Title: Sandwich technique in the Gospel of Mark

Author: Marcin Moj

Citation style: Moj Marcin. (2018). Sandwich technique in the Gospel of Mark. "The Biblical Annals" (2018, nr 3, s. 363-377), DOI: 10.31743/ba.2018.8.3.03

Sandwich Technique in the Gospel of Mark

MARCIN MOJ

Theological Faculty, University of Silesia in Katowice
e-mail: djpower1@wp.pl
ORCID: 0000-0002-8726-4804

Summary: Intercalations are found in the Gospel of Mark. They are graphically described by the following scheme: A – B – A'. Mark's convention consists of the break off narration (pericope A) through insertion of another one (B) and placing it inside. Such a technique is called intercalation, interpolation or a sandwich technique. The use of intercalation is somehow intended. The purpose of this article is to indicate a problem of criteria that will allow to select the texts of intercalations precisely. The analysis of the criteria and the features of intercalations corroborates the use of sandwich technique by Mark in the six commonly accepted by the biblical scholars conjoined narratives: 3:20-35; 5:21-43; 6:6b-31; 11:12-25; 14:1-11; 14:53-72 and also in case of the juxtaposed pericopes from the group of disputable ones: 8:1-21 and 15:40–16:8.

Keywords: intercalation, sandwich technique, Gospel of Mark

Characteristic of Mark is utilizing a literary device which consists in juxtaposing two pericopes in line with the pattern A-B-A'. An initiated narrative (A) is interrupted with another story (B), after completion of which the previously discontinued narrative is resumed (A'). This technique is described by an English word intercalation (insertion) or sandwiching.[1] Of all the Evangelists, Mark uses this device most often. The first biblical scholar to pinpoint this phenomenon was E. von Dobschütz.[2]

1 The article was written as a result of the research devoted to the notion of intercalation in the Gospel of Mark. The public defence of the corresponding PhD dissertation took place on 25th of May 2017 at the Theological Faculty, University of Silesia in Katowice. The project was financed by the funds from the National Science Center granted based on Decision no. DEC-2011/01/N/HS1/00960.

2 See E. von Dobschütz, "Zur Erzählerkunst des Markus", *ZNW* 27 (1928) 193-198. A few examples literature about intercalations: D.B. Deppe, *The Theological Intentions of Mark's Literary Devices. Markan Intercalations, Frames, Allusionary Repetitions, Narrative Surprises, and Three Types of Mirroring* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock 2015) 30-94; J.R. Donahue, *Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS 10; Missoula: Scholars Press 1973) 42-43; F.G. Downing, "Markan Intercalation in Cultural Context", *Narrativity in Biblical and Related Texts* (ed. G.J. Brooke – J.-D. Kaestli) (Leuven: Leuven University Press 2000) 105-118; J.R. Edwards, "Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31743/ba.2018.8.3.03

ISSN 2083–2222
e-ISSN 2451-2168

Currently, it is commonly accepted that the Gospel of Mark comprises six interrelated narratives[3]: Jesus' relatives and the Beelzebub controversy in 3:20-21(22-30)31-35; Jairus and the woman suffering from haemorrhage in 5:21-24(25-34)35-43; the mission of the Twelve and the martyrdom of John the Baptist 6:7-13(14-29)30-31; the cursing of the fig tree and the cleansing of the temple in 11:12-14(15-19)20-25; the betrayal of Jesus and the anointment at Bethany 14:1-2(3-9)10-11; Peter's denial and the trial of Jesus in 14:53(54)55-65(66-72). Sometimes also another fragments are distinguished, as for example: the Parable of the Sower and the purpose of the parables in 4:1-9(10-12)13-20.[4] Is it, therefore, possible to unequivocally indicate the places in the Gospel of Mark where the sandwiching technique is used?

1. The criteria for determining intercalations

The answer to this question is undoubtedly related with criteria for determining intercalations, which in turn are connected with the characteristic features of these narrative compositions. In the studies that have so far been published, some biblical scholars point to such features, justifying this way the occurrence of intercalations.

