Mark 10:45: How Did Jesus understand his death?

The church, in understanding the crucifixion of Jesus soteriologically, has frequently made a link between the suffering of the servant in Deutero-Isaiah (DI) and the passion of Jesus—Jesus, like the servant of DI, vicariously suffers the punishment that is due for others. This point, however, is contentious within scholarship, as for some scholars the servant-Jesus motif is the theological development of the later Christian church, whereas for others the servant-Jesus motif can be traced back to Jesus himself.2

This debate takes places at both macro and micro levels. By macro I mean those who seek to offer full face portraits of the historical Jesus such as Wright3, Dunn4, Meier5 and Crossan, whereas by micro I refer to those who, through monographs and scholarly articles, offer detailed exegesis of particular gospel passages6. At a micro level Mark 10:45 is possibly the most debated verse within the gospels. For some this offers a full blown theory of the atonement coming from the lips of Jesus, whereas others debate its authenticity, whilst still others although not disputing its authenticity do not see substitutionary/servant theology within it. For any involved in historical Jesus research, whether it be at a macro or micro level, it is a fruitful endeavor to

1 Mk 10:45
2 For popular and influential popular writings see the recently published Pierced for Our Transgressions 52-67 and the classic work by John Stott Cross of Christ 133-163 ‘It seems to be definite beyond doubt, then, that Jesus applied Isaiah 53 to himself and that he understood his death in the light of it as a sin bearing death’ 147. Numerous monographs and journals attacks and defend the authenticity of Mark 10:45. Rainer Riesner presents a scholarly and novel approach to its authenticity Back To the Historical Jesus Through Paul and His School (Ransom Logion—Mark 10.45; Matthew 20.28) in Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus 2003; 1; 171
3 N.T. Wright Jesus and the Victory of God: ‘I propose then, that we can credibly reconstruct a mindset in which a first-century Jew could come to believe that YHWH would act through the suffering of a particular individual in whom Israel’s sufferings were focused; that this suffering would carry redemptive significance; and that this individual would be himself. And I propose that we can plausible suggest that this was the mindset of Jesus himself.” 593
4 James D.G. Dunn Jesus Remembered, pp 809-818“The upshot [after looking at Luke 22:37, Mark 10:45, 14:24] is that a convincing case cannot be made that Jesus saw himself as the suffering servant.”
5 J.P Meier A Marginal Jew The final, as yet unpublished, volume will look Jesus death and self understanding.
6 Such as McKnight, Hooker and a host of others.
engage with Hooker’s challenging thesis *Jesus and the Servant* (1959). This book advocates the view that we do not find any correlation, within the gospels, between the death/suffering of Jesus and the suffering of the servant.

In this paper I intend to summarize and critique Hooker’s position whilst keeping a close eye on issues relating to ‘Historical Jesus’ methodology and Jesus’ self understanding regarding his death. I will limit my micro exploration of *Jesus and the Servant* to issues pertaining to Mark 10:45, and seek to draw out conclusions that show the interplay between *macro* and *micro*.

Following the flow of *Jesus and the Servant* we shall look at:

**The Servant Passages: Their meaning and Background**

**Jewish Interpretations of the Servant**

**Mark 10:45 and the Servant**

1) The Servant Passages: Their meaning and background

After beginning her work with a survey of recent servant scholarship Hooker seeks to place the servant songs within the framework of Deutero-Isaiah (DI) as a whole. DI, according to Hooker, can be ‘summed up as: ‘Israel, who has been chosen by Yahweh as his servant, is to be restored from Exile and will manifest God’s glory to all nations’.” This threefold theme is also to be found within the servant songs which

---

7 Also C.K Barrett ‘The Background of Mark 10:45’ ‘[It] appears that the connection between Mark 10:45 and Isa 53 is much less definite and more tenuous that is often supposed.’
8 For the purpose of this study we will not be looking at Hooker’s survey of scholarship (Ch 1), linguistic parallels outside of Mark 10:45, or at the development of the servant concept within the early church (Chapters 5-7)
9 *Jesus and the Servant* Ch. 2
10 ibid. Chapter 3
11 ibid. Chapter 4
12 Hooker joins with the scholarly consensus in following Bernhardt Duhm in identifying four DI passages as “servant songs” 42:1–4; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12. John W Watts challenges the current trend in *Word Biblical Commentary: Isaiah Vol 25* by seeking to distance the sufferer in Is 53 from the servant of YHWH.
13 *Jesus and the Servant* 29
'gives strong support to our claim that the songs should be studied, not simply in isolation, but against the background of Deutero-Isaiah’s other oracles.'\(^\text{14}\)

After comparing DI with Ezekiel and Jeremiah, Hooker finds that the emphasis in DI, and with it the servant songs, is to be placed in the imminence of the end of exile.

