

The Concept of Faith in Paul and Mark

William Loader

This is the pre-published unedited version of the paper published as:

“The Concept of Faith in Mark and Paul” in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays Part I Two: Authors at the Beginnings of Christianity* (BZNW 198; ed. by Ian Elmer, David C. Sim and Oda Wischmeyer; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014) 423-64

Faith is a central concept in both Mark and Paul’s undisputed letters and serves as a useful basis for comparison between the two. There have been few attempts to compare faith in Mark and Paul, most focussing on what is believed rather than the nature of faith itself.¹ The following discussion understands faith as the expected or hoped for response by human beings to God, especially as expressed in response to the good news set forth in word and action. It includes therefore much more than a word study of the πιστ - stem, not least because sometimes faith’s response is depicted not by such words but by narrative description. It necessarily includes beliefs, which are addressed more directly in other contributions to this volume. In this chapter they cannot be ignored, because how faith responds has much to do with what faith believes, but they will be dealt with only in overview. The chapter first explores faith in Mark (understood as the earliest gospel) and Paul (the undisputed letters) before turning to compare the two and reflect on the implications of the comparison.

1. Reading for Faith in Mark

The discussion of faith in Mark must delineate two levels of meaning, that of the narrative world of Mark, and that of Mark and his hearers. The extent to which they overlap is in itself an important question. For instance, while within the narrative faith in Jesus as the Christ rarely appears, from Mark’s perspective his narrative is the good news of Jesus the Christ and to be believed as such.

¹ Thus Joel Marcus, “Mark-Interpreter of Paul,” *NTS* 46 (2000): 473-87, notes the following similarities: use of εὐαγγέλιον; the crucifixion as apocalyptic turning point; victory over demonic powers; fulfilment of prophecy; Jesus as the new Adam; faith in God and Jesus; the dualism of election and universal choice; atoning death; the sequence first, Jews, then, Gentiles; change to the Law, including abrogation of food laws. See also Joel Marcus, *Mark*, 2 vols, AYB 27/27A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000/2009), 74-75. Similarly William R. Telford, *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), who also includes the eucharistic tradition; attitude towards the state; preference for Son of God over Son of David; language of mystery; tensions with the Jerusalem church (164-69). See also John R. Donahue and Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, SP 2 (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2002), who list also common vice lists; Rufus (Mark 15:21; Rom 16:13); and church houses (40). For a critical assessment of such claims and their significance see most recently James G. Crossley, “Mark, Paul and the Question of Influence” in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Controversies*, LNTS 411, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joel Willitts (London: T&T Clark, 2011) 10-29, who argues that many are not limited to Mark and Paul, but reflect common tradition, some contain significant differences (such as on Israel’s ultimate salvation), and others are wrongly conceived (disputing Mark’s alleged abrogation of food laws). Marcus is deliberately challenging the arguments by Martin Werner, *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium. Eine Studie zur neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1923), who disputed such influence. Werner’s exposition is unmatched in detail and precision by the dissenting responses and so remains fundamental to the discussion.

1.1. Setting the Parameters of Faith in 1:1-20

At the level of the narrative and its participants, John's call for faith (1:4) entails *μετάνοια*, changing one's ways in the context of the promise of forgiveness, which John offers freely to all through baptism (1:5). That response was called for as part of preparing the way of the Lord (1:2-3), which John's listeners hear as promising someone greater than himself, who would baptise with the Spirit (1:7-8). No reference is made to their witnessing Jesus' baptism. The narrative implies that some probably did, though not its secret communications which only Jesus sees and hears. The people of the narrative next appear as those now called to faith by Jesus (1:14-15), again a call to change, but without mention of forgiveness, which was surely implied, or baptism, yet similarly in the light of God's action in the future and as belonging to the end of time, namely the kingdom of God. Their faith response was to turn around and embrace the good news which Jesus announced. Within the narrative we are not told immediately how they would have understood that hope or what their response of faith would look like. Mark's continuing narrative will shed light on this.

At the level of Mark's hearers much more information is to hand. The issue of faith confronts them in the opening words of the Gospel according to Mark, because it declares itself to be reporting "good news/gospel", which is clearly something to be believed and welcomed (1:1). The opening words find their echo within what is portrayed as the summary of Jesus' message: "repent and believe in the good news" (1:15). At the level of Mark this believing assent has as its substantial focus "the good news", which one can rightly identify as the whole of the document,² but, within it, also as particular "good news". The ambiguity of the genitive in "good news of Jesus Christ" (1:1) might be resolved as a subjective genitive in the light of 1:15, but it certainly applies also objectively, whether intended or not, in the way the prologue proceeds, for it is also *about* Jesus.³ Ultimately, as the summary of 1:14 puts it, it is about "the good news of God", which Jesus brings on God's behalf and has as its focus God's coming reign.

They are to believe that the good news fulfils biblical prophecy, in the mixed citation of 1:2-3, and biblical patterns, in portraying John in prophetic style (1:6) and portraying both John and later Jesus as entering the wilderness, the place of preparation and promise (1:4, 12). This is also implied in Jesus' proclamation in 1:15 which begins with the words, "The time is fulfilled".

We may assume that Mark intends John's call to faith, namely that his hearers change and be baptised to receive forgiveness of sins (1:4-5), also to have relevance for Mark's hearers. Their faith also entailed radical change and almost certainly baptism, but in the name of Christ, which they may have recognised as prefigured in Jesus' baptism (1:9-11). They might have associated forgiveness now primarily with Christ's death (cf. 14:24). While significant, however, forgiveness was not the primary focus, but treated as preliminary in preparation for what God was going to do. It is not even mentioned in Jesus' call to change, though it is

² Thomas Söding, *Glaube bei Markus. Glaube an das Evangelium. Gebetsglaube und Wunderglaube im Kontext der markinischen Basileiatheologie und Christologie*, SBB 12 (Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1987) 277.

³ Söding, *Glaube*, notes that the genitive is best seen as encompassing both (223).

surely implied. Jesus' proclamation continues: "The kingdom of God is at hand" (1:15). Faith's focus is the coming kingdom of God.

By the time Mark's listeners hear this call, however, they have far more information and a much better idea of what that future will be about. For unlike the participants in Mark's narrative world, they will mostly already know the whole story, and here have had the privilege of being reminded who Jesus is, Jesus the Christ (1:1), one whose coming both scripture (1:2-3) and John as forerunner had announced (1:7-8) and who is about to embark on a ministry of baptising with the Spirit. Above all, they have been made privy to secrets in Jesus' baptism (1:9-11). For its symbolic narrative has God tear open the sky to enable Jesus alone to see the Spirit's descent and hear God's affirmation of his unique relation of sonship (a relation not further defined) (1:9-11; cf. Isa 64:1; 42:1; Ps 2:7). The wilderness scene has given some profile to what this Spirit-bearing and Spirit-baptising means: it enables Jesus to confront Satan and by implication the demonic powers (1:12-13). When therefore Mark's listeners hear Jesus' call to change and believe the good news that God's reign is at hand in 1:15, they know whose authority is speaking, what equipment he has, and at least part of what that entails: deposing the rule of Satan and his spirits, as the exorcisms will show.⁴ Belief in the gospel is therefore both belief in God's kingdom and inextricably at the same time belief in Jesus as the Son of God, its agent, and his story.⁵

Mark adds a further component to what faith meant and means: it meant for some in the narrative that they followed Jesus to be engaged in his ministry, which included bringing others to faith (1:16-20). For Mark's hearers it implies that a faith response may entail a special calling to such leadership and that people in such leadership are to be recognised and respected, though as Mark will also point out they are also fallible and can themselves fail when it comes to faith.

The opening 20 verses of Mark thus set important parameters for Mark's understanding of faith, which remain visible in the remainder of the gospel.⁶ Reduced to a summary one might say that for Mark faith means welcoming the good news in a way that is transformative and includes appropriation of forgiveness of sins. It means believing claims about Jesus which set him in continuity with God's engagement with Israel in the past (in prediction and pattern), give him a unique status before God as God's Son, and portray him as the bearer of God's Spirit to bring about God's reign and to dethrone the powers of Satan. It also means acknowledging other human beings as enlisted to be part of this action.

1.2 Exorcisms and Faith

Mark is writing primarily to evince and sustain faith among his hearers. It is therefore noteworthy how he chooses to begin his depiction of Jesus' ministry. He begins with an

⁴ Werner, *Einfluss*, observes: "Überaus charakteristisch ist es auch, dass für Markus das erste Werk des Messias in der Überwindung einer satanischen Versuchung besteht" (52).

⁵ So rightly Söding, *Glaube*, who writes: "Der Glaube an das Evangelium, von Jesus im Programmwort seiner Basileiaverkündigung gefordert (1,15), ist für Markus Glaube an Jesus Christus (den vollmächtig wirkenden, den leidenden und den auferstandenen Gottessohn) und – grundlegend – Glaube an Gott" (547). See also pp. 250, 276, 278, 293, 517.

⁶ Christopher D. Marshall, *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative*, SNTSMS 64 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), rightly notes that 1:15 is to be heard throughout the narrative which follows (38-39).

exorcism which is depicted as a sign of Jesus' teaching authority (1:21-28). This opens up a number of issues relating to Mark's understanding of faith.

Here in 1:21-28, in the accounts of summary healings and exorcisms (1:32-34 and 3:7-12), and in the dramatic exorcism at Gerasa (5:1-20), demons, who belong to the spiritual world and should know, recognise who Jesus is, but resist him. As James wrote, the demons believe and shudder (2:19). They illustrate right belief, but wrong response. Mark is also using these accounts both as arguments for the truth of who he claims Jesus to be and as indications of the power he can exercise. Other indications of the latter are the report of his exorcisms throughout Galilee (1:39), the exorcism of the Syrophenician's daughter at a distance (7:24-30), of the boy (9:14-29), and of the storm (4:35-41). For Mark, as we have seen in 1:12-13, Jesus' equipment with the Spirit enables him to confront the demonic world. Mark carries this through consistently, so that in defending the integrity of Jesus' exorcisms against criticism that he performs them with the help of Beelzebul (3:22-30), he has Jesus declare that they are a work of the Spirit and so warns against blaspheming not himself but the Spirit (3:28-30).⁷

While one could read Mark's account as operating only at the level of propaganda, that is, reinforcing (or evoking) faith (as hearing and hearkening) on the basis of what he claims Jesus could do – and that is surely part of it – it seems likely that the depiction of Jesus as exorcist speaks to faith in other ways as well. One clue to this is in the sending out of the disciples in 6:6-13, where exorcism remains among their tasks. While the few statements about the future actions of disciples in the post-Easter period, such as we find in Mark 13, do not include exorcisms, it seems likely that they still occur in Mark's time. That would make sense of the exchange between Jesus and his disciples in 9:29 about their failure to exorcise the boy. While one might argue that it serves simply to underline Jesus' exorcistic power, it most likely also addresses a problem of contemporary relevance for Mark's hearers: why they sometimes fail as exorcists.⁸ Some exorcisms will work only by prayer (9:29). The earlier comment by Jesus in that context, "If you are able – all things can be done for the one who believes" (9:23)⁹ and the saying about the prayer of faith being able to move mountains (11:23-24), even though related immediately to cursing fig trees and God's judgement on the temple,¹⁰ would imply that the issue is both prayer and faith and remains current for Mark

⁷ "Sein Christus ist nicht der δοῦλος, sondern vielmehr der Bezwingler der Geistermächte: in der Wüste bezwingt er die Anschläge des Satans und die Dämonen, die unreinen Geister, müssen seinem Befehlswort gehorchen; sie erkennen ihn als den, der gekommen sei ἀπολέσας ἡμᾶς (1 24)." So Werner, *Einfluss*, 60.

⁸ On Mark's addressing the post-Easter community in the depiction of instruction about prayer and faith here and in 11:22-24, see Söding, *Glaube*, 526-30.

⁹ Best understood as including a self-reference. Cf. Sharyn Dowd, *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22-25 in the Context of Markan Theology*, SBLDS105 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), who believes it is left deliberately ambiguous (111).

¹⁰ One might take it as a reference to Zion, subverting the hope of elevating Zion (Mic 4:1; Isa 2:2), as William Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, JSNTSup 1 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 59; or as an allusion to making mountains low in Isa 40:3-5; 49:11; 54:10; cf. Mark 1:2-3, as Ferdinand Hahn, "Das Verständnis des Glaubens im Markusevangelium." In *Glaube im Neuen Testament. Festschrift für Hans Binder*, ed. Ferdinand Hahn and Hans Klein (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982) 43-67, 51; or as an allusion to the moving of the Mount of Olives in Zech 14:4, as Mary Ann Beavis, "Mark's Teaching on Faith," *BTB* 16 (1986): 139-42. Allusions to Zechariah in the wider context favour the latter. All would be more applicable to Jesus'

and his hearers.¹¹ “Have faith in God” (11:22) is as central for Mark as “Believe in the gospel” (1:15).¹² Mark may well intend that his hearers make a connection between Jesus’ withdrawal for prayer and the power he can employ, a juxtaposition present in 1:12-13 before 1:21-28; 1:35 before 1:39; 6:46 before 6:47-52; and 9:2-8 before 9:14-29.¹³

Exorcisms require the Spirit’s power in the exorcism and faith, that is, belief in what the Spirit can do. The account in 9:14-29 has Jesus issue the rebuke: “You faithless generation, how much longer must I be among you? How much longer must I put up with you? Bring him to me” (9:19). It follows someone in the crowd explaining the boy’s condition, but is addressed to “them”, probably meaning not the crowd to which the man belonged but the disciples.¹⁴ Their faith was inadequate for them to be able to perform the exorcism. In conversation with the father, Jesus then makes the statement cited above about faith (9:23), to which the father famously responds: “I believe; help my unbelief” (9:24). Mark does not explain why Jesus requires belief on the part of the father, except at least to imply that it should include believing that Jesus can help and so bringing the child to him.

