

THE SOVEREIGN(S) SUPPORT
AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF THE SPIRIT IN MARK AND HIS CONNECTIONS
TO THE KINGDOM

by

Justin Andrew James Comber, B.Th.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of McMaster Divinity College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
the degree of Master of Arts

McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario
2008

M.A.
Hamilton, Ontario

McMASTER DIVINITY COLLEGE

TITLE: The Sovereign('s) Support: an Exegetical Study of the Spirit
in Mark and His Connections to the Kingdom.

AUTHOR: Justin Andrew James Comber

SUPERVISOR: Stanley E. Porter

NUMBER OF PAGES: viii + 167.



McMASTER DIVINITY COLLEGE

Upon the recommendation of an oral examination committee, this thesis-project by

Justin Comber

is hereby accepted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Christian Studies


Stacy C. Pater
First Reader and Advisor


Cynthia A. Wood
Second Reader



Dean

Date: *January 8, 2008*

ABSTRACT

“The Sovereign(’s) Support: an Exegetical Study of the Spirit in Mark and His Connections to the Kingdom.”

Justin Andrew James Comber
McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario
Master of Arts, 2008

There are very few treatments of the Spirit in Mark, and those are often dismissive or too eager to find a larger pattern of pneumatology than the relative dearth of material in the Gospel justifies. It has become necessary to approach the text of Mark carefully and exegetically in order to discover any Markan emphasis on the Spirit. As such, this study will examine each passage pertaining to the Spirit with the theological development of Mark in mind, after examining the Gospels and Pauline Epistles for their emphasis on the Spirit. This will reveal a marked pattern of association between the Spirit and the Kingdom of God in Mark’s Gospel which, though not representative of a carefully formed Markan pneumatology, distinguishes the Markan emphasis on the Spirit from the rest of the New Testament’s.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a thesis is not as solitary an endeavour as I expected, and I owe much to many people. My Mother and Father have sacrificed more than I could ask to ensure that I was prepared for the task. My sister, Allyssa, consistently tells me that I'm smart. The sentiment is appreciated. I am grateful to Bob Mercer. Our long discussions on Lukan pneumatology, which doubtless interrupted not a few classes, and may have even involved a few cusses, set the foundation for this work. Most of all, I owe my sanity, here at the end, to Brittany. You were the most pleasant distraction. And I hope to return the favour in the many years to come. All of these people provided invaluable background support, and I am grateful.

During the writing stage, however, there were a few people whose input invariably shaped the final draft. I owe a great debt of thanks to Dr. Stanley E. Porter for his great honesty and sharp mind. His input and guidance helped to shape every aspect of this thesis. I am grateful to Cindy Westfall, especially for her enthusiasm for both serious scholarly work, and the process of spiritual development that should accompany biblical research. Your enthusiasm is contagious. With this in mind, I am thankful to the Spirit. Biblical research is, necessarily, a conversation with God. I am grateful for that opportunity, and have not come out unaffected.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	vii
Introduction	1
1. The Spirit in The New Testament	11
1. The Spirit in Matthew	12
2. The Spirit in Luke-Acts	14
3. The Spirit in Johannine Literature	26
4. The Spirit in the Pauline Epistles	29
Conclusions	37
2. The Spirit in Mark 1:1–15	40
1. The Exclusivity of the Spirit to Jesus in the Markan Prologue	43
2. The Holy Spirit in Intertextual Context	53
Conclusions	68
3. The Spirit in Mark 3:20–30	70
1. The Relationship between the Spirit and Jesus in Mark 3:28–30	72
2. The Spirit and the Kingdoms of God and Satan in Mark 3:20–30	82
3. The Kingdom at Work in the Larger Context of Mark 3:20–30	92
Conclusions	96
4. The Spirit in Mark 12:1–37	98
1. Pentecostal Pneumatology in Reference to Mark 12:36	100
2. The Spirit in the Structure of Mark 12:1–37	105
3. The Spirit in the Text of Mark 12:1–37	112
Conclusions	121
5. The Spirit in Mark 13:1–37	122
1. The Little Apocalypse Theory and Recent Scholarly Discussion	125
2. The Spirit and Persecution in Mark 13	132
3. The Spirit in the Prophetic Paraenesis of Mark 13	140
Conclusions	149
Conclusion	151
Bibliography	157

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	David N. Freedman, ed. <i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BLG	Biblical Languages: Greek
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary
BNTCC	Black's New Testament Commentary Companion Series
BR	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BRBS	Brill's Readers in Biblical Studies
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CGTC	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary
COQG	Christian Origins and the Question of God
DJG	Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall eds. <i>Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels</i>
DPL	Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid eds. <i>Dictionary of Paul and his Letters</i>
GP	Gospel Perspectives Series
Herm	Hermeneia
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JGRChJ	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
JPT	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i>
JPTS	Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series.
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
KBANT	Kommentare und Beiträge zum alten und neuen Testament
LNTSSup	Library of New Testament Studies Supplement Series.
Louw & Nida	Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida eds. <i>Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains</i> . Second Edition.
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIDNTT	Colin Brown, ed. <i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i>

NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplement Series
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PRS</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>RAT</i>	<i>Revue Africaine de Théologie</i>
RNT	Reading the New Testament
SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNTG	Studies in New Testament Greek
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>TDNT</i>	Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>Them</i>	<i>Themelios</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
UBS	Kurt Aland et al. eds. <i>The Greek New Testament: Fourth Revised Edition.</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

INTRODUCTION

The formulation of a comprehensive pneumatology from the material presented on the Spirit in Mark's Gospel is a task exegetically equivalent to the piecing together of a Mercedes from a few tires, a steering wheel, and a box of mismatched lug-nuts. There simply isn't enough material and, at first glance, there is little connective tissue between the individual parts. Fortunately for the reader of the New Testament, the Spirit need not be understood as a foundational character in the Gospel. There are other, more pressing concerns. It is fortunate for this particular work that there exist connections between the pieces of Spirit discourse. That is, the Spirit discourses in the Gospel of Mark, though they are not immediately interconnected, are each equally connected to the dialogical development the Kingdom of God.

The Spirit in the Gospel of Mark is best described as a theological adjunct. There are many theological threads that trace their way through the Markan narrative and some of those, and especially the rejection of the temple, the Markan christology and the theology of the Kingdom, occupy large amounts of the Gospel and are intimately interconnected. The Markan development of these ideas, and especially his theology of

the Kingdom, provides a home for the presence of the Spirit in the Gospel. As Mark's Kingdom theology progresses through the Gospel, entwined with christological emphasis, there are several instances in which the Spirit appears and furthers the reader's understanding of that theology, contributing a unique spiritual emphasis.

With that said, it must be emphasised that this is not a study of the Kingdom of God in Mark, nor of its christology or the way in which it presents Jesus' rejection of the temple. Each of these is already the topic of a great number of books and does not represent the present intent. Though each of these emphases, and especially that of the Kingdom, will be explored in this work, the primary focus here is the Spirit in Mark's Gospel. The other Markan emphases, though they are decidedly more prominent, will be discussed only as far as they are influenced by Mark's discussion of the Spirit.

In order to maintain some sort of definition, two assertions must be made presently. First, this is a study of the Spirit in the Gospel of Mark. Even though it has been acknowledged that there is no single comprehensive Markan pneumatology, there is still sufficient material dedicated to the Spirit in Mark to warrant closer examination. Second, this is an exegetical study of the Spirit in the Gospel. As such, each discourse on the Spirit in the Gospel will be examined within the larger context of the Markan discourse. Similarly, each passage will be examined in its immediate context for its contribution to the overall development of the text with specific interest paid to the role of the Spirit in that overall development. It is difficult to reduce the present method to a simpler definition than "exegetical," however, in the interest of clarity, a few exegetical limitations and presuppositions must be clarified.

It is well beyond the scope of this work to define the precise methodological processes which will be used during the exegesis of the passages pertaining to the Spirit in the Gospel of Mark. There have been several works dedicated to the development of an exegetical process, many of which have informed this study directly. It is not necessary to reinvent the exegetical wheel for the study of the Spirit in the text. Therefore, rather than elaborating on the intricacies of the standard exegetical method, it is best to refer the reader to those works concerned with that method directly, and especially those texts which deal with exegesis in a text's original languages.¹ With that said, there is no intention here of developing a Markan biblical theology of the Spirit. As mentioned before, due to the relative dearth of Spirit discourses in the Gospel, the task and the method simply do not mix. That is, our concern will be on the emphasis placed on the Spirit in those pericopes in the Markan text that concern him, with no thought given toward synthesis of these emphases into a larger Markan or biblical pneumatology.

The term exegetical should also serve to define, at least in some small part, the present approach to the text. That is, though there are many specific forms of criticism that can be applied to a text, the present analysis will focus on the final form of the text, and consider Mark an independent theologian.² With this in mind, though there are points at which redaction criticism and other methods of interpretation inform the

¹ Of particular interest is the work of Porter (Porter, *Handbook*), Fee (Fee, *Exegesis; Gospel and Spirit*), and Osborne (Osborne, *Spiral*). Furthermore, I must acknowledge the influence of Cynthia Long Westfall (Westfall, *Hebrews*) and Stanley E. Porter (Porter, *Idioms*; Porter, *Aspect*) on the exegetical analysis of semantics and grammar respectively.

² This claim is particularly relevant to the study of the Spirit in a Gospel text. It is meant as a direct response to those who, especially in the face of emerging Pentecostal scholarship on the Spirit in Luke-Acts, assert the necessity of interpreting Scriptures according to other Scriptures. When imposed on the text, this method tends to subjugate the Gospels, which are called historical texts, to the "didactic" material represented by the Epistles (Stott, *Baptism*, 8; Pinnock and Osborne, "Truce Proposal", 6-9). This often results in the insistence that the Gospel text must be interpreted by history, with little allowance given for the formation of a narrative by its author (Ramm, *Interpretation*, 6) This is largely influenced by the Princeton school of thought on the Scriptures (e.g. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*).

exegetical process, in terms of method, the examination to follow will concern itself with the meaning of the final form.³ Finally, the present examination of the Spirit in Mark will be not only exegetical, but it will discuss the work of other authors who have wrestled with various other facets of the Markan text as such discussion becomes relevant to the task at hand.

To this point presuppositions have been identified and, brief credit has been given to those whose work has laid the way for an exegetical analysis of the text. It now remains only to discuss the work of the analysis of the Spirit in Mark itself, the claims of this work, and the manner in which those claims will be communicated. Simply stated, the Spirit works as a divine supporter and witness to the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. This is accomplished through Jesus, in whom the Spirit acts as a divine witness and qualifier for Kingdom ministry, empowers Jesus exorcisms, and serves as a witness to the validity of Jesus' Kingdom rule in opposition to the kingdom of Satan and the Jerusalem authorities. It is also accomplished when the Spirit acts as an aid to Jesus' followers in the face of future opposition from the Jerusalem authorities, for the task of perpetuating and preserving the Kingdom of God amid eschatological persecution. Simply, the Spirit is the helper and witness to those in need of Him in their work in perpetuating and growing the Kingdom of God, to the downfall of the kingdom of Satan and every opposing earthly kingdom. This will be developed over five chapters, each with its own contribution to this understanding. The first chapter will concern itself with

³ For a similar assertion see Conzelmann (Conzelmann, *Theology*, 9). This is in contrast to examinations of Mark and the Synoptics which have a stated interest in finding the true text, which can be found in the source documents (Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*; Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*; Dibelius, *Tradition to Gospel*). Aside from redaction critics, though this study is not limited to a particular form of criticism, some indebtedness should be acknowledged to the influence of the reader-response school of interpretation (van Iersel, *Mark*), the rhetorical-critical school (Witherington, *Mark*), narrative criticism (Sternberg, *Poetics*), and especially the discourse analytical school of interpretation (for a brief summary see Porter "Survey," 14–35).

the Spirit in the New Testament, in order to provide the reader with a broader context for comparison of the emphasis of Mark on the Spirit, and will provide the study with a basis for synoptic comparison with Mark on the issue of the Spirit. The second chapter will begin the exegesis of Mark with the exegetical analysis of Mark's prologue (1:1–15), which contains the highest concentration of references to the Spirit in the Gospel. This will be followed by an examination of Mark 3:20–30, and the Spirit in relation to the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit and exorcism. The fourth chapter, dealing with Mark 12:1–37, will address the Spirit in the context of opposition from the Jerusalem authorities. The final chapter, which will address Mark 13:1–37, will explore the Spirit in the eschatological context of the church amid persecution, after some initial discussion on Colani's little apocalypse theory. In preparation for these arguments, and in support of the larger claim of this thesis, the manner in which each chapter develops the present thesis, that the Spirit is a supporting theology and has strong connections with the development of the Markan theology of the Kingdom, will be explored presently.

The first chapter, as has been mentioned, explores the emphasis placed on the Spirit within the New Testament canon as a whole, with commentary throughout on the similarities and dissimilarities that each canon within the canon shares with the Markan text. It is shown here that the Spirit in Luke-Acts, unlike that of Mark, is one very much like the Old Testament Spirit of Prophecy, and also functions transformatively to mould every aspect of the believer into a witness for Christ. This second emphasis is not unlike that of Mark, but with a larger focus on the nature of the work of the Spirit in the believer. The pneumatology of Luke/Acts is simply too developed to provide a reasonable parallel with the Markan text's emphasis on the Spirit. Very much like Mark,

however, the Spirit in Matthew serves as an adjunct to larger theologies. However, where the Spirit in Mark's focus is on the Kingdom of God, the Matthean emphasis is on redemptive messianic ministry of Jesus. A close comparison to the Markan Spirit is found in John's dual emphasis on Spirit, who serves as a witness to Jesus' sent-ness from the Father, though he has redemptive qualities, and the Paraclete, who is the eschatological aid to the church. Finally, the chapter will discuss the Pauline emphasis. There is little in common between the Markan emphasis on the Spirit and the charismatic and soteriological emphasis placed on the Spirit in Paul, though they share equally in Trinitarian emphasis. Though this initial chapter does little to directly prove the claim that Mark uses the Spirit as a theological adjunct to his Kingdom theology, it presents the reader with several perspectives on the Spirit that are different in content and form than that of the Markan text. These perspectives will serve as points of comparison, and even justification for an examination of the Spirit in Mark, since his intrinsic connection between the Spirit and the Kingdom is unique in the New Testament canon.

It is in the second chapter that this claim will begin to be developed. It will be shown that the Spirit is at work programmatically as a witness to Jesus' divinity and is an active participant in his ministry. This is demonstrated by the Spirit's filling, which begins his ministry, and the work of the Spirit in the temptation account, which serves to prove that Jesus is a fit candidate for the role of ruler in God's Kingdom in Mark 1:1-15. This will be established by an analysis on two levels of the comparison that occurs in the text between John the Baptist and Jesus. On the first level it will be shown that John is presented with the semantic profile of a great prophet, who is sent by God as an emissary and accomplishes everything that God has called him to do, namely preaching and

baptising. As such, John's ministry is equated with the beginning of the Gospel. In comparison with John, the great God-sent prophet, Jesus is portrayed in language that outshines even John. He is frequently associated with the Spirit, given the titles Son of God and Christ. The connotations of these titles begin the Kingdom hope in the Gospel, especially when considered in the context of the pericope which follows the prologue. Thus, semantically, the Spirit provides Jesus with part of his divine qualifications and associates Jesus with both the Spirit and the Kingdom. On the second level, it will be argued that the same comparison is accomplished with intertextual allusions. Mark presents John the Baptist as Elijah returned, and Jesus as none less than the coming Yahweh and Son of God through allusions to several intertestamental and Old Testament prophetic texts. Inherent in this great/greater relationship developed between the two is the attribution of the Spirit to Jesus alone. This is more significant in light of the remarkable similarities between the ministries of John and Jesus, which are both categorized by preaching and baptising early in Mark's Gospel, and both are associated with the beginning of the Kingdom of God.

In the third chapter, it will be proven that the Spirit is directly related to the casting down of Satan's kingdom and the expansion of the Kingdom of God in the ministry of Jesus. It will be shown that, in Mark 3:20-30, the Spirit is at work intrinsically in Jesus. It portrays the nature of the Spirit as it works in Jesus' ministry and gives contextual support. This will be accomplished by showing thematic and linguistic ties between Mark 3:20-30 and other passages in close proximity. This first argument, that the Spirit is behind Jesus' ministry, will be developed through an examination of Jesus' accusation of the Pharisees, in which they are charged with blaspheming the Holy Spirit

after attributing one of Jesus' exorcisms to Satan. It will be shown that Jesus' response in context gives direct credit to the Spirit for his actions, proving the involvement of the Spirit in the ministry of Jesus to that point. This will be followed by a discussion of the nature of Jesus' ministry and his connections to the Spirit. To this end, the two parables which portray Jesus as the strongman who will raid and dismantle the kingdom of Satan, empowered by the Spirit, will be discussed. The continued connections between the Spirit, Kingdom, and exorcism will be explored by a further examination of the close relationship that exists between 3:20–30 and 1:21–28; 5:1–10. These portray Jesus dismantling the kingdom of Satan through exorcisms, and especially the exorcism of the demon who had defeated all strongmen before Jesus. These connections effectively complete the connection between Jesus' exorcisms, the Spirit who empowers them, and the victory of the Kingdom of God over that of Satan.

In the fourth chapter, as is to be expected in a document without a singular all-encompassing pneumatology, the emphasis on the Spirit is slightly different than in the opening chapters. However, there are still definite connections between the Spirit and the development of Jesus as the ruler of the Kingdom of God. Here, it will be proven that the Spirit works to display Jesus as the King on David's throne, though he is greater than David, and also to display the divinity of Jesus and the merit of his teachings in the face of his challengers, the Jerusalem authorities. This chapter will address the claims of some Pentecostal scholars, who believe that there is a unified independent Markan pneumatology centred on Mark 12:1–37 and the Spirit's work in the interpretation of Scripture. These claims depend on developments in other Gospels, and especially on the Lukan association of Spirit with Power, which is not present in Mark. This discussion

will be followed by an examination of the larger discourse in which the pericope concerned with the Spirit occurs. It will be shown that there is a definite connection between Jesus and the rule of David in the passage and that the primary concern of the passage is the superiority of Jesus and his teaching over the Jerusalem authority. In the closer analysis of the text, these themes will play out to show that the Spirit is the witness to Jesus' Davidic kingship, though David is no match for Jesus. Though Jerusalem has rejected him, Jesus is both the prophesied messianic King and the ruler in the coming Kingdom of God.

Finally, in order to prove the continuing development of the theology of the Kingdom within the Spirit discourses in Mark, Mark 13:1–37 will be examined to show the Spirit at work eschatologically as the only hope and promise for the disciples in persecution so that they may persevere to the second promise of Jesus, the eschatological end. In this chapter, it will be proven that the Spirit is the only support promised to the disciples as they are issued the command to remain faithful to Jesus' words in the face of the kings and leaders of the kingdoms of the earth. In order to prove this it will be necessary first to address the majority of scholarship on this chapter, which concerns the apocalyptic tones that some have detected in the pericope. It will be proven here that the passage is not loosely symbolic apocalyptic literature, but something far more beneficial to the disciples. The content of the passage itself will be examined to paint a rather dire picture for the future ministry context of the disciples. Both the Kingdom of God and Jesus' words will come under scrutiny and attack from all sides, and the disciples themselves will be called before rulers to defend them. An examination of the genre and structure will reveal a predominant paraenesis which places on the disciples the

responsibility to keep watch and not worry, despite their context. However, of two promises, one of an eschatological end to persecution and the other of the Spirit, only the promise of the Spirit is for the age of persecution. The Spirit will enable the disciples to speak and defend the Kingdom of God in the face of worldly rulers and uncommonly cruel abuse.

All of these emphases will contribute to the overall understanding of the Spirit in Mark. He is present at moments when the Kingdom of God is in need of divine intervention. He is an empowerer against the kingdom of Satan, a provider of speech in times of intense persecution, and the confirmer of Jesus' heavenly identity to qualify him as the ruler in God's Kingdom. By the Spirit, Jesus' kingdom will prevail, despite persecution from the kingdoms of Satan and this world. These claims seem, at moments, to present a unified theology of the Spirit in Mark. However, what is occurring in Mark is a unified thematic development of the Kingdom of God, which is being shown to be predominant over all opposition, whether demonic or from Jerusalem, in the ministry and person of Jesus. These are not the only passages in which this development occurs. However, if any connection between the Spirit discourses is noted it is their connection to the unified theology of the Kingdom in Mark. That is, if there is any unity in Mark it is in the theology of the Kingdom and its relationship to Jesus, not in his depiction of the Spirit. The passages pertaining to the Spirit in Mark are all of a very different nature. However, when connected to a wholly developed coherent theology, tangible similarities begin to appear.

Chapter 1

THE SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

It is impossible, when examining any of the New Testament books for a particular emphasis, to ignore the presence of that emphasis in the rest of the New Testament. There has been great debate over the nature and influence of intertextuality on interpretation. Parallelism and differences in the Gospels place the interpreter on a continuum, fighting the tension between intertextuality and independence. There is an inherent risk in any attempt to reconcile Gospel accounts of losing the individual emphasis of each, but also an equal danger in assuming that authorial individuality excludes a broader New Testament understanding. This issue is not limited to the Gospels, but is also pertinent when comparing the pneumatology developed in each of the Gospels with that of Paul in his letters. There are great differences in the manner in which Paul speaks of the Spirit and the manner in which Mark or any of the evangelists speak of the Spirit, and the tension between individual emphasis and systematic pneumatology is no less real between narrative and epistle than it is among the Gospels. This thesis will examine the manner in which Mark speaks of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, there will be no endeavour here to reconcile the Spirit passages in Mark into a coherent New Testament

pneumatology. With this in mind, the emphasis of each of the Gospels and Paul on the Spirit will be considered individually, for the sake of comparison and to build a context for an examination of the Spirit in Mark. However, not every text will be given equal priority. Rather, a great deal of emphasis will be placed on Luke-Acts, since it is by far the most heavily concentrated treatment of the Spirit in the New Testament, and has also been the subject of much controversy. Conversely, though there has been a great deal of controversy with Pauline pneumatology, the writings of Paul have less in common with the Gospel genre, and will receive less attention than Luke-Acts. The remainder of the Gospels will be discussed insofar as their reference to the Spirit and scholarly discussion on the topic dictate it.

1. *The Spirit in Matthew*

Like Mark, Matthew has had a relative dearth of secondary literature dedicated entirely to his portrayal of the Spirit.¹ This is most likely due to the small number of references to the Spirit in Matthew.² This unfortunate trend was broken recently with the publication of a work on the subject by Blaine Charette.³ According to Charette, the Spirit in Matthew, though he is mentioned only a few times, takes a place of prominence as both the divine impetus of the work of Jesus as the Messiah in the restoration of Israel to the glory of David after the exile, and the empowerer of the eschatological church that is presented in Matthew in the same expectational and prophetic light as the first coming of Jesus the Messiah.

¹ There is, to my knowledge, only one monograph dedicated to the Spirit in each. Mansfield has written a monograph on the Spirit in Mark (Mansfield, *Spirit and Gospel*), and Charette has written on the Spirit in Matthew (Charette, *Presence*).

² There are 19 occurrences of πνεῦμα in Matthew. Twelve of those refer to the Holy Spirit, though the formula varies. Of the others, one refers to Jesus' Spirit, two refer to the human spirit, and there are four references to demons.

³ Charette, *Presence*.

Charette's major focus in this study is not, however, those passages that deal with the Spirit. According to Charette the Spirit is presented as programmatic in Matthew's christology, soteriology, ecclesiology and eschatology. This is best illustrated in the infancy narratives, where Jesus is introduced initially as the culmination of the creation, glory, and ultimate downfall of Israel, which is established in the introduction and the genealogy. The Holy Spirit is mentioned twice within three verses at this point. He is the one by whom Jesus was conceived, and therefore may be interpreted as that divine person who is enabling the coming of Messiah.¹

Similarly, as central as the Spirit is to the divinely ordained messianic role, he is also programmatic for his entire ministry, and serves as the impetus for the redemptive ministry of Jesus through his Jordan experience and John's prophecy concerning him (3:11, 13–17). Thus, through the anointing of the Spirit, Jesus the Messiah comes to redeem and restore Israel, while judging those on the outside.² Similarly, the same Spirit responsible for the messianic nativity and anointing is at the centre of the confirmation of Jesus' role as redeemer in Jesus' desert trial (4:1–11). There is also a very strong correlation between Jesus, the Spirit and the Kingdom of God.³ It is clear when one analyses Jesus' confrontation with the Pharisees that the Spirit is the impetus behind Jesus' miraculous ministry and practice of exorcism, and that to attribute these acts of Jesus to Βεελζεβούλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων (Mt 12:22) is a crime against, not Jesus

¹ Charette, *Presence*, 36–41 (cf. Nolland, who reduces the role of the Spirit here simply to “power from God producing the extraordinary” [Nolland, *Matthew*, 94]).

² Charette, *Presence*, 41–48.

³ Charette, *Presence*, 66–67.

himself, but the Spirit who is at work enabling Jesus to fulfill his messianic role (Mt 12:22–32).¹

The remaining occurrences of πνεῦμα in Matthew seem to be eschatological and ecclesial in nature. In 10:20 the Spirit is promised as the impetus of the disciples' declarative ministry. In 22:43 it is David who is speaking by the Spirit, and in 28:19, the disciples, perhaps reflective of the Baptist's promise in 3:11, are now baptizing people in the name of the Holy Spirit.² It is clear that Matthew is working to establish that Jesus the Messiah's legacy is not at an end, but is being carried out in the Spirit-empowered works of the disciples. Just as David prophesied the coming of the Messiah by the Spirit, and Jesus fulfilled his calling as Messiah by the Spirit, Israel will continue to be renewed by the work of the Spirit in the disciples.

2. *The Spirit in Luke-Acts*

The advent of redaction criticism, though it brought with it a great deal of negativity towards the historical reliability of the Gospels, began a trend among scholars that saw the Gospels examined individually, separate from the theological assertions made in New Testament epistolary literature.³ As a consequence, a great amount of debate has sprung up concerning Lukan pneumatology. Recently, the debate has been added to as Pentecostalism has begun to come into its own in the realm of evangelical theology. Although most scholars have come to recognize that Luke's emphasis on the Holy Spirit is mainly focussed on prophetic empowerment, the nuances of explanations and intended implications vary greatly. There are, however, three schools of thought which dominate

¹ Charette argues similarly, but in greater christological detail (Charette, *Presence*, 76–79).

² Concerning the correlations between the disciples' commission and the Spirit empowered work of Jesus, see Charette, *Presence*, 126.

³ This stems from Gunkel's assertion of the great chasm between the theology of Paul and that of the Gospels (Gunkel, *Wirkungen*).

the current debate on Lukan pneumatology. The view that the Spirit in Luke/Acts is indicative of salvific conversion is best represented by James. G. Dunn. Alternately, there are those scholars who claim that the Spirit is represented as the intertestamental Spirit of prophecy. In recent years, however, Pentecostalism has added its voice to the study of the New Testament, and has claimed that the Spirit in Luke-Acts is not associated with a conversion/sonship experience, but represents empowerment for mission.

2.1. *Conversion/Sonship*

One of the modern pioneers in Lukan pneumatology is James Dunn. For Dunn, the Spirit in Luke-Acts resembles very closely the Spirit in the rest of the New Testament, and is predominantly concerned with the induction of the new believer into the body of Christ.¹ According to Dunn, Luke's reference to a baptism in the Spirit (Lk 3:16; Acts 1:5; 11:16) ought to be interpreted through Paul's assertion that καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐν σώμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν (1 Cor 12:13), and this, when combined with the inaugural sense given to the term in John's baptism, suggests that the Spirit in Luke's writing must refer to inauguration into the church.² The Spirit is also that agent which works in Jesus to confirm his sonship, and in the church to establish the sonship of believers in the Kingdom of God. Implicit in this understanding of the Spirit is the Lukan birth account. Here, Mary is promised a child when the Spirit comes upon her (Lk 1:35). Dunn also points to the voice from heaven at Jesus' baptism, claiming him as divine son, and Jesus' confirmation of his own ministry (Lk 4:16–21).³ Here, Dunn bases his claims

¹ Dunn, "Response," 223–4.

² Dunn, "Response," 223–4.

³ This passage parallels the Markan prologue, where the reader is introduced to Jesus' divinity. Similar proclamations are made outside of the prologue by demons (Mk 1:24), disciples (Mk 8:29) and minor characters in the Gospel (Mk 15:39). This parallelism and its implications will be discussed further in chapter 3.

that a new epoch has begun which inaugurates the beginning of Jesus as the man of the Spirit, until the next epochal marker at his ascension. It is the beginning for Jesus of a new phase of sonship with the Father that will be become archetypal for the church and was completed upon his ascension and granted to the church through the Spirit from his exalted position.¹ There are differences, however, in the way that the Spirit is at work in Jesus in Luke and the way that he is at work in the community of God in Acts.² Though Dunn hesitantly acknowledges the Spirit at work in Jesus as the Spirit of prophecy, with due consideration paid to the charismatic and prophetic nature of the Spirit's work in Jesus,³ he does not believe that this is the Spirit's definitive function. Rather these functions of the Spirit come as a result of his true work, which is initiation of the believer into the community of Christ. Thus, the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost, and the coming of the Spirit at every other junction in Acts, is directly linked to initiation or sonship.⁴

In Acts 2:38–39, Dunn claims that the gift promised to accompany the Spirit is new life. Repentance and baptism are featured in the conversion event, but the crowning achievement in every case of salvation is the reception of the Spirit. The Spirit is the evidence that the believer has been transformed.⁵ The reception of the Spirit occurred among the gentiles precisely at the moment in Peter's message when the same formula, of faith, repentance and baptism, for salvation was recounted, which leads to the simple conclusion that the Spirit fell on the household the moment they repented and believed. The Spirit must be active in the conversion of the Gentiles.⁶ It is suggested here, and

¹ Dunn, "Spirit," 9.

² Dunn, "Spirit," 9.

³ Dunn, "Spirit," 9; Dunn, "Response," 226–27.

⁴ Dunn, "Response," 229–33.

⁵ Dunn, *Acts*, 32–33.

⁶ Dunn, *Acts*, 144–45; Dunn, "Response," 230.

confirmed in 11:14–18, that the Spirit is God’s sign of acceptance of the gentiles and must be the same Spirit that inaugurates them into salvation.¹

Dunn’s ideas, though influential, have certainly not avoided scholarly criticism. First and foremost among the criticisms of scholars is Dunn’s tendency to read Luke-Acts with Pauline pneumatology in mind.² Menzies accuses Dunn of misinterpretation of Luke in light of his claim that Luke’s emphasis must be the same as Paul’s. Further, Dunn accuses Luke of literary ‘lopsidedness’ for failing to organize these emphases prominently within his narrative.³ On other occasions in Dunn’s writings, it appears that he does not take into account the independence of Luke’s narrative relative to the Gospels. Dunn seems to ignore the Lukan redaction of Q 12:28 when he emphasises the tie between the Kingdom of God and the Spirit of God in the synoptic tradition,⁴ since Luke has replaced πνεύματι with δακτύλῳ (Lk 11:20).

2.2. *The Spirit of Prophecy*

There is another set of Luke-Acts scholars who focus, not on the soteriological nature of the Spirit, but rather on Luke’s reflection of Old Testament and inter-testamental ideologies of the Spirit, and more specifically on the Spirit of prophecy. To Turner, this emphasis is established through a complex interrelationship between the portrayal of Jesus in Luke as the Isaianic prophet-Messiah,⁵ and the disciples in Acts as the empowered witnesses and prophets of the Messiah by the Spirit. The Spirit also serves to

¹ Dunn, “Response,” 230.

² This response comes chiefly from the Pentecostal movement, though others share the sentiment (Stronstad, *Theology*, 9–12).

³ Dunn, *Jesus*, 191; Dunn, *Unity*, 181. This same criticism is offered in Menzies, *Development*, 34.

⁴ Dunn, “Holy Spirit,” 6.

⁵ Max Turner is responsible for what is, in my estimation, the most thorough scholarly summary and biblical theology on the Spirit in Luke-Acts (Turner, *Power*, 428–31). This is his major work on the topic, and all citations will point to his summary and argument here. However, the thesis and argument from this text have been reproduced and summarized in several other sources (Turner, “Holy Spirit,” 341–51; Turner, *Holy Spirit*, 19–55).

build them up in the faith, and is often visible at points in Acts where witness is not the primary concern.¹ Turner occupies a well formulated middle-ground between Dunn and Pentecostal scholars by asserting that the Spirit is not remotely connected to sonship for Jesus, but rather that the Spirit empowered Jesus for the completion of his messianic task. Conversely, he asserts that it is difficult to extend the same idea of empowerment from Jesus to the apostles, due to the delicate nature of his empowerment.² The connection between Jesus and the Spirit is implicit throughout the entire book of Luke and begins with the Elijahic role of John. He preaches that Jesus is the Messiah and that Jesus' preaching is inspired by the Spirit.³ Even previous to the coming of John as the Lukan Elijah, the birth account is riddled with Spirit-inspired actions and prophecy foretelling the coming of the Messiah.⁴ Similarly, Luke often alludes to Davidic and messianic passages and the Spirit together, suggesting that Luke's intention was to portray Jesus as a Spirit-empowered messianic Davidid.⁵ All of this leads to the conclusion that the Spirit in Luke is strongly connected to the empowered Messiah, who has come to fulfill the prophecy concerning the restoration of Israel.⁶

The working of this Spirit of prophecy is more complex than it appears in his work in the church. The Spirit of prophecy far surpasses the obvious outlets such as

¹ Turner, *Power*, 431–33.

² Dunn asserts that Jesus is confirmed as son while Turner stresses Jesus' anointing as the true Isaianic Messiah. Both stress that neither of these are applicable to the church, but represent the Spirit only as he is at work in Jesus (Dunn, "Holy Spirit," 9; Turner, *Power*, 428–31).

³ Turner, *Power*, 428.

⁴ See especially the visits of Gabriel to Mary and Elizabeth in Lk 1–2, the spiritual conception of Christ in Lk 2, and Elizabeth and Zechariah's proclamations in Lk 1:41; 67. Turner also mentions the *Magnificat*, the *Nunc Dimittis*, and the *Benedictus* among the Spirit-inspired prophecies of Jesus as Messiah in the birth account (Turner, *Power*, 143).

⁵ Most clear are the quotations from Isa 42:1–2 and Ps 2:7 at the baptism account and Isa 49:24–25 in the temptation account (Turner, *Power*, 428–31).

⁶ Turner, *Power*, 428–31.

witness or teaching.¹ Rather, concepts connected to the Spirit of Prophecy include the expectation of revelation, wisdom, invasive speech and praise,² miraculous power,³ and both individual and corporate ethical transformation.⁴ In the church age the Spirit of Prophecy was also interpreted to suggest a power in preaching or declaration, and even inspired speech and witness.⁵ On a similar note, Turner absolutely denies that the Spirit in Acts is always a sign of initiation. This does not mean that he does not view the Spirit as a soteriological necessity. However, he criticises the claim that the Spirit is given as a *donum superadditum* in Acts as naïvely simplistic. Thus, the conclusion that initiation is not emphatic in Luke's pneumatology cannot justify the stretch to a complete denial of the soteriological implications of the Spirit in Luke, when it is most likely that the effects of the Spirit in Luke are partially reflective of the working out of salvation in the church.⁶ Finally, it seems that, even though Luke records situations where there seems to be a difference in time between conversion-initiation evidenced by baptism, faith and repentance and the filling in the Spirit,⁷ they are evidently out of place to Luke himself and ought not to be considered as programmatic for the continued experience of the church.⁸

2.3. *The Spirit as Empowerment for Witness*

In the last few decades Pentecostals have begun to emerge into the realm of biblical scholarship. Pentecostal scholarship was born in Lukan Pneumatology, and remains influential there still. There are many works on the current subject that may be labelled as

¹ Turner, *Power*, 432–33.

² Turner, *Power*, 86–104.

³ Turner, *Power*, 105–18.

⁴ Turner, *Power*, 119–37.

⁵ Turner, *Power*, 103.

⁶ Turner, *Power*, 435–38.

⁷ Most notably in Acts 8:9–17.

⁸ Turner, *Power*, 373–74, 437.

Pentecostal; however, this study will limit itself to the scholarship of Robert P. Menzies¹ and Roger Stronstad.² There are a number of elements that are shared among Pentecostal scholars in their views of the portrayal of the Spirit in Luke-Acts, but the most significant is the belief in an experience of the Spirit that is separate and subsequent from salvation.³ This experience is most commonly called the baptism of the Holy Spirit. However, the exact nature of this baptism is subject to slightly more discussion.

For Robert Menzies the gift of the Spirit in Luke-Acts is exclusively representative of empowerment for mission. In Luke, this is primarily communicated in the prophetic sayings concerning the coming of the Messiah, and the Spirit in Jesus works to empower his preaching ministry. It is also prophesied, through the Baptist, that the community will partake in this same prophetic ministry. The Spirit is portrayed by Luke as that charismatic power that enables the mission of the church to be accomplished according to the form outlined in Acts 1:8.⁴ As has become typical of Pentecostal scholarship, Menzies defends these beliefs in a series of interrelated and programmatic example texts throughout Luke-Acts, which will be explored presently.

Menzies claims that there is a high degree of narrative correlation between preaching and the Spirit in Luke-Acts. He finds that, in nearly every instance that the Holy Spirit appears in Luke-Acts, the emphasis is either directly or indirectly on Spirit-empowered declaration for the purpose of fulfilling the mission of the Church. Thus, the Baptist's promise of a Messiah who would baptise with Spirit and Fire, which is

¹ Menzies' most notable work is a revised version of his Ph.D. dissertation (Menzies, *Development*), though he has published widely on the subject, including a popular invitation to debate on the issue co-written with his father (Menzies and Menzies, *Spirit and Power*).

² Stronstad is widely recognized for an adaptation of his Master's thesis (Stronstad, *Theology*). Somewhat less well known is a monograph published well after his thesis, which serves entirely to apply the findings of his previous work in greater detail (Stronstad, *Prophethood*).

³ This idea has been previously summed up in the phrase *donum superadditum*.

⁴ Menzies, *Development*, 278–80.

confirmed in Acts 1:5,¹ was fulfilled at Pentecost when the believer's baptism enabled them to fulfil the first aspect of the promise of John, the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. This baptism serves to empower the mission of the church to win converts, while judgement, would be reserved for an eschatological future. It is for this reason that judgement, as a theme, does not play a large part in Luke's second volume.² Similarly, many scholars have challenged Menzies' thesis on the account of Spirit-conception of Jesus in Mary (Lk 1:35). In reply, Menzies claims that the *magnificat* (Lk 1:46–56), which immediately follows the account of Elizabeth and Mary, is the definitive event of Spirit-inspired speech resulting from Mary's filling.³

For Menzies, the spiritual empowerment for witness is only displayed as declaration in Luke-Acts, and miraculous power is not attributed to the πνεῦμα ἅγιον, but rather to Luke's highly nuanced usage of δύναμις.⁴ It is this highly nuanced usage of δύναμις that is most often associated with the miraculous, and even serves to temper the creative role attributed to πνεῦμα in the birth account. Thus the Spirit in Luke is decidedly and exclusively an empowerment for inspired speech, while even the miraculous is described alternately as the result of God's power.

The scholarship of Roger Stronstad, for the most part, stands parallel to that of Menzies. He too equates the Spirit in Luke with charismatic power to witness, and clings to the programmatic nature of the first chapters of Acts.⁵ For Stronstad, however, power to witness is not limited to inspired speech, but involves empowerment by the Spirit to

¹ Luke excludes καὶ πρὸς from his discourse on the promise of John the Baptist, which is included in the Gospel's account.