The events which he depicts are the signs which were commonly recognised to be those which would accompany the New age [as with Ezekial and Jeremiah]. The new factor in his message was that these things are happening-now!\(^\text{15}\)

Israel, so Deutero-Isaiah believes, is at the turning point of her history: the sufferings are over, her exaltation is imminent; the figure of the servant thus stands between the two eras of Jewish thought: the old has gone, but the birth-pangs of the new are almost over, and everything is concentrated in expectant hope for the future.\(^\text{16}\)

What is true for Israel in DI as a whole is attributed to the servant within the servant songs.\(^\text{17}\) Hooker, although recognising a multiplicity of interpretations\(^\text{18}\), leans towards a collective/corporate understanding of the servant, given the close link ‘between the Songs and the other oracles’\(^\text{19}\).

‘In seeking a solution to the problem of the Servant, we have to remember, not only that the nation could be spoken of in highly individualised terms, but also that the whole community could be represented in the figure of one man.’\(^\text{20}\)

The servant, within this collective understanding, is to be identified as Israel. However ‘there is fluidity in the concept which makes it possible to pass from an individual to the group of which he is a member and back again without any straining of the idea.’\(^\text{21}\) Hooker, with this fluidity in mind, states that the ‘servant is at once Israel and the prophet and the Messiah, so that although one concept may be primary [collective/Israel], we cannot deny the presence of the others.’\(^\text{22}\)

Isaiah 53, which within a traditional popular evangelical reading is used as part of the argument for constructing a penal substitutionary model of the atonement, is to be interpreted, according to Hooker, in accordance with the themes of DI. The suffering of the servant is the suffering of Israel at the end of exile.

‘Israel had been subjected to terrible humiliation, she was oppressed and afflicted, taken from her own country and led like a lamb to the slaughter: but now her sufferings are over, and she is to return; she will be exalted and know prosperity again…The fact that the servant is spoken of as an individual does not invalidate this theory.’\(^\text{23}\)

\(^{14}\) ibid. 29-30  
\(^{15}\) ibid. 40  
\(^{16}\) ibid. 45  
\(^{17}\) ibid. 29  
\(^{18}\) ibid. 41  
\(^{19}\) ibid. 42  
\(^{20}\) ibid. 43  
\(^{21}\) ibid. 42  
\(^{22}\) ibid. 44  
\(^{23}\) ibid. 47
DI does not foretell of a ‘righteous man [who will] suffer for her sins sometime in the future’\textsuperscript{24}, instead, YHWH ‘is redeeming her’ as ‘Israel herself has been punished’.

Hooker’s thought can be summarised as follows,

I) DI, like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, proclaims the forthcoming ‘end of exile’.

II) DI, in contrast to Jeremiah and Ezekiel, sees this end as imminent.

III) The Servant Songs are consistent with the theme of DI as a whole

IV) The identity of the servant is to be understood collectively—the servant is Israel

V) Is. 53 does not look ahead to a righteous individual who will suffer on behalf of Israel

Critique and Comments: DI and Historical Jesus Research

I/III) Hooker correctly locates the themes of DI into the metanarrative of the bible—that is the themes of DI are related, not to abstract theological propositions, but to the particular historical situation of exile.\textsuperscript{25} Israel, because of her sin, was warned of future judgement and received it (Is 1-39). DI, like Deuteronomy, proclaims a time when her punishment, that is exile, will be over,

\begin{quote}
Speak kindly to Jerusalem, and tell her that her time of warfare is over, that her punishment is completed.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

If Jesus does see himself in the role of the servant, we should expect that the themes of DI as a whole will be displayed in the ministry of Jesus. Hooker points to a threefold theme of DI: Israel, ‘who has been chosen [covenant] by Yahweh [monotheism] as his servant, is to be restored from Exile [eschatology] and will manifest God’s glory to all nations’\textsuperscript{27}.

\textsuperscript{24} ibid. 47
\textsuperscript{25} Later developers of PSA models of the atonement have often appealed to Isaiah 53 without taking into the account that the servant suffers to bring about the end of exile.
\textsuperscript{26} Is 40:2
\textsuperscript{27} 29 The words in parenthesis show that Hooker’s summary of DI relate, quite coherently, to the threefold grid of covenant, monotheism and eschatology which N.T. Wright uses as a constant refrain. See NTPOG, Fresh Perspectives
If Jesus is modelling his life on a DI theme we should expect to find him reaffirming the election of Israel, whilst seeing himself as the chief player (servant) in a drama that will see a restoration of the fortunes of Israel and the unveiling of YHWH to the nations. 28

It may be helpful to bring the recent work of Scott McKnight into this discussion 29. As part of his running argument McKnight puts forward the position, in Jesus and his Death, that Jesus is to be understood as a scripture prophet—a scripture prophet being a prophet who finds resources and direction for his life from the texts and characters of the scriptures.