Mark makes no reference to faith being required in the victims of demon possession, though their exorcism can be depicted as persuading them and those seeing the exorcism to believe (5:19-20). Thus exorcisms falls into the category of occasional divine intervention through the exorcist. Belief that this is possible would cohere with Mark’s belief that the kingdom of God will come not only in such occasional acts, as the Q saying explicitly notes (Matt 12:28; Luke 11:20), but also in the final intervention of God’s reign at the climax of history. That could be seen as a great exorcism, which would, among other things, disempower Rome.¹⁵ Belief both that Jesus performed exorcisms and that disciples still could would contribute to such hope. Mark does not, however, make the connection explicit. A central aspect of faith, nonetheless, remains belief in hope, even in the face of what might seem hopeless, as depicted in the parables of the sower (4:3-9), the growing seed (4:26-29), and the mustard seed (4:30-32; cf. Matt 17:20; Luke 17:6). Mark’s Jesus, speaking to the disciples about the future, promises the coming of the Son of Man and the gathering of the elect within a generation 13:26-27, as he had with a similar time-frame promised the coming of the kingdom in power (9:1).

1.3. Miracles and Faith

faith than to that of the disciples, whose faith is the focus in what immediately follows. But then we need to see Mark portraying the praying community as the temple’s replacement, thus making sense of the focus here on prayer within the context of the narrative of judgement on temple, which was meant to be a house of prayer for all peoples (11:11:17).

¹¹ On faith as believing that God can do the impossible as a feature of Hellenistic thought, see Dowd, *Prayer*, 96-102.

¹² Söding, *Glaube*, 516-17.

¹³ See also Dowd, *Prayer*, 119.

¹⁴ Marcus, *Mark*, 653.

¹⁵ On the potential relevance of Mark’s christological claims as contrasting with claims made of the emperors in imperial propaganda, see Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27 – 16:20*, WBC 34B (Nashville: Nelson, 2001), lxxx-xciii.

Similar issues arise in relation to miracles of healing, which fill out the rest of Mark's account of the first day of Jesus' ministry (1:29-45). We turn to them before returning to the issue of authority and teaching in 1:21-28.

Within Mark's narrative world people flock to Jesus because they believe he can heal, either themselves or others (1:32-34). In a number of instances a response of faith is expressed by the victim before healing, such as with the leper (1:40-45), the man with the withered hand, at least in stretching out his hand (3:1-6),¹⁶ the woman who touches Jesus' garment (5:25-34), and Bartimaeus, whose cry reflects both correct belief and confidence in Jesus' power to heal (10:46-52). The words, "Your faith has made you well," there (10:52) and in 5:34, are not commending the power of auto-suggestion, nor identifying what earned the healing response, but indicating that coming to Jesus in the belief that he could heal was the basis for the achievement. The use in both instances of σώζειν suggests that more than simply bodily healing is being described. At the very least they are experiencing the blessing promised for the end time in the prophets.¹⁷

In many other instances no preliminary faith is required on the part of the victim, but the faith of accompanying persons is noted. Thus no preliminary response of faith is required on the part of Simon's mother-in-law (1:29-31), though her son-in-law Simon and friends believe, nor of the paralytic, though his friends' faith is noted, who demonstrate it by cutting a hole in the roof (2:1-12), nor of Jairus' daughter (who has, of course, died), though Jairus believes (5:21-24.35-43), nor of the Syrophenician woman's daughter, effectively an exorcism by distance (7:24-30), though her mother's like the paralytic's friends' faith is exemplary, nor of the exorcism of the boy, though his father asserts his belief (9:14-29). Nor is faith required of the deaf and dumb man in the Decapolis (7:31-37), nor of the blind man at Bethsaida, except at the level of consultation about the effects (8:22-26). Negatively, Mark notes of Jesus' hometown (kin and house) that with a few exceptions, Jesus "could do no deed of power there" (6:5), clearly because they typically reflected the behaviour of people not honouring one of their own as a prophet despite the astonishing reports, but demonstrating unbelief (6:1-6).

The role of faith on the part of accompanying persons is best taken not as something which Jesus counts as earning a reward or deserving a response, nor psychologically as a kind of transference of auto-suggestivity without which the miracle cannot work, but simply as Jesus noting with approval their belief in his power to heal and so their calling on him to act.¹⁸ Where response to healings is mentioned, it includes responses of faith (5:19-20), the increased popularity of Jesus (1:32-34; 3:7-8; 7:36-37) and praising God (2:12).

¹⁶ One might with Marshall, *Faith*, add the paralysed man, who at least has to respond to Jesus' instruction to get up (87).

¹⁷ So Hahn, "Verständnis des Glaubens," 56; Marshall, *Faith*, 96.

¹⁸ So Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, who write that faith is not a precondition for healing "rather it dramatizes the willingness of suffering people to break through physical and social boundaries in order to approach Jesus" (98). Similarly Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26*, WBC 34A (Waco: Word, 1989), who writes that faith "involves actions that transcend human obstacles or limitations and cross social boundaries (crowds-2:4 and 10:48; futility and shame-5:26-27, 33; death-5:35). And in each case faith is seen in the actions taken to receive Jesus' help rather than in any specific Christological content" (85). Similarly Werner, *Einfluss*, 108.

For Mark and Mark's hearers such stories, like the exorcisms and also the nature miracles, serve as propaganda. They "prove" the authority of Jesus and the Christian gospel. Mark is aware that "signs and wonders" belong also to the propaganda of others, as the warnings about false messiahs and prophets in 13:22 show. Does faith within Mark's community still include belief that healings can happen? Again, as with exorcisms, the sending of the disciples (6:6b-13) may well imply that this is so.¹⁹ There seems no reason to suggest that what Mark portrays in Jesus' world was not applicable in his. Thus acts of healing would promote faith and faith would lead people to access healing.

The so-called nature miracles, the stilling of the storm (4:35-41), walking on water (6:45-52), and the miraculous feedings (6:30-44; 8:1-10), will have served propaganda purposes and were probably not seen by Mark as foreshadowing similar achievements in his day, unlike the healings and exorcisms. For Mark's hearers they served two further roles. Typological correspondences with acts of God, Moses, Elijah and Elisha, would serve propaganda arguments or faith sustenance for those steeped in Jewish tradition. In addition Mark uses them in a sophisticated way to serve as symbols, especially the feedings, of the inclusion of both Jews and Gentiles (8:14-21), as he does also some of the healings, such as of the blind in contrast to the faith blindness of the disciples (8:22-26; cf. 8:27-31; 10:46-52; cf. 10:32-45).

The account of the transfiguration (9:2-9) also fits broadly within the category of the miraculous. Within the narrative world of the text it draws a positive but inappropriate faith response from the disciples, a regular theme to which we return below. The appropriate response is to listen to him, particularly telling as he confronts their values and declares God's will in what follows through to chapter 10. For Mark's hearers the scene functions similarly to the symbolic narrative of Jesus' baptism with which the gospel began. Thus it reinforces that faith is to believe that Jesus is God's Son, though again without further explication.

The appearance of Elijah with Moses would most likely have intimated to them that this is a foreshadowing of history's climax when these two figures were to reappear and to which Mark had already alluded in 8:27 and to which he would return in the account of the discussion on the way down the mountain, identifying John in Elijah's role (9:11-13), and in the passion narrative where some misunderstand Jesus as having called for Elijah (15:35-36). The immediately preceding verses, 8:38-39 and 9:1 pointed them already to the eschatological theme.

For faith, then, the account of the transfiguration reinforced belief that Jesus is God's Son and that he would indeed appear at the climax of history. The other figures may well have also reinforced their belief that Jesus stood in continuity with Israel's faith, a secondary emphasis, as some have subsequently seen it, with Moses representing the Law and Elijah, the prophets.²⁰ Certainly the notion of continuity with Israel's past through typological allusion and reuse of scriptural motifs, not least from Zechariah and the Psalms, finds reinforcement in the passion narrative.

¹⁹ So Söding, *Glaube*, 292.

²⁰ So already Origen, *Commentary on Matthew*, 12.38.

The resurrection clearly serves Mark's hearers as a fundamental proof of Jesus' legitimacy and of the promise of future hope. Within the narrative world of the text, however, despite the young man's interpretation of the event as evidence that Christ has been raised from the dead (16:5-7), we seem to be left with the prospect of a fearful silence (16:8). This provocatively enigmatic ending may well be a literary ploy to invite hearers to fill the apparent void. They may have seen their own fears before their eyes in 16:8, but they know that the story went on, as Mark's Jesus had already clearly intimated in Mark 13.

One peculiar element in the stories of exorcism and healing is that sometimes Jesus urges the event not be reported and sometimes allows it. The leper's failure to keep silent (1:44-45) made it difficult for Jesus to enter towns, but one wonders how credible that is after already the mass success reported in 1:32-34 (similarly 3:12), where thronging the door already happened before it happened again in 2:1 after the leper's disobedience. It may make better sense as something Mark included to impress his hearers about Jesus' impact and to serve his story line, which will have Jesus needing to escape to a boat (3:9; 4:1). The silencing of Jairus and friends (5:43) similarly strains credibility within the narrative, as does the silencing of those who saw the deaf man healed (7:36).²¹ The blind man is not to enter the town of Bethsaida (8:26). Within the narrative world, these may relate to Jesus' fears, perhaps of too much publicity, of distraction (cf. 1:36-37), perhaps of danger to himself through being acclaimed Messiah or as a powerful figure. The latter appears as a motive in John 6:12-13, but not specifically in Mark.²² Some might see fear of Rome determining the clarification about taxes in 12:13-17, either in the world of the narrative or in Mark's world, or possibly both.

For Mark and his hearers such inconsistencies about silencing or not silencing responses may simply serve to enhance the propaganda value; Jesus was so popular. Even when he tried to silence people his popularity was irrepressible. Did they also sense some dangers for themselves through such activities, especially when associated with proclaiming Jesus as messiah and God's kingdom/empire? One can only speculate. The suggestion that the silencing serves polemical purposes against a miracle-based christology²³ might be more convincing if the silencing were consistent and Mark showed no propensity to use miracles for propaganda, himself, but the opposite is the case. It makes no sense to depict Mark carefully making a case with miracles for the in-breaking of the kingdom in the first eight chapters only to have him reverse his theology in what follows. Mark appears to have been able to hold together belief in Jesus' miraculous power and belief in his vulnerability to political powers, perhaps a reflection of his community's own experience.

²¹ "Viewed historically, the injunctions to secrecy are quite implausible" – so Telford, *Theology of Mark*, 45.

²² Cf. Telford, *Theology of Mark*, who connects the demoting of the title, "Son of David" in 12:35-37 to a wider concern to reject nationalistic messianism (41, 50-54), following J. B. Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark," in *The Messianic Secret*, ed. C. Tuckett (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 35-43, but it is not clear to me that this implies that Mark embraces a hellenistic thaumaturgical model. See the discussion in Crossley, "Mark, Paul," 22-24.

²³ Cf. T. J. Weeden, "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel," in *The Interpretation of Mark*, ed. William Telford (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 89-104. On this see Telford, *Theology of Mark*, 49-50; Marshall, *Faith*, 45-58; and Jesper Svartvik, "Matthew and Mark." In *Matthew and his Christian Contemporaries*, LNTS333, ed. David C. Sim and Boris Repschinski (London: T&T Clark, 2008) 11-49, 32-33.

Faith in Mark's world appears then to embrace belief in the ability which Jesus had, and some of them had, to perform exorcisms and healing miracles and that this was both useful for propaganda and indicative of the gospel they proclaimed, namely that it was about liberation and would one day be comprehensive when God's empire/kingdom would be established.²⁴ In this sense the understanding of the gospel within Mark's narrative world coheres with Mark's own understanding of the gospel and so, therefore, does its understanding of faith.

1.4. Teaching and Faith

If we return to the opening scene of Jesus' ministry, Mark juxtaposes statements about Jesus' authority as a teacher with an exorcism (1:21-28). "They were astounded at his teaching, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes. ... 'What is this? A new teaching—with authority! He commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him'" (1:22.27). In part the connection is at the level of propaganda: anyone who can perform exorcisms deserves to be listened to. But it is more than that. Mark refers to Jesus' teaching, but fails to mention what he taught. The hearer has to supply this from the context. The relevant immediate context is the message of the nearness of God's kingdom (1:14-15), which follows immediately after the account of Jesus' defeat of Satan (1:12-13) and his empowerment through the Spirit to baptise people with the Spirit's liberating power (1:8-11). So the teaching is about the coming of the kingdom as divine exorcism. The exorcism then illustrates the substance of the teaching.²⁵

In the narrative world admiration for Jesus' authoritative teaching and admiration for his exorcisms and miracles go hand in hand, as the further references to teaching, healing, and exorcism illustrate (1:39; 4:1; 6:2.6b.34). Mark gives special emphasis to Jesus' teaching for his hearers in the chapter which follows. Thus teaching with authority and not as the scribes (1:22) comes to be illustrated first in any detail in 2:1 – 3:6, where we find the first scene (2:1-12) returning to the motif of authority as authority to forgive sins (2:10), and the centrepiece of the fivefold structure (2:18-22) talking about the "new" (2:21-22; cf. 1:27). Faith in the narrative world of Mark means accepting Jesus' approach to scripture, rather than that of the scribes (1:22) and this is clearly also what Mark understands faith to entail in his world.

