TIMOTHY C. GRAY

The Temple in the Gospel of Mark

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 242

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

242

Timothy C. Gray

The Temple in the Gospel of Mark

A Study in its Narrative Role

Mohr Siebeck

Timothy C. Gray: born 1968; 2006 PhD; currently Assistant Professor of Scripture at the St. John Vianney Theological Seminary and President of the Augustine Institute, both Denver, Colorado.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151585-9
ISBN 978-3-16-149685-1
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de.*

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Held in Rottenburg.

Printed in Germany.

This work is dedicated
to my wife Kris

Preface

In a seminar on the Gospel of Mark, led by Fr. Frank Moloney, the narrative artistry of Mark's story captured my imagination. One section particularly struck me, the eschatological discourse in Mark 13. Mark 13 is one of the rare departures from narrative in Mark and certainly contains the longest discourse in the story. Attempting to tackle this complex and controversial discourse in a simple seminar paper was rather like trying to take a sip of water from a fire hydrant. My inititial work for that seminar sparked a desire to better understand Mark's purpose in such a dramatic departure from his more typical narrative style, and led me to the focus my dissertation on this topic. Given this starting point, it was natural to have Fr. Moloney direct the project. I am deeply grateful for all he has taught me about narrative and scholarship, and I count myself blessed to have had such a wise and learned guide.

Years before, while studying for my Th.M. at Duke University, I had the opportunity to study under Richard Hays. In his New Testament Intertextuality seminar I had the chance to read through many important texts in Mark. I will always remain deeply grateful for the generous time and assistance he gave me. Looking back now, it is clear to me that studying intertextuality with Richard Hays and narrative analysis (intratextuality) with Frank Moloney provided key methodological tools for my reading of Mark, to which this work and I am greatly indebted.

Besides the fortune of having Fr. Moloney, I profited tremendously from Frs. Frank Matera and Frank Gignac. I doubt if anyone could have had three readers more committed and meticulous. Their diligent reading and feedback was a model of professionalism from which I benefited more than words can say. Of course I am responsible for the flaws that remain, but this study is far better thanks to their invaluable assistance. To Frank Gignac in particular, I owe a deep debt for going above and beyond the call of editing and giving me critical feedback that has saved me from many errors and clarified my thought throughout the work. His love for the Greek text and accuracy is a great inspiration and model.

At the start of my writing I had the daunting challenge of having just moved to Denver to start a new job teaching at St. John Vianney Seminary. I am grateful to the rector, Fr. Michael Glenn, and the entire Scripture department, Sr. Timothea Elliot and Frs. Andreas Hock and Federico

Colautti, for giving me a lighter teaching load while working on the dissertation. I am especially grateful to Sr. Timothea Elliot, a wise and learned Scripture scholar, for giving me constant encouragement and hope along the way.

Above all I want to thank my beloved wife, Kris. Without her incalculable patience, sacrifices, and assistance I could never have persevered. I find marriage a shared adventure, and she has been a partner in this project with me in many ways. I hope I am a better man from this process and that it will enable me to better serve and love her and our son Joseph.

Timothy C. Gray

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Demonstration in the Temple

The drama of Mark's narrative is generated by the conflict between the Jewish leaders and Jesus, which reaches a climax with Jesus' arrival in the temple (Mark 11). From this point forward the temple plays a prominent role in the narrative. Scholars have recognized for some time the salient place held by the temple in Mark's story. The temple plays a vital role in the temple cleansing, trial, and crucifixion scenes, each time in a way that is unique to Mark's gospel. The importance of the temple for Mark is not in question, but what remains to be examined is why Mark gives the temple such a conspicuous place in his narrative. In order to explore this question, a careful analysis of how Mark shapes his narrative needs to be given. This chapter will begin such an analysis by sketching the temple's place in Mark 11–15, illustrating how Mark structures the latter part of his narrative on Jesus' relationship to the temple.