Markan Narratives", *NovT* 31/3 (1989) 193-216; G.M. Feagin, *Irony and the Kingdom in Mark. A Literary-Critical Study* (MBPS 56; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press 1997); R.M. Fowler, *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press 1991) 140-147; M. Kusio, "Theological Implications of Markan Interpretative Intercalations", *RBL* 68/3 (2015) 265-288; G.D. Miller, "An Intercalation Revisited: Christology, Discipleship, and Dramatic Irony in Mark 6.6b-30", *JSNT* 35/2 (2012) 176-195; G. van Oyen, "Intercalation and Irony in the Gospel of Mark", *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* (ed. F. van Segbroeck – C.M. Tuckett – G. van Belle – J. Verheyden) (Leuven: Leuven University Press 1992) II, 949-972; M. Rosik, "Chrystologiczna funkcja interkalacji Markowych", *QS* 18 (2004) 111-137; T. Shepherd, *Markan Sandwich Stories: Narration, Definition, and Function* (AUSDDS 18; Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press 1993); T. Shepherd, "The Narrative Function of Markan Intercalation", *NTS* 41 (1995) 522-540; G.A. Wright, *Markan Intercalations: A Study in the Plot of the Gospel* (Ph. D. diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary 1985).

3 The inner narratives of the respective intercalations are provided in parentheses.

4 See Edwards, "Markan Sandwiches", 197, 213-215. Sometimes yet other fragments of the Gospel of Mark are indicated which are supposed to exhibit features of the said composition: the preaching of John the Baptist and the announcement of the coming of the Messiah 1:1(2-3)4-8; preaching in the synagogue and the healing of the possessed man 1:21-22(23-26)27-28; preaching at Capernaum and the healing a paralyzed man 2:1-5(6-10a)10b-12; entering the synagogue and the healing of the man with a paralyzed hand 3:1-2(3-5-)6; Second multiplication of the loaves and the demand of another sign 8:1-10(11-13)14-21; the prediction of betrayal and the institution of the Lord's Supper 14:17-21(22-26)27-31; sentencing and derision of Jesus 15:6-15(16-20)21-32; the presence of women and the entombment of Jesus 15:40-41(42-47)16:1-8.

A condition that is basic in establishing the use by Mark of the sandwiching technique is the above-mentioned fact of the composition being made up of two pericopes. This assumption may be illustrated by the pattern A-B-A'. An initiated narrative (A – a speech, story) is interrupted by another one (B), after the completion of which the previous story is resumed (A'). The first part of a pericope (A) remains "incomplete." After close reading, however, we arrive at a conclusion that the narrative in question may lack some addition, that in fact it is a kind of introduction which requires an ending. On the other hand, its second part (A') contains a reference to the first one (A), and together they compose a single narrative (speech) A-B-A'. Therefore, the first basic feature of intercalations consists in the conjoining of two narratives (speeches) according to the pattern A-B-A'.

The second characteristic feature of intercalations is an ostensible lack of correspondence between the conjoined narratives.[5] Upon the first reading, pericopes seem to be entirely unrelated events that have nothing to do with each other. However, a reader might be struck by repetition of some words, by similarities or contrasts as to features of characters or actions undertaken by protagonists. Reflecting on those noticed correspondences leads to unveiling of their true meaning: in actuality, pericopes constitute each other's mutual interpretation. This in fact is the main purpose of intercalations: narratives interpret each other, that is, by interlacing them, a sense is created that would not be attainable without juxtaposing side-by-side pericopes thus selected. What is responsible for this superficial lack of correspondence between the narratives juxtaposed, seem to be the following characteristics of those narratives: the possibility of continuing the initiated story (A) with the omission of the second one (B), as well as the possibility of the story (B) to be a stand-alone one and to function independently from the encircling ("flanking" in J.R. Edwards's terms) narrative (B). The stories' independence obtained this way, genuinely surprises the reader – for the ostensibly coincidental relationship between the events appears to have a deeper meaning. Thus, the basic (major) features of intercalations are the following:

- two stories (speeches) conjoined according to the schema A-B-A';
- the ostensible lack of relationship (between the narratives, speeches A and B);
- a possibility of continuation of the narrative (speech) A with the omission of the narrative (speech) B;

5 Not all among biblical scholars acknowledge this fact, for instance, G. van Oyen does not mention the ostensible lack of correspondence between the narratives in intercalations. See van Oyen, "Intercalation and Irony in the Gospel of Mark", 949-974. It may also seem that this criterion is not distinctive enough; however, due to the specificity of Mark's narrative technique that is supposed to surprise the reader, it has been included into the list of criteria for determining intercalations.

– an independent functioning of the narrative B;
– alluding (e.g., by referring to characters, places, events etc.) in A' to the part one of narrative (speech) A.

The subsequent features of the intercalation seem to be subordinate to the above-mentioned major ones. There are several narrative means responsible for producing the stories' independence in intercalations: separate characters (besides Jesus) appearing in the stories, the time lapse in the outer (encircling) narrative (unless the events take place simultaneously), a change of location. On the other hand, the features responsible for building connections between the narratives are: Jesus' actions (or his presence alone) in both the pericopes; in the first part of the external story there appears a possibility for the event described in the internal narrative (B); in both of the narratives (speeches) A and B appear similar words, phrases, or descriptions of activities (often described by the German *Leitwort* 'cathphrase', motif, motto).