² Menzies, *Development*, 141–45.

³ Menzies, *Development*, 127.

⁴ Menzies, *Development*, 127.

⁵ Stronstad notes a series of programmatic instances in which the coming Spirit is promised (1:5, 8), described (2:1–4), interpreted (2:14–21), and applied (2:37–39; Stronstad, *Theology*, 49–50).

induct believers into a kind of prophethood.¹ While this is most frequently denoted by prophetic speech, this prophethood is a charismatic prophethood, and prophetic speech is accompanied by any other gift needed to accomplish the mission of the church.² Even the prophetic speech of those empowered by the Spirit, though it is for the ultimate accomplishment of the mission of Christ, is not restricted to evangelistic preaching but includes tongues-speech as a sign act testifying to spiritual empowerment, praise, boldness in speech, and even judgement.³

Characteristic of both Menzies and Stronstad is the claim that Luke understands that his charismatic Spirit is given as a *donum superadditum*. Since they differentiate between the charismatic and soteriological works of the Spirit, and assert that Luke is only concerned with the former,⁴ there is no requirement for Luke to record the presence of the Spirit at salvation. This is only strengthened when, at certain points in Acts, the Spirit seems to be disconnected chronologically from salvation. To make this separation, Menzies and Stronstad parallel Jesus' anointing at Jordan, which is exclusively an empowerment for ministry, and the disciples' reception of the Spirit at Pentecost, which is promised as an empowerment for mission in Acts 1:8.⁵ There is also a chronological distinction between salvation evidenced by faith, repentance and baptism in the Samaritan converts and their subsequent Spirit filling at the hands of the Apostles (Acts 8:9–17), which is largely unexplained elsewhere.⁶ Both Menzies and Stronstad claim this as further proof that Luke does not intend to write about the Spirit as he is at work in

¹ This is the thesis of his second book on the topic *Prophethood*.

² Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 114–24.

³ Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 114–24.

⁴ Contra Dunn, "Response," 229–33, and Turner, *Power*, 435.

⁵ Stronstad, *Theology*, 75–76; Menzies, *Development*, 206, 246–47.

⁶ For an excellent summary and critique of explanations concerning the evident separation between the Samaritan response and Spirit-filling see Turner, *Power*, 360–75.

salvation. Rather, they claim that Luke writes about the Spirit as a *donum superadditum* for the purpose of the charismatic empowerment of the church to fulfill the mission of Acts 1:8.

2.4. Critique and Synthesis

Since the writings of Dunn appeared, many have protested against his restriction of the work of the Spirit to the completion of the *ordo salutis* and to the work of conversion-initiation into the body of Christ. It seems plain initially that, in the latter half of Acts, records of conversion exclude mention of the Spirit.¹ This argument is admittedly limited in scope, since early on in Luke's text he establishes a formula including baptism, repentance, belief, and the Spirit at salvation (Acts 10:34–48). This pattern in later verses is often reduced to its simplest form in belief, with the occasional mention of repentance. The Spirit is the only element in this formula that is frequently mentioned outside of the initiation sequence. This most frequently occurs in situations where the tone is decidedly prophetic. Also, if Dunn's theories are correct, one would expect that the Spirit is used in language describing salvation in Luke. Rather, in the Lukan narrative membership in the church or salvation is often reduced to πίστις,² πιστεύω is the reduced action of salvation and Christians are often referred to as πιστεύοντες.³ With this in mind, it is difficult to see how Luke could be perceived as painting a picture of a predominately soteriological Spirit, unless he was looking to an outside source for help in his portrayal of the work of the Spirit.

¹ Especially the Samaritans (Acts 8), Persecutors (Acts 9), Gentiles, (Acts 10–11) and Disciples of John (Acts 19).

² Examples include Lk 5:20; 7:50; Acts 6:7; 13:8; 14:27; 15:9; 16:5; 20:21; 24:24; 26:18.

³ Acts 2:44; 4:32; 5:12; 10:43; 13:39; 15:5 etc. There are a few exceptions best represented with Luke's use of πίστος in 10:45, 16:1,15, and ἁγίους in 9:41.

Although the research of Turner has escaped the trappings of such a narrow definition, his method has also led him to over-apply external definitions to the Spirit in Luke-Acts.¹ Luke seems to offer preliminary definition of the function of the Spirit in Acts 1:8, where he calls the Spirit an empowerment for witness. Turner's research, though precise, has ignored the implications of this passage for the ministry of the apostles. Turner may be in danger of applying a strictly intertestamental understanding of the Spirit of Prophecy onto the Lukan text, rather than allowing this understanding to inform the Lukan definition, which seems to concern witness.² Turner credits this to instances in the book of Acts where the Spirit seems to move in ways that do not immediately result in the furtherance of mission.³ To Turner, though the Spirit is not portrayed as soteriological in nature, there is no evidence to suggest that the Spirit in Luke is not that soteriologically necessary Spirit of Pauline tradition.⁴

Pentecostal scholarship, though it has claimed that the Spirit is for empowerment for mission, has neglected to emphasise those aspects of the Spirit in Luke-Acts that do not support a direct evangelistic action.⁵ Pentecostalism has also been severely questioned on their assertion that the so called baptism of the Holy Spirit in Luke is a *donum superadditum*.⁶ What most scholars have failed to note is the nature of the promise

¹ His theories seem to rest more strongly on Isaianic and intertestamental quotations than the text of Luke itself.

² Turner spends a great deal of time developing an intertestamental Jewish Spirit of Prophecy (Turner, *Power*, 82–139). While this work is polished and thorough, there is little in the way of justification for the application of this work to the text of Luke. At times, then, it seems as though Luke is being forced into an intertestamental pneumatological mould.

³ Turner, *Power*, 431–33.

⁴ Turner, *Power*, 435–37.

⁵ Turner notes the lack of narrative emphasis of mission on the Spirit fillings of the Samaritans, and even the household of Cornelius since neither of those groups are seen evangelizing (Turner, *Power*, 432).

⁶ This criticism has come from both within and from the outside. Gordon Fee is among those within the movement who criticize the idea of separation and subsequence of a baptism in the Spirit on exegetical grounds. According to Fee, Acts is representative of historical literature and there are no grounds within the

itself. Turner rightly emphasises that the gift is all encompassing, while mainly focussed on prophetic speech, while Menzies and Stronstad limit the gift of the Spirit so that it only supports or builds the action of mission. What both groups fail to notice is the substantive nature of the gift to the apostles. The promised result of the Spirit for the disciples from Jesus was that ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες. In this promise it is the substantive μάρτυς that is in focus. The preposition ἐν seems to indicate where the disciples will go as witnesses, rather than describe a venue for the fulfillment of an action. It is likely that Jesus' promise entailed something far surpassing the act of evangelism, and that Luke envisioned the creation of a community of Spirit-filled witnesses to Jesus in word, deed, and character. That is, the emphasis is not on the acts of witnessing or evangelism, but rather on the spiritual transformation of the community of believers into witnesses to the risen Christ.

Implicit to this understanding, however, is a key difference in the nature of the Spirit in Jesus and in the disciples. The temptation account in the Gospel of Luke is unparalleled in the book of Acts and serves as a spiritual confirmation of the suitability of Jesus as a perfect witness to the Father (Lk 4:1–13). The narrative emphasis of the temptation account stresses the faithfulness of Jesus to his father's word and character. Directly following his temptation, Jesus himself confirms his anointing for service through the Isaianic Messiah prophecy (Lk 4:14–21). Similarly, the disciple's status as μάρτυς is granted by the Holy Spirit through the mediation of Jesus, as prophesied through the Baptist (Lk 3:16; Acts 1:5). This spiritual empowerment for the disciples is the enabling and guiding power that allows them to reflect and testify to Jesus as Jesus

genre for interpreting the evident chronological separation between salvation and Spirit filling as programmatic (Fee, *Gospel*, 105–19).

was the perfect witness to God through the Holy Spirit. As evidenced in the writings of Turner, Menzies and Stronstad, this empowerment is represented in the greatest degree by the Old Testament and intertestamental Spirit of prophecy, typified by inspired speech. However, the whole community is to become a witness to the message and character of Christ. Therefore, it should not be surprising when the Spirit acts in judgement to purify the community of sinful character (Acts 5:1–11), or is seen empowering disciples of Christ to acts of service for one another (Acts 6:1–6).¹ It is assumed that all who are saved will receive this Spirit. It seems to be treated as anomalous when he is not received at salvation,² yet the reception of the Spirit seems conceptually distinct from conversion in Luke-Acts. With that said, it seems impossible to decide whether the Spirit is a *donum superadditum*, although Luke's emphases on the Spirit, even if he is portraying the Spirit as a soteriological necessity, do not seem to concern salvation. Simply stated, the Spirit for Luke is that power which transforms and empowers the church into a community whose existence and actions testify to the message of Jesus through Spirit inspired words, purity (Acts 5:1–11), equality (Acts 10:1–11:18), and justice (Lk 4:18–19).

3. *The Spirit in Johannine Literature*

The Gospel of John presents an immediate curiosity to the scholar endeavouring to extract a theology of the Spirit from its pages. John is unique to the New Testament canon in that he uses language separate from πνεῦμα in plain reference to the Spirit.

There are two terms, in fact, which must be explored in the Gospel, though they may be

¹ It is interesting, however, that Stephen, named in a list of servants who are connected to the Spirit, is seen in the next chapter dying as a result of Spirit-inspired speech before the Sanhedrin. Stronstad notes the strong possibility of an inclusion connecting the mention of Spirit in 6:5 in Stephen, and again in 6:55 after his speech, which further connects the Spirit to inspired speech (Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 16).

² See especially Acts 8:4–13; 19:1–7.

differentiated, to come up with any satisfactory Johannine pneumatology. As a result, this study, though brief, will concern itself with the Johannine usage of both πνεῦμα and παράκλητος.¹

3.1 πνεῦμα in John

In the Gospel of John the word πνεῦμα is used primarily to distinguish those things which are divine and originate from the Father from those things that are earthly and human. Thus, to have the Spirit is to participate in the true way of the Father. In this manner the usage of the Spirit in John is similar to the Gospels, where the Spirit is portrayed as anointing or empowerment for ministry, and also to Paul, where the Spirit is the power of God at work in the believer to restore and redeem. Brown, in her analysis of πνεῦμα in John, points to a key textual relationship that illustrates these claims between the Johannine baptism record in 1:29–34 and the insufflation account of John 20:22.²

The Johannine baptism account, above that of any of the synoptic accounts, is explicit as to the intended interpretation of Jesus' action in the Jordan and the subsequent descent of the Spirit upon him. In this account, the Baptist himself testifies twice to the Spirit. Not only did he see τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ upon Jesus, but John alone adds καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν (Jn 1:32).³ This suggests that John intended the Spirit to remain in the minds of the readers from that point onward. Further,

¹ I cannot continue past this point without acknowledging my great indebtedness on the subject to a study by Tricia Brown, which handles the issue thoroughly and with great ease and organization (Brown, *Spirit*).

² Brown points to several texts, though this particular relationship seems to typify them well (Brown, *Spirit*, 168–69).

³ cf. ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν (Mt 3:16). Luke omits additional comment, simply noting that καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν (Lk 3:22). Mark also omits additional detail concerning the descended Spirit upon Jesus (Mk 1:10), though neither Mark nor Q are likely sources for the Lukan account.

John adds that the implications of the Spirit,¹ not only identify Jesus as the sole baptiser in the Holy Spirit, but identify him as the Son of God (John 1:33–34).² This is passed from Jesus to his disciples upon the event of his ascension in John 20:22. At that moment the disciples are empowered to minister and confirmed as the bearers and baptisers of the Holy Spirit. This gift bestowed on them the same authority of forgiveness of sins borne by the Spirit-baptised Jesus throughout the Johannine narrative (John 20:21–23).³

3.2. *παράκλητος* in *John*

It is immediately clear that a study of *παράκλητος* in John is, in fact, an endeavour into Johannine pneumatology. The term appears only four times in the Gospel (Jn 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7–13) and is equated with the Spirit directly in each instance. Whether *πνεῦμα* and *παράκλητος* ought to be explored separately or as a singular unit is of little consequence to this study. The terms *πνεῦμα* and *παράκλητος*, by all indications, refer to the same person with slight differences in emphasis.⁴ It is this difference of emphasis that will be the subject of analysis.

¹ Johnston claims that the reason why the Baptist's necessary prophetic Spirit-filling was most likely excluded from the text for polemical reasons, though he is not clear whether this is a polemic against the disciples of John the Baptist, or if he simply means to elevate the status of Jesus rhetorically by allowing only Jesus to bear the Spirit (Johnston, *Spirit-Paraclete*, 17).

² Brown, however, does not see the Spirit's descent on Jesus as an empowerment episode, as we have noted earlier, but strictly as a means of comparison with John's baptism, which was an earthly baptism. Jesus is now given the gift of the Spirit that sets him apart as the sole and exclusive source of Spirit baptism (Brown, *Spirit*, 90–91), while John's testimony that Jesus is *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* only serves to widen the gap between John the water-baptiser and Jesus the Spirit-baptiser. Both titles (Son of God and Spirit-baptiser) are confirmed by the descent of the Spirit of God upon Jesus.

³ Exclusivity claims dominate the narrative of John, and are often connected to Spirit as the content of Jesus' exclusivity (see especially Jn 3:31–36; Brown, *Spirit*, 112, 168). See also the corresponding relationship between "Spirit birth" and salvation that parallels the promised result of the Spirit infilling of Jn 20:22–23 and Jn 3:6–8.

⁴ In Jn 14:26, the author informs the reader that the Paraclete is, in fact, the Holy Spirit (*ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατήρ*). That the Paraclete is called the Spirit of Truth elsewhere (*τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας* [Jn 14:16; 15:26; 16:13]), this serves only to further refine John's understanding of the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete. Though they are the same person in the Gospel of John, the simple fact that the terms Holy Spirit and Paraclete are used independently is justification enough for individual analysis.

The παράκλητος in John's narrative has a specific connection with Jesus, who as the first παράκλητος (Jn 14:16; 1 Jn 2:1), is always mentioned as the sender of the παράκλητος. This second paraclete operates only as Jesus wills him to. The function of the Spirit-paraclete is to bring the message of Jesus to the world,¹ and to enable the disciples to participate in and communicate effectively the truth about Jesus.² Thus the Spirit is, in effect, the presence of the Spirit among the disciples to maintain Jesus' message among them and to keep them for the Father through their faith in Jesus. Simply, the Spirit is Jesus' post-resurrection representative on earth for the help of all who believe in him.

4. *The Spirit in the Pauline Epistles*

The Pauline epistles³ provide a unique venue for a spiritual theology. By nature the writings of Paul are applied, and much of the theology that came from the pen of Paul was written with a specific audience in mind. Thus any theology appearing out of the Pauline canon is be centred on the church and the implications for practical and spiritual living. This does not place narrative literature on a higher theological plane than epistolary literature, though it does present some difficulty to the task of reconciling the two.

Of first concern when developing a Pauline pneumatology is Paul's usage of the term πνεῦμα. There is a considerably amount of controversy over Paul's use of the term in certain passages in 1 Corinthians that seem unclear as to whether they are written

¹ Brown suggests that the παράκλητος is present to point out the "wrongheadedness" of those in the world (Brown, *Spirit*, 232).

² That is, the Spirit speaks continually to the disciples, and reminds them of what he said and did while with them, and ultimately the truth of Jesus, who sent him (Brown, *Spirit*, 232).

³ For the purpose of this study, each of the letters of the New Testament identified as Pauline in the letter itself will be considered.

concerning the Spirit of God, or simply a human spirit.¹ The answer to this question is by no means simple, and commentators often vary in their approaches. Gordon Fee has suggested that these passages should be considered reflective of both the human and divine s/Spirit, since it is there that humanity and God interact in Pauline literature. Fee also suggests that, for the Christian, there is little reason to differentiate between the human spirit and the Holy Spirit working in the human spirit. He notes that the two are not always separate, since the Spirit of God often possesses people, and πνεῦμα is often used to reflect this possession.² However, this thesis is primarily concerned with those passages that refer to the Spirit of God alone. Therefore, in the interest of exploring Pauline pneumatology, this study will limit itself to those passages which concern the Holy Spirit and not those which refer to the human spirit or evil spirits.

On this issue of method, this study will concern itself with a synchronic view of Pauline pneumatology.³ It may be asserted that the pneumatology of the letters of Paul was developed diachronically as Paul met and responded to new situations.⁴ However, recent research has furthered the idea that much of the theology of the early church was established and already highly developed in the church before the composition of the earliest letters of Paul, and present therein in traditional and liturgical forms.⁵ Thus, there

¹ See especially 1 Cor 5:3, 4; 6:17; 14:14, 15 (Fee, *Presence*, 25). Though the context of 2:4 seems to make it evident that it is the Spirit of God (cf. 1 Cor 2:10 and the third instance of πνεῦμα in 2:11), while instances such as the beginning of 1 Cor 2:11, 5:5, and 16:18 clearly concern the human spirit.

² Fee proposes the inconvenient translation “S/spirit,” which denotes that it both the Spirit of God and the human spirit at work, and to reflect the interface of human and divine (Fee, *Presence*, 24–26).

³ This study is very much indebted to the work of Turner, (Turner, *Holy Spirit*), Fee (Fee, *Presence*), and Paige (Paige, “Holy Spirit,” 404–13) and is not intended as a criticism of their work, but rather a concise summary of Paul’s pneumatological tendencies, and will build on their contextual and exegetical work with the hopes of finding common ground.

⁴ Horn summarizes this diachronic development quite succinctly (Horn, “Holy Spirit,” 265–78). He is also summarized concisely in Turner, *Holy Spirit*, 104–6.

⁵ Paul Barnett has recently published a study of the early Pauline canon and Acts which reveals traditional and liturgical quotations and allusions developed which were most likely present in the early teachings of the disciples (Barnett, *Birth*).

was most likely a pneumatological constant upon which the development of Pauline practical theology was built.

Recent scholarship has explored the pneumatology of the Pauline epistles as it is related to the specific life situation of the recipient communities. For example, Terence Paige claims that Paul portrays the Spirit as God and the Spirit of Christ. Paige identifies thematic ties between the Spirit and wisdom, power, mission, new life, eschatology and worship in the Pauline epistles.¹ Turner, in another study on Paul, examines the different usages of πνεῦμα in Paul. His work has focussed specifically on the relationship between the Spirit and other aspects of theology, and most prominently christology, ecclesiology, and eschatology.² Gordon Fee summarises the Pauline representation of the Spirit as that eschatological Spirit of God, who is present in the community of believers to empower them to meet the eschatological goal in the face of adversity.³ Further, acknowledgement must be given to the influence of Thiselton on the present understanding of Pauline pneumatology, and especially his renewed emphasis on Pauline Trinitarian thought. The works of each of these authors will be examined presently as that relate to the soteriological, charismatic and Trinitarian emphases in Pauline pneumatology.

4.1 *Paul and the Soteriological Spirit*

For Paul, the Spirit is primarily that person of God who, by the merits of Christ, draws people into salvation, enacts the purification of that salvation and empowers them to persevere in salvation in and with the entire Spirit-filled community. The Spirit is a down payment and provides the first fruits of that salvation until it is completed eschatologically in the coming of Christ.

¹ Paige, "Holy Spirit," 404–13.

² Turner, *Holy Spirit*, 114–35.

³ Fee, *Presence*, 5–9.

First and foremost, in the affirmation of this claim, it is imperative to note the intimate connection between the gospel message and the Spirit in Paul's thought. It seems that, to Paul, the Spirit of God is the ultimate source and communicator of the gospel of Christ. The gospel, the message of Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἑσταυρωμένον (1 Cor 2:2), is also called θεοῦ σοφίαν, and τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην (1 Cor 2:7) by Paul and is contextually also τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor 2:14). In this case ψυχικός, which represents natural humanity, is understood as being without the Spirit, or "a person who lives on an entirely human level."¹ Thus, the gospel² is not understood by those without the Spirit but only by those with the Spirit. The Holy Spirit is the only means by which humanity can understand the gospel. Paul is clear elsewhere that any saving knowledge of the gospel only comes through the Spirit,³ who draws, convicts and empowers the gospel to reach the lost (1 Thes 1:5). Belief in Jesus as Christ is the primary evidence of life in the Spirit (1 Cor 12:3). Paul also often uses ἐν πνεύματι to indicate that the Spirit is the agent of salvation, and that conversion-initiation is, by definition, the work of the Spirit (Rom 2:29).⁴ The Spirit in Paul is definitively opposed to both sin and the law, and works against both.⁵ The Spirit is not, however, a simple individual gift, and even salvation is a corporate affair, accomplished by the communal filling of the Spirit.⁶

¹ Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 268.

² Conzelmann is correct to note that the subject of vv. 10–16 is still wisdom, which is none other than the wisdom of the cross. He claims that it "cannot be a supplementary factor alongside the cross, but can only be the understanding of this word [of the cross (the Gospel)]" (Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 57).

³ In contrast with the Law (Gal 3:12; Paige, "Holy Spirit," 408). Paige also cites 2 Cor 3:3 as a passage showing Paul's focus on the Spirit as the mark of salvation (Paige, "Holy Spirit," 406–7).

⁴ Here περιτομή used metaphorically for belonging to the covenant people of God (Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, 126–28). See also Rom 15:16; 1 Cor 6:11, Gal 3:3; 5:25. Some passages communicate the same message without the preposition, using the dative (cf. Eph 1:13, Eph 2:22). See also Rom 5:5, which uses διὰ and the genitive.

⁵ See especially Gal 5:16. For a detailed analysis of the nature of the relationship between the Law, sin and the Spirit see Fee, *Presence*, 427–38.

⁶ Paige argues that 2 Cor 13:13 is justification for equating πνεῦμα with κοινωνία. However, he and Fee are far more astute on this point by relating the "body" metaphor of 1 Cor 12:12–13 (Paige, "Holy Spirit,"

However, Paul does not suggest that the work of the Spirit is completed in the conversion-initiation process. Rather, the Spirit works to sustain and purify the believer¹ and acts as a “down-payment” and “first fruits” of the salvation that is yet to come.²

4.2. *Paul and the Charismatic Spirit*

No discussion of Pauline pneumatology is complete without a discussion of spiritual gifts. The discussion stems from Paul’s use of the term *χαρίσματα* when it occurs directly or contextually with the term *πνευματικά*, and especially throughout 1 Corinthians 12–14.³ Historically, there has been much discussion of the relationship between the two terms, since each is used independent of the other and there are lists of gifts which use term *χαρίσματα* alone. This has led scholars to question the complex set of interrelationships and seeming disparities between Paul’s independent use of the terms *χαρίσματα* and *πνευματικά*, and their concurrent use in 1 Corinthians 12–14. It seems that, in most circumstances, *χαρίσματα* in Paul refers directly to gifts such as eternal life, deliverance, and the preferential treatment that God gives to his chosen people (Rom 6:23; 11:29; 2 Cor 1:11).⁴ With this in mind, it seems problematic that Paul would refer to *ἀγάπη* outside of the realm of the *χαρίσματα*, that he would hail prophecy as among the chief gifts and make frequent mention of mutual edification as the purpose of the *χαρίσματα*. The answer to this question lies in the epistolary nature of the list. First,

410; Fee, *Presence*, 177–83). Turner notes the communal focus in Ezekiel’s prophecies concerning the restoration of Israel by the Spirit, and the correlations between these and 1 Thess 4:7–8; 2 Cor 3:3–18 (Turner, *Holy Spirit*, 114–19).

¹ See especially Gal 5:16–26.

² 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:13–14. 1 Cor 15:42 (Paige, “Holy Spirit,” 411; Turner, *Holy Spirit*, 124–26). Fee also develops heavily on the eschatological and salvific nature of the Spirit in Paul (Fee, *Presence*, 803–26).

³ Fee also notes a list of apparent “gifts” in Eph 4:11 (Fee, “Gifts,” 339–47). However, *χαρίσματα* is not used at all within the passage. Rather the list is subjected contextually to another term, *δωρεά*, which is interesting in its own right, but not influential on this particular study, since it is Paul’s particular choice of *χαρίσματα* that is of greatest interest presently.

⁴ Fee, “Gifts,” 340.

it must be asserted that Paul did not by any means intend to create a new category of works of the Spirit called the χαρίσματα. Fee is adamant that the lists in I Corinthians are not to be interpreted as exhaustive, but rather define things that the Spirit gives as demanded by the situation at Corinth. That is, Paul only included those gifts in the Corinthian list that were necessitated by the apparent Corinthian fixation on tongues-speech.¹ Also pertinent to the discussion is the context of the list in Romans 12:6–8, which lists many of the same χαρίσματα as the Corinthian list, but credits them to χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν with no mention of the Spirit whatsoever. An examination of the contexts of both of the letters will reveal that χαρίσματα is being used as a symbol of the disconnection between the gifts and the recipient by emphasising the gracious nature of their bestowal.² That is, Paul's use of χαρίσματα in each of these lists is most likely a rhetorical tool, intended mainly to devalue the contribution of the recipients of the gifts in Spirit-inspired worship (1 Cor 12–14), and to encourage an attitude of selfless service without hypocrisy in worship (Rom 12:1–13). Paul did not intend to create a new category for defining the work of the Spirit.

It is clear that Paul did not intend the Spirit, who has already been noted as the giver and sustainer of salvation, to be understood solely as an aid to the individual growth of the believer. Nor was the Spirit only an aid to the building of the body of Christ by the inauguration and development of new members. Rather, the Spirit was also to be understood as working through the members of the church for the edification of the rest

¹ Fee, *Presence*, 886–87.

² Turner argues for an understanding of χαρίσματα that emphasizes the 'gracious' nature of the gift, in opposition to Dunn who looks back to χάρις, rather than χαρίζομαι, for his understanding of the term (Turner, *Holy Spirit*, 264–65).

of the church, or in the very least, necessary for the wholeness of the church.¹ The lists of gifts in Paul's understanding of the work of the Spirit, though they are no means exhaustive, include prophecy, service, exhortation, teaching, leadership (Rom 12:6–8), and also wisdom, the word of knowledge, faith, miracles, prophecy, discernment, and tongues-speech related gifts to name a few (1 Cor 12–14). Simply, Paul intended his readers to understand that the Spirit is the one who builds and sustains the community of the saved.

4.3. *Paul, the Spirit, and Trinitarian Thought*

If it became imperative to identify a single overarching fault in modern exegetical method, most biblical scholars would be forced to admit their disconnection with the development of Christian theology, and reluctance to incorporate the interpretations of the first church into their own exegesis. Conversely, Anthony Thiselton has written an analysis of the Spirit in Pauline literature that has challenged the work of other scholars. To this point the analysis of the Spirit in Paul has limited itself to the work of the Spirit in the epistles, as though to explain the work of the Spirit were Paul's primary goal.

Thiselton, however, has challenged some of the findings of such studies, and accused them of missing the intended goal of the passage. It is not Thiselton's goal to attempt to discover Paul's intentions in the text. Rather, it is his argument that that text ought to be understood in light of its effect on the development of the Christian church by an examination of the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the text. Simply, Thiselton has examined the manner in which Paul's writings, and especially those texts which deal with the Spirit,

¹ Fee, *Presence*, 886–92; Turner, *Holy Spirit*, 271.

were received and interpreted by the early church and used in the formulation of their own doctrinal and polemical works.¹

It seems that the interpretive focus of the patristic period has little to do with the nature of the Spirit in salvation or in the gifts, but rather with the Spirit as a member of the Trinity and as that person of God who communes with Christians.² It is hardly a stretch, however, to conclude that the concerns of Paul's interpreters were similar to those of Paul. It is not a stretch at all to assume that Paul's concerns were not in establishing the Spirit as a mover in salvation or as the giver of the gifts, which must have been assumed by all, but rather in the Spirit as God, fully God in full partnership with the Father and Son. With this in mind, Fee's emphasis on *s*/Spirit in the gifts is unthinkable. Paul is not in the least concerned with the human spirit and its role in the charismata. Rather, he writes about the Holy Spirit of God in a Trinitarian sense, and the way in which the Holy Spirit of God works among the people of God. Paul emphasises the Spirit's nature, rather than his works. This is especially true in Thiselton's discussion of the Pauline formula "the Spirit and power," which he identifies in every case of Pauline use as hendiadys. In this sense, the phrase does not denote something akin to Fee's *s*/Spirit, but is a clear

¹ Thiselton, "Holy Spirit," 211–16. For Thiselton's complete argument see Thiselton, "Holy Spirit," 207–28. Thiselton seems most heavily influenced by the work of Jauss (Jauss, *Aesthetic*), though he displays dependence for background theory on Gadamer (Gadamer, *Truth*).

² Thiselton argues that the focus of the majority of patristic work is on the Trinitarian role of the Spirit and the defense of the Spirit as a member of the Godhead. In support he cites Cyril of Jerusalem who is emphatic that, in the context of the gifts, there is no reference whatsoever to the Spirit as the human spirit (Catechetical Lectures 16:1.3.12–13, 15–17). Similarly, Irenaeus argued that even when people were called spiritual, it referred to the work of the Spirit of God in them, and not to their human spirit (*Against Heresies* 5:6:1). Gregory of Nazianzus, equally, attributes the act of worshipping the Spirit to the Spirit of God in the Christian, so that even the gifts performed by Christians were in a sense actions of the Holy Spirit (*Theological Orations* 5:2.12). Thiselton claims that this interpretation of Paul is most likely the best representation of the Spirit, in contrast to the majority of modern exegesis and its methods. Furthermore, it is Thiselton's argument that the exegesis of the Fathers is also more accurate than most modern scholarship and, though it is not the primary concern of his interpretation, Patristic exegesis reflects the concerns of Paul with a greater degree of accuracy (Thiselton, "Holy Spirit," 224).

depiction of the Spirit as the powerful Spirit of God.¹ There is no confusion in the term πνευματικά either. It either refers directly to the actions of the Holy Spirit of God, which is Paul's definition, or it is being used by Paul as a quotation of the Corinthian usage, designating the actions that they consider to be spiritual.² However, even in the separation of these two usages, it is clear that Paul's intention is to place the Spirit in a strong Trinitarian framework and make firm the equality of the Spirit and God, while keeping both Father and Son in firm focus.

Conclusions

With such a diversity of emphasis on the Spirit in the New Testament, the formation of an overarching Theology of the Spirit seems an impossible task. The diversity of the Spirit has been shown across the New Testament, and especially in the Gospels. What is more significant, it has been shown that even those texts which are reliant on other source documents, and especially the Gospels which rely on Mark as a source, display a great deal of theological independence in the way in which they portray the Spirit. Though initially the purpose of this chapter was to provide an exegesis of the Markan Spirit passages with some sort of theological starting point, it may serve better to provide the text of Mark with several well defined counterpoints. It is impossible at this point to establish a close comparison between the Markan Spirit, and the way that the Spirit is portrayed in other Gospels. This is especially true since most New Testament works place deliberate emphasis on the Spirit. Conversely, Mark treats pneumatology as an adjunct to other theological threads, and especially the theology of the Kingdom of God. Paul is primarily interested in issues of salvation, and the Trinitarian Spirit of God at work in the

¹ Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 222.

² Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 225.

Church as the centre of its function and life. Similar to Mark, Matthew often treats pneumatology as an adjunct doctrine. However, his primary concerns rest more with the restoration of Israel through a Jewish Messiah, and his emphasis on the Spirit reflects these concerns. Luke places a great deal of emphasis on the Spirit as he works in Jesus and the early church to fulfill the commission of Jesus by bringing the Gospel to a worldwide audience, with specific emphasis on speech and miraculous acts. Luke is far more defined in his depiction of the Spirit than Mark, and does not have the same emphasis on the Kingdom of God. By and large, the closest Gospel to Mark in its depiction of the Spirit is the Gospel of John, and especially the paraclete theology of John. Neither the Johannine Paraclete, nor the Markan Spirit occurs with any degree of regularity throughout their respective Gospels, though there seems to be a greater uniformity in the development of the paraclete. Both seem to share at least some eschatological emphasis, and both serve as an aid to the disciples in times of persecution.¹ Similarly, there is a great deal of connective tissue between the Spirit and Jesus' mission to bring the Kingdom of God to earth in the first half of Mark. He is an aid to the disciples, and is also highly connected to Jesus, who is called the first paraclete by the Gospel. Though this is not perfect comparison, the Gospel of John provides the text of Mark with the similarities needed to justify its unique emphasis, and provides Mark with a definite place in establishing new nuances in current New Testament pneumatology. A Markan emphasis on the Spirit is a New Testament emphasis and, though it is by no means comprehensive, the text of Mark does make a contribution to that study. As it has been shown in this chapter, it may be some time before an acceptable New Testament pneumatology is formulated, if the task is at all desirable or possible. Nevertheless, the

¹ See especially chapter 4 on the Spirit in Mark 13.

remainder of this study will be dedicated to exploring the difference facets of the Spirit emphasised uniquely by the Gospel of Mark and, though there should be no expectation of discovering a uniform thread of pneumatological emphasis that pervades Mark's Gospel, there is most certainly unique emphasis. For too long the Markan passages on the Spirit have stood next to other Gospel passages on the same topic as side notes and supporters to other Gospel's emphasis. In the rest of this work, if only here, Mark will be given an independent voice, and be allowed to speak above the crowd.

Chapter 2

THE SPIRIT IN MARK 1:1–15

The introductory chapter of Mark stands in stark contrast to the rest of the book in form and content. There is no other place in the Gospel that Jesus is portrayed so blatantly in a divine manner. He is called Christ, the Son of God, the Isaianic Messiah, the returning one of Malachi, and the one baptised by the Spirit, who will baptise with the Spirit. All of these titles lend a sense of empowerment and divine confirmation to his ministry. The text of Mark is truly interested in answering the question “who is Jesus?”¹ and works to inspire a confession of faith in Jesus.² The Spirit in the first chapter acts to root the ministry of Jesus more deeply in the divine by providing practical evidence for the claim of divinity in 1:1. Mark’s reference to the Spirit also serves to connect Jesus’ divinity with all of his actions by showing a divine empowering presence with Jesus. The Spirit is

¹ This is the thesis of Ben Witherington, who claims that questions form an organizing principle in the Gospel of Mark. That is, the first section of the text, after the prologue, contains a number of questions concerning the identity of Jesus, while the second section answers the question. It reveals that Jesus is the Christ and also that he has a mission to accomplish. The third section concerns the fulfillment of that mission (Witherington, *Mark*, 37–39). This is similar to France and Hooker, who claim that the prologue reveals Jesus’ identity to the reader completely, while the rest of the text concerns itself with that identity as it is experienced by the unknowing crowds whose understanding of Jesus develops throughout the text of the Gospel (Hooker, *Mark*, 16; France, *Mark*, 58–59).

² Williams writes predominately on the function of minor characters in Mark’s Gospel to accomplish this goal. That is, to effect a Markan rhetorical strategy designed to cause the reader to imitate those in the Gospel who respond to Jesus’ teaching with faith (Williams, *Followers*, 89–90).

also the contrasting feature between Jesus the son of God, and all other God-sent prophets embodied in John the Baptist. Above all, Jesus' titles and spiritual empowerment seem to act as the credentials required for Jesus to be the ruler and inaugurator of the Kingdom of God. Both the high christology of Mark and his discussion of the Spirit support the Markan theology of the Kingdom. As it will be shown here, the Spirit serves as an adjunct to the development of Mark's Kingdom theology. Here, Mark depicts the Spirit as a witness to Jesus' divinity, testing, and superiority to all of his predecessors, so that he may be recognized as a suitable centre of faith, and ruler in the Kingdom of God.

From the outset, it may seem a little odd that the intended scope of this exegesis includes the whole of Mark 1:1–15, when it is widely accepted, and also the claim here, that the prologue in Mark's Gospel comes to its conclusion in 1:13.¹ There are, however, several semantic similarities that occur within the first few verses of the second episode that serve to join the first and second episodes together. In this section, the grammatical features of the text will be explored systematically in order to establish an intricate understanding of the passage and place the discussion of the Spirit in the first chapter in a more intimate context. This study will lead directly to the conclusion that the Spirit in the Gospel of Mark is intricately involved in the development of a Markan Kingdom theology, by means of christology, and serves to answer that question of Jesus' identity by setting up a "great and greater than" relationship with John the Baptist in both nature

¹ Deixis, in Mark, is one of the clearest indications of a break in the narrative (Porter, *Idioms*, 301–2). As such, the shift from the wilderness context to Galilee seems to suggest that Jesus' wilderness inauguration discourse has come to an end and the ministry of Jesus has begun elsewhere. This geographical break suggests the beginning of a new pericope (France, *Mark*, 58–59; cf. Dowd, *Mark*, 9; contra Guelich, *Mark*, 3–5; van Iersel, though he concludes the passage with 1:15, notes that 1:2–13 is a single discourse unit (van Iersel, *Mark*, 91–92, 104–8).

and empowerment.¹ This comparison is accomplished through a series of linguistic tools, including a series of semantic chains and intertextual allusions that portray John as the Elijanic prophet figure,² while Jesus is portrayed as the Son of God and the Spirit-empowered, Spirit-baptising, Spirit-tested Messiah and the Spirit-enabled inaugurator of the Kingdom of God.³ Again, the claim of this thesis is that Mark portrays the Spirit as a supporter in Jesus' mission to establish the Kingdom of God on earth, and that the text highlights the Spirit as the background force empowering and directing Jesus in his efforts to establish the Kingdom of God on the earth. It will also be noted that the Spirit continues his work into the church age by directing and moving the disciples through trials, similar to those of Jesus, so that they are able to persevere to the eschatological end.⁴ This chapter, however, will focus on the development of the Spirit as the empowerer of Jesus' Kingdom ministry by examining the inauguration of that ministry, and the Spirit's role in the calling and testing of Jesus. Special attention much also be

¹ Witherington, though he approaches the text from a rhetorical standpoint, seems oblivious to this relationship. His best answer for the inclusion of John in the introduction of the Gospel is that John was somehow involved in the early ministry of Jesus (!) (Witherington, *Mark*, 70-1). Though he does not address the great/ greater relationship that exists between Jesus, van Iersel notes that John is present as an authoritative Elijanic figure, which lends greater authority to his words, notably focussed on Jesus (van Iersel, *Mark*, 96). The closest depiction of this relationship, and study which inspired this comparison, occurs in the writings of Westfall in her comparison of the prophets and messengers with Jesus in the first chapters of Hebrews (Westfall, "Ties," 14-21; cf. Westfall, *Hebrews*, 88-99).

² It is the nature of this study to be interested in a Markan understanding of the Spirit. The immediate focus is the relationship between Mark's use of the prophets and his development of Jesus and the Spirit. With this in mind, it is of little interest to establish an accurate reading of the prophets at their final redaction. Rather, it is best to understand them as Mark read them, in Greek, and to establish the text as Mark read it, in order to provide a context and contrast for the Markan text. With this in mind, the LXX will be used as the primary source document for Old Testament quotations rather than a Hebrew text which, though it may be more accurate to the original, stands at too far a distance from first-century Christianity.

³ The Spirit is not mentioned in the inauguration passage. However, the focus here seems to be on defining who Jesus is and providing credentials for his ministry. His ministry begins in 1:14 and is immediately concerned with the Kingdom. Dowd and Malbon provide an interesting comparison between the declaration of John for baptism and repentance, and Jesus' similar declaration in 1:14, with the added mention of the Spirit (Dowd, and Malbon, "Significance," 275)

⁴ See discussion in Chapter 6.

paid to the Spirit's role in affirming the divinity of Jesus, and enabling the Kingdom of God to be established through the ministry of Jesus.