A scripture prophet is someone who, as a result of contemplating scripture as an active, combustible presence, is bound by those traditions, and those traditions shape the person's identity, behaviour and mission.

The scripture prophet connects the dots of various passages, and that leads to past, present, and future, and yet so comprehensively explanatory, that its discovery strikes their followers as beyond human capacity. The most significant perception of the scripture prophet is that he (or she) seems himself (or herself) in the various figures of the Tanack. 30

McKnight draws attention to six historical figures from second temple Judaism. 31 Each figure is shown to have based his life-script 32 on the Tanack.

The degree of correspondence between life and script may vary from case to case, but the impression is secure: there were leaders at and around the time of Jesus who found a script for life in ancient biblical and historical figures. In so conducting their lives they found a typological interpretation of the Tanack 33

In light of McKnight’s contribution we may rephrase our question?

Was Jesus’ life script informed by Servant? 34

---

28 Time does not permit a full discussion of this but I would suggest that it is exactly these issues which become a focal point for Jesus’ ministry.
29 Jesus and His Death
30 ibid 180
31 Ibid Ch 8 Mattathis, Judah Messiah, Taxos, Theudas, Jesus Ben Anias, John the Baptist
32 It is interesting to note how ‘life-script’ and worldview interact. My guess is that a ‘life-script’ relates to the story element of a worldview.
33 Jesus and His Death 186
34 What method would we use for finding this out? Would we look for common linguistic features of Jesus sayings and DI, yet this would rule out apriori Jesus symbolic actions. Wright J&VOG ‘It is… highly probable that, in addition to several other passages which informed his vocation, Jesus regarded Isaiah 53, its whole literacy and historical context, as determinative’ 603. ‘I suggest, then, that Isaiah 40-55 as a whole was thematic for Jesus’ kingdom announcement’ ‘Jesus’ personal reading of Isaiah belongs not so much in the history of ideas, as in the history of vocation, agenda, action and ultimately passion’ 604
In a concluding chapter of his book, McKnight states ‘there is negligible evidence that Jesus saw his life as the Servant of Isaiah.’ However in his study of relevant passages he does find that a DI influence on the figure of Jesus and, as the quote shown below, the servant does have some forming influence on Jesus.

‘What is clear, though, is that there are sufficient indicators that Jesus did see Isaiah 40-55 to be paradigmatic for what God was doing in him. And, with a small bundle of passages that either do or possibly allude to the Servant of Isaiah, we are on firm ground to say that Jesus did seem to consult the Servant figure at various periods in his life. The figure is nowhere near as central as Son of Man, but the servant does still seem to be standing.’

It seems that McKnight does not allow this ‘firm ground’ to shape his understanding of Jesus. This firm ground seems, in my reading of McKnight, not to be allowed to be built upon.

‘The Servant of Isaiah is not an upper case figure for Jesus; instead, the servant of Isaiah is Israel, and that figure in Israel betrays that common interchange between the individual and the collective… But that Jesus saw in the Servant of Isaiah a figure of prophecy whose destiny he was to fulfil, particularly with respect to his death, is far from clear’

In personal correspondence with McKnight concerning this issue McKnight clarifies his position.

In summary: Yes, I think Jesus saw the Servant as a script for his own life, but I think the evidence for Jesus thinking his suffering and death were Servant sufferings etc is much harder to prove. So, yes, Servant; suffering Servant? Hard to prove.

I would like to offer, tentatively, macro and micro arguments, assuming the authenticity of the gospel accounts, for seeing Jesus life-script as being heavily informed by the themes of DI and the servant.

**Macro Level**

Jesus, as with DI, proclaims, in word and action, the return of Israel from exile, forgiveness of sins, and the return of YHWH to his people. Jesus’ message revolves

---

35 Jesus and His Death 338
36 Jesus and His Death 223
37 Jesus and His Death 224
38 E-mail correspondence with McKnight in January 2007. A further e-mail asks the following question which is relevant to my study of Mark 10:45. Why did Jesus choose “Son of Man” in Mark 10:45 if he really meant “Servant of Isaiah”? 

around the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ which is arguably the hope of seeing Di’s great promises being fulfilled.

**Micro level**
In Luke 22:35-38 Jesus refers to himself as fulfilling one of the characteristics of the servant. Jesus paraphrases Is 53:12 (LXX) when he says καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη: McKnight thinks that two completely different meanings can be derived from this text.

1) ‘Jesus thinks he is the servant and alludes to the entire line of soteriology for his followers’
2) Jesus Realises he is to be arrested and will be ‘stigmatized as a thug, or as one outside the bounds of Israel’

McKnight prefers the latter reading. However, I disagree with McKnight, as, and to use McKnight’s own words, ‘Jews of the first century didn’t invade texts like these, excerpt a favourite portion, and then forget forever his larger contexts.’ Jesus relates the prophecy to his own life (ἐν ἐμοί,) and thus has identified himself with the suffering servant. For McKnight this statement is not ‘soteriologically designed’ yet this quotation comes from a portion of scripture which shows a servant suffering for the sins of others. ‘yet he bore the sin of many, and makes intercession for the transgressors.’ Like the servant, Jesus, in the following Lukan pericope makes intercessions.