After giving a broad sketch of the literary role of the temple in Mark, I shall examine how Mark begins the climax of his story with Jesus' entry into the temple. Jesus' entry is a watershed moment, one that illustrates the temple's pivotal role. Jesus' entry into the temple leads to a dramatic conflict between the authorities and Jesus when Jesus enacts his demonstration. The importance of this demonstration for Mark is evident by the rhetorical framing of this episode with the cursed fig tree, an account unique to Mark. Thus, the three parts of this chapter are: (1) an overview of the narrative role of the temple in Mark 11–15; (2) an examination of how the entry narrative is a watershed moment in Mark; and (3) a careful exegesis of Jesus' temple demonstration, the understanding of which is vital for understanding the role of the temple in Mark's narrative.

1.1 Narrative and Intertextual Approach

In order to explore the reasons why Mark gives the temple such prominence in his Gospel, this study will present a narrative analysis of Mark 11–15 as its narrative relates to the temple. Narrative analysis seeks to discern the plot of a given story by examining the parts of the story in

relation to the entire narrative world depicted in the story. Since the temple motif is interwoven throughout Mark's narrative, its meaning for Mark's Gospel is embedded in the overall plot of the story. Therefore, the study of the temple theme in Mark requires that we examine the role of the temple within Mark's larger plot.

Although many insights into Mark's narrative and overall theology have been gleaned through redaction criticism since the 1950s, this method has largely neglected the temple motif in Mark.[1] To explain further why redaction criticism has not given much attention to the temple motif in Mark, a brief sketch of the methodological nature of redaction criticism, in comparison to narrative criticism, shall be given.

By noting editorial emendations, redaction criticism seeks to understand the aims of an author.[2] The theology of the author is reconstructed based on how he adopts and modifies the traditions inherited through his sources. Redaction criticism has sought to understand more fully the contributions that the authors of the gospels have made, whereas earlier form critics focused on discovering the traditions and sources behind the gospel narratives. Redaction critics, such as G. Bornkamm and H. Conzelmann, emphasized that the authors of the gospels were more than mere collectors of traditions and that their shaping of their sources was done with the care and ingenuity of an author. Thus, redaction criticism built upon the form critic's focus on sources and concentrated on how the gospel authors used those sources as well as what that said about their theology and outlook.

---

[1] Both William R. Telford (*The Theology of the Gospel of Mark* [New York: Cambridge, 1999] 28) and Francis J. Moloney (*The Gospel of Mark* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002] 9) list the major themes of Mark that have been the focus of Markan redaction criticism, such as the "messianic secret," Son of Man, Kingdom of God, Jewish leadership, geography (such as Galilee vs. Jerusalem), Gentile mission, persecution, discipleship, Son of God, cross, suffering, eschatology, gospel, identity of Jesus, passion of Jesus. In neither list is the temple motif found, because this theme has not come into the purview of redaction critics. Two redaction studies that give significant attention to the temple theme in Mark are John R. Donahue (*Are You the Christ?* [SBLDS 10; New York, 1973]) and Donald Juel (*Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* [SBLDS 31: Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977). However, in the introduction to his recent commentary on Mark (*The Gospel of Mark*, written with Daniel J. Harrington [SacPag; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002] 8–47), Donahue makes no mention of the temple motif in his discussion of the gospel's major themes.

[2] For a further discussion of redaction criticism, see Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism?* [London: SPCK, 1970]; C. M. Tuckett, "Redaction Criticism," in *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden; London: SCM, 1990) 580–82. For a review and critique of redaction criticism of the Gospel of Mark, see Christopher D. Marshall, *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative* (SNTSMS 64; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 8–14.

To uncover the agenda and theology of the author, one needed to analyse precisely how he used his sources. The method of redaction criticism required that one be able to isolate the contribution of the evangelist from the material inherited from earlier sources. Thus, redaction criticism, not unlike form criticism, focuses on the seams in the narrative and the sources they may bespeak.[3] Redaction critics do not aim to understand the unity of the narrative as a story. Coherence is found by deconstructing the sources behind the text to discover the unity of perspective or apologetic concern of the author.

This stands in contrast to narrative criticism, which sees coherence as deriving from the plot and ideological point of view displayed in the story as a whole. For narrative criticism, the theology emerges from the story, not vice versa.[4] On the one hand, redaction critics tend to view the text as an effect, the cause of which must be understood as extrinsic to the text itself – hence the energy to uncover what lay outside the text. On the other hand, narrative criticism sees that cause and effect as enmeshed into the narrative logic of the text itself and a careful analysis of the plot as the best means to uncovering the causation that moves the story and gives it meaning.[5] Thus, redaction criticism ultimately aims beyond the text and is characteristically extrinsic, whereas narrative criticism looks within the text and is intrinsic in regard to the text. This is why redaction criticism is more interested in the intention of the redactor (author) than in the intention of the text as it stands, which is the interest of narrative criticism.