The first conflict has Jesus claim authority to declare God's forgiveness (2:10), as had John before him (1:4-5), over against criticism which misses the point by alleging blasphemy as though Jesus claimed to do on his own right what only God can do (2:7). Probably at the level of Mark's hearers this, like the Jewish trial which it foreshadows (14:53-65), mirrors accusations they faced from Jews of their day (cf. 13:9-13). Conflict over claims for Jesus echoes in the claims that he makes to "have come" (2:17b), and to be "lord also of the Sabbath" (2:28; cf. 2:10), but the stories also show Jesus advocating an approach to biblical

²⁴ Marshall, *Faith*, writes of miracles in Mark as "dramatic parables which refer beyond themselves to the manifestation of God's kingly power in Jesus and its radical implications for those who respond to its demands" (64). Similarly Werner, *Einfluss*, 107.

²⁵ While it is true that teaching in the form of collections of sayings is confined in Mark to Mark 4 and 13, it is not true as alleged by Svartvik, "Matthew and Mark," that Mark is like Paul in showing "an astounding lack of interest in the teaching of Jesus" (31).

law which puts response to human need ahead of demarcation disputes about forgiveness (2:9), concern about bad company (2:117a) and about Sabbath (2:27; 3:4). The stance of Jesus in these disputes informs the way Mark gives profile to faith.

The next major dispute (7:1-23), which begins over ritual hand washing (7:1-5), leads to the declaration that nothing from outside can make a person unclean (7:15). That is not just a statement about clean food being declared clean under all circumstances,²⁶ but about all food, as the argument of the context indicates (7:17-19), and on the basis of which Mark's Jesus shows such food laws to be therefore invalid (καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα) (7:19c).²⁷ At the level of Mark's composition this then serves to indicate the removal of what had apparently made the belonging of Gentiles along with Jews in the people of God problematic. Such belonging had to override the food laws. Mark's argument is not that such provisions now no longer apply, but that they never made sense, because food is external and simply goes into the stomach and then the toilet. Only what comes from within matters in relation to purity (7:21-23). Espousing central values of scripture can, however, also lead in the opposite direction: not setting laws aside but making them stricter, as the discussion of divorce illustrates (10:2-12), and understanding the commandments to imply radical concern for the poor shows (10:17-22).

Faith, especially for Mark, entails therefore a differentiating stance towards scripture in the light of what Mark has Jesus defend as scriptural values. It includes setting food laws aside, as it probably included setting the requirement of circumcision aside, of which however Mark makes no mention. It also included replacing the temple with the community of faith (11:12-25; 12:10; 14:58; 15:29-30.38).²⁸

For Mark, however, faith's response did not abandon scripture. In response to the scribe's question Mark has Jesus affirm the two great commandments, understood as a setting of priorities rather than as a mandate to observe everything without discrimination (12:28-34). Within the framework of his selective hermeneutic Mark portrays faith as doing the will of God. This comes through most clearly in the response of Jesus to the rich man's quest for eternal life (10:17-22). Jesus' response of requiring that he keep the commandments, which Jesus loosely summarises, was not deliberately false or inadequate, but real.²⁹ The problem lay not with Jesus' answer, nor with the man's claim to have done just that, but that he failed

²⁶ So Crossley, "Mark, Paul," who reads Mark 7:19 as declaring that reads it as "all foods permitted in the Law are clean" (14). Cf. also Michael F. Bird, "Mark: Interpreter of Peter and Disciple of Paul," in *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Controversies*, LNTS 411, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joel Willitts (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 30-61, 49-51, who wonders why Matthew would then need to omit it (51).

²⁷ Boris Repschinski, *Nicht aufzulösen sondern zu erfüllen. Das jüdische Gesetz in den synoptischen Jesus Erzählungen* (FzB 120. Würzburg: Echter, 2009), describes Mark as pushing the argument to its "sarkastischen Höhepunkt" (180; cf. also pp. 183-86, 212). Even if we read καθαρίζων with some later uncials (Κ Γ 33), the import is the same, a dismissal of food laws. See also William Loader, "Attitudes to Judaism and the Law and Synoptic Relations" in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008* (ed. A. Gregory, P. Foster, J. S. Kloppenborg and J. Verheyden; BETL 239; Leuven: Peeters, 2011) 347-69, 348-53.

²⁸ On this see further William Loader, *Jesus' Attitude towards the Law: A Study of the Gospels*, WUNT 2.128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 65-85, 122-36; Repschinski, *Nicht aufzulösen*, 213. Cf. Werner, *Einfluss*, who notes Mark's foregrounding of the ethical (87), but argues that Mark espouses full Torah observance and the setting aside only of oral law (81, 84).

²⁹ Werner, *Einfluss*, 92.

to do so in the way that Jesus taught the commandments.³⁰ For if he had, the demand that he give to the poor and follow Jesus would not have been so problematic.

For Mark, then, faith means doing the commandments as Jesus teaches them, thus following Jesus, whether that entailed leaving behind possessions and joining him like the itinerant disciples or staying at home. Heard in the context of Mark's world, the challenge of faith in Jesus included commitment to keep the commandments as Jesus interpreted them. It meant to "listen to him" (9:7). It coheres with this emphasis that in speaking of his new fictive family of believers Jesus declares as his brothers and sisters those "do the will of God" (3:31-35). That, therefore, included following his teaching about marriage (10:2-12), but also his teaching about greed, which the sequel to the conversation with the rich man (10:23-31), the parable of the sower (4:19) and the judgement on temple leaders (12:8-40) identify as a chief concern.

While Mark cites a tradition which speaks of little ones who believe (9:42), depicts the scribes as challenged to believe Jesus if they believed John (11:31), has the scribes make belief in Jesus conditional on his descent from the cross (15:32), and warns people about believing false prophets (13:21), Mark's usual way of expressing commitment to Jesus is to speak of following him, not to speak of believing in him.³¹ Where faith is directed towards Jesus it is fundamentally understood as belief that in Jesus God's reign is being exercised. It is believing that good news, as in 1:15, and so is less focused on his person than on his power.³² It is faith in God. In the four instances cited above, it relates to believing in his legitimacy.³³ They are not, however, to be seen as a separate category, but rather reflect the complex interconnection in Mark between faith in God and faith in Jesus, especially as seen from the perspective of Mark and his hearers.³⁴ Always theocentric, even to the extent of sometimes having no explicitly christological link, as in instruction on prayer, Mark's various references to faith must be seen as integrated with belief in who Jesus is. His acclamation as Son of God by God in the baptism and transfiguration and by the centurion at the cross is central, and confessing him is made the criterion of judgement (8:38).³⁵ The call to believe in

³⁰ Werner, *Einfluss*, notes that 10:17-22 is "von entscheidender Bedeutung" for understanding Mark's attitude towards the Law (91).

³¹ Hahn, "Verständis des Glaubens," notes: "Es bleibt auffällig, dass dieser Sprachgebrauch bei Markus nicht häufiger auftritt, wie das bei Johannes oder bei Paulus der Fall ist" (62-63).

³² Thus in relation to 5:35 Hahn, "Verständis des Glaubens," writes: "Hier geht es nicht um das Vertrauen auf irgendeine menschliche Macht, aber auch nicht auf Jesu Person und Wunderkraft, an den sich der Vater ja bereits hilfesuchend gewandt hat, sondern um ein uneingeschränktes (μόνον) Sich-verlassen auf den Gott, der Tote wieder lebendig machen kann" (55; similarly 60). Similarly Werner, *Einfluss*, who notes that the focus in Mark is on faith in God, and response to the Kingdom of God, not faith in Jesus as Messiah (107-108). For someone responding he writes, "Es steht ihm frei, Jesus einfach für einen wundertätigen Gottesmann und Propheten von der Art eines Elia oder Elisa zu halten, und das mag ihm als Stütze für seinen Glauben genügen" (109; similarly 111).

³³ So Hahn, "Verständis des Glaubens," 61-62. "Aber Markus folgt, abgesehen von Mk 9,42, der ihm vorgegebenen Jesus Tradition, die πιστεύειν/πίστις im Zusammenhang mit dem Vertrauen auf die Heilsmacht Gottes verwendet und die unmittelbare Bindung an Jesu Person nicht mit dem Begriff des Glaubens, sondern mit der Vorstellung der Nachfolge zum Ausdruck bringt. Glaube ist hier noch nicht umfassende Beschreibung der christlichen Existenz, sondern Bezeichnung für ein wesentliches Element christlichen Verhaltens" (63).

³⁴ Söding, *Glaube*, 518-26, 551.

³⁵ So Söding, *Glaube*, 251, 276, 376-77, 381.

Jesus, rarely expressed, though widely assumed as central, in Mark, reflects the understanding of faith in Mark's day and come closer to the direct notion of faith in Christ found in Paul. In Mark such faith means believing that Jesus is the Son of God, authorised to announce and enact God's reign, in exorcism and healing, in bearing forgiveness including through his death, in teaching, including instruction about prayer and faith in God, and in calling to discipleship.

1.5. Failure and Faith

Mark's account also addresses potential problems with faith. It will be with an eye to his own day that Mark presents the exposition of the parable of the sower (4:13-20). Beside affirming the certainty of a harvest and depicting it as coming about despite setbacks, surely an encouragement for Mark's hearers facing adversity, Mark has Jesus explain why faith sometimes fails. Faith sometimes fails to get a start; Satan taking away the seed (4:15). Sometimes it fails in face of adversity or because of greed (4:16-19). Endurance in faith facing adversity is a theme in the predictions of the future in Mark 13:13b.33-37 and by implication in the Gethsemane scene (14:32-42). Jesus becomes its model in the passion narrative and the disciples, Peter, and Judas, in particular, of failure, though except for the latter not hopelessly so. Mark rationalises failure by drawing on Isa 6:9, which suggests that God blocks people from responding in faith (4:12), explaining the use of parables as designed to produce this effect.³⁶ The obverse is that those who believe are elected by God, from which they can take assurance and so strengthen their resolve to remain faithful. Typical of literature of the time Mark does not take this to its logical conclusion which would make faith so predetermined as to become meaningless. It was a common way of trying to come to terms with failure and finding consolation in being special.

From the Caesarea Philippi episode on (8:27 – 9:1) faith faces a crisis. Already exposed for not grasping Jesus' teaching (4:13), not believing in Jesus' power (4:40), and not reading the symbolic message of the feedings, a failure making sense only at the level of Mark and his hearers (8:14-21), they now find their faith in Jesus as the Christ flawed. The crisis is over correct belief about Jesus and ultimately about God and plays itself out among Jesus' closest followers (8:27-33; 9:30-37; 10:32-45). For Mark's community that might be a reflection on leaders known to them with connections to the disciples,³⁷ but they could just serve a provocative educational strategy to show that even Jesus' closest followers could get it wrong.³⁸ Peter's sincere faith and devotion has no place for a Christ who as Son of Man suffers and dies instead of succeeding (8:27-33). Success and power, as opposed to a path of suffering, inform both the dispute among the disciples about who is the greatest (9:30-37) and hope of James and John to be Jesus' vice-regents (10:32-45).

Pitted against these ambitions, what they have for themselves and project onto Jesus, are the images of Jesus as Son of Man going to Jerusalem to his death and the values of lowly service. Ultimately, the issue of faith is depicted as theological, that is, a matter of what they

³⁶ So already Werner, *Einfluss*, 188.

³⁷ Marcus, "Mark-Interpreter of Paul," 475; Telford, *Theology of Mark*, 164.

³⁸ Bird, "Mark," writes: "The misunderstanding and failure of the disciples are narrative devices in Mark about epistemology and discipleship – knowing and following Jesus – and attempts to freight them with internecine Christian polemics are blandly overstated" (34).

believed were God's priorities, expressed in the rebuke given to Peter: "you are setting your mind not on divine things but on human things" (8:33). There is, accordingly, a coherence between Mark's approach to scripture and Mark's depiction of the belief about God which Jesus represents and which is Jesus' own belief; it rests on his understanding of God's priorities. Mark's passion narrative continues the theme of subverting the disciples' values by depicting Jesus as the Christ, the king, but crowned with thorns on a cross. It also coheres with these values that Mark portrays the lowly and powerless as the ones who truly understand Jesus,³⁹ including the women.⁴⁰

Within the passion narrative is the account of Jesus' last meal with his disciples (14:22-25). It includes reference to his own death. In giving the bread, he simply states; "This is my body"; but in relation to the cup, declares: "This blood is the new covenant in my blood poured out for many". The only other reference of this kind speaks of his giving his life as a "ransom for many" (10:45). An allusion to Isa 53:12 is likely in 14:24 and probable in 10:45.⁴¹ Both sayings interpret Jesus' death as on behalf of or in the interests of others. This must be an allusion to the widespread tradition which saw Christ's death as "for us", "for our sins". One could conclude that these two references indicate that faith for Mark now sees Christ's death as the salvific moment which brought forgiveness of sins, so that this should be seen as the unexpressed assumption wherever Mark speaks of the gospel and intends it to apply to his own day.