In my opinion, and in this I disagree with McKnight and Hooker, Jesus, in some sense, identified himself with the servant of Isaiah. He, like the servant, understood his task as having soteriological significance.

**Mark 1:11, 9:7 Luke 23:35**

And a voice came from heaven, “You are my Son, the Beloved(ὁ ἀγαπητός); with you I am well pleased.”

Then a cloud overshadowed them, and from the cloud there came a voice, “This is my Son, the Beloved(ὁ ἀγαπητός); listen to him!”

8
And the people stood by, watching; but the leaders scoffed at him, saying, “He saved others; let him save himself if he is the Messiah of God, his chosen one! (ὁ ἐκλεκτός)

A connection can be made between ‘the beloved’ and the ‘elect one’ to Isaiah 42:1. (LXX) Ἰσραηλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου

McKnight tentatively supports the view that Jesus gained his life scripts from the servant. If Jesus sees himself as the ‘servant’, and given his expectation of suffering a violent death is it not highly probable that he saw his role as fulfilling that of the suffering servant?

II) Hooker suggests that DI sees the ‘return from exile’ as actually happening, whereas Jeremiah and Ezekiel look to a future hope. Hooker gives examples of verses which illustrate, at least in her interpretation, the immediacy of the return.

Go up on a high mountain, O herald Zion! Shout out loudly, O herald Jerusalem! Shout, don’t be afraid! Say to the towns of Judah, “Here is your God!”

Look, the nations are like a drop in a bucket; they are regarded as dust on the scales. He lifts the coastlands as if they were dust.

Hooker states that the ‘tone of the prophecy suggests that the promises are now all being fulfilled.’ It is important however to make a distinction between the language of immediacy which presents itself in the prophetic, and the actuality of a return from exile. God is making the offer and promise, but this promise has not yet been fulfilled.

Morna appears contradictory when she moves from seeing the covenant promises as actually happening to suggesting that they are dependant on a response from Israel,

---

39 Is 40:9
40 Is 40:15
41 Jesus and the Servant 38
42 The splendour will be revealed (40:5). God is coming (40:1) to bring his people back from the extremities (41:9). God will respond to Israel’s prayers (41:17). Before these things become an actuality YHWH reveals them (42:9), God is going to do something new (43:19). The descendants of Israel will be vindicated (45:25)
Commenting on 55:3-4, ‘here the covenant is to be established in the immediate, not the remote, future; it is made when the people accept the invitation to come to YHWH.’

Perhaps standing behind Hooker’s presentation of DI is the view that the ‘exile’ actually ended in 538 with the return to Jerusalem. In disagreement with this view NT Wright has argued, and this point remains extremely controversial within Biblical Studies, that the exile in its full sense, was not over and its arrival was anticipated by at least some within 2nd temple Judaism.

‘But in Jesus’ day many, if not most, Jews regarded the exile as still continuing. The people had returned in a geographical sense, but the great prophecies of restoration had not yet come true.’

IV) A Collective Understanding of the Servant

Hooker’s collective interpretation, although seemingly convincing is not without its critics as, whether that be within early Jewish/Christian dialogue or later biblical

---

43 Jesus and the Servant 38 Emphasis my own
44 ‘We would need stunningly strong arguments to convince that these Jews really believed they were in exile when they were in Israel. All Wright’s arguments for this view, however, seem to me to be quite spurious.’ Casey ‘Where Wright Is Wrong’ in JSNT 1998; 20; 99 also Jesus and the Restoration of Israel
45 N.T Wright J&VOG also NT&POG 268-72, 299-301. It would be appropriate, given the tremendous weight which Wright puts on’ return from exile’ to research the evidence for this position.
46 An assumption is made, by Hooker and most exegetes, in following Bernhardt Duhm by identifying four passages as “servant songs” that the person who suffers in Is 53 is the servant. Although I agree with this assumption we do find scholarly dissenters such as John Watts in Word Biblical Commentary.

This commentary will show that “the sufferer passages” are distinct from “the servant passages” sufferer and the servant are not the same person and that the in the Vision. Israel and the Persian emperor (Cyrus or Darius) are called “the anointed” or “the servant of Yahweh”. But the sufferer in 50:4–9 and the dead sufferer in chap. 53 is more likely to be a leader in Jerusalem (perhaps Zerubbabel) who has been executed before the arrival of authorities sent by Darius.

