

VU Research Portal

Restoring Mark – Reducing Q? A Note on the Reconstruction of the Original Text of Mark 9:28-29

Smit, P.B.A.

published in

Biblische Notizen
2017

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

document license

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Smit, P. B. A. (2017). Restoring Mark – Reducing Q? A Note on the Reconstruction of the Original Text of Mark 9:28-29. *Biblische Notizen*, 172, 53-64.
https://www.academia.edu/34016761/Restoring_Mark_Reducing_Q_A_Note_on_the_Reconstruction_of_the_Original_Text_of_Mark_9_28_29

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

BN *Biblische Notizen* *Biblical Notes*

Neue Folge. Herausgegeben von Kristin De Troyer und Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer, Salzburg, in Verbindung mit Reinhard Feldmeier und Karin Schöpflin, Göttingen.
Betreut am Fachbereich Bibelwissenschaft und Kirchengeschichte der Paris Lodron Universität Salzburg.

Inhalt

- Mary Katherine Y.H. Hom**, On the Use of עַם־אֲבֹתָיו + וַיִּשְׁכֵּב ... SEITE 3
Tobias Häner, Salomo und das Lied der Lieder SEITE 13
Emanuel Pfoh, Notes on Ethnographic Method ... SEITE 43
Peter-Ben Smit, Restoring Mark – Reducing Q? SEITE 53
Martin Willebrand, Markus mit narratologischer Brille gelesen – *Teil 1* SEITE 65
Mitchell Alexander Esswein, The Οἶκος of the Lord ... SEITE 87
Stefan Bojowald, Eine weitere ägyptisch-akkadische Parallele ... SEITE 111
Alexander Noak, Ein römischer Kaiser als Rächer Asiens – *Teil 2* SEITE 119
Buchvorstellungen SEITE 141

HERDER FREIBURG · BASEL · WIEN

West, G.O., The Historicity of Myth and the Myth of Historicity: Locating the Ordinary African "Reader" of the Bible in the Debate, in: *Neotestamentica* 38 (2004) 127-144.

Whitelam, K.W., The Death of Biblical History, in: Burns, D. / Rogerson, J.W. (eds.), *Far From Minimal: Celebrating the Work and Influence of Philip R. Davies* (LHB/OTS, 484), London 2012, 485-504.

Dr. Emanuel Pfoh
National University of La Plata &
National Research Council (CONICET)
Saavedra 15 – 5to piso
C1083ACA Buenos Aires
Argentina
E-Mail: epfoh@conicet.gov.ar

Restoring Mark – Reducing Q? A Note on the Reconstruction of the Original Text of Mark 9:28-29

Peter-Ben Smit

1. Introduction

Mark 9:28-29 provides the readers with a thematic and spatial conundrum (of which the contours will be outlined below), besides this, it and its (partial) parallels in Mark 11:22-23, Matt 17:20 and 21:21, as well as Luke 17:6 (cf. also 1Cor 13:2, Gos. Thom. 20, 48, 106) constitute, as Derrett has it "a delightful synoptic problem."¹ In this note, a new proposal will be made concerning this problem, in particular by suggesting a new solution for the reconstruction of the original wording of the Markan text. This amounts to arguing that the text found in Mark 9:29 now is secondary and ought to be replaced with a combination of the texts found now in Matt 17:20 and Luke 17:6, which are, in the process, both seen to be variations on the original text of Mark and not as stemming from Q. The basis for this proposal is in narrative and synoptic observations and a redaction-critical proposal involving both the Gospel of Mark and that of Matthew and Luke. Although redaction-criticism plays a role of importance in this paper, the end result will amount to a proposal for an alternative text in this part of the Gospel of Mark.

In the following, first narrative (synchronic) observations on Mark 9:28-29 and its context will be offered, illustrating the incoherence of the current text. Next, a synoptic comparison will provide the basis for redaction-critical considerations, which will show that there is little reason to think that either the Matthean or Lukan text has influenced the Markan text, or that Matthew and Luke knew the Markan text in its present form, but that it is more likely that they had a version of Mark as their source that did not include Mark 9:28-29 in its current (canonical) form. Subsequently and on this basis, a textual proposal, a conjecture, given the lack of manuscript evidence for it, is advanced for the Gospel of Mark, replacing Mark 9:29 with Matt 17:20 / Luke 17:6. The background for the replacement of the

I am grateful to the valuable input of the reviewers of Biblische Notizen and to Mr. Simone Ramacci (Colchester, UK) for proofreading this paper.

