2 G. Guttenberger, Die Gottesvorstellung im Markusevangelium (2004)

Guttenberger's monograph, *Die Gottesvorstellung im Markusevangelium* (2004) explores how Mark presents "God" in his narrative while investigating a number of interesting issues under her designated topical headings, including transcendence/immanence, monotheism/Christology, particularism/universalism, function of God as a ruler/rescuer, and monism/dualism. By utilizing both historical and literary methods, Guttenberger's work on Mark's Gospel takes a commentary-like approach. This wide coverage, however, results in an incomplete treatment on specific topics. In fact, her monograph assigns only limited space to the discussion of the one-God motif in Mark's Gospel while attempting to cover virtually every major passage.

Only chapter 6 of her monograph, which deals with the relationship between monotheism and Christology in Mark, is relevant for this study. Guttenberger limits her discussion to a couple of select issues. First, addressing the issue of "blasphemy" in Mark's Gospel (2.7; 14.64), Guttenberger argues for tension between the idea of monotheism and Jesus' claim for his independent exercise of divine-like authority and goes on to claim that this phenomenon is similar to that found in John's Gospel (5.18; 10.33).

---

the apocalyptic imagery in 1.10–11 and 15.38–39, see Gurtner, "The Rending of the Veil and Markan Christology."

[17] See, e.g., the references to the works of Bauckham, Hurtado, and Dunn among others in chap. 2, passim.

Second, discussing the secrecy motif and the corresponding use of the title "Son of God" in Mark's Gospel, Guttenberger asserts that Jesus' silencing of the demons who confess his divine sonship indicates Mark's hesitancy to address Jesus as "Son of God" for the sake of not violating Jewish monotheism and the First Commandment. Only Gentiles are allowed to use such a designation (e.g., Mark 5.7; 15.39) and, for them, calling Jesus "Son of God" signifies a move toward monotheism.

Guttenberger's latter point, in particular, appears problematic for a few reasons. To begin with, it is not obvious from the text that Mark is hesitant to use the title "Son of God" for Jesus. More-than-implicit language of Jesus' divine sonship as claimed by various figures in the Markan narrative,[18] including Jesus himself (8.38; 13.32; cf. 14.61–62) and God (1.11; 9.7) whose perspectives the Evangelist portrays as authoritative, problematizes Guttenberger's conjecture.[19] Moreover, it seems unlikely that the pagan confession of Jesus as God's Son should be understood in such a "discriminative" sense within Mark's narrative. It does not seem plausible that the title "Son of God" is designated only for pagans in Mark's Gospel. Since the epithet was used with various referents both in Jewish and non-Jewish settings, Guttenberger's suggestion appears to force an artificial contrast between Mark's use of the expression and that of his contemporaries.[20]

---

[18] See Mark 1.11, 3.11, 5.7, 8.38, 9.7, 13.32, 14.61, 15.39.

[19] Demons in Mark's Gospel appear to be rather "faithful" witnesses to Jesus' identity as the Son of God (3.11; 5.7). There is no hint in 3.12 and 5.8 (cf. 1.25) that the preceding demoniac "confession" of Jesus' divine sonship was technically wrong. Ironically, while Jewish leaders and even Jesus' own disciples do not comprehend Jesus' true status and significance, the diabolic spirits appear to recognize the unique identity and authority of Jesus (see also 1.34). Their "confession" serves to accentuate Jesus' unique status and significance within Mark's narrative. In light of this, again, Guttenberger's understanding of Jesus' silencing the demons, who reveal his divine sonship, as due to the Evangelist's monotheistically-grounded reservation, seems unfounded.