The problem with such a conclusion is the paucity of references to it in Mark and especially in the passion narrative where Mark could easily have included comment and citation making this clear. He does, after all, edit the passion narrative to develop key themes, such as his threefold reference to Jesus in relation to the temple (14:58; 15:29-30; 15:38) and as Messiah, Son of God (14:61; 15:32; 15:39),⁴² and his depicting Jesus as a model for those facing similar trials and adversity. That he did not do so in relation to his death as vicarious does not indicate that the two logia, which he probably inherited from tradition, are mere

³⁹ Marshall, *Faith*, who illustrates this in detail (75-133).

⁴⁰ On women in Mark see Mary Ann Beavis, "Women as Models of Faith in Mark," *BTB* 18 (1988): 3-9.

⁴¹ So Adela Y. Collins, *Mark*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007) 81, 83; Marcus, *Mark*, 756-57, 966-67.

⁴² The threefold structure makes clear that Mark's primary allusion in the tearing of the curtain (15:38) is to judgement on the temple which the previous two verses mention, the charge and the mockery, reinforced by the similar structure of the charge, the mockery and the confession of Jesus as Son of God. As many have noted the verb *σχίζω*, which is natural enough here, is a striking parallel to its use to describe the rending of the heavens in 1:10 at the baptism, but there it derives from the allusion to Isa 64:1 (though not LXX), so should not be oppressed. Brendan Byrne, "Paul and Mark before the Cross: Common Echoes of the Day of Atonement Ritual" in *Transcending boundaries: Contemporary Readings of the New Testament: In Honour of Professor Francis Moloney, S.D.B.* (ed. Rekha M. Chennattu & Mary L. Coloe Rome: LAS Publications, 2005) 217-30, has speculated that with the rending of the curtain (15:38) Mark reflects atonement day typology, like Paul in Rom 3:25. This is far from secure, given the primary reference, and even then one would have to ask, as with 14:25, how Mark would then have understood this in the light of already acclaiming universal forgiveness through John and Jesus during his ministry. For Mark its primary reference, a symbolic fulfilment of God's judgement, foreshadowing the temple's destruction, this is more than negative, since it relates to the promise that the new community will function as a temple and so be a bearer of the good news of atonement. If in some ways this may sound Pauline, it is because of the common tradition which each uses with significantly different weight.

relics or reluctant concessions.⁴³ But equally it strains credibility to claim that Christ's death as vicarious was just as central as in Paul; it is just that Mark failed to make much of it.⁴⁴ For Mark indicates that universal forgiveness was already an aspect of both John's and Jesus' teaching during his ministry (1:4-5; 2:10).⁴⁵ Clearly for Mark, Jesus' ministry was already bringing liberation and future liberation was at the heart of the message of the kingdom. Mark may well have seen Jesus' death as reinforcing the promise of forgiveness, but for Mark the gospel is about much more. For Mark forgiveness of sins is simply an element of the promised liberation.

For the figures within Mark's narrative world, faith means primarily believing Jesus' claim to be bringing the kingdom of God and therefore his ability through the Spirit to heal and exorcise. Beyond that, a faith response means both believing what he teaches and living accordingly by doing God's will as expounded by Jesus, which has particular application to wealth but also the ethical commandments generally, being alert and prepared to endure persecution and not be deceived in the future by false claims, and, for some, following Jesus in his tours of ministry and sharing in his activity.

For Mark and his hearers faith means the same, except that it now includes believing the whole story as narrated by Mark,⁴⁶ which includes, in addition, his death and resurrection, and an understanding of his death as vicarious, though it appears that this does not assume central or sole significance, since the gospel remains focused primarily on the liberation which God's reign brings and will bring. Faith is strongly focused on hope but also on endurance, for which Jesus' own arrest, trial, passion and resurrection serve as a comforting model.

While the narrative distinguishes between those who respond by following and those who respond by remaining where they are, there is some indication that following is being used metaphorically in a broader sense to apply to all, especially in the saying about denying self and taking up the cross (8:34-37). Faith is such following. It is nowhere itself made the focus of rival understandings, though clearly Mark strongly affirms that faith believes that both Jews and Gentiles, in that order (7:27), are to be seen as recipients of the gospel and that whatever is believed to prevent that, including biblical laws, is to be set aside. Failure on the part of disciples includes not understanding this as they fail to understand Jesus' mission (8:16-21), but nowhere does this appear to reflect seriously rival notions of faith, such as in

⁴³ Cf. David Seeley, "Rulership and Service in Mark 10:41-45," *NovT* 35 (1993): 234-50, 249. So rightly Bird, "Mark," 46.

⁴⁴ Werner, *Einfluss*, writes: "Diese Lehre von der Notwendigkeit der stellvertretenden Selbstopferung des Messias erscheint freilich bei Markus nicht zu strenger, prinzipieller Allgemeingültigkeit erhoben" (64).

⁴⁵ So already Werner, *Einfluss*, 118-19.

⁴⁶ Marshall, *Faith*, rightly observes: "Just as the disciples' present role is an extension of the ministry of Jesus set out in 1:14f, so is their predicted future role. They are given the same essential message and the same sphere of action that Jesus adopts at the beginning. In 13:10, Jesus entrusts his followers with the proclamation (κήρυσσειν) of the εὐαγγέλιον to all nations as a prelude to the End (cf. 14:9). Within the logic of the narrative, 'the gospel' can be none other than that first announced by Jesus, although now enriched with additional content supplied in the intervening material" (40). Bird, "Mark," writes: "Jesus' gospel is dissimilar to the early church in that his announcement is theocentric and focused on the kingdom with no reference to atonement theology" (44), a message entirely conceivable within Judaism of the time (44).

Paul. Similarly doing the will of God is determined not by a process in relationship whereby the Spirit bears fruit, but by obedience to Jesus' teaching of God's will, in attitude and action. The Spirit's role remains primarily as the power to enable manifestation of the kingdom in the present, not to generate ethics.

2. Faith in Paul

As with Mark, to understand faith in Paul's writings we need to look at more than just the occurrence of the individual words for faith and believing. We need to examine both elements of what was believed, though we can do this only in overview, and what was deemed as appropriate response to such believing. Unlike Mark, who offers us narrative which includes accounts of people coming to believe and continuing to believe, Paul's undisputed letters are largely occasional, in which particular issues are addressed, and in which faith's belief and response is to some degree incidental, except where matters of belief become central or where Paul's understanding of the response of faith is set in contrast to that of others. The different nature of the material thus determines to some degree what is said about faith.

2.1. Faith and Eschatology

There is an important cognitive component to Paul's understanding of faith. It includes, uncontroversially, belief that a day of judgement is soon coming associated also with the coming of Christ (1 Thess 2:19-20; 3:13; 5:9-10.24; 1 Cor 16:22; 2 Cor 1:14; 2:14-16; 5:9-10; 11:2; Phil 1:6.10; 3:20; 4:5; Rom 2:3.5-16; 5:9) and that human beings need to be delivered from the prospect of divine anger on that day. It is typically represented in 1 Thess 1:9-10 ("how you turned to God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead—Jesus, who rescues us from the wrath that is coming") (similarly 1 Cor 5:5.13; 6:2-3; 10:33). This is a consistent feature, sufficient to describe it as an axiom of Paul's belief system, like the belief in one God (cf. also 1 Cor 8:1-6; 10:14-22). It comes in many variations, including traditional language of the kingdom of God (1 Thess 2:12; 1 Cor 6:9-11; 15:50), as in Mark.⁴⁷ Paul uses Hab 2:4 to link the promise of future "life", which justification guarantees, with the response of faith (Gal 3:11; Rom 1:17), in contrast, again, to judgement and God's wrath from which one can be rescued (Rom 1:18; 2:3.5-16; 5:9).

2.2. Faith in Christ's Redemptive Death

Though absent from 1 Thessalonians, a second core element in Paul's belief system and preaching is that God has taken an initiative to rescue people from future judgement by offering right standing, justification, having made it possible by Christ's dying for us. The issue at stake in being right with God is sin and God's action through Christ's death dealt

⁴⁷ Like Mark, Paul also preserves sayings which refer to the kingdom of God as in part a present reality manifest in miracles: When Paul then announces his intent to visit, he focuses not on spoken word, but on power as characteristic of 'the kingdom of God' (οὐ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει 4:20). Cf. also Rom 14:17.

with sin, bringing forgiveness and thus making restoration to a right relationship possible, most fully expounded in Romans (1:16-17; 3:23-26; 5:1.12-21; 9:30-32; 10:6; cf. also Gal 5:5) and rooted in the tradition of Christ's death for our sins (1 Cor 15:3-5). Christ's status and role in this and in the future, variously expressed, is a core element in faith's belief, as is his resurrection, which plays a key role in demonstrating God's power and assuring the believers that they, too, will be raised to life at the judgement (1 Cor 15:1-28; Rom 4:25; 10:9; 1 Thess 4:14; 1 Thess 5:24). That belief entails an understanding of resurrected life as being of a spiritual transformed state not a physical resuscitation (1 Cor 15:35-57; 2 Cor 5:1-5). A consistent element in such belief is also a claim that what it believes fulfils God's intent as predicted and foreshadowed in Israel's scriptures (Rom 1:2.17; 3:21).

2.3. Faith and Faithfulness

Faith includes believing in the hope and in what made it possible, Christ's redemptive death, and responding both by acceptance of the offer of a restored right relationship with God and by living out the consequences of that relationship, a life pleasing to God. Sometimes Paul speaks of faith to refer to the moment of coming to faith, to the initial act of believing (1 Thess 1:3, 8; Gal 2:16; [ἐξ ἁκοῆς πίστεως] 3:2.14; Rom 1:8.16-17; 3:22.25.28.30; 5:1; 10:17; 1 Cor 15:11). Sometimes he uses it to refer to a believer's ongoing faith (1 Thess 3:2, 5-7.10; Rom 1:12; 15:13; 1 Cor 2:5; 16:13; 2 Cor 1:24; 5:7; 10:15; 13:5; Gal 5:6; Phil 1:25; Phm 5-6). Always Paul assumes that faith is to be something which continues.⁴⁸ Paul writes of his calling as to bring about ὑπακοὴν πίστεως (1:5), a double expression indicating that he understand faith as both belief and acting in accordance with belief in submitting to its claims (cf. 10:3; 10:16 Ἄλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· cf. also Rom 15:18; 16:19.[26]; 2 Cor 10:5).⁴⁹ Paul accordingly uses ἄπιστος as a term to describe unbelievers (1 Cor 6:6; 7:13-15; 10:27; 14:22-24; 2 Cor 4:4; 6:14-15), as he does πιστος and πιστεύω for believers (e.g. 1 Cor 14:22; 2 Cor 6:15; 1 Thess 1:7; 2:10), and ἀπιστία and ἠπίσθησαν to depict the act of unbelief and the continuing refusal to believe (Rom 3:3; 11:20.23). Sometimes he speaks of "the faith", to refer to the new possibility offered in the gospel (Gal 1:23; 3:23.25) and speaks of the body of believers as the household of faith (Gal 6:10; cf. also Phil 1:27).

To ongoing faith as the basis of the relationship with God in Christ belongs also the quality of faithfulness. It can be thus separately identified as a virtue or fruit as in Gal 5:22 (as it can be as a charism related to miracles as in 1 Cor 12:9; 13:2 to which we return below) and is sometimes used of Paul's faithful colleagues (1 Cor 4:2.17; 7:25). More significantly Paul can use it of God to underline God's utter dependability: "God is faithful, who..." (1 Cor 1:9; 10:13; similarly 2 Cor 1:18 and Rom 3:3). God also entrusts, treats as faithful, people deemed reliable, like Paul himself (1 Thess 2:4; 1 Cor 9:17; Gal 2:7; Rom 3:2). In Paul faith regularly comes to expression as ongoing faithfulness, especially in the face of adversity, including mortal danger (2 Cor 1:3-8; 4:7-12; Phil 1:27-29; cf. also 1 Thess: 1:3.5-

⁴⁸ James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 635.

⁴⁹ See the discussion in Andrie du Toit, "Faith and Obedience in Paul." In *Focusing on Paul. Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*, BZNW 151, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and David S. du Toit (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007) 117-27; Dunn, *Theology*, 635.

6; 2:1-12). What grounds that faithfulness is faith's belief in hope, based on belief in what Christ has done, and assurance through the resurrection that it will be realised and soon (2 Cor 1:9-11.14-18). Paul uses Christ's suffering, death, and resurrection as the basis for claiming that his suffering also will bring life (2 Cor 4:7-18). Holding onto the unseen hope of the future is fundamental to Paul's faith (2 Cor 5:7-10) and confidence in his ministry (2 Cor 5:11-20).