¹ Derrett, Mountains, 231. Due to the poor editing of this paper (c.q.: translation from an Italian version?), the solution that Derrett had in mind is not at all clear from its publication; it does seem, however, that he does not consider the textual development as it is proposed here (see Derrett, Mountains, 231).

original contents of Mark 9:29 with what is found there now will be located in charismatic authority and ritual practices of exorcism in the early church.

In doing so, this note moves beyond current research on Mark 9:29 / Matt 17:20, in which typically the three scenarios, as summarized by Luz, cover the extent of proposals for the solution of the textual conundrum in the Markan text and its relation to its Matthean parallel. Luz's three scenarios are (for the entirety of Mark 9:14-29 and its Matthean and Lukan counterpart, albeit with a focus on v.14-27): 1) the independent (and partially parallel) redaction of the current Markan text by both Luke and Matthew, which Luz thinks to be unlikely, given the many *minor agreements* that are hard to explain on the basis of coincidental parallel redaction only, in other words: both must have had a different Markan text at their disposal than the one currently preserved in the New Testament; 2) Matthew and Luke used an older version of the tradition now found in Mark 9:14-29, which did not contain the conversation between Jesus and the father; this tradition may have been oral (Luz thinks that this is possible, but hard to prove);² 3) Luke and Matthew used a redacted version of Mark 9:14-29, which shortened and simplified the Markan text.

With regard to Mark 9:28-29, Luz is of the opinion that, even if one may think of influence both of oral tradition and a redacted version of the Markan narrative now contained in the canon, Matthew redacted the text heavily himself as well, "Vor allem hat er das Mk 9,28f als Anhang überlieferte Jüngergespräch zum eigentlichen Zentrum der Geschichte gemacht."³ A similar set of scenarios is provided by Sterling,⁴ albeit he states that the replacement of Mark 9:29 with a different content in Matt 17:20 is due to the use of a Q tradition, also found in Luke 17:6 (the partial parallel in Gos. Thom. 48 is of lesser relevance, given that although reference is made to moving mountains, what causes it there, reconciliation and peace, differs significantly from the faith mentioned in Matthew and Luke; something analogous applies to the parallel in 1Cor 13:2).

In fact, when surveying the literature on Mark 9:14-29parr., one gets the impression that most energy is spent on arguments concerning Mark 9:14-27parr., with different scenarios being proposed for the interrelationship between the two other synoptic gospels and (different editions of) the

² See also, e.g., the considerations of Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 139-140, who speaks of the Lukan version of Matt 17:20 being influenced by a "Traditions-variante," but without elaborating on this (see also 185-186); he does indicate on 149 that Luke likely moved the saying commenting on the withered fig tree (Mark 11:23) to another place in his Gospel.

³ Luz's considerations, see: Luz, *Evangelium*, 519-520.

⁴ See: Sterling, *Jesus*, 473-474.

Gospel of Mark, while the awkward transition (cf. below) from the body of the healing story to the "indoor" teaching episode is usually attributed to Markan redactional work, the replacement of the Markan text on prayer (and fasting) with a teaching on faith in Matt 17:20 / Luke 17:6 is usually explained on the basis of the use of a tradition stemming from Q in those two gospels. The latter, a position also held by Sterling, is not necessary, however, as will be argued below, as a scenario can also be made plausible in which Matthew and Luke together preserve what is used to be in Mark 9:29.

Thus, without arguing that Matthew and Luke used a "Deutero-Mark" or the like,⁵ or even without engaging the broader redaction history of Mark 9:14-29 and its synoptic parallels, from which the problem at stake here is to some extent separated, given that it concerns a brief episode following the exorcism in Mark 9:14-27,⁶ it is argued here that the original text of Mark for what is now Mark 9:29 differed from its present contents, which, however, have been preserved in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. The redaction-historical framework that is preferred to that of a "Deutero-Mark" (and, as a consequence, an *Urmarkus* to go with it),⁷ is rather one in which the textual history of Mark is the point of departure, which can be well understood by assuming a number of alterations to the original text of Mark (if such a notion is not deemed problematic to begin with), including the various recensions of its ending and also probable glosses that has have become incorporated into the main text by accident or on purpose, like Mark 7:3-4.