Along with the advance of the study field of narrative criticism, the said features have been particularized by indicating that there always appear similarities and/or contrasts between characters as well as their actions in the conjoined narratives. The interrupted narrative is not in fact suspended (its time continues to envelope or, alternatively, the events take place concurrently). Under the actions of the characters is hidden a second, deeper meaning. The characters, through their actions and words, imbue with additional sense the conjoined narratives, but they remain oblivious of it. Hence, some biblical scholars, in order to describe the phenomenon of intercalations, use the term dramatic irony.[6]

In delimitating intercalations (especially in terms of indicating outer and inner stories) the stress is put on focalization (concentrating). A shifting perspective (e.g., concentrating on different character or solely on some of the previously enumerated ones) delimitates the beginning of the next narrative.[7]

The inquiry into such particular features, in case of narrative criticism, disqualifies pericopes that lack some of them. For example, if we acknowledge as an intercalation the narrative on preaching at Capernaum and the healing of the paralyzed man in 2:1-5a(5b-10a)10b-12, what is usually pointed out is the presence of the term "paralyzed" in both inner and outer narratives. In "classical" intercalations, apart from Jesus, no other persons from the narrative A are mentioned in the narrative B. Moreover, the time of the outer story (2:1-5a.10b-12) does not pass during the Jesus' conversation with the scribes (2:5b-10a), but the cessation of action takes place. This suspension is absent from all of the

6 Cf. van Oyen, "Intercalation and Irony in the Gospel of Mark", 965-974; Shepherd, *Markan Sandwich Stories*, 326-331; idem, "The Narrative Function of Markan Intercalation", 522-540.
7 Cf. Shepherd, "The Narrative Function of Markan Intercalation", 65.

six "classical" intercalations. One cannot also in this case notice the dramatic irony (no contrasts; characters do not construct another, deeper meaning of their actions).[8] Therefore, the juxtaposed pericopes on preaching at Capernaum and the healing of the paralyzed man in 2:1-5a(5b-10a)10b-12 cannot be regarded as an instance of the intercalation.

A similar situation appears in the narratives on sentencing and the derision of Jesus in 15:6-15(16-20)21-32. They seem to be a single story (a succession of subsequent scenes of the very same narration). And thus what is missing here are two separate narratives making up an intercalation. Another thing missing is the time lapse separating the outer story from the inner one, and the produced dramatic irony (the manner in which religious leaders and soldiers mock Jesus) does not render all the connections between them.[9]

From the point of view of narrative analysis, two of the above pericopes do not meet the criteria for producing dramatic irony, and hence, are not considered intercalations. Is, therefore, discovering the presence of dramatic irony the only reliable and precise device in the endeavour to determine such compositions? It would not seem so. Lately, in the most recent publications devoted to intercalations, only the main features of intercalations are underscored (pericopes conjoined in accordance with the schema A-B-A', the possibility of independent functioning of the inner narrative).[10] The scholars' interest is mostly focused on the stories' mutual interpretation and the more comprehensive clarification of their meaning by the juxtaposed narratives.[11] This approach to interconnected narratives (speeches) accentuates the semantic analysis rather them purely structural one. In this case, it is a fundamental issue to uncover the meaning given to pericopes, which Mark attains by utilizing the said literary technique. Pinpointing the intercalations consequently leads us to unveiling of the deeper sense of the interconnected events.

Upon comparing various lists of characteristic features,[12] we need to first carry out an inquiry that would allow us to ascertain which among them genuinely

8 Cf. Shepherd, *Markan Sandwich Stories*, 357.

9 Cf. Shepherd, *Markan Sandwich Stories*, 358-359.

10 Cf. S.G. Brown, "Mark 11:1-12:12: A Triple Intercalation?", *CBQ* 64 (2002) 78-89. The article pertains to two intercalations: 11:1-11(12-14)15-19 and 11:15-19(20-25)27-12:12. S.G. Brown suggests that the entirety of 11:1-12,12 may be understood as a triple intercalation. Even though the episodes in 11:1-11; 11:15-19 and 11:27-12:12 are not, strictly speaking, a one complete story, they are nonetheless closely interconnected. What is the most important here, these narratives juxtaposed allow to better understand the symbolism of the events' mutual connection.