It would be naïve to assume that Mark intended the Spirit to be on the minds of his readers at every point in Jesus' ministry. However, it must be acknowledged that the Spirit is unique to Jesus in the prologue, which contributes the divine tone that pervades it. With this in mind, the remainder of this chapter will seek to establish the Spirit as a unique gift given to Jesus the divine Son to empower and witness the coming of the Kingdom.¹ In order for this to be accomplished, this chapter will contrast the ministries of John the Baptist and Jesus in order to establish the "great and greater than" relationship that typifies Mark's depiction of these two characters. The Holy Spirit will be shown to be the differentiating marker between John and Jesus which highlights Jesus as the Spirit-anointed Son of God over John the Baptist, the God-sent prophet whose ministry is oddly not demarcated by the Spirit. This will be done first by exploring the language used to develop each character, and second, by exploring Mark's formation of each of the characters through allusion to Old Testament and intertestamental literature.

1. The Exclusivity of the Spirit to Jesus in the Markan Prologue

Key to the understanding of the Spirit in the Gospel of Mark is the idea of a contrast between Jesus and John the Baptist. This contrast is not diminutive of John, but establishes him as a key prophetic figure, and then places Jesus above him in a "great-greater than" contrast. This is made clear by a set of contrasting and cooperative semantic chains that depict the tasks of Jesus and John the Baptist. While John's ministry is characterized by terms of preparation and prophecy, Jesus' ministry is punctuated with

¹ It will be established in Chapter 6 that the Spirit is also present in the disciples, but they themselves may be understood as unique since they are portrayed as the messengers of Jesus after his predicted departure (Mark 8:30 and onward).

constant reference to the Spirit, messianic titles, and sonship, all following Jesus' introduction in 1:1. In the following section, it will be established that the Spirit is used as a semantic tool to elevate Jesus over John the Baptist in a great/greater relationship. Further, it will be established that the lexis used in reference to John places him in a unique place of importance as a God-sent prophet. This will further emphasise the uniqueness of Jesus and the unparalleled importance in nature and ministry that is attributed to him by the empowerment of the Spirit.

1.1 *John*

When the language of the Markan prologue is examined, without consideration of intertextual influence, John the Baptist is nothing less than the God-sent messenger and declarer of God's words in preparation for the Lord's coming. There is nothing diminutive in the opening verses of the Gospel towards John. He is given extremely high honours.¹ This is dramatically clear when one considers the titles used to represent John the Baptist in the opening of Mark, their uniformity in portrayal of the Baptist, and the verbs in which John appears as either subject or object.

When all of the substantives representing John the Baptist, and all of the verbs in which John is subject, object, or speaker are collected in the first chapter of Mark, a somewhat predictable pattern begins to appear. He is called τὸν ἄγγελόν μου (1:2)² and

¹ France notes the immediate proximity of John's ministry declaring Jesus' coming to ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, which seems to indicate that ministry of John is approximated with the beginning of the gospel message, and not simply Mark's text (France, *Mark*, 69–70; Rowe, *Kingdom*, 117).

² There has been some confusion over this term, and some have even suggested that it should be interpreted to suggest an angelic presence in John. Joynes argues that John might be perceived as an angelic figure as an explanatory attempt to describe how both Elijah and John the Baptist could be the exact same person, as posited by Öhler (Öhler, *Elia*, 108; cited in Joynes, "Elijah", 8–13; cf. Öhler, "Elijah," 461–76). This confusion is most likely caused by the unmitigated use of lexical variances provided by the standard lexicons (see TDNT, NIDNTT, etc). However, as the context will further display, there is a remarkable similarity between τὸν ἄγγελόν μου and certain terms in the text that suggests that the term is used of a sent representative of God; God's messenger (Louw & Nida, 33.195). There is also recent scholarly

φωνῆ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (1:3).¹ He is the object of God's sending (ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω [1:2]).² He is the preparer for the ministry of the Messiah (κατασκευάσει, ἔτοιμάσατε [Mk 1:2–3]).³ If the subordinate phrase of 1:2–3 is seen as a direct modifier to the predicators in 1:4,⁴ then included in the semantic chain of preparation in 1:2–3 are the terms βαπτίζων and κηρύσσων.⁵ The response of the Judeans in 1:5 (ἐξολογούμενοι) is purposefully connected to the term ἐβαπτίζοντο by Mark, as is the declaration in 1:7 which is connected semantically to the rest of the paragraph as the content of John's preaching (ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων). At its core, this thread is based on semantically related terms. For example, the verb ἀποστέλλω is intrinsically tied to ἐγένετο in the sense of movement and direction.⁶ Ἀποστέλλω is also highly connected

precedent in the association of ἄγγελος and Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ (cf. Louw & Nida 33.459). In a monograph on the letter to the Hebrews, Westfall has argued that the mention of ἄγγελος in the first chapter, which has traditionally been interpreted as a polemic against angel worship, is in fact semantically tied to the messengers and prophets who come before Jesus (Westfall, "Ties," 14–21; Westfall, *Hebrews*, 91–92).

¹ Louw & Nida, 33.103; 33.81.

² There is no immediate correlation in Louw & Nida between ἀποστέλλω and the other lexis that appear in reference to John, perhaps because John is the subject. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that John is the object. The force of the verb implies that he carries a prophetic message (see Louw & Nida, 15.67–68).

³ Again, there is no semantic correlation between these two verbs and others relating to John (Louw & Nida, 77.3; 77.6–7). However, they are without question representative of the work intended by the sender (ἀποστέλλω [1:2]).

⁴ καθὼς in 1:2 is meant to modify ἐγένετο in 1:4 rather than hanging on its own or modifying an unexpressed verb in 1:1. This is contrary to the claims of Croy. Croy claims that there are no instances of subordinate phrases containing embedded quotations which occur before their head predicator. However, he acknowledges that there are instances where subordinate phrases occur before their predicators with no quotation involved (Croy, "Text," 111–12). With this in mind, it is impossible to rule out the possibility of a quotation preceding its head term in a subordinate phrase, and it is most likely that this is exactly the case in Mk 1:1.

⁵ These two terms, though not semantically related, seem to be the acts of John mandated by ἀποστέλλω. They are also the applied representations of κατασκευάσει, and ἔτοιμάσατε. If it were necessary for all of the terms in a semantic chain to belong to the same semantic category, these verbs would be excused. However, Westfall argues that authors sometimes create ad hoc chains of terms not related in their definitions, but connected by the argument of the author (Westfall, *Hebrews*, 47–50). This is the case here, since these unrelated terms seem to fulfill the prophecy of the previous verses. Though it is not explicitly stated by the author, it seems that Mark, by the way he has organized his introduction, is telling the audience "these are those actions that John was sent (ἀποστέλλω) to do. Thus, without stating it outright, Mark has created an equivalent relationship between the predicators of 1:2–3 and the participles in 1:4.

⁶ Louw & Nida 15.1, 66–67. There is the possibility that ἐγένετο is not a verb of motion (for a similar argument, concerning ἐγγίζω, see Porter, "Vicinity," 91–104), though it is classified that way by Louw &

to the noun ἄγγελος in the sense that the ἄγγελος, as a messenger, is sent from a higher authority. These terms are conceptually connected to verbs such as κατασκευάσει and ἐτοιμάσατε, which are semantic equivalents. This connection is implied in the text, since these terms act as specifying modifiers to the role of ἄγγελος, and represent the intended action of the sending (ἀποστέλλω [1:2]). Similarly, the phrase φωνὴ βοῶντος is connected with the group since it is in apposition with ἄγγελον. The chain is completed both by the semantic connections between κηρύσσων and βοῶντος, and the conceptual equivalency gained between the former chain and the terms βαπτίζων and κηρύσσων generated through the use of καθὼς, which qualifies these actions as the narrative equivalent to the prophetic action listed in 1:2–3.¹ Also connected is a small section that is bracketed by this information detailing the clothing and diet of John the Baptist (1:6). It is not immediately semantically pertinent to the development of John as a character, but paints a picture of John that heightens the prophetic portrayal of John the Baptist when its Old Testament sources are considered.² Thus, John is the prophetic figure that is sent by God himself to prepare the way for the coming of the Messiah. He is a messenger of God. He is sent by God, and speaks directly for him. The actions of John's prophetic ministry are baptising and preaching, both for repentance and forgiveness, and also forward looking, subjecting John's baptism and preaching to the baptism and preaching of the one who is to come. John is in no way downplayed by his portrayal in the Gospel. Curiously,

Nida. In either case, it is clear that the beginning of John's ministry, signified by ἐγένετο, is a direct result of the sending implicit in the verb ἀποστέλλω. It is this verbal connection that justifies the linking of the two passages.

¹ See discussion on καθὼς above for reasons why it should be considered as a connector between 1:2–3 with the text of 1:4–6.

² This will be discussed in greater detail in §2.1.

despite his prophetic calling and close connection to God,¹ there is no mention of the Spirit in connection with John's ministry.² In fact, the only connection between John the Baptist and the Spirit is in his own preaching concerning the coming one. Here, John contrasts his own baptism with the baptism that Jesus will bring. In John's own preaching, his baptism is in water (ὕδατι), while the baptism of the coming one is with the Holy Spirit (πνεύματι ἁγίῳ). This suggests that, in light of the high language in connection with John the Baptist, and the similarity in ministry, the Spirit is acting as representative of a superlative ministry for Jesus. The Spirit is attributed to Jesus in Mark to provide him with an exclusive connection with God, and an incomparable empowerment. This is especially clear when Jesus is compared with a figure portrayed with such a close connection to God as John the Baptist in Mark 1:2–8, and suggests a connection between Jesus and the Kingdom of God.³

1.2 *Jesus*

The language surrounding Jesus is of a different nature than that of John. While John is portrayed as a sent emissary of God, the language surrounding Jesus is distinctly divine. He is frequently associated with the terms θεός and πνεῦμα. There are two patterns that emerge in the text, and the two serve to display Jesus as the Christ and the Son of God who is empowered by the Holy Spirit in all of his actions, and completely obedient to the direction of God through the Spirit. The first semantic pattern includes those nouns which

¹ That is his sent-ness (ἀποστέλλω) as messenger (ἄγγελος).

² See further discussion on the Markan portrayal of John in § 2.1.

³ It has been suggested by both Öhler and Boers that the first century messianic expectation was that the coming of Elijah would directly precede the coming of the Kingdom (Boers, *Jesus*, 48–49; cited in Öhler, "Elijah," 476). John comes as Elijah in the prologue of the Gospel. He is followed immediately by Jesus, who is Spirit filled before declaring the Kingdom. With this in mind, it seems that the emphasis on the Kingdom began in 1:2 and not 1:14. The Spirit-empowerment of Jesus was the inaugural step for Jesus which placed the Kingdom firmly in his hands from John, in whom it had already begun through his declaration of the coming Christ.

refer to Jesus, and all verbs in which he is subject. The second includes all nouns referring to God, or to the Spirit, and verbs in which God is the subject. Using these two interconnected patterns the following discussion will show that Jesus is both the coming *χριστός*, the leader of the Kingdom and the Son of God, and also that these concepts are very closely related to his Spirit-baptism.

1.2.1 *Jesus the Divine Messiah*

The first line of Mark's Gospel, which some have argued to be a form of title or superscript, contains the first reference to Jesus, and gives him the dual titles *χριστός*, which draws immediate reference to the Kingdom of God,¹ and *υἱός θεοῦ*.² It is also widely accepted that *κυρίου* in Mark 1:3 is a direct reference to Jesus. To this point, Jesus, *ὁ ἄγγελος*, and God, the speaker, are the only three known characters. Jesus has

¹ Rowe notes the tendency of the LXX, which is Mark's primary source, to portray the Christ as an 'annointed king' (Rowe, *Kingdom*, 165–66).

² Before any argument concerning Jesus' role as the Son of God can continue, it must be brought to the attention of the reader that the inclusion of the phrase *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* in Mk 1:1 is not uniformly supported in the textual tradition. It has been the argument here that Mk 1:1 is a summary statement for the entire text to follow and answers immediately the question "who is Jesus?" The answer to this question is established in the first episode (see Mk 1:11). It is questioned in the second episode by Jesus' audience (this question appears most clearly in 4:41, though Witherington lists several questions related to Jesus' identity and nature [Witherington, *Mark*, 37]). It is answered in the third (Mk 8:29), and displayed in the fourth (Mk 14:61–62, 15:2, 22–39). This pattern carries stronger influence on the text of Mark if the term *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* is in fact present in the text of Mk 1:1. It is the argument of this work that the textual evidence is in support of the standard reading, which includes the phrase. In support, it should be noted that *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* is present in \aleph^1 (the corrective hand is most likely an original scribe) A B D L W Δ *al* (A Δ read *υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*). The best options for the omission of *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* are found in the apparent original reading of Sinaiticus (\aleph^a), corrected by the original hand, the highly suspect ninth-century codex Koridethianus (Θ), and the final correction of an eleventh-century miniscule (28^c). Similarly, those who prefer to eliminate the text of 1:1 completely (Croy, "Text," 107–10; Elliott, "Addition," 586 [Elliott is more extensive, and prefers to eliminate the whole of 1:1–3]), do so primarily on the basis of 28^c, as well as an apparent lack of uniformity on the content of the verses. Croy identifies nine distinct textual options, though he does not seem count for the quality of the varying manuscripts (Croy, "Text," 107–10). Scholar's primarily reject the text based on a grammatical difficulty in which 1:2–3, a subordinate phrase, lacks a predicate to modify in 1:1 (Croy "Text," 110–5; Elliott, "Addition," 585). It is almost immediately obvious that, though a number of texts support the omission of *υἱοῦ θεοῦ*, the quality of those texts is negligible. This is especially true in light of the four manuscripts which include it dating between the fourth and fifth centuries (\aleph^1 A B D). Similarly, though Croy and Elliott argue that *καθώς* (Mk 1:2) never occurs with an embedded reference without a preceding predicate (Croy, "Text," 111–12; Elliott "Addition," 585), it is quite possible that *καθώς* modifies the predicate that it immediately precedes in Mk 1:4 (*ἐγένετο*), since the actions that John began upon his arrival (*βαπτίζων* and *κηρύσσων*) seem to fulfill the predicted actions of the prophet in 1:2–3.

been called the son of God, and the LXX source of the quotation has been redacted in Mark to make the identity of κύριος more likely to be Jesus, since the original concludes εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν (LXX Isa. 40:3), rather than the Markan εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ (1:3).¹ The difference is subtle, but the Markan redaction ensures that Jesus is understood as the second figure in the quotation by replacing the third person τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν with a masculine singular pronoun, presumably referring to Jesus. The term κυρίου is not removed, assuring that Jesus is understood as the divine Lord.

The beginning is also quoted from Exodus 23:20, and Malachi 3:1 in a manner that is reflective of the an understanding of the text of Malachi 3:1 derived from a Hebrew or Aramaic reading, rather than one from the LXX. This indicates that Mark was familiar with the Aramaic or Hebrew text of the Old Testament.² It also proves, however, that Mark was sufficiently displeased with the ability of the LXX to convey the role of John as a preparer for someone none less than the Lord, embodied in the person of Jesus Christ. Thus, though the Markan pattern is to extract Old Testament references directly from the LXX, the priority in Markan redaction is to display Jesus as the divine Son. This priority is reflected in the exclusive attribution of the Spirit to Jesus.

¹ France, *Mark*, 64.

² Marcus, *Way*, 16. The beginning phrase is a direct quotation from the LXX of Ex 23:20, while the second half of the text is reminiscent of Mal 3:1. The LXX uses ἐπιβλέπεται, while Mark substitutes κατασκευάσει. At first glance, since Mark relies almost exclusively on the LXX, it appears that this is a Markan redaction of the text, based on familiarity with the concepts of the Aramaic/Hebrew. However, the tendency in redaction might lead to the use of ἐτοιμάζω over κατασκευάζω in order to reconcile the text with the Isaianic quotation. This leads to the conclusion that Mark had some other source, perhaps in Greek, to aid in the combination of the two Old Testament quotations. It is also significant, for later developments, that the wilderness context of Ex 23:20 was chosen of the temple context in Mal 3:1, which is omitted. This is most likely reflective of the abandonment of the temple and the enmity between Jesus and the temple authorities which will prove a significant theme throughout the Gospel (France, *Mark*, 64).

This thread continues into John's confession. Though Jesus' name has not appeared since the introduction, it is clear that he is the object of John's proclamation. At this point John begins his contrast between Jesus and John and, though Jesus has not yet entered into the narrative,¹ Jesus is called the greater one. In contrast to the high position attributed to John in 1:2–8, now John is unworthy of the coming one (Mk 1:7)!² The thread continues with a further connection between Jesus and the divine, this time through means of the Spirit. In contrast with John's water baptism, Jesus will baptize with the Spirit. This is the first connection between the Spirit and Jesus, and it contrasts the ministry of the God-sent prophet, and that of Jesus the Son of God. The Spirit is the defining characteristic of Jesus' ministry who separates him from John the Baptist. The connection made in the first episode between Jesus and the Spirit is one of several means by which Mark communicates that Jesus is the uniquely sent messenger of God. However, he is not only a messenger but the Son of God himself and is far greater than John the Baptist who is the uniquely sent prophet of the Messiah. The Spirit here ensures that the reader understands that Jesus' ministry is God's ministry and that the Spirit is an empowering force who will guide Jesus as he rules in God's place in the Kingdom. The foundation for this understanding is established here as Jesus is shown to be the son of God, the only one capable of truly establishing the reign of God on the earth. The Spirit is already becoming implicit, both in the understanding of Jesus as the unique son of God, and also as that arm of God that is at work in Jesus to prove his divinity and capability to

¹ He is introduced as the subject in Mk 1:1. This passage, though too involved to be a superscript, is not included in the narrative. It acts more like a programmatic title phrase. It introduces the first episode in one sense. However, it also introduces the nature of the content of the entire book and the answer to the question asked by the entire text.

² Though John is painted as none less than the expected Elijah, the coming of Jesus, for both Mark and John, is no less than the coming of Yahweh, who is the prophesied coming one in both the Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3 (France, *Mark*, 70). In this context, though there is a contrast between the lofty portrayals of John above, there is no doubt that the coming of God should merit such a change in language.

reign in the Kingdom of God. The Spirit will direct and move Jesus as he seeks to establish the Kingdom of God on the earth.

1.2.2 *Jesus the Spirit-empowered and directed Son*

This connection between Jesus, the divine, and the Spirit is seen further in Mark 1:10–11. Immediately upon Jesus' introduction into the narrative Mark mentions his baptism, during which the Spirit descends upon Jesus (1:10), and a heavenly voice speaks from heaven confirming that Jesus is God's Son (Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός [Mk 1:11]). This is among the first of a number of allusions to 1:1 that will occur throughout the Gospel. The progression will move from the mouth of God (1:11), to the mouth of demons (1:24), to the Sanhedrin (14:61–62) and finally from a random character who has seen Jesus' actions, and especially the action of the cross, and come to a conclusion of faith (15:39). In this pericope, however, the Markan strategy is still in the process of convincing the reader of Jesus' divinity. The characters in the Gospel experience Jesus without the grandiose introduction given in this first episode. Thus, the connection of Jesus to God in this chapter functions to divulge to the reader exactly who Jesus is so that the reactions of the characters to follow can be measured by his introduction in the prologue.¹ The Spirit plays a prominent role in the accomplishment of this goal by displaying a divine connection between God and the actions of Jesus. First, Jesus is established in the text as the Son of God, the only one who can oversee the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the earth. He is declared a son by a heavenly voice, which is accompanied by the descent of the Spirit. Thus, though this is not the only manner by which Jesus' sonship and divine appointment is shown, the Spirit acts to confirm that

¹ Williams claims that the presentation of minor characters in the text especially functions rhetorically to influence the reader to imitate those who emerge from the crowd and experience Jesus, especially in their expression of faith (Williams, *Followers*, 89–90).

Jesus is the uniquely appointed and Spirit-baptised Son of God. This is reinforced in Jesus' obedience to the Spirit in his testing (τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον [Mk 1:12]).¹

Throughout the introductory chapter of Mark, Jesus is constantly mentioned in connection with God, who claims him as Son, and with the Spirit, who descends upon him and directs him. Immediately after the Spirit descends on Jesus and sends him for temptation, Jesus begins his ministry, preaching and baptizing, just as John had, though Jesus' preaching is concerned with the Kingdom of God (Mk 1:14). The Spirit is a unique element in the preaching and ministry of Jesus that defines him as greater than John, even though it has been noted that John is by no means slandered by his portrayal in the Gospel. Rather, John is portrayed as a unique messenger from God, sent directly from God, yet in comparison he is unworthy, and the most apparent difference in terms of his relation to God, as ἄγγελος rather than υἱός, and the unique endowment of the Spirit on Jesus that is not mentioned in connection with John, though his ministry is substantial and directed by God.

1.3. *Conclusions on the Superiority of Language Referring to Jesus in the Prologue*

Through the language of the prologue it has been shown that John is none less than the God-sent prophet Elijah who is the precursor of the coming of God, the inaugurator of the Kingdom of God. John's ministry is the beginning of the Gospel. In light of this initial portrayal it is surprising that John should speak of anyone who he is unworthy to serve as slave.² However, Jesus, who is described in language that eclipses even the high language referring to John, is portrayed as none less than God himself. He is given the title Son of

¹ Van Henten argues that the testing of Jesus emphasises the humanity of Jesus, since testing presupposes choice (Van Henten, "Testing," 363–64).

² France, *Mark*, 70.

God, filled with the Spirit, proven to be the one who Elijah speaks of, and called the Christ, the righteous expected king in God's Kingdom. This relationship, between a great coming one who is to be followed by a greater king, is built directly into the semantics of the text. However, as it will be shown immediately, the semantics do not prove this alone, but it is also evident in the manner in which Mark makes use of Old Testament and intertestamental literature.

2. The Holy Spirit in Intertextual Context

In previous discussion of the semantics describing Jesus and John it was discovered that Jesus is the Son of God who is tested and directed by the Spirit, in contrast with John the Baptist who is portrayed as the prophet of God sent to pave the way for the Messiah. Through this semantic comparison it was noted that, though John was attributed with such lofty titles as ἄγγελος, and, in a sense, ἀπόστολος,¹ John was still unfit to lace Jesus' sandals and his baptism was still in water. In comparison, Jesus was attributed with the title υἱὸς θεοῦ and uniquely attributed with the Spirit in his prediction, baptism, and testing. These semantic differences in their mutual descriptions signal to the reader that Jesus is far superior than his predecessor. However, there is still much information that waits behind the words in Mark's use of Old Testament and intertestamental allusions to Jesus and John the Baptist. The remainder of this chapter will seek to develop Mark's usage of Old Testament allusion and symbolism to depict John as the Old Testament Elijianic Prophet, and Jesus as the prophesied coming Lord. It will be noted that the Spirit has been purposefully omitted by Mark in the context of the Elijianic prophet, though there is full justification for the Spirit's inclusion in such a context. This will help to establish the role of the Spirit in Jesus a God-given director and authority. Similarly, the

¹ John is the implied object of ἀποστέλλω in Mark 1:2.

Markan formation of the baptism and testing accounts will be examined in order to show that Mark is uniquely focussed among the synoptics in presenting the Spirit simply as Jesus' director and empowerer, especially as it pertains to the establishment of the Kingdom of God. This will be done by noting significant omissions from other Gospel accounts and displaying Old Testament parallels with the Markan account which portray Jesus as a Davidic king and Son of God.

2.1 *John*

As discussed earlier, the language surrounding John the Baptist suggests that he is nothing less than a God-sent prophet, charged with the task of preparing for Jesus' coming. Though all of this is apparent in a simple examination of the semantic content of the passage, Mark is known for using ideas from the Old Testament, and especially Isaiah.¹ As such, there are allusions to four Old Testament passages that are used in reference to John the Baptist within the first episode of Mark's Gospel. There are two in the introductory verses from Exodus 23:20 and Malachi 3:1, and one from Isaiah 40:3 respectively. The final is a section of allusive language which described the diet and dress of John the Baptist and connects him to Elijah the prophet. Each of these instances will be examined individually in order to discern its impact on the portrayal of John as the divine messenger of God, his relationship to Jesus, and its effect on the understanding of the first episode and the Spirit in Mark.

The first reference to John the Baptist in the Gospel of Mark occurs in the second verse, where John is called the ἄγγελος of God and is sent to prepare the way before the Lord. It appears that this is not a Markan creation, however, but a conflated quotation

¹ The ties between Mark and Isaiah have become of great interest to scholars in recently history. Some have even begun to refer to the book as the Gospel according to Isaiah (Beavis, *Audience*, 110; Marcus, *Way*, 12–47).

from Exodus 23:20 and Malachi 3:1. The introductory text is taken straight from the LXX text of Exodus 23:20, where the focus of the text is on the preparation of Israel to enter into the Promised Land. More importantly, in contrast to the Jerusalem setting of Malachi passage, the use of Exodus communicates a wilderness context for the coming of the messenger.¹ Malachi 3:1 provides the basis for an understanding of the passage.² The role of the coming messenger is not, as in Exodus 23:20, to prepare Israel to enter the Promised Land. Malachi 3:1 is more explicit on the role and nature of the messenger and should be looked at primarily for an understanding of John the Baptist's role. The Markan redaction of Malachi 3:1 has been performed solely to highlight the role of John the Baptist as a preparer for the coming one, as is the emphasis in Isaiah 40:3 and in Markan usage. However, the choice of Malachi 3:1 for this purpose also prepares the reader for the Elijianic identity of John the Baptist.

Key to the understanding of the role of John the Baptist in Mark 1:1 are the terms ἄγγελος and ἀποστέλλω, from the LXX text of Malachi 3:1,³ and the term κατασκευάσει.⁴ It is evident that, both semantically and in light of the connections between John the Baptist and Malachi's prophetic preparer for the Lord, the ministry of John is indeed preparation for the coming of the Messiah. However, there is more explicit detail involved in the semantics of the LXX text of Malachi that are not often explored. In

¹ France, *Mark*, 63.

² Allusions to Malachi occur all throughout the first verse of Mark, while the Exodus passage, though quoted directly, has little influence on the interpretation of the passage aside from the wilderness context. It is likely that Exodus was chosen as a source for direct quotation in order to provide a wilderness context for the prophetic foreshadowing of John since a direct quotation of Malachi would omit the need for an Exodus reference, and highlight the temple as the context of the coming Messiah. It is no wonder then, since the rejection of the temple is a theme that will come to a peak with the mention of the Spirit in Mk 13, that Mark has chosen a wilderness context (France, *Mark*, 63).

³ There is a small difference in that the LXX uses ἐξαποστέλλω, drawn from Ex 23:20 which uses the term ἀποστέλλω. Though the former may be indicative of more highly nuanced speech in the Malachi passage, the difference is negligible in Mark's usage.

⁴ The text of Malachi 3 uses the term ἐπιβλέψεται to convey similar meaning.

the Malachi passage there is a strong implied connection between the heavenly ἄγγελος and Elijah.¹ Some have dismissed the title as reference to a vague angelic emissary from God, since the Markan paradigm for the term is indeed angelic and not used in the general sense of “messenger.”² However, evidence from Malachi seems to indicate otherwise. Mark is specific about the identity of John the Baptist as Elijah, and ἄγγελος in 1:1 is the only recorded singular reference to ἄγγελος in the Gospel. Every other reference occurs in the plural (1:13; 8:38; 12:25; 13:27, 32). Also, the text of 1:2 is redacted source material from Malachi, and may not be reflective of Mark’s own usage. Though not stated in the passage directly, it is highly likely that the LXX version of Malachi 3:1 is in direct reference to Elijah, and that it was Mark’s intention to portray John the Baptist as the returned Elijah. The LXX text reads ἰδοὺ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου, καὶ ἐξχαίφνης ἦξει εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ κύριος, ὃν ὑμεῖς ζητεῖτε, καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς διαθήκης, ὃν ὑμεῖς θέλετε, ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται. It is important to note that the differentiation between ὁ ἄγγελος and ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς διαθήκης is implicit in the text.³ The addition of τῆς διαθήκης seems to indicate a title, and denotes a new character. The passage, after it introduces the coming Lord and the messenger who will precede him and prepare for the coming of the Lord, is followed by a brief discourse on the day of the Lord’s coming. Though the identity of the messenger is vague at this point⁴ the same term is used in a similar context in the conclusion of the book that may provide definition for the ambiguous messenger.

¹ Merrill, *Malachi*, 430.

² See especially Joynes, “Elijah,” 463–66.

³ Hill notes that the Hebrew presents three major characters rather than simply two. He claims that מַלְאָכִי and מַלְאָךְ הַבְּרִיָּתָה are separate characters (Hill, *Malachi*, 265). The first is a generic messenger, who prepares the way, and the second is the messenger of the covenant.

⁴ מַלְאָכִי is the source of the title of the prophetic work and most scholars assume that it is a word play on the name of the author in the superscript (Hill, *Malachi*, 265–66; Merrill, *Malachi*, 429–32).

At the conclusion of Malachi the context appears to be the same. The discussion centres on the coming of a messenger who will precede the day of the Lord, and who will prepare for the coming of the Lord. The introductory language in this text is nearly identical to Malachi 3:1 and only the name of the messenger is substituted in the formula. That is, where Malachi 3:1 reads ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελον μου (LXX Mal 3:22), 4:5 reads ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω ὑμῖν Ηλιαν τὸν θισβίτην. The context of Malachi points to Elijah as the messenger who is to prepare for the coming of the Lord¹ and the LXX has added θισβίτην to the original to ensure that it is none other than the prophet himself who is to return, and not some type or Elijianic figure (1 Kgs 17:1).²

The reference to John the Baptist as an Elijah figure may be hidden in the text of Malachi 3:1. However, when combined with the likely allusion to Elijah in the depiction of John the Baptist in Mark 1:6, there is little doubt that Mark intends for the reader to make this connection. The LXX is most likely the source for the Markan allusion, though it is clear that Mark is not attempting to quote the passage as a whole. The first similarity between John and Elijah in the Markan text, that John wore a cloak of hair, does not quote directly from any passage describing Elijah. It does, however, record of a similarity between the two that has caused some to question whether Mark was trying to associate the two figures rhetorically, or if John himself was attempting to appear as the prophet.³ In either case, there is clear reference to the fact that John the Baptist is portrayed in Mark as an Elijianic figure. This first reference is vague, but not absent. In 4 Kingdoms

¹ Hill, *Malachi*, 265–66; Merrill, *Malachi*, 429–32.

² See esp. Öhler, *Elia*, 108. in Joynes, “Elijah,” 455–56.

³ Joynes, “Elijah,” 460–61.

1:8 Elijah is referred to as hairy (ἄνῆρ δυσῦς).¹ The Greek of 4 Kingdoms 1:8 does not compare to the description of John as ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου, and there are simply no grounds for the translation of אִישׁ בְּעֵל שָׁרָר as a man clothed in hair.² A similar formula is found in reference to prophets in general in Zechariah 13:4. However there is only the term θρίξ and a cognate of the verb ἐνδύω in common between the Markan and Zechariah passages, and only the context of a prophet in general shared. It is unlikely that that the two are connected. Rather, though there is no direct semantic correlation between 4 Kingdoms 1:8 and Mark 1:6, there are certainly suggestions that John appeared as Elijah might have, whether this is a conscious choice or not. John the Baptist, clothed in the hair of a camel, would have most certainly appeared hairy like the prophet Elijah³ and there is no symbolism lost in the lexical change between Malachi and Mark. The next verse, however, has both elements present. In a near exact quotation, Mark records that John wrapped himself with a leather belt.⁴ There is an unmistakable connection between John the Baptist and Elijah developed in the first episode of Mark. Furthermore, the connection developed allusively in the first chapter is confirmed by Jesus in Mark 9:13 when he claims that Ἡλίας ἐλήλυθεν, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῶ ὅσα ἤθελον, in reference to the arrest and death of John (cf. Mk. 1:14; 6:14-29).⁵

¹ France, *Mark*, 69; cf. Guelich, who claims that the allusion is not to Elijah, but to the nomadic prophet in general (Guelich, *Mark*, 21).

² Hobbs, *2 Kings*, 10. This has been a common assertion, especially among New Testament scholars. France is quick to assert that there are no other clothes mentioned in the passage besides the leather belt (France, *Mark*, 69; Witherington, *Mark*, 73).

³ Joynes argues that there may have been an Elijahic awareness in John the Baptist that may have motivated him to make himself appear like Elijah in this description (Joynes, "Elijah," 460). This would seem to include donning a garment of hair.

⁴ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ (Mk. 1:6). c.f. ζώνην δερματίνην περιεζωσμένος τὴν ὀσφύν αὐτοῦ (4 *Kgdms* 1:8).

⁵ Joynes claims that the text of Mark makes a clear differentiation between Elijah and John the Baptist in 6:14–16 (Joynes, "Elijah," 462). She is partially right, in that there is a differentiation made, but not necessarily a Markan one. The differentiation is made by Herod, who killed John the Baptist as a

A brief survey of the Old Testament passages concerning Elijah, and the prophets in general, reveals an unnatural omission in the description of John in Mark. The term πνεῦμα is used almost programmatically in association with Elijah. It was well recognized that Elijah was so apt to be moved by the Spirit that a search party was sent for him after he was taken up in order to ensure that the Spirit had not once again displaced him into the mountains (2 Kgs 2:16; cf. 1 Kgs 18:12). The phrase τὸ πνεῦμα Ἁλίου became synonymous with the anointing of Elijah, which was passed on to Elisha, and that typified both of their ministries (2 Kgs 2:9, 15; Sir 48:12; Lk 1:17). Similarly, the Scriptures frequently make mention of the activity of the Spirit in “the former prophets” among whom Elijah was a member (Neh 9:30 and Zech 7:12). It is odd that there is absolutely no mention of the Spirit in connection with the ministry of John the Baptist. He is called a prophet and associated with Elijah. He is called the messenger of God and is even sent by God to preach and baptize. Nevertheless, all mention of the Spirit in connection with John the Baptist is carefully avoided by Mark though he is connected with John the Baptist elsewhere (Lk 1:17). In short, one of the most likely figures in the entire Old Testament to be mentioned as driven by the Spirit, in the same passage which speaks of him as the God sent predecessor declaring the coming of the Lord carries no reference to the Spirit whatsoever. In contrast, the Spirit is generously attributed to Jesus and his ministry. The obvious conclusion is that the Spirit is used in Mark to denote a special anointing; the empowerment of the Spirit to enable the coming of the Kingdom of God through the ultimate figure placed against John in a great-greater

realization of his fears and out of his obvious ignorance. More than anything, this passage serves to denote the obvious confusion caused by Jesus’ ministry, not to make truthful statements about the natures of either Jesus or John the Baptist. On references to John as Elijah late in the text of Mark see Öhler, “Elijah,” 464–65.

contrast. That is, the Spirit is a presence in Jesus ministry alone in the prologue of Mark's Gospel and, though he plays a part in the ministry of Elijah, there is no mention of the Spirit in connection with the ministry of John the Baptist. In the Markan prologue the Spirit serves to elevate the divinity and exclusivity of messianic calling that is present in Jesus Christ, the Messiah, the Son of God.

2.2 *Jesus*

As it has already been shown by Mark's usage of the Old Testament in connection with John the Baptist, it is Mark's intention to limit the Spirit to the ministry of Jesus, though Old Testament allusion would more than justify attributing the Spirit to John. John is the ultimate God sent prophet, who is the very person of Elijah, and has been given the task of preparing for the coming of the Lord himself. Yet, despite this emphasis, there is not a single mention of the Spirit as an empowerer of John's ministry. In this section, Mark's use of the Old Testament and shaping of the content of Mark 1:1–13 will be shown to present Jesus as the God-sent son of God who is uniquely empowered and directed by the Spirit of God to accomplish his mission, which is the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. This will be done by demonstrating that Mark portrays Jesus as the Son of God, upon whom the Spirit has descended with language reminiscent of Davidic psalms and promises for the king of Israel. It will also be shown that Mark shapes the narrative by omitting all details that do not point to the singular function of the Spirit to direct Jesus, as evidenced by the slim content of the temptation account in contrast with the synoptics, while the Spirit remains at the forefront of the Markan account.

Mark 1:2–3 and the quotation from Malachi 3 and Isaiah 40, though they are focussed primarily on John the Baptist, contain some of the highest christology in the

synoptics. This, in contrast with the shroud of mystery that Jesus surrounds himself with in the rest of the Gospel, has caused some to doubt the originality of the text, citing irreconcilable differences between the opening verses and the remainder of the Gospel.¹ These differences provide the reader with an understanding of Jesus that the characters of the Gospel are not privy to prior to meeting him. They are left to decide for themselves whether faith ought to be placed in Jesus or not.²

2.2.1 *Prophecies concerning Jesus*

Of major consequence to an understanding of the representation of Jesus in Mark 1:23 is the identity of σου from 1:2 and ὁ κύριος from 1:3. The answer is clarified by the context of Isaiah 40:3. Just as Jesus is introduced in 1:1 as υἱὸς θεοῦ, now Mark is comparing him to the Lord of Israel.³ There is no doubt that the usage of κύριος in the LXX is in reference to the Lord of Israel, whether the original Hebrew is the exclusive יהוה of Israel, or the more general יהוה, which can apply to a human lord. Both terms are used within the two verses quoted by Mark, the former in Isaiah 40:3 and the latter in Malachi 3:1. With this in mind, though some may argue that the term κύριος from the LXX is ambiguous, there is no doubt that, given the Hebrew roots of the term, not only in יהוה, but also in יהוה, the idea that Jesus is being represented as anything less than deity is preposterous.⁴ Jesus is treated as the coming Lord and the day of his coming is the

¹ See especially Croy, who dismisses Mk 1:1 with some textual support, and Elliott, who dismisses the whole section from 1:1–3 with no textual support for the latter half of his omission (Croy, “Text,” 127; Elliott, “Addition,” 586).

² Many scholars have noted the programmatic nature of Mk 1, though it differs widely in tone with the rest of the Gospel. Rowe calls this “a coherence of themes” that exists between the two (Rowe, *Kingdom*, 118).

³ France, *Mark*, 69–70.

⁴ Contra Bultmann (Bultmann, “Confession,” 273–90; cited in Boring, “Christology,” 452–54).

coming day of the Lord from Malachi. Simply, John the Baptist is none less than Elijah who prepares for none less than the coming Lord of Israel.

2.2.2 *The Baptism of Jesus*

At Jesus' baptism there is mention of the heavens being split and the Spirit descending upon Jesus in the form of a dove. In the tension between historicity and Markan rhetoric, this passage is often left by the wayside and is attributed to Christian legend concerning Jesus.¹ The question seems to be whether the text has a meaning outside of the historical acknowledgement of the Spirit descending on Jesus or, if it was a necessary addition by a redactor whose intent was to portray Jesus as divine. It is not necessary to answer no to either of these questions. The inclusion of the historical Spirit-descent must be recognized as an integral part of the Markan strategy. The inclusion of this episode and its placement in proximity to the arrival of Jesus from Galilee, the proclamation of John concerning the coming baptiser, and the testing by the Spirit in the desert is no accident of history.