It is worth noting that exegetes, myself included, are building on the assumptions of previous commentators. This reminds us that the historical-critical method is not a neutral reading of the text but comes, as postmodernity has reminded us, with certain interpretative lenses and presuppositions.
47 In agreement Bruggeman ‘There is no doubt that Is 53 is to be understood in the context of the Isaiah tradition. Insofar as the servant is Israel - a common assumption of Jewish interpretation - we see that the theme of humiliation and exaltation serves the Isaiah rendering of Israel, for Israel in this literature is exactly the humiliated (exiled) people who by the powerful intervention of Yahweh is about to become the exalted (restored) people of Zion. Thus the drama is the drama of Israel and more specifically of Jerusalem, the characteristic subject of this poetry.’ Walter Brueggemann, Isaiah 40–66 (Louisville: Kentucky, 1998), p. 143
scholarship. Is. 53 in particular does not seem to be able to hold the weight of a collective interpretation unless we allow the author extreme poetic license.

The following verses illustrate the individual reading, inasmuch as the servant is to be distinguished from those who deserve punishment.

All we like sheep have gone astray;
we have turned every one to his own way;
and the Lord has laid on him
the iniquity of us all. 49

Hooker makes use of H Wheeler Robinson’s idea of corporate personality to interpret the servant songs. Robinson, in turn, basis his work on an understanding of ‘primitive thinking’ from the anthropologist L. Levy Bruhl. However, Bruhl may be overstating the difference between the primitive mindset and the modern, for ‘it assumed that primitive communities suffered from blurred and poorly defined perceptions’ of individual and group identity. Hooker, and presumably Robinson, are right to show that, within Israel, the individual and the community are bound up with each other, but to be bound up with each other does not necessarily mean that the corporate subsumes the individual within it.

Clements sketches out three motifs which are present within Ancient Israel which highlight how the individual can represent the community yet remain distinct from it. Royal Servant,

(i) The Servant as Prophet,
(ii) Mosaic Servant

• We must be careful though as to whether we limit the potentiality to Jesus using the servant as a life-script to a pure historical-critical reading of the text.

48 ‘[F]ew scholars have found such a literacy explanation convincing, since, in the fourth Servant Song, the individual experience appears too exceptional, and the details of the suffering too precise, for a straightforward poetic device to have led to its creation.’ Clements ‘Isaiah 53 and the Restoration of Israel’ in Jesus and the Suffering Servant. 42
49 Is 53:6
50 Jesus and the Servant 42 and Robinson Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel
51 See Endnote II
It is important to understand not only authorial intent but also later interpretations.

- What role is given to the prophetic nature of Isaiah? Did Isaiah have to be aware of the identity of the servant?

ii) Jewish Interpretation of the Servant

Having analysed DI and the servant songs from a historical-critical perspective Hooker moves on to see how the servant songs were interpreted by the later Jewish community. However, for Hooker, there is ‘very little evidence regarding the interpretation of the Servant during this period; references in contemporary literature (2nd temple Judaism] are few and uncertain, and even where they exist they are often obscure.’

Hooker’s thought can be summarised in the following table

| The Old Testament | ‘There are no certain references to the Servant passages’
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------
| Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha | Wisdom 5:1-5 ‘There is no connection with vicarious suffering’
|                      | 4 Maccabees contains ideas of Vicarious suffering but there are no ‘linguistic echoes’ with Is. 53.
|                      | The parables of Enoch fused together the son of man with ‘servant’ However ‘he nowhere speaks of the son of man suffering in anyway’
| The Gospels | “[I]t is quite clear from the gospel narrative that the idea of a Messiah who was destined to suffer was alien to at least the majority of the people”
| Greek translations, Peshitta and Targum of Christian influence on the Peshitta ‘makes it impossible to accept them as witnesses to Jewish

52 Jesus and the Servant 53
53 ibid 53
54 Ibid. 54
55 4 Macc 6:27-29, 17:20-22
56 Ibid. 54
57 The gospels as testimony to Jewish thought not ‘as evidence for the origin of the use of the Servant concept by the early Church’ ibid. 55
58 ibid. 55

11
Targum of Jonathan is ‘extraordinary’ in its messianic interpretation of the servant with the Messiah, but it ‘transfers all the phrases of suffering to either Israel or the Gentiles’. There is no link between the Messiah and suffering. | Other Jewish Writings | Philo, Josephus and DSS have ‘made no use of the actual servant concept.’ |
| Rabbinic Literature | The Talmud and the Midrash contain examples of ‘the idea that the death of the righteous atones, or helps to atone, for the sins of the community’. However this was comes from a later date ‘when the cessation of the sacrificial system naturally caused other means of atonement to become increasingly important.’ |

Hooker summarizes this survey,

“The evidence which we have examined thus points to the conclusion that there was no pre-Christian doctrine of a suffering Messiah based upon Deutero-Isaiah. Nowhere in Jewish Literature before the time of Christ, or in the tradition of the earliest centuries A.D., is there any reference to the servant concept which combines the idea of suffering with the dignity of Messiahship: the two concepts seem to be mutually exclusive.”