11 Cf. Brown, "Mark 11:1-12:12: A Triple Intercalation?", 86.

12 One of the first, relatively extensive, lists of intercalations' characteristic features, was provided by J.R. Edwards. The scholar enumerated the following features of such compositions:
1) they are composed of two narratives (stories, speeches) in accordance with the schema A-B-A';

determine classifying a pericope as an intercalation. We shall investigate herein both the narratives accepted by all biblical scholars as such (the six "classical" cases) and also those that are arguable in this respect. All the foregoing pericopes should undergo an analysis concerning all the features, which shall allow to indicate also these among them which are characteristic for each of the two groups ("classical" cases and the arguable ones). The introductory analysis of the narrative features of intercalations is therefore aimed at defining the basic criteria that would also be sufficient to determine such compositions occurring in the Gospel of Mark.

2) the internal narrative is an independent unit;
3) the encircling ("flanking") narrative is built in such a way that the initiated part (A) requires (A') for its narrative to be complete;
4) the inner episode (B) consists of only one story (and not a series of events);
5) part two of the narrative (A') normally contains an allusion to the initiated part (A).

The above criteria allow J.R. Edwards to determine nine pericopes which represent the intercalation: Jesus' relatives and the accusations of the religious leaders in 3:20-25; the Parable of the Sower and the purpose of the parables in 4:1-20; healing of the woman with the haemorrhage and Jesus raises the Jairus's daughter in 5:21-43; the mission of the Twelve and the martyrdom of John the Baptist in 6:7-30; withered fig tree and clearing of the Temple in 11:12-21; anointing of Jesus at Bethany and Judas agreement to betray Jesus in 14:1-11; the Last Supper and Peter's denial of Jesus in 14:17-31; Jesus' inquisition before the Sanhedrin and Peter's Denial of Jesus 14:53-72; women at the Cross and the entombment of Jesus in 15:40-16,8. See Edwards, "Markan Sandwiches", 197-198.

The most detailed discussion of intercalations' characteristic features has been presented by T. Shepherd. The author uses narrative criticism, and while formulating definition he enumerates the following features of conjoined narratives (particularizing the notions described by J.R. Edwards):

1) both the narratives feature separate main characters (besides Jesus) who do not cross between the two narratives;
2) focalization at separate places;
3) at the beginning of the internal/inner story, the outer/external story is "incompletely defocalized," which means, in other words, that the focalization is suspended and to be completed in (A');
4) temporal linkage (the initiated story (A) is interrupted, and completed only after the conclusion of story (B));
5) correlation between major characters (similarities, contrasts);
6) interlinking of plots and gaps.

Thus distinguished features allow to describe six "classical" intercalations as the dramatic irony. Cf. T. Shepherd, "The Narrative Function of Markan Intercalation", 522-540. F.G. Downing, in turn, before setting to investigate the occurrence of intercalations in ancient extra-biblical literature, enumerates the following defining features of intercalations:

1) a distinct or completely distinct character in the inner story;
2) a separate locality, even if neighbouring the previous one, in the inner story;
3) time sequence in line with the schema A-B-A' or contemporaneity of the two, but A is never complete before B;
4) there appear similarities and contrasts in characters and actions;
5) dramatic irony, that is, hearers know more than the characters. Cf. Downing, "Markan Intercalation in Cultural Context", 107.

The features of narratives that need to be investigated (in the order reflecting their validity – starting with those commonly agreed upon by the biblical scholars):

- the interconnection of the two stories (speeches) in line with the schema A-B-A';
- the possibility of continuing the outer story with the omission of the inner one (B);
- the independent functioning of the inner story (B);
- the ostensible lack of connection (between the narratives A and B);
- part one of the outer narrative (A) contains an opportunity for the event B to transpire;
- alluding (referring) in narrative A' to the part one thereof (A);
- separate characters in both the narratives (besides Jesus);
- Jesus' actions in both of the narratives;
- the change of locale;
- *Leitwort* (repetitive words, phrases, motifs, a motto) in both the narratives (A and B).

2. The investigation of the intercalations' features in the proposed pericopes

The following tables present the results of research into features of the intercalation in the particular narratives. The plus (+) sign used in the tables denotes the occurrence of a given feature in the fragment under analysis, whereas the minus (-) sign – the lack thereof. The zero (0) in the tables refers to the cases when it has been impossible to determine an indicated feature.