At the same time, the proposal that is advanced here does not involve a rejection of the Q-hypothesis in general, it only argues for a different scenario for the case at stake.⁸ The assumption of a similar (somewhat

⁵ Such as, e.g., Michelsen, *Evangelie*, 97 (kind reference of Dr. Jan Krans, *Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*). See also Sterling, *Jesus*, 473 note 24, for some more recent proposals; for Klein, *Lukasevangelium*, 350-351, some of the Lukan differences from the Markan and Matthean version of Luke 17:6 can also be explained on the basis of a deuteron-Mark.

⁶ See, e.g., Koester, *Gospels*, 281-282, who treats Mark 9:14-27 and its parallels as a problem of its own and does not consider v.28-29 in his attempts to reconstruct the redactional process. This also applies to Neirynck's response to such attempts in: Neirynck, *Agreements*, 82-94.

⁷ See for an overview, e.g., Tuckett, *Sayings*, 100-103, as well as, much more extensively, the overview provided by Van Oyen, *Studie*. In relation to Mark 9:14-29, see especially: Aichinger, *Traditionsgeschichte*.

⁸ In doing so, the approach taken here differs from that of, e.g., Hahn, *Jesu*, who does not substantiate his assumption that Matt 17:20 / Luke 17:6 derives from Q, but rather takes that assumption as a vantage point for the reconstruction of

accidental but still explicable) textual change in Mark 9:28-29, in particular in v. 29, suffices, this notwithstanding the broader problems contained in the interrelationship between Mark 9:14-29 and its synoptic counterparts.

2. Narrative Observations

Whoever reads Mark 9:28-29 in its context will be struck by a number of oddities, as they have been noticed frequently by commentators on this text, which, as such, contains few oddities within itself as well – it runs as follows: 28 Καὶ εἰσαθρόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν ἐπιρώτων αὐτόν· ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό, 29 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελεθεῖν εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ. The little chreia that this text consists of, however, is as consistent within itself, as it is inconsistent with its immediate narrative context, in terms of location, themes, and flow of the narrative. The most striking elements are the following.

First, v.28 refers to Jesus' entering a house together with his disciples. This house, however, is not mentioned in the narrative preceding Mark 9:28-29 (i.e. 9:14-27) and on which it comments by way of presenting to the reader, rather nicely as such, a private conversation between Jesus and his disciples in an enclosed space, to which the reader of the gospel now also becomes privy and is accordingly placed in the same privileged position as the disciples in the narrative. All this literary beauty notwithstanding, the oddity of the location of remains, especially as it is introduced in quite a self-explanatory manner, which sits uneasily both with the preceding narrative and with its continuation in v.30.

Second, there are thematic oddities. As it can be easily recognized, a core theme in Mark 9:14-17 has been the topic of believing (πιστεῦω, cf. v.19.23-24), which is the topic of both Jesus' evaluation of "this generation" (v.19) and of his exchange with the father of the boy with the "dumb spirit" (v.23-24). Especially v.23-24 suggest that the basis for the exorcism is faith / trust / belief (even if it is not specified in whom or what). V.28-29 take a completely different take on the matter, however, given that here fasting (when following the "majority text") and prayer are mentioned as instruments for driving out a demon, which play no role whatsoever in v.14-27. Thus, apart from an awkward shift in location, there is also a rather striking thematic shift.⁹

Jesus' own words. – See for similar considerations also Davies / Allison, Commentary, 727-728.

⁹ Which is frequently observed, e.g., by Twelfree, Jesus, 97, his suggestion, however, that the shift may be explained through Markan clumsiness when combining the story about the boy with the dumb spirit with the teaching in Mark 9:28-29, is less convincing the present argument that suggests that an

Third, when considering the link between v.27 and 30, which would need to be a better fit than the current fits between both v.27 and 28 and v.29 and 30 should a conjectural emendation be likely here, it can be established that this is the case indeed, both in terms of location and in terms of theme. Κάκειθεν ἐξελεθόντες in v.30 is quite a smooth transition from the (otherwise unidentified) location of the preceding scene in v.14-27 and certainly less awkward than the introduction of an unknown house as it exists now in v.28. In terms of theme, however, there is also an important connection between the resurrection imagery in esp. v.26-27 (καὶ κράζεις καὶ πολλὰ σταράζεις ἐξηλθεν· καὶ ἐγένετο ὡστε νεκρός, ὥστε τοὺς πολλοὺς λέγειν ὅτι ἀπέθανεν· ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἤγειρεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀνέστη.) and the topic of Jesus' conversation with his disciples while roaming the Galilean countryside, which is also about death and resurrection, especially in v.31: ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται.) The agreements in vocabulary are striking and it can be argued well that the fate of the boy in v.14-27 is a narrative prefiguration of Jesus' fate as it is described in v.31 and as it will be recounted later on in the Markan passion narrative.