Rather, Mark has placed these episodes in quick succession and has most likely excluded much of what was known about the event in early tradition.² There is little known about the sources of any of the Gospels, and it is likely that the authors of Matthew and Luke had copies of Mark and other hypothetical source documents. However, the omission of material contained in these sources from the Markan prologue does not necessitate that this material was not available to Mark, since any source material would most likely be involved in the tradition and worship of the church. It is more likely that Mark, as the

¹ Esp. Dibelius, *Tradition*, 271; Bultmann, *History*, 247; and Demaris, "Possession," 3. It is of some significance that, though he dismisses the entire even as myth, the meaning of the passage is not lost on Dibelius. That he understands that the Spirit's work is to affirm Jesus' divinity is clear when he writes: "Jesus at this moment was instituted Son of God. [...] this was made plain by the descent of the Spirit upon him" (Dibelius, *Tradition*, 271).

² The events discussed in Mk 1:8–11 are paralleled in the synoptic Gospels, but include only a fraction of the information reported in the Matthean and Lukan accounts. See Mt 3:11–4:11, and Lk 3:16–22, 4:1–13 which includes a genealogy between the baptism and temptation accounts.

earliest writer, chose to record that material that directly supported his claims. With this in mind, it is significant that three episodes in which the Spirit plays a major part are grouped together in rapid succession in the introduction of Mark, which already displays differences from the remainder of the text. In order to provide an accurate summary of the text, the accounts of Jesus' baptism and temptation will be discussed individually. It is important, however, to understanding the close proximity that these stories share, and the unique emphasis on the Spirit in the Markan prologue, with such a concentration of references to the Spirit in stories that have already been reduced to their basic forms. With this in mind, it is difficult to deny that the Markan prologue has a unique emphasis on the Spirit as the director of Jesus' ministry.

The baptism narrative in the Gospel of Mark is proof-positive that Mark was not only familiar with the LXX, but also highly aware of early tradition concerning Jesus and with first century Judaic messianism. This is due to the fact that, though there is no direct quotation from the Old Testament in Mark 1:9–11, the passage is rife with reference to ideas present in the Old Testament Scriptures. These ideas have already been documented in a study by Edwards, but are pertinent enough to the discussion of the Spirit to be included in part here. Edwards notes that the descent of the Spirit, the tearing of the heavens, and the voice of God present at the baptism of Jesus are all reminiscent of events that will occur at the eschatological coming of the Kingdom of God in Judaic and intertestamental prophecy.¹

There is a perfect parallel to Mark 1:9–11 with the tearing of the sky in Isaiah 64. The terms in the LXX and Mark are similar, though they are exactly the same in the

¹ This is especially evident in *T. Levi* 18:6–8 and *T. Jud* 24:1–3. He notes that the dating of *T. 12P* is controversial, but that it was written no later than 107 BC (Edwards, "Baptism," 43–44).

Lukan and Matthean accounts. It seems, however, that the idea of Isaiah 64 is being alluded to, though Mark has strengthened the term from ἀνοίγω to σχίζω. The *T. Levi* passage, however, uses the word σχίζω, suggesting that, at the very least, Mark's reference to Isaiah has been formed partially by intertestamental messianism, which awaits the coming of the Lord to rule (*T. Levi* 18:6–8).¹

The source of the nearest parallel to the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus in the Markan prologue is in Isaiah, and the Isaianic ideal is mirrored in intertestamental messianism. Edwards reads the passage most closely through intertestamental messianism in *T. Jud.* 24:2.² He claims that the Markan concepts of the Spirit and Messiah are more likely linked closer to those of intertestamental thought than their predecessors in Isaianic Judaism. However, he also points to three Isaianic passages which may provide a closer image of the Spirit and his operation at the baptism of Jesus. Isaiah 42:1 mentions the coming of the Spirit upon his servant. The language of Isaiah 42:1 contains both the reference to the Spirit descending upon God's chosen vessel³ and quite possibly provides the source for Mark's record of God's words from heaven in Mark 1:11 (Σὺ εἶ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός; cf. ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου).⁴ Allusion to Isaiah 11 is also notable, as it records that the Spirit rested upon the coming Davidid and effected his reign upon the earth in wisdom under the direction of the Lord. This is a near perfect match to the concepts presented in the Markan text. The Spirit of

¹ Edwards, "Baptism," 43–44.

² Edwards, "Baptism," 47.

³ Isaiah reads ἐπ' αὐτὸν, while Mark uses εἰς αὐτὸν (Edwards, "Baptism," 48).

⁴ Van Iersel is hesitant to make this connection, since the language is quite different (*Mark.* 101). However, Guelich is quite happy to note some resemblance (Guelich, *Mark.* 34). France admits the connection, though he is not thoroughly convinced there are not better references elsewhere (France, *Mark.* 80–82). There is, admittedly, little connective tissue between the two passages, except for some reminiscence in the form of a catch phrase, which evokes a much larger understanding than the words themselves communicate.

the Lord enters Jesus the Messiah and, led by the Spirit, he propagates the rule of the Lord through preaching of the Kingdom of God (Mk 1:15), which leads to the destruction of the kingdom of Satan.¹ As the Spirit in the Davidid will establish the reign of God through him, so the Spirit operates in Jesus to establish the reign of God on earth.

This is only confirmed by the final element of the Baptism account, which records the voice from heaven declaring Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. This passage is undoubtedly a combination of Psalm 2:7 (Υἱός μου εἶ σύ),² which effectively describes the enthronement of the King, and Isaiah 42:1 (ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχὴ μου),³ describing the suffering of the servant of God. As these verses are blended, the ideas combine in Mark to introduce the King of Israel, the one will bring effect the rule of the Kingdom of God on earth. Similarly as is reflected in the ultimate establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth in Mark in the passion, the introduction of that king from heaven contains elements of a suffering servant. Jesus is introduced from heaven as a suffering servant who will effect the rule of God on earth. All of this will be effected by the Spirit of God, since it is the leading of the Spirit that, though it is not as prominent in the Isaianic sources, dominated the text of Mark. This is especially clear in contrast to the large amount of source material which is excluded from the text of Mark.

There are definite connections in the text of Mark to the exodus. The similarities include the use of the number forty to symbolize the duration of the exodus in years and

¹ O'Brien, "Principalities," 110–50. For more detail see discussion on the Kingdom of Satan in chapter 4.

² It is here, as well as in the pronouncement of Jesus as Christ, that the connection between the Kingdom of God and the Spirit is clearest in the epilogue. Though it is not mentioned specifically until Jesus' ministry begins in 1:14, it is clear that this is precisely what Jesus is being prepared for. It is the Spirit who is accomplishing this preparation (Rowe, *Kingdom*, 108, 165).

³ See note above on the challenges of this association, though Rowe has no doubt whatsoever (Rowe, *Kingdom*, 117).

the temptation in days, the wilderness context, and the heavenly provision.¹ There are many implications that could be brought to the text of Mark from the exodus, however it seems that the most important similarity is the passages' mutual use of the term *πειραζόμενος* (1:13).² Simply stated, the desert was for Jesus, as it was for Israel, a testing ground for faithfulness to God. That is, the outcome of the temptation is not recorded because the temptation itself is not perceived as a threat to Jesus. Rather, it shows his faithfulness to the leading of God.³ It must be noted that the temptation accounts in Matthew and Luke contain a great amount of Exodus symbolism. It is not inconceivable that the tradition recorded in Matthew and Luke predates all of the synoptic Gospels, including Mark, the earliest.⁴ It should be noted that, though there is a good chance that Mark was aware of the larger body of tradition that was later incorporated into the other synoptics' temptation accounts, he records very little. Only that Jesus was tested, that Satan was his tempter and that he was there by the action of the Holy Spirit is recorded. Since Mark is widely recognized as a source document, it is difficult to analyse Markan redaction. However, it is highly likely that the full record of Jesus' temptation existed in the oral tradition surrounding the account. It is significant that, despite the

¹ Gibson notes especially the use of the number forty and the wilderness context to denote similarities between Jesus' temptation in the desert and the wilderness trials of Israel, in order to refine an understanding of the temptation account from the relative dearth of information given by Mark (Gibson, "Temptation," 17–18).

² With this in mind, Gibson claims that other elements, including the wilderness context, the tempter etc., all serve to define the central the usage of both Mark's and Exodus' use of the term (Gibson, "Temptation," 3–34).

³ Gibson notes that the excluded information from Mark's temptation account does not imply a lack of a conclusion to the question of the nature and result of Jesus' temptation. Rather, all of those details are available implicitly from the information given. He argues that the temptation account is inseparably joined to the baptism account and that the two together show that Jesus is the Son of God who is moved by God. The temptation serves as a display of connectedness between God and Jesus. The outcome of Jesus' temptation was never in question (Gibson, "Temptation," 3–34).

⁴ Barnett argues that the majority of the Christian theology applied and recorded in the New Testament, and especially in the Pauline epistles, predates the New Testament (Barnett, *Birth*). With this in mind, it is not unlikely that Mark, though he has not recorded some of the traditional material that was later incorporated into Matthew and Luke, was aware of it.

wealth of information concerning the temptation of Jesus, Mark chooses only to acknowledge that Jesus was tempted as a result of the action of the Spirit upon him. Thus, though the Spirit is not featured as heavily in other sections of the Gospel, in the introduction the Spirit is intimately connected with the direction of Jesus. This is especially clear in his connection with the anointing of Jesus as the Davidic king that has just been established in the previous verses. However, there is also the record of Jesus' interaction with wild animals to consider, which has been detrimental to this conclusion in the past, but will be shown to support it.

The consideration of the wild animals and their nature alone has drawn a wide and varied response.¹ However, it is best interpreted in the dual light of the nature of Jesus' temptation and period literature concerning wild animals. The Gospel of Mark has already displayed a resemblance to *T.12P* in the Baptism account, which Gibson argues is synonymous with the temptation account.² *T.Naph.* portrays a scene almost identical to this in which Satan is said to flee the subject, the animals are afraid of him, and the angels stand by him.³ The presence of animals in the desert, their association with Satan in *T.Naph.*, and the record of a temptation by Satan in the desert only places Jesus in a position of dominion over all the fearful beasts of *T.Naph.* The passage describes a victorious Jesus, not only over Satan, but over the wild beasts of the desert. With this in mind, the focus of Mark is on presenting Jesus as the anointed Son of God and suffering servant who is in all ways guided by the Spirit in his conquest over the power of Satan

¹ Guelich claims that Jesus is at peace with the wild beasts and that this peace is symbolic of a restored Adam typology (Guelich, *Mark*, 39). Heil has concluded that the wild beasts are representative of the arduous nature of Jesus' temptation, and propagate a suffering servant motif in the Gospel (Heil, "Animals," 63–78). Gibson argues similar to Guelich, using μετά to indicate that he had somehow subdued them and that he was their master (Gibson, "Temptation," 3–34).

² Gibson, "Temptation," 6–9.

³ *T.Naph* 8:4 (France, *Mark*, 87).

and in the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the earth. This is shown through the baptism account and its emphasis on Jesus as the messianic hope, and establisher of the Kingdom who is so by the presence and leading of the Spirit, and who is displayed subject to the action of the Spirit upon him and victorious over the power of Satan.

2.3 Conclusions on Mark's use of the Old Testament and the Spirit in the Prologue

It has effectively been shown that, in Mark's use of the Old Testament and intertextual literature. Mark understood John to be Elijah, the beginning of the Gospel and forerunning prophet for Yahweh himself. Mark understood that Jesus was the Lord that John prophesied, the Son of God, the Christ, and the perfect embodiment of the expected saviour and king who would come after Elijah. His rule was anointed. He was fully proven and prepared in baptism in temptation for his reign. Son of God and anointed king combine in the Markan text in the form of Jesus, and the anointed king is the ruler of the Gospel's Kingdom of God. The Spirit is at work intrinsically in this process. The Spirit in the prologue is given exclusively to Jesus the anointed king and thus serves to both prepare and mark Jesus as the only qualified candidate for the role of anointed king. The Spirit in the prologue, in light of Mark's Old Testament usage, is the marker of the true messianic king.

Conclusions

The Spirit functions in the book of Mark to demarcate the special and unique anointing that Jesus has to bring about the coming of the Kingdom of God. That is, the Spirit works in the Gospel to signify that Jesus is the Son of God and the only one competent to rule as God on earth. This pattern is continued into the church age, where the disciples continue Jesus' ministry with the Spirit as their director and mover as they work in the face of

great persecution. This schema is the result of a dialogical combination of several passages in Mark. However, the first chapter alone begins the process by which the Spirit in Jesus is defined. In it, Jesus is shown to be superior to even the God-sent Elijianic prophet John. The language surrounding Jesus testifies to his position as the Son of God, who even the God-sent prophet is unworthy of. Further, the Spirit is used as a marker of this sonship, not to symbolise conversion, as in Dunn, but to symbolize that Jesus is the divine heir to the Kingdom of God. Similarly, the use of Old Testament allusion re-establishes this great-greater than relationship which exists between John and Jesus and points to John as the preparer for the coming of the Lord. Jesus is the coming Lord whose reign is affirmed in the voice from heaven. Similarly, in the temptation account the contrast between the rising Kingdom of God against Satan's kingdom is predicted as Jesus, by the Spirit, is triumphant over Satan and the Kingdom of God is begun on the earth.

Chapter 3

THE SPIRIT IN MARK 3:20–30

Mark 3:20–30 stands at the centre of an episode focused on the identity of Jesus. Up to this point Jesus has been prophesied, anointed, and tested, all by the Spirit. He has begun his public ministry, which is characterized by healing and preaching the coming of the Kingdom of God. At this point, it is the central concern of the text to portray the public recognition or rejection of Jesus. With this in mind, any examination of the passage must take the general context of the passage in mind, remembering that the Spirit in Mark is closely related to Mark's christology. That is, in an examination of the Spirit in Mark, and especially Mark 3:20–30, the question must be asked why the Spirit appears in a passage designed to portray the public acceptance and rejection of Jesus? The passage itself follows a description of Jesus' miraculous activity. At its very beginning, Jesus is accused of demonic activity. What follows is Jesus' response to his accusers in the form of a parable recounting a homeowner and a plunderer. The passage comes to a conclusion with a warning concerning the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. It will be argued here that the Spirit is intrinsically connected with the mission of Jesus to overcome the spiritual kingdom of Satan, by establishing the Kingdom of God on earth through the Spirit. The

Spirit, though he is not a major emphasis in the Gospel, is strongly connected with the development of the Kingdom of God and the defeat of the kingdom of Satan, and is even given credit for it at this junction. In this passage, it is equally the goal of the Spirit to overcome the kingdom of Satan as it is Jesus' goal. Jesus himself insinuates in 3:20–30 that the Spirit is the guiding and empowering force, at work in Jesus for the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth which displaces the kingdom of Satan. This will be established by an examination of the unforgivable sin in order to display that the Spirit is active in Jesus' ministry. Following this, the parable of the binding of the strongman will be examined to show that the Markan emphasis on the binding of the kingdom of Satan contributes to the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the earth. The parable of the strongman is the first concrete statement of Jesus' intention to destroy the kingdom of Satan. However, he has been acting on it since the inauguration of his ministry, and his spiritual empowerment and testing in the first chapter. This ministry will be examined in order to display the building of the Kingdom of God over the kingdom of Satan through the release of those captive to Satan's rule in the miraculous ministry of Jesus. This pattern begins in Jesus' inaugural act in ministry among an innumerable crowd, and is confirmed in the exorcism of the man possessed with many demons in the opening verses of the fifth chapter, which is linked strongly to the Markan account of the unforgivable sin and the parable of the strongman. With this in mind, this chapter will attempt to show that Mark portrays the Spirit as that force that moves and drives the ministry of Jesus as he brings the Kingdom of God to earth and displaces the former spiritual kingdom, that of Satan. In order to accomplish this, Jesus' response to the Pharisees' accusations that Jesus accomplished the displacement of Satan's kingdom by Satan will be shown to place the

Spirit as an active mover in the ministry of Jesus. Second, the accusations of the Pharisees themselves will be examined to show that Mark wishes his readers to understand that Jesus' ministry is concerned with the founding of the Kingdom of God on earth and the displacement of the kingdom of Satan. Also, it will be shown that these two goals are not features of Jesus' ministry alone, but are the result of his spiritual empowerment. This will be accomplished with an examination of the Pharisees accusations and Jesus' response in Mark 3:20–27. The passage itself seems to indicate that the Spirit has been behind the ministry of Jesus from the start. This is especially clear when one considers the programmatic statements concerning the Spirit in the prologue¹ and the textual similarities between the present text and the ministry of Jesus in 1:21–28, and 5:1–10. These two texts will be examined so that their connections with 3:20–30 can be shown to prove that the Spirit is at work in the text beyond the present pericope. This influence is most clearly present at certain points in the discourse of Mark 1:1–5:10.

1. *The Relationship between the Spirit and Jesus in Mark 3:28–30*

Though this passage occurs at the conclusion of the pericope examined here, it serves as a summary statement which gives meaning to all that has been written before it, and acts programmatically for all that will follow. Jesus' accusation that the Pharisees have committed a crime against the Spirit portrays the Spirit as an active participant in his ministry, since their accusations were directed against both him and the Spirit within him. As is typical of the Gospel of Mark outside of the prologue, the Spirit receives little mention, and occurs only once in this pericope. However, this particular pericope

¹ For the programmatic function of the Spirit in the Markan prologue, see the discussion in chapter 3. Scholars who emphasise the programmatic nature of the Spirit in Mark I include Keener (Keener, *Spirit*, 49–90), and Hooker (Hooker, *Mark*, 51). There is also similar discussion on the Spirit in Luke-Acts (Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 15).

displays several qualities that distinguish it from the surrounding text, including a geographical differentiation from the entire second episode.¹ This occurs in the form of an intrusion by the Jerusalemite Pharisees into Galilee. As such, this section will establish that the Spirit is strongly present in the ministry of Jesus at this point and especially, as the following argument will show, in the exorcisms performed by Jesus, which are both symbolic and functional representations of the victory of the Kingdom of God over Satan. This argument will be followed in later sections by further discussion which will define the ministry of Jesus, and also expand the implications of the Spirit in this passage to the text of 1:14–5:10.

1.1. *The Spirit in the Text of Mark 3:28–30*

The discourse on the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit in Mark 3:28–30 is a pivotal text in the development of how Jesus' audience understands his nature and ministry.² It is certainly not the first time that Jesus has been challenged in his ministry to this point, nor is it the first time that a character in the text has been accused of blasphemy. Only one chapter earlier Jesus himself was accused of blasphemy for forgiving the sins of a paralytic in

¹ Many of the proposed structures of Mark use geography as justification for the division of the text into episodes. Notably, though he is by no means alone, France divides the text into a prologue (1:2–13), an episode on Jesus' ministry in Galilee (1:14–8:21), an episode concerning Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, which also emphasizes Jesus' teachings about the cross (8:22–10:52), and an episode on Jesus in Jerusalem (11:1–16:8) (France, *Mark*, 11–15). There are several scholars whose divisions are nearly exactly the same including (Dowd, *Mark*; Witherington, *Mark*; van Iersel, *Mark*). It is of interest, then, that the first episode, which records only Jesus' ministry in Galilee, should present Jesus with opposition to his message at the only instance where the Jerusalem establishment leaves Jerusalem to hear Jesus in Galilee. France notes that these are not resident Pharisees, but that they have come up from Jerusalem for the purpose of confronting Jesus (France, *Mark*, 169). Even this is not without significance since, in the remainder of the text, the Spirit will not only appear in the context of the development of the Markan theology of the Kingdom, but in contexts which place the Spirit in conflict with Jerusalem or its authorities (for a discussion of the relationship between ministry and conflict, Galilee and Jerusalem see Lightfoot, *Locality*; Lohmeyer, *Galiläa*; France, *Mark*, 34–35).

² France notes that Jesus' ministry is summarized succinctly in his exorcisms. These are more than simple shows of power over demons. Rather, they are symbolic of the downfall of the kingdom of Satan. At this point, the audience realizes that the work of Jesus is the destruction of Satan's kingdom and that the Spirit is intrinsically at work in the ministry of Jesus to accomplish this goal (France, *Mark*, 168–69).

need of healing (2:7). The accusation, however, came with the qualifier τίς δύναται ἀφείναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός; The question is a rhetorical one, which presumes that the answer is negative, and that Jesus is not God.¹ However, the statement is one of many used by Mark to demonstrate that Jesus is, in fact, God. Mark often refers to accusations of blasphemy in passages designed to reaffirm Jesus' divinity or spiritual empowerment. This pattern is continued in the accusation that the Pharisees had committed blasphemy, having failed to recognize the work of the Spirit when they see it and even attributing it to Satan. This particular text, however, is the first acknowledgement of impetus since Jesus' baptism and testing/proof narrative in 1:9–13, though he has personally acknowledged his status or nature on a few occasions to this point in the narrative.² As a result, with the support of the adjoining text,³ whatever claims Jesus makes can be understood to be programmatic to the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. It is Jesus' ministry that is challenged and the discourse on the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit is in response to that challenge.

¹ As indicated by the use of μή to negate the question (Porter, *Idioms*, 277). Witherington places a great deal of emphasis on these questions. As such, this particular one is typical of the first episode of the Gospel, in which Jesus is unknown. The primary question posed by this episode is “who is Jesus?” (Mk 1–8:27), and it is followed by episodes answering this question (Mk 8:27–30), detailing Jesus' mission as Christ (Mk 8:31–10:32), and a final episode in which Jesus the Christ fulfills his mission on the cross (Mk 11–16) (Witherington, *Mark*, 37–39).

² Though they are often disguised in double speak, such as Jesus' claim in Mk. 2:28 that ὥστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου. As discussed in chapter 3, this most likely a reference to the eschatological figure. However, it is suitably masked in an idiom that, apart from intertextual reference, could easily be a Hebraism for “human.” Similarly, France has concluded that the term in context does not refer to the rights of all humanity, but to Jesus himself (France, *Mark*, 147–48). Since Mark has already established that Jesus is in fact Lord, with divine implications (see chapter 4 on intertextuality and Jesus), this is most likely a double spoken claim to divinity by Jesus. See also Mk 3:12, though his acknowledgement here is not publicly explicit.

³ This will be discussed at length in § 2.

The passage itself begins¹ with the phrase ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν (3:28).² It is not an uncommon phrase in Jesus' teaching, and occurs in this form and in the Johannine form where ἀμὴν is repeated. The formula is unique to Jesus, however, and is not found in any other period literature. It is distinct from the claims of any other teaching predating Jesus. Commentators have come to the conclusion that it is a formula denoting the self reliance of Jesus as testimony for his words.³ That is, Jesus was not in need of any support for his teaching. Jesus' teaching gained its authority from him or whatever empowered and directed him. He continues from there by declaring πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ ἀμαρτήματα καὶ αἱ βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἔαν βλασφημήσωσιν (Mk 3:28). Assuming the same group of Pharisees are present, it is interesting to note the similarities between Mark 3:28 and 2:5, 10. Just as blasphemy is the central concern in both passages, so is forgiveness, and the same term is used for both in both cases. In the first passage, Jesus forgives and is accused of blasphemy. In the latter case, Jesus declared that both all sins⁴ and "all the blasphemies that [one] can blaspheme" will be forgiven. He

¹ It begins with the telling of the parable of the binding of the strongman. This section, however, will consider itself only with the latter half, concerning the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit directly.

² This phrase is the basis for future claims that Jesus speaks on his own authority and, as such, it is unparalleled in Jewish literature (France, *Mark*, 175). Guelich goes as far as to compare it to the introductory phrase of a prophet "Thus says the Lord," which places even more emphasis on the weight of Jesus' words (Guelich, *Mark*, 177).

³ See esp. Dunn, *Jesus*, 79; France, *Mark*, 174–75; Guelich, *Mark*, 177; Witherington, *Mark*, 158 etc.

⁴ Many scholars differentiate between the use of ἀμάτημα (Mk 1:28; 3:29) and ἀμαρτία (Mk 2:5). The former is called a guilty offence, while the latter is any wrong act committed regardless of intention (*TDNT*; cf. *NIDNTT*). However, this definition does not adequately summarize the usage in Mark 3, though it takes into account a great deal of previous contextual studies. It has been argued, most vocally by Eugene Nida, that the definition of any term ought not to be explored universally in these instances. Rather, a word should be considered based on lexical similarities within the its immediate context (Nida, "Context," 20). This is the same theory at work in the idea of semantic chaining, which will be discussed briefly in this chapter, and has found applications in other texts. This theory can be seen at work in Westfall's examination of Hebrews (Westfall, "Ties"). With this in mind, France is close in his estimation that ἀμάτημα does little more than provide a general synonym for βλασφημία, since blasphemy is called the αἰώνιον ἀμάτημα (France, *Mark*, 175). However, it is more likely that Mark intended ἀμάτημα to be both synonymous with and inclusive of blasphemy. The term is used to round out Jesus claim to include every conceivable wrong (hence the nominative πάντα ἀμάτημα, which surrounds the entire phrase), with none of the trivial implications placed on the term by standard lexicons.

then continues with the grave warning ὅς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος (3:29). It is important to note the development that occurs surrounding the idea of forgiveness, blasphemy, sin and eternity. The first three terms act together to describe a set of relationships involving forgiveness, sin and blasphemy, and the implications are eternal. All sin and blasphemy will be forgiven, but blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not.

There is a second set of terms, representative of the characters within the text, which aid in the conceptual development of the passage. The first character is Jesus, who is introduced by name in 3:7. From that point, he is referred to in the third singular until 3:23. Here he is introduced as the speaker and is referred to in the first person from that point until 3:30. The second Markan character is actually a group. Jesus' audience is identified in 3:23 in the third plural αὐτούς.¹ Finally, the last group of characters is called οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, and is inclusive of all humanity.² With this in mind Jesus instructs his audience, on his own authority, that every human being will be excused of every sinful act and any number of blasphemies, or as much blasphemy as any one of them is capable. In contrast, the consequences of blasphemy towards the Holy Spirit are eternal and unforgivable. That is, blasphemy of the Holy Spirit results in eternal

¹ There are three plural groups mentioned in the discourse before this point. This most likely refers to the last group, the Pharisees. Williams sees this as a part of a recurrent pattern in which those who are "outside of the kingdom", including the Pharisees, are constantly spoken to in parables in Jesus' teaching. In contrast, those on the inside by faith are spoken to directly (Williams, *Followers*, 107). As such, it might be said that "the messianic secret" of Mark is an inappropriate title for information that is available by faith, and only hidden from those who cannot or will not understand. After the prologue, where Jesus is identified in no uncertain terms, the Markan narrative turns to Jesus among the unknowing crowds composed of "men and women who stumble around, wondering what is happening" (Hooker, *Message*, 16; in France, *Mark*, 58–59). Concerning this claim, Williams is more closely focussed on the reader than even France and Hooker. His argument is that the minor characters in Mark are presented as part of Mark's rhetorical strategy, and that the minor characters, are designed to display the right and wrong responses to Jesus, with the intention of influencing the reader to choose the right response to Jesus' message (Williams, *Followers*, 89–90).

² Guelich, *Mark*, 178.

condemnation. However, their blasphemy¹ and any number of sinful acts will be forgiven, presumably by the one who declared it true by his own authority.

It is important to note that ἀμάρτημα, the term used for sin here, stands out in the Gospel of Mark. It occurs twice in quick succession at this point, but never again in the remainder of the Gospel. There are two other occurrences of the term in the New Testament. Both of them appear in the Pauline epistles. Though some have attempted to separate their meanings to refer to “sinful acts” rather than “sin” in general,² the semantic differences ought not to be overstated in the theological development of “what can be forgiven.” It is likely that the term was chosen for two principal reasons. First, the usage implied in ἀμάρτημα over ἀμαρτία is better suited to its parallel αἱ βλασφημίαι ὅσα ἐὰν βλασφημήσωσιν. That is, ἀμάρτημα may fit better semantically in contexts where individual actions are the subject, though this should not be applied as a general rule. This is likely in the context of a phrase like “all of the blasphemies that you can commit.” This is especially pertinent when it is considered that the phrase is directed against the Pharisees, who were notorious for their categorization of individual ἀμάρτημα. Second, the rarity of the term, in contrast to the frequency of usage of ἀμαρτία, suggests that the passage was intended to stand out as unique in the Gospel.

The term blasphemy itself, however, presents the reader with a bit of a puzzle. The term has two senses in first-century usage. The first usage seems to denote a religious infraction, which some limit to speaking the name of God in accordance with classical rabbinic literature,³ while the general term seems to indicate slander, or verbal

¹ See discussion on popular and Markan usages of βλασφημέω to follow.

² Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 6:18 (Guelich, *Mark*, 178–79).

³ *m.Sanh* 7.5 (Collins, “Blasphemy,” 379–401; France, *Mark*, 175).

defamation.¹ It is in cases such as these where strictly drawn lines, especially strictly drawn rabbinic lines, are not necessarily reflective of common usage.² There are several other charges of blasphemy in the Gospel of Mark. Each of these appears to be used in a religious sense. Though the context in 2:5 has already been discussed, it is clear that the intended meaning was that Jesus had committed blasphemy by claiming to be God, or committing actions that only God can commit. This in itself tends to describe blasphemy in the text of Mark as it is applied to Jesus. It finds its ultimate expression in the trial of Jesus, where Jesus is asked if he is, in fact, the Son of God.³ There is no mention of the name θεός during Jesus' trial, which leaves one of three possibilities for the nature of his blasphemy. The first possibility is that the trial was in Hebrew and that Jesus' pronunciation that "I am" in context was close enough to the name YHWH to justify blasphemy, though this is unlikely due to the common nature of the simple phrase. The second acknowledges that ἐγώ εἰμι is a quotation from the LXX and would most likely have been reference enough to accuse Jesus of claiming to be none less than the God of Israel himself, whether that name was spoken or not.⁴ However, neither of these first two

¹ See especially Tit 3:2 (Louw & Nida).

² France argues that the term has more than one sense. The rabbinic technical sense is clearly defined against the wider range of meaning. The rabbinic sense limits itself to uttering the divine name of God, while the popular usage, in France's estimation, is something closer to slander (France, *Mark*, 175). For the purposes of this study, the term will be acknowledged to have a single sense, that of a serious defamation, with both religious and pedestrian applications. Furthermore, Evans has criticised those interpretations of the term which rely to heavily on Mishnah. The traditions which define blasphemy as the uttering of the divine name are too late to be of any influence to the Markan text. Rather, any speech or action that is offensive to God or his representatives, and even sin in general can be understood as a blasphemy against God (Evans, *Mark*, 453–55).

³ Σὺ εἶ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ; (Mk 14:61). Uttering the name of God is not the only sense that blasphemy carries. However, it is certainly true in this case as Jesus' accusers opt for εὐλογητοῦ rather than speaking the name of God.

⁴ The first instance of this formula is found in reference to God speaking to Abraham. Here God says Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου (Gen 17:1). In the context of this first appearance of the formula, there is no doubt who the referent is and how ἐγώ εἰμι would have been interpreted. Most scholars, however, have dismissed this connection. It is most likely true that ἐγώ εἰμι, in this instance, was simply the common positive response "I am he." The term is quite often designated divine in Johannine Literature (see esp.

possibilities are likely. With this in mind, it is equally unlikely that Mark's understanding of terms like βλασφημέω is similar to the classical rabbinic usage. It is likely that a third option is more reflective of Mark's understanding. Any positive answer to the question posed in 14:61 would have been enough to justify the crucifixion of Jesus. Even though Jesus did not use the divine name, there is no question that by responding "ἐγώ εἰμι" Jesus claimed a whole host of divine titles implied by the council's question, leading to a charge of blasphemy.¹

There is a final option, however, that is far more likely than any previously discussed. To this point, discussion of Jesus' blasphemy has centred on the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι. Jesus' blasphemy most likely did not stem from his use of this phrase. Ἐγώ εἰμι is a phrase that is, more often than not, theologically loaded. No examination of any pericope in which the phrase occurs would be complete without consideration of its usage. However, in this case, there are no divine implications in Jesus' use of the phrase and closer attention should be paid to the whole of Jesus' answer.² According to Evans, Jesus' references to Old Testament prophetic literature shed a great deal more light on the

Barrett, *St. John*, 282–83; Beasley–Murray, *John*, 89–90, 130–31; Bruce, *Gospel*, 148, 193) and even in pseudepigraphal works. Sell is of the opinion that the term is a divine designation in Mat 16:13–19, as well as in what he claims is a reference to this claim in *Acts Pet 12 Apost* (Sell, "Confession," 344–56). However, Bultmann has summarized several differing usages of the term in John variously (Bultmann, *John*, 225–26). In light of Bultmann's analysis of Johannine usage of ἐγώ εἰμι, it is doubtful that this constitutes a direct reference to the divine name, though the implications of Jesus' answer may be equivalent. Evans is of the opinion that Jesus reply was not a reference to the divine name, but rather a reversal of position in which Jesus was judge of his judges. This is implied by quotations from Dan 7:13–14 and Psalm 110:1, which place Jesus in a position of judgement and his judges before him grovelling. It has already been acknowledged that this may not be a direct reference to the divine name. To this end, Evans cites *TJob* 29:3–4 as an example of the formula in response to a question in a context which clearly does not refer to YHWH (Evans, *Mark*, 448–52). However, with such fantastic claims made following the absolute ἐγώ εἰμι (France, *Mark*, 610–11; van Iersel, *Mark*, 447–51), it is not surprising that some scholars rightly claim some distinction in Jesus' speech. That is, Jesus may not have been referring to the "I am" statements of the Old Testament directly, but there can be no doubt that his claims insinuated something similar (Burge, "Sayings," 354).

¹ France, *Mark*, 610–11; van Iersel, *Mark*, 447–51.

² Evans compares ἐγώ εἰμι here to its usage in *TJob* 29:3–4, where it seems to be used as a conflated "yes" (Evans, *Mark*, 450).

reactions of the council. Here, Jesus references Dan 7:13–14 and Psalm 110:1.¹ By quoting these two scriptures together Jesus has made claims that place him above his judges and equal to God himself. Despite the fact that he now stands accused before the council, he will one day sit in judgement enthroned at the right hand of God. Those who oppose him will become his footstool.² These claims, and not Jesus' use of ἐγὼ εἶμι, validate the charges against Jesus. To have claimed a place above the Jerusalem authority at the right hand of God is inconceivable to the members of the council. By his bold statement Jesus has claimed equality with God himself.³ By claiming equality with God in judgement and position on the throne, Jesus has committed blasphemy in the New Testament religious sense of the word.⁴

With all of this information, it is obvious that βλασφημέω is used primarily in its religious sense in the text of Mark. There is no indication that Jesus meant to accuse the Pharisees of blasphemy in the rabbinical sense, nor is there any evidence in the text to suggest that they had committed it. Rather, Mark informs the reader that the actual crime that the Pharisees had committed was accusing Jesus of working by the power of an evil

¹ Evans, *Mark*, 450–51.

² Evans, *Mark*, 451.

³ That Jesus claims equality with God, and not simply Davidic authority, is inherent in the Markan text. Evans argues that the titles Son of the Blessed One, and Son of Man pointed to Jesus as Davidic Messiah in the first century understanding. This understanding is behind the Council's question in Mk 14:61 (Evans, *Mark*, 448–52). It seems that Markan program is at work against the reduction of Jesus to a simple Davidid. Aside from the title Son of Man, Jesus is only otherwise called the Son of God or, in the previous verse, the Son of the Blessed. However, Jesus himself, in Mark 12, seems to indicate that the Messiah should not be understood as he is related to David. The Messiah is greater than David. He is David's Lord, not his equal representative (Mk 12:35–37). Evans is correct in noting the first century understanding that the titles Son of God, Son of Man, and Son of the Blessed One all refer to David or David's descendant (Evans, *Mark*, 448–52). Furthermore, it is likely that Mark is aware of this understanding. However, it is likely that the Markan text is corrective of this understanding, not subject to it. Furthermore, Evans claims that Jesus' blasphemy stemmed both from his insult to the Sanhedrin, which would have seen itself as God's authority on earth and, more importantly, that Jesus claimed for himself the full divine authority of heaven (Evans, *Mark*, 456–57).

⁴ For a full exploration of blasphemy, its usage before the first-century, and the implications of that usage on Mark, see Evans, *Mark*, 453–58.

spirit (ὅτι ἔλεγον, Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει [3:30]). That is, by attributing the miracles of Jesus to an evil spirit, the Pharisees were speaking against God himself, and specifically against the Holy Spirit.

There has been much debate over the reasons why blasphemy of the Spirit carries such a strict penalty. Part of this confusion results from the Lukan and Matthean passages, which include blasphemy of the Son of Man as part of the innumerable blasphemies allowable from Mark 3:28 (cf. Mt 12:31, Lk 12:10).¹ O'Neill has noted an early interpretive error here. The Gospel of Thomas includes blasphemy of the Father in the list of forgivable offences.² This creates the impression that, among the Trinity, only the Spirit cannot be blasphemed without hope of forgiveness.³ It is unlikely that Mark meant the phrase to mean that the Holy Spirit was the only member of the Trinity whose character demanded eternal punishment if insulted. What is more likely is that, in Mark, Jesus is responding to people who have actually blasphemed the Holy Spirit. The response is tailored to the offence. The Pharisees, by attributing the works of Jesus to Satan, are actually blaspheming the Holy Spirit. It is clear in Mark 1:9–13 that the Spirit is present in Jesus, guiding and empowering him in his ministry of declaration of the

¹ It is for precisely this reason that it was established in the introduction of this work that Mark would be treated as an independent author. This is even more applicable to Mark than Matthew and Luke, since it is assumed in this work that the text of Mark was the first to be written (contra Farmer, *Problem*; cited in Penner, "Transmission", 416; see also Guelich's note on the neo-Greischbach school [Guelich, *Mark*, xxxiii]). Mark could not have had any knowledge of the other formal Gospels, nor of the purported Q source of the alternate saying (Guelich, *Mark*, 177). Boring argues that, no matter which Gospel is older, the Markan source for the unforgivable sin logion at least predates the others, and developed quite separately (Boring, "Sin," 258–59).

² *GThom* 44; O'Neill, "Sin," 38. Similarly, the other synoptics include blasphemy against the Son of Man as an acceptable offence. This is most likely a tool to display the Son of Man's reliance on the Holy Spirit, since the Spirit is the Divine actor behind the Son of Man. However, Mark does not include the phrase, though the Son of Man is a Markan emphasis. This is most likely due to the divinity that it is part of the Markan program to impart on Jesus.

³ O'Neill dismisses the interpretation that "the blasphemy of the Spirit" is a mistranslation, and argues that Jesus was referring to blasphemy against "this spirit," the spirit of v. 28 which forgives all sins. Therefore, unforgiveness is unforgivable (O'Neill, "Sin," 37–42). However, he seems to miss the Markan usage of βλασφημέω, and provides little evidence to support the omission of the Holy Spirit textually.

Kingdom of God. Therefore, by attributing an exorcism to an unclean spirit, since it is the Holy Spirit which is at work establishing the Kingdom, the Pharisees have effectively called the πνεῦμα ἅγιον a πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, and not just this, but ὁ Σατανᾶς!