Table 1. "Classical" cases of intercalations

	3:20-21 (22-30) 31-35	5:21-24 (25-34) 35-43	6:7-13 (14-29) 30-31	11:12-14 (15-19) 20-25	14:1-2 (3-9) 10-11	14:53 (54) 55-65 (66-72)
Two stories (speeches)	+	+	+	+	+	+
Is there a possibility to continue the story (speech) A with omission of the inner one B?	+	+	+	+	+	+

	3:20-21 (22-30) 31-35	5:21-24 (25-34) 35-43	6:7-13 (14-29) 30-31	11:12-14 (15-19) 20-25	14:1-2 (3-9) 10-11	14:53 (54) 55-65 (66-72)
The story (speech) B functions independently	+	+	+	+	+	+
Ostensible lack of connections between A and B	+	+	+	+	+	+
A introduces the possibility for the occurrence of an event from B	+	+	+	+	+	+
Reference in A' to the part one of the story (speech) A	+	+	+	+	+	+
Separate characters in both stories (speeches)	+	+	+	+	+	+
Jesus' activity in both stories (speeches)	+	+	–	+	+	–
A time lapse in the outer story (speech) A	+	+	+	+	+	+
A change of location	+	+	+	+	+	+
Leitwort (motto)	+	+	+	+	+	+

Table 2. Pericopes to which there is a doubt whether they are intercalations or not

	1:1 (2-3) 4-8	1:21-22 (23-26) 27-28	2:1-5 (6-10a) 10b-12	3:1-2 (3-5) 6	4:1-9 (10-12) 13-20	**8:1-10 (11-13) 14-21**	14:17-21 (22-26) 27-31	15:6-15 (16-20) 21-32	**15:40-41 (42-47) 16:1-8**
Two stories (speeches)	+	+	–	+	+	+	+	+	+
Is there a possibility to continue the story (speech) A with omission of the inner one B?	+	–	+	+	0	+	+	+	+

	1:1 (2-3) 4-8	1:21-22 (23-26) 27-28	2:1-5 (6-10a) 10b-12	3:1-2 (3-5) 6	4:1-9 (10-12) 13-20	**8:1-10** **(11-13)** **14-21**	14:17-21 (22-26) 27-31	15:6-15 (16-20) 21-32	**15:40-41** **(42-47)** **16:1-8**
The story (speech) B functions independently	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+
Ostensible lack of connections between A and B	–	–	–	–	–	+	–	–	+
A introduces the possibility for the occurrence of an event from B	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Reference in A' to the part one of the story (speech) A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Separate characters in both stories (speeches)	–	+	+	–	+	+	–	+	+
Jesus' activity in both stories (speeches)	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	–	–
A time lapse in the outer story (speech) A	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
A change of location	0	–	–	–	+	+	+	+	+
Leitwort (motto)	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

The investigated herein features of narratives are practically all found in the six "classical" cases of intercalations, with the exception of pericopes on the mission of the Twelve and the martyrdom of John the Baptist in 6:7-13(14-29)30-31, on the Peter's denial and the trial of Jesus in 14:53(54)55-65(66-72), where Jesus' activity does not occur in both parts A and B. However, his (passive) presence

is mentioned.[13] At the same time, one can notice that the two intercalations are dealing with Jesus' identity.

When it comes to the arguable pericopes (to which there is a doubt whether they are intercalations or not), the collected results of the analyses focusing on all the characteristic features of the technique utilized by Mark finally allow to see that the second multiplication of loaves and the demanding of another sign in 8:1-10(11-13)14-21 and the presence of women and the entombment of Jesus in 15:40-41(42-47)16:1-8 exhibit the greatest number of the sought-after features. In this aspect they are no different from the "classical" cases of intercalations. What is interesting, is that the only missing feature in the remainder of the arguable pericopes (excluding the two aforesaid) is the ostensible lack of connections between the parts A and B of which such compositions consist. This lack surely stems from the non-occurrence of another features, particularly separate characters in both stories (speeches) and/or the change of location. Each of the narratives (speeches) is, however, characterized by the time lapse in the part A, when the event (speech) B takes place (except for the pericope on the preaching of John the Baptist and the announcement of the sending of the messenger Analogically, in all of the studied texts the following features appear: a reference in A' to the part one of the story (speech) A; first part of the external narrative (A) introduces the possibility for occurrence of an event from B; *Leitwort* (repetitive word, phrase, motif, a motto) in both the narratives (A and B).

What is more, one may notice that the activity of Jesus in both stories (speeches) is not required to qualify a narrative as an intercalation. It suffices that His person is passively present (alluded to, mentioned). It would be worth to add that narratives in which Jesus is only passively present (both among the acknowledged and arguable paricopes): the mission of the Twelve and the martyrdom of John the Baptist in 6:7-13(14-29)30-31, the Peter's denial and the trial of Jesus in 14:53(54)55-65(66-72), as well as the presence of women and the entombment of Jesus in 15:40-41(42-47)16:1-8, thematize His identity.