This background may help explain why the temple as a dimension of Mark's story has not been within the purview of redaction critics. Given the inclination of redaction criticism to look for extrinsic causes of the text, the focus on the temple inevitably turned to the historical events surrounding the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70. It was believed that the events surrounding the temple's demise generated much of the eschatological emphasis in Mark (particularly Mark 13) as well as the significant attention to the temple in Mark's story. Thus, redaction critics felt that the effect (the temple's prominent focus in Mark) was to be understood by the cause (the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70). Whether this historical analysis of the Gospel of Mark and the end of the temple is correct (and it may well be), this approach leaves aside the question of Mark's theological understanding of the temple's demise. It is precisely Mark's theological concerns regarding the temple that will be

---

[3] Marshall, *Faith as a Theme*, 9.

[4] Thomas R. Hatina, *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative* (JSNTS 232; New York: Sheffield, 2002) 88.

[5] Hatina, *In Search of a Context*, 87.

pursued in this present study by examining how Mark carefully teaches about the temple and its relationship to Jesus throughout. What the author of Mark conveys to his readers through the inner dynamics of his story is a theological message that cannot be reduced to historical analysis of the temple's destruction and its relation to Mark's story. However, the historical events surrounding the destruction of the temple influenced Mark and his audience, since Mark's text was generated within that particular historical context. In this case, redaction and narrative criticism need not be in opposition. Redaction criticism on Mark has illustrated the importance of the destruction of the temple as a context for reading Mark's narrative. Narrative criticism, as this study hopes to show, can show another dimension to Mark's story: a theological account that gives meaning to the temple's demise for the Markan community. Redaction criticism in Markan studies has so often focused on the historical events behind Mark's text that it has neglected Mark's theological reflection on these events.[6] The aim of this study is to explore the role of the temple within Mark's narrative world while at the same time recognizing that that world was generated by the events surrounding the demise of the temple.

Throughout Mark's narrative world, the Scriptures of Israel have a prominent place.[7] Howard Kee observed, "The Scriptures are indeed an indispensable presupposition of all that Mark wrote."[8] Thus, the narrative approach of this study will be accompanied by an investigation into Mark's intertextuality in the sections that pertain to the temple theme.

---

[6] Raymond E. Brown (*An Introduction to the New Testament* [New York: Doubleday, 1997] 26) asserts that one of the strengths of narrative criticism is that it moves beyond the historical context to speak to the theological interpretation that is given in narratives to that history: "Narrative Criticism counters the excesses of historical investigation and helps to highlight the author's main interest."

[7] Many works have noted the vital role played by the OT in Mark, e.g., Willard M. Swartley, *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels: Story Shaping Story* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994); Howard Clark Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11–16," in *Jesus und Paulus* (ed. E. Earle Ellis and E. Grasser; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1975) 165–88; idem, *Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977) 46–49; Rikki Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997); Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1992); Thomas Hatina, *In Search of a Context*; W. S. Vorster, "The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark," *Neot* 14 (1981) 62–72; H. Anderson, "The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring* (ed., J. M. Efird; Durham: Duke University Press, 1972) 280–306; R. Schneck, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark 1–8* (BIBALDS 1: Vallejo, CA: BIBAL, 1994).

[8] Kee, "The Function of Scriptural Quotations,"165–88.