Regarding the opening verse, while a majority number of manuscripts include υἱοῦ θεοῦ, early manuscripts (a* Q 28^{c}) omit the phrase. This phenomenon can be explained either as the copyists' unintentional omission or as a later expansion of the "title" of the book. Among commentators, Taylor, Gundry, France, Guelich, Schenke and Trocmé regard υἱοῦ θεοῦ as authentic (also Wasserman, "The 'Son of God' Was in the Beginning"), while Pesch, Marcus, and Collins (also, Head, "A Text-Critical Study of Mark 1.1," 621–29; Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 72–75) do not. Hooker is undecided. While leaving the authenticity of the phrase open, the present writer leans toward its authenticity in light of its strong MSS support (a^{1} B D L *pc* latt sy co; cf. A, which reads τοῦ θεοῦ). Its absence in a* Q 28^{c} can probably be accounted for as an unintentional omission in the transmission of the manuscripts. Whether "Son of God" is authentic or not in Mark 1.1, its prominence is clearly attested throughout the gospel (e.g., 1.11, 3.11, 5.7, 8.38, 9.7, 13.32, 14.61, 15.39). For further discussion of the title, "Son of God," see section 5.2.1 below.

[20] Especially for Jewish examples, see Wis 2.16–20 (applied to wise or righteous individuals; cf. Matt 5.9; Rom 8.14); Gen 6.2; Job 1.6 (to an angelic being); Ps 2.7 (to a Judean

Finally, in Guttenberger's monograph, the Markan Shema quotation (12.29; 12.32) is not an object of serious, focused consideration, nor are other passages which employ the one-God (εἷς + ὁ θεός) language (2.7; 10.18). An exploration of the relevant Second Temple background is largely absent. Although Guttenberger's *Gottesvorstellung* is an important contribution to Markan scholarship and the understanding of Mark's theology proper in general, it is difficult to consider this monograph a detailed study of the topic with respect to its treatment of the one-God language.

1.1.3 Two Minor Studies: J. Marcus, "Authority to Forgive Sins upon the Earth" (1994), and J. Gnilka, "Zum Gottesgedanken in der Jesusüberlieferung" (1994)

There are two shorter studies on the one-God motif in Mark.[21] Marcus, in his, "Authority to Forgive Sins upon the Earth" (1994), which develops his passing note in *The Way of the Lord* (1992),[22] argues for the apologetic function of the Shema in Mark's Gospel (12.29) in an attempt to read it as linked to the portrayal of Jesus' exaltation in the subsequent passage (v. 36; cf. Ps 110.1). According to Marcus, the Evangelist emphasizes the Shema (Mark 12.29) in order to respond to the Jewish charge of "Two Powers"/ditheism.[23] The Second Evangelist replies to the charge by pointing out that Jesus' authority is derived from YHWH and that his exaltation does not violate monotheistic commitment. Therefore, the charge of ditheism proves to be ungrounded.

Although short in length, Marcus' treatment of the Markan Shema is the most relevant to the current study in that he seriously considers the connection between Mark 12.28–34 and vv. 35–37 and the need to interpret these passages in light of each other. I will interact with Marcus' position in detail in chapter 3 (esp. section 3.4.1) and suggest some corrections and refinements. I will argue that the immediate and broader literary context of the Markan Shema (12.29) implies that the Evangelist makes a more accentuated christological claim than what Marcus allows, engaging in an innovative redefinition of the traditional understanding of God's uniqueness by linking Jesus directly and inseparably with God and presenting Jesus on par with God. While Marcus' suggestion will be evaluated closely in chapter 3, one observation can be made in advance: whether Marcus' arguments are persuasive or not, he is limited to

---

king at his coronation); 4Q246 (*Aramaic Apocalypse*), which Hengel notes, in particular, as evidence that "the title 'Son of God' was not completely alien to Palestinian Judaism" (*The Son of God, 44–45 [quotation from 45]).* For discussion on Jewish and pagan backgrounds of the term "Son of God," see Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*.

[21] Marcus, "Authority to Forgive Sins upon the Earth," 196–211; Gnilka, "Zum Gottesgedanken in der Jesusüberlieferung," 144–62.

[22] Marcus, *Way*, 145–46; cf. 134–36.

[23] Marcus' suggestion is adopted by Carlson, "The Shema in Mark," 67–70.

addressing God's oneness in Mark's Gospel in general terms only, due to the brevity and scope of his article.