Keeping the foregoing remarks in mind, we ought to ask why in the case of the remaining seven arguable pericopes we cannot speak of intercalation? First, we should acknowledge the way the narratives (speeches) in those pericopes are connected. The intercalation consists in two narratives (speeches) connected according to the pattern A-B-A'. The following table provides the connection patterns of stories (speeches) from the group of arguable pericopes:

13 The passive presence consists in solely mentioning a person in one of the pericopes. He or she may also be an implied subject. He or she is not, however, a subject of any foreground activity (i.e., a one that would be expressed in indicative mood of the present tense or as an aorist).

	1:1 (2-3) 4-8	1:21-22 (23-26) 27-28	**2:1-5** **(6-10a)** **10b-12**	3:1-2 (3-5) 6	4:1-9 (10-12) 13-20	8:1-10 (11-13) 14-21	**14:17-21** **(22-26)** **27-31**	**15:6-15** **(16-20)** **21-32**	15:40-41 (42-47) 16:1-8
Connection schema of two stories (speeches)	A-B-A’	A-B-A’	**A-A’-A”**	A-B-A’	A-B-A’	A-B-A’	**A-A’-B**	**A-B-B’**	A-B-A’

Among the said pericopes we may notice alternative variants of connections to those characteristic of intercalations:

– preaching at Capernaum and the healing of paralyzed man in 2:1-5(6-10a)10b-12 constitutes a single narrative, and therefore, it is not a juxtaposition of two events that interpret each other (A-A’-A’’);
– Jesus’ prediction of the betrayal and the establishment of the Eucharist in 14:17-21(22-26)27-31, despite being conjoined description of two events, its first (14:17-21) and second part (22-26) compose a single narrative, whereas the third one is a description of another event (A-A’-B);
– the conviction of Jesus and and His derision in 15:6-15(16-20)21-32 also combines two narratives, but according to the pattern A-B-B’.

What disqualifies the above-mentioned pericopes as intercalations is the very way they conjoin the stories.

Among the remaining pericopes, as it has already been said, only two display the ostensible lack of connections between parts A and B: the second multiplication of loaves and the demand of another sign in 8:1-10(11-13)14-2, as well as the presence of women and the entombment of Jesus in 15:40-41(42-47)16:1-8. Other pericopes from the group under analysis lack yet another additional features.

In the preaching of John the Baptist and and the announcement of the sending of the messenger in 1:1(2-3)4-8 one cannot speak of separate characters. It is also impossible to unequivocally establish whether the change of place and the time lapse occur.

As for the preaching at the synagogue and the healing of the possessed man in 1:21-22(23-26)27-28 the most serious deficiency is the inability to continue the external story (A) with the omission of narrative (B). Both the stories are closely intertwined and connected (“Here is a teaching that is new, and with authority behind it: he gives orders even to unclean spirits and they obey him”; 1:27b). Neither does transpire the change of location.

We deal with a similar type of situation in the pericope on entering the synagogue and on the healing of the man with a paralyzed hand in 3:1-2(3-5)6. Its final verse is the reaction to the said healing of the paralyzed man by Jesus: “And the Pharisees went out, and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against him, how they might destroy him” (3:6). Another fact testifying in

favour of close, unifying connection within the pericope is the absence of the change of location.

The most important is the Parable on the Sower and the purpose of parables in 4:1-9(10-12)13-20. Despite the presence of separate characters in both the Jesus' speeches and the change of location, what is absent is the ostensible lack of connection between parts A and B. At a first glance, it seems that Jesus' speech may be continued, and we might follow through with the explanation of the purpose of the Parable on the Sower (A') with the omission of the purpose of the parables in 4:10-12 (B). The latter internal part (B) may function independently. But when we refer to the sentences concluding the fragment on preaching in parables in 4:34 ("He would not speak to them except in parables, but he explained everything to his disciples when they were by themselves"), we must conclude that in fact the both juxtaposed pericopes cannot function separately. The context that follows (4:34) clearly indicates their mutual interconnectedness and dependence without producing any additional meaning.[14]

3. Extended list of intercalations

The narrative features of the six "classical" intercalations are characteristic of only two among the arguable pericopes, namely: the second multiplication of loaves and the demand of sign in 8:1-10(11-13)14-21 and the presence of women and the entombment of Jesus in 15:40-41(42-47)16:1-8. However, both the foregoing cause some problems absent from the remaining six commonly accepted intercalations.