There has been debate in recent years as to whether some expressions translated traditionally as "faith in Christ" (διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Gal 2:16; similarly 2:17.20; Rom 3:26; Phil 3:9) should to be read as referring to Christ's faithfulness in acting as God's agent.⁵⁰ One can then also read the matching double expressions in Romans (ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν) (1:17) and (δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας) (3:22) as referring first to Christ's faithfulness and then to the believer's response to that of faith, although the proximity in 1:17 of ἐκ πίστεως in the citation of Hab 2:5 meaning the believer's faith makes this less likely, at least there.⁵¹

Abraham serves not as an example of faithfulness as elsewhere in his willingness to sacrifice Isaac (Jas 2:21-23; 1 Macc 2:52), but of belief in God's promise, given in Gen 12:3, 15:1-5, and 18:18 (Gal 3:8), and being willing to act on it, which God, as Paul argues, counted as righteousness (Gen 15:6), right standing with himself. He is thus the forerunner of all who by believing in God's promise in Christ and embracing it are similarly therewith brought into right relationship with God (Rom 4:1-25; cf. also Gal 3:6-9).⁵² Paul exploits the story to build the parallels, including both the important cognitive element, that God can do the impossible, bring life from the dead, something out of nothing (4:17.19.24-25), and the responsive element, acting on his belief by engaging in sexual relations with Sarah despite their age to become the father of many nations (4:19-20).

2.4. Faith and the Law

⁵⁰ See the most recent discussions in Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle, eds., *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009). James D. G. Dunn, in the "Forward" observes that the notion of Christ's faithfulness is not dependent on reading the genitive as subjective (xvi-xvii). Some of the concern with arguing for a subjective genitive appears to relate to the fear of otherwise seeing faith as a work, as, for instance, in Mark A. Seifrid, "The Faith of Christ," 129-46, 146, but this is not necessary. It may be, as suggested by Richard H. Bell, "Faith in Christ: Some Exegetical and Theological Reflections on Philippians 3:9 and Ephesians 3:12," 111-25, that the idea of Christ's faithfulness in Hebrews is read into the Pauline texts (124). See also the discussion in Moisés Silva, "Faith Versus Works of Law in Galatians," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism. Volume II. The Paradoxes of Paul*, WUNT 2.181, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids, Baker, 2004), 217-48, who argues that the weight of linguistic evidence, such as the use of the verb, suggests that the genitive is objective (233).

⁵¹ So rightly Francis Watson, "By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and its Scriptural Solution." In *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (Milton Keynes: Paternoster; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 147-63, who concludes: "In Galatians as also in Romans, Paul's prepositional faith-formulations all derive from the ἐκ πίστεως of Habakkuk 2:4 which also occurs in variant and extended forms" (162).

⁵² On Paul's creative linking of Gen 15:6 not with Genesis 22 as commonly occurred (e.g. Jas 2:21-23; 1 Macc 2:52; 4QMMT) but Gen 15:5; 17:5, see Dunn, *Theology*, 376-78.

In most of Paul's letters he shows himself in conflict with other Christians who differed from him over what faith should entail. His defence of his understanding of faith must be seen in the light of these conflicts, because they have clearly shaped his approach. In Galatians he confronts an alternative view which required of Gentiles that their response of faith include circumcision and observance of Torah, much as would have been expected of anyone converting to Judaism as a proselyte (1:6-9; 4:1-4; 5:11-12; 6:12-13). In many ways that alternative view was the normal view and still is. We may suspect that what will have in part motivated Paul and others in the movement to drop the scriptural requirement of circumcision was at one level basic human kindness in not requiring that Gentile men undergo that ordeal (Acts 15:10,19). This is possibly what evoked the charge that Paul was seriously compromising God's law in the interests of making it easier for Gentiles, that he was as he puts it in Gal 1:10 trying to please Gentiles by watering down the requirements.

Paul defends his stance towards faith, however, not by an appeal for sympathy for those who might have to undergo circumcision, but by a range of arguments, mostly theological in character. In Galatians he appeals to his stance in not requiring circumcision as an agreed stance which had the support of the leading apostles, Peter, James, and John (Gal 2:1-10; cf. Acts 15). But even before that, he had been engaging in mission to Gentiles without that requirement (Gal 1:22-24; 2:1-2). His experience may have been similar to that of Peter, namely seeing signs of God's acceptance of Gentiles before and without their being circumcised (Acts 10:44-48; 11:1-18; cf. Gal 3:1-5). Perhaps it had been one of the reasons for his earlier passionate attacks on the Christian movement (Gal 1:23). However he reached this conclusion, he defended it vigorously.

Paul argues that the free offer of a right relationship with God comes with no pre-requisites (Rom 1:16-17; 3:21-26; Gal 2:16; Phil 3:9). Faith is simply to believe in the offer and to accept it, thus entailing both a cognitive and a responsive component. Accordingly, he denies that Torah observance is the basis for both entering right standing with God and, as we shall see, sustaining that relationship, both getting in (Gal 3:2, 5) and staying in (Gal 2:16,19). To demand Torah observance, including circumcision, is to contradict what he believes God has now made possible through Christ's death (Gal 2:18-19). He thus dismisses what others would doubtless have described as an essential element of faith's response, because he sees it being in conflict with faith as he understands it and with the gospel itself. In his view such a view of faith is therefore not a tolerable variation in belief, as he can treat different views about whether to eat meat (e.g. Rom 14:13-23), but a position hostile to the gospel which can even be deemed a work of Satan (2 Cor 11:3-15; cf. 12:7) and as equivalent to calling people back to serve false gods (Gal 4:8-11). Its perpetrators should be dismissed like Hagar and Ishmael in his allegory (Gal 4:28-31).

Paul opposes the approach of requiring Torah observance on grounds that it discriminates against Gentiles and leads to Jews claiming a superiority which is unwarranted, and which is also divisive (Rom 3:27-30; Gal 2:11-14; 6:12-13). That set him at loggerheads, however, not only with those demanding circumcision, but also with others who still required observance of other parts of Torah, including food laws, including some, like James and his people, who saw Torah observance requiring separation between Jews and Gentiles at meals (Gal 2:11-14). In Galatians Paul correlates the three alternatives he identifies, those promoting circumcision (1:6-9; 5:2-12; 6:12-15), those promoting separation (2:12), and those

persuaded by the latter (2:11-14), as denying the gospel that required only faith and not the works of the Law, with which he especially singles out what he sees as the divisive requirements (2:16; 3:2.5.10; Rom 3:19-20), but refers thereby not just to them⁵³ but to law observance as a whole (Rom 3:19-20; 9:30-32; 10:2-3; 11:7).⁵⁴

His defence of his understanding of faith includes arguing that it is to be seen as what counted for Abraham before God, long before there was a Law (Gal 3:15-18), and before he was circumcised (Rom 4:1-12), that the fact that Gentiles received the Spirit before they did anything like becoming Jews confirms that it has God's approval (the argument used by Peter in relation to the descent of the Spirit on Cornelius and friends in Acts) (Gal 3:2-5; Acts 10: 44-48; 11:1-18), and that if observance is to count, it should be total, and no one achieves this, so observance cannot suffice, thus levelling Jews and Gentiles as people needing rescue by a gift of God's grace (Gal 3:10-14; Rom 3:9-20.23). Paul uses Lev 18:5 to secure his argument that Torah observance must be total (Gal 3:12; Rom 10:5). This then has implications not only for the faith response of Gentiles, but also for that of Jews, who, Paul argues, must now accept the gift of life offered through God's new initiative, and so are no longer required to observe Torah, but have died to the Law (Gal 3:16-19; Rom 7:1-6; 1 Cor 9:20). That releases them, accordingly, also from behaviour which Paul sees as discriminatory, such as in the incident at Antioch which he reports (Gal 2:11-14).

As Paul faced controversy about what faith should entail, so Paul's own stance has been a source of controversy. While the outline above depicts the danger of boasting as something done over against Gentiles (Rom 3:27), an important strand of Pauline interpretation tracing itself at least back to Luther and still with many exponents today argues that Paul's concern is boasting before God (Rom 3:19-20; cf. also Eph 2:8-9⁵⁵; Tit 3:5). Accordingly, they see faith set in contrast to an approach to God which seeks to make a claim on God on the basis of good works that a person deserves right standing.⁵⁶ While some texts can be read in that way,

⁵³ A view propounded initially, for instance by James D. G. Dunn, "The Justice of God," *JTS* 43 (1992): 1-22, 11-12, but then significantly modified as the following comment shows. "Thus we can recognize the criterion by which Paul judged the relevance of the law as a whole and in any of its particulars. Whatever commandment directed or channelled that reliance on God or helped bring that reliance to expression in daily living was the law still expressive of God's will. Conversely whatever law required more than faith ... could not be lived out as an expression of such trust in God alone, whatever ruling hindered or prevented such faith, that was the law now left behind by the coming of Christ" (641). Bird, "Paul," opines that "Paul's 'Law-free gospel' is really a 'proselytism-free gospel' since his antithetical remarks about the Law pertain primarily to instances where Gentile believers are compelled to be circumcised and to adopt a Jewish way of life (e.g. Gal. 2.11-21)" (48), but goes on to note that a change of epochs means that believers have died to the Law, which is fundamentally terminated and has only a "consultative role" (48).

⁵⁴ So Silva, "Faith Versus Works of Law," 221-26. He writes that "the works of the law" "includes those ceremonial elements of the Mosaic law that served to highlight the distinction between Jew and Gentile. But we have no good reason to infer that this phrase overshadows – much less that it excludes – the requirements of the Sinaitic covenant more generally" (222).

⁵⁵ Though there, too, the focus of the broader context is unity between Jews and Gentiles, which must be seen as the context of the concern about boasting.

⁵⁶ E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM, 1977), most notably challenged the assumption that Judaism was a legalistic religion obsessed with self-righteousness. For a defence of the notion that Paul's issue about justification by faith was about more than relations with Gentiles, against Sanders, Dunn, and Wright, see Peter T. O'Brien, "Was Paul a Covenantal Nomist?" In *Justification and Variegated Nomism*.

and Paul's stance warrants the conclusion that making claims on God, self-justification by human achievement, is wrong, a profound observation on the human condition, this is not Paul's primary focus.

In dismissing Torah observance as an element of faith's response and as inadequate Paul must counter a number of criticisms, including whether he is calling God's covenant faithfulness to Israel and its election into question, whether he is disparaging the Law, and whether not requiring Torah observance by implication promotes lawlessness and sin. His answers to these all inform his understanding of faith

Paul refutes the suggestion that he questions God's keeping faith (Rom 3:1-8), resorting ultimately to a claim that somehow God will eventually bring Israel to faith, even though in the interim he had hardened all but a remnant of Israel into unbelief (Romans 9–11). In a tortuous argument Paul defends God's right to make selections, explains why Israel failed by not embracing the offer of a right relationship by faith and instead seeking it on the basis of Law observance (9:30-33; 10:2-3), rationalises it as opening the offer to Gentiles, whose response he believes will prompt Israel to change (11:11-24), but ultimately affirms his belief that all Israel will be saved (11:25-36).

He resolves the status of the Law, partly by giving it a lower status as something given only indirectly by God through lesser beings (angels) (Gal 3:19-20), partly by arguing that God had assigned it a temporary role as the means for establishing the need for the gift that now God offers through Christ (Gal 3:21-25; Rom 4:15; 5:20), and partly by describing its psychological effects as counterproductive in terms of trying to effect right behaviour (Rom 7:7-24). It is consistent with this latter argument, which is most developed in Romans 7, that Paul also addresses the criticism that in dismissing the Law, except as predicting the gospel, he promotes lawlessness (Rom 6:1-23). For he argues that when believers respond in faith to the gospel, they are raised to a new life made possible by the Spirit and as long as they remain open to the Spirit, produce behaviour which more than fulfils what he still values in the Law, namely ethical attitudes and behaviour, at the heart of which is love (Rom 8:1-4; similarly 8:5-17).

This, in turn, enables Paul to argue that far from disparaging or doing away with the Law (which is "good" Rom 7:7.12), he upholds it (Rom 3:31).⁵⁷ But he can make this claim only by an approach to the Law which argues from its core intent (Rom 3:27),⁵⁸ readily sets aside

Volume II. The Paradoxes of Paul, WUNT 2.181, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids, Baker, 2004), 249-96; and Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).

⁵⁷ νόμος here may mean principle or approach. So, for instance, E. P. Sanders, *Paul, The Law, and the Jewish People* (London: SCM, 1982), 33. But here and in 9:30-33 it could refer to the Law treated in two different ways, as possibly in 3:27-31 since Gerhard Friedrich, "Das Gesetz des Glaubens Römer 3,27," *ThZ* 10 (1954): 409-11; Dunn, *Theology*, 638.