An important methodological presupposition of this study holds that Mark's use of Scripture is often more than atomistic, and so the wider context of the OT citation or allusion will be examined.[9] The literary method of evoking a particular context and meaning of one text through an allusion or brief citation of that text in another is called metalepsis. The rhetorical function of this literary trope is the echoing of an earlier text by a later one in a way that evokes resonances of the earlier text beyond what was explicitly cited or alluded to directly.[10] Richard Hays, building on the work of John Hollander who illustrated that this was a common trope among ancient and modern literature in the West, demonstrated how often the technique of metalepsis was used by Paul.[11] Other scholars have noted that this method was used by ancient Jewish sources, and therefore it is not surprising to find it employed similarly in Mark.[12] Of course, there is danger of this method being abused, and so the methodological controls suggested by Hays for discerning metalepsis shall be referred to and presumed in this study.[13]

Just as Markan scholarship has advanced beyond the notion that Mark was a simple collector of traditions to the point that he is a very capable storyteller and author of significant ability, so too this study hopes to advance the view that Mark is not simply proof-texting Scripture but rather is a sophisticated author who often employs the contextual richness of the OT texts he uses, which he interweaves into his wider narrative. It is vital that the careful narrative reading of Mark be combined with an attentive intertextual reading that examines how the OT citation or allusion affects

---

[9] Marcus (*The Way of the Lord*) has argued against seeing Mark's use of the OT as atomistic, and throughout his work he demonstrates that the wider context of the OT citation often sheds light on Mark's narrative and use of Scripture. More recently, Thomas Hatina (*In Search of a Context*) and Rikki Watts (*Isaiah's New Exodus*) follow up the work of Marcus in illustrating the importance of noting the contextual background of OT citations and allusions in Mark.

[10] Richard Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 2–3, and *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989) 14–21.

[11] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 18–21.

[12] Rikki Watts (*Isaiah's New Exodus*, 111) observed that "in the absence of chapter and verse divisions, partitions were apparently used as shorthand references to larger contexts, and the same could reasonably be expected of allusions." See also C. E. B. Cranfield, "A Study of St. Mark 1:9–11" *JST* (1955) 53–63; C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952) 126; Joachim Jeremias, *TDNT* 5. 701.

[13] Hays (*Echoes of Scripture*, 29–33) gives seven tests for discerning intertextual echoes in Scripture. More recently, he has given an updated description of these seven tests in *The Conversion of the Imagination*, 34–45.

the larger narrative context in Mark.[14] Thus, not only is there an intelligent intratextuality in Mark's narrative, but there is a sophisticated intertextuality as well.[15] Moreover, as this study hopes to illustrate, the intratextuality and intertextuality are deeply linked in Mark to significant effect. Often, the OT motifs quoted or alluded to by Mark are planted in his narrative and spring up throughout the story as the common themes of the Gospel. Thus, Mark weaves the key points of his OT texts into the tapestry of his narrative: thus to understand fully Mark's narrative logic one must unearth the role of the Scripture passages embedded in his story.

1.2 Narrative Overview: Mark 11–15

The tension between Jesus and the temple dominates the landscape of Mark 11–15 and propels the narrative to its climax.[16] Much of the narrative

---

[14] Thomas Hatina (*In Search of a Context*, 49) captures the importance of reading Mark's narrative with a view to its use of intertextuality: "A reciprocal dynamic is necessarily effected: the narrative serves as the context for reading the quotations; and yet the quotations play an important role in contributing to the understanding of that narrative."

[15] Elizabeth Struthers Malbon (*In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark's Gospel* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000]) as well as Donahue and Harrington (*Mark*, esp. 1–3) note the importance of intertextuality and intratextuality for reading Mark. However, neither book shows how intimately these two methods are related in Mark, with his taking OT themes (intertextuality) and weaving them into his narrative motifs (intratextuality).

[16] Although the salient role of the temple in the latter part of Mark's narrative is widely recognized by scholars, there is no single monograph on the temple in Mark's narrative. Juel's work, *Messiah and Temple*, focuses on the role of the temple in the Markan trial narrative. Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synopic Gospels* (NovTSup 23; Leiden: Brill, 1970), is focused on historical questions regarding Jesus and the temple, and although he draws heavily upon Mark, Gaston never draws any conclusions or synthetic analysis of the role of the temple for Mark's story. Sam P. Matthew, *Temple-Criticism in Mark's Gospel: The Economic Role of the Jerusalem Temple during the First Century CE* (Delhi: ISPCK, 1999), focuses, with a historical aim, on the socio-economic issues in Mark's gospel. He does not focus on the role of the temple in Mark's narrative or theology. The importance of the temple for Mark's gospel has also attracted much attention in scholarly articles, e.g., John Paul Heil, "The Narrative Strategy and Pragmatics of the Temple Theme in Mark," *CBQ* 59 (1997) 76–100; Ernst L. Schnellbächer, "The Temple as Focus of Mark's Theology," *HBT* 5 no. 2 (1983) 95–112; David Seeley, "Jesus' Temple Act," *CBQ* 55 (1993) 263–83; Paula Fredriksen, "Jesus and the Temple, Mark and the War," *SBL 1990 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP 29; ed. David J. Lull; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 293–310; Morna Hooker, "Traditions about the Temple in the Sayings of Jesus," *BJRL* 70 (1988) 7–19.