1.2. *Conclusions on the Spirit in Jesus' Ministry in Mark 3:28–30*

According to Mark 3:28–30, the role of the Spirit in the Gospel of Mark is to empower Jesus' ministry. The Spirit enables Jesus to effect the coming of the Kingdom of God, as a result of his spiritual empowerment in Mark 1:9–13. This is confirmed when Jesus accuses those who attribute his ministry to Satan of blasphemy against the Spirit himself, signifying that the Spirit was the empowerer of Jesus' ministry. Specifically, as will be explored in the following argument, Mark intended for the reader to understand that the Spirit was a work in the establishment of the Kingdom of God through exorcism. Thus, the Spirit was an aide in Jesus' Kingdom ministry, effectively dismantling the kingdom of Satan. They have not insulted Jesus directly, but have blasphemed the Spirit which does possess Jesus, and by whom Jesus does cast out demons. Therefore, it might be said that ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια.¹

2. *The Spirit and the Kingdoms of God and Satan in Mark 3:20–27*

To this point, it has been established that the Holy Spirit works to drive and empower the ministry of Jesus (Mark 3:20–30), though it has not been defined. Mark 3:28–30 serves in connection with the empowerment discourse of Mark 1:9–13 to specify the work of the Spirit in Jesus. Mark 1:9–13 details the Spirit as the mover of Jesus, through the action of ἐκβάλλω after he has descended into Jesus. In Mark 3:28–30 the Spirit is confirmed as the impetus for Jesus' ministry to that point. The passage also serves as a reference point for later passages. As a result, the Spirit as Jesus' empowerer in Mark 3:20–30 is

¹ Cf. ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων (Mark 3:22).

reflected on in Mark as late as 5:1–10. The question that remains concerns the exact nature of the work of the Spirit in driving and empowering. This chapter will show that the Spirit is responsible for the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the earth, and not this alone, but the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth through victory over the kingdom of Satan and the displacement of the kingdom of Satan.¹ This victory and displacement is spoken of metaphorically in the parable of the binding of the strongman. It is also seen occurring from the outset of Jesus' Spirit-empowered ministry through the miracles of Jesus, and especially those involving exorcism. Exorcism in Mark represents, not only deliverance from physical ailment, nor simply deliverance from demonic influence, but also freedom from the rule of Satan and the beginning of the experience of the Kingdom of God. That the Spirit is a central mover in the establishment of the Kingdom of God, and that this is accomplished primarily through exorcism and the routing of the kingdom of Satan is implicit in the parable of the binding of the strongman in Mark 3:20–27. As such, this passage will be examined to display the implicit connections between the Spirit, who is acknowledged as the impetus of this ministry in 3:28–30, and the casting out of demons as the text of 3:20–27 elaborates.

¹ Recent theories have led to the discovery of hidden speech, and especially in the Pauline canon, which speaks against the Roman hierarchy. It is not uncommon for a Roman Caesar to be labeled "Satan." With this in mind, it seems reasonable to question the appearance of royal language in conjunction with the term Satan in Mark, and to wonder whether it is a representation of the Roman hierarchy. The relationship between Rome and the New Testament has been the subject of scores of recent publications (Crossan and Reed, *Paul*). However, though these insinuations are by definition hidden, it is outside of the narrative strategy of the Gospel of Mark to defame Rome. Though Jesus is often given titles attributed to Roman rulers in the prologue, the rhetorical strategy of the Gospel seems to present Jesus to faceless crowds and display their reactions to Jesus. That is, any high-language in Mark is not focused on contradicting the claims of Roman rulers, but rather on informing the reader of the truth that the characters in the Gospel will be confronted with in Jesus' acts. There is little focus on the alternatives. This is especially true when one considers how neither the position of the Pharisees, nor the Kingdom of Satan is discussed with any detail in Mark, aside from being presented as an opposite of Jesus and his ministry. There simply is not enough time spent on the evils of the Kingdom of Satan to merit any serious study on who it might represent. It is simply enough to call Satan "Satan" in the Markan text.

2.1. *The Spirit and the Kingdom in the Text of Mark 3:20–27*

The parable of the binding of the strongman is Jesus' response to the accusations from the Pharisees that he had been casting out demons by the ruler of demons. For their accusation of Jesus and lack of faith, the Pharisees are spoken to in parables rather than plainly.¹ This pattern is broken in the latter half of the passage, in Jesus' discourse on the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit. However, Jesus' parable is much more than a discourse on the sins of the Pharisees, as with the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit discourse. Rather, Jesus reveals the exact nature of his mission to the Pharisees in hidden speech. That is, in response to accusations of participation in the demonic, Jesus reveals that it is his goal, by the Holy Spirit, to overturn the kingdom which he has been accused of collaborating with. It is the mission of Jesus, through the power of the Holy Spirit, to displace the kingdom of Satan with that of God.

The text itself begins with the introduction to Jesus' ministry, and a culmination in activity that draws the Pharisee's attention and leads to their accusation. By this time, the miracles recorded previously in the text have drawn large crowds and on this particular day, after Jesus had returned home, the crowds are so great that reportedly neither Jesus nor his companions have time to eat. This causes the crowds to seize him and question his sanity (3:20–21). The context of verse 22 suggests that Jesus, as before,

¹ Though he has a somewhat negative picture of Mark and his redactive work, Hedrick is convinced that the parables, since their language is hidden and metaphorical, are the primary means that the Jesus of Mark communicated the Kingdom of God. This is especially true since the Kingdom is, in his estimation, the primary concern of the historical Jesus (Hedrick, "Parable," 179–99). Though his conclusions concerning the historical Jesus are not supported by the claims of this particular work, it is valuable to note that the primary means for communicating the central theology of the Markan Jesus, the Kingdom, was the parabolic form, which is by nature guarded and vague. It is quite notable, then, that Jesus should break from his parabolic speech and address the sins of the Pharisees directly, pointing to the severity of their crime and the importance of the Spirit at work in Jesus.

was healing and casting out demons among the crowd.¹ The Pharisees, after seeing Jesus' ministry among the crowds, accuse him of being possessed with Satan and casting out demons by the ruler of demons (3:22). Hearing this, Jesus calls the Pharisees to him and responds to their accusations in the form of a series of short parables. These two initial parables are followed by another short parable illustrating the impossibility of their accusations, and more importantly, the reality of his mission.²

With this in mind, it is pertinent to note a division in the text at 3:23. The former part of the text builds the story to the point of the parable and rhetorical questions, while the second contains the words of Jesus. There are a number of thematic ties that help texture the pericope. Specifically, there are two series of interconnected terms, which refer to Jesus and Satan respectively. Both of these series are composed of proper names like Jesus and Satan, pronouns, and even metaphorical representations of these two main characters, namely the plunderer and the strongman. The first grouping of terms represents Satan and his kingdom, and it is posed against Jesus, both literally and metaphorically in the parable. Finally, the verbal ideas of the text join serve to place the two main characters of the parables, Jesus and Satan, and their metaphorical

¹ It has already been mentioned that the crowd itself is a fixture in Mark's Gospel. The readers are often meant to sympathize with the crowd, and resonate with the crowd's initial ignorance of Jesus. Their decisions are based on their experiences with him (Williams, *Followers*, 89–90). It is likely that the crowd here is the same crowd that has been with him since the beginning of his ministry, and have witnessed the great number of exorcisms that he has performed to this point (Mark 1:14–3:20).

² Rowe notes the fact that those outside the Kingdom of God are spoken to in parables (Rowe, *Kingdom*, 126–27). Busch affirms that the Markan emphasis is on the victory of Jesus over Satan. However, Busch analyses Jesus' claims on a logical framework and suggests that, due to a logical contradiction, Jesus cannot be claiming that the kingdom of Satan is falling. This would invalidate his entire argument. This leads Busch to the conclusion that there is a certain amount of double speak occurring in the passages, with two contrasting intentions (Busch, "Discourse," 477–505). Busch, however, has depended far too much on Jesus' spoken word in the Gospel of Mark, and has taken him at face value, as though he had said everything that there is to be said. Mark's Jesus, however, is an entirely different breed. Busch has failed to consider the whole picture. There is no logical contrast in the passage, there is simply missing information in Jesus' speech, though it is intended to be read into the passage. Jesus cannot say openly that it is his mission to destroy the kingdom of Satan, especially since it is often inferred that there is a connection between this kingdom and Jesus' accusers.

representations, in conflict. The verbal ideas connected to possession are accomplished by Satan, the strongman. Those connected to exorcism are accomplished by Jesus, who is metaphorically represented by the plunderer in the parables.¹ This pattern, where Jesus and Satan are contrasted using the verbal ideas connected to possession and exorcism, runs through the entire text in several definable literal and parabolic forms.

This contrast in its initial form contrasts Jesus with Satan and his kingdom. In the beginning they are connected by the Pharisees, who are mere observers at this point and not addressed directly until 3:28. Ἐκβάλλω is used to describe the exorcism of Satan performed by Jesus. Jesus is accused of being possessed by Satan, using the first term in the verbal chain, ἔχω.² Jesus' response displays the discontinuity in their argument with the rhetorical question πῶς δύναται Σατανᾶς Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; This shows that two figures on the same side of the opposing kingdoms, either Satan's evil kingdom or the divine Kingdom, cannot both possess and exorcise. These two verbal ideas are

¹ There is some initial theological difficulty that might be caused by the use of the term κλέπτης to allegorize Jesus. That title has been applied to the subject of Mk 3:27 by the later Gospels (Mt 24:43; Lk 12:39). It is arguable that, in these contexts, the thief is a sinister character not befitting comparison with Jesus. This is exaggerated when John's usage of κλέπτης is considered. In every instance of the term in John, it represents Satan (Jn 10:1, 10; 12:6). There are, however, a number of instances of the term throughout the New Testament where the coming Lord is equated with a thief (1 Thes 5:2; 2 Pet 3:10; Rev 3:3; 16:15). With this in mind, there is nothing out of place with the use of a thief metaphor in reference to Jesus in the New Testament. However, possibly aware of the conflict that using the term κλέπτης might cause, Mark did not use it in his parable. Rather, the term is assumed by Mark's use of the verb διαπτάζω. It is notable that Mark has not chosen κλέπτω, which suggests that "plunder" is a better translation option than "steal." This is a better fit with the Mark's use of ἀνέστη, which seems to indicate a revolt or uprising. Thus, the plundering of Mk 3:27 is not simple thievery, as might be indicated by κλέπτω, but something more closely resembling a *coup d'état*. Commentators like Guelich and France point to several other semantic clues that the plunderer is Jesus. To Guelich, those who are the possessions (σκεύη) of the strongman are those who are demonized (Guelich, *Mark*, 176). France notes a correlation between Mk 3:27 and Isa 49:24–26. Especially convincing are the correlations that are developed in Isa 49 between the possessions (σκῦλον) of the strong one (γίγαντα), who is most definitely sinister, and the possessions of the strongman in Mark 3:27 (France, *Mark*, 172–74). Isa 49 uses language similar to Mark 3:27 to describe redemption from the hands of the enemy (France, *Mark*, 173). Further, the binding (δέω) of Satan is reminiscent of the eschatological disabling of Satan (France, *Mark*, 173–74). Though France limits this to the eschatological victory of the Kingdom of God, dismissing its implications on exorcism (France, *Mark*, 173–74), it is not unlikely that Mark uses exorcism as a sign of this victory, or even as a means by which this victory is accomplished.

² Βεελζεβούλ ἔχει.

directly opposed to one another. The three short parables to follow illustrate Jesus' claims. The first tells the story of a kingdom, and uses military language to illustrate the idea of exorcism. A kingdom cannot rise up against itself and hope to stand, just as Jesus, if he were possessed, could not exorcise and hope to be successful. Kingdom, in this short parable, is most likely associated with the kingdom of Satan, since royal language has already been used in reference to Satan (ὁ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων [Mk 3:22]).¹ To this point Satan has not been equated with a kingdom. Rather, only the Kingdom of God has been mentioned.² At this point, however, we learn that Satan is a ruler, and that under his command are all of the demons.³

The first metaphorical declaration from Jesus is that ἐὰν βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῆ, οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι ἢ βασιλεία ἐκείνη. This is the first of two parallel sayings, with the second one presenting οἰκία in the place of βασιλεία.⁴ Similarly, in these two parallel passages, Jesus claims that the kingdom of Satan, if it rises against the kingdom of Satan, will fail. The idea represented by ἐκβάλλει (3:22) is continued

¹ France has already noted that Jesus' mission is directly against the kingdom of Satan (France, *Mark*, 168–69). There is a definite semantic connection between the term ἄρχων and the prevailing discussion of βασιλεία in the text (see *Louw & Nida* 37.56, 64–65, 105).

² The term βασιλεία is used only once prior, in reference to the Kingdom of God. It is the centre of Jesus' preaching ministry. It is mentioned 16 times following, and only twice used to describe anything but the Kingdom of God. It is important, however, to qualify the term Kingdom of God. As France and others claim, the term does not indicate a place or a people. The Kingdom is neither the place where God rules, nor the people who God rules. It is the rule of God itself, the reign of God. France describes it as a catchword which is the equivalent of saying "when God rules." This does not place emphasis on the time, as if to say that the Kingdom of God is the time when God will rule. Rather, it should be interpreted as a catch-all phrase that describes anything characteristic of the rule of God (France, "Kingdom of God," 30–44). Perrin's claims are quite similar to those of France, especially when he refers to the Kingdom of God as a symbol for "God acting in sovereign power" (Perrin, *Language*, 43, 45; in Marshall, "Kingdom," 6). For the present definition, however, we will have to turn to Marshall who emphasises that the Kingdom of God is, in fact, the ministry of Jesus, which represents the power of God manifest on earth (Marshall, "Kingdom," 8).

³ O'Brien, "Principalities," 110–50; Mk 3:22.

⁴ The text of the first parabolic saying is replicated in the final chapters of Mark, where Jesus describes the ruin that is to come. On that day, Jesus predicts that kingdom will rise against kingdom and this will be the sign of the final fulfillment of the destruction of the temple and the last days (ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν [Mk 13:8]).

through to the end of the parable and is represented figuratively by μερίζω.¹ The point of the passage is that, if Satan were to rise up against himself or allow upheaval within his own ranks, he would fail. The same argument is made using the example of a household. That is, in the context of the ancient Roman household, in which Satan is represented metaphorically by the paterfamilias. If it were to rise against itself, that household would fail.² Finally, Satan and the accusations of the Pharisees are addressed directly and Jesus claims καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἐμερίσθη, οὐ δύναται στῆναι ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει (3:26), following a pattern similar to that of the previous passages. The language of Mark 3:26, however, is heightened from the rest from the preceding two parallel passages. In the preceding formula the cognate of μερίζω is always found in the aorist subjunctive. However, beginning in v. 26, it is substituted with ἀνίστημι. It is no longer subjunctive, but an aorist indicative and occurs in a first class conditional phrase, rather than the third class conditionals in the first two.³

This short parabolic statement is broken into three parts. That is, three metaphors. Through an examination of the conditional sentences that make up the parable, however, it is clear that the three parabolic statements together form a single argument. That argument consists of two purely hypothetical illustrative sentences that are used in support of the third statement. This third statement seems to be the point of the whole

¹ Though they are not, strictly speaking, semantic equals, their usage in plain speech (ἐκβάλλει) and parabolic speech (μερίζω) is undoubtedly equated in the text of Mark. Though it is not necessarily representative of a semantic chain, Westfall notes the tendency of language to create ad hoc chains, or at least semantic ties, between two terms of that are not necessarily related (Westfall, "Ties," 6–7). This is exactly what has happened in this instance.

² Guelich is among many who recognize that Jesus' argument is repeated twice using alternating military and household motifs respectively. The reason why Jesus chose these two institutions is simply that they were intimately familiar, and the listeners most likely experienced them both on a daily basis (Guelich, *Mark*, 176).

³ Porter, *Idioms*, 254–67.

argument and, though it is in metaphorical language, it is the centre of Jesus' speech and has real consequences in the Markan programme. This is evident by the extended application that accompanies the final conditional argument, and it is also visible in the passage's grammar. The first two parabolic statements are third class conditional sentences. The final is a first class conditional statement.¹ Neither has any influence on the truth of the statement, and both are entirely hypothetical.² The first two phrases, which make use of the third class conditional, seem to act as stepping stones to guide the reader to the base of the real argument. The third class conditional, as suggested by the subjunctive protasis, seems to indicate purely hypothetical argument. However, it is not the strong argument of the first class conditional, but a saying offered up for the listener's consideration.³ That is, in the beginning of his parabolic statements, Jesus offers the Pharisees a number of statements that are not particularly controversial. He offers for their consideration a number of statements that they are unlikely to disagree with, but are equally unlikely to be of much consequence. In fact, by using third class conditionals, Jesus is building a hypothetical background for his main point, which follows directly. Beginning in Mk 3:26, the tenor of Jesus' speech changes dramatically. He is no longer speaking in the third class conditional. The tense shifts from subjunctive to indicative in the protasis and Jesus offers the Pharisees the beginning of a larger argument in the form of a first class conditional.⁴ It is important to note that, as a first class conditional

¹ Both include ἐάν and the subjunctive in the apodosis (Porter, *Idioms*, 261).

² Porter, *Idioms*, 256–59, 261–63. Porter seems to allow for the translation “since” in the protasis of first class conditional sentences. He does this based on the acknowledgement that a large percent of first class conditional protases contain statements of true fact. Also, first class conditional sentences are, by nature, argumentative and it seems to make sense that a true protasis, upon which the argument of the apodosis is built, should be introduced with “since.” However, this seems to make room for further unproductive sub-categorisation of the conditional based on the truthfulness of the protasis.

³ Porter, *Idioms*, 261–63.

⁴ Porter, *Idioms*, 256–59.

sentence, Jesus argument is still hypothetical. However, the shift in conditional seems to indicate an equal shift from a mild suggestion of a saying for consideration to a strongly argued claim. Built on the foundation of the two earlier statements, Jesus has submitted his argument against the Pharisees' claims. However, Jesus' argument surpasses their accusations. The first two phrases seem to debunk the idea that Jesus is empowered by a sinister force. One cannot stand against oneself. This final argument, though it partially opposes their accusations, seems to suggest something beyond the impossibility of a work of Satan in Jesus. Jesus' argument suggests that he is engaged against the kingdom of Satan, and has made plans for its destruction. There is no indication in the text that Satan has divided against himself. It is, however, evident that the kingdom of Satan is falling, and that the Kingdom of God is displacing it through the miracles and exorcisms of Jesus.¹ Therefore, since it is not Satan rising against Satan that is causing the fall of his kingdom, it is Jesus himself who is rising against the kingdom of Satan, and it is because of the insurgence of the Kingdom of God that Satan has his end.²

It is at this point that Jesus shifts from the parable of houses and kingdoms, used to describe the fall of Satan hypothetically, to a final parable. Though Jesus speaks in parables as before, it is clear here that he is asserting that he is the one who will bring Satan's kingdom to an end. The parable begins with the introduction of a hypothetical figure, who will continue the chain of referents to Jesus from before, who is attempting to plunder ὁ ἰσχυρός. The strongman is symbolic language representative of Satan. This is accomplished partially by the inclusion of the term οἰκία in reference to the strongman, which connects with the οἰκία of Mark 3:25. No one is able to plunder the house of ὁ

¹ Contra Busch, "Discourse," 477–505.

² France, *Mark*, 171–72.

ἰσχυρός until he has first bound him. This phrase uses ἐάν and the subjunctive to denote the possible option that would lead to the negation of the assertion before that no one is able to plunder the strongman. If he is first bound, then the strongman's house will be plundered. The parable finishes with the future indicative phrase καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει. Jesus, by saying this to the Pharisees, has indicated that his ministry to date has been to establish the Kingdom of God by binding Satan, the strongman. It is this ministry, accomplished in Jesus' miraculous healings and exorcisms, which will destroy Satan's kingdom.¹ This implies that the end of the kingdom of Satan is a feature of the beginning of the Kingdom of God. With this in mind, the Spirit must be given equal credit for the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the earth, since it is by the Spirit that the actions implicit in the bringing of the Kingdom of God, and specifically Jesus' ministry of exorcism, are accomplished.

2.2 Conclusions on the Spirit and the Kingdom in Mark 3:20–27

In earlier arguments it was discovered that Jesus was empowered by the Spirit to accomplish some undefined ministry. Through the present analysis it has been proven that that ministry is the founding of the Kingdom of God on earth, and the destruction of Satan's present kingdom. This was established by showing kingdom language in the text in relation to both Satan, and to Jesus. Subsequently, in a series of parables, it is discovered that the kingdom of Satan is about to end its reign. Jesus, metaphorically represented by a plunderer, is to be the one to bind Satan's kingdom and take all for his

¹ This function of the text is understood by most, though it is not directly spoken by Jesus himself. It is the nature of Jesus' parables themselves to present himself in a manner that is not immediately obvious (Williams, *Followers*, 107; Hedrick, "Parable," 179–99). With this in mind, there is no doubt that the rhetorical strategy of Mark is in play currently to show that Jesus is the one who will topple the kingdom of Satan (France, *Mark*, 172–73). Many note the tendency to conclude that, since he is referred to as ὁ ἰσχυρός in 1:7, Jesus must be calling himself the strongman (France, *Mark*, 172–73; van Iersel, *Mark*, 171). However, it is more likely that Satan is the strong man, and that there is presumably someone stronger that will bind him before plundering his kingdom.

own. This is represented by an exorcism that was not described by Mark at the beginning of Mark 3. However, Mark is careful to record several exorcisms to this point in the text and Satan's strongest in the very near future will be dethroned.

3. *The Kingdom at Work in the Larger Context of Mark 3:20–30*

It is not enough to examine the ministry of Jesus and the empowerment of the Spirit in a hypothetical sense. The ministry of Jesus itself is begun with the declaration Πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (1:15). This declaration is immediately followed by a discourse which details the actions of Jesus, rather than his preaching.¹ These actions are, by and large, healings and exorcisms. The parable of the binding of the strongman in 3:20–30 is implicitly connected with the account of the ministry of Jesus that surrounds it. The miraculous events recorded to this point display the nature of the ministry of Jesus as it is the result of the empowerment of the Spirit in 1:9–13. This parable serves as a confirmation of the nature of Jesus' ministry to this point, and reasserts that the ministry of Jesus in establishing the Kingdom of God, as promised in 1:9–13, is the result of the Spirit at work in Jesus. However, to understand the work of Jesus and the role that the intimate connection between Mark's Kingdom theology and the Spirit, Mark 3:20–30 must be examined as a part of a larger discourse. To this end, there are two passages that deserve attention due to their obvious ties to Mark 3:20–30. The first passage to be considered is the very first recorded miracle at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, in which a man is released from an unclean spirit (Mk 1:21–28). The second is the Markan account of the man possessed with many demons (Mk 5:1–10). By demonstrating parallelism between the parable of the binding of the strongman in Mark 3:20–30 and the exorcism of the demon in 5:1–10, it will be shown

¹ O'Donnell, "Strongman," 169.

that the Spirit is at work empowering the ministry of Jesus. The Spirit is at work in these introductory chapters of Mark in Jesus. He brings about the Kingdom of God through exorcism beginning early in the Gospel and continuing well into the second episode.

3.1. *Kingdom and Exorcism: Connections between Mark 3 and 1:21–28*

Mark 1:21–28 is immediately significant in the Gospel due to its early position. After Jesus' ministry is inaugurated (Mk 1:9–13),¹ Jesus has only time for the calling of one pair of followers before he is immediately faced with a demon-possessed man and his ministry is first seen in action. Though in Mark 1:14–15 Jesus' ministry begins with a few remarks concerning its nature, which is concerned mainly with the Kingdom of God, the first recorded series of actions in the ministry of Jesus involves the exorcism of an evil spirit. It is significant that the first demonic presence encountered in the book of Mark is given the title πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον,² which stands in direct contrast to the πνεῦμα ἅγιον of 1:9–11.³ Though the story contains a number of details concerning the nature of the exorcism, it is significant to this discussion that the demons recognized him as a representative of God, and therefore the Kingdom of God. They knew immediately that his task was to overthrow them (Τί ἡμῖν σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι

¹ Though Jesus is introduced as the Son of God and Spirit-empowered king in the prologue of Mark's Gospel, there is still the impression that active ministry belongs to John at this point. Scholars, however, mark a difference at 1:14. At this point active ministry is passed from John, whose ministry ends, to Jesus, whose ministry is just beginning (Dowd and Malbon, "Significance," 274–75).

² Mark is known for many and varied titles for the members of the kingdom of Satan including Σατανᾶς, Βεελζεβούλ, and ὁ ἀρχῶν τῶν δαιμονίων. His followers are called πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον and δαιμόνιον. It is of some secondary interest to note that there is no recorded reason for the synonymy of Σατανᾶς, a definitive term, and Βεελζεβούλ, which has its roots in the ancient Palestinian deity. It is only known that Mark uses them synonymously, with no reference back to the root of the term Βεελζεβούλ (France, *Mark*, 169–71).

³ France notes the frequency of use of this particular term to refer to demons, which is used equally as often as δαιμόνιον (France, *Mark*, 103). Guelich observes that, of the eleven times πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον is used in Mark, six of those occur in the present story and in the other text parallel to 3:20–30, Mark 5:1–10. There is a high concentration of demons being referred to in the discourse surrounding 3:20–30, and a noted influence on the passage directly preceding it (Guelich, *Mark*, 56). It is likely that these terms provide a counterpoint to the πνεῦμα ἅγιον, who is at work in their dethronement.

ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ [1:24]). Also, it is significant that the demons were obedient and immediately overthrown, and it was even noted by those who witnessed that the demons must obey Jesus (1:27). Thus, within a chapter of the beginning of the text, Jesus, newly empowered by the Holy Spirit, is preaching the Kingdom of God, and unclean spirits are being displaced and obeying him. This is strongly connected to the text of Mark 3:27, where one of Jesus' exorcisms results in a discourse describing the expulsion of the kingdom of Satan. It is Mark's intention, then, to show Jesus at work exorcising demons and showing his authority over them. These works recorded earlier in the Gospel are summarized in 3:20–30 as the dissolution of the kingdom of Satan, which Jesus accomplishes through the empowerment of the Spirit.

3.2. Kingdom and Exorcism: Connections between Mark 3 and 5:1–10

The account of the exorcism of the legion of demons in Mark 5:1–10 is intimately, if not explicitly, connected to the idea of the Spirit as Jesus' empowerer in the expulsion of the kingdom of Satan from power. It is highly related to the text of Mark 3:20–30, and includes a significant degree of repetition. With this in mind, the idea of 3:20–30 is carried out in action in this passage. Thus, 3:20–30 serves both to clarify that the Spirit has been at work since Jesus' inauguration, and also to suggest that Jesus is moved by the Spirit further into the Gospel of Mark.

In the passage itself there are many semantic similarities with 3:27. There is the mention of πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον in the opening. Similarly, the phrase οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι (5:3) bears a striking resemblance to ἀλλ' οὐ δύναται οὐδεὶς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ εἰσελθὼν τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ διαρπάσαι, ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον τὸν ἰσχυρὸν δῆσῃ (3:27). Also, whereas Satan is represented with ὁ ἰσχυρός in 3:27, those

who had before attempted to bind the possessed man were deemed insufficiently strong (οὐδεὶς ἴσχυεν αὐτὸν δαμάσαι [Mk. 5:4]).¹ Thus, the demoniac in 5:1–10 is representative of the strongman that no one is able to bind in 3:27. The simple fact that Jesus is capable of exorcising the legion of demons is proof that Jesus is the one who will bind the strongman, Satan, in 3:27. If Jesus is able to drive out the legion of demons from the possessed man in 5:1–10, then Jesus is the one who is binding Satan in 3:27. Jesus is the one who is bringing the Kingdom of God by dismantling the kingdom of Satan. This passage acts to prove in action what that Jesus says directly in Luke that εἶ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (Lk 11:20).² However, in this case it is not the ambiguous δάκτυλος θεοῦ that serves as Jesus' empowerment. Rather, the connection between Mark 5:1–10 and Mark 3:27 reveals that it can be none other than the πνεῦμα ἅγιον who is the driving force behind Jesus' Kingdom ministry. Therefore, it is by the Holy Spirit that Jesus casts out demons (cf. Mk 3:22), and it is by the Holy Spirit that Jesus is bringing about the Kingdom of God in opposition to the kingdom of Satan.

3.3. *Conclusions on the Spirit in the Text Surrounding 3:20–30*

The Gospel of Mark, from the introduction of Jesus' ministry at 1:14, to the end of the discourse in 5:20 is presenting a unified whole. It is clear that the central focus in the development of the passage is the victory of the Kingdom of God over that of Satan,

¹ Guelich notes that it is rare for the Markan text to elaborate on the condition of a demon possessed person. Often, Mark simply pronounces the person demon possessed or attributes an illness to a demon (Guelich, *Mark*, 277). It is unfortunate, then, that he skips completely over the third mention of ἰσχυρὸς in 5 chapters, each in highly significant contexts. There is a clear relationship between the language of 3:20–30 where Jesus claims to bind Satan, the strongman, and take his belongings, and 5:1–10 where a man possessed with demons who is too strong to be bound is exorcised by Jesus and claimed for the Kingdom of God. This connection is not lost on van Iersel or Camery-Hoggatt, who both see the exorcism in 5:1–20 as the raiding of the strongman's house described in 3:27 (van Iersel, *Mark*, 171; Camery-Hoggatt, *Irony*, 132–33).

² O'Donnell, "Strongman," 169.

primarily accomplished through exorcisms. This is shown immediately after Jesus' inauguration, where Jesus is recognized as the Son of God by demons that he has cast out. It is also shown in Mark 3:20–30, where Jesus is represented in a parable as the one to come and bind the strongman and plunder his house. Finally, the connections between exorcism and the Kingdom of God are clear in Mark 5:1–10, where Jesus places the parable into action and casts out the demons who had resisted strong men before him. All of this is qualified by the words of Jesus in 3:28–30, where it is made clear that it is the Spirit in Jesus who is working to expel demons, and therefore it is by the Spirit that Jesus is fighting the Kingdom of Satan, and gaining victory for the Kingdom of God.

Conclusions

It has, to this point, been the claim of this work that Mark does not have an independently developed pneumatology. Rather, as in the prologue's connection of the Spirit with christology, and especially as that christology functions to provide credentials for Jesus as the ruler of God's Kingdom, the Spirit has provided strength and the presence of God in conjunction with the developments of other theologies. This is especially true for the Markan theology of the Kingdom. In this chapter, it has been established that the Spirit operates in Jesus to empower his ministry. The Spirit in the Gospel of Mark is connected to Jesus' ministry. This is clear in Jesus' own claim that the Spirit empowers his ministry, and especially his exorcisms, in the face of accusations of demonic activity. This passage supports other evidence that suggests that this spiritual empowerment is programmatic to the ministry of Jesus elsewhere in the Gospel, and especially throughout Mark 1:14–5:10. Specifically, it is the foundation and progress of the Kingdom of God on earth, by the displacement of the evil spirits securing Satan's reign, that is empowered by the Spirit

through Jesus' actions in Mark's Gospel. This is seen in the implicit connection between Jesus' discourse on the fall of Satan in Mark 3:20–27 and the empowerment of the Spirit in Mark 3:28–30. However, parallels with this text in Mark 1: 21–28 and 5:1–10 expand the implications of the Spirit throughout the second episode, and confirm the connection established in Mark 3:20–30 between the Spirit-empowered ministry of Jesus, and the foundation and furtherance of the Kingdom of God on earth. There is an implicit connection in the Gospel between the Spirit at work in Jesus, and the reign of God on earth. Though rarely mentioned directly in the Gospel, the role of the Spirit is connected very closely with the reign of God on earth through Jesus. It is specifically clear, in this case, that the reign of God is begun by the casting out of demons as a realization of the destruction of Satan's kingdom. This makes room for the growth and dominance of the Kingdom of God, with Jesus as its ruler.

Chapter 4

THE SPIRIT IN MARK 12:1–37

If Mark's portrayal of the Spirit were to be allegorized at this point in the discussion, it is more than likely that it would be reminiscent of a consistently appearing legislative rider which seeks to fulfill its own agenda by attaching itself to bills of far greater importance. In the prologue of Mark's Gospel, the Spirit acts as an adjunct to Markan christology. The Spirit makes the existing equality between God, the sender and Jesus, his Son, increasingly implicit, and completes Mark's Trinitarian emphasis. The prologue also develops an emphasis on Jesus' spiritual empowerment, in which the Spirit enables and directs Jesus in his earthly ministry. This ministry is clarified immediately to be the inauguration of the rule of God on earth. The second occurrence of the Spirit strengthens the already established connection between the Spirit and the mission of Jesus to bring about the Kingdom of God, to the detriment of the kingdom of Satan. This is shown in Mark through the expulsion of the satanic kingdom through miracles and exorcisms. By the twelfth chapter a great deal has developed in Markan theology, and there seems to be little further emphasis placed on Jesus' healing ministry. Rather, Jesus seems to be in full-out conflict with Jerusalem. It is into this context that the Spirit makes his next

appearance. Once again, as discussed before, the Spirit seems to be a rider on other more thoroughly developed theologies in the Gospel of Mark. So far, the Spirit has attached himself to Markan christology and Kingdom theology. Later in the Gospel, Mark will introduce the Spirit into his eschatology, with further connections to the Kingdom of God. This theme, in which the Spirit is a side note to the more developed Kingdom theology, will be continued in this passage. However, unlike early chapters where the Spirit was key in the establishment of the Kingdom over that of Satan, here the Spirit seems to be a witness to Jesus, both as Davidic king, and also, with christological implications, to Jesus as the Son of God. In a sense, Jesus refers to the Spirit as though he were saying “God is on my side.” This claim is, of course, made in the context of opposition, and is interpretive of the conflict in the parable of the landowner earlier in the chapter. That is, Jesus uses the Spirit as a tool to assert that he is the Son of God,¹ and that he is the one whose rule constitutes the Kingdom of God. Though references to the Spirit are too sparse to formulate a comprehensive Markan theology of the Spirit, there is at least some degree of connection between the passages in that they all connect, secondarily, to Mark’s theology of the Kingdom. Though this does not by any means constitute a Markan pneumatology, it may give some dignity to the independence of Mark in his representation of the Spirit and as a Kingdom theologian. The goal here, then, must be to establish that there is some connection between the Spirit in Mark 12 and the contextual development of Mark’s Kingdom theology. Specifically, it will be shown that the Spirit is used as a witness to Jesus’ claim that he is the divine Son of God. As such, he

¹ For further discussion of the Spirit in relation to Jesus’ sonship, see chapter one on Dunn and the Spirit in Luke. It seems that Dunn, though he has been the subject of much criticism in this and other works, has simply mis-sourced his theology. That is, though there is no connection between the Spirit and Jesus’ sonship in Luke, there may be some connection in this passage.

must also be the Messiah and king whose rule constitutes the Kingdom of God. In order to accomplish this goal, the claims of the Pentecostal school of theology, who assert that it is Mark's intention to portray the Spirit as the only person through whom Scripture can be interpreted, must be shown in error. Second, the discourse itself must be established to include the parable of the tenants and the realization of the parable in the rejection of Jesus by the scribes. This is concluded in Jesus' remarks concerning being sent by God, according to the parable, and place as the Son of God, by the witness of the Spirit. Finally, the text of the pericope itself will be examined on a micro level in order to display the text's portrayal of Jesus' sonship, position as king, and the role of the Spirit in confirming Jesus' sonship and Kingdom rule.

1. Pentecostal Pneumatology in Reference to Mark 12:36

There can be no denying that Pentecostalism has made a major influx into the realm of biblical studies. Scholars such as Menzies, Stronstad, and others have contributed a great deal to the understanding of the Spirit in the biblical text. In a sense this work itself may be considered of Pentecostal origin. However, since scholars like Stronstad have labelled introductory passages concerning the Spirit in Luke and Acts programmatic, and claimed large scale patterns governing the author specific use of terms such as πνεῦμα, it has become quite fashionable in such circles to find similar patterns in other canonical works. At times, it is only the scarcity of Spirit language that has kept this work from using such universal language. It must be acknowledged that the Spirit in the prologue is meant to provide the reader with some lasting impression of a spiritual empowerment in Jesus' ministry.¹ However, this is not by any means a declaration of a universal Markan pneumatology. It is also not an invitation to apply the Spirit to the text of Mark anywhere

¹ Keener, *Spirit*, 49–90; Hooker, *Mark*, 51.

that it is not mentioned explicitly or by some other means of extension.¹ Nevertheless, this trend of defining universally applicable author specific pneumatologies has found its way to Mark.

A recent article in the *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*² has claimed to have summarized universally the pneumatology of the Gospel of Mark. This is of particular relevance to this chapter since, according to the author, Mark 12:35–37 is the clearest summary of the Markan pneumatology.³ Partly in support of this claim, and partly as an independent notion, Powery has also claimed that the term ἡ δύναμις θεοῦ, which occurs only once in Mark, is synonymous with the Spirit and should be interpreted as the power to interpret the Scriptures. These claims, however, are counterproductive to any endeavour to define a Markan use of the Spirit. There is simply too little reference to the Spirit in Mark to justify a Markan pneumatology. Likewise, there is little uniformity in the depiction of the Spirit in Mark, with the exception of its tendency to use the Spirit to contribute to various other topical theologies in the Gospel, and especially the theology of the Kingdom. However, Powery's claims do merit brief discussion, since they are among the only other scholarly opinions on the Spirit in Mark. With this in mind, a discussion of the relationship between scriptural interpretation and the Spirit, and also on the synonymy of power and the Spirit will follow. This will show that neither claim has any particular merit, and that the Spirit is most likely used in connection with the Kingdom of God and Markan christology.

¹ For an example of extension, see the direct parallelism built between the binding of the strongman in Mark 5 and Jesus' discourse on the Spirit as his enabler in the binding of Satan, the metaphorical strongman, in Mark 3, discussed in fine detail in chapter 3 of this work.

² Powery, "Spirit," 184–98.

³ This is claim of Powery's article, and it is supported throughout Powery, "Spirit," 184–98.

1.1. *Powery and the Spirit as the Interpreter of Scripture in Mark*

Powery's argument that the Spirit is the divine interpreter of Scripture simply does not fit the Spirit passages in Mark. This is, by his own admission, more clearly depicted in the Gospel of Luke. It is in Luke that he begins his argument, and he remains there the majority of his argument for the Spirit as scriptural interpreter.¹ Second, in his own admission, Mark 12:35–37 is the only instance in the entire book of Mark where this connection is made.² In spite of these two great difficulties, Powery claims that the emphasis on the Spirit in Mark is on scriptural interpretation. He leans on the fact that Mark 12 is the only instance in which the Spirit speaks in Mark. Therefore, since at no other time is the Spirit speaking, every other passage that mentions the Spirit works to accustom the reader to the Holy Spirit. Mark gives small pieces of information at a time. For example, through the prologue the reader learns that there is a coming baptism from Jesus for his followers, and that Jesus himself is baptised in the Spirit, which programmatically affects his entire ministry. However, it is not precisely clear what it is that the Spirit will have Jesus do or speak.³ The second mention of the Spirit outside of the prologue (Mk 3:29)⁴ relates only that the Spirit is at work in Jesus, and that it is wrong to attribute the work of the Spirit to Satan. Powery claims that there is no specific act attributed to the Spirit. Therefore, the passage adds nothing to the understanding of

¹ The majority of argument for the Spirit as an interpreter of Scripture in the article takes place in the Lukan text, and is then extended into Mark. The Markan text is not so explicit, and the Lukan text uses the term "power of God" rather than "Spirit" (Powery, "Spirit," 185–86).

² Powery, "Spirit," 185–86.

³ Powery, "Spirit," 186–88. Keener (Keener, *Spirit*, 49–90) argues that the Spirit ought to be considered programmatic to Mark based on the Markan prologue. This is quite similar to the claims that Pentecostals such as Stronstad have made for Luke (Stronstad, *Theology*, 36–37) and Acts (Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 15).