In pericopes on the second multiplication of loaves and the demand of sign in 8:1-10(11-13)14-21 one may observe the superficial lack of connections between the narratives. Problematic, however, remains the place of ending the narrative on the second multiplication of loaves (A). The said issue stems from discrepancy in classifying the verse 8:10 by some biblical scholars. It may belong to the narrative on the multiplication of the loaves (8:1-10), as well as serve as the initial verse of a new narrative on the seeking of the sign by the Pharisees (8:10-13).[15] Yet, the more important question here concerns the concluding place

14 For a more detailed explanation of why Mk 4:1-20 is not an instance of intercalation, see: M. Moj, "Tajemnica dla będących z Nim (Mk 4,1-20)", *GRATIAS AGAMUS DOMINO DEO NOSTRO. Księga Honorowa dedykowana Księdzu Jerzemu Palińskiemu Rektorowi Wyższego Śląskiego Seminarium Duchownego w Katowicach w latach 2006–2013* (ed. M. Panek – J. Wilk) (Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka 2014) 183-190.

15 Biblical scholars classify this verse in diverse ways. Some of them confirm its belonging to the narrative on the multiplication of loaves (8:1-10): J.R. Donahue – D.J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark* (Sacra Pagina 2; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press 2002) 243-247; T. France,

of the narrative on the multiplication of the loaves: is it verse 10? And if so, then the juxtaposition of pericopes follows the patter A-B-C (three separate narratives). The pericope on the leaven of Pharisees and the leaven of Herod in 8:14-21 (A') in that case cannot be perceived as continuation of the story on the feeding of the crowd (the second multiplication of loaves) in 8:1-10 (A). The narratives do not actualize the connection that is characteristic of intercalations, in which one pericope (A) is interrupted by insertion of another (B), after which the previously initiated narrative is resumed (A'). In this situation (the lack of the A-B-A' connection of the pericopes) we cannot speak of intercalation. Until it remains a disputed issue among some of the commentators, we may treat the pericopes on the multiplication of the loaves and the seeking of the sign in 8:1-10(11-13)14-21 as two separate narratives of which one is resumed after the other is concluded (part two of the narrative on the second multiplication of loaves is a fragment on crossing the Sea of Gallilee by boat and the preaching on the leaven of Pharisees and the leaven of Herod. Then and only then, it is justified to count these pericopes among the intercalations.

In turn, the intercalation on the presence of women and the entombment of Jesus in 15:40-41(42-47)16:1-8 seems to not fully meet the criterion of the separateness of persons (different characters in pericopes A and B, besides Jesus). It stems from the fact that in the inner narrative (B) appear Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joset (15:47), who are also mentioned and take an active part in the external narrative (A). The activity ἐθεώρουν ('they looked, gazed') by Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joset in the internal pericope (B) was, however, expressed in *imperfectum*, therefore it describes an activity

The Gospel of Mark. A Commentary on the Greek Text (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Paternoster Press 2002) 305-309; M.D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Black's New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Hendrickson 1991) 187-190; H. Langkammer, *Ewangelia według św. Marka. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz* (Pismo Święte Nowego Testamentu III/2; Poznań – Warszawa: Pallottinum 1977) 200-203; A. Malina, *Ewangelia według św. Marka 1,1–8,26. Wstęp. Przekład z oryginału. Komentarz* (ed. A. Paciorek – R. Bartnicki – T. Brzegowy – A. Tronina – J. Warzecha) (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny II/1; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2013) 443-450. Others suggest that it initiates a new story on the demand of another sign by the Pharisees (8:10-13): M.E. Boring, *Mark. A Commentary* (The New Testament Library; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press 2006) 218-221; R.H. Gundry, *Mark. A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross. Volume 1 (1–8)* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1993) 392-395; J. Marcus, *Mark 1–8. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Yale Bible 27; New Haven – London: Yale University Press 2000) 498-506; R.H. Stein, *Mark* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic 2008) 364-372. One is compelled to support the opinion that this verse is in fact a linkage between the two narratives, but more closely related to what preceded than to what follows. The disciples are mentioned at the beginning of the pericope on the second multiplication of loaves (8:1), and their presence is merely implied in the scene with the Pharisees (in 8:13 Mark informs about Jesus having left people seeking the sign and His entering the boat that He had previously entered with disciples in 8:10). Cf. Malina, *Ewangelia według św. Marka 1,1–8,26*, 443-444.

taking place in the background, being a backdrop of the main described events. The said mention is important from the point of view of the subsequent narrative, in which women came to the tomb (they knew the place of His burial). Is it therefore possible to continue the pericope on the women after the death of Jesus (A) without the internal narrative (B)? In such situation it is slightly curious that the women exchange a word among themselves about the stone having been rolled away (Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joset were in fact witnesses when a stone was being rolled against the door of the tomb, which was emphasized in the inner pericope of the intercalation – B). The intercalation fulfils the criterion of possibility to continue story A with the omission of story B. Therefore, we shall include it among the intercalations.