When considering these initial observations further in the light of the tendencies of the Gospel of Mark in general, it seems that in particular the thematic shift between Mark 9:14-27 and 9:28-29 is of significance. This is the case, because shifts from Jesus' public activity to private instruction to his disciples in a suddenly appearing house occur more frequently in Mark and are apparently a characteristic of this gospel as a whole.¹⁰ With that, it must be assumed that the shift to a more private scene (also retained in Matthew, albeit that Matthew removes the *domus ex machina* here) was part of the original text of Mark, which also renders suggestions to excise the entirety of Mark 9:28-29 unlikely, even if there would be a good thematic fit between 9:14-27 and 9:30ff. as such and if the Lukan version of the narrative might suggest such a version of Mark, given that it contains no

originally well-fitting teaching was, probably through a gloss that has crept in upon the original text, replaced by the current reading of Mark 9:28-29.

¹⁰ See Sterling, 'Jesus,' n. 62. With, e.g., Schenk, Tradition, 77, this may be an indication that what follows in the indoor scene has been added to a "Vorlage" by Mark. This may, indeed, be the case, but it is an observation that pertains to a discussion of the pre-history of the story of the boy with the dumb spirit and its inclusion into Mark, rather than to a consideration of the further development of this story in the history of reception of Mark, both in as far as its text is concerned and in relation to its reception by Luke and Matthew.

traces of Mark 9:28-29 in the appertaining place in that gospel. In order then, to consider this matter further, a more detailed synoptic comparison may be in order, focusing on the latter part of Mark 9:14-29, rather than on v.14-27 as it is often done.¹¹ In doing so, it will become apparent that it is anything but unlikely that Mark 9:28-29 contained at the place of v.29 the text that is now found in Matt 17:20 / Luke 17:6, probably with the Lukan wording.

3. Synoptic Observations

The relevant synoptic parallels can be found in Matt 17:14-21 and Luke 9:37-43. The Lukan text is, at first glance, only of “negative” relevance: it presents a somewhat condensed version of the Markan narrative that does not include a parallel to Mark 9:28-29, but Luke does contain a parallel to Matt 17:20 in its 17:6. While this latter parallel will be considered later on, at this point it ought to be noted already that the Lukan omission of the entire private dialogue from his version of the exorcism fits his redactional tendency well, having a preference for condensing such stories and ending on a note of acclamation (an effect of this redaction is also that the contrast between the successful exorcism and the subsequent passion prediction is strengthened).¹² Both the fact that Luke also contains v.17:6 and that his redactional tendency would indeed be one to excise the private teaching at this point make it unlikely that he used a version of Mark that did not contain a form of Mark 9:28-29 at all. The inclusion of the verse in ch. 17 makes sense, as there Luke collects a variety of teachings from a number of sources (Q, L, and Mark).

Turning then to the Matthean parallel, a number of observations can be offered as well. To begin with, a verse, included in many manuscripts of Matthew and that provides the most direct parallel to the Markan text, Matt 17:21, is generally considered to be secondary (cf. the preference of NA28 and earlier editions) and may well be based on the Markan parallel (which would suit later stages of church history well), while, on the other hand, Matt 17:19 is close to Mark 9:28, but has omitted the awkward reference to entering a house,¹³ even if the teaching that follows there is not parallel to Mark 9:29 at all, but continues in a much more elegant fashion the topic of faith / belief, which governed the preceding narrative about the healing of the boy with the “dumb spirit.” This leads to an interesting situation, as the question is how to evaluate the presence of the parallel between Matt 17:19 /

¹¹ See, e.g., Sterling, Jesus.

¹² See, e.g., Sterling, Jesus, 480.

¹³ Even if it suits a Markan narrative strategy, houses that appear out of nowhere are odd.

Mark 9:28 (Luke 17:6), the clearly secondary character of v.22 in Matt 17, and, by consequence of the secondary character of Matt 17:21, the absence of such a parallel between the subsequent verses in Matthew and Mark 9:29? One solution, and it might not even be the most adventurous, is to argue that an operation was performed on the Markan version of the story at some (early) point in the history of transmission, which led either to the insertion of what is now Mark 9:29, replacing its original contents, while both its original contents and its later revision were received in the text of Matthew in two stages, eventually combining what is now Matt 17:20 with the contents of Mark 9:29, resulting in the secondary Matt 17:21, while the (smoothed) introduction to the private conversation between Jesus and his disciples was retained in Matt 17:19.