⁴ Powery places a great deal of emphasis on this position, noting that it is the first mention of the Spirit outside of the prologue, and the first mention of the Spirit from Jesus (Powery, "Spirit," 188). Though this is an initially impressive argument, one must realize that there are only six appearances of the Spirit in the Markan text.

the Spirit's work.¹ Finally, in dealing with chapter 13, Powery draws on the similarities between 12:35–37, and the Spirit in 13:5–37. The conclusion is made that, since in both passages the Spirit inspires speech, but only in Mark 12 is the content of that speech specifically described, Mark 12 must be the ultimate representation of the Spirit's work. The Spirit in Mark 12, according to Powery, is an interpreter of Scripture.² Following Powery's argument, since the Spirit here is interpreting Scripture, scriptural interpretation must be the focus of Mark's pneumatology. From this, he draws the conclusion that, not only is the primary focus of the Spirit in Mark the spiritual interpretation of Scripture, the text must suggest that David could have only spoken about the Messiah by the Spirit.³ Therefore, in the text of Mark, the Spirit is representative uniformly as the Spirit of scriptural interpretation and the only means by which Scripture could possibly be understood.⁴ These arguments assume a great deal more than they are worth. His initial argument, which claims strong ties between the Spirit and Scripture interpretation, is at the centre of the article's flaws. There is some emphasis on the power of God and the composition of Scripture in Luke.⁵ However, it cannot possibly be a major Markan emphasis. There are only four pericopes that deal specifically with the Spirit. The Spirit is only presented in relation to the Scriptures in one of them, and the interpretation of Scripture is far from the centre of that pericope's argument. In Mark 12 the Holy Spirit confirms that the one that the Father sends is God. The passage places emphasis on the confirmation of the Messiah's divinity, rather than the scriptural source. Even if Powery's

¹ Powery, "Spirit," 188.

² Powery, "Spirit," 189–91.

³ Powery, "Spirit," 191.

⁴ Powery notes that, in Jesus arguments with the Jerusalem establishment, it is the baptism of the Holy Spirit on the ministry of Jesus that prevails, and not the reason of their content (Powery, "Spirit", 186). As justification for these claims, Powery argues, with Hays, that this charismatic exegesis, which states that the Spirit alone, and not human reason, can interpret Scripture (Hays, *Echoes*; cited in Powery, "Spirit," 186).

⁵ Powery, "Spirit," 185–86.

claims concerning the message of Mark 12 were correct, he imposes his conclusions on Mark 12 upon the entirety of the Gospel and focuses unjustifiably on speech as the definer of the Spirit's work.¹ There are simply too many other emphasis placed on the Spirit for such claims to hold any weight. This is especially true since Powery's claims rely on unjustified assumptions, such as the assumption that the ministry of the Spirit is defined by his speech. It may be sufficient to label the development of the Markan pneumatology dialogical; built by a series of passages which might not all contain the same emphasis. However, it is foolish to do so in a work with such little reference to the Spirit. It is acceptable to assume that Mark, if he does not conform to any other pattern, portrays the Spirit independently of other canonical authors. However, it is not justifiable to claim that Mark, for whom the Spirit does not seem to be of primary importance, has formulated a systematic pneumatology like the one developed by Powery. In this case, since the only similarity that each passage seems to have with every other passage is a connection to another of Mark's primary emphasis, it must suffice to say that the Spirit is secondary in the Gospel of Mark. Though there is a definite pattern in the theological connections made between the Spirit and the Kingdom, this reflects more highly on the Markan concept of Kingdom than on the Spirit.

1.2. *Powery and the Synonymy of 'Power' and 'Spirit'*

That the Spirit is, in fact, the Spirit of scriptural interpretation, is not Powery's only claim. Partly in support of this claim, but also as an independent notion, he suggests that

¹ Powery quite often argues that the Markan records of the Spirit in the prologue, Mark 3, and Mark 13 are insufficient to define the nature of the Spirit's work. He argues this based on the seeming silence of the Spirit in those passages. That is, the words of the Spirit are not recorded (Powery, "Spirit," 184-98). This may be a result of his connections with Pentecostal theology which, almost by default, makes the same connection as a result of the insistence of early Pentecostals that the direct result of a post-salvation spiritual baptism are glossolalia and empowerment for speech to witness.

the power of God, mentioned in this pericope, and the Spirit are synonymous in Markan usage.¹ His claim is bolstered by Hooker, who posits that the term is used elsewhere in the text of Mark to represent God (Mark 14:62).² He also leans on the connections made between the terms by both Dunn and Fee in the letters of Paul.³ His basic contention is that Jesus' accusation that the Sadducees neither knew the Scriptures nor the Power of God meant that they did not possess the Spirit. Therefore, they could not understand Scripture.⁴ Though this is a convenient argument for his other claims, it seems a stretch to assume that Mark, who has been proven an active redactor earlier in the Gospel,⁵ would not use πνεῦμα here. Mark has shown that he is quite willing to claim the Spirit as a witness against the Sadducees in Mark 12:35. It seems unlikely that Mark would use a synonym for the Spirit here when he is perfectly willing to reference the Spirit directly. Power, in this setting, is more likely to refer to the power of God to accomplish a resurrection, which the Sadducees had denied. It is doubtful that Mark wished to connect the theology of the resurrection with pneumatology.

2. *The Spirit in the Structure of Mark 12:1–37*

In previous discussion, the claims of Powery were examined for their content. However, they are based on a hermeneutical method that is reminiscent of the interpretive process which gave birth to modern Pentecostal claims. Classical Pentecostalism has always defended its claims, and traditionally these claims involved the baptism of the Holy Spirit or glossalalia as its evidence, using a sort of spot-focussed hermeneutic. This interpretive style jumps from passage to passage in search of the Spirit, with little focus given to the

¹ Powery, "Spirit," 194.

² Hooker, *Mark*, 284.

³ Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 851; Fee, *Presence*, 35–36.

⁴ Powery, "Spirit," 194–95.

⁵ See especially the discussion of Mark's redaction of the Septuagint in chapter 3 of this work.

development of other theological emphases in the text.¹ The Spirit in Mark is always mentioned in correlation with Kingdom theology. The Spirit's role in this particular pericope is twofold. First, it establishes that Jesus is the true Son of God. Second, he is the only king whose rule constitutes the Kingdom of God. This is especially pertinent in the face of the current corrupt Jerusalemite religious rule. Though similar thematic elements unite the entire discourse from Mark 10:46—12:37, only the pericope from Mark 12:1–37 makes mention of the Spirit. In order to build a reasonable understanding of the flow of the text, the text as early as 12:1, beginning with Jesus' parable concerning a landowner, must be considered. There are significant conceptual threads that are built between 12:1 and 12:37. These will show that the passage considers Jesus both Son of God and Kingdom ruler. It will be the goal of this section to display the thematic structure of the text, and the boundaries of the pericope before continuing on to an examination of the content of the text and its emphasis on the Spirit. In order to accomplish these goals, the individual pericope within this greater discourse will be outlined to present a larger context for the Spirit, and display the thematic connections to the Kingdom of God and Markan christology. Following this, the text of the immediate pericope will be explored and limited to 12:1–37. Finally, the structure of the discourse will be explored to display that the Spirit in the text is intimately connected with Mark's christology and Kingdom theology. That is, the Spirit is a witness to Jesus the Son of God and ruler of God's Kingdom.

¹ For example, classical Pentecostals often cite 5 chapters in Acts (2:1–21, 8:14–24, 9:17, 10:34–48, 19:1–7, all built on the framework of 1:8). Though this theology has been developed using this spot-focused theology, it certainly is not true that Pentecostals are guilty of proof-texting. The development of this particular doctrine, though it depends on isolated instances within the text, more closely resembles narrative criticism in its approach. That is, whole pericopes are often taken into account for their effects on the whole text (For examples of this approach, see Stronstad, *Theology*; Stronstad, *Prophethood*; and Menzies *Development*).

2.1. *The Structure and Thematic Unity of Mark 12:1–37*

The present discourse as a whole, in actuality, runs from Mark 10:46 to the end of Jesus' eschatological discourse.¹ This larger pericope sets the stage for many of the themes that will occur in its second half. It is important to note that, in this larger section six of the seven total references to David in the text of Mark occur.² The passage as a whole deals with Jesus' final confrontation with the Jerusalem establishment before his arrest, trial, and crucifixion.³ The Markan contrast between Jesus' supporters in Galilee and his critics in Jerusalem is particularly prevalent in this section.⁴ Jesus' rejection of Jerusalem

¹ This pericope (Mark 13:1–37) will be the subject of chapter 6. Therefore, it will not be the subject of any detailed analysis in this chapter. This particular division is noted by many scholars in their overall division of the structure of Mark. This exact division of the text of Mark is suggested by Evans, who was not given the opportunity to write a complete commentary on the Gospel, but titled this particular section "Jesus confronts Jerusalem" (Evans, *Mark*, 126). Guelich, who authored the first volume, notes a pericope of the exact same title which begins in 11:1 (Guelich, *Mark*, xxxvi–vii; cf. Bacon, *Beginnings*, xi–vii; Lane, *Mark*, 29–32). Though his structure is completely different, France begins the present pericope in 11:1 at the triumphal entry. This is due to his emphasis on the work of geography in the division of the text, since 11:1 begins Jesus' ministry within Jerusalem (*Mark*, 426). France's work is representative of a great deal of scholarship, and there is very little difference between his division of the text and that of, Dowd (Dowd, *Mark*). Witherington, who arranges the entire book around a series of rhetorical questions, notes the beginning of the final discourse which answers all of the questions of the book, at 11:1, though he maintains that 11:1–13:37 constitutes a single unit (Witherington, *Mark*, x, 36–39). Smith, working on Bilzekian's conclusion that the Gospel was a drama prepared for public presentation, attempted to fit the Gospel into the dramatic form with strikingly similar results, though the pericope from 11:1–13:37 was divided into two separate dramatic episodes (Bilezikian, *Gospel*; Smith, "Tragedy," 239–47). Linguistic arguments for a division of the text are presented equally by Cook, who uses graded frames of speech to determine his structure (Cook, *Structure*, 151–57), and Longacre (Longacre, "Analysis," 140–168). Perhaps the most aptly titled division of the text belongs to van Iersel, who captures not only the struggle, but also the apparent superiority Jesus enjoys over the Jerusalemite establishment before he is unfairly tried. His subsection "Winning in the Temple Court" runs from 11:1–12:44 (van Iersel, *Mark*, 351–86).

² According to discourse analysts, such a high concentration in a limited area suggests a certain amount of lexical cohesion within the text and differentiation from the surrounding text. This may serve to define it as an individual unit. Porter uses similar methodology to distinguish the eschatological discourse in Mark 13 from the rest of the Gospel (Porter, *Criteria*, 220–34). However, the main thrust of the study is in the recognition of stratification in a discourse, which consists of grammatically and lexically unified sections above the sentence and paragraph level (see esp. Reed, "Cohesiveness," 28–46; Reed, *Philippians*, 42–51), which this particular discourse represents adequately.

³ See especially Evans, *Mark*, 126; Guelich, *Mark*, xxxvi–vii.

⁴ In the text of Mark, the crowds who paraded Jesus entry into Jerusalem do not seem to be from Jerusalem. Those from Jerusalem are never portrayed as supportive of Jesus' ministry (see especially the conflict between Jesus and Pharisees discussed in chapter 4 of this work). Rather it is an envoy from outside of Jerusalem who accompany Jesus into Jerusalem, whose inhabitants have markedly less enthusiasm for him. Williams notes that Bartimaeus, an outcast from Jerusalem, follows Jesus on the road after being healed (10:52), presumably into Jerusalem (Williams, *Followers*, 161–63). In short, and especially in light of

is implicit in the first half of the larger section, centred on the parable of the fig tree.¹ More importantly, however, the themes that connect the larger Jerusalem discourse are prevalent in the second half of this larger discourse. It is here, in Mark 12:1–37, that these themes show that the Spirit is at work in the conflict between the Kingdom of God and the authorities in Jerusalem. That the Spirit is Jesus' witness against the accusations of Jerusalem, and that the Spirit testifies to Jesus' divinity and place him as the ruler of the Kingdom of God is implicit in the structure of Mark 12:1–37. This will be shown by an examination of that structure.

Mark 12:1–37 revolves around the parable of the landowner and tenants.² In this particular section, Jesus tells the story of a landowner who rented his property. Several of the landowner's representatives are abused in the landowner's efforts to collect his share of the harvest. When he sends his son, representative of Jesus in this case, he is rejected and killed by the tenants. In the following discourse, Jesus once again clashes with the Pharisees and they plot against him. In the end, however, they are likened to the tenants in God's Kingdom. Jesus, foreshadowing his death, allegorizes himself as the son in the parable. This is mirrored in his claim that the Messiah, who he is claiming to be, is the Son of God, not of David. This is supported by the testimony of David and the Spirit.

There are several thematic elements which contribute to the overall development of Mark 12:1–37. They will be indispensable in any attempt to identify the reasons for the Markan inclusion of the Spirit in the text, and goal that this inclusion accomplishes. It is

references to οἱ προπάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες (Mark 11:9), even the crowds who supported Jesus in Jerusalem seem to be followers of Jesus from outside of Jerusalem. Similarly, Jesus' primary critics in Galilee were intruders from Jerusalem. Though many have commented on this particular issue (see particularly Lohmeyer, *Galiläa*; and Lightfoot, *Locality*) a particularly good summary can be found in France, *Mark*, 34–35.

¹ Heil, "Strategy," 77–78.

² van Iersel, *Mark*, 346–50.

impossible to comment on the Spirit in Mark 12:36 without also discussing Jesus' role as king and Messiah. It is also necessary to discuss the relationship between the title Son of David, which is applied to him extensively in this particular section, and Son of God, which is claimed for him several times throughout the text. Jesus also seems to claim this title for himself in Mark 12.¹ Finally, there is the issue of the conflict between the Jerusalem establishment and Jesus, which seems, in the Markan text to be akin to a battle between the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of this world. The latter of these has strong conceptual connections with the kingdom of Satan.² The most that can be done at this point, however, is to identify the theological trends that run through the text and provide context for the present examination of the Spirit. They will be dealt with in far greater detail as they relate to the Spirit in the final exegetical examination of the text.³

2.2. *Grammatical Elements Uniting Mark 12:1–37*

Mark 12:1–37 constitutes an independent discourse in which the Spirit witnesses to Jesus' divinity and kingship.⁴ It is, however, difficult to give grammatical justification

¹ Rowe, *Kingdom*, 282.

² For a discussion of this possible connection, see discussion in chapter 4 on the kingdom of Satan.

³ See § 3 of this chapter.

⁴ This view is not supported by a majority of scholars. It is more common to follow the route of scholars such as Evans, who divide larger sections of Scripture (for example "Jesus Confronts Jerusalem" runs from 10:46–13:37) into a series of multiple smaller conversations (Evans divides the present pericope into smaller sections, including the telling of a parable, three separate instances of confrontation with the Jerusalemites, and also Jesus' own question concerning David) with no hint of groups of conversations or teachings above this small conversation level, and the larger discourse level (Evans, *Mark*, 210–84). By doing this, Evans has turned a blind eye to many structural elements and relationships between smaller discourses which may prove beneficial for larger study. One key example of this is Evans' insistence on dealing with both pericopes concerning the fig tree, and the emptying of the temple in separate discussions (Evans, *Mark*, 147–82). Sharyn Dowd, however, is closer to the mark. She recognizes a differentiation within the larger discourse between Jesus' deeds (11:1–25) and words in the Temple (11:27–12:44 [Dowd, *Mark*, 118–27, 128–34]). However, she interprets repetition in the text, not as a sign of further division, but rather as the benchmark of chiasm and organizes the text of the 11:27–12:44 accordingly (Dowd, *Mark*, 128–34; cf. van Iersel's chiasm which encompasses 11:1–12:44, with its centre in the parable of the tenants [van Iersel, *Mark*, 346–50]). France's work offers a middle ground between these two scholars, representing larger scale divisions in the text below the tripartite structure of the Gospel, but also recognizing larger scale pericope above the conversation level (France, *Mark*, 451–52). There is, however the small consolation of the work of van Iersel. He includes the whole of 11:1–12:44 in a single discourse,

for the isolation of this pericope since there are no changes in setting, time, or any other deictic marker at its beginning or end. Neither are there any conjunctive changes that might signal a shift.¹ There is, however, a trait within the text of Mark 12:1–37 closely resembling deixis. Each of the smaller units within the larger defined text begins with the introduction of a new subject, who will undoubtedly question Jesus. The last of these subjects is, of course, Jesus himself (Mark 12:13, 18, 28, 35). Though there is a notable shift in the text with the introduction of each new subject, the basic structure of each of these pericopes mimics the others.² This lends some measure of continuity to the passage by the innate similarities in its components, and Mark’s obvious intention to present them together.³ It is notable that the passage is also prefaced by with an attempt by the Pharisees and Herodians to trap Jesus (καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν πρὸς αὐτόν τινὰς τῶν φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν ἡρωδιανῶν ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ [12:13]). This harks back to the description of the tenants’ treatment of the son of the landowner in the

with smaller divisions below that. However, he also organizes the chapter chiasmally around the parable of tenants. There is no acknowledgement of chiasm in this study. It is enough to note that the van Iersel’s central pivotal passage includes the same text which will be analysed presently (van Iersel, *Mark*, 347; cf. Witherington’s two part “Honor Challenges with the Titans” section, divided at approximately the parable of the tenants [*Mark*, 318–35]).

¹ Though the whole discourse cannot be dealt with, the parable of the tenants seems to bridge the ideas between the earlier discussions with the Jerusalem establishment and the later ones. There is the use of ἄρχω at 12:1, which has implications to time built into the verbal idea. However, none of the classic particles indicating a time change appear (for examples see Porter, *Idioms*, 214). Also, there is no change in place. Similarly, the Markan tendency to begin each sentence with καὶ is unbroken. This is a tendency widely acknowledged in Mark, but used specifically to determine discourse division by scholars such as Westfall (Westfall, *Hebrews*, 46) and Porter (*Idioms*, 305). Similarly, the verbal structure of the passage is unspectacular (for more on the use of verbal signals in discourse shifts see Porter, *Idioms*, 301).

² That is, a new character arrives (13; 18; 28; 35) and asks Jesus a question concerning the Law (14–15a; 19–23; 28b). Jesus then promptly answers each question, with some sort of comment on the questioner’s spiritual condition (15b–17; 24–27; 29–31, 34).

³ There has been some argument that the pericope bears close resemblance to Jewish Passover eve liturgy, in which four questions are each asked by “a wise son, a wicked son, a son of simple piety, and [...] the head of the household” (Witherington, *Mark*, 306; Daube, “Evangelisten,” 119–26). The categorical definition of each question (one refers to law, the second is a mocking question, the third concerns the relationship of God to man and the final is an exegetical question [Witherington, *Mark*, 306; Daube, “Evangelisten,” 119–26]) seems to match quite closely to the Markan text. However it is unlikely that any of the Jerusalem establishment, and especially the Pharisees and Herodians (12:13), would have earned the title “wise” by Markan standards. At best, this is a Markan adaptation of a Passover ritual and significant for the coming events, but not necessarily the passage at hand.

beginning parable (12:7). There is also the matter of the obvious ties between the son of the landowner in Jesus' parable, and the implied son of God in Jesus' discussion of Psalm 110.

2.3. *Conclusions on the Spirit and the Structure of the Discourse*

In short, I have argued that the Spirit is best understood by a full examination of the passage from 12:1–13:37. This passage displays a relatively large amount of similarities, and even some parallelism. The structure of the underlying pericopes that make up the section, namely the four questions asked of Jesus, are all astoundingly similar to one another in form and seem to build on one another as though Mark intended for the reader to assume that they occurred within the same day.¹ The passage also begins and ends with discussions of a rejected son and the son of David, as well as a murdered son and plots to capture Jesus. There should be no doubt that these verses contribute to a single understanding of Jesus, his message, and his opponents. This is evident in Mark's repeated claim that Jesus is the Son of David, which is presented in contrast to the Jerusalem establishment's rejection of Jesus. Though the full consequences of these conclusions on the Spirit are yet to be explored it is safe at this point to draw a few rudimentary guidelines and applications. First, it may be said that the Spirit is used in open conflict between Jesus and the Jerusalem establishment. Second, it must be said that the Spirit is highly connected with the idea that of Jesus is the Son of God and king on his throne. This is in opposition to the title Son of David, which is even given by his supporters. Lastly, since there is no hiding the conflict that dominates the section, and the

¹ Some commentators simply note that the present discourse has been grouped together because of similarities in subject-matter (Witherington, *Mark*, 306; van Iersel, *Mark*, 346–50). However, the scene seems to flow together with far too much continuity. It is likely that, even if each encounter occurred separately, it was Mark's intention to portray a single scene (France, *Mark*, 451–52).

apt note by van Iersel that Jesus is portrayed as victorious,¹ it may be inferred that the Spirit has some part in that victory. The Spirit is a witness to the fact that Jesus is, in fact, the Son of God, the Messiah, and the only king whose rule constitutes the Kingdom of God. As such, it is by the Spirit that Jesus' Kingdom is victorious over the Jerusalem authorities and the kingdom of Satan.

3. *The Spirit in the Text of Mark 12:1–37*

In the larger discourse of Mark surrounding Mark 12:1–37, there are frequent references to David, and to Jesus as his son. Jesus has spoken mysteriously about a Son sent by a very wealthy landowner who was murdered by his father's tenants. He has entered Jerusalem to the welcoming cries of its outsiders, and has, since that point, been engulfed in a bitter battle. This battle will come to a head in the trial and crucifixion of Jesus. Though it seems that this it will end in the Jerusalem establishment's victory, at least for a while, in Jesus' crucifixion, there is no denying that they are being beaten at every point. Jerusalem, formerly the capital of God's Kingdom on earth, has rejected Jesus. The Spirit has been recruited as a witness to Jesus' true nature, the Messiah, the Son of God, and the ruler in whose reign the Kingdom of God is accomplished. Mark 12:1–37 will be examined for two main emphases, the first on the discussion of Jesus' status as son of God and Lord, and the second on the Markan emphasis on the Kingdom of God, and its subtle entry into the text. Each of these unique emphases will, in turn, be discussed for their unique effects on the Markan portrayal of the Spirit in this particular pericope. Finally, though the intent of this study is to display the function of the Spirit in Mark 12:1–37, there are several thematic elements in the text that must be discussed, since they bear on the Markan understanding of the Spirit.

¹ Hence his section title "Winning in the Temple Court" (van Iersel, *Mark*, 351).

3.1. *A Close Examination of Mark 12:35–37*

The text of Mark 12:35–37 has been the subject of some discussion over authenticity, though not to the same degree as the following chapter. The discussion begins with Bultmann. He labels the passage apophthegmatic, having its roots in the early Christian community, due to the fact the question, atypically, was both asked and answered by Jesus.¹ Other scholars have suggested that Jesus' question was in response to another asked by the Pharisees which was lost before Mark acquired the source.² However, Porter has already noted Jesus' tendency to begin short discourses with questions in the Markan text.³ There is nothing amiss in the text. Rather, Jesus is taking the opportunity to question those who have questioned him, or to trap them in their own practice. It is not uncommon practice for Jesus to respond to the Pharisees with questions. In this instance, Jesus' question followed a long interrogation of sorts. Evans puts it quite succinctly when he writes:

One challenge and question after another has been hurled at Jesus, and each one has been answered with skill and, in some circumstances, surprising innovation. Jesus will now take the initiative.⁴

¹ Bultmann, *History*, 66. Evans also notes that Suhl (Suhl, *Funktion*, 89–94) supports Bultmann in this claim (Evans, *Mark*, 270). Porter, however, recognizes a certain degree of continuity in the text, as a result of its use of the imperative and Jesus' tendency to open short discourses with questions in the rest of the Gospel (Porter, *Criteria*, 228–29). This continuity may be of some help in verifying that the text is authentic. Aside from the Bultmann's source critical questions, there are no textual reasons to dismiss the passage. There are slight variants in the passage, but most amount to no more than the addition or subtraction of an article. One variant, however, presents itself as an attractive note for an analysis of the *wirkungsgeschichte* of the text. The phrase αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι is added in verse 37, making it explicit that the Spirit featured strongly in the early interpretation of the passage, though the variant does not make an appearance until roughly the 9th century AD. There is no reason to suggest that homoioarcton contributed to the addition, since the Psalmic quotation remains intact. It is likely a purposeful scribal addition, meant to mirror the near parallel statement in 35.

² Evans, *Mark*, 271. For this interpretation, Evans relies on Gagg (Gagg, "Davidsohnefrage," 18–30) and Cranfield (Cranfield, *Saint Mark*, 381–82).

³ Porter, *Criteria*, 229.

⁴ Evans, *Mark*, 267.

In short, Jesus will question his questioners as a test of their knowledge of the Messiah. He is destined to win, since it is obvious to Mark's readers that Jesus is that Messiah.¹

The introduction itself seems to indicate that this is precisely the case. Mark 12:35 begins with the aorist participle ἀποκριθεὶς, which acts to set the background of Jesus' coming discourse.² Jesus has answered the questions of the Jerusalem authorities. Now it is time for his own question. The question is one that has caused a great deal of trouble within New Testament studies. In what seems to be a break from tradition, Jesus challenges those who call the Messiah the son of David. Witherington is quick to note that, although the precise term "son of David" does not appear before *Pss.Sol.* 17:23, there is ample evidence of a messianic hope connected to David and his descendents long before this.³ Many, however, do not believe that Jesus is denying that he, the Messiah, is the son of David.⁴ Rather, if Daube is correct in his estimation that Jesus' is asking a question concerning seemingly contradictory Scriptures,⁵ then the answer might simply be that Jesus intended to place himself hierarchically over David. He is the Son of God though he is, in fact, of Davidic descent. Similarly, Rowe claims that Jesus avoided the

¹ Jesus has, on numerous occasions accepted the title Χριστὸς (1:24, 8:29, 14:61), and was introduced by the title in Mark 1:1.

² There is no claim here that the aorist participle acts to finalize Jesus' answers, as any *Aktionsart* grammar worth its weight might suggest. For example, Moule is clear that the temporality of the participle depends on the main verb, but insists that the aorist participle, like all aorists, suggests punctiliar action (Moule, *Idiom Book*, 99; cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 858–64). Rather the participle itself serves the dual purpose of modifying both subject and verbal idea, and also might suggest antecedent action, due to its relative placement before the head term (Porter, *Idioms*, 187–88; cf. Fanning, *Aspect*, 413). It should be understood that Mark is simply portraying the fact that Jesus has finished answering questions, and will now proceed (as per the head term) to ask his own. There is nothing out of the ordinary in the aorist form here. The participle is a simple statement of fact. It provides the background information that allows the action of the head term to proceed.

³ Both Witherington and Flusser point to this tendency. Witherington cites *4QFlor* 1:11–13, which reflects the tendency within early Judaism to interpret 2 Sam 7, where David is promised an everlasting kingdom, through Amos 9:11. This particular passage predicts the rebuilding of the Davidic monarchy, with obvious Messianic implications (Witherington, *Mark*, 332; Flusser, "Midrash," 99–109).

⁴ Witherington claims that it is impossible that Jesus is denying that the Messiah is the son of David. Jesus believes himself to be the Messiah and does not, in the many instances in which he is given the title, deny it (Witherington, *Mark*, 332–33).

⁵ Daube, "Evangelisten," 119–26; in Witherington, *Mark*, 332–33.

title in this case because it might suggest that Jesus had aspirations of becoming a political leader, when Jesus had no such desire. He is a king of a much different sort than David.¹ Jesus is not denying his Davidic lineage, nor is he denying that the Messiah is a son of David. Mark seems to be organized around the question “who is Jesus?”² The Markan Jesus is simply redefining the Jewish perception of Messiah from a political leader, to something completely different.³ It is the Markan agenda to present Jesus as this new kind of Messiah. This Messiah heals and forgives, and looks for need and faith among his followers.

In light of this new hierarchical reordering of Jesus over David, and the messianic hopes attached to Jesus, it is interesting that Jesus is often called the son of David by the crowds of people who follow him. This is compounded when one considers that Jesus never corrects their claims. The story of Bartimaeus provides an excellent example. He represents the classic Markan minor character who has placed his faith in Jesus and, thus, has not misinterpreted Jesus.⁴ When Jesus is referred to as the son of David twice by Bartimaeus (10:47–48) Jesus does not correct him. To Bartimaeus, Jesus is the saviour of those in need who is more than capable of healing him. This, to Bartimaeus, is wrapped up in the messianic title son of David.⁵ To this perception, Jesus offers no resistance.

¹ Rowe, *Kingdom*, 280. See also Moule, who argues that Jesus was trying to convince the Jerusalemites that “their messianic expectations were too superficial” (Moule, *New Testament*, 64).

² Witherington, *Mark*, 36–39.

³ Rowe, *Kingdom*, 280.

⁴ Williams claims that the Bartimaeus narrative sets a precedent for all minor characters to follow. That is, Bartimaeus is presented to the reader as an example to follow. He has understood the message of Jesus, and his example is continued in the minor characters which follow in the discourse. The best example of this is the soldier at the foot of the cross. Both Bartimaeus and the Roman soldier are examples of a proper reaction to Jesus in the Markan narrative (Williams, *Followers*, on Bartimaeus and following, 151–52, on the centurion, 183–86; Kingsbury, *Christology*, 105; Malbon, “Followers,” 31).

⁵ It is unlikely that Bartimaeus was simply referring to a familial connection between Jesus and David. Evans suggests the possibility of it being a reference to Solomon, who was reputed to have healing powers (Evans, *Mark*, 132; citing *Pss. Sol.* 17:20). France argues that *Pss. Sol.* 17:20 is messianic in nature, and that Bartimaeus is calling to a Messiah (France, *Mark*, 423).

It is at this point that Jesus introduces the Spirit into his argument. He begins by introducing Psalm 110 as a Psalm about the Christ,¹ written by David,² and spoken by the Holy Spirit (εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ [12:36]). Based on this, the Spirit is both responsible for, and witness to David's words. Specifically the Markan Jesus is both giving credit to, and attaining the witness of the Spirit in defence of his claim. There are two connotations of the Psalmic text which bear on the Markan interpretation of the Spirit in this passage. First, the Spirit is witness to Jesus, who is the son of God. Second, the Spirit is witness to Jesus the ruler of the Kingdom of God. These twin emphases will be explored immediately following the present analysis of the text.

The text itself, having introduced David as the speaker, continues to present the argument that, since David spoke to the Messiah as κυρίῳ μου,³ the Messiah must be greater than David. There is also the promise, which may be interpreted relative to the pressure applied to Jesus by the Jerusalemites, that the Lord would place the Messiah's enemies below his feet. The pericope is concluded with Jesus' brief interpretation of the Psalm. His argument is that, since David calls the Messiah Lord, the Messiah cannot be the son of David. The question remains, if he is too great to be called the son of David, whose son is he? The answer in the Markan text is simple. In the introduction Jesus is

¹ Allen is sensitive to the canonical significance of the Psalm in relation to Jesus, but insists that there was no such intonation in its authorship (Allen, *Psalms*, 84)

² This was likely more than a simple presumption. Canonical tradition suggests that David was its author, as reflected by the Septuagint introduction to the text "τῷ Δαυιδ ψαλμός." The text of the Psalm in Mark is nearly identical to the Septuagint text, except for the Markan replacement of the noun ὑποπόδιον, footstool, with the preposition ὑποκάτω, underneath. There is no evidence of any variants to support the replacement. It is best concluded that the substitution is a clarification of the grammatically awkward text.

³ There is no indication whatsoever that the text of the psalms understands ὁ κύριος as the Messiah. Rather, Allen argues that the composer is actually a servant of David's and that "my Lord" refers to David, in conversation with Yahweh (Allen, *Psalms*, 83–87). The text of Mark, however, assumes that David is speaking, and refers to κυρίῳ μου in 37 as αὐτόν, in reference to ὁ χριστός in 35. The quote is framed with constant reference to the Messiah, in the Markan passage. There can be no doubt that this Messiah is ὁ κύριος.

called the Son of God. Though the Pharisees do not see this, and even some of Jesus' followers may not understand completely, Jesus is hinting at his true identity here. The Spirit is witness to Jesus' identity. By the Spirit Jesus' audience is told that this man, who the Pharisees are addressing with contempt, is the Lord that they claim to worship.

3.2. *Jesus the Son of God and the Spirit his Witness*

The answer to the question "whose son is Jesus?" is not, admittedly, communicated clearly in this passage by any means. Though this might present a problem elsewhere, when interpreted through the frame of the Markan Jesus, there is no problem here. France has already argued that Jesus will not be revealed to anyone in the main body of Mark unless by their own inference. The truth about who Jesus is has been communicated in no uncertain terms in the prologue of the Gospel, and from the first lines of the story after the prologue it has been up to the characters in the text to decide who Jesus is.¹ There are a few clues, however. First, Jesus is explicitly referred to as *ὁ κύριος* in his own recitation of Psalm 110. Similarly, though Jesus never explicitly calls himself the Son of God in the Markan text, he seems to be guardedly accepting the title *Χριστός* at present. This acceptance, however, is subject to his own interpretation, which is connected in no uncertain terms to the Markan *υἱὸς θεοῦ*.² Also, it is quite evident that it is Jesus who represents the son of the landowner who was sent and rejected by the tenants in 12:6. That parable was followed by a quotation of Psalm 118. This is nearly identical to Mark's usage of Psalm 110 in Mark 12:36–7. The Psalm predicts that the rejected son will rise above his enemies, those who rejected him, by the work of the Lord (12:10–11). There

¹ France, *Mark*, 58–59.

² Rowe, *Kingdom*, 282. Similarly, the list of scholars who contend that Jesus is making claims to divinity is extensive. Witherington notes that Jesus was alluding to his own divinity (Witherington, *Mark*, 333), and draws the support of both Taylor (Taylor, *Saint Mark*, 493) and Marshall (Marshall, *Luke*, 746–49).

have been references to Jesus as son throughout the passage, first in the parable, then in the question referring to the Christ (αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον, καὶ πόθεν αὐτοῦ ἔστιν υἱός [12:37]). Though it is not stated explicitly, nor should it be expected that the Markan Jesus would state it explicitly, the pericope has built an image of Jesus as the Son of God. Jesus is the divine Lord who is sent by the Lord.¹ He is too great to be called a son of David. It is only by the Spirit, however, that David makes this realization, and it is only by the Spirit that David is witness to the divinity of Jesus. The Spirit here is intimately connected to Mark's christology. Mark is presenting Jesus as the divine Lord, most clearly in Psalmic quotations. However, there is another aspect to the Psalmic quotations which has not yet been discussed. It is not uncommon for the Spirit to be used in support of a Markan high christology. However, it is even more common for the Spirit to be used in connection with the development of Markan Kingdom theology. With this in mind, there is more being presented here than Jesus' divinity. Jesus kingship is also being communicated in the undertones of Jesus' speech. Mark, as is fairly typical, is presenting Jesus as the ruler of the Kingdom of God in hushed language in the body of his text, though it has been made explicit in the prologue. As such, the present focus will turn from the Spirit in support of a Markan christology to the Spirit in the development of a Markan Kingdom theology.

3.3. *Jesus, the Spirit, and the Kingdom of God*

The original context of the Psalm 110, though not necessarily messianic, fits perfectly into the Markan text. In short, not only is the Christ being hailed as something equivalent to the Lord himself, he is also being greeted as a king! Jesus refers to the Kingdom

¹ Rowe makes it perfectly clear that that the parable of the tenants is intended by Jesus to reveal that God, the landowner, had sent him, the son, and the prophets to Israel (Rowe, *Kingdom*, 128).

several times in the text preceding Mark 1:1–37. Each time Jesus is either the ruler in the Kingdom, in hidden language, or an authority on its nature. Upon his arrival into Jerusalem, his followers proclaim that the kingdom of David has arrived. When this claim comes from the lips of Jesus followers, once again, there is no correction (Mark 11:10).¹ There is nothing to correct. In the pericope that immediately precedes the present one, Jesus is questioned by a scribe. After confirming that Jesus' words are true concerning the greatest commandment, Jesus, as an authoritative voice, declares that he is not far from the Kingdom. Mark presents Jesus as the chief authority on the Kingdom of God. In contrast, Jesus refers to the Christ in royal terms in 12:36–37 by suggesting that he is not beneath David, but superior to him even as a descendant. All of this is proven using a royal Psalm, used only in direct reference to Israel's ruler.² Rowe notes the significance of this, and claims that the invitation to sit at God's right hand is an invitation to enthronement.³ That is, not only is Mark presenting Jesus as a chief authority on the Kingdom of God, he is presenting him as the chief authority in the Kingdom of God. Jesus is the king. This is an extension of God's ruling power to Jesus, under the rule of God, and witnessed through King David by the Spirit.⁴ In the Markan text God is passing Jesus the authority to rule the Kingdom of God. This is accomplished primarily by the application of the title ὁ κύριος to Jesus, but also involves the Spirit as both a validator

¹ There is no reference to "followers" in the text. The claim is made by the crowd that accompanies Jesus into Jerusalem. Many scholars have noted the shifting function and composition of the crowd in Mark and that often the crowds are "the recipients of Jesus' ministry, his teaching, healing, and feeding" (Williams, *Followers*, 12; cf. Malbon, "Characters," 113). It is likely that those who have remained with Jesus thus far, though they may not completely understand, are those who have already received these things. Like Bartimaeus, the crowd's newest member (10:52), most are there because of a sincere faith.

² Allen, *Psalms*, 83–87.

³ Rowe, *Kingdom*, 283.

⁴ Rowe, though he is explicit on the relationship between the Lord as it represents Yahweh, and the Lord in the persona of Jesus, does not make any reference to the Spirit in his comments on this particular passage (Rowe, *Kingdom*, 283). If anything, this represents the Rowe's greatest weakness. He brings the argument only so far and then falls short of identifying the third divine person mentioned within a two verse radius in the Markan text.

of Jesus' kingship. The Spirit is the divine witness to the fact that Jesus is the ruler of the Kingdom of God. Through Psalmic quotation, and in Markan subdued language, Mark has presented the reader with a new king in the Kingdom of God. Earlier in the text, Jesus presented the idea that he was the ruler, despite the Pharisee's rejection (Mark 10:12; Psalm 118:22). Here, Mark presents the same idea using Kingdom language. It is clear to the reader, who has been informed of Jesus' kingship, and to the wise listener that the Lord who David refers to is Jesus. Jesus is a king on David's throne who even David bows to. Jesus is a ruler of a new kingdom, the Kingdom of God, and the Spirit is his chief witness.

3.4. Conclusions on the Text of 12:1–37

Throughout the examination of the text it has become apparent that the Spirit is connected strongly to the christology of Mark. This has been accomplished by the textual connection between Jesus the sent son and the parabolic landowner. Jesus is greater than David and called the Lord. Jesus claims that he is greater than David, and too great to be called David's son, since David himself called him Lord. He is called the Christ, a title connected with the Son of God repeatedly in Mark. He is called the Son of God in the first verses of the book. He is also referred to using kingdom language. He accepts the title king from his followers at the triumphal entry, and presents himself as an authority on the Kingdom of God before alluding to himself as greater than David in a Psalm saturated with royal emphasis. Though the text of Mark often makes direct reference to Jesus as the bringer of the Kingdom, and the Son of God, they very rarely come from the mouth of Jesus himself. In this speech Jesus comes closer to claiming these two titles than he has in the whole of the preceding text. The emphasis of this particular text is

unmistakably on Jesus the Son of God and ruler in God's Kingdom, and there is no doubt that the Spirit, in the immediate context of 12:35–37, is witness to this fact with Jesus, alongside the Father who sent him.

Conclusions

The Spirit in Mark 12:35–37 is used as a witness and a supporter of both the divinity of Jesus, and his position as the ruler of God's Kingdom. The Spirit does this in the face of opposition from the Jerusalemites, the former leaders of God's Kingdom who have rejected God's envoy to them, as evidenced in the parable of the tenants, which serves as an introduction to the pericope in which the Spirit occurred. This passage's portrayal of the Spirit lends both importance and ambiguity to him in the text of Mark. There is importance due to the fact that the Spirit, as in other passages in the Gospel, is used as support for both the christology and Kingdom theology of Mark, both of which serve a major role in the Gospel. However, there is admittedly ambiguity in the very little amount of text given to the Spirit in the Gospel. It is because of this that it must be emphasised that there is no unified pneumatology presented in the Gospel of Mark. There simply is not enough reference to the Spirit to formulate one. However, there is a rather distinct pattern of usage in which the Spirit is called in as witness on a few key occasions in support of the strong high christology of the Gospel of Mark, and also the Markan Kingdom theology. Though the Spirit is of little representative merit alone in the Gospel, it is used in support of two of Mark's great contributions to New Testament theology.

Chapter 5

THE SPIRIT IN MARK 13:1–37

It is in the latter half of Mark that its brevity and sparse use of the Spirit in the narrative takes its toll on the formation of any comprehensive Markan pneumatology. As it has already been shown, the first five chapters show a remarkable consistency in their treatment of the Spirit. He is credited with much involvement in the beginning of the rule of God on the earth through the miraculous ministry of Jesus. This is especially true through Jesus' exorcisms. There is no such unity in the treatment of the Spirit in the latter half of the Gospel. There are similarities in the manner in which the Spirit is spoken of in chapters thirteen and twelve. However, they do not form an overarching pneumatological thread which pervades the entirety of the Gospel, nor do they invite simple summary. This is not a Markan downfall, however. Mark demonstrates a uniquely formed connection between πνεῦμα and βασιλεία early in his Gospel. Though the situation has changed significantly since those opening chapters, the Spirit is still connected with the development of the Kingdom of God. If there is little uniformity in Mark's portrayal of the Spirit, there is a great deal of uniformity in his development of the Kingdom of God. The development of the Kingdom in the latter half of Mark has shifted focus. Mark is

now concerned with showing the Kingdom of God in opposition to Jerusalem, and its persecution and victory. With this shift in Kingdom theology in mind, it is not surprising that Mark's portrayal of the Spirit has shifted in the same manner. There are several distinguishable themes that trace their way through the Gospel, including a distinctive christology and Kingdom theology. There is also a unique emphasis on Galilee and Jerusalem. Many other themes including secrecy, discipleship, and eschatology, trace their way through the discourse.¹ With this in mind, the Spirit, since it does not play a part as an organizing theme in Mark's Gospel, may best be understood relative to the particular developmental context in which it appears. Therefore, it makes perfect sense that the Spirit ought to be connected so strongly with the Kingdom of God, especially over the kingdom of Satan through exorcism in the first episodes of the Gospel. It is precisely those themes which are being developed in the early chapters of Mark. Thus, an examination of the role of the Spirit in Mark 13 ought to keep in mind the immediate thematic context of the Gospel surrounding Mark 13:10, and the greater development that is occurring in this pericope. That is, the Spirit ought to be examined in the context of the Kingdom of God and the opposition that it finds in Jerusalem.

It is of some benefit, then, that this particular passage has become the focus of an immense amount of scholarly discussion as the longest of Jesus' discourses in the Gospel and also for its seemingly indefinable genre. The discussion surrounding this passage has centred mainly on its resemblance to the Jewish apocalyptic form and the issues surrounding its redaction and relation to the Jesus tradition. Consequently, little else has been elaborated on in any great detail, least of all the consequences of the passage on a

¹ Notable studies include Witherington, *Mark*, 40–54; France, *Mark*, 20–35; Rowe, *Kingdom*; Williams, *Followers*; Evans, *Mark*, lxxvii–xxx; Guelich, *Mark*, xxxvii–xl; among others cited in this chapter.

Markan understanding of the Spirit. Therefore, it will be the goal of this chapter to develop an understanding of the Spirit as it is portrayed in Mark 13. This will be done with the thematic development of the chapter, and the chapter's contribution to Mark as a whole firmly in mind. The immediate context of 13:10 seems to indicate that Mark intended to portray the Spirit as power for speech, much in the same way that Stronstad and Menzies have summarized the work of the Spirit in Acts.¹ However, the passage differs from Acts in several ways. The Spirit here is used in a far broader sense. Though the immediate result of the Spirit's presence is speech, this is not at all in focus in the Markan text. Rather, the Spirit seems to be the sole aide promised to the disciples during the eschatological persecution. The emphasis of the passage, genre notwithstanding, rests primarily on its commands, as evidenced by the passage's paraenetic structure. Through repetition, it is easily discernable that the message of Jesus concerns perseverance to the end in the midst of eschatological persecution. The Spirit in Mark 13:10 is intrinsically tied to the idea of perseverance through eschatological persecution and it will be shown, through an examination of the structure of Mark, that the Spirit is the only help promised to the disciples in their eschatological time of need. This, when considered with the immediate context mentioned earlier, seems to indicate that Mark wished to portray the Spirit as an aid to the church, both as a provider of speech, and as a divine presence in the face of persecution. It will be shown that the theme and genre of the entire eschatological discourse (Mark 13:1–37) is paraenetic in nature, rather than apocalyptic. Next, the content of Jesus' message in 13:1–13 will be examined provide a close context for the Spirit in 13:10. This will show that the Spirit is the eschatological aid to the church, so that they will be witnesses of Christ in persecution and not lose the blessed

¹ See the discussion on the Pentecostal influence on Lukan pneumatology in chapter 2.

hope that belongs to those who persevere. This will be followed by a discussion of the paraenetic structure and the prophetic genre of the passage with particular emphasis on 13:5–13, which emphasises Jesus' call for perseverance in the eschaton and the days before. This will prove definitively that the passage is instructional, rather than predictive, and that the Spirit is the sole promise to the disciples in their responsibility to stand firm as witnesses during the persecution that they will face until the end. If they stand firm for the Kingdom of God, in spite of the challenges that they will face from the kings and rulers of this earth, they will inherit salvation in the end.

1. The Little Apocalypse Theory and Recent Scholarly Discussion

George Beasley-Murray has noted in the introduction to his text on Jesus' eschatological discourse that any author attempting to analyse critically this, or any other controversial passage, is bound inseparably to the cultural climate in which he or she writes.¹ It is unfortunate for this particular work that the tides of cultural influence have moved in such a way as to avoid any discussion of the Spirit in Mark 13. In contrast, so many authors have been led to debate the authenticity of Mark 13, and the possibility of its roots in Jewish apocalyptic literature. It is due to this unfortunate trend that this chapter, though it is first an examination of the Spirit in Mark 13, must divert momentarily to explore the implications of redaction criticism on Mark 13, and discuss its genre. Though the specific arguments fronted by those who believe the text to have origins in Jewish apocalypse have little immediate relevance, they will be a beneficial counterpoint to the present claim. That is, that the pericope is actually representative of eschatological paraenesis. This will be established first by a discussion of Timothy Colani's work on the little apocalypse theory. This will be followed by an examination of modern reactions to

¹ Beasley Murray, *Jesus*, 1.

the theory and its developments, with a final summary detailing the present rejection of the little apocalypse theory.

1.1. *Colani's Little Apocalypse*

Though the development of the little apocalypse theory is well documented by Beasley-Murray,¹ the work of Timothy Colani is among the earliest representations of the theory in its complete form.² Colani picked up on the discussion among biblical scholars concerning the nature of the text, begun by D.F. Strauss, who insisted that Mark 13:32 constituted an unfulfilled prophecy. To Strauss, this demonstrated unequivocally the weakness of a faith built upon the supposed divinity and infallibility of the historical Jesus.³ It was also the claim of Strauss and many of his successors that, not only were Jesus' predictions false, they were also unoriginal. They borrowed heavily from the language of the Old Testament and the first century apocalypses. It is this theory, particularly, that captured Colani's interest. The little apocalypse theory is Colani's endeavour to show the roots of Mark 13 in apocalyptic literature and the redactor's hand in incorporating some pre-existent apocalypse into the text of his Gospel.

Colani's theory, in its simplest form, is that the basic teachings of Jesus preclude any eschatological elements, and especially the idea of a *parousia*. That is, the authentic sayings of Jesus are so contradictory in nature to the kind of early Jewish messianism that would include the promise of a second coming that it is impossible for the eschatological sayings attributed to Jesus to be authentic.⁴ Therefore, the pericope must have been redacted into the text by some of Jesus' followers. Colani's next step is to label the

¹ Beasley-Murray, *Jesus*, 1–32.

² Colani, *Jésus*.

³ Strauss, *Life*, 86; cited in Beasley Murray, *Jesus*.

⁴ Colani, *Jésus*, 146–48.

imported speech a Jewish apocalypse, complete with the phraseology of verse 14, which indicates that the apocalypse itself is not heavily redacted. According to Colani, verse 14 is a dead giveaway of the inauthenticity of the passage, since it is apparently designed to be read.¹ Upon further examination, Colani concludes that Mark 13:32 contains the authentic answer to the question asked in 13:4. Therefore, it is likely that the apocalypse has been inserted between question and answer, and includes the entire discourse from Mark 13:5–31.² As with Holtzmann, Colani divides the apocalypse into three passages, with each title taken from the passage itself. They are “the sorrows of childbirth” (αἱ ὠδίνης, Mk 13:5–8), “the affliction (ἡ θλίψις, Mk 13: 9–13), and “the end” (τὸ τέλος, Mk 13:14–31).³ With these three categorical divisions, Colani came to the final conclusion that the text is representative of early Jewish Christian thought. It was written sometime between the ministry of Jesus and the redaction of Mark, which he estimates occurred in the late 60s AD by early Christians. It was later imported into the Gospel by the evangelist.⁴ Though Colani gives adept reasons for his theory, perhaps due to the fact that his writing on Mark 13 is a conclusion to a much larger work, the little apocalypse theory went largely undeveloped in his work. Beasley-Murray has catalogued the further development of the theory through time.⁵

¹ Colani, *Jésus*, 207.

² Colani, *Jésus*, 202–3.

³ For an excellent summary of the division of the text by Colani (*Jésus*, 204–5), and Holtzmann (Holtzmann, *Evangelien*), see Beasley-Murray (*Jesus*, 10–11, 13–20). It should also be noted that, though Colani’s division of the apocalyptic text was based on Holtzmann’s earlier work, it was not identical. Holtzmann, divided the text into the ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων (in the world [Mk 13:5–8] and the kingdom [Mk 13:9–13]), the θλίψις (Mk 13:14–23), and the παρουσία (Mk 13:24–7).

⁴ Colani, *Jésus*, 204–5, 207.

⁵ *Jesus and the Last Days* is dedicated to the development of Colani’s theory with a breadth and scope far beyond the means of this chapter to accommodate, as well as some rebuttal and commentary on the passage by Beasley-Murray.

1.2. *Discussion of the Little Apocalypse in Contemporary Scholarship*

Though there are variations in the definition of an apocalypse, certain elements remain consistent. Koch has listed six characteristics that are indicative of apocalyptic literature that include “long discourse cycles, forecasts of spiritual turmoil, paraenetic discourses, pseudonymity, mythical images rich in symbolism and composite character [...]”¹

Koch’s definition, though not programmatic, is typical. In reference to Jewish apocalypses specifically Allison adds:

[Jewish Apocalypses] all draw heavily on OT phraseology, themes and motifs. All are filled with mysterious revelations, heavenly secrets, obscure symbolism and esoteric wisdom. All reflect alienation from the world as it is. All are also pseudonymous, so that in each case the purported author, who is the recipient of revelation, is always a great hero from the sacred past [...]. Finally, most of the apocalypses wrestle with the problem of evil and most anticipate evil’s eschatological undoing [...].²

Though apocalyptic literature and Jewish apocalypses are not different genres, it is possible for a text to be apocalyptic, but not a Jewish apocalypse. It is expedient, therefore, to compare Mark 13 against both criteria. It is not the conclusion of this paper alone, but the conclusion of the majority of scholarship on the matter, that Mark 13 is not, in fact, a Jewish apocalypse.³

¹ Koch, *Rediscovery*. For a brief summary of Koch’s work and the genre in general see Allison, “Apocalyptic,” 17.

² Allison, “Apocalyptic,” 18.

³ Allison is one of many modern scholars who do not believe that the text is representative of a redacted apocalypse, since it is not pseudonymous, but rather anonymous, and there is no heavenly intermediary, allegory, or symbolism (Allison, “Apocalyptic,” 18–19). Similarly, Geddert admits that the passage seems eschatological in nature and includes what seem to be predictions of blessing and woes. However, there is nothing recorded about “other worldly journeys,” including forays into hell, heaven, or heavenly courts. Likewise, the passage is not designed to give a timetable of the coming events using masked symbolism. Most importantly to Geddert is the claim of ignorance on the part of Jesus, which is absolutely atypical of the messengers of apocalyptic literature (Geddert, “Teaching,” 21–23). Wenham has argued that the passage is completely authentic, and that it has no ties to Jewish Apocalypse. He claims that it makes no predictions concerning the coming of Jesus, but rather addresses the immanent destruction of the temple and persecution and coming of Christ on completely different levels. Though Wenham is shy of discussing the apocalyptic form forwardly. He does not even include a reference to apocalypse or apocalyptic literature in his index. His conclusions concern the originality of the discourse, and are critical of the

1.3. Modern Theories on the Genre of Mark 13

Though the majority of discussion around Mark 13 has centred on the controversy of its origins, there has in the past few decades been a re-advent of critical methods which focus on the final form of Scripture and its meaning. Often, little or no emphasis is placed on the evolution or formation of texts. The reader-response and rhetorical critical methods of interpretation are two such highly interrelated methods which have emphasised structure highly, whether intentionally organized by the author or read into the text by the reader. As such, these methods deserve mention here. Van Iersel, representative of the first school, has read the text as a multi-layered concentric discourse, focussed around the coming of Jesus in Mark 13:26.¹ In his estimation, the passage does not represent a single chiasm alone. Rather, he claims that the passage is composed of three chiasms in a chiastic arrangement relative to one another. Thus, the first chiasm contains signs of the coming of the Son of Man (Mk 13:5–23) and finds its centre in the discussion of coming persecutions (Mk 13:9–13) surrounded by signs of those persecutions. The final chiasm also contains signs of the coming and centres on Jesus' claim that the precise time is unknown (Mk 13:30–32). This claim is surrounded on both sides by parables (Mk 13:28–37). The central chiasm concerns the coming of the son of

tendency to assume that redaction critical methods, which must include the imposition of apocalyptic tendencies on the text, are the best methods (Wenham, *Rediscovery*, 364–74). McDonald and Porter are clear that apocalyptic literature requires “the otherworldly intervention of God,” which is communicated to the writer by “translation from this world to another” (McDonald and Porter, *Christianity*, 421). This does not by any means occur in Mark 13, though the language of other apocalypses is present (McDonald and Porter, *Christianity*, 64). This same opinion is reflected in Lane (Lane, *Mark*, 445), and also in France, who adds the criteria of the division of historical events into meaning groups. He claims that apocalyptic discourse is never this brief and never found implanted into a narrative in this fashion (France, *Mark*, 498; cf. Malina, “Eschatology,” 49–59). Recent scholarship in support of the theory usually does so by making the connection between Mark 13 and apocalyptic writings in Daniel (Aage Pilgaard, “Apokalyptik,” 187–91; Theissen, *Lokalkolorit*, 133–76; Collins, “Rhetoric,” 5–36). However, a quotation from the apocalyptic genre does not by any means affect the Markan narrative, and the formal characteristics of the passage itself must be weighed.

¹ Though he does not use the term specifically, van Iersel seems to be advocating a chiastic structure, and so it will be referred to as such from this point onward (van Iersel, *Mark*, 391).

man (Mk 13:26), which is detailed fully in the passage (Mk 13:24–27).¹ Thematically, it seems that Van Iersel has identified the passage's organization quite well. However, his conceptual strengths seem to have overridden his grammatical sensibilities. This particular organization seems to have stressed too highly the ability to divide a passage conceptually on a micro level. He is right in assuming that there is a great deal of conceptual division in the text, however, his conceptual analysis is forced to fit into such a neat framework, and needs to be clarified grammatically. It is impossible to reduce the context of the Spirit to simple signs of the coming of the Son of Man. One must first consider the grammatical predominance of paraenesis in the text.

1.4. Conclusion: Weighing the Evidence on the Little Apocalypse Theory

Admittedly, Mark 13:5-37, at first glance, appears apocalyptic. It speaks of a coming τέλος, and also of a coming persecution. It is written in response to the promised destruction of the temple, and follows a request for σημεῖα. It also bears initial similarities to *I Enoch* 91, and especially in its grammatical cycle between imperative, and explanatory and prophetic discourses. The similarities, however, break down quickly under close examination. Though Weiffenbach argues that the discourse is attributed pseudepigraphically to Jesus, he does not seem to be an apocalyptic heaven-sent messenger, nor does he speak in apocalyptic symbolism.² In light of Weiffenbach's argument, it must be asked whether redaction, if it is indeed taking place at this point in Mark, constitutes pseudepigraphy. This, however, is not likely. At worst, the passage must be labelled anonymous. If the passage is attributed to Jesus, it is not by some pseudepigraphal author, but by Mark. As mentioned, the passage is devoid of heavenly

¹ van Iersel, *Mark*, 391.

² Weiffenbach, *Wiederkunftsgedanke*, 133–34; in Beasley-Murray, *Jesus*.

messengers, extra-worldly trips, and though it shows some sign of alternating paraenesis, it is unlikely, as has been asserted elsewhere, that the entirety of the passage is concerned with the signs of Jesus' return and the end of the age.¹ Rather, the passage serves as a warning of present persecution (Mk 13:31) which is inevitable before some unknown eschatological end (Mk 13:32). It does not, in fact, strictly delineate signs that will accompany the end of the age, as might be expected in an apocalypse.

At this point, it is necessary to provide some caveat for those who do see apocalyptic elements in the text. In the following discussion, Mark 13 will be compared to Old Testament prophetic literature. Those passages in which the prophet bears the role of covenant mediator provide the closest parallels in genre. The strongest evidence for this, and the centre of the current argument, is the centrality of paraenesis to the text.² That is, Jesus' commands are at the centre of the passage, not the accompanying signs. It is my claim that the passage is not, in fact, apocalyptic. However, other argument aside,

¹ This theory has most recently come to popularity as the result of Wenham's work on the subject *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse*. Geddert's differentiation between a known time of persecution, and an unknown *telos* indicates that he is at least in partial support. However, he refuses to claim this, and sees his own opinion as a compromise against those who claim that the eschatological coming and the coming persecution are separate events. However, in calling the eschatological coming a purposefully unknown day, Geddert has made some differentiation between this day and the predicted persecution and ought to be included with those who insist on a differentiation between the two (Geddert, "Teaching," 21–23).

² Paraenesis seems to be the backbone upon which the structure of the pericope is built (Porter, *Aspect*, 433–35). Elliott, however, argues that the discourse ought not to be organized around the imperatives. In his schema, the passage is organized around its placement of verbs within the sentence (Elliott, "Position," 140–42). Elliott himself, though he identifies verses occurring later in the pericope, argues that this syntactical variation might be better adapted to emphasis, since Mark places emphasis on the beginnings of his sentence (140). In view of the large number of primary position verbs in the pericope (Elliott counts 60 in Mark 13 ["Position," 137–38]), in comparison to the relatively low number of final position verbs with a noted concentration around 11–14 (Elliott, "Position," 140), it might be better to assume that 11–14 constitutes a narrative peak, at least within the first section of the pericope. In contrast to Elliott's claim, a paraenetic backbone fits the organization of the passage, in which the imperative command and subjunctive explanation are followed repeatedly by descriptions of the situation in the future form. Though the temporal context of the situation is the future, this future context is not accomplished entirely by the future form, though there is some degree of separation from Jesus' context accomplished with the future form (see especially the ch. 9 of Porter, *Aspect*). This separation is aided in portraying a temporal future by the use of such deictic markers such as *πότε* in relation to the coming signs in 13:4, and *ὅταν* in relation to events that the text is clear represent a time that is not yet (*οὐπω*). That time is the end (*τὸ τέλος*), a term which, in itself, denotes temporal separation.

Koch notes that paraenetic discourses are often indicative of apocalyptic literature.¹

Though the remainder of this chapter will assume that Mark 13 is not apocalyptic, it is not necessarily based on that assumption. The reader who is unconvinced of the present dismissal of Mark 13 as a Jewish apocalypse should still recognize the centrality of paraenesis to the text, and the implications that this has on the Markan portrayal of the Spirit.

2. *The Spirit and Persecution in Mark 13*

To this point, it has been established that the text is not, in fact, representative of a redacted first-century apocalypse. During this discussion, frequent mention was made to the paraenetic nature of the pericope, and the high likelihood that the text is representative of an instructional or paraenetic form. The form and genre of the passage are important to an understanding of the way that the passage speaks of the Spirit.

However, in keeping with previous form, this examination must begin at the smallest level of exegesis; at the word and sentence level. It will proceed from that point to a discussion of genre and structure. The first task is to examine the text on a verse by verse basis, with specific attention paid to the text of Mark 13:11 and its surrounding context.

This study will reveal a pattern in the text which portrays the Spirit as a divine gift to those who endeavour to remain faithful in the Kingdom of God in a period of coming persecution. This is most clear when they are called to be witnesses of the Kingdom of God to kings and leaders.² The intent of the passage is to encourage the disciples to

¹ Koch, *Rediscovery*; in Allison, "Apocalyptic," 17.

² There may be a small connection between this passage and earlier passages which speak of the Spirit as an agent in the coming of the Kingdom of God. That is, the Spirit is not only a bringer of the Kingdom of God, which acts to negate the kingdom of Satan (see Chapter 4 and discussion on the Spirit in Mark 3), in this case the Spirit is an agent which serves as a witness before persecuting kingdoms. There are similarities in the Markan concepts of the kingdom of Satan, and the βασιλεία and ἔθνος of 13:8, as well as the βασιλέων and ἡγεμόνων of 13:9. However, it would be an overstatement of these similarities to claim that

remain faithful during the coming persecution. The promise of the Spirit is the sole reassurance in the midst of the many commands in the passage. The Spirit promises to enable the disciples to endure to their coming salvation at the end of the age, and serve as witnesses to Jesus. This will be proven presently with a reiteration of the theme and outline of the passage at hand, followed by an intimate analysis of the workings of the Spirit in the text of Mark 13:5–13.

2.1. *Theme and Outline*

There is some discussion among scholars over the subject matter of the pericope.¹ The discourse itself begins directly after the disciples' question in verse 4 and continues with the final command to wariness in verse 37.² Quite often, though there are scholars who

these similarities contributed to a unified and specifically defined pneumatology in the book of Mark. Though there is admittedly continuity with the message of Mark in this pericope, it has more to do with the development of Mark's development of a divorce between the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of Satan, which will continue briefly into the period to come. Thus, though there is some development of a Markan pneumatology occurring in this passage, it should not be overestimated as a universal Markan pneumatology, but rather an adjunct to the other major theological themes in the discourse.

¹ The subject matter of the passage itself has been a source of discussion. Colani is quite notable among those who characterise the whole passage as descriptive of the time leading to Jesus' return. That is, the whole passage described the eschatological period which he would completed in the parousia, and it was primarily his objection against the possibility of eschatological elements in Jesus teaching, and especially a theology containing a parousia, that led him to dismiss the entire passage from 13:5–31 (on the dismissal of a parousia from Jesus' teaching see Colani, *Jésus*, 146–48, and the dismissal of the entire Markan passage 201–3). Conversely, there are those, such as France and N.T. Wright, who dismiss the possibility that the passage is speaking of a literal second coming at all (though France sees a break between verses 31 and 32 which allows the latter an eschatological theme), and contend that the entirety of the material in Mark 13:5–31 has been fulfilled, and was fulfilled in the coming of Jesus' Kingdom at the fall of the Jerusalemite rule with the destruction of the temple (France's commentary on Mark contains a well charted model of the passage, divided by theme and period [*Mark*, 497–505, 504; cf. Wright, *Victory*, 341–42]). Wenham makes a differentiation between the end of the age that is spoken of early in the discourse, and the *parousia* of Jesus, which is the subject of the latter half (Wenham, *Rediscovery*, 333). Geddert makes the same division, though he is tentative to formally distinguish the two, since the *parousia* is unknown both to Jesus and the writer (Geddert, "Apocalyptic," 21–23). Beasley-Murray writes that Mark 13:5–23 detail signs to bring hope to those looking for Jesus' second coming, and that 13:24–26 is descriptive of that coming itself (Beasley-Murray, *Jesus*, 372–75). In either case, it is clear that there is the possibility of differences of interpretation, and therefore for the understanding of the role of the Spirit, in the passage. What is most clear, and will be the presumption upon which this study is based, is that the former half of the passage, and most clearly the pericope between 13:5–14, does not concern itself immediately with the period approaching Jesus' return. Rather, it deliberately diverts the reader's attention from that period as a seeming warning against seeing it before it has actually come.

² This is the contention of most modern scholars (France, *Mark*, 497–505, though he includes the question of verses 3–4; Porter, *Aspect*, 433–35). Van Iersel recognizes a concentric unit from Mark 13:5–27, though

would claim that the passage is unified in theme to verse 31, it is assumed that different sections within the pericope are dedicated to different eschatological stages. That is, while certain sections deal with the question of the destruction of the temple others deal with the second coming of Jesus. In either case, there seems to be a clear division in theme after verse 13.¹ It is this first section beginning with the question from the disciples, and continuing on to verse 13, that will be the centre of this study, since it is in this distinct section that Mark's brief mention of the Spirit occurs.

Though not included directly in the accepted Jesus discourse, the preceding verses are imperative for an understanding of the section from verses 5–13. Whether their questions are answered or not they are, in fact, Jesus' response to the disciples' questions. The passage itself begins with two short discourses on the temple. Each occurs in a separate location, and the second contains the question which motivates Jesus' extended discourse, and is built on the first. Each instance is opened with a genitive construction,² which seems to set the background of each discussion relative to the temple in some way. In the first instance, the genitive construction ἐκτοπευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (Mk 13:1) places Jesus and disciples immediately at the temple, where one of the disciples comments on its magnificence. In response Jesus predicts its utter destruction in no

the pericope, in his estimation, begins at verse 1 (van Iersel, *Mark*, 387–412). However, Colani argues that there is a sharp divide between verses 31 and 32, since everything between verses 5 and 31 was an addition to the original text, which resumes at verse 32 (Colani, *Jésus*, 201–3).

¹ In France's estimation, after this point the author begins his discussion on the events immediately preceding the destruction of the temple, where before the pericope was defined by the phrase 'not yet' (France, *Mark*, 504).

² Porter describes the genitive absolute purely for its potential to act as a finite verbal phrase (Porter, *Idioms*, 183–84). In contrast, Wallace argues that the genitive absolute is primarily used to indicate time (Wallace, *Grammar*, 654–55). Fuller, on the other hand, contends that the genitive construction has a great deal more to do with background information pertinent to the main argument than temporality, and it is this hypothesis that will be applied here (Fuller, "Genitive Absolute," 142–67).

uncertain terms.¹ Obviously confused, the disciples are led to the side of the Mount of Olives facing the temple, which is marked in the text as the background of their next conversation again by the genitive construction καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ (Mk 13:3). At this point the disciples ask him the time² and signs which would indicate that all that Jesus had predicted would come about.³ The majority of the discourse responds directly to these two instances. That is, everything that Jesus says from this point on is either directly, or indirectly, in reference to this question, whether or not the destruction of the temple is in focus. Though the structure of the passage is yet to be discussed, this analysis will confine itself to the section of the discourse from Mark 13:5–14 where there is a much recognized break in the text. It is only in this section that there is direct reference to the Spirit. As for the previous discussion, it is enough to summarize that, in whatever capacity, the Spirit should be understood in light of the disciples question, since Jesus is immediately concerned with information that the disciples will need to know in light of the content of their curiosity.

Jesus' response, and especially the beginning of his response, is puzzling for many reasons. First, and most importantly, Jesus begins by issuing a warning to the disciples. It was their wish to have answers concerning the destruction of the temple, but instead they received warnings to stay steadfast in their faith and to keep a cautious guard. In a sense, Jesus answered the question better than the disciples asked. They asked for the sign of a great event. Instead, he told them of the difficult times that they would

¹ The passage records Jesus using a series of two double negatives (οὐ μὴ) in conjunction with the two subjunctive words. Jesus might have been saying "Not a single stone will be left upon another stone. They will all be torn down."

² πότε is used here as a deictic marker. The disciples are asking when specifically all of these things will take place. On the use of deixis as a temporal marker see Porter, *Idioms*, 25–26.

³ It is interesting that the disciples should use the plural ταῦτα πάντα in reference to the things to come when only the destruction of the temple is listed directly (though the text does seem to indicate that there was more discussion that occurred but was not recorded).

face with the constant interjection that, though the times would be extremely trying, their persecution would still decidedly not be one of the signs they requested. Jesus' words were still far from being fulfilled. The tone of the passage, though it is to be expected from the Markan Jesus, is slightly mismatched to the question.

2.2. *The Spirit in the Text of Mark 13:5–13*

The passage itself begins, after introducing Jesus as the speaker,¹ with a stern warning for the disciples to be on their guard. This is accomplished with the present imperative βλέπετε (Mk 13:5), warning the disciples to watch out because there is a time likely coming² when false teachers will try to mislead them. It seems as though this is a warning to listen to whatever he is about to say, by precluding the other teachings. The same pattern begun with an imperative, which is usually a warning similar to that of Mark 13:5, and followed by a subjunctive condition permeates the entire passage. Thus, this warning against being misled is not simply an introduction to the content of the pericope, it is representative of the content of the pericope. This warning is followed by a description of the future circumstances described in the subjunctive warning.³ In this case, Jesus predicts the coming of many who will try to deceive, and proclaim that they have come in his name.

¹ The combination ἤρξατο λέγειν is typical of Mark when introducing notable speech. However, it is usually reserved for emphatic statements (Mk 10:28, 32, 47; 14:19, 65, 69), rather than the extended pericope which it introduces in this case.

² Aside from the imperative introduction, the condition for the imperative (μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ), appears, as it will always in the pericope, in the subjunctive.

³ This fits the typical form of the passage, in which the imperative command and subjunctive explanation are followed by descriptions of the situation in the future form. Though the temporal context of the situation is the future, this future context is not accomplished entirely by the future form, though there is some degree of separation from Jesus' context accomplished with the future form (See especially the ch. 9 of Porter, *Aspect*). This separation is aided in portraying a temporal future by the use of such deictic markers such as πότε in relation to the coming signs in 13:4, and ὅταν in relation to events that the text is clear represent a time that is not yet (οὐπω). That time is the end (τὸ τέλος), a term which, in itself, denotes temporal separation.

These lines set the stage, not only for the grammatical repetition of the passage, but also the general tone. They serve as the beginning of the historical/eschatological backdrop for the promise of the Spirit. Already the situation in which the disciples are going to face is bleak. So far, lies concerning Jesus have been predicted, and it seems that Jesus will not be there to defend himself. The remainder of the pericope continues on this tone predicting an environment in which lies and trouble will challenge the Kingdom of God, and in which the kingdoms of the world seem to impose on it. Similarly, as indicated by the imperative, it seems that the disciples who are being instructed will be the sole combatants in the fight against these encroaching kingdoms, and the sole possessors of the message of the Kingdom.¹ It is no small wonder that it is into this picture, which we will continue to explore, that the Spirit is promised. This is especially true of the command not to worry (μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε [13:11]) when called on to speak. The future portrayed in Jesus' warnings, and the prospect that even these difficulties are just the beginning of trouble (ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα [13:8]) seems an impossible one for the victory of the Kingdom of God. However, it is into this situation that the call to persevere in the face of extreme persecution is met with the equal promise of the Spirit.

In the text to follow, Jesus' commands are all adapted to the task to come. The disciples are to keep their guard against coming false teachers. They are also commanded to keep their guard when they are faced with courts, synagogues, kings, and governors. All of these represent the kingdoms currently in place (Mk 13:9) which are in opposition to the Kingdom of God. There is also the command not to fear (μὴ θροεῖσθε [Mk 13:7])

¹ This is especially true since that the core of Jesus' disciples alone have been given this knowledge. Mark is careful to note that the disciples are on their own with Jesus at this point (ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν κατ' ἴδιαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας [13:3]).

when they hear of wars and rumours of wars.¹ This is made concrete, once again in the future form, when wars within earthly kingdoms are predicted, alongside earthquakes and famines (Mk 13:8). Similarly, with the imperative once again following the subjunctive situation, the disciples are instructed not to worry (μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε [Mk 13:11]) when they are handed over (ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες) to the kingdom representatives mentioned in Mark 13:9. In this situation, however, the passage supplements the future form explanation of the subjunctive prediction with a second imperative/ subjunctive pair. That is the command to speak (τοῦτο λαλεῖτε) what is given to the disciple in that hour (ὁ ἔαν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ [Mk 13:11]). Both of these commands, set aside from the normal parallelism of the rest of the passage by the inclusion of two imperative/subjunctive pairs, are given the future form reassurance that it will be the Spirit who speaks, and not them (Mk 13:11). This double pair seems to place the promise of the Spirit, grammatically, at the pinnacle of the passage.

The passage itself is capped off with a final prediction, all in the future form, that the disciples will be hated and betrayed by all, including their own families because of their affiliation with Jesus (Mk 13:13). This is concluded with the promise of salvation, presumably from the persecutions described, to all those who persevere to the end (Mk 13:12–13). It is notable that this promise comes directly after the initial promise of the Spirit to the disciples. There are also the two commands in quick succession along with an increase in Mark's use of the subjunctive, future, and imperative in the last two verses. It is probable that the two promises that accompany this heightened language, the

¹ In this command/subjunctive pair, though the description of events which will fulfill the prediction follow in the future form, there two subjunctive situations. The first concerns the handing over to authorities, and the second subjunctive is in reference to the speech required of the disciple, which should not be worried about, since it will be provided.

promise of the Spirit and the promise of salvation in the end, are meant to summarize the entire passage. The disciples are meant to endure many struggles and persecutions.

However, there is a great deal of hope to be had in two promises. The ultimate promise is for salvation in the end. However, before the end there is the promise of the Holy Spirit as a keeper and witness for the disciple throughout all of the prophesied persecutions.

Though salvation may be considered the ultimate of Jesus' promises, the Spirit is the only substantial gift that they will receive in the midst of persecution. There is little mention of the Spirit in the Markan text. Similarly, there is little uniformity in the Markan portrayal of the Spirit. However, in connection with the Kingdom of God, Mark has a strange propensity to place the Spirit in roles that place a great deal of emphasis on his role.

There can be no denying that the Spirit is the solitary hope for the disciple's perseverance to the end, in the face of seemingly insurmountable opposition from earthly kingdoms.

This emphasis is unique to Mark 13, and does not appear anywhere else in the Gospel.

The Spirit must not be overemphasized in the Gospel of Mark, he simply does not record enough about the Spirit to justify the formulation of a Markan pneumatology. However, in those instances where the Spirit does appear, he is no minor player.

2.3. Conclusions on the Examination of the Text

The text of Mark 13:5–13 seems to describe events which will place the disciples with the great responsibility of solely bearing Jesus' name in a world dominated by the kingdoms of the earth. They will endure lies and false witnesses, their message will be second guessed and they will be forced to face those who wish to confuse Jesus' message. They will be abused, threatened, turned over to death and betrayed by family and friends alike. They will be challenged and accused before kings and religious leaders for the message

of Jesus and beaten by the same people. This future promises hatred, physical abuse, the prospect of misunderstanding of their message and lies for the disciples. In this dangerous context, they must persevere. There are only two bright spots in this setting. Though they are both given in the future form, they occur at different points temporally.¹ The ultimate promise is deliverance from persecution and the atmosphere created by the persecution they await at the end. In the mean time, the solitary ray of hope within persecution is the promise of the Spirit.

3. *The Spirit in the Prophetic Paraenesis of Mark 13*

In any responsible exegetical work there must be some time dedicated to exploring the genre of a particular work before serious conclusions can be made regarding its content. In previous chapters, no mention has been made of genre, and each passage has been examined as a part of an interconnected theological narrative. However, with the mass of form critical literature focussed particularly closely on this passage, it would not be prudent to ignore the question of genre. To this point it has been argued that, contrary to the claims of nineteenth century form critics and their modern successors, Mark 13:5–13 is not an imported Jewish apocalypse.² The content of the discourse may share some

¹ This is indicated by the repetition of οὐπω in relation to future events, in contrast to the other future event, τὸ τέλος.

² The redaction of the passage and the differentiation between source and original material within the discourse will be discussed as necessary for an understanding of the passage. It should be noted, however, that this paper will operate under the assumption that the passage is reflective of authentic words of Jesus. There is no small amount of proof that the general tenor of the passage differs from the majority of the Gospel (For a comparative analysis of the grammar and lexis of Mark 13, see chapter 6 in Porter, *Criteria*, 220–34). However, this only suggests that Mark made use of a pre-existent source for the discourse, and that he did not make any significant changes to it. It says nothing about the authenticity of the source. This sentiment is echoed in Verheyden (Verheyden, “Persecution,” 1147), who claims that the source was added to the discourse prior to 70 AD in order to make the gospel relevant to the suffering of the period audience (cf. van Iersel, “Followers,” 245–46). Both of these, however, make the assumption that the source text was added after the completion of the final form, which carries only hypothetical weight. This is complicated further by the assumption of Markan priority, which offers no primary sources for comparison. There are a number of dissenting arguments, the majority of which have been summarized well in Beasley-Murray’s work on the topic (Beasley-Murray, *Jesus*).

thematic elements with apocalypses and eschatological discourses. Similarly, the tenor of speech in the passage differs from the rest of Mark. However, the style itself is indicative of a New Testament narrative and there is no indication of a change of genre. It has also been argued that paraenesis, and especially the use of the imperative mood, has played a large role in the text. The Spirit, in this case, occurs in a cautionary/instructional pericope in a narrative, and is used to provide explanation for one of a series of commands.

Specifically, the Spirit is promised as a helper for the command not to worry but to speak as witnesses of Jesus (Mk 13:9–11). In order to display the significance of the proximity of the Spirit to this command, the remainder of this present discussion will explore the overall narrative instructive genre of this passage. This will be done with specific references to formal parallels with the Old Testament prophetic genre. The most significant parallels are with those prophetic passages that function to mediate an already existing covenant. That is, certain Old Testament prophetic passages encourage the elect to follow an already established set of commands in light of a new or forthcoming circumstance. It will be shown that these passages provide Mark 13:5–13 with the closest possible parallel. This will be followed by an exploration of the structure of the narrative, and the position of the Spirit relative to other structural elements, and especially in relative position to the dominant paraenetic elements in the passage.

3.1. *The Spirit Forthtold: Mark 13 as Prophetic Literature*

Though there are superficial elements that connect Mark 13 to apocalyptic literature, and especially those elements which predict a coming saviour, the passage itself shares a great deal more in common with the narrative genre. With this in mind, though connective material can be found elsewhere, it seems most responsible to look at the

passage for common traits which take the whole passage into account. The formal characteristics of the passage bear a close resemblance to other exhortations from Jesus, but more importantly, the exhortations of Jesus often bear resemblance to hortatory or paraenetic literature outside of the Gospels, and specifically in Old Testament prophetic literature. All of this carries with it the conclusion that the Spirit, in Mark 13:11, is more likely presented as a favourable reward. The promise of the Spirit is a confidence building promise to encourage obedience to the imperative. It is not a vague apocalyptic vision symbolic of unknown events to come.