in these chapters focuses on this tension or is colored by Jesus' controversial actions in the temple.[17] Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem (11:1–11) raises questions about Jesus' identity and authority, questions that come to the fore after his demonstration in the temple (11:27–33). Jesus answers questions about his authority with the parable of the wicked tenants (12:1–12), which vindicates his authority while also criticizing the temple establishment. Jesus' parable provokes questions aimed at entrapping him (12:13–34), after which Jesus responds with further criticisms (12:35–44). Finally, Jesus leaves the temple – never to return – (13:1) and gives an apocalyptic-style discourse ostensibly about the end of the temple (13). Mark 14–15 is the story of Jesus' passion, but even here, the temple occupies a presence in the narrative. When Jesus is arrested, he questions why they did not arrest him when he taught every day in the temple (14:49). At Jesus' trial, he is accused of threatening the temple (14:58). Jesus is mocked, with this same charge, during the crucifixion (15:29). Finally, as Jesus dies the curtain in the temple is torn from top to bottom (15:38), and Jesus' death is mysteriously linked to the end of the temple.

There is little doubt that the temple dominates Mark's brief narrative about Jesus, particularly Mark 11–15. Indeed, Mark not only positions the temple at the center of the narrative, he also draws parallels between Jesus and the temple. This can be seen at the macro level with Mark's subtle division of 11–15 into two halves, one about the end of the temple (11–12), and the other about the end of Jesus (14–15). Mark enhances this division as he carefully juxtaposes the preparation of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem and the temple with the preparation of Jesus' Last Supper. Mark's focus on Jesus' obtaining the colt is unique to his gospel; the detailed account of Jesus' ride on the colt into Jerusalem is also found in Mark's description of the Passover preparations (Mark 14:12–16). Mark has deliberately and subtly crafted the two units to create the striking parallel. This parallelism creates two narrative units, Mark 11–12 and 14–15. The two narratives of preparation – obtaining the colt for entering Jerusalem (Mark 11:1–6) and obtaining the room for Passover (Mark 14:12–16) – each mark the beginning of a new and significant narrative section. The two episodes have strong verbal parallels, illustrated in the following chart:

---

[17] John R. Donahue ("Temple, Trial, and Royal Christology," in *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14–16* [ed. W.H. Kelber; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976] 61–79) highlights how the motif of the temple is threaded throughout Mark 11–16. For Donahue, the Temple is at the heart of the dramatic conflict in the latter half of Mark: "From Mk 11 onward the opposition is directed clearly at the Temple" (ibid., 69).

	Mark 11		*Mark 14*
vs. 1c–2a	ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς	vs. 13a	ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς
vs. 2a	ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην	vs. 13a	ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν
vs. 3b	εἴπατε· ὁ κύριος	vs. 14b	εἴπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ ὅτι ὁ διδάσκαλος
vs. 4a	καὶ εὗρον	vs. 16b	καὶ εὗρον
vs. 11b	ὀψίας ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.	vs. 17	καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

These two narratives of preparation serve as introductions to the two halves of Mark 11–15 and thus suggest that each part, on the temple and Jesus respectively, is related to the other. More specifically, the preparation for Jesus' entry into Jerusalem serves as a prologue for Mark 11–13, which focuses on the temple; this first narrative unit, Mark 11:11–13:1, recounts Jesus' words and actions in the temple and the subsequent conflict between Jesus and the Jewish leaders. Jesus' entry (εἰσῆλθεν … εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, 11:11) and Jesus' exit (ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, 13:1), frame this tight narrative.