4. Conclusions

The analysis of the criteria and the features of intercalations corroborates the use of this technique by Mark in the six "classical" (commonly accepted by the biblical scholars) conjoined narratives: 3:20-35; 5:21-43; 6:6b-31; 11:12-25; 14:1-11; 14:53-72. In my opinion we can also speak of such compositions in case of the juxtaposed pericopes from the group of "dubious" (disputable) ones: 8:1-21 and 15:40-16,8. Therefore, eight fragments from the Gospel of Mark are based on the schema of joining narratives visualized by A-B-A' pattern (two narratives, of which one is interrupted by another story, after which the resumption of the first story occurs). The precise indication of each and every intercalation in the Gospel of Mark constitutes the basis of detailed research of connections within those narratives, also in connection to the entirety of Gospel.

Bibliography

Boring, M.E., *Mark. A Commentary* (The New Testament Library; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press 2006).

Brown, S.G., "Mark 11:1-12:12: A Triple Intercalation?", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (2002) 78-89.

Deppe, D.B., *The Theological Intentions of Mark's Literary Devices. Markan Intercalations, Frames, Allusionary Repetitions, Narrative Surprises, and Three Types of Mirroring* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock 2015) 30-94.

Dobschütz, E. von, "Zur Erzählerkunst des Markus", *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 27 (1928) 193-198.

Donahue, J.R., *Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS 10; Missoula: Scholars Press 1973) 42-43.

Donahue, J.R., Harrington D.J., *The Gospel of Mark* (Sacra Pagina 2; Collegeville: The Liturgical Press 2002).

Downing, F.G., "Markan Intercalation in Cultural Context", *Narrativity in Biblical and Related Texts* (ed. G.J. Brooke – J.-D. Kaestli) (Leuven: Leuven University Press 2000) 105-118.

Edwards, J.R., "Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in Markan Narratives", *Novum Testamentum* 31/3 (1989) 193-216.

Feagin, G.M., *Irony and the Kingdom in Mark. A Literary-Critical Study* (MBPS 56; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press 1997).

Fowler, R.M., *Let the Reader Understand: Reader-Response Criticism and the Gospel of Mark* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press 1991) 140-147.

France, T., *The Gospel of Mark. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Paternoster Press 2002).

Gundry, R.H., *Mark. A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross. Volume 1 (1–8)* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1993).

Hooker, M.D., *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Black's New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Hendrickson 1991).

Kusio, M., "Theological Implications of Markan Interpretative Intercalations", *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny* 68/3 (2015) 265-288.

Langkammer, H., *Ewangelia według św. Marka. Wstęp – przekład z oryginału – komentarz* (Pismo Święte Nowego Testamentu III/2; Poznań – Warszawa: Pallottinum 1977).

Malina, A., *Ewangelia według św. Marka 1,1–8,26. Wstęp. Przekład z oryginału. Komentarz* (ed. A. Paciorek – R. Bartnicki – T. Brzegowy – A. Tronina – J. Warzecha) (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny II/1; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2013).

Marcus, J., *Mark 1–8. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Yale Bible 27; New Haven – London: Yale University Press 2000).

Miller, G.D., "An Intercalation Revisited: Christology, Discipleship, and Dramatic Irony in Mark 6.6b-30", *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 35,2 (2012) 176-195.

Moj, M., "Tajemnica dla będących z Nim (Mk 4,1-20)", *GRATIAS AGAMUS DOMINO DEO NOSTRO. Księga Honorowa dedykowana Księdzu Jerzemu Palińskiemu Rektorowi Wyższego Śląskiego Seminarium Duchownego w Katowicach w latach 2006–2013* (ed. M. Panek – J. Wilk) (Katowice: Księgarnia św. Jacka 2014) 183-190.

Oyen, G. van, "Intercalation and Irony in the Gospel of Mark", *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium; (ed. F. van Segbroeck – C.M. Tuckett – G. van Belle – J. Verheyden) (Leuven: Leuven University Press 1992) II, 949-974.

Rosik, M., "Chrystologiczna funkcja interkalacji Markowych", *Quaestiones Selectae* 18 (2004) 111-137.

Shepherd, T., *Markan Sandwich Stories: Narration, Definition, and Function* (AUSDDS 18; Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press 1993).

Shepherd, T., "The Narrative Function of Markan Intercalation", *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995) 522-540.

Stein, R.H., *Mark* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic 2008).

Wright, G.A., *Markan Intercalations: A Study in the Plot of the Gospel* (Ph. D. diss. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary 1985).