Rather than weakened, this proposal is strengthened, when the second instance of mountain moving faith in Matthew and Mark is taken into consideration. The scenario just introduced can be expanded somewhat, then, leading to a situation in which the following seems to have happened, first presented here in the form of a table:

Original Mark	Adjusted Mark	Matthew	Luke
Mark 9:28-29: teaching of Jesus, re: faith, mustard seed, moving a mountain from here to there	Current Mark 9:28-29	17:20: Has retained the Markan original, but exchanged the mulberry tree for the mountain of the transfiguration, adjusted Mark has left traces in the textual tradition (17:21).	Combines in 17:6 the two original Markan texts on faith in a new narrative setting, retaining the original parallel between mustard seed / mulberry tree (both vegetation), but having the latter move into the sea. Adjusted Mark has left no traces here. ¹⁴
Mark 11:22-23, faith commanding a mountain to move into the sea	No changes.	21:21, by and large reproduces the Markan text.	

¹⁴ Admittedly, this suggestion goes against the Lukan redactional tendency not to combine sources, but to choose between them. Yet, even if Luke is to be seen as receiving a saying from Q here that contained a reference to a seed like a mustard seed and a mulberry tree that could be moved “from here to there” (see Matt 17:20; no movement into the sea there), one still needs to assume that Luke combined the Q saying with the Markan saying (Mark 11:22-23), which contains the sea. In other words, in either scenario, Luke must be seen as going against

This way of looking at the tradition and redaction history of these texts has a number of advantages: a) it explains the presence of the double saying about mountain moving faith in both Mark and Matthew; b) it accounts for the oddity in Mark 9:28-29 and part of the textual tradition of Matthew (17:21); c) it gives a plausible reason for the diverging Lukan tradition without having to assume a parallel Q tradition, or the like. At the same time, it avoids recourse to a full-scale revised version of Mark. The original version of the Markan text, then, can be reconstructed from both its Matthean and Lukan parallels: the Matthean parallels has retained the double tradition, but, as will be argued in a moment, not the wording of what was there in Mark 9:28-29 originally, that has been preserved in Luke (as also the International Q Project has argued, but, of course, attributing the Matthean / Lukan tradition in Matt 17:20 / Luke 17:6 to Q).¹⁵ This to say the following, when following the prior argument from which it results that Mark contained, like Matthew, two sayings on the part of Jesus involving faith and moving unmovable items, such as mountains, this does not mean that also the wording preserved in Matthew, in which the two sayings are very similar (the difference consists mainly of the presence of a mustard seed and the place where a mountain moves to), is the one originally present in Mark. That there might be another option is indicated by the (single) Lukan version of the Matthew saying, which, whereas Matthew has two moving mountains, has a single moving mulberry tree.

There are a number of reasons to prefer the wording of, at least, the first part of Luke's version of the saying as that what used to be in Mark 9:28-29. The main reason is that it is much easier to explain why Matthew

his own redactional tendency, which is well possible, given that it is a tendency, not a law.

¹⁵ The International Q Project follows a similar line of thought (with as important difference that it does attribute this parallel tradition to Q) and proposes the Lukan wording here as the most authentic, see, e.g., Robinson, Q. This is also the view of Fieddermann, Mark, 178-182, who assumes that the saying derives from Q and that Luke preserves the more authentic wording, while Matthew might have been influenced by Mark (and, it seems, Mark's reception of the same saying also found in Q). In a not altogether dissimilar way, also Ennulat, *Agreements*, 258, does not really consider the matter further than that there is a Q tradition at stake here: "Mk 11,20-25 (.26) ist wie schon 11,12-14 ohne Entsprechung bei Lk und insofern nur von peripherer Bedeutung für die Frage nach mtlk Übereinstimmungen gegen den MkText. Etwas kompliziert wird ein Vergleich der Texte dadurch, daß sich zu Mk 11,23 eine Parallel in der Logienüberlieferung (Mt 17,20/Lk 17,6) befindet (...)." See further also, e.g., Hahn, *Jesu*, 162, as well as Fitzmyer, *Gospel*, 1142, with reference to Bultmann, *History*, 75, who opined differently.