In contrast to Hooker it is necessary to sort through some of the evidence, and perhaps arrive at a different conclusion.

Targum Jonathan: The Targums offer a unique insight to Jewish interpretation of Isaiah. Targum Jonathan provides a loose translation of the prophets and was in circulation by AD500.
Behold, My Servant the Messiah shall prosper

The servant, at least by AD500, was identified as the Messiah. However the Targum seeks to place suffering on the people rather than the servant (Tg Jonathan 53:7)
There is the possibility that this interpretation goes back further than AD500 as we allow for the oral/written development of the Targum. The Qumran Isaiah scroll 52:13-53:12 suggests that an individual reading was often given to these texts.  

We should, of course, remind ourselves that the earliest Christian communities contained a large proportion of followers of Judaism, and that by the middle of the first century the Christian communities were making a link between Jesus’ passion and the suffering servant. This evidence, although secondary, does point to a possibility that the early church were not simply digging the old testament for suffering passages, but that the concept of a suffering servant was ‘active’ in the 1st century Jewish communities, and that with the arrival of the Messiah this position has now been filled.

**iii) Jesus and the Servant**
In Chapter 4 Hooker analyses the synoptic gospels and finds that there is ‘very little in the Synoptics to support the traditional view hat Jesus identified his mission with that of the Servant of the Songs.’
This judgement is based on the following criteria which is applied to two categories of texts:

1) Texts which have ‘linguistic affinity’ to one of the servant songs
2) Texts which express the ‘necessity for Jesus to undergo suffering’

---


*I have struggled to locate this in Qumran Scrolls. It is mentioned by McKnight page 208*

*ibid. 102*

*ibid. 62*
Group 1: Linguistic References to DI

The following assumptions are made,

1) Verbal similarity between DI and a passage in the synoptics cannot be taken as conclusive unless it ‘can be shown that the language and ideas found in the New Testament reference have come from, and could only have come from, that particular Old Testament passage’.?

2) If a linguistic connection is made a link cannot be made between the identification of Jesus and the servant ‘unless the words are found to apply in both cases to the person or mission of the central figure’.?

3) If references to the servant are shown to have connections with Jesus’ life it cannot be taken as proof that Jesus saw himself as the ‘suffering servant’ unless the it can be shown that Jesus fulfils the ‘unique function of the Servant’.

Group 2: Predictions of Suffering in the mouth of Jesus

1) When suffering is mentioned it must not be assumed that Isaiah 53 is being applied

2) If there are no linguistic references to DI within these suffering texts then we must come to the conclusion ‘that there was no connection in his own mind between the destiny of the Servant and the purpose of his own suffering and death’.

---


71 Ibid. 62

72 Ibid. 62

73 Ibid. 63


75 63-64
Comments on Method

Hooker offers a ‘conservative methodology’ which will yield positive results only if the very words of Is. 53 are used, and only if it comes from a part of the servant songs where suffering is explicit. The methodology steers the results to a minimalist standpoint.

It needs to be said though that Jesus, and the gospel writers, are capable of evoking the stories of the Hebrew Bible without using strong linguistic parallels. The temptations of Jesus, feeding of the 5,000, and the beatitudes evoke the story of the exodus without necessarily using the wording of the LXX.

Hooker is to be commended for dealing with the servant passages throughout the synoptics. She analyses the synoptics phrase-by-phrase—checking whether each phrase refers to a passage from within the servant songs. Yet it seems that it would make more sense, not to look at the verses in a piecemeal fashion, but to look at the overall picture which is created by whole verses, pericopes, and ultimately the gospels themselves. Rikki Watts sums up the findings of Jeremias, France and Kruse

[Hooker and Barrets] works have been criticised for dealing with sayings in a piecemeal fashion, treating linguistic parallels in isolation, and to varying degrees failing to take account that the whole is commonly greater than the sum of the parts. [6]

Mark 10:45, and other verses, cannot be read in a vacuum but must be read within their context. Likewise in the quest for the historical Jesus we must welcome the move made by Wright, following Meyer, to proceed by method of hypothesis and verification. That is the ‘Jesus quester’ must begin with a hypothesis which can be verified by the data.

Hooker seems to work by the method that Jesus, or the gospel writers, could only have in mind one verse from the Hebrew scripture. By way of method, Hooker, rules out the possibility that Jesus or the gospel writers were capable of evoking more than one passage at a time. Hooker looks for ‘mono’ links whereas it is possible that a more synthetic approach is needed.

It is possible that Jesus could have fused together the role of the Son of Man with that of the suffering servant?