⁵⁸ One approach to Torah emphasises the need to keep it in full (διὰ τοῦ νόμου; τῶν ἔργων;), the other focuses on adhering to its deeper values as seen by faith (διὰ νόμου πίστεως) (3:27) and so is prepared to set some things aside. Accordingly Israel was pursuing right thing the law of righteousness the wrong way. So Dunn, *Theology*, 639-40. See also Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), who has mounted a case that in fact Paul stands within a legitimate stream of interpretation of scripture in his approach towards the Law: "Paul's controversy with 'Judaism' (Christian or otherwise) is in fact a conflict about interpretation of Torah" (528).

aspects which he sees as divisive, and sees it fulfilled not by keeping commandments but by living out the fruit of the Spirit, which he argues is the best way to end up doing and doing more than the commandments require (Rom 8:4). Observing the Law has become for Paul not a necessity, but a strategy to be engaged in as appropriate to the context for the sake of not giving offence and promoting good relations (1 Cor 9:19-23; 10:23 – 11:1; Rom 14:13 – 15:13). In Rom 15:7-12 Paul may be suggesting that Jesus “became a servant of the circumcised” in the same strategic spirit. For Paul the believer has died to the Law and is no longer under the Law (Gal 2:19; 5:16; Rom 7:1-4; 3:21).

2.5. Faith and Ethics

Love is a fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22-23). Paul consistently derives his ethics, both in terms of positive behaviours and of warnings against sin, not from biblical commandments of Torah, but from insights and implications drawn from the new relationship of the believer with God through the Spirit (1 Thess 2:12; 3:13; 4:3.7-8.9-12; 1 Cor 6:12-20; 12 – 14; Gal 5:1.13-25; Rom 6:1-23; 8:4-17; 12:1-21). This new relationship, Paul argues, sets the believer free from the fruitless bind of seeking to observe the Law produces (Rom 8:3-4; 7:1-6), and so faith means both believing in what God has offered and remaining faithful and submissive to the dynamics which that new life in the Spirit makes possible.

Paul can also, however, point out that by walking in the Spirit and bearing the fruit of love one thereby meets the requirements of the commandments, clearly having the ethical ones in mind. Thus he explains that “the one who loves another has fulfilled the Law” (Rom 13:8) and that loving one another sums up the requirements of the second table of the Decalogue (13:9-10; similarly Gal 5:13-15). Paul’s exhortation is neither to observe these commandments in order to receive eternal life nor to do so in order to retain it, but to walk in the Spirit (Gal 5:16). This does not hinder Paul sometimes using biblical law to reinforce his ethical concerns (e.g. 1 Cor 9:8-9), but the primary driver of faith’s ongoing response is not the commandments but the relationship with Christ through the Spirit and the way it leads to Christ’s and ultimately God’s behaviour reproducing itself in the believer. In Galatians he describes this as “faith working through love” (5:6),⁵⁹ fulfilling the “law of Christ” (6:2; similarly 1 Cor 9:21), and a “new creation” (6:15). Faith thus serves the expression of love: “And now faith, hope, and love abide, these three; and the greatest of these is love” (1 Cor 13:13; cf. also 16:14; Rom 8:31-39).

Clearly faith’s response, however, entails something more than the spontaneity which might result from such freedom in the Spirit. It also needs instruction and focussing, as Paul’s many ethical instructions illustrate, but the underlying assumption is that Paul is telling people how faith should work, how fruit should be born, and making the connections between the new freedom in finding God’s goodness and the impact it should be allowed to have on daily life (1 Thess 2:12 walk worthily in the interim). In this the corporate dimension of faith’s response is a regular feature, because for Paul love has relational implications which embrace not only the individual’s relation to God but also common life (1 Corinthians 12–14; Romans 12; Gal 6:1-10). This includes what Paul sees as good order, with women taking

⁵⁹ Dunn, *Theology*, writes of ‘faith operating effectively through love’ (637). “It is precisely faith as complete reliance on and openness to God’s grace which (inevitably) comes to expression in love” (638).

their ordered place and behaving accordingly (1 Cor 11:2-16; 14:33-36), marriage being upheld, except where Paul's preferred option of celibate singleness in the light of the nearness of the end and non-sexual character of the age to come is adopted, and for periods of prayer when entering the holy requires such abstinence (1 Cor 7:1-6).

Faith's response may entail compromise, where one acts contrary to one's own beliefs in order not to create problems for those within the believing community who take a different stance within the range of acceptable beliefs (1 Cor 10:14 – 11:1; Rom 14-15). In such contexts the word πίστις can refer to one's choice within such a range of beliefs, which Paul designates strong and weak (Rom 14:2.22-23). He clearly places himself on the side of the strong: "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself; but it is unclean for anyone who thinks it unclean" (οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν κυρίῳ ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν) (14:14). Interestingly, in stating his opinion, Paul, on the one hand, does not impose it but relates it to conscience (as 14:5): to act against one's conviction is sin (14:23). This expresses a degree of tolerance. His statement, "For the kingdom of God is not food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (14:17), serves the appeal to the strong like himself, that unity in the community of the kingdom of God is a higher priority than exercising their freedom to eat anything and so offend the weak, even though as Paul restates: "Everything is indeed clean" (πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ) (14:20). On the other hand, he claims that he has been persuaded of his view "in the Lord Jesus", but offers no further explanation.

Faith's response also includes concern for the poor within the community of faith, which at one level expresses itself in Paul's making a collection for the poor believers in Jerusalem (Gal 2:10; 1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 8 – 9; Rom 15:15.25-27). Christ's generosity serves as a model (2 Cor 8:9). Similarly Paul reminds Philemon of their shared faith and so responsibility as he confronts the Corinthians about neglect of their poorer members and about disorder (1 Cor 11:17-34).

Sometimes Paul uses faith to speak of confidence or assurance, in the face not only of adversity but also of conflict and of the need to exercise authoritative leadership (Gal 1:10-12; 2 Cor 4:13; Rom 1:5-7). Faith for Paul entails both believing the goodness and submission to what it offers, which includes, to Paul's mind, submission also to the one who offers it (2 Cor 2:9.16-17; 7:15; 9:13; 10:5-6; 12:20 – 13:2; 13:6-10; 1 Thess 5:12-13). This is not a claim to power in itself, but a claim that inasmuch as someone is truly authorised to represent the gospel, submission to the gospel ought to include submission to that person's authority. Sometimes Paul simply assumes that faith would understand this; at other times he must defend the claim against those who dismiss his having such status (2 Cor 10:1 – 12:13; Phil 3:2-6.17-19; 1 Cor 9:1-23; Gal 1:10-24).

Paul can also use faith to describe the particular roles which people are called and equipped to exercise as part of their response of faith (Rom 12:3.6; cf. 1 Cor 12:9). These are often associated with the Spirit, which is seen as enabling such roles, and may also be described as gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor 12:9; 13:2). Paul uses the word χάρις to describe his own role as apostle to the Gentiles. Within the range of such roles exercised as one's response of faith under the impact of the Spirit Paul also includes charismatic phenomena, including speaking in tongues, and miracles. Paul notes that he exercises the first (1 Cor 14:18), and on a few occasions mentions signs and wonders as accompanying his apostolic

ministry, presumably acts of healing (1 Thess 1:5; 1 Cor 2:4; 4:20; 2 Cor 12:12; Gal 3:5; Rom 15:18-19), described also as manifestation of the kingdom of God in the present (1 Cor 4:20). As in Mark, these appear to have a legitimising function, a tool of propaganda to evoke faith. Sometimes Paul uses faith in the sense of belief being sufficient to effect miracles, sharing with Mark the formulation, faith to move mountains, probably as in Mark linked to prayer for power to do miracles (1 Cor 13:2; cf. Mark 11:22-24).

3. Key Aspects of Faith in Mark and Paul Compared

3.1. Hermeneutics: Faith and the Law

Both Paul and Mark share as part of their faith the belief that Christ's coming fulfilled scripture. Typically, therefore, Paul commences his letter to the Romans with reference to fulfilment of scripture (1:2), and Mark does the same (1:2). The latter inherits typologically rich anecdotes which connect Jesus to God's actions through Moses, Elijah, Elisha, and Jonah, and in his own way Paul alludes typologically to Moses and allegorically to Abraham. Mark has Jesus argue for priorities in scripture, Genesis over Deuteronomy on divorce, an argument about theological intent, and Paul argues similarly in relation to Abraham and the Mosaic law. Both shared such prioritising with others in the Christian movement.

3.1.1 Removing Barriers Created by the Law

Paul's statements about the Law relate closely to conflict over incorporation of Gentiles into the people of God, their acceptance before God. Mark also engages the Law in the context of affirming that the nourishment represented in the bread of the feedings is given to both Jews and Gentiles. This is important common ground.⁶⁰ Both also assume God's offer has been first to Israel and then to the Gentiles (Mark 7:27; Rom 1:16), a sequence hardly unique to the two.⁶¹ This is the context for Paul's reflection on hardening, though he concludes that all Israel will be saved. Mark's comments on hardening, also using Isa 6:9, are not directed to this theme in particular nor does he indicate belief in Israel's ultimate salvation.⁶² Indeed Mark explains the process of hardening as effected through the use of parables.⁶³ Dealing with rejection and also belonging by using notions of election and hardening or predestination was a common strategy, not peculiar to these two authors.⁶⁴

3.1.2. Mark's Stance on Law

⁶⁰ This inspires, for instance, Jesper Svartvik, *Mark and Mission: Mk 7:1-23 in its Narrative and Historical Contexts* (CB.NY 32; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2000) to claim that Mark is "a narrative presentation of the Pauline gospel" (2). See also, Svartvik, "Matthew and Mark," 33.

⁶¹ Crossley, "Mark, Paul," points out that already Gal 2:15 shows that Paul assumes it is also Peter's view (18-19). Cf. Marcus, "Mark-Interpreter of Paul," 475.

⁶² So Werner, *Einfluss*, 193-94; Crossley, "Mark, Paul," 12, rejecting the argument of B. W. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1919), 263. Cf. also Marcus, "Mark-Interpreter of Paul," 475; Telford, *Theology of Mark*, 164, 168.

⁶³ Werner, *Einfluss*, 188, 192.

⁶⁴ So already Werner, *Einfluss*, 196, who notes that Mark writes of the hardening of the disciples, a most unlikely move had he known of the special usage in Paul (195).

Mark has Jesus address those issues of Law which he assumed created barriers to the admission of Gentiles. They related not to circumcision, but to food laws. He employs a logion of Jesus which asserted that not so much what entered a person made them unclean but what came out of them, actions stemming from evil attitudes, and used it to make an absolute claim that what enters a person cannot by its very nature make them unclean, no longer a relativisation of purity laws in relation to food, but a dismissal of such categories altogether as making no sense, and so removing also what he sensed was a barrier, laws about unclean foods.

3.1.3 Paul's Stance on Law

The later paulinist author of Ephesians re-presents Paul's stance, when declaring that God had removed the barrier, the enmity between Jew and Gentile, namely the law of commandments (Eph 2:15). Paul's own stance was to remove the Law from its absolute position and so dismiss its continuing validity, both for Gentiles who joined the people of God and for Jews. Its observance for him is now just a matter of mission strategy depending on the circumstances or of sensitivity to living with the weak, who are still observant. Paul's statements in Romans that he believes that nothing is unclean in itself (14:14), that everything is clean (14:20) and that "the kingdom of God is not food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" are close to Mark's view, especially Mark's editorial comment, that Jesus was making all foods clean (7:19), but lacks the disparagement present in Mark's discussion. If there is connection between the two here, it is scarcely from Mark to Paul, but could be from Paul to Mark if Mark's formulation, καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα in some way stands under the influence of Paul's πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ (Rom 14:20), though the parallels are not precise. Paul, on the other hand, may have stood under the influence of a Jesus logion like that preserved in Mark 7:15, especially in Rom 14:14, but on that one can only speculate.⁶⁵ But these are not the only authors to deal with food laws as an issue, as Acts 10 shows.⁶⁶

3.1.4. Mark is More Radical than Paul

While Paul can employ the contrast between literal circumcision and circumcision of the heart, external and internal, earlier and later (Rom 1:25-29), and even argue that the letter kills (2 Cor 3:6) and the Law though good does not work (Rom 7:5.8.10-13; 8:3-4),⁶⁷ he never goes so far as Mark to dismiss aspects of the Law as making no sense. On this Mark is more radical.

3.1.5. Paul more radical than Mark

On the other hand, Paul is more radical than Mark in consistently basing ethics not on the commandments, but on what flows from one's relation to Christ and what constitutes the fruit of the Spirit. He argues that he upholds the Law in the sense that the gospel he preaches

⁶⁵ Bird, "Mark," who argues that Paul could have said such a thing without dominical authority and suggests that ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ ὅτι may reflect this (50-51).

⁶⁶ So Crossley, "Mark, Paul," 13.

⁶⁷ Werner, *Einfluss*, notes that Mark gives no indication that the Law as summarised in 12:29-31 cannot be fulfilled unlike Paul (96). On the contrary Mark sees the Law as able to be fulfilled.

produces as an outcome behaviours which more than satisfy the Law's demands. In such contexts he can cite the ethical commandments of the Decalogue as evidence that this is so and even loving one's neighbour as summarising the Law. One gains eternal life through faith in Christ, however, not by keeping the biblical commandments.