removed a mulberry tree and introduced a mountain than to explain the reverse scenario for Luke. If Matthew found indeed a saying in the version of Mark that he worked with that referred to faith like a mustard seed that was able to relocate a mulberry tree from one place to another in a pericope just following on Jesus' transfiguration on the mountain, he could gain in two ways by supplanting the tree with a mountain: a) the saying fitted the narrative context better now, given that Jesus can refer back to the mountain that the reader has just encountered;¹⁶ b) the force of the saying is increased. In doing so, he likely reduplicated the wording of the reference to the mountain in the parallel saying in Mark 11:23 / Matt 21:21 (compare Mark 11:23: τῷ ὄρει τοῦτο, Matt 17:20: τῷ ὄρει τοῦτο, and Matt 21:21: τῷ ὄρει τοῦτο). In doing so, Matthew also removes an otherwise uncommon kind of tree from his text (that is to say: uncommon in the New Testament). Luke, by contrast refers in Luke 17:6 to a συκάμινος that is to be moved by faith introducing a mountain as it is the case in Matthew, provides the reader with a consistent use of vegetation imagery (two plants/trees) and with a nice assonance as well,¹⁷ likely betraying an oral background and, with that, an older layer of tradition than the Matthean version. The main remaining difference between Matt 17:20 and Luke 17:6, the place where the unmovable object is moved to, i.e. ἐθεν ἐκεῖ or ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ, can well be explained on the basis of the assumption of a Lukan combination of the imagery that he found in Mark 9:28-29 (ἐὼν ἐγγυρὲ πῖστον ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως) and the (more forceful) movement that he found in Mark 11:23 (ἀρῆθην καὶ βλάθην εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν), resulting in: εἰ ἐχέτε πῖστον ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐλέγετε ὃν τῇ συκαμίνῳ [τῷτῃ]· ἐκρῖζέθητι καὶ φυτεῖθην ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ (Luke 17:6), thus creating a stronger statement on the part of Jesus and eliminating a potentially awkward reduplication of Jesus' saying about faith moving unmovable objects.¹⁸ This scenario has two consequences: it allows

¹⁶ This is at least as plausible as arguing that Matthew derived his mountain here from the parallel saying in Mark 11:23, as it is done by Schulz, Q, 465-468, who assumes that Q is the source of Matt 17:20 / Lk 17:6 and suggests that Matthew has introduced a mountain here from Mark 11:23, but without considering the possibility that the mountain was also attractive to Matthew because of the narrative setting. In doing so, he also indicates that he thinks that the reference to the mulberry tree is more authentic (466-467).

¹⁷ On the suitability of this imagery, see, e.g., Bovon, *Evangelium*, 140.
¹⁸ See, e.g., Bovon, *Evangelium*, 135 (cf. 492), who notes that Luke probably operated along these lines and that Matthew has much less difficulties with reduplications. While Bovon assumes that the saying derives from Q and that Luke preserves its more original wording, he also considers the possibility that

for the reconstruction of the original text of Mark 9:28-29 (esp. v.29) and it makes it unnecessary to think that Matt 17:20 / Luke 17:6 derived from Q.

Finally and as already indicated in the table above, it can be observed that the fact that the current version of Mark 9:29, in its longer recension (including a reference to fasting), has influenced the text of Matthew at a later stage of its existence (producing the secondary verse 17:21) can also be interpreted as witnessing to the emergence of a second version of Jesus' response to his disciples in Matt 17:20 / Mark 9:29 that began to interfere with Matthew's use of the earlier version that it had already incorporated.

4. Proposal for a Solution

All of the above leads to a complicated, but not impossible scenario with four stages and with much plausibility in the light of the development of early Christian spirituality (as will be indicated subsequently): at stage one, chapter 9 of the Gospel of Mark does not include the current v.29, it likely includes v.28, however awkward it may be (see above), and it likely contained some other answer by Jesus, which may be preserved in Matt 17:20 / Luke 17:6 now, probably in a wording akin to the Lukan version as far as the vegetation imagery is concerned and to the Matthean version as to the unmovable object's trajectory is concerned.

At stage two, "Matthew" uses this text, retaining it in its context and smoothing over the awkwardness contained in Mark 9:28 (see Matt 19:19) and either reworks what used to be there in Mark 9:28, probably introducing the reference to a mountain, given the dialogue's narrative context; at the same time, Luke removes the private teaching of Jesus here, increasing the contrast between Jesus' success as an exorcist and his upcoming death, and uses the contents of Mark 9:29 in Luke 17:6, combining it with what he found in Mark 11:23, a verse that has equally disappeared in Luke.