Gnilka, in his "Zum Gottesgedanken in der Jesusüberlieferung" (1992), writes about the concept of God in the Jesus tradition of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Gnilka argues that while the Synoptic concept of God is rooted in biblical-Judaic soil, it obtains its specific features from the message and the person of Jesus. Thus, it is impossible to speak about God without speaking about Jesus. Although Gnilka's article appears to have a thrust in the right direction in addressing the concept of God in relation to Jesus in the Synoptics, his concise study is focused neither on the one-God language nor on Mark's Gospel. Regarding the motif of the oneness of God in Mark's Gospel, in particular, Gnilka's study provides only a brief introduction.

A survey of the history of research on the "oneness of God" in Mark's Gospel reveals a surprising lack of any substantial analysis and in-depth treatment of the topic. If indeed Mark's Gospel is serious about God in that Jesus is portrayed as Son *of God*[24] and that the central theme of this gospel, arguably, is the kingdom *of God*,[25] and if the "oneness of God" is an essential element in the theology of this first-century account (see Mark 2.7; 10.18; 12.29; 12.32) and its contemporary Jewish literature,[26] then the one-God language in the Second Gospel deserves a more detailed, comprehensive, and systematic treatment. Here, I attempt to engage in a study with a focus, scope, and depth that goes beyond that of the above-reviewed studies.

This study on the one-God language in the Second Gospel can benefit Markan scholarship in several ways. It contributes to the study not only of Mark's theology proper and especially his use of the Shema language in three related passages (2.7; 10.18; 12.28–37) but also of his Christology, since the Second Gospel is a narrative about Jesus (1.1) – though its orientation is, nevertheless, consistently theocentric (see chap. 5.1.2 below). As a result, the relationship between Mark's theology proper and Christology will also be illuminated. Since Christology is a crucial part of Mark's message (1.1), this book will contribute also to a broader discussion on Mark's theology. Moreover, given the discussion of Second Temple Jewish monotheism (chap. 2) as a primary background for appreciating Mark's Shema language (chaps. 3–4), this study offers valuable insights for the oldest written gospel's twenty-first-century readers, whose idea of God's oneness and uniqueness has often

[24] Note also ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ in 1.24.

[25] See Mark 1.14–15 and 4.1–34. Note also the phrase, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ (1.14), which is the only usage of the expression outside the Pauline Epistles (see Rom 1.1; 15.16; 1 Thess 2.2, 8, 9). See also Ladd's chapters on the Synoptic Gospels in idem, *A Theology of the New Testament*, 31–245.

[26] Regarding the prominence of monotheistic concern in first-century Judaism, see my discussion in chap. 2 below.

been formed under the influence of a seventeenth-century definition of "monotheism."[27] The present study aims to provide these noted contributions to Markan scholarship by investigating the function and significance of the Evangelist's monotheistic language via the following methods and strategies.

1.2 Methods and Strategy

The present study will engage Mark's Gospel with one central question – *How is the Shema used and understood in Mark's christologically-shaped narrative* (cf. Mark 1.1)? In order to reach a satisfactory answer to the question, I will make use of composition-critical and narrative-critical analyses in interpreting Mark's Gospel.[28] Furthermore, I will carefully examine the nature of Jewish

[27] For the problem of imposing a post-seventeenth-century understanding of "monotheism," see MacDonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of "Monotheism*," 14–21. Even though MacDonald points out the problems in Old Testament scholarship, his insights can be applied to New Testament scholarship as well. For a nuanced definition of "monotheism" used to describe an aspect of Second Temple Judaism, see the discussion at the beginning of chap. 2 below. Only with a nuanced definition of the term as such, this study will employ the noun "monotheism" and the adjective "monotheistic."