3.1.6. Mark and the Commandments

Mark is clearly different. Mark would not embrace the notion that believers had died to the Law, nor that it was impossible to keep it, let alone that Christ's death brought its end.⁶⁸ His Jesus tells the rich man that the way to inherit eternal life is by keeping such commandments, as elsewhere he identifies the criterion for being his fictive family as doing the will of God and affirms the need to keep the greatest commandments. Doing the will of God also includes believing in Jesus, but Mark's understanding is that following Jesus includes following his understanding of the commandments, which the test question to the rich man exposed him as unwilling to do. Mark's faith addresses greed and poverty generally. While Paul's shares concern for the poor, his focus is on the poor among believers, "the saints" (1 Cor 16:1; 2 Cor 9:1; Rom 15:26; cf. also Gal 2:10).⁶⁹

3.1.7. Significant differences in attitude towards the Law

If Paul's approach to scripture is one which gives priority to the gospel as ancient promise and dismisses the Law as no longer in force, Mark's approach is to dismiss aspects of the Law as never having been valid, but affirm that keeping, above all, its ethical commandment is essential to faith's response.⁷⁰ These are thus significant variations, but overall Mark and Paul share a willingness to set parts of Torah aside in the interests of inclusion of Gentiles in contrast to Matthew and Luke. On the other hand, both Mark and Paul hold firmly to commands attributed to Jesus, including on divorce and remarriage and support of people on mission. Both use Gen 2:24 similarly to argue permanence, Jesus, the permanence of marriage, Paul, the permanence of severing oneself from Christ when joining oneself in sex to an illicit partner.

3.2 Soteriology

3.2.1. Soteriology in Mark

The different responses of faith cohere with a difference in soteriology. Mark's Jesus promises hope, but already during his ministry brings the transforming reign of God through healing, exorcism, and the call to change, offering forgiveness and belonging in God's people

⁶⁸ So Werner, *Einfluss*, 89. He writes: "ein ganz besonderes Gewicht kommt aber der Tatsache zu, dass die Heilsbedeutung des Kreuzestodes wie Markus sie fasst, nicht in Gegensatz tritt zu der Grundanschauung über die Heilsbedeutung des Gesetzes" (92).

⁶⁹ See William Loader, "What Happened to 'Good News for the Poor'? On the Trail of Hope Beyond Jesus," in *Reflections on Early Christian History and Religion*, AJEC 81, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and Jörg Frey (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 233-66, 256-59.

⁷⁰ Crossley, "Mark, Paul," concedes this when he writes: "Even if Mark was aware of non-observance, he shows no serious indication of such a phenomenon and no indication of a Pauline view that the Law is a thing of the past or a Pauline view that the Law has no role in salvation and justification" (21). Repschinski, *Nicht aufzulösen*, writes of Mark's stance towards the law as a "kuriose Mischung aus Kontinuität und Diskontinuität" (209).

to all. Faith is to believe who Jesus is and what he offers and to respond by heeding his teaching, which includes the message about what God requires: to do God's will as described above. The message of hope promises change in the future. Faith in Mark as in Paul means believing the coming day of judgement and the appearance of Christ and the hope of being with him rather than suffering divine judgement. Both use the term εὐαγγέλιον, though Mark with a much wider application. Though also a term used in imperial propaganda, it most likely derives from use of Isaianic LXX texts (61:1; 57:6),⁷¹ the former of which is attested elsewhere, rather than indicating a dependence of Mark on Paul or Pauline tradition,⁷² though at least the latter is one possible option among others.⁷³

In Mark the promise of the kingdom seems to exist in itself with faith needing to believe that Jesus is indeed God's agent to announce it and to achieve it. It is the good news and constitutes Mark's soteriology. Neither within Mark's narrative world, which depicts the time before Jesus' death, nor in projections beyond it, is there clear evidence that the cross as effecting atonement has become the main focus of the good news, as it is in Paul, according to whom only on that basis can freedom from divine judgement be possible. Had this been so also for Mark, one would expect to see traces of it at least in the passion narrative, where Mark has been actively engaged in highlighting other key values. Mark's message in Jesus' ministry is already about belonging and already included forgiveness, offered to all, as it was already in the call to change by John.

Mark also knows the tradition about Christ's death as redemptive, to which he alludes in the ransom saying and the words over the wine. They could now simply refer to Jesus' self-giving throughout his life and even to death in order to bring the benefit of the good news to all and so be saving in that sense. Mark is here drawing on tradition, just as Paul had earlier, for whom Christ's redemptive death formed the heart of his gospel. The two allusions in Mark are scarcely derived from Paul, who uses neither λύτρον and "for many"; nor is his account of the last meal where the latter reference occurs derived from Paul's tradition as does Luke's. While for Paul it is the saving event *par excellence*, in the light of which Jesus' prior ministry is largely without significance, this is not the case with Mark.⁷⁴ For, while sharing with Paul the common eschatological meaning of being saved from the judgement, Mark's understanding of salvation is not just about sin and redemption, but about liberation and healing, which he finds already coming to expression in Jesus' ministry, to which forgiveness belongs but only as one element.⁷⁵ As we have seen, it is also highly unlikely that Mark saw Jesus' ministry as expressing a different understanding of salvation from what

⁷¹ Crossley, "Mark, Paul," 20. Werner, *Einfluss*, argues on the basis of Gal 1:6-9 that Paul inherited use of the term from tradition (103).

⁷² Cf. Marcus, "Mark-Interpreter of Paul," 475; Telford, *Theology of Mark*, 168.

⁷³ Cf. Bird, "Mark," who writes: "the language and perspective in Mk 13.10 is undoubtedly Christian and, more specifically, Pauline" (47). "This suggests that the Pauline mission to the nations is the social context of Mark's Gospel" (47).

⁷⁴ I find the argument of Marcus, "Mark – Interpreter of Paul," 479-81, that the emphasis of each is on the cross needs significant qualification. The commonality lies in both in very different ways highlighting the path of suffering, but not in the weight given the cross's soteriological significance, which is so much more in Paul.

⁷⁵ So Werner, *Einfluss*, 62, 118-19.

Mark would now preach in his own time.⁷⁶ He did after all write a gospel, to indicate not only what *was* good news but what *is* good news. Its balance and proportions, including the place of atonement theology, are likely to indicate the nature of Mark's own theology and understanding of the Christian message. Thus Mark shows that he knows the motif which for Paul was so central, but weights it very differently.

3.2.2. Soteriology in Paul

Paul's soteriology is, indeed, very different. He says little of Jesus' ministry. Rather the focus is his death, about which he has a range of traditions, all of which signify that this was the event in which God dealt with human sin by having Christ die. Christ died for us. Christ died for our sins. That made forgiveness and reconciliation possible. That was the act of a righteous God, setting about to set people in right relationship with himself, as a result of which they would then live rightly. The soteriology is directly related to the ethics.

Righteousness gives birth to righteousness, otherwise described as the fruit of the Spirit, generated in the new life which through Christ's death has died and through his resurrection has risen to new life and new beginnings. Paul enables us to see how transformative all this is for the individual who embraces it in faith. This is a sophisticated theology in which faith's response is entry into an ongoing relationship which through the Spirit generates goodness in response to goodness, righteousness in response to righteousness.

This is not Mark's theology, though one can argue that what Paul identifies as happening in Christ's death, an act of reconciliation and justification, Mark demonstrates indirectly as occurring in Jesus' ministry. Mark's account of Jesus' baptism find echoes in Paul's notion of baptism and the receiving of the Spirit as the moment when the believer is adopted as a child of God, but Mark sees fictive kinship differently: Jesus' family are those who do the will of God, though surely Mark's community also saw baptism as part of the process of joining the believing community. Mark shows no awareness of the response of faith as engagement in a relationship which by the Spirit engenders ethical fruit. Ethics mean keeping the commandments and following Jesus. The Spirit enables miracles.

3.3. Common Eschatology

Despite the very different soteriology and significantly different approach to the Law, both Mark and Paul share a common eschatology. Both use kingdom of God to refer to the future hope, associated with the return of Christ, sometimes expressed in similar terms (coming in clouds and accompanied by holy ones). Both speak of a future judgement, a surprisingly constant and frequently neglected feature in Paul's thought. If, as appears to be the case, Mark understands the transfiguration scene as a foreshadowing of the return of Christ, then both share an understanding of resurrected existence as transfigured into something spiritual, not a physical resuscitation. Both assumes a sexless age to come, though, unlike Paul, Mark

⁷⁶ Werner, *Einfluss*, astutely relates the different soteriology to the different stance towards the Law: "In Wahrheit stoßen wir hier einfach auf die Konsequenz der positiven soteriologischen Wertung des Gesetzes, wie Markus sie vertritt: wo es sich um die Bedingung zur Erlangung der ζωή αἰώνιος handelt, eben da erscheint bei Markus nicht die Forderung des Glaubens an den Messias Jesus, sondern da heisst es einfach: 'Du kennst die Gebote' (10:19). Hier muss also in der Tat der Grund für das auffallende Zurücktreten der Forderung des Glaubens an Jesus als den Christus liegen" (111-12).

shows no signs of knowing people who want to impose this on the present. Both have an expectation that the coming of Christ and the kingdom will occur within a generation. The common eschatology is best explained as derived from common early tradition.⁷⁷

3.4. Christology

Mark also shares with Paul the belief in Jesus' unique relation to God, though without specifically identifying pre-existence as an element of his christology or drawing on wisdom christology. Paul lacks the title Son of Man,⁷⁸ but otherwise shares a similar apocalyptic eschatology. Both affirm Christ's resurrection, including the appearance to Peter. The major differences in christology between Paul and Mark are the absence of reference to Christ's pre-existence in Mark and the absence in Paul of references to the significance of Jesus' ministry. Both share an emphasis on Christ's suffering, Paul, as an interpretation and defence of his own frailty and suffering, Mark, apparently in presenting Jesus as a model for believers of his day, perhaps even to the extent of having the Jewish trial sound more like a trial of Christians in his day than an historical event of forty years earlier. Mark has nothing equivalent to what many read in Paul as a reference to the faith or faithfulness of Christ, not surprisingly since it occurs in Paul's statements about Christ's death for our sins, not an emphasis in Mark. On the other hand, Mark's narrative of the passion does illustrate Christ's faithfulness. Mark's christology does not show signs of having derived from Paul's, which is more developed.

3.5. Misdirected Faith

It is equally interesting that both deal with what they deem is misdirected faith. For Paul that entails confronting the Corinthians whose powerful charismatic experiences threaten both the unity of the community and its integrity. A significant element is also that it appears to fuel disparagement of Paul's authority as an apostle. Against these trends Paul asserts love and mutual responsibility, both in caring for one another and in recognising different kinds of gifts. In his own defence he aligns his apparent unimpressiveness with Christ's suffering and death, arguing for the cross as a symbol God's way of love which is superior to powerful miracles and powerful wisdom.

While Mark does not appear to be confronted with lofty claims to wisdom, his gospel challenges what it depicts as the obsession of the leading disciples with positions of power. Peter does not want a suffering messiah. The disciples argue about who will be the greatest. James and John want the top positions beside Jesus in the kingdom. Mark's Messiah is then depicted as a crucified king, crowned on a cross with thorns. Nothing indicates a direct relation to Paul's arguments, but there is a common emphasis.⁷⁹ Such issues of appropriate

⁷⁷ Werner, *Einfluss*, while noting common traditions (144) also points to significant differences including Mark's reference to signs before the end, unlike Paul (147-48), different understandings of future resurrection and the fate of unbelievers, and absence in Mark of the notion an interim reign of Christ (153-55, 161-77).

⁷⁸ On attempts to find commonality between Son of Man and last Adam see Telford, *Theology of Mark*, 166. Marcus, "Mark-Interpreter of Paul," sees the commonality in Adam tradition in Mark's wilderness scene (475).

⁷⁹ Crossley, "Mark, Paul," writes: "Certainly, we can say that issues of authority and/or suffering are tied in with terms such as 'son of God' and 'son of man' and the general issue of a theology of the cross is no doubt a clear similarity between the two" (27).

faith are, however, by no means peculiar to Paul and Mark. Dealing with faith overly focused on signs and wonders was apparently a widespread problem, evident in the closing sections of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (7:15-23), and in the depiction of those who on the basis of miracles trusted in Jesus' name in John 2:23 – 3:5, and in whom Jesus could not bring himself to trust, but who required new birth if they were to see the kingdom.

Miracles served both Mark's account and Paul as corroboration of God's presence in people, but assume much greater significance in Mark as signs of the kingdom. Both know the image of faith moving mountains. Such use of signs and wonders as propaganda was not unproblematic, as our discussion has shown, but, for all its dangers, remains in both a component which serves to enhance faith. This was probably something they shared in common with others in the movement.