At a third stage, the original contents of Mark 9:29 are replaced with its current contents, which may have well originated as a gloss, commenting on the means needed for a successful exorcism: prayer and fasting were in early Christian practice just as, if not more important or more characteristic as spiritual virtue necessary for the performance of exorcisms than faith (see, e.g., Rapp's overview and cf. patristic commentary on Matthew, including Chrysostom: *Homily 57* on Mt and Origen *Comm. Mr.*, book 13, ch. 7).¹⁹ It is anything but unlikely that the pervasiveness of such practices

the reference to the mulberry tree derives from L, rather than Q – the reasons that lead to that consideration on Bovon's part would also be addressed by the reconstruction proposed here.

¹⁹ See in general: Rapp, *Bishops*, 56-58.

gave rise to a change in the Markan text, for example through the replacement of the original text by a gloss that became part of the text itself (in two stages: first having Jesus refer to prayer only, then to prayer and fasting).

After this third stage, a fourth and final stage of textual transmission led to interference of the new Markan text with the Matthean text, producing Matt 17:21, which offers, in the extant manuscripts, a parallel to the longer redaction of the secondary version of Mark 9:29. All of this, then, this leaves us with a situation in which it may well be preferable, when aiming at the reconstruction of the earliest textual shape of the Gospel of Mark, to remove from Mark either 9:28-29 as a whole, or at least the contents of v.29, replacing them, for lack of a better alternative, with the text what may well be closest to its original contents, the mixture of Luke 17:6 and Matt 17:20 indicated above.

A text-critical solution for the conundrum provided by Mark 9:(28-)29 thus is preferred here over a more clearly redaction-critical one, which would have the replacement of Mark 9:29 in, in particular, Matt 17:20 derive from Q, rather than from an earlier recension of the Markan text. In fact, just the reverse is argue here: Matthew and Luke preserve an earlier version of Mark here than the current version of Mark does.

Summary

Mark 9:28-29 provides the readers with a thematic and spatial conundrum, besides this, it and its (partial) parallels in Mark 11:22-23, Matt 17:20 and 21:21, as well as Luke 17:6 (cf. also 1Cor 13:2, Gos. Thom 48) constitute an intriguing synoptic problem. In this note, a new proposal will be made concerning this problem, in particular by making suggesting a new solution for to the reconstruction of the original wording of the Markan text. This amounts to arguing that the text found in Mark 9:29 now is secondary and ought to be replaced with a combination of the text found now in Matt 17:20 and Luke 17:6, which are, in the process, both seen to be variations on the original text of Mark and not as stemming from Q.

Zusammenfassung

Mk 9:28-29 stellt für den Leser des Evangeliums ein thematisches und räumliches Rätsel dar, zudem bildet es mit seinen Parallelen in Mk 11:22-23, Mt 17:20 und 21:21, sowie Lk 17,6 (vgl. auch 1Kor 13,2 und EvThom 18) ein faszinierendes synoptische Problem. In diesem Beitrag wird ein neuer Vorschlag gemacht für die Lösung dieses Problems und zwar, indem auf eine neue Art und Weise versucht wird, den ursprünglichen Wortlaut des markinischen Textes wiederherzustellen. Dies führt zur These, dass der Text, der sich in modernen Textausgaben in Mk 9,29 befindet, sekundär ist und ersetzt werden sollte durch eine Kombination der ältesten Schichten von den Texten die sich jetzt in Mt 17,20 und Lk 17,6 befinden, welche deswegen auch nicht als Q-Texte, sondern als Spuren des ursprünglichen Markustextes verstanden werden sollten.