[28] Sinclair notably argues that, in spoken and written discourse, "the whole text is present in each sentence" (idem, *Trust the Text,* 14). What he means by this assertion is not that the reader brings absolutely everything into a sentence, still less the exact wording and nuances from earlier parts of the text. However, while the totality of previous detail may be lacking in the reader's (or audience's) mind, "some form of mental representation of the text so far, the state of the text, must be building up in the mind of a competent reader, and must be available for interpreting the text at any particular point" (ibid.). Thus, it is not the whole text with all its intricacies, but "the previous states of the text … in so far as they are needed" (ibid.) that are brought to the meaning of each new sentence by the reader or audience. Mark's audience, according to such an understanding, would be able to bring a mental representation of the Shema with them from Mark 2.7 to 10.18 and even to 12.29 (cf. v. 32).

With this linguistic framework in mind, one should note that the mental representation here discussed is based on multiple (not a single) factors. The mental representation is carried from Mark 2.7 to 10.18 by the common phrase εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός, which is associated with a question about God's uniqueness in both instances. There is also concern for God's uniqueness in Mark 12.29 (κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστιν; cf. Deut 6.4) and its paragraph in Mark 12.32 (εἷς ἐστιν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ). Even though one might argue that the wording of these two respective monotheistic references in Mark 12 differs from that of 2.7 and 10.18, the mental representation requires only a similar phrase and not necessarily the exact wording. There is a further link between the monotheistic language of 2.7 and that of 12.29, as both are part of a collection of controversy stories (2.7 as part of the collection in 2.1–3.6, and 12.29 as part of the collection in 11.27–12.37). The former controversy collection, located in Galilee, and the latter, situated in Jerusalem, appear to balance each other within Mark's literary structure. Another link may also be established between 10.18 and 12.29 in that both monotheistic references are connected, in their given contexts, to the Decalogue. That is, 10.18 is followed by the social commands of the Decalogue (v. 19) while

"monotheism" in the Second Temple period and the three "monotheistic" references in Mark's Gospel, which employ εἷς along with ὁ θεός (2.7; 10.18; 12.29 [cf. Deut 6.4 LXX]).

1.2.1 Methods

The task of interpreting biblical texts, not least Mark's Gospel, occurs at the intersection of history, theology, and literature.[29] It is, thus, reductionistic to assume a single methodological model is sufficient for such a multi-dimensional task.[30] In order to appreciate Mark's narrative fully, on its own first-century terms, this study will benefit from the insights of composition criticism[31] and narrative criticism.[32] The former will facilitate a historical-

---

12.29 is followed by the requirements to love God (12.30; cf. Deut 6.5) and to love neighbor (Mark 12.31; cf. Lev 19.18) – the double commandment that probably summarizes the Decalogue. For the view that the citation of Deut 6.4–5 in Mark 12.29–30 represents the first half of the Decalogue while the quotation of Lev 19.18 in Mark 12.31 points to the second half, see Allison, "Mark 12:28–31 and the Decalogue," 270–78.

[29] See Telford, "Introduction," 1–61 in idem, *The Interpretation of Mark*, for a brief history of interpretation of the Gospel of Mark. For a sample of various contemporary readings, approaches, and methodologies, see idem, *Writing on the Gospel of Mark*, chap. 2.

[30] Cf. Schneiders, *The Revelatory Text*, chap. 4.

[31] The composition-critical side of redaction criticism (which is, at times, called "composition criticism") reflects an adaptation of traditional redactional analysis. This modified approach values not only modifications/additions made by the Evangelists but also traditions preserved by them, thus engaging a reading that deals with the Gospels and Acts in a more integrative manner than classical redaction criticism. Overall, this adaptation is to be welcomed since an author's emphasis is not determined by the origin of a source he uses in the writing and, relatedly, a change could reflect merely a minor concern on the part of the author. Osborne lists four compositional categories to be considered in addition to traditional redaction analysis: (1) "Structure"; (2) "Intertextual Development"; (3) "Plot"; and (4) "Setting and Style." See Osborne, "Redaction Criticism," 666–67. For a more recent echo of these comments, see Goodacre, "Redaction Criticism," 770.