Can individuals evoke multiple passages in the same verse? The answer to the latter question seems to be ‘Yes’.

Eg. Two examples will suffice to show that a method of intertextuality needs to account for the potential of the authors/characters dynamic creativity—that is the fusing of two different initial contexts together into a logion.\textsuperscript{77}

Mark 1:2 bringing together Mal 3:1, Exodus 23:20, and Is 40:3
Mark 11:16 with Isa 56:7, Jer 7:11

We need to be aware that when we simply look for linguistic connections (1:1 correlation) between the New Testament and the LXX we may not be allowing for semantic change. Rikki Watts makes this clear in his discussion of the use of γίγας and τοξυρός in Mark and LXX. See Mark 9:27 and Isaiah 49:24, also Rev 19:18 and Ezekial 39:20. Within 1\textsuperscript{st} century literature the word γίγας had been replaced by τοξυρός.

The point here is that merely consulting the LXX of Isaiah fails to take into consideration either the idiosyncratic translation tendencies evident in that book (LXX) or the effects of semantic change whereby the earlier Septuagintal choice of a word might no longer be a valid option the first century.\textsuperscript{78}

In the first part of her book Hooker has shown that the servant songs should not be divorced from DI as a whole. However, Hooker, in setting forth her method does not allow for the unity of Servant Songs (SS) and DI, for it seems that in Hookers approach we can allow DI to have an influence on Jesus’ own understanding, but unless explicitly stated, we cannot bring with that the SS\textsuperscript{79} The SS and DI are a unity and if we find Jesus alluding to DI we should assume that the SS are not far behind. Recent work by Rikki Watts and Joel Marcus\textsuperscript{80} has argued that Mark’s Gospel reflects the theme of new exodus from DI. Is Mark being theologically creative or are these

\textsuperscript{77} Rikki Watts Jesus’ Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited 127
\textsuperscript{78} Similar to the discussion of McKnight above.
\textsuperscript{80} Isaiah’s New Exodus and Mark, J. Marcus: The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament.
creative echoes of DI a part of Jesus’ self understanding. If Watts and Marcus are correct then ‘if there is any doubt concerning the source or significance of a given allusion, then the first port of call ought to be those Isaianic texts which concern the NE [New Exodus].’

Instead of looking as to whether Jesus is the servant, we should ask whether Jesus is evoking the content of DI and with it the SS?

Mark 10:45

γαρ ο ιος του ανθρωποι ουκ ηλθεν διακονηθηναι ἀλλα διακονησαι και δουναι την ψυχην αυτου λυτρον αντι πολλων

‘Servant’: διακονησαι (v45), δοῦλος (v44)

The word διακονέω (v45) is unknown to the LXX. However, Hooker, allows δοῦλος (v44) into the discussion, thus providing a strong linguistic link with DI. The LXX prefers to uses the words παῖς and δοῦλος to translate שָׁבִית . The N.T frequently uses the word διακονέω yet it is not used in the LXX and only appears rarely in the intertestamental period (2 Mac 11:58, 4 Macc 9:17). We may suggest then that διακονε- has undergone a semantic shift, perhaps appropriating some of the δοῦλος functions. Although the LXX Is 53 uses παῖς in a titular way a derivative of διακονέω, δουλεύοντα, is used in LX 53:11. It is used alongside πολλοῖς which provides a possible linguistic link with Mark 10:45. None of this evidence is conclusive within itself but is part of an accumulative argument. If Jesus’ ministry is set in the broad context of DI then it makes hermeneutical sense to assume Isaiaic content when linguistic parallels may be vague.
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Hooker describes states the traditional reading is often assumed for ‘the concepts of service, the ransom and the giving of life, and in the word ‘many’.” However, Morna, points out that the servant in DI are to be seen as the ‘Yahweh’s servant’, the one who is ‘submissive to the will of Yahweh,’ In contrast the ‘service’ of Mark 10:45, and the preceding verses, is ‘the picture drawn here is one of willing service but those whom the world would expect to be served.’ There is no connection according to Hooker, with Is 53.

However, in response to this we must note the following.

- The servant in DI not only serves YHWH but also provides a service for the people. He bears grief and sorrow (v4), suffers on behalf of the people (v5),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark 10:45</th>
<th>Is 53:11</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44 καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν υἱῷ εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος 45 καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἠλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.</td>
<td>44 and whoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all. 45 For the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.”</td>
<td>ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέσει, δικαιώσαι δίκαιον ἐν δουλεύόντα πολλοῖς, καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85 Sir Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton (1807-1862) originally published by Samuel Bagster & Sons, Ltd., London, 1851]
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89 as with C.K Barret ‘the connection between Mark 10:45 and Is 53 is much less definite and more tenuous than is often supposed.’ *The Background of Mark 10:45*
made an offering for sin (v10,11,12), justifies many (v11). He served Israel but also the nations (Is 42:1-4, 6;49:6,8,9;53:12)

- Jesus says that he serves others, but this service to others, like the great ransom of the exodus (ala Moses), is also service to God. Jesus’ death is a service to God (Mark 14:36)

Hooker states that the concept of suffering only enters into the second part of the verse. It is to be noted that all three passion predictions (8:31, 9:31,10:32ff) follow a pattern

i) prediction

ii) failure to understand

iii) subsequent teaching

Mark 10:45 should not be divorced from the thrust of the other predictions. Mark 10:45 is not merely a comment on the role of leadership but is the rounding off of Jesus’ teaching.