Mark 14 begins a new focus in the narrative, marked by the notice that Passover will occur in two days (v. 1). If in Mark 11–13 the temple provides the spatial context of the narrative, the Passover sets the temporal context for Mark 14–15. At the beginning of the chapter Mark presents a story of a woman who anoints Jesus, which is interpreted by Jesus as an anointing "for burial" – this story clearly foreshadows Jesus' impending passion and death. This story is also positioned in parallel to the last incident of Jesus in the temple, wherein he sees the widow at the treasury (12:41–11). The parallel of the widow who gives ὅλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς to the temple (12:44) with the woman who pours out the costly ointment upon Jesus (14:3) fits the classic pattern of Markan intercalation. The intercalation of the generous women serves to frame the almost free-standing discourse of Mark 13, a subject I shall examine in Chapter Three. The parallel between the two women mirrors the deeper parallel between Jesus and the temple: the object of the widow's gift is the temple, whereas Jesus is the object of the gift of ointment. It is just such a parallel that is suggested in the narrative account of the disciple's preparation for both Jesus' entry into the temple and the Passover meal. With these preparations, Mark underscores the importance of the temple incident and Jesus' Passover meal and suggests, at a narrative level, that there is an important relationship between Jesus and the temple. The temple

demonstration augurs the temple's end, and Jesus' silencing of the Jewish leaders also portends to the reader that the Jewish leadership that opposes Jesus is coming to an end. The end of both the temple and the entire Jerusalem establishment comes into sharp focus in the ominous discourse of Mark 13, an apocalyptic discourse that takes up the end of the temple, Jerusalem, and even the world. In the same way, the end of Jesus shadows all the events of the Passover meal, the garden of Gethsemane, and the rest of the passion narrative. Therefore, the end of the temple (11–12) and the end of Jesus (14–15) are juxtaposed, with Mark 13 standing in between these narratives as the vital link.

Mark 13 stands apart from its surrounding narrative for several reasons. First, Jesus exits the temple (ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ), which sets the stage for 11:11–12:44. Next, the context of Mark 13, the Mount of Olives (τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, 13:3), allows the teaching here to have a geographical marker that sets it apart from the surrounding locations of Bethany, temple, and Jerusalem. Finally, from a narrative perspective, Mark 13 is unique in that it is the only long discourse, besides Mark 4, delivered by Jesus in the entire story. Another distinctive feature of this discourse is its apocalyptic style. Despite the unique features of Mark 13, the content of Jesus' discourse serves as a bridge for the narrative units that precede and follow it.

Although Mark 13 in many ways stands apart from its surrounding narrative, it does have an important relation to the temple-dominated narrative of Mark 11–12, for three reasons. First, the discourse of Mark 13 begins with a discussion of the wonderful (ποταπός) stones and buildings (ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαί) of the temple (13:1–2). Second, Mark describes Jesus as sitting opposite the temple, κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ, thus employing imagery that suggests, particularly after the events of Mark 11–12, a hostile relationship. Finally, Jesus foretells the end of the temple (13:2, 14–23). Thus, the established conflict between Jesus and the temple in Mark 11–12 is addressed in the apocalyptic discourse of Mark 13, where the temple prophetically comes to an end.

Mark 13 does not merely focus on the end of the temple, however; it also takes up the apocalyptic imagery of the son of man's triumphant return at the end. This complex eschatological discourse concludes with an enigmatic parable that has strong narrative links to the passion narrative and the death of Jesus. No one knows the time the master will come, but the servants must watch (γρηγορεῖτε, Mark 13:33,34,35,37) lest he find them sleeping (καθεύδοντας, v. 36). The focus on temporality is made explicit in four instances in verse 35: evening (ὀψέ), midnight (μεσονύκτιον), cockcrow (ἀλεκτοροφωνίας), and morning (πρωΐ). Three out of the four are named, with the other being alluded to, in exactly that order

in the passion narrative that begins with the Last Supper (14:17, 41, 72, 15:1). Thus Mark 13 continues the motif of the temple found in Mark 11–12, while at the same time it looks forward to the story of Jesus that follows in Mark 14–15. Mark 13 plays a pivotal role in Mark's narrative by bridging the story of the temple's end with that of the end of Jesus. By highlighting the similarities and differences between the ends of each, Mark intends to lead his reader into a deeper understanding of the relationship between Jesus and the temple, an understanding that is – from Mark's perspective – the key to eschatology.