Although C. C. Black is, at times, referred to as one who has terminated the dominance of redaction-critical methods, he, nevertheless, did not deny the benefits from the insights of redaction criticism. What he attacked was its use as the single, dominant method. Black differentiates "a redaction-critical perspective" from "a cluster of redaction-critical methods" (Black, *The Disciples according to Mark*, 20). On the other hand, it can be pointed out that what Black attacked was a slightly outdated form of redaction criticism since a number of practitioners of the discipline, especially in the United States, were already adopting the insights of composition-critical and literary-critical perspectives, thus engaging a more holistic reading of the text. Cf. Donahue, "Redaction Criticism," 27–57.

[32] The use of narrative-critical methods for interpreting Mark is, at least generally, justified by the fact that the Evangelist wrote a *story* for his audience. For an overview of the history and methodology, see Brown, "Narrative Criticism," 619–24. For more substantial treatments of narrative-critical methods, see the programmatic study by Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, and Markan studies with narrative-critical approaches such as Tannehill, "The

critical and theological reading of the selected passages, while the latter enables an integrated understanding of those passages in view of the story of the Second Gospel as a whole – the macro-text.[33] *The driving force in employing these two methods is to interpret the text as it stands*[34] *and in light of how the original audience would have understood it*. The question of the so-called "Historical Jesus," and the issues related to traditions/sources as well as their transmission are topics for legitimate discussion and cannot and should not be avoided. They are, however, outside the concentration of this study. I limit myself to focus on the issue in the context of one specific early Christian text, Mark's Gospel, as it stands.[35]

1.2.2 Argumentation Strategy

As the title of the book (*Christological Rereading of the Shema [Deut 6.4] in Mark's Gospel*) indicates, the present study explores the question of *how the Shema is used and understood in Mark's Gospel.* The main point to be argued is that, in Mark's Gospel, *the Shema language of Deut 6.4 is not simply reiterated in a traditional sense but is interpreted in a remarkable way that links Jesus directly and inseparably with Israel's unique God*. Such an innovative rereading of the Shema must be viewed within the context of (a)

Disciples in Mark," 386–405; Rhoads, Dewey, and Michie, *Mark as Story*; Malbon, "Narrative Criticism," 29–57; Smith, *A Lion with Wings*. For the unity of Mark's narrative, see Petersen, "'Point of View' in Mark's Narrative"; Tannehill, "The Gospel of Mark as Narrative Christology"; Dewey, "Mark as Interwoven Tapestry."

Regarding the superfluity of too "sophisticated" a narrative method, see Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology,* 9ff. Rowe especially notes that engaging a solid exegesis is more important than following an imposed narrative theory in reading a gospel narratively and in examining critically a term/theme according to the narrative development.

[33] Cf. Perrin, "The Evangelist as Author," 9–10, 15–17, for the validity of combining redaction-critical and literary-critical methods. Perrin argues that, in view of the fact that "the evangelists are genuinely authors," a development of a "general literary criticism," which adopts insights of non-biblical literary approaches, will be indispensable for studying the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (9–10). Perrin specifies that "composition and structure" as well as "protagonists and plots" should be concerned in the use of the general literary criticism (15–17). See also Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* 3; Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels*, 1–13.

[34] For the benefit of reading Mark as it stands now, see, e.g., Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 379: "Many learned attempts … at unscrambling the various elements have revealed the difficulty of the undertaking and the wisdom of reading the text as it now stands in Mark's Gospel and as a literary unit." The comment was made in the context of discussing the historical context of Mark 13 but can be applied to studying Mark's Gospel in general.

[35] By no means do I leave out the textual discussion on Mark's Gospel – I will integrate the discussion, as needed, in this study. On the other hand, I think that the fluidity of the text seems to have been somewhat overemphasized at times (e.g., Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels*) although one should not neglect the factor.

Index of References

Old Testament

Old Testament Apocrypha

Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

New Testament

Dead Sea Scrolls

Targums

Mishnah

Talmud

Other Rabbinical Works

Apostolic Fathers

Ancient Authors

Index of Modern Authors

Index of Subjects