Λύτρον, according to Hooker, is never used in the LXX ‘as a sacrificial term’ but ‘only in the technical sense of ‘purchase money’. The cognate term λύτρωσις is used far more frequently. Stemming from the Hebrew words בָּשָׂם and נֵבֶט it is a term which is used within the Pentateuch to look back to the redemption from Egypt, whereas they are used in DI to look forward to the ‘Return from Exile’.

Hooker states

‘It should be noted that the primary thought in this conception of God as Redeemer is one of historical activity by Yahweh, either in the past, at the Exodus, or in the future, at the Return; it may be used too, of the deliverance of some individual from distress: if the forgiveness of sins is sometimes involved, then it is secondary to the main theme.’

For Hooker, Jesus drew from the language of DI and ‘understood a connection between his own mission and the New Era announced by the prophet.’ However

---
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there is no evidence, according to Hooker, to 'show that λύτρον is referring back to ἁςα, ᾔςα in 53:10.

Hooker does see ‘considerable evidence to justify the linking of λύτρον with the general theme of Deutero-Isaiah, which is the expected redemption of Israel by Yahweh. 'This concept of redemption, according to Hooker, is a much larger theme than that of the servant, 'although it may include the servant'. This verse is not about sacrifice, or substitution, but about the redemption of Israel.

We may want to notice though that

‘Return from exile’ is closely tied together in DI with the forgiveness of sin. When sins are forgiven the exile will be over—that is God’s covenantal curse will be removed. A look in a lexicon tells us,

37.130 λύτρον, ou: ἀντίλυτρον, ou n: the means or instrument by which release or deliverance is made possible—‘means of release, ransom.’ λύτρον: δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν ‘to give his life as a ransom for many’ or ‘to die as a means of liberating many’ Mt 20.28. ‘To liberate many’ may be expressed in many languages as ‘to cause people to go free’ or, in a more idiomatic manner, ‘to untie many’ or ‘to unchain many.’

It is often use to describe the payment for prisoners of war or slaves.

Λύτρον is a noun derived from → λίω that designates (with the ending -τρον) the “means” of release, i.e., the ransom. “Ransom” is spoken of (frequently in the PL) in Greek texts of antiquity including the LXX, Philo, and Josephus, predominantly in reference to prisoners of war, slaves, and debtors. Λύτρον is thus the “price of release” for the liberation of a prisoner or debtor, in which the extent of the price of redemption and the manner of its payment follows certain conventions, but is commonly determined by the “right of the sovereign.” OT and rabbinic texts (Exod 21:30; 30:12; Num 35:31; Qam. 40a, 41b; b. Mak. 2b) indicate the connection between “ransom” and “atonement.” A ransom is paid for the expiation of a life that has fallen into debt.

---


If this idea is present in Jesus’ use of λύτρον then is ties in closely with the themes of DI, in which Israel are imprisoned (exiled) on account of their sin, when an offering is needed for their sins—that is when freedom and forgiveness arrive the end of exile is present.

As Hagner comments:-

The lack of actual linguistic parallels at these points (they are present in the case of ψυχή and πολλοὶ) cannot obscure the significant conceptual parallels. It is simply too easy to insist on the difference of the words and to attribute different nuances to them, while at the same time ignoring their similarities. In both passages one who has been designated as rendering service gives his life for the salvation of the people. The אָשָׂם, āšām, “guilt offering,” can without difficulty connote payment to release from penalty of sin (the meaning of λύτρον).95

Mark 10:45: Brief Concluding Remarks and Suggested Future Research

In this paper I have sought to follow carefully, whilst keeping an eye on methodological concerns, Hooker’s Jesus and the Servant. This study has sought to offer a critique of Hooker and has highlighted several areas which require further research. These include:

1) A study of how a full sketch of Jesus’ ministry can impact the readings of individual verses.
2) A study of Jesus’ potential life scripts.
3) A study of the ‘son of man sayings’ in response to McKnight’s question ‘Why did Jesus choose “Son of Man” in Mark 10:45 if he really meant “Servant of Isaiah”?’
4) A study of the hope for ‘return from exile’ and the fulfilment of DI promises within 2nd temple Judaism.
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