Bibliography

- Aichinger, H., Zur Traditions- und Epileptiker-Perikope Mk 9, 14-29 par Mt 17, 14-21 par Lk 9, 37-43a, in: Fuchs, A. (ed.), Probleme der Forschung, Wien 1978, 114-143.
- Bovon, F., Das Evangelium nach Lukas III, Zürich 2001.
- Bultmann, R., History of the Synoptic Tradition, New York 1963.
- Davies, W.D. / Allison, D.C., A critical and exegetical commentary on the gospel according to Saint Matthew II, Edinburgh 1991.
- Derrett, J. / Duncan M., Moving Mountains and Uprooting Trees (Mk 11:22; Mt 17:20, 21-21; Lk 17:6), in: BeO 30 (1988) 231-244.
- Ennulat, A., Die "minor agreements": Untersuchungen zu einer offenen Frage des synoptischen Problems, Tübingen 1994.
- Fitzmyer, J.A., The Gospel according to Luke, New York 1985.
- Fleddermann, H.T., Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts, Louvain 1995.
- Hahn, F., Jesu Wort vom bergversetzenden Glauben, in: ZNW 76 (1985) 149-170.
- Klein, H., Das Lukasevangelium, Göttingen 2006.
- Koester, H., Ancient Christian Gospels, London 1990.
- Luz, U., Das Evangelium nach Matthäus II, Zürich 1980.
- Michelsen, J.H.A., Het evangelie van Markus, Amsterdam 1867.
- Neirynck, F., The Minor Agreements and Proto-Mark. A Response to H. Koester, in: EThL 67 (1991) 82-94.
- Rapp, C., Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition, Berkeley, CA 2005.
- Robinson, J.M., The International Q Project Work Session 16 November 1990, in: JBL 110 (1991) 494-498.
- Schenk, W., Tradition und Redaktion in der Epileptiker-Perikope Mk 9 14-29, in: ZNW 63 (1972) 76-94.
- Schramm, T., Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas. Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, Cambridge 1971.
- Schulz, S., Q, die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten, Zürich 1972.
- Sterling, Gregory E., Jesus as Exorcist: An Analysis of Matthew 17:14-20; Mark 9:14-29; Luke 9:37-43a, in: CBQ 55 (1993) 467-493.473-474.
- Tuckett, C., From the Sayings to the Gospels, Tübingen 2014.
- Twelftree, G.H., Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus, Tübingen 1993.
- van Oyen, G., De studie van de Marcusedactie in de twintigste eeuw, Leuven 1993.

Prof. Dr. Peter-Ben Smit
 Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam / University of Pretoria
 Herengracht 559 HS
 1017 BW Amsterdam
 Niederlande
 E-Mail: psb380@vu.nl

Markus mit narratologischer Brille gelesen

Beobachtungen und Deutungsperspektiven zur Erzählerinstanz
 in Mk 7,31-37 und 8,22-26¹

Martin Willebrand

Teil I

Dass Mk 7,31-37 und Mk 8,22-26 eine von der markinischen Redaktion aufgelöste Doppelüberlieferung bilden, ist beinahe Konsens; inhaltliche und formale Parallelen und Unterschiede sprechen dafür². Ein *synchrone* Blick auf die Perikopen, der mittels erzähltheoretischer Kategorien die Instanz des *Erzählers* untersucht, widerspricht diesem diachronen Befund nicht. Er zeigt aber: Bisherige Beobachtungen bestätigen zum Teil sich auch im *narratologischen* Blick auf die Perikopen. Und: Diese Perspektive birgt auch weitergehendes Deutungspotenzial.

1. Wer oder was ist der Erzähler?

Spätestens seit der harschen Kritik am Autorkonzept in den 1960er Jahren³ kann nicht mehr angenommen werden, dass es der Autor selbst ist, der als Erzählerinstanz im Text begegnet. Die Alternative besteht in der Annahme eines Erzählers als „textinterne[r] Vermittlungsinstanz von Erzählungen“⁴. Diese ist jedoch meist, wenn sie nicht auf sich selbst referiert, keine gleichsam positiv gegebene Größe, sondern kann „nur als Vorstellungsobjekt aufgrund mehr oder weniger deutlicher Spuren im Text rekonstruiert werden“⁵. Es handelt sich also um ein Produkt der Konstruktionsleistung des Lesers. Eine solche textimmanente Erzählerinstanz wird unabhängig davon, wie explizit sie im Text begegnet, für *alle* erzählenden Texte angenommen⁶ – so auch für das MkEv: „Jedes einzelne Wort, das wir im Markusevangelium lesen

¹ Der Aufsatz stellt Teilergebnisse einer Masterarbeit (M.A.) vor, die im März 2013 am Lehrstuhl für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Prof. Dr. Lothar Wehr) an der Katholischen Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt eingereicht wurde.

² Vgl. Gnilka, Evangelium, 312; Kertelge, Wunder, 163. Degegen Lüthmann, Markusevangelium, 139.

³ Vgl. z.B. Barthes, Tod; Foucault, Autor; Nünning, Autor, 41-49.

⁴ Wolf, Erzähler, 173.

⁵ Wolf, Erzähler, 173.

⁶ Prince, Narratology, 8. Vgl. auch Schmid, Elemente, 81.