3.6. Pneumatology

For Mark the Spirit is primarily the power of God in Jesus which enables him to perform exorcisms and healings and at most is promised as a helper of believers facing trials, a motif developed into the paraclete in the Johannine final discourses. It also inspired David to write Ps 110:1. Faith's focus in relation to the Spirit is thus primarily on the miraculous, not the ethical. In Paul, by contrast, the Spirit is manifest primarily in the fruit of the Spirit, especially love, which is the measure for assessing all other expressions or claims to the Spirit's activity. So while Paul, too, shares the primitive notion that the Spirit empowered miracles of healing and exorcisms, he has gone far beyond such notions along paths clearly unknown to Mark.⁸⁰

3.7. Authority and Leadership

In both Mark and Paul faith entails for some a special calling, to share Jesus' ministry and represent him. Paul's difficult manoeuvrings reflect dispute about his status as apostle and indicate conflict with Peter, whose leadership of the initial group is assumed in Mark, and with the subsequent leader in Jerusalem, James, brother of Jesus, who barely features in Mark. One might speculate that Mark's depiction of the disciple's dullness and failure to understand is replaying Paul's earlier conflicts or perhaps continuing the fight with the conservatives and moderates. That is speculation.⁸¹ For Mark's final words affirm Peter's

⁸⁰ So Werner, *Einfluss*, 126-27. Maureen W. Yeung, *Faith in Jesus and Paul: A Comparison with Special Reference to 'Faith Can Remove Mountains' and 'Your Faith Has Healed/Saved You'* (WUNT 2.147; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), develops the argument that Paul in fact developed the approach of the historical Jesus towards faith, which she portrays as faith in his ability and in his person, leading both to healing and to salvation, as acceptance into the kingdom, illustrated by the statement that faith saved the woman with the bleeding (in relation to impurity) (175-79) and Bartimaeus (in relation to no longer being seen as a sinner) (183). On the basis of use of Hab 2:4 and Gen 15:6 she argues that Paul takes "Jesus' miracle-salvation faith a step forward" (281), indeed, much further forward as he develops a different soteriology based on Christ's death.

⁸¹ Crossley, "Mark, Paul," notes that "the disputes with family and the disciples in Mark do not, in sharp contrast to Paul, directly involve the Law and its validity and Jesus even defends his disciples on the issue of plucking grain on the Sabbath, which, as we saw, is the kind of interpretative dispute known in early Judaism" 23; cf. Marcus, "Mark-Interpreter of Paul," 475; Telford, *Theology of Mark*, 164. According to Werner, *Einfluss*, Mark has a high view of the twelve despite their lack of understanding (179-80), since they are

priority as witness to Christ's appearance in Galilee without any hint of denigration.⁸² Mark reflects the tradition according to which the twelve disciples are apostles (6:30), possibly exclusively so, unlike in Paul,⁸³ who also never used "disciples" of them.⁸⁴ The poor performance of the disciples in Mark probably has less to do with history, including the history of Paul's conflict with some of them or Mark's conflict with their influence in his day, than with Mark's pedagogical agenda which challenges all to an informed faith. One might at least conclude that Mark is not in a context where to say such things would have offended anyone to whom he or his community is beholden. On the other hand, Mark's stance would certainly put him and his community offside with the Law observant Christians. That doesn't make him Pauline, any more than John's one-upmanship of the beloved disciple over Peter, while respecting the latter's legitimacy as leader. Paul's conflicts with these leaders was over Law; Mark's depiction of their weakness relates not to Law, but to their failure to understand the way of lowly suffering. Both Paul and Mark advise respect for secular authorities, including payment of taxes,⁸⁵ though differently (Mark 12:13-17; Rom 13:1-7), but are not alone in this.

4. Conclusion

What brings Mark and Paul together is the common interest in dealing with the inclusion of Gentiles by redefining the place of Law in a way that sets them apart from Matthew and Luke, who show by their reworking of Mark, that they disagree with Mark, though Paul and Mark still differ on the Law's status. What sets Mark and Paul apart also is the very different soteriology, pneumatology, and basis for ethics, such that it would be hard to place Mark in a Pauline trajectory, such as we find in Colossians, Ephesians, or the Pastoral epistles.⁸⁶ These differences have major implications for the understanding of faith in each, which accordingly is significantly different. In Paul it means believing and embracing the gift of reconciliation made possible through Christ's death which guarantees escape from wrath to come and through the Spirit living out that relationship in ways that more than fulfil the Law's demands. In Mark it means believing and embracing the promise of the kingdom, including the promise now of forgiveness and belonging, and following Jesus by doing God's will,

privileged throughout. Their failure to understand need for Jesus' suffering and death is not the same as their role in Paul where they oppose the true gospel and that the cross sets Law aside (unlike in Mark) (181-82). Mark's disciples are not legalistic but free as 2:1 – 3:6 and 7:1-23 show (182).

⁸² For an attempt to reclaim the second century tradition of Mark's dependence on Peter, see Bird, "Mark," 30-61. I still find the comment by Fenton, "Paul and Mark," more apposite: "The extant evidence points as much to Mark's companionship with Paul as to Mark's companionship with Peter" (111).

⁸³ Werner, *Einfluss*, 178-79.

⁸⁴ Werner, *Einfluss*, attributes this to his different understanding of the relationship with Jesus.

⁸⁵ Telford, *Theology of Mark*, 166

⁸⁶ Marcus, *Mark*, concludes: "The most reasonable conclusion would seem to be that Mark writes in the Pauline sphere of activity and shows some sort of Pauline influence on his thought, although he is not a member of the Pauline 'school' in the same sense that the authors of Colossians-Ephesians and the Pastorals are; unlike them, he has not studied, internalized, and imitated Paul's letters" (75).

including a selective keeping of the Law based on priorities set by Jesus.⁸⁷ It is hard to get from Paul to Mark in the light of such difference.

Mark and Paul share enough, however, for us to say that Mark will have been written in a community which has needed to affirm Gentile participation, and so is probably predominantly Gentile, though with a sufficiently well-educated constituency of Jews and possibly proselytes for the many subtle allusions to scripture in Mark not to be lost on them. This makes it likely that Mark's radical approach to the Law draws its inspiration not from non-Jewish or anti-Jewish circles, but from the fringes of Judaism where Paul had been at home and whose thought could address the issues of Gentile belonging so radically. Given levels of communication in their world, it is surely possible that Mark would have known of Paul and known of Pauline traditions, though these are difficult to trace.

Mark's theology has most in common with what is probably Paul's earlier extant letter, 1 Thessalonians. Both share a focus on the eschaton (kingdom, judgement, coming of Christ), on faith as enduring adversity, some ethical implications as appropriate for life in the interim, a corporate dimension, including respect for leaders, and use of Spirit-generated miracles (and the resurrection) to enhance credibility of the message; and nothing about Christ's death as salvific.

The different soteriology and pneumatology, and so the difference in the understanding of what are to be faith's beliefs and faith's response, suggest that Mark cannot be seen as simply a more radical paulinist. The common ground suggests a Christian group within the diverse mix of evolving Christian communities, which had also needed to deal with inclusion of Gentiles by addressing issues of Law, but in its self-understanding and primitive concept of faith was much more closely aligned with what appears to have been the message and mission of the historical Jesus, which it therefore seeks to re-present.

⁸⁷ Werner, *Einfluss*, writes: "Der Gottesglaube des Markus zeigt praktisch-religiöse Art: er ist die ungeteilte Zuversicht, dass Gott Bitten, wie sie des Lebens Notdurft Tag für Tag dem Menschen auf die Lippen zwingt, erhören wird (Mc 11 24). Der Gottesglaube des Paulus ist mehr theologisch-theoretisch: er ist die Zuversicht, dass Gott in Erfüllung gehen lässt, was er im heiligen Buch vor Zeiten dem auserwählten Volk versprochen hat. Hinter dem Gottesglauben des Markus steht die Vorstellung von Gott als Vater, der das einzelne Individuum kennt und sich seiner in den Sorgen der Erde annimmt; hinter dem Glauben des Paulus steht der Gott der 'Heilsgeschichte'" (113).

Bibliography

- Bacon, B. W. *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1919.
- Beavis, Mary Ann. "Mark's Teaching on Faith," *BTB* 16 (1986): 139-42.
- Beavis, Mary Ann. "Women as Models of Faith in Mark," *BTB* 18 (1988): 3-9.
- Bell, Richard H. "Faith in Christ: Some Exegetical and Theological Reflections on Philippians 3:9 and Ephesians 3:12." In *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird, and Preston M. Sprinkle, Milton Keys: Paternoster; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009, 111-25
- Bird, Michael F. "Mark: Interpreter of Peter and Disciple of Paul." In *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Controversies*, LNTS 411, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joel Willitts, London: T&T Clark, 2011, 30-61.
- Byrne, Brendan. "Paul and Mark before the Cross: Common Echoes of the Day of Atonement Ritual." In *Transcending Boundaries: Contemporary Readings of the New Testament: In Honour of Professor Francis Moloney, S.D.B.*, ed. Rekha M. Chennattu and Mary L. Coloe Rome: LAS Publications, 2005, 217-30.
- Collins, Adela Y. *Mark*, Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Crossley, James G. "Mark, Paul and the Question of Influence." In *Paul and the Gospels: Christologies, Conflicts and Controversies*, LNTS 411, ed. Michael F. Bird and Joel Willitts, London: T&T Clark, 2011, 10-29.
- Donahue, John R. and Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, SP 2, Collegeville: Liturgical, 2002.
- Dowd, Sharyn Echols. *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22-25 in the Context of Markan Theology*, SBLDS105, Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.
- du Toit, Andrie. "Faith and Obedience in Paul." In *Focusing on Paul. Persuasion and Theological Design in Romans and Galatians*, BZNW 151, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach, and David S. du Toit; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007, 117-27.
- Dunn, James D. G. "Forward." In *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird, and Preston M. Sprinkle, Milton Keys: Paternoster; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009, xv-xix.
- Dunn, James D. G. "The Justice of God," *JTS* 43 (1992): 1-22.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Evans, Craig A. *Mark 8:27 – 16:20*, WBC 34B, Nashville: Nelson, 2001.
- Fenton, John C. "Paul and Mark." In *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Blackwell, 1955, 89-112
- Friedrich, Gerhard. "Das Gesetz des Glaubens Römer 3,27," *ThZ* 10 (1954): 409-11
- Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1-8:26*, WBC 34A, Waco: Word, 1989.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. "Das Verständnis des Glaubens im Markusevangelium." In *Glaube im Neuen Testament. Festschrift für Hans Binder*, ed. Ferdinand Hahn and Hans Klein. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982, 43-67; also in Ferdinand Hahn, *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, 2 vols, WUNT 191-192, eds. Jörg Frey und Juliana Schlegel, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006, 409-31.
- Loader, William. *Jesus' Attitude towards the Law: A Study of the Gospels*, WUNT 2.128, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

- Loader, William. "Attitudes to Judaism and the Law and Synoptic Relations" in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008*, BETL 23, ed. A. Gregory, P. Foster, J. S. Kloppenborg and J. Verheyden, Leuven, Peeters, 2011, 347-69
- Loader, William. "What Happened to 'Good News for the Poor'? On the Trail of Hope Beyond Jesus." In *Reflections on Early Christian History and Religion*, AJEC 81, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach and Jörg Frey, Leiden: Brill, 2012, 233-66.
- Marcus, Joel. "Mark – Interpreter of Paul," *NTS* 46 (2000): 473-87.
- Marcus, Joel. *Mark*, 2 vols, AYB 27/27A, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000/2009.
- Marshall, Christopher D. *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative*, SNTSMS 64; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- O'Brien, Peter T. "Was Paul a Covenantal Nomist?" In *Justification and Variegated Nomism. Volume II. The Paradoxes of Paul*, WUNT 2.181, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids, Baker, 2004, 249-96.
- Repschinski, Boris. *Nicht aufzulösen sondern zu erfüllen. Das jüdische Gesetz in den synoptischen Jesus Erzählungen*, FzB 120. Würzburg: Echter, 2009.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, London: SCM, 1977.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul, The Law, and the Jewish People*, London: SCM, 1982.
- Seeley, David. "Rulership and Service in Mark 10:41-45," *NovT* 35 (1993): 234-50.
- Seifrid, Mark A. "The Faith of Christ." In *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird, and Preston M. Sprinkle, Milton Keys: Paternoster; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009, 29-46
- Silva, Moisés. "Faith Versus Works of Law in Galatians." In *Justification and Variegated Nomism. Volume II. The Paradoxes of Paul*, WUNT 2.181, ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Grand Rapids, Baker, 2004, 217-48.
- Söding, Thomas. *Glaube bei Markus. Glaube an das Evangelium. Gebetsglaube und Wunderglaube im Kontext der markinischen Basileiatheologie und Christologie*, SBB 12, Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1987.
- Svartvik, Jesper. *Mark and Mission: Mk 7:1-23 in its Narrative and Historical Contexts* (CB.NY 32; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2000).
- Svartvik, Jesper. "Matthew and Mark." In *Matthew and his Christian Contemporaries*, LNTS333; edited by David C. Sim and Boris Repschinski; London: T&T Clark, 2008) 11-49.
- Telford, William. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree*, JSNTSup 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Telford, William. *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Tyson, Joseph B. "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark." In *The Messianic Secret*, ed. C. Tuckett; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, 35-43.
- Watson, Francis. "By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and its Scriptural Solution." In *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*, ed. Michael F. Bird, and Preston M. Sprinkle, Milton Keys: Paternoster; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009, 147-63.

- Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Weeden, Theodore J. "The Heresy that Necessitated Mark's Gospel." In *The Interpretation of Mark*, ed. William Telford; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995, 89-104.
- Werner, Martin. *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium: eine Studie zur neutestamentlichen Theologie*, Giessen: Töpelmann, 1923.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Yeung, Maureen W. *Faith in Jesus and Paul: A Comparison with Special Reference to 'Faith Can Remove Mountains' and 'Your Faith Has Healed/Saved You'*, WUNT 2.147; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.