1.3 Jesus' Way to the Temple

Mark's account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (Mark 11:1–11) functions in many ways as a prologue for the remainder of his gospel, particularly for Mark 11–12. While this entry pericope anticipates many of the themes and issues that will soon unfold in the rest of Mark's story, the entry narrative also looks back to several themes that have run through Mark's preceding narrative. This oscillation illustrates how imperative Jesus' entry into Jerusalem is; indeed, I argue that it is a watershed moment in Mark's drama.[18]

To appreciate this narrative significance fully, I will trace the elements of the entry narrative that relate to the temple, as well as details that anticipate the subsequent story of Jesus' teaching and actions in the temple. There are four items in the entry narrative that have special relevance to the subsequent story of Jesus in the temple: (1) the details and pace of the narrative; (2) the motif of royalty (ὁ κύριος); (3) the motif of "the way" (ἡ ὁδός); and (4) the motif of "the coming one" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) from Psalm 118. Finally, I shall conclude with a brief summary of how these details and themes from the entry narrative prepare the reader in important ways for the story of Jesus that unfolds in the temple.

---

[18] Narrative forecasts and echoes are a common feature of Mark's narrative. Joanna Dewey ("Mark as Interwoven Tapestry: Forecasts and Echoes for a Listening Audience," *CBQ* 53 [1991], 224) observes that the "Gospel of Mark does not have a single structure made up of discrete units but rather is an interwoven tapestry or fugue made up of multiple overlapping structures and sequences, forecasts of what is to come and echoes of what has already been said." This nature of Mark's narratives will often be a focus of our study. See also Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "Echoes and Foreshadowings in Mark 4–8: Reading and Rereading," *JBL* 112 (1993) 211–30.

1.3.1 Narrative Pace

One of the most striking features of Mark's account of Jesus' entry (Mark 11:1–11) is the narrative pace, punctuated by intense detail. The reader, accustomed to the typically breathless pace of the Markan narrative, would note this significant change in narrative pace.[19] By slowing the pace, Mark intensifies the reader's sense of drama, thereby sharpening the narrative focus on Jesus' entry into the city where, as the reader well knows, he will be killed.[20] This change in narrative tempo is not meant to depict Jesus' journey as leisurely; rather, the narrative tempo gives a deliberative, even solemn, tone to the pace, serving to highlight the importance of Jesus' entry and presence in Jerusalem and its temple.

1.3.2 Which Lord? (κύριος)

Commentators have been divided as to precisely whom κύριος refers to in Mark 11:3, and recent commentators tend to be against seeing Jesus as the referent. Craig Evans is representative of many when he says, "To whom ὁ κύριος, 'the Lord,' refers is not easy to decide: Jesus, God, and the owner of the colt seem to be the options."[21] Evans ultimately posits that κύριος refers to the colt's owner or God. He excludes Jesus as a possibility, concluding: "The Markan evangelist (in contrast to Luke) never calls Jesus ὁ κύριος, so it is probably not prudent to see it as a reference to Jesus."[22] John Donahue and Daniel Harrington agree with Evans.[23] But R. T. France argues that the referent is God, as Jesus boldly enlists God as the κύριος, thereby giving legitimacy to Jesus' claim on the colt.[24]

Although the title "lord" (κύριος) is not a prominent christological title in Mark as it is in Luke, Mark nevertheless offers narrative clues that point to this possibility; indeed, the particular context of 11:3 even allows for this alternative reading. Mark begins his story of Jesus with the authoritative word from Scripture (Isa 40:3) commanding the voice in the wilderness (John the Baptist), ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου (1:3). Thus, from the very beginning of Mark's gospel, the reader is prepared to see

---

[19] "This narrative style creates a sense of urgency in the narrative. The Markan Jesus appears as a person in a hurry, moving somewhat breathlessly from place to place, taking the lead and determining the direction of the narrative. Yet the pace of the narrative slows as the Passion approaches" (Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 17).

[20] Mark forecasted Jesus' death in the three passion predictions, Mark 8:31, 9:31, 10:33–34, which lead up to Mark 11.

[21] Craig Evans, *Mark 8:27–16:20* (WBC 34B; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001) 143.

[22] Ibid.

[23] Donahue and Harrington, *Mark*, 321–22.

[24] R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 432.