Though this is the first promise of the Spirit in Mark, the passage in which it is presented resembles closely the prophetic model of covenant mediation. That is, the form of the passage follows closely with Old Testament prophecy as it was spoken through a covenant mediating prophet, with allusions to a former promise or agreement.¹ In support of this claim, it is important to note similarities between the language of Mark 13 with that of certain passages of the Old Testament prophetic genre, in which the prophet seems to be taking the role of covenant mediator. Evans notes that there are several allusions in the first portion of the Markan discourse to Old Testament prophetic literature, the most

¹ VanGemenen notes that Jeremiah functions as a mediator between God and Judah. Jeremiah is working primarily to ensure that the promises made to Israel, presumably in the covenants, were fulfilled. More specifically VanGemenen called Jeremiah “God’s man who used social criticism as a means of determining how the people had failed to live up to the covenantal ideal” (VanGemenen, *Word*, 301–3). Osborne mirrors VanGemenen’s claims closely (Osborne, *Spiral*, 206–9). He is often uses the terminology “forthtelling” to describe the role of the prophet, explaining that there was little new about the prophet’s message. Rather, the prophet “applied the truths of the past to the nation’s current situation” in calling for reform (Osborne, *Spiral*, 208). “The truths of the past” in this case refer unquestionably to the Torah. Prophetic literature is best typified by phrases such as “Turn from your evil ways. Observe my commands and decrees, in accordance with the entire Law that I commanded your fathers to obey and that I delivered to you through my servants and prophets” (2 Kings 17:13–14; Osborne, *Spiral*, 208–9). Thus, prophetic literature is centred mainly on its paraenetic content, rather than its future visions. Mark 13, with its specific injunctions not to worry, and to be on one’s guard, fits perfectly into that mould.

clear of which is to Isaiah 19:2.¹ Both the Markan prediction and the Isaianic passage seem to deal with future wars involving familial and national uprising and betrayal. The repetition of the content of the Isaianic speech in Jesus' discourse serves to confirm that the passage serves a prophetic purpose. However, it has more to do with covenant mediation, an encouragement to reform, and the reiteration of a previously established relationship than with apocalyptic signs. This is doubly confirmed when the language of Mark 13 is compared to Jeremiah 51:46, which does not necessarily convey the same message, but is similar in its form. In the Jeremiah passage, the Markan imperative not to fear is echoed and it is followed by an explanatory passage which mentions coming rumours of wars. It includes language similar to Mark 13:8 and Isaiah 19:2 and is built upon the premise of the destruction of Babylon. This provides a very close comparison to the destruction of the temple, which precedes the discussion in Mark 13.² The prophetic

¹ Evans, *Mark*, 307. The similarities in composition between the Markan and Isaianic passages are unmistakable, though there is some difference in language. The transition from the Isaianic Αἰγύπτιοι to the Markan ἔθνος is simple redactional ambiguation. Similarly, the Isaianic city (πόλις) and province (νομός) have both been collectively replaced with βασιλεία, which is often the subject of Jesus' teaching in Mark. Finally, though there is no simple reduction of the phrase καὶ πολεμήσει ἄνθρωπος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄνθρωπος τὸν πλεσίον αὐτοῦ, there is mention of brothers rising against brothers in Mark 13:12, only four verses later. Also striking is the resemblance between the Isaianic usage of πολεμέω, and the Markan reference to πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων (Mark 13:6). It has been argued that these passages ought to be interpreted as predictions of normalcy. France summarizes Jesus' predictions here "history will continue to take its regular course" (France, *Mark*, 511), though they are called eschatological signs by others (Black, "Oration," 74–76). Evans notes that, whether eschatologically significant or indicative of normal troubles of first century living, the signs given, and especially the prediction of the destruction of the temple, were by no means original. They occurred commonly in the writings of other first century sects, and especially the Qumran community (Evans, "Destruction," 89–147). Common as these predictions may be in period literature, there is no question that these circumstances will be new for Jesus' disciples. Though some signs, such as the predictions of earthquakes and wars, will simply be a continuation of the normal, others, such as the directed persecution towards the disciples "in my name," will take on greater intensity than currently experienced by Jesus' disciples and entirely new consequences (Mk 13:9–14).

² It is, admittedly, impossible to compare the two verses grammatically with any reliability in Greek, since the Septuagint Jeremiah excludes the modern Jeremiah 51:45–48. This difficulty has been the centre of a large amount of debate over the text of Jeremiah, and especially the Oracles against Egypt and Babylon in Jeremiah 50–51. In this section especially there are several discrepancies in content and order between the ninth century Masoretic text and the Septuagint. There has been much debate over these varying texts and differing conclusions as to which text most accurately summarizes the original. Sharp, in a case by case analysis of the textual variances between the texts, has claimed that the masoretic inclusion of 44d–48 is

genre and its paraenetic structure provides the closest comparison for the text of Mark 13.

It is most likely that the Spirit, in this passage, was a part of an explanatory note modifying the command not to worry. In short, the Spirit in Mark 13:11 acts to provide the readers with the justification and comfort that they need to fulfill Jesus' commands.

It is odd for prophetic literature to provide its own justification, since it has been noted before that most prophets relied on the commands of previous covenants for their injunctions. For example, the prophets often relied on the Mosaic covenant as the standard for their commands for Israel to reform.¹ However, in the Gospel text, there is an unspoken basis for Jesus' commands. Jesus is speaking with authority, and the promise of the Spirit is based on the prophetic commands Jesus not to worry, which find their sources in earlier commands of Jesus.² That is, Jesus, even here while acting as a covenant mediating prophet, is basing the authority of his prophecy on his own covenant, on his own promises. The Spirit is the unique gift of the unique son of man and will be given as a gift to all those who wish to comply with his commands and to have a place as active followers of Jesus. Jesus, though his language resembles that of Isaiah and Jeremiah, is more closely related to Moses, since his commands are not based on a predecessor, but on a covenant that he mediates. Thus, throughout the passage Jesus

more reflective of an original work than the LXX exclusion, which is most likely the result of homoioareton (Sharp, "Scroll," 499). Most, like Janzen, have summarized that the shorter less coherent LXX version is to be preferred as the original (Janzen, *Jeremiah*, 116; cited by Sharp, "Scroll," 487). Others, however, argue for the priority of the masoretic text (Fischer, "Fremdvölkersprüche," 474–99; in Sharp, "Scroll," 487). Though it is not the concern here to decide the original text of Jeremiah, it is important that the masoretic text reading, though far later than the LXX version, predated both the modern masoretic text and the LXX. Therefore, it is probable that the text of Jeremiah 51:44–48 was known in the first century. With this information, it is possible that Mark knew and made reference to this particular pericope. In the very least, the formal characteristics of the passage were known to Mark. It is quite possible, then, that Mark is referring to Jeremiah 51:44–48 in Mark 13.

¹ VanGemeren notes the tendency of the prophets to call for repentance, which constituted a return to the Sinaitic covenant mediated by Moses (VanGemeren, *Word*, 113–19). Osborne notes that, not only were prophets often dependent on the accepted words of prophets before them, they also all depended on the Torah as a foundation for their message (Osborne, *Spiral*, 208).

² Cf. Mark 1:27.

warns the disciples not to deviate from his unique teaching. Others will come in his name but they must not be fooled. These are only a few of the commands that Jesus leaves. All of them are given to preserve his teachings. This is highly reflective of paraenetic/prophetic literature. Jesus' authority to commands is only bolstered when the Spirit is introduced as the preserver of Jesus' authority into the coming age. The prophetic genre lends the Spirit the role of preserver, not only of the faith of the disciples, but also the authority of Jesus. The Spirit serves as another point of authority for Jesus teaching, even in his absence.

3.2. *The Spirit and Jesus' Commands: The Paraenetic Structure of Mark 13*

All of this argument begs the question of structure. It has been established that paraenesis, as a benchmark of prophetic literature, has a great degree of importance in the discourse. However, this conclusion is subject to the literary organization of the text. The primacy of paraenesis as an organizational factor, in principle, has been shown. However, it remains wholly subject to the grammatical organization of the text. It should not be a surprise that the paraenesis of the text seems to form the backbone of its organization. The structure that has already been mentioned, one of commands followed by elaboration or explanation permeates the entire discourse.

Speculation as to the overall division of the text predates Colani and his little apocalypse thesis. Theories concerning the division of the text initially centred on redaction criticism, and arguments concerning the alternation between redactor and source material in the pericope. Colani's initial division is based entirely on content, since he recognizes no editorial material within the text. He dismisses the whole of Mark 13:5–13 as an inauthentic addition. In his estimation the text is divided into sections discussing

the labour pains of persecution, the persecution itself, and the end.¹ His analysis of the passage's structure, perhaps due to the fact that his interests lay elsewhere, progressed no further than this point, and it seems that the structure of the passage was little more than a reflection of the passage's apocalyptic content. This is one of Colani's greatest weaknesses. The structure of the passage, and especially the prevalence of paraenesis, is as informative as its content.

The trend toward a study of the final form of a text has penetrated recent biblical criticism to the core, and redaction and reader-response critics have not been the only ones to respond. As of late, the grammar of a given text has also been of great interest to scholars, and discourse analytical critics have expanded the grammatical analysis of traditional exegesis in order to detect grammatical patterns throughout entire discourses, rather than the simple constructional analysis which dominated earlier exegetical works.² As evidence of the benefit of using a wider grammatical lens, many scholars have discovered large scale grammatical patterns in the text of Mark 13 based on smaller scale grammatical elements. It is here where the present argument, which presents the text of

¹ All of these sections occur between verses 5 and 31. Verse 32 was not included in the discourse because Colani estimated that it was Jesus' true answer to the disciples question in v. 4, and therefore not a part of the imported apocalyptic discourse (Colani, *Jésus*, 201–5). There are others who make differentiations between editorial text and source text within the discourse, though Colani makes the assumption that the whole text is unoriginal source material. Weisse was among the first to claim some sort of internal redaction in the text. However, rather than discuss editorial speech as evidence of a redactor, Weisse claimed that the passage represented three independent discourses (Weisse, *Geschichte*, 590–92; cited in Beasley Murray, *Jesus*, 6–8). Others have since made some differentiation between editorial text and source text (see especially Porter, *Criteria*, 220–34), though it is not necessarily prudent to for this to be the basis for an overall structure, since editorial comments are not necessarily markers of a change in subject or section.

² In the past, the analysis of grammar in exegesis was rarely done above the pericope level, and was done mainly at the word and sentence levels. Many grammatical teaching texts focus closely on individual grammatical constructions at the word and sentence level, and rarely, if ever, discuss a text above the sentence or paragraph level. This assumption, that grammatical analysis is understood to be relevant only to the understanding of individual pericopes, is evident in such teaching texts as Guthrie and Duvall. Even in their guide to the exegesis of a passage, though a read through of the text in English is recommended, there is no indication that the grammar taught in the text is useful beyond the individual paragraph to be analysed (Guthrie and Duvall, *Exegesis*, 101–65).

Mark 13 as a predominately prophetic/instructional text, and the Spirit in Mark 13 as a promise to aid in the obedience of those instruct, finds its greatest support. A grammatical analysis of the text points directly to its paraenetic elements as the backbone of the pericope. Porter is among the first to notice that this pericope differs from the rest of the entirety of the book of Mark predominately in its elevated use of the imperative.¹ He notes that paraenesis, represented by the imperative and hortatory subjunctive, operated to divide the text into smaller subsections.² Porter describes a series of alternating commands that are each followed by an aorist subjunctive, describing the future event in which the imperative will be needed and reasons for each.³ This pattern of alternating imperative, aorist subjunctive, and explanation establish a grammatical outline to guide the interpretation of the passage. This only reinforces the claim that the Spirit in Mark 13 is the promised aid as the disciples obey the imperative not to fear (μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε). The specific future context for the command is delineated clearly by the aorist subjunctive ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες. Thus, the Spirit in Mark 13 is a gift of speech given in times of persecution, and specifically when the speaker is called to defend his/her faith before kings and leaders.

3.3. *Conclusions on the Spirit and the Genre and Structure of Mark 13*

Though the genre and structure of the passage do not seem immediately relevant to an understanding of the Spirit in this passage, they play a great, though understated role, in the exegetical framework of the passage. It has been argued that the passage represents a

¹ Porter, *Criteria*, 229.

² Porter, though a pioneer in linguistic analysis, was not the first to notice this pattern. He himself gives credit to a large number of scholars who divide the text in an almost identical manner including Lambrecht (Lambrecht, *Markus-Apokalypse*), Pesch (Pesch, *Naherwartungen*), Lane (*Mark*, 446), Rousseau (Rousseau, "Structure", 157–72), and Beasley-Murray (*Jesus*; cited in Porter, *Aspect*, 433–44).

³ Watch out (5b), don't be upset (7), watch out (9a), and don't worry about what to say (11a) (Porter, *Aspect*, 433–35).

prophetic/paraenetic genre. Had it been proven that the passage was a Jewish apocalypse, it might have been perfectly reasonable to assume that the Spirit in the passage was representative of some divine messenger. In this case, the Spirit would fill a mandatory role in the bringing of a message. Instead, this research has confirmed that the passage is quite reflective of a form of prophecy which is known for “forthtelling” rather than for its emphasis on the future. That is, the predicted future in this case is a new context for the application of an already established teaching. In this case, it is the authority of Jesus and his message that the future context would challenge. The Spirit, in this context, acts as a promised aid to those who follow this authority. In this passage particularly, the Spirit is the only aid promised in the age to come. The Spirit is the sole help given to the disciples in persecution so that they can stand firm on the teachings of Jesus. With the help of the Spirit, they can and remain faithful in a context in which they might otherwise succumb to the pressures of the kingdoms of this world. This very same conclusion is collaborated by the structure of the passage, which holds the commands of Jesus at its very centre. Around this imperative skeleton a flesh of subjunctives is built. These subjunctive clauses clarify the reason for the imperative and introduce a series of future form phrases, which place the commands in their future context. Each of these future form phrases promise a coming event. Most of them predict hardship and persecution. However two of these hold hope for the disciples. The first is the promise of the Spirit and the second is the promise of salvation in the end. Only the promise of the Spirit coincides with the period of persecution. Thus, by confirming the situational “forthtelling” nature of the prophetic genre, and the structure arranged around paraenesis, it has been confirmed that the Spirit in Mark 13 is the sole aid to the disciples in a period of persecution, and is present in

order to keep them faithful to the message and authority of Jesus and the Kingdom of God.

Conclusions

Though not necessarily in the same way as in the introduction of Mark, the Kingdom of God and the Spirit have been shown to be highly connected. As it has been argued before, this in no way acts to form an overarching Markan pneumatology, but shows only that the Markan emphasis on the Kingdom of God pervades the entire book. Mark has a penchant for tying small discourses on the Spirit to the larger thread of Markan Kingdom theology. This study has revealed that, once again, Mark has used a great deal of Kingdom language in reference to the causes of persecution for the disciples and, once again, it is the Spirit that will be working against these kingdoms not of God. The emphasis here, as opposed to earlier discussions, is not on the action of the Spirit in bringing down these kingdoms in favour of the growth of the Kingdom of God. Rather the Spirit is the voice for those who are persecuted by these kingdoms as a witness to Jesus. The Spirit is also the authority of Jesus to preserve and keep his followers faithful until the end. In the same breath that Mark describes these kingdoms' wars against one another, and their persecution of the disciples to come, he mentions many other troubles and a context that is, not only opposed to followers of Jesus, but full of confusion concerning who his followers are. It is into this context that the Spirit is promised.

The examination of Mark 13:1–14 has determined that Jesus left the disciples with a timely predictive set of commands. The passage is organized around these commands in the prophetic/paraenetic form. The commands unanimously encourage the disciples to remain steadfast and focussed on the message of Jesus that they have already

heard, and not to be confused or afraid. The Spirit is the only help offered in this context to guarantee that the disciples will be able to stay faithful. Therefore, the content and grammar, genre and structure of the pericope all point in the same direction. The Spirit is the sole promised gift to the disciples in the predicted time of persecution to ensure that they, and the Kingdom of God with them, persevere over the kingdoms not of God. The Spirit enables the disciples to serve as witnesses to Jesus in the great time of persecution that they must endure until their final salvation in the end.

CONCLUSION

Through the examination of the Gospel of Mark it has been discovered, above all else, that Mark is a formidable author. He has formed his narrative carefully. He has placed specific focus on broad themes such as the development of a Kingdom theology, an unmistakably high christology, and an unfortunate rejection of Jesus by the Jerusalem establishment. There seem to be two scholarly approaches to the Spirit in the text of Mark. One side presents a clear and unified Markan pneumatology. The other refers to Mark on the Spirit, often in footnotes, in passages referring to the Spirit in other Gospels. Neither of these, however, is sufficient for the manner in which Mark has pieced together his Gospel, and neither does justice to its complexity. The first places too much emphasis on a small amount of material. The second does not do justice to Mark's originality and often misrepresents his goals. There are recognizable reasons for allotting the Spirit in Mark a place in support of another Gospel's claims. There is simply too little focus on the Spirit in the Gospel to have justified a thorough examination of the Markan emphasis on the Spirit. However, when a reasonable exegetical attempt is made at such a task, the results will invariably reveal much more depth to the Markan portrayal of the Spirit than

has been credited to it in the past. The Spirit, though there is no unified Markan pneumatology, is presented without fail in the development of the Markan theology of the Kingdom. Though the individual Spirit discourses of Mark may not have much in common, they do share a common bond in their development of the Kingdom of God.

In the first chapter of this work there is a large amount of evidence presented that differentiates the portrayal of the Spirit in other Gospels from Mark, suggesting that Mark used the Spirit in a manner unique to his Gospel within the New Testament. The Gospel of Matthew uses the Spirit in the same way that Mark does. In both, the Spirit is mentioned in relation to the author's primary theological concerns. The focus in Mark is on the Kingdom, while Matthew chose to use the Spirit in relation to the redemption and restoration of Israel. In contrast, however, this language seems antithetical to the Markan temple rejection theme. Similarly, Luke-Acts emphasises the power of the Spirit, his relation to the Spirit of prophecy, and the transformative nature of the Spirit at work in the Church. The Spirit works in the church in Mark to preserve the Kingdom of God in persecution. In contrast, Luke emphasises the power of the Spirit to transform the church. Though John's concepts are similar to Mark's, John seems to place a great deal more emphasis on the work of the Spirit in the proclamation of the Gospel than Mark. Finally, Paul's emphasis on the Spirit is soteriological and charismatic. Neither of these themes are even remotely connected to the Spirit in Mark. Simply, there is no place for the Spirit in Mark in the footnotes of another study without some mention of Mark's unique emphasis.

The Spirit is decidedly present in the first chapter of Mark. There is an unquestionable connection between the Spirit and the development of Mark's christology

and Kingdom theology. There is an immediate comparison drawn between Jesus and John the Baptist, both semantically and in Mark's use of the Scriptures, which serves to place John and Jesus in a great/greater than comparison. Semantically, John is connected with prophets, called a sent one from God, and is equated with the beginning of the gospel. Upon the arrival of Jesus, however, the semantics change. John, who was painted with grandiose language, now becomes subservient to Jesus. Jesus is called the Son of God, the Christ, and is served by John and prepared by the Spirit for his Kingdom ministry. The same picture is painted by Mark's use of the Old Testament and intertestamental literature. John is painted as none less than the great prophet Elijah going before Yahweh to prepare his way. Upon the arrival of Jesus, however, Jesus is now the superlatively great coming one, the Son of God, and the Isaianic deliverer, the coming one of Malachi and the promised salvation of the Exodus. In all of this, it is only the Spirit and the direct connection to the Kingdom which separate the ministries of Jesus and John. Jesus, the divine Christ, is proven by the Spirit to be the only fitful ruler of the Kingdom of God, which has arrived in force at the exact moment that Jesus begins his public ministry.

The connection between the Spirit and the Kingdom of God is once again revealed in Mark 3:20–30. In this passage, the Spirit is developed as the empowerer of Jesus' exorcisms. He is the means by which Jesus undermines and dismantles the kingdom of Satan, and works towards the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the earth. This is shown by Jesus' own words when he claims that his task, in response to an accusation of demonic possession, is to tear down the Kingdom that he has been accused of associating with. Similarly, though Satan has in the past been represented by a

strongman, the mission of Jesus is very much like a thief who ties a strongman up, and then plunders his every possession. In the same way, Jesus is binding the kingdom of Satan and pillaging it through exorcisms. Further, in response to the accusation that he operates by an unclean spirit, Jesus makes it unmistakably clear that his actions, and especially the exorcisms that he performed, are the direct result of the Spirit. To accuse him of working by an unclean spirit is to blaspheme the Holy Spirit. Connections between this account and the surrounding story ensure that the Spirit is understood to have been at work from the beginning of the Gospel in Jesus' exorcisms. Directly after his anointing and testing by the Spirit, Jesus begins his ministry of exorcism and the destruction of the kingdom of Satan. Similarly, as late as 5:10–20, Jesus can be seen at work fulfilling his mandate from 3:20–30, by casting out a demon that even the strongest of men before could not control. Jesus is plundering the kingdom of Satan by the Spirit. This is emphasised from the inauguration of Jesus' ministry to the end of the strongman discourse in Mark 5.

Similarly, in the face of questioning from the Pharisees, the Spirit can be seen at work as a witness to Davidic and messianic kingship of Jesus in Mark 12:1–37. In this passage there are strong connections made between Jesus and the coming son of David. There is also a great deal of emphasis on the rejection of Jesus by the temple authorities. Jesus is being hailed as a king by all of his followers, but there are those who doubt him and seek to destroy him. This is illustrated in the parable of the vineyards, in which Jesus is represented by the son of the landowner, and the Jerusalem authority is accused of rejecting him and attempting to kill him. Jesus fulfills the messianic hopes encapsulated in the title "son of David," which has been given to him by his followers. However, the

Spirit himself has testified that Jesus is far greater than even David. He is not only the expected coming king, but God himself. It is shown in the passage that Jesus is the Son of God. Jesus is also referred to with royal Psalmic language. All of this is spoken by the Spirit against the claims of Jesus' opposition, placing the Spirit as the unequivocal witness to Jesus' status as the divine ruler in the Kingdom of God.

Finally, in an episode which is quite different from any of the previous Spirit discourses, it is the disciples who are in need of the Spirit (Mark 13:1–37). The Spirit is actively defending the Kingdom from attacks from the kings and rulers of the earth. In this context the disciples are promised a miserable future, filled with betrayal and physical abuse. They will be forced to stand before kings to defend the Kingdom and turned over to the authorities to be beaten. Amidst all of this persecution there will be people who try to distort the Kingdom of God. In the midst of this persecution, the disciples have been issued some commands and warnings. They are not to fear. They must constantly be vigilant so that they will not be lost. With these commands come two promises. The first is for all those who make it through the eschatological persecution. For those who follow Jesus' commands and remain faithful, there is salvation in the end. The only other promise, and the only one applicable in the eschatological persecution, is the Spirit. The Spirit will be a guide and protector to the disciples. He will give them the words to speak when they stand before the kingdoms of the world. The Spirit is the only guide that the disciples will have in their task to maintain and stay faithful to the Kingdom of God.

As it has been shown here, the Spirit is intimately connected with the development of the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel. It should not be overemphasised,

since the Kingdom of God is developed throughout the Gospel and the Spirit is only mentioned in four pericopes throughout the Gospel. Even in these pericopes, the Spirit is rarely the main character. It is clear, however, that, though there is nowhere enough material, nor enough immediate unity to formulate a Markan pneumatology, the Spirit makes a distinct contribution the development of a Markan theology of the Kingdom of God. The emphasis on the Spirit in the Gospel of Mark, and his connection with the Kingdom of God, is without equivalent in the whole of the New Testament.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Leslie C. *Psalms 101–150*. WBC 21. Milton Keynes: Word, 1987.
- Allison, Dale C. "Apocalyptic." In *DJG*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992. 17–20.
- Bacon, Benjamin Wisner. *The Beginnings of Gospel Story: A Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Sources and Structure of the Gospel According to Mark, with Expository Notes upon the Text, for English Readers*. New Haven: Yale, 1925.
- Barnett, Paul. *The Birth of Christianity: The First Twenty Years*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Barrett, C.K. *The Gospel According to St. John: an Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. London: S.P.C.K., 1958.
- Bilezikian, G.G. *The Liberated Gospel: A Comparison of the Gospel of Mark and Greek Tragedy*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
- _____. *John*. WBC 36. Waco: Word, 1987.
- Beavis, Mary Ann. *Mark's Audience*. JSNTSup 33. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Black, C. Clifton. "An Oration at Olivet: Some Rhetorical Dimensions of Mark 13." In *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy*. Edited by Duane F. Watson. JSNTSup 50. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991. 66–92.
- Boers, Hendrikus. *Who was Jesus? The Historical Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989.
- Boring, M. Eugene. "Markan Christology: God-Language for Jesus?" *NTS* 45 no. 4 (1999) 451–71.
- _____. "The Unforgivable Sin Logion Mark III 28–29/Matt XII 31–32/Luke XII 10: Formal Analysis and History of the Tradition." *NovT* 18 no. 4 (1976) 258–79.
- Brown, Tricia Gates. *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-scientific Perspective*. JSNTSup 253. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

- Bruce, F.F. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "The Christological Confession of the World Council of Churches." In *Essays Philosophical and Theological*. London: SCM, 1955.
- _____. *The Gospel of John*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.
- _____. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Revised edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1972.
- Burge, Gary M. "'I am' Sayings." In *DJG*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992. 354–56.
- Busch, Austin. "Questioning and Conviction: Double Voiced Discourse in Mark 3:22–30." *JBL* 125 no. 3 (2006) 477–505.
- Camery-Hoggatt, Jerry. *Irony in Mark's Gospel: Text and Subtext*. SNTSMS 72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Charette, Blaine. *Restoring Presence: The Spirit in Matthew's Gospel*. JPTS 18. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Colani, Timothy. *Jésus Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps*. Second Edition. Strasbourg: Treuttel et Wurtz, 1864.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Apocalyptic Rhetoric of Mark 13 in Historical Context." *BR* 41 no. 1 (1996) 5–36.
- _____. "The Charge of Blasphemy in Mark 14:64." *JSNT* 26 no. 4 (2004) 379–401.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Herm. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- _____. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Busswell. New York: Faber and Faber, 1960.
- Cook, John G. *The Structure and Persuasive Power of Mark: A Linguistic Approach*. SBLSS. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1995.
- Cranfield, C.E.B. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. CGTC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Crossan, John Dominic, and Jonathan L. Reed. *In Search of Paul: How Jesus' Apostle Opposed Rome's Empire with God's Kingdom—A New Vision of Paul's Words and World*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 2004.

- Croy, N. Clayton. "Where the Gospel Text Begins: A Non-Theological Interpretation of Mark 1:1" *NovT* 43 no. 2 (2001) 105–27.
- Daube, David. "Evangelisten und Rabbinen." *ZNW* 48 no. 1–2 (1957) 119–26.
- Demaris, Richard E. "Possession, Good and Bad- Ritual Effects and Side Effects: The Baptism of Jesus in Mark 1:9–11 from a Cross Cultural Perspective." *JSNT* 80 no. 1 (2000) 3–30.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Betram Lee Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- Dowd, Sharyn. *Reading Mark: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Second Gospel*. RNT. Macon: Smyth and Helwys, 2000.
- Dowd, Sharyn, and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon. "The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience." *JBL* 125 no. 2 (2006) 271–97.
- Dunn, James D.G. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press, 1996.
- _____. "Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts." In *The Christ and The Spirit: Collected Essays of James D.G. Dunn: Pneumatology*. Volume 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1998. 222–42.
- _____. *Jesus and the Spirit: a Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975.
- _____. *Romans 1–8*. WBC 38A. Dallas: Word, 1988.
- _____. *Romans 9–16*. WBC 38B. Dallas: Word, 1988.
- _____. "Spirit and Holy Spirit in the New Testament." In *The Christ and the Spirit: Collected Essays of James D.G. Dunn: Pneumatology*. Volume 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1998. 3–21.
- _____. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: an Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*. London: SCM, 1977.
- Edwards, James R. "The Baptism of Jesus According to the Gospel of Mark." *JETS* 34 no. 1 (1991) 43–57.
- Elliott, James K. "Mark 1.1–3 – A Later Addition to the Gospel?" *NTS* 46 no. 4 (2000) 584–88.

- _____. "The Position of the Verb in Mark with Special Reference to Chapter 13." *NovT* 38 no. 2 (1996) 136–44.
- Evans, Craig A. *Mark 8:27–16:20*. WBC 35B. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001.
- _____. "Predictions of the Destruction of the Herodian Temple in the Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Scrolls, and Related Texts." *JSP* 10 no. 1 (1992) 89–147.
- Fanning, Buist M. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Farmer, William R. *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. Dillsboro: Western North Carolina Press, 1976.
- Fee, Gordon D. "Gifts of the Spirit." In *DPL*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downer's Grove: InterVarsity, 1993. 339–47.
- _____. *God's Empowering Presence: the Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- _____. *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.
- _____. *New Testament Exegesis: A Handbook for Students and Pastors*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Fischer, Georg. "Jer 25 und die Fremdvölkersprüche: Unterschiede zwischen hebräischem und griechischem Text." *Bib* 72 no. 4 (1991) 474–99.
- Flusser, David. "Two Notes on the Midrash of 2 Sam. 7.1." *IEJ* 9 no. 2 (1959) 99–109.
- France, R.T. "The Church and the Kingdom of God: Some Hermeneutical Issues." In *Biblical Interpretation and the Church: Text and Context*. Edited by D.A. Carson. Exeter: Paternoster, 1984. 30–44.
- _____. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002.
- Fuller, Lois. "The 'Genitive Absolute' in New Testament/Hellenistic Greek: A Proposal for Clearer Understanding." *JGRChJ* 3 (2006) 142–67.
- Gadamer, H.G. *Truth and Method*. Second revised edition. London: Sheed and Ward, 1989.
- Gagg, Robert P. "Jesus und die Davidssohnfrage: zur Exegese von Markus 12,35–37." *TZ* 7 no. 1 (1951) 18–30.

- Geddert, Timothy J. "Apocalyptic Teaching." In *DJG*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992. 20–27.
- Gemeren, Willem Van. *Interpreting the Prophetic Word: An Introduction to the Prophetic Literature of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.
- Gibson, Jeffrey B. "Jesus' Wilderness Temptation according to Mark." *JSNT* 53 no. 1 (1994) 3–34.
- Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1–8:26*. WBC 35A. Dallas: Word, 1989.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Die Wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes nach der Populären Anschauung der Apostolischen Zeit und der Lehre des Apostels Paulus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888.
- Guthrie, George H. and J. Scott Duvall. *Biblical Greek Exegesis: A Graded Approach to Learning Intermediate and Advanced Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hedrick, Charles W. "Parable and Kingdom: a Survey of the Evidence of Mark." *PRS* 27 no. 2 (2000) 179–99.
- Heil, John Paul. "Jesus with the Wild Animals in Mark 1:13." *CBQ* 60 no. 1 (2006) 63–78.
- _____. "The Narrative Strategy and Pragmatics of the Temple Theme in Mark." *CBQ* 59 no. 1 (1997) 76–100.
- Henten, Jan Willem Van. "The First Testing of Jesus: A Rereading of Mark 1:12–13." *NTS* 45 no. 3 (1999) 349–66.
- Hill, Andrew E. *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 25D. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Hobbs, T.R. *2 Kings*. WBC 13. Waco: Word, 1985.
- Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology*. London: Thomas Nelson, 1873.
- Holtzmann, H.J. *Die synoptischen Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter*. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1863.
- Hooker, Morna. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. BNTC. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.

- _____. *The Message of Mark*. London: Epworth, 1983.
- Horn, F.W. "Holy Spirit." In *ABD*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992. 265–78.
- Iersel, Bas M.F. van. "Failed Followers in Mark: Mark 13:12 as a Key for the Identification of the Intended Readers." *CBQ* 58 no. 2 (1996) 244–63.
- _____. *Mark: A Reader-Response Commentary*. JSNTSup 164. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998.
- Janzen, J.G. *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1982.
- Johnston, George. *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Joyes, Christine E. "The Returned Elijah? John the Baptist's Angelic Identity in the Gospel of Mark." *SJT* 58 no.4 (2005) 455–67.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *The Christology of Mark's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich eds. *TDNT*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 9 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–74.
- Koch, Klaus. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*. SBT 2/22. London: SPCK, 1972.
- Lambrecht, Jan. *Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung*. AnBib 28. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1967.
- Lane, William L. *The Gospel According to Mark: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lightfoot, R.H. *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Galiläa und Jerusalem*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1936.
- Longacre, Robert E. "A Top-down, Template Driven Analysis, Illustrated by Application to Mark's Gospel." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. JSNTSup 170, SNTG 4 Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999. 140-68.

- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida eds. *Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. Second Edition. 2 vols. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988/1989.
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "Disciples/Crowds/Whoever: Markan Characters and Readers." *NovT* 28 no. 2 (1986) 104–30.
- _____. "Fallible Followers: Women and Men in the Gospel of Mark." *Semeia* 28 (1983) 29–48.
- Malina, Bruce J. "Exegetical Eschatology, the Peasant Present and the Final Discourse Genre: The Case of Mark 13." *BTB* 32 no. 2 (2002) 49–59.
- Mansfield, Robert M. "*Spirit and Gospel*" in *Mark*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987.
- Marcus, Joel. *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.
- _____. "The Hope of a New Age: the Kingdom of God in the New Testament." *Them* 11 no. 1 (1985) 5–15.
- _____. *New Testament Theology: Many Witnesses, One Gospel*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.
- Martin, Ralph. *Mark: Evangelist and Theologian*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973.
- Marxsen, Willi. *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel*. Translated by James Boyce, Donald Juel, William Poehlmann, and Roy A. Harrisville. New York: Abingdon, 1969.
- McDonald, Lee Martin and Stanley E. Porter, *Early Christianity and Its Sacred Literature*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000.
- Menzies, Robert P. *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke Acts*. JSNTSup 54. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.
- Menzies, William W, and Robert P. Menzies. *Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience—A Call to Evangelical Dialogue*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Merrill, Eugene H. *An Exegetical Commentary: Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi*. Chicago: Moody, 1994.

- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Second Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Moule, C.F.D. *The Birth of the New Testament*. BNTCC 1. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962.
- _____. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Nida, Eugene A. "The Role of Context in the Understanding of Discourse." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. JSNTSup 170, SNTG 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999, 20–27.
- Nolland, John. *Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- O'Brien, Peter T. "Principalities and Powers: Opponents of the Church." In *Biblical Interpretation and the Church: Text and Context*. Edited by D.A. Carson. Exeter: Paternoster, 1984. 110–50.
- O'Donnell, Matthew Brook. "Translation and the Exegetical Process, Using Mark 5.1–10 'The Binding of the Strongman', as a Test Case." In *Translating the Bible: Problems and Prospects*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Richard S. Hess. JSNTSup 173. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999. 162–88.
- Öhler, Markus. *Elia im Neuen Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im Neuen Testament*. BZNW 88. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.
- _____. "The Expectation of Elijah and the Presence of the Kingdom of God." *JBL* 118 no. 3 (1999) 461–76.
- O'Neill, John C. "The Unforgivable Sin." *JSNT* 19 no. 1 (1983) 37–42.
- Osborne, Grant R. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1991.
- Paige, Terence P. "Holy Spirit" In *DPL*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993. 404–13.
- Penner, Todd C. "'In the Beginning': Post-Critical Reflections on Early Christian Textual Transmission and Modern Textual Transgression — In Memoriam William R. Farmer." *PRS* 33 no. 4 (2006) 415–34.

- Perrin, Norman. *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Pesch, Rudolph. *Naherwartungen: Tradition und Redaktion in Mk 13*. KBANT. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968.
- Pilgaard, Aage. "Apokalyptik als bibeltheologisches Thema: Dargestellt an Dan 9 und Mk 13." In *New Directions in Biblical Theology: Papers of the Aarhus Conference, 16–19 of September 1992*. Edited by Sigfred Pedersen. NovTSup 76. Leiden: Brill, 1994. 180–200.
- Porter, Stanley E. *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals*. JSNTSup 191. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- _____. "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and D.A. Carson. JSNTSup. 113 Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995. 14–35.
- _____, ed. *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Second edition. BLG 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- _____. "'In the Vicinity of Jericho': Luke 18:35 in the Light of its Synoptic Parallels." *BBR* 2 (1992) 91–104.
- _____. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*. SBG 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- Powery, Emerson B. "The Spirit, the Scripture(s), and the Gospel of Mark: Pneumatology and Hermeneutics in Narrative Perspective." *JPT* 11 no. 2 (2003) 184–98.
- Ramm, Bernard. *Protestant Biblical Interpretation: A Textbook of Hermeneutics*. Third Revised edition. Grand Rapids: Baker 1975.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. "The Cohesiveness of Discourse: Towards a Model of Linguistic Criteria For Analyzing New Testament Discourse." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. JSNTSup 170, SNTG 4. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999. 28–46.
- _____. *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*. JSNTSup 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

- Robertson, A.T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research*. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.
- Rousseau, François. "La Structure de Marc." *Bib* 56 no. 2 (1975) 157–72.
- Rowe, Robert D. *God's Kingdom and God's Son: The Background of Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in Psalms*. AGJU 50. Brill: Leiden, 2002.
- Sell, Jesse. "Simon Peter's 'Confession' and the Acts of Peter and the 12 Apostles." *NovT* 21 no. 4 (1979) 344–56.
- Sharp, Carolyn J. "'Take Another Scroll and Write': A Study of the LXX and the MT of Jeremiah's Oracles Against Egypt and Bablyon." *VT* 47 no. 4 (1997) 487–516.
- Smith, Stephen H. "A Divine Tragedy: Some Observations on the Dramatic Structure of Mark's Gospel." In *The Composition of Mark's Gospel: Selected Studies from Novum Testamentum*. BRBS 3. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Strauss, D. F. *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. Translated by George Eliot. London: Chapman, 1846.
- Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.
- _____. *The Prophethood of All Believers*. JPTS 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Suhl, Alfred. *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Gospel According to Saint Mark*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1966.
- Theissen, G. *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. NTOA 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- _____. "The Holy Spirit in 1 Corinthians: Exegesis and Reception History in the Patristic Era." In *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004. 207–28.

- Turner, Max. "Holy Spirit." In *DJG*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Scot McKnight. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992. 341–51
- _____. *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts in the New Testament and Today*. Revised edition. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.
- _____. *Power from On High: the Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. JPTS 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Verheyden, Jozef. "Persecution and Eschatology: Mk. 13,9–13." In *The Four Gospels: 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Volume 2. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. BETL 100. Leuven: Peeters, 1992. 1141–59.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Weiffenbach, Wilhelm. *Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu nach den Synoptikern kritisch untersucht und dargestellt*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1873.
- Weisse C.H. *Die evangelische Geschichte, kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1838.
- Wenham, David. *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse*. GP 4. Sheffield: JSOT, 1984.
- Westfall, Cynthia Long. "Blessed Be the Ties that Bind: Semantic Domains in Hebrews 1:1–4:16." Presented to the Theological Research Seminar: McMaster Divinity College, November 2005.
- _____. *A Discourse Analysis of the Letter to the Hebrews: The Relationship Between Form and Meaning*. LNTSSup/JSNTSup 297. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Williams, Joel F. *Other Followers of Jesus: Minor Characters as Major Figures in Mark's Gospel*. JSNTSup 102. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Witherington, Ben III. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Wright, N.T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. COQG 2. London: SPCK, 1996.