

Durham E-Theses

The Baptismal Episode as Trinitarian Narrative: Proto-Trinitarian Structures in Mark's Conception of God

MORTENSEN, HALLUR

How to cite:

MORTENSEN, HALLUR (2018) *The Baptismal Episode as Trinitarian Narrative: Proto-Trinitarian Structures in Mark's Conception of God*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/12543/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

The Baptismal Episode as Trinitarian Narrative: Proto-Trinitarian Structures in Mark's Conception of God

by

Hallur Mortensen

Abstract

This thesis examines the concept of 'God' in Mark's Gospel, with particular emphasis on the baptismal scene of 1:9-11. The introduction outlines the previous research on the subject. Despite recent contributions, the nature of the relation between God, Jesus, and the Spirit is still understudied. Chapter 1 discusses the preliminary question of the extent and function of Mark's prologue and Mark's use of the Old Testament. Chapter 2 argues that the beginning and end of the prologue (1:2-3 and 1:14-15) concerning the coming of the Lord, the good news, and the coming of God's kingdom, must be related with each other and establish the context for interpreting the baptismal narrative. This chapter also examines Jewish monotheism and argues that God is known in his actions and relations. Chapter 3 argues that the torn heaven at the baptism alludes to the plea for God to tear open the heavens in Isaiah 63:19. This is linked with the tearing of the temple veil in 15:38. Chapter 4 examines allusions of the divine voice to Psalm 2 and Isaiah 42, and especially its function in revealing the identity of Jesus. The chapter also argues for the narrative unveiling of Jesus as the Son of God, and thus also of God as the Father of Jesus. Chapter 5 argues that the Spirit's descent is an anointing of Jesus and has a critical function in the coming of the kingdom and the defeat of Satan. The identity of the Spirit is examined and found to be divine yet distinct within God. The final chapter proposes that Mark has a proto- and narrative trinitarian conception of God and that later trinitarian doctrine is a response to pressure exerted by texts such as this one. The appendix further examines the open heaven motif in depth.

**The Baptismal Episode as Trinitarian Narrative
Proto-Trinitarian Structures in Mark's Conception of God**

BY

HALLUR MORTENSEN

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

AT

**DURHAM UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY AND RELIGION**

2017

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	1
Statement of Copyright.....	1
Acknowledgements	1
Introduction: Mark's God in the History of Research.....	4
Chapter 1: Reading Mark.....	32
a. Mark and the Old Testament.....	32
i. Defining Citations and Allusions.....	33
ii. Isaiah as Mark's Narrative Framework.....	41
iii. The Theological Function of Mark's Use of Scripture	43
b. The Function of Mark's Prologue	48
i. The Extent of the Prologue	48
ii. The Narrative Function of the Prologue	53
c. Conclusions.....	56
Chapter 2: The Theological Context of the Baptism Episode	57
a. The Gospel of Mark and the God of Israel	57
b. God's Narrative Identity	63
c. The Opening Citation and the Coming of the Lord	75
d. The Gospel and the Kingdom	84
i. The Gospel.....	85
ii. The Good News of God's Reign in Isaiah	87
iii. The Kingdom in Daniel	93
iv. The Meaning of the Kingdom of God.....	99
e. Conclusions.....	103
Chapter 3: The Torn Heaven.....	106
a. The Open Heaven Motif	106
i. Ezekiel and the Conceptual Background.....	107
ii. Other Call Narratives.....	110
iii. The Function of the Open Heaven Motif.....	117
b. Mark's Torn Heaven and Isaiah's Plea	119
c. The Torn Veil and the Divine Presence	127
d. Conclusions	139
Chapter 4: The Divine Sonship of Jesus.....	140
a. The Father's Voice at the Baptism.....	141
i. The Allusion to Psalm 2.....	145
ii. The Allusion to Isa 42:1	149
iii. The Function of the Divine Voice.....	150
1) Calling/Commission	151
2) Adoption	152
3) Coronation/Installation/Consecration.....	154
4) Revelation of the Son of God	157
5) Conclusion.....	162
b. The Narrative Revelation of Divine Sonship	163
i. Non-Human Knowledge of Jesus' Divine Sonship	167
ii. Human Knowledge of Jesus' Divine Sonship.....	169
1) Peter's Confession and the Voice from the Cloud	171

2) The Parable of the Vineyard	176
3) Mark 13:32	177
4) Jesus before the High Priest and Pilate.....	177
5) The Centurion's Confession.....	180
6) Conclusion.....	183
c. God as Father	184
d. Conclusions	187
Chapter 5: The Spirit's Descent	189
a. The Spirit's Anointing of Jesus	189
i. The Eschatological Spirit of Isaiah.....	190
ii. The Manner of the Spirit's Descent	192
iii. The Spirit-Anointed Jesus	194
b. The Spirit and the Defeat of Satan.....	197
i. The Parables of Beelzebul	199
ii. Jesus the Stronger One	201
iii. The Spirit and the Kingdom	203
iv. Blasphemy Against the Spirit	204
c. The Spirit Speaks	205
d. The Identity of the Spirit	207
i. The Spirit in Isa 63:7-64:11	207
ii. The Angel of His Presence	208
iii. The Spirit as Hypostasis of God and Beyond	212
e. Conclusions.....	216
Chapter 6: Towards a Trinitarian Conception of God?.....	217
a. Is Mark Trinitarian?	218
b. Narrative Trinity	221
c. Can the Word Trinity be Used?.....	223
Bibliography	227

Abbreviations

All abbreviation of ancient literature, academic journals and monograph series follow the forms indicated in the SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006).

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Acknowledgements

Without the help of many people the completion of this thesis would not be possible. Here I would like to take the opportunity to acknowledge them and give my sincere thanks.

First of all I would like to thank my supervisory team, Prof. Francis Watson as primary supervisor, and Dr. Jan Doehorn as secondary supervisor. I could not have asked for a better team and their different expertise complemented each other well. Their wisdom, advice, and encouragement has been invaluable. Their influence is greater than the footnotes would suggest. Thanks also to my first New Testament lecturers, Dr. Stephen Chester, Dr. Marion Carson, and Dr. John Dennis who introduced me to and taught me to navigate the fascinating area of New Testament Studies.

I could not have wished for a better place to do my research than the Department of Theology and Religion at Durham University. The supportive faculty and staff, the active doctoral student body, and the inspiring weekly New Testament Seminar all created a great environment for working on this project. Especially I would like to thank the fellow members of the PG5 study room: Samuel Tedder, David Merrill, Tavis Bohlinger, Ruth Perrin, Jerry Lofquist and Rob Haynes, who provided both an academically stimulating and pastorally supporting community that made for an enriching and wonderful experience. In Durham, I also would like to thank King's

Church, our spiritual home, who welcomed us with open arms and provided a spiritual community for us in Durham.

I am very grateful for Studni for providing the finances for the project and without whom the undertaking of this projects would have been impossible. I also wish to give sincere appreciation to Lívðin Church in the Faroe Islands and Agape Community Church in Japan who supported us both spiritually and financially throughout this time and believed in its importance. Thanks also to my parents Herluf and Joana for their continual support, encouragement, and interest.

Finally, and most of all, I would like to thank my wife Shino for her extraordinary patience and enduring support during these years. She has been a co-traveller on this journey, starting from Nigeria where the preparation for this project began, to England, to the Faroe Islands, and finally to Japan. The journey has not only been a geographical one, but also a spiritual one, and she helped me to keep my eyes on what is truly important. To you, my best friend and beloved companion, I dedicate this thesis.

To my three beloved children, Kano, Nana, and Louie, who although I have been busy for these years, your presence always enriched my day and made my return home my daily highlight.

Soli Deo gloria

Here then we have the Trinity presented in a clear way: the Father in the voice, the Son in the man, the Holy Spirit in the dove. This only needs to be barely mentioned, for it is so obvious for anyone to see. Here the recognition of the Trinity is conveyed to us so plainly that it hardly leaves any room for doubt or hesitation.¹

When in Jordan thou wast baptized, O Lord, the worship of the Trinity was made manifest. For the voice of the Father bare witness unto thee, calling thee his beloved Son, and the Spirit, in the form of a dove, confirmed the steadfastness of that word. O Christ our God, who didst manifest thyself, and dost enlighten the world, glory to thee.²

-
1. St. Augustine. Simonetti, Manlio, *Matthew 1-13*. ACCS. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001), 54.
 2. From The Syrian Orthodox liturgy for Epiphany, Antiphon III, Tone 1. Cited in Letham, Robert, *The Holy Trinity: In Scripture, History, Theology, and Worship*. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2004), 51.

Introduction

Mark's God in the History of Research

In 1975 Nils A. Dahl issued his now famous plea that both direct reference to and detailed examination of statements regarding God had been neglected in New Testament research.³ While his article has received a response and studies on 'God' in various New Testament books⁴ have appeared it is still a minority concern in NT scholarship.⁵ In Markan studies the focus has traditionally been on Christology, ethics, and eschatology, while 'God' is hardly discussed at all. But isolating Jesus from God would be arbitrary, and would be to make a move that is not made by Mark, who so closely associated the two that one cannot be separated from the other. This is true on even the basic level that God sends Jesus and Jesus reveals God. But the argument in this thesis goes beyond this minimalistic view and focuses on the relationship between the one who calls Jesus his Son and the one who calls God *abba*. As the subsequent survey and argument will demonstrate, there is a particular concentration of God language and God activity in the prologue. Only twice in Mark does God enter the story directly, albeit in a voice from heaven, which is at the baptism (Mark 1:11) and the transfiguration (9:7), and these thus become key entry points for discussing Mark's understanding of who God is. But Jesus and God, who are identified in relational terms as 'son' and thus by implication 'father', are not the only characters involved in the baptism event. Prior to the Father's utterance, someone or something called the 'Spirit' descends from heaven and comes to Jesus. While a multiplicity of questions remain to be answered, the argument of this thesis is that this amounts to a proto-trinitarian and narrative trinitarian understanding of God's identity.⁶

3. Dahl, Nils A., "The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology," in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*. Ed. Donald H. Juel (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991a), 154. Originally published in Dahl, Nils A., "The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology" *Reflections* 75 (1975).

4. Hereafter NT.

5. But see Hurtado's review of the situation, which was also a stimulus for this project. Hurtado, Larry W., *God in New Testament Theology*. (Nashville: Abingdon, 2010).

6. While the words 'trinity' and 'trinitarian' are used here and elsewhere, it should be stressed that nuances of later doctrinal debates should not be imported here. However, an alternative word such as 'triadic' does not suffice for it does not capture Mark's simultaneous insistence on monotheism, Jesus' identity as Lord, and the distinction of the Spirit. Using the word 'trinity' in a qualified sense, as well as the more precise terms 'proto-trinitarian' and 'narrative-trinitarian', without implying the later highly specific definitions of the term,

Nils A. Dahl (1975)

While Dahl noted the dearth of treatments on 'God' in New Testament studies, he also noted that textbooks on New Testament theology that did discuss God followed the outline of systematic theology and focused on God's "essence and attributes".⁷ However, his own article proceeded in the same manner with sections on 'God as one', 'the Creator is the giver of life', 'God is the sovereign ruler', 'God is the righteous judge', and 'God is merciful'.⁸ However, Dahl made an important contribution, first because his appeal served as an impetus to renewed interest in the subject and second, though his own article was limited in its constructive work, he pointed to the necessary way forward. On the second point Dahl referred to O. Cullmann's statement that "early Christian theology is in reality almost exclusively Christology",⁹ but Dahl rather suggested that it could just as well be the "other way around".¹⁰

Robert C. Tannehill (1979)

Although Tannehill's *Semeia* article is not strictly about Mark's view of God, it is important in this context for two reasons. It was the first major 'narrative Christology' on Mark's Gospel (and also introduces the term) and was influential in this regard. Secondly, he stated that in Mark God and his purpose is "lying behind the central events of the story".¹¹ Tannehill continued to argue that Jesus and the narrative about him concerns how Jesus accomplishes his purpose and mission. While Tannehill did not explore Mark's God in depth and in the end argued for a functional Christology, these comments were influential for subsequent examination of the Markan God.

John R. Donahue (1982, 1984)

John R. Donahue responded directly to Dahl's appeal and wrote on 'God' in Mark's Gospel. He contends that in order to focus on 'God', it is necessary on the outset to

is desirable because the term emerged in the context of serious engagement with Scripture.

7. Dahl, (1991a), 155.

8. Dahl, (1991a), 159-160.

9. Cullmann, Oscar, *The Christology of the New Testament*. (London: SCM, 1959), 2-3.

10. Dahl, (1991a), 154.

11. Tannehill, Robert C., "The Gospel of Mark as Narrative Christology" *Semeia* 16 (1979), 62.

"bracket out" the "question of the relationship of Jesus to God".¹² He argues that in Mark the transcendence of God is emphasised,¹³ and that Mark is almost unique in the NT in being characterized by a lack of anthropomorphisms and ascriptions which suggests 'reserved speech' concerning God.¹⁴ In this sense Mark diverges from Jewish writings, being influenced by Hellenistic philosophy.¹⁵

Donahue focuses on the three passages in 12:13-34 - on taxes, on the resurrection, and on the greatest commandment - and suggests that this section is "more directly theological".¹⁶ Since the demands and nature of God is expressed and the sovereignty of God is affirmed¹⁷ he called this passage a "little treatise *De Deo Uno*".¹⁸ God is the God of the living¹⁹ and "[t]he question of the resurrection provides the centerpiece of Mark's theistic creed."²⁰ For the Markan Jesus the one God is known through the OT, and the one who confesses this is not far from the kingdom. But this passage also pertains to the relation between Jesus and God, and the former defines his relationship with God²¹ as the one who renders the things of God unto God. Donahue argues that while Jesus speaks authoritatively for God, his nearness to God cannot undermine God's sovereignty, which underlines Jesus' subordination to God.²²

In a little noted 1984 chapter, Donahue also argued that Mark - especially in 1:9-11 and 9:2-8, but also in the miracles and the forgiving of sins - sees "in Jesus a unique revelation or disclosure of God."²³ He argues that this revelation is not in a simple one to one correspondence, but carries a deeper level of meaning: as the 'Revelatory Symbol' or 'Parable of God'.²⁴ In yet another essay expanding on the same theme he writes: "Ultimately then the christological titles in Mark are not simply descriptions of Jesus but are metaphors of what God has done in Jesus."²⁵

12. Donahue, John R., "A Neglected Factor in the Theology of Mark" *JBL* 101/4 (1982), 564-565.

13. Donahue, (1982), 569.

14. Donahue, (1982), 566-567, 569.

15. Donahue, John R., "The Revelation of God in the Gospel of Mark," in *Modern Biblical Scholarship: Its Impact on Theology and Proclamation*. Ed. Francis A. Eigo (Villanova, PA: The Villanova University Press, 1984), 158-160.

16. Donahue, (1982), 571.

17. Donahue, (1982), 573.

18. Donahue, (1982), 570. Donahue, (1984), 160.

19. Donahue, (1982), 575-578.

20. Donahue, (1982), 575. Donahue, (1984), 164.

21. Donahue, (1982), 574.

22. Donahue, (1982), 582.

23. Donahue, (1984), 169-170.

24. Donahue, (1984), 170-175. Also Donahue, John R., "Jesus as the Parable of God in the Gospel of Mark" *Int* 32 (1978)

25. Donahue, (1978), 379.

While Donahue suggested there may be "nothing distinctively new or Christian" in Mark's view of God,²⁶ this thesis will argue that the disclosure of God encompasses Jesus himself who shares in God's divine identity. For while Donahue rightly highlights Mark 12 which contains paramount statements of Jesus regarding God, his three contributions do not do justice to Mark's opening citation, the baptism narrative, and Jesus' message of the good news of the kingdom. In this framework God's Spirit and the nature of divine sonship are also neglected. The question remains unanswered: What is the meaning of the relationship between God and Jesus his Son; and what does this mean for God?

Joachim Gnilka (1992)

Another early yet often overlooked contribution is Gnilka's section on the notion of God in Mark's Gospel in his article on 'God' in the Jesus tradition. Gnilka first discusses the vocabulary used for God; θεός, κύριος, πατήρ, as well as divine passives and the genitive constructions like the 'kingdom of God' or 'Son of God'.

Gnilka stresses that Mark's God is the God of the OT, identified as the creator, the one who unites man and wife in matrimony, forgives sins, spoke to Moses, and is the God of the patriarchs. In short, "[d]er Gott des Evangeliums ist der Gott der Bibel, der Gott Israels."²⁷ The oneness of God is thus confirmed in Mark 2:7, 10:18 and 12:29ff. and Gnilka writes, "[d]as monotheistische Glaubensbekenntnis ist im Markusevangelium fest verankert." Gnilka suggests that Mark may have been written in a situation where the Markan community, i.e. in Rome, was accused of ditheism by the synagogue because of its views on Jesus. But Mark and his community hold fast to both a biblical monotheism and to Jesus as the Christ, Son of God, and the Son of Man who will come to judge the world.²⁸ Meaning 'theological' in the narrow sense, Gnilka concludes that "[w]ir stehen an den Anfängen eines christologisch-theologischen Reflexionsprozesses." Reflection on God in Mark cannot be done without incorporating Jesus who reveals God and through whom God establishes his kingdom.²⁹ While Gnilka's section is too short for treating the question

26. Donahue, (1982), 566.

27. Gnilka, Joachim, "Zum Gottesgedanken in der Jesusüberlieferung," in *Monotheismus und Christologie: Zur Gottesfrage im hellenistischen Judentum und im Urchristentum*. Ed. Hans-Josef Klauck (Freiburg: Herder, 1992), 150-151.

28. Gnilka, (1992), 152.

29. Gnilka, (1992), 151-154.

of God thoroughly, he rightly acknowledges that Jesus cannot be 'bracketed out' and that this will necessarily lead to a renewed understanding of God.

François Vouga (1995)

Vouga's chapter on this topic has two central arguments. First, he argues that while Jesus proclaims the kingdom of God the kingdom is not tied to Jesus as a person³⁰ and writes, "mit seiner person ist aber die βασιλεία keineswegs verbunden."³¹ The second, and correlative argument, is that to believe in the gospel is to believe in God, not Jesus.³² He says concerning 1:14 "Jesus ist hier eindeutig der Verkünder und nicht der Inhalt des 'Evangeliums'".³³ Faith should therefore be directed towards God and not to Jesus as a person, for he is merely a proclaimer of the kingdom and a witness to faith as an existential posture.³⁴ Vouga thus argues that there is no theological connection between the kingdom, the gospel, and Christology.³⁵ But this thesis will argue in depth that there is an intimate connection precisely between the gospel, the kingdom, and Jesus as the Son of God and that it is precisely this which is critical for understanding the Markan God.

Klaus Scholtissek (1996)

K. Scholtissek first provides an overview of both direct and indirect words used for God in Mark.³⁶ He then surveys especially the use of θεός, noting its connection to other words, including 'son', 'kingdom', 'gospel', 'power', 'authority', and 'Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob', as well as God as the object of faith.³⁷ He looks at one parable for its depiction of God, the parable of the vineyard, and states that here God is the one who planted the vineyard, both created and chose Israel, holds the workers

30. Vouga, François, "Habt Glauben an Gott". Der Theozentrismus der Verkündigung des Evangeliums und des christlichen Glaubens im Markusevangelium," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Eds. Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 93-94, 97, 106.

31. Vouga, (1995), 93. Also 94, 106.

32. Vouga, (1995), 94-97, 100, 104.

33. Vouga, (1995), 99. Also 100.

34. Vouga, (1995), 103. Also 96-98.

35. Vouga, (1995), 94.

36. Scholtissek, Klaus, "Er ist nicht ein Gott der Toten, sondern der Lebenden' (Mk. 12,27). Grundzüge der markinischen Theo-logie," in *Der Lebendige Gott: Festschrift für Wilhelm Thüsing zum 75. Geburtstag*. Ed. Thomas Söding (Münster: Aschendorf, 1996), 77-78.

37. Scholtissek, (1996), 81-86.

responsible, expects obedience and is judge.³⁸ His article concludes with four basic points, three of which are relevant for our concerns.

Firstly, the God of Mark's Gospel is the God of Israel, the God of creation, and the one God of the patriarchs, who spoke in the law and through the prophets, who has promised that he himself will come and rule and who is now working an eschatological work of salvation.³⁹ Secondly, the depiction of God in Mark is in light of the fact that the two leitmotifs in Mark - the Kingdom of God and Son of God - belong together.⁴⁰ God sends his own Son who proclaims the arrival of the kingdom.⁴¹ His third point is the theocentricity of Jesus, who prays to God and does his will proclaiming, teaching, and acting with divine authority.⁴²

Naturally, not all can be covered in a short chapter, but Scholtissek's work is helpful, stressing the key points of the continuity between Mark's God and God in the OT, and the link between the Son of God and the kingdom. However, he does not explore the intimate relationship between the Father and the Son, and what this does for the meaning of God's identity. Likewise, the Spirit of God is not included in his discussion.

Kisun No (1999)

The unpublished Ph.D. thesis of Kisun No from 1999 at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary: "The Narrative Function of God in the Gospel of Mark", has a narrative critical approach. The method is based particularly on E.M. Forster's idea of round (complex) versus flat (predictable) characters,⁴³ and B.D. Gowler's distinction between direct definition and indirect presentation of a character. Kisun No argues that God fulfills the conditions of qualifying as a character in Mark who both acts and speaks,⁴⁴ and contends that God is a 'round' and complex character.⁴⁵ A

38. Scholtissek, (1996), 87-91.

39. Scholtissek, (1996), 96. Also 78.

40. Scholtissek, (1996), 79-80.

41. Scholtissek, (1996), 97, 80-81.

42. Scholtissek, (1996), 97-98.

43. No, Kisun, "The Narrative Function of God in the Gospel of Mark" (Ph.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1999), 26, 29-30.

44. No, (1999), 1, 20-25.

45. No, (1999), 177.

key argument is that God in Mark is not a background or minor character⁴⁶ but "a main character".⁴⁷

God is particularly prominent at the beginning and the end of the narrative. At the beginning God initiates the gospel, sends John, tears heaven, dispatches the Spirit, and speaks from heaven.⁴⁸ At the end of the Gospel God hands Jesus over, tests him in Gethsemane, is present in the darkness,⁴⁹ rends the temple veil, and raises Jesus from death.⁵⁰ It is thus God who directs the plot,⁵¹ and all things, including the passion, happen according to God's plan.⁵² Mark both 'shows' and 'tells' who God is. By 'telling' (or 'direct definition') Mark states that only God is good, that all things are possible for God, that God is one, that he is the God of the living, the God of Abraham, and the Father of Jesus.⁵³ 'Showing' (or 'indirect presentation') is indicated by God's speech and action,⁵⁴ including the presentation of God in the parables.

For No "God as a character functions primarily to establish the characterization of Jesus in the narrative. He as a director acts decisively and directly, leading Jesus toward the certain goal."⁵⁵ God is the force behind Jesus' exorcisms, miracles, and teachings⁵⁶ and God's power is behind the withered fig tree and thus also the destruction the temple.⁵⁷ But it is not only God, but the story itself and many of its other characters who function to show who Jesus is.⁵⁸ No contends that Jesus in the opening citation is identified with the Lord in Isaiah and Malachi, and is thus presented as a 'divine being' before the baptism and is thus eternally divine.⁵⁹ This is confirmed in the following narrative; for instance in Mark 5:19-20 where Jesus and God are equalled.⁶⁰ Mark 2:1-12 also "presents Jesus' divine identity",⁶¹ for "[b]y

46. No, (1999), 177, 179.

47. No, (1999), 4, 44, 79, 178.

48. No, (1999), 66, 68, 73.

49. No, (1999), 174. Also 178.

50. No, (1999), 49, 158, 170-171, 177-178.

51. No, (1999), 80, 177.

52. No, (1999), 105.

53. No, (1999), 150, 179-182.

54. No, (1999), 148.

55. No, (1999), 175.

56. No, (1999), 97, 100, 178.

57. No, (1999), 127, 138.

58. No, (1999), 8.

59. No, (1999), 53-55. Also 98.

60. No, (1999), 97.

61. No, (1999), 81.

comparing God's ability to forgive with his own, Jesus asserts that he also is a divine being."⁶²

Although No states that this thesis "is not intended to synthesize all results", this is also one of its problems,⁶³ for while the thesis is broad and helpfully gives an overview of Mark's God-language, at some point there needs to be more depth in order to ask and answer the critical question of Jesus' relation to God and what this does for God's own identity. To state that Jesus is "also is a divine being"⁶⁴ begs the question whether there are two gods, and what this does to the notion of God's oneness.⁶⁵

No states that while the authority of Jesus comes from God a rejection of this is an unforgivable sin against the Spirit.⁶⁶ The Holy Spirit is the "divine authority" speaking through David but is also an "agent from God".⁶⁷ Thus the Spirit is conceived of as both an agent and as the power and authority of God - implying that the Spirit is both divine yet distinct from God - but No refrains from discussing the Spirit and its relation to God, a question that needs to be addressed for a complete view of Mark's God.

Philip Reuben Johnson (2000)

Another Ph.D. thesis that examines the Markan God from a narrative angle is Philip Reuben Johnson's thesis "God in Mark: The Narrative Function of God as a Character in the Gospel of Mark" from 2000 at Luther Seminary.

His first chapter lays out his methodology, where he stresses the usefulness of character theory over narratology and relies especially on the work of Baruch Hochman. He concludes that the best theory to use is one that can hold together the paradox of 'separability' and 'inseparability' - a major theme in his thesis.⁶⁸ The second chapter establishes the character-hood of God.⁶⁹

62. No, (1999), 86-87.

63. No, (1999), 179.

64. No, (1999), 86-87.

65. No, (1999), 150-151.

66. No, (1999), 91.

67. No, (1999), 152.

68. Johnson, Philip Reuben, "God in Mark: The Narrative Function of God as a Character in the Gospel of Mark" (Ph.D., Luther Seminary, 2000), 11, 65-66.

69. Johnson, (2000), 67ff.

Johnson notes that God is almost as often referred to as Jesus in Mark⁷⁰ and states: "No person can read the Gospel of Mark without encountering God."⁷¹ God is identified by different terms, such as θεός, κύριος, πατήρ, and πνεῦμα and is primarily presented indirectly.⁷² The most important descriptive statements of God are that he is the God of the living and able to do all things.⁷³ God speaks directly in first person citations from the OT (1:2-3, 7:6-7, 11:17, 12:26, 14:27);⁷⁴ each of which needs to be appreciated for the characterisation of God.⁷⁵

For characters relations are important, and for God his relation to Jesus is pivotal.⁷⁶ This relationship is especially stressed in the introduction (1:1-13),⁷⁷ transfiguration (9:2-8), Gethsemane (14:32-42), Golgotha (14:22-38), and the resurrection (16:1-8). While these are points in the story of the life of Jesus, Johnson also states that "these same episodes need to be considered as moments in God's story."⁷⁸ The main characters in these episodes are the same: God and Jesus.⁷⁹

Johnson emphasises the narrative 'gradual unfolding' of the knowledge of God's identity.⁸⁰ The first episode (1:1-15) creates high expectations and gives foundational information and shows God acting, speaking, and relating.⁸¹ Here God is identified as *Lord*, *Voice*, and *Spirit*; According to Johnson the Spirit and God are identical and interchangeable, and the Spirit is simply an 'identifier' or an 'appellation' referring to God⁸² and should "not be construed as a distinct character from God".⁸³ It is therefore God who descends and drives Jesus into the desert.⁸⁴ God is the first to speak and act in Mark, and is the central character of 1:1-15 which shows that "[t]he Gospel of Mark is a story about God."⁸⁵ Johnson stresses 1:9-11 because of its relational character, and one needs to look at this event not only for what it means for Jesus,

70. Johnson, (2000), 83-84.

71. Johnson, (2000), 72.

72. Johnson, (2000), 115. Also 105-106.

73. Johnson, (2000), 99.

74. Johnson, (2000), 100, 103, 164.

75. Johnson, (2000), 91-93.

76. Johnson, (2000), 129-130.

77. But in his discussion he refers to 1:1-15, rather than 1-13.

78. Johnson, (2000), 130, 135.

79. Johnson, (2000), 133-134.

80. Johnson, (2000), 121, 124-126, 149.

81. Johnson, (2000), 142.

82. Johnson, (2000), 78, 189.

83. Johnson, (2000), 77.

84. Johnson, (2000), 143-144, 179, 250.

85. Johnson, (2000), 198. Also 161, 166, 169.

but also what it means for God.⁸⁶ In the following section (1:16-9:1) there is no description of God, though God is indirectly present.⁸⁷ The characterisation of God in 1:16-9:1 is again in relation to Jesus.⁸⁸ God (i.e. the Spirit) has entered Jesus and thus God's identity is in him so that "[t]hose who see and hear God's son react like those who have heard and seen the divine."⁸⁹ However, "[t]hese scenes push the reader to consider the inseparable identities of Jesus and God yet at the same time do not allow their distinct identities to dissolve."⁹⁰

While the emphasis in 1:1-15, and to a lesser degree in 1:16-9:1, is on the 'inseparability' of God and Jesus, this focus is reversed at the transfiguration (9:2-13).⁹¹ God again is the main character in that he acts and speaks. Jesus is transformed and God appears in the cloud.⁹² Now the stress is on the 'separability', not 'inseparability', between God and Jesus.⁹³ The transfiguration passage is not simply a revelation of Jesus, but presents God who views himself as the Father of Jesus, for "God cannot utter 'my son' without declaring himself Jesus' father."⁹⁴ This shows what God thinks about himself.⁹⁵

In the interim section of 9:14-13:37 almost every pericope concerns God and what Jesus says about him. Here, however, there is no direct address to God by Jesus, nor any words or actions from God.⁹⁶ Now the emphasis is even more on 'separability' and Jesus' subordinate status is indicated by what he says about God: that only God is good (10:18), the position of the right hand is only for God to grant (10:40), and only the Father knows the hour (13:32).⁹⁷ It is God who saves, commands, and is the object of faith, love, prayer, and devotion.⁹⁸ But while the stress is on 'separability', 'inseparability' is not dissolved for in 9:37 Jesus states that the one who receives him receives the Father.⁹⁹

86. Johnson, (2000), 177-179.

87. Johnson, (2000), 248.

88. Johnson, (2000), 250.

89. Johnson, (2000), 240-242.

90. Johnson, (2000), 242-243.

91. Johnson, (2000), 261.

92. Johnson, (2000), 257, 264, 268, 289.

93. Johnson, (2000), 275, 276, 283, 285, 292.

94. Johnson, (2000), 280. Also 291.

95. Johnson, (2000), 281.

96. Johnson, (2000), 296, 312. Though there are things that must take place, p.313.

97. Johnson, (2000), 297, 307-308, 328.

98. Johnson, (2000), 316, 321, 330.

99. Johnson, (2000), 311.

The last main chapter of the thesis discusses 14:1-16:8 and especially the three episodes of Gethsemane, Golgotha, and the resurrection. In Gethsemane God is unexpectedly silent, which creates a distance between God and the reader¹⁰⁰ and this further extends the 'separability' between Jesus and God.¹⁰¹ The narrator's focus in Gethsemane is not on Jesus' submission, but rather that Jesus' will is different from God's.¹⁰² On Golgotha God abandons his Son Jesus¹⁰³ and this is the deepest expression of their 'separability',¹⁰⁴ and God's self-identity as 'Father' is surrendered as he does not act on behalf of his Son.

Johnson concludes that God in Mark is not easily systematised.¹⁰⁵ While God is not a 'round' or 'full-fledged' character he is still a main character and Mark 'shows' rather than 'tells' the reader who God is.¹⁰⁶ God is in a father-son relationship with Jesus, and while they are closely associated they are never collapsed into one as the narrative moves from 'inseparability' to 'separability'.¹⁰⁷ Johnson writes: "The identities of these two characters will at times appear to merge into one, blurring distinctions, and at other times appear to be most definitely separable and distinct."¹⁰⁸

The increasing separation between God and Jesus creates antipathy for the reader against God. In the beginning of the story God pushed Jesus into the desert into conflict with Satan,¹⁰⁹ and at the end God is silent like the sleeping disciples.¹¹⁰ Indeed, in the end "God will kill Jesus."¹¹¹ Mark's God is both unsettling¹¹² and "is a God not so easily loved, or believed in."¹¹³

In his thesis Johnson has shown the complexity of the Markan God and states that Mark's "main story-line" is the complex relationship between God and Jesus.¹¹⁴ He rightly holds together their 'separability' and 'inseparability', but nowhere solves its

100. Johnson, (2000), 332, 339.

101. Johnson, (2000), 338.

102. Johnson, (2000), 340, 343.

103. Johnson, (2000), 332.

104. Johnson, (2000), 378.

105. Johnson, (2000), 409.

106. Johnson, (2000), 409-410.

107. Johnson, (2000), 410-412.

108. Johnson, (2000), 182.

109. Johnson, (2000), 285.

110. Johnson, (2000), 346.

111. Johnson, (2000), 337.

112. Johnson, (2000), 407, 409, 418.

113. Johnson, (2000), 354.

114. Johnson, (2000), 194, 275, 276, 283, 285, 292.

inner tension. His sequential reading also has the effect of undermining the critical importance of the prologue for understanding the Markan God.

Paul L. Danove (2001, 2005)

Paul Danove's two contributions to this topic both focus on characterisation and rhetorical analysis for understanding Mark's presentation of God. In his 2001 article Danove firstly notes that only rarely is ὁ θεός explicitly used and that the agency of God is often indicated by more "oblique designations".¹¹⁵ Danove categorises 199 references to God in six domains: as agent, experiencer, source, goal, benefactive, and patient.¹¹⁶ God is 'agent' in e.g. in sending Jesus (9:37). God is 'experiencer' when he is pleased (1:11), wills (14:36), and knows (13:32). God is also the 'source' of the Sabbath (2:27) and eternal life (9:43, 45). God is the 'goal' when people pray (1:35) or give thanks (8:6). God is 'benefactive' in that he has angels (8:38), a kingdom (1:15), a will (3:35), and a word (7:13). God is 'patient' when he is the object of direct transitive verbs, for instance 'love' (12:30), 'glorify' (2:12) and 'honour' (7:6) or object of predication, including 'good' (10:18) or 'who is in heaven' (11:25).¹¹⁷

Secondly, Danove examines the use of repetition in the characterisation of God. This means that when the same particular verbs are used of both God and Jesus they are aligned and their relationship is reinforced.¹¹⁸ For example, Danove argues that with the word ἀποστέλλω there is a "positive alignment" of Jesus with God when the disciples are sent and produce the same kind of work Jesus did when he was sent from God.¹¹⁹ Another instance is the 'forgiving' in 2:1-12 and 5:19-20 which aligns Jesus positively with God.¹²⁰ On the other hand, characters who are negatively aligned to Jesus are also negatively aligned to God, which in turn positively aligns Jesus with God.¹²¹

Thirdly, Danove focuses on references to God in the development of the narrative. His narrative analysis shows the greatest concentration of references to God in

115. Danove, Paul L., "The Narrative Function of Mark's Characterization of God" *NovT* XLIII/1 (2001), 12, 14-18.

116. Danove, Paul L., *The Rhetoric of Characterization of God, Jesus, and Jesus' Disciples in the Gospel of Mark*. JSNT Sup. 290. (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 30. See also Danove, (2005), 35ff.

117. Danove, (2001), 16-18. See also Danove, (2005), 40ff.

118. Danove, (2001), 18.

119. Danove, (2001), 19.

120. Danove, (2001), 19.

121. Danove, (2001), 23-24.

1:1-15,¹²² and states that these verses "stress Jesus' positive and intimate relationship with God that approaches identification with God at certain points."¹²³ That Jesus is indirectly or directly associated with every part of God's characterisation in the prologue indicates a bond between Jesus and God that "precludes any understanding of either character without immediate reference to the other."¹²⁴ He notes that when references to God and God's agency is decreased after the prologue, the person of Jesus takes centre stage¹²⁵ and argues that the close alignment and relationship between God and Jesus invites the reader to find "a profound identification of Jesus with God that extends beyond the aspects of identification within the assertions of 1:1-15."¹²⁶

Four years later Danove published a larger second study on the characterisation of God, Jesus, and the disciples in Mark. The chapter on the characterisation of God builds on the former article and adds a section on 'repeated contexts' which associates 1:1-15, 12:1-12, 13:32-37 and 1:1-15, 8:31-9:1, 13:3-13 with each other respectively. The former are linked by 'son', 'lord', 'come', and 'time' and the latter are linked by 'gospel', 'come', and 'reign'. Danove concludes that such repeated contexts link the actions of Jesus and God and reinforces their relationship.¹²⁷ Mark's characterisation of Jesus and God emphasises their intimate relation and even "Jesus' identification with God".¹²⁸

Danove's works helpfully provides good analysis of the textual data and demonstrates the 'positive alinement' of Jesus to God. However, he falls short in examining what this 'positive alinement' means¹²⁹ and especially what it means for God: especially in light of Mark's affirmation of monotheism. Likewise Mark's key themes of divine sonship and the role of the Spirit are left undeveloped.

Jack Dean Kingsbury (2002)

Jack Dean Kingsbury also uses narrative criticism in his essay on this subject. He argues against the position that Mark's 'suffering son of man Christology' is a

122. Danove, (2001), 25-26.

123. Danove, (2001), 25-26.

124. Danove, (2001), 26.

125. Danove, (2005), 52.

126. Danove, (2001), 27. Danove, (2005), 52.

127. Danove, (2005), 43-48.

128. Danove, (2005), 149.

129. It is not synonymous with identification, for John is also aligned positively with God. Danove, (2001), 22.

corrective against a 'Hellenistic divine man Christology', for who can correct God's statement in 1:11 regarding Jesus' divine sonship? Rather the reader is to adopt God's 'point of view' concerning Jesus' identity.¹³⁰ God also enters the narrative at the transfiguration to declare Jesus' divine sonship, which also involves suffering.¹³¹ Kingsbury states that the Gospel presents a narrative unveiling of Jesus' identity as the Son of God which in Mark constitutes "the deepest mystery of Jesus' person, namely, the mystery of his relationship to God."¹³² Though he also stresses God's superiority over Jesus (10:18, 10:40, 13:32).¹³³

There are only two possible views concerning Jesus. God's point of view, and the human/satanic point of view.¹³⁴ Because of Jesus' obedience, his point of view becomes identified with God's point of view,¹³⁵ and God's point of view is also reflected by the reliable narrator,¹³⁶ as well as the demons, the disciples, the Syrophenician woman, and especially the centurion.¹³⁷

This short essay, as well as Kingsbury's book on Markan Christology,¹³⁸ with his emphasis on God's point of view, makes a significant contribution to the understanding of Mark's Gospel. However, while focussing on what God thinks of Jesus, Kingsbury omits asking what God says about himself while calling Jesus his Son. While Kingsbury is right in saying that the author is not concerned with Jesus' 'nature', this does not necessarily mean that Mark's Christology is entirely 'functional'.¹³⁹ The interpreter must also factor in Mark's opening citation, the kingdom, as well as the coming of God's Spirit in order to appreciate Mark's presentation of God.

130. Kingsbury, Jack D., "God' within the Narrative World of Mark," in *Forgotten God: Perspectives in Biblical Theology: Essays in Honor of Paul J. Achtemeier on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Eds. A. Andrew Das and Frank J. Matera (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2002), 76-78.

131. Kingsbury, (2002), 81.

132. Kingsbury, (2002), 78. Also 80.

133. Kingsbury, (2002), 81.

134. Kingsbury, (2002), 79.

135. Kingsbury, (2002), 82-83.

136. Kingsbury, (2002), 84.

137. Kingsbury, (2002), 85-87.

138. Kingsbury, Jack D., *The Christology of Mark's Gospel*. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

139. Kingsbury, (1983), 63.

Another contribution to this subject is C. Drew Smith's article: "'This is My Beloved Son; Listen to Him': Theology and Christology in the Gospel of Mark",¹⁴⁰ which is an adaptation of the second half of the fourth chapter of his Edinburgh University Ph.D. thesis from 2003 entitled: *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark A Literary-Theological Investigation into the Presentation of God in the Second Gospel*.

Since the article is an adaption of a section of the thesis, with the majority of the paragraphs identical, I will present the fuller argument of the thesis. His major concern is to relate the question of God with both Christology and discipleship; two themes that have been recognized to be particularly prominent in Mark. Smith approaches Mark from a literary standpoint and seeks to treat the narrative holistically.¹⁴¹ In his thesis Smith offers a linear reading of Mark and discusses most episodes¹⁴² and focusses on both the explicit and implicit presentation of God within the story. He reads the narrative on two levels, on how the narrative's characters understand the situation, and how the reader would have understood it.¹⁴³ Rather than outlining Smith's comments and conclusions for each passage, it is better to focus on his main results which he also published in his article. The key points are that in most of these passages God is presented as the source of Jesus' identity, authority, and mission.

Smith notes the titles used of Jesus but points out that simply examining titles is not sufficient, for Mark also *shows* and not only *tells*, who Jesus is.¹⁴⁴ Firstly, Jesus is *sent* by God to represent God on earth. This is indicated by the citation in 1:2-3,¹⁴⁵ Jesus' statement in 9:37 'the one who welcomes me, welcomes the one who sent me', the parable in chap 12,¹⁴⁶ and especially the heavenly voice (9:7).¹⁴⁷ Jesus is also an *actor* for God, who is given unique authority at the baptism¹⁴⁸ to teach, cast out demons,

140. Smith, C. Drew, "'This is My Beloved Son; Listen to Him': Theology and Christology in the Gospel of Mark" *HBT* 24 (2002)

141. Smith, C. Drew, "The Theology of the Gospel of Mark: A Literary-Theological Investigation into the Presentation of God in the Second Gospel" (Ph.D., University of Edinburgh, 2003), 2, 22, 28.

142. Leaving out only 1:16-20, 5:20-6:56, 7:24-8:10, 8:14-26, 10:46-52, 12:38-44, 14:1-16, 14:51-52, 14:66-15:32, 15:40-47, 16:9-20.

143. Smith, (2003), 28, 30.

144. Smith, (2003), 176.

145. Smith also notes 1:24, 1:38, 2:15-17, 10:45, 11:9

146. Smith, (2003), 181. Smith, (2002), 59.

147. Smith, (2003), 182. Smith, (2002), 60.

148. Smith, (2003), 75.

and cleanse impurity. Jesus shows both God's compassion¹⁴⁹ and God's judgment.¹⁵⁰ He is or brings present God's numinous presence, so that people fear and are astonished.¹⁵¹ Jesus also *speaks for God* - with God's authority - in proclaiming the kingdom, commanding demons, and in speaking of himself as God's envoy. At the transfiguration God says, 'Listen to him', which means he has authority to speak on God's behalf.¹⁵² Jesus' *death* is a ransom for God, is in obedience to God and he establishes a new covenant with God (10:45, 14:22-25) which is God's purpose and initiative.¹⁵³ God resurrects and exalts Jesus, and Jesus will come in the glory of his Father (8:38) and be seated at God's right hand (14:62).¹⁵⁴ Smith concludes that God acts first and last in this Gospel and that "God is indeed the *main* character behind the narrative."¹⁵⁵ Jesus is to be understood in light of the narrative presentation of God who sends, commissions, authenticates and vindicates Jesus,¹⁵⁶ for "[t]hrough the genre of narrative Mark presents a portrait of Jesus that is an aspect of his portrait of God."¹⁵⁷ And "thus the Christology of Mark is better understood as an aspect of the theology of Mark."¹⁵⁸ Christology and theology are thus interrelated.¹⁵⁹

The other major part of Smith's discussion is discipleship, which he points out is not only about the relationship between Jesus and the disciples, but also about God and the disciples.¹⁶⁰ For Smith the key point is that Jesus is the 'paradigmatic disciple' who models prayer, faith, and doing God's will.¹⁶¹ They are the new people of God, chosen, empowered, and saved by him.¹⁶²

Smith concludes his thesis with a chapter on 'the theology of Mark's Gospel', where he states Mark's view of God more systematically. The Gospel of Mark is a story of the living God who has begun something in the past and now completes it in Jesus, in whom God is primarily known and experienced. God is the authoritative identifier

149. Smith, (2003), 47, 186, 194-195. Smith, (2002), 61ff.

150. Smith, (2003), 93.

151. E.g. when he speaks with authority, heals, and walks on water 1:22, 27; 2:12; 4:41; 5:15, 20, 33, 42; 6:50-51; and 7:37. Smith, (2002), 73. Also 72-74. Smith, (2003), 196-200.

152. Smith, (2003), 201-206.

153. Smith, (2003), 214-217, 220. Also Smith, (2002), 81-82.

154. Smith, (2003), 217-218.

155. Smith, (2003), 145. Emphasis original.

156. Smith, (2003), 145, 150, 177, 219-220. Smith, (2002), 56ff., 86.

157. Smith, (2002), 86.

158. Smith, (2003), 28.

159. Smith, (2003), 221. Smith, (2002), 86.

160. Smith, (2003), 225-226.

161. Smith, (2003), 248, 262.

162. Smith, (2003), 146.

of Jesus, and is active in his suffering and vindication, through which God dispels evil and establishes a new covenant community.¹⁶³

There is much to be gained from Smith's works. He rightly argues that Christology which is not understood in the light of Jesus' relationship with God is deficient, stating: "the theology of Mark's narrative is not a set of ideas or propositions, but a dynamic relationship between the God of Israel and God's Beloved Son."¹⁶⁴ But while Smith notes Jesus' nearness to God, and that "[t]he Markan Jesus takes on the prerogatives of God in action and in speech"¹⁶⁵ at the same time "Jesus does not take on the fullness of God's prerogatives".¹⁶⁶ Smith talks about Jesus being inseparable from God,¹⁶⁷ yet also submissive to God¹⁶⁸ and that Jesus does not supplant God when he heals and forgives sins.¹⁶⁹ Noting both Mark's monotheism and Jesus' exalted status, he concludes that: "The narrative, therefore, carefully holds in tension the separateness of God and Jesus with the unity between the Father and the Son."¹⁷⁰ But while he demonstrates the complexity of the relationship between God and Jesus, he does not propose how this paradox can be explained.

Smith argues that not only is Jesus to be understood in the light of his relationship with God, but so also God is to be understood in light of his relationship with Jesus. "Mark's narrative is as much a theological narrative as it is a christological narrative, for it has as much to say to its audience about God as it does about Jesus."¹⁷¹ However, Smith does not push this point. Nor does he press the question of what the close identification of Jesus with God does for the meaning of the term 'God'.

Gudrun Guttenberger (2004)

The first, and still only major, book-length publication on 'God' in Mark's Gospel, is Gudrun Guttenberger's *Die Gottesvorstellung im Markusevangelium* from 2004. Her approach is thematic and discusses five themes in succession: 1) God as Lord of

163. Smith, (2003), 299-306.

164. Smith, (2003), 301.

165. Smith, (2003), 301.

166. Smith, (2003), 301.

167. Smith, (2003), 221. Smith, (2002), 80.

168. Smith, (2003), 209-210. Smith, (2002), 79.

169. Smith, (2003), 48.

170. Smith, (2003), 145.

171. Smith, (2003), 309.

history 2) God as law-giver 3) the power and omnipotence of God 4) God and evil 5) Monotheism and Christology.

After preliminaries Guttenberger first discusses God as the Lord of history. The 'Grundtenor' in Mark, is according to Guttenberger, the transcendence of God.¹⁷² She stresses the continuation of the history presented in Mark with the history of Israel.¹⁷³ Mark's God is the God of the Scriptures, for of the eighteen occurrences of *theos* in Mark eleven are in scriptural citations.¹⁷⁴ God is presented as in control of both the beginning and end of history, as represented by Mark 1:1-15 and 13:3-37.¹⁷⁵ God is responsible for the events of the end and also as creator of new creation.¹⁷⁶ Because God is the Lord of history he is ultimately responsible for Jesus' death and suffering (14:21, 27), however God does not act directly, but allows it to happen: "Gott handelt nicht, er lässt geschehen."¹⁷⁷

Secondly, Guttenberger discusses the Markan God as the law-giver. While history follows God's plan, which is linked to Scripture, he does not act directly in history but as law-giver. The parable of the vineyard in Mark 12 points to a God who is distant, but whose will is made known and accomplished through his messengers and his Son.¹⁷⁸ In discussing God as law-giver, she examines the themes of purity, Sabbath, marriage and divorce, the highest commandment, and the temple action. She argues that in Mark there is a '*Christologische Zuspitzung*',¹⁷⁹ for God's will on these matters is now known through Jesus who has the authority to make declarations concerning the Torah and discern the real will of God.¹⁸⁰

The third theme Guttenberger examines is the power and omnipotence of God. In Mark, *dynamis* is the domain of God, (14:62, 12:24) and is the only attribute of God mentioned in Mark. The power of God includes the power to give and create life, and as the God of the living, (12:27) is the originator of life.¹⁸¹ The crisis in 14:32-42 is not that God is judging Jesus, but that God does not intervene though he has the power to do so. Guttenberger notes that Jesus is not wrong to declare God's absence

172. Guttenberger, Gudrun, *Die Gottesvorstellung im Markusevangelium*. BZNW. 123. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 115.

173. Guttenberger, (2004), 49.

174. Guttenberger, (2004), 54-55.

175. Guttenberger, (2004), 65, 74.

176. Guttenberger, (2004), 333.

177. Guttenberger, (2004), 94. Also 108, 196, 198.

178. Guttenberger, (2004), 118.

179. Guttenberger, (2004), 162. Emphasis original.

180. Guttenberger, (2004), 147.

181. Guttenberger, (2004), 217.

(15:34), but still God is present. She writes, "Gott ist als Abwesender präsent und als Verborgener epiphan. Jesus ist als der Sterbende und Verlassene Gottes Sohn."¹⁸² The death of Jesus becomes an epiphany.¹⁸³ Thus while God is almighty, he is not the origin of evil. However, his withdrawal gives space for evil (Unheil) through which he accomplishes salvation (Heil).¹⁸⁴

In the fourth chapter Guttenberger deals with the question of God and evil, and argues that Mark's Gospel displays both a monistic and a dualistic way of understanding this issue. In the former, it is human beings who act and are responsible for Jesus' death and suffering,¹⁸⁵ and while God is in the background he is not directly responsible¹⁸⁶ and is linked only indirectly to the purpose of Jesus' death in 10:45 and 14:22-25.¹⁸⁷ On the other hand, a dualistic way of understanding the problem of evil is visible in 1:12 and 3:22-30, though Jesus' death is neither caused by Satan¹⁸⁸ or the demons.¹⁸⁹

The final chapter explores the oneness of God and its relation to Christology. In this context Guttenberger discusses the blasphemy charges in 2:1-12 and 14:61-62, and argues that both cases show Jesus' exceptional bond with God. Regarding 2:7 she argues that Jesus appropriates a role that is the domain of God alone; that of forgiving sins.¹⁹⁰ In 14:62 Jesus reveals his relation to God, in that he as the 'Son of Man' will sit at the right hand of God. This, together with him accepting the designation 'Son of the Blessed One', is blasphemy according to his enemies and an insult against the oneness of God.¹⁹¹ Guttenberger also discusses Mark 12:36 which cites Ps 110:1, and argues that in this passage both God and Jesus are *kyrios*. She writes: "Der Christus trägt den Namen Gottes, der Christus ist der *κύριος*, ist von Gott nicht mehr unterschiedbar."¹⁹² However just prior to this Jesus has affirmed the *Shema* (12:32),¹⁹³ but this does not appear to infringe upon monotheism in Mark's view.¹⁹⁴ The Gospel avoids both the error of stressing the oneness of God to the

182. Guttenberger, (2004), 208.

183. Guttenberger, (2004), 200.

184. Guttenberger, (2004), 217.

185. Guttenberger, (2004), 222.

186. Guttenberger, (2004), 219, 285.

187. Guttenberger, (2004), 222, 224-225.

188. Guttenberger argues that 'satan' is likely a collective, rather than a singular being.

189. Guttenberger, (2004), 285, 244.

190. Guttenberger, (2004), 292-295

191. Guttenberger, (2004), 302-305.

192. Guttenberger, (2004), 310. See also 337-338, 285.

193. Guttenberger, (2004), 311.

194. Guttenberger, (2004), 286.

extent of rejecting Jesus' exalted status, and the error calling Jesus Son of God at the expense of true monotheism.¹⁹⁵ Thus while God is transcendent and hidden, he is present and revealed in Jesus¹⁹⁶ and their relation is expressed in a Father/Son relationship.¹⁹⁷ The term Son is used to express Jesus' relation, difference, and submission to God.¹⁹⁸ The epiphany of God is linked to Jesus only and in this relation God is known and God is revealed as Father.¹⁹⁹

Guttenberger's work is a significant contribution to the subject, and while one cannot comment on every point of disagreement, there are three points that need to be made. First, Guttenberger rightly stresses the intimate relation between the Father and the Son, even to the point of there being no border ('Grenze') between them. She notes the tension between Markan Christology and monotheism, but does not try to resolve it.²⁰⁰ Secondly, early in the book Guttenberger notes that the 'kingdom of God' is referred to fourteen times in Mark, and which is the place where the word 'god' most often appears. However she thinks that "[f]ür die Gottesvorstellung sind diese Stellen jedoch wenig ertragreich."²⁰¹ But it will be shown in Chapter 2 of this thesis that the notion of the coming of God's kingdom is a critical component not only of Mark's soteriology or Christology, but also his theology proper. Thirdly Guttenberger, with merely a handful of references, lacks any discussion of the Holy Spirit. Though at one point she does state that in 3:22-33 the demarcation between God, Jesus and the Spirit dissolves.²⁰² Thus while Guttenberger has discussed the close relation between God and Jesus, and the tension this makes with Mark's monotheism, and has also remarked that it can at times be hard to distinguish between the Spirit and God, she does not explore these issues from a trinitarian angle, which could be the underlying logic of the text itself.

Geert van Oyen (2006, 2012)

Geert van Oyen has two relevant contributions. The first is in fact an essay on the meaning of Jesus' death in Mark, but in the first half he makes some critical

195. Guttenberger, (2004), 325, 331, 334-335.

196. Guttenberger, (2004), 115-116, 335.

197. Guttenberger, (2004), 85.

198. Guttenberger, (2004), 336.

199. Guttenberger, (2004), 93.

200. Guttenberger, (2004), 337-339.

201. Guttenberger, (2004), 24.

202. Guttenberger, (2004), 248.

observations. He states that Mark's title "makes clear that the central theme of the Gospel is Jesus' relationship with God."²⁰³ Van Oyen argues that it is not only the identity of Jesus, his divine sonship, that is revealed at the cross, rather the death of Jesus also reveals something about God. He argues that the story of this Gospel is "oriented toward a new understanding or a new significance of God." Indeed, he asserts, "the real issue of the story is not so much the problem of understanding how Jesus has become Son of God, but how one can believe in a God and understand a God who accepts Jesus as his Son."²⁰⁴ Thus the crucial question of not: 'What kind of Messiah is this?' but rather: 'What kind of God is this?'²⁰⁵

In his second piece in a *Festschrift* to Camille Focant, van Oyen argues that surprise is a major element throughout Mark; both between God and other characters and God and the readers' experience in reading Mark.²⁰⁶ While a reader's understanding of Mark's God is necessarily in light of his pre-understanding of God, a good reader is eager to listen to what the text says regarding God.²⁰⁷ For although Mark is not a theological treatise on God, the author presents God to the reader through the interactions between God and other characters, especially Jesus, for just as in the OT "Dieu n'est pas une idée abstraite mais se rencontre dans l'expérience du peuple."²⁰⁸

The content of Mark's Gospel is God accomplishing his work and while God sends Jesus the focus is on the latter. But this does not astonish the readers for they live in a context where this is expected.²⁰⁹ But reading 1:14-15 after 1:1 the reader is surprised to find that the Gospel is in fact about God, not Jesus only.²¹⁰ It is very important and surprising that God is revealed by a human being and thus in Mark there is a "changement fondamental dans la caractérisation «traditionnelle» de Dieu." That is, God is now not only the transcendent God outside history, but enters history in the human person of Jesus.²¹¹ Thus in Mark there is mystery with regard to God and Jesus' teaching about God, as indicated by the incomprehension of disciples, Jesus'

203. Oyen, Geert van, "The Meaning of the Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark: A Real Reader Perspective," in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. Eds. Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 55.

204. Oyen, (2006), 56.

205. Oyen, (2006), 58.

206. Oyen, Geert van, "Dieu: Un Personnage Surprenant dans l'évangile selon Marc," in *La Surprise dans la Bible: Hommage à Camille Focant*. Eds. Geert van Oyen and A. Wénin (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 191.

207. Oyen, (2012), 193-195.

208. Oyen, (2012), 191, 195.

209. Oyen, (2012), 195-197.

210. Oyen, (2012), 199.

211. Oyen, (2012), 200-201.

abandonment cry and Gethsemane prayer. Mark shows a new face of God.²¹² But Jesus' opponents refuse to alter their views on God, and since God is present in Jesus opposing him is opposing God.²¹³

These two contributions both make the important argument that Mark's Gospel, while speaking of the God of the OT, does not leave the image of God unaltered. Rather God comes to be known in a new way. In similarity to Johnson, he argues that in the first part of the Gospel Jesus is especially close to God, but in the second part the difference between them is strengthened in that the Father is superior to the Son.²¹⁴ He also downplays the close union between Jesus and God and suggests that the supposed shared identity Father and Son based on Jesus' identification as Lord in Mark 1:2 and Jesus being God himself, is too influenced by later high Christology. Rather, he argues that narrative criticism shows a tension between the transcendent God who sends the human Jesus as Son and the human Jesus who is elevated to a transcendent level in order to do his work.²¹⁵ However, while van Oyen's argument that Mark presents a new understanding of God is acknowledged, this thesis will argue that this is exactly in light of the striking relation between God and Jesus (and the Spirit) exhibited in Mark 1:2-3, 9-11 and 14-15.

Ira Brent Driggers (2007)

Ira Brent Driggers's book does not examine Mark's God *per se*, but in relation to the theme of discipleship. A key concern is to show that these are interrelated themes in Mark, for 'God' cannot be separated from following 'God'. Driggers stresses that one cannot limit the study of the Markan God to direct statements, for characterisation of God's actions also needs to be considered.²¹⁶ He notes that "[a]lthough Mark will not depict God with a plethora of 'traits', he will depict God as the story's dominant agent of activity".²¹⁷

Driggers emphasises the tensions within the Gospel, especially between Jesus and God. In Mark 1:2-3 Jesus is identified as the Lord God, while the baptism in 1:9-11

212. Oyen, (2012), 208.

213. Oyen, (2012), 203.

214. Oyen, (2012), 205-206.

215. Oyen, (2012), 197-198.

216. Driggers, Ira Brent, *Following God through Mark: Theological Tension in the Second Gospel*. (London: Westminster/John Knox, 2007), 99.

217. Driggers, (2007), 11.

highlights a distance or separation between them, however Driggers does not draw out the tension between the voice and the Spirit though he says the owner of the voice possesses Jesus by the Spirit.²¹⁸ In Mark God both acts transcendentally and invasively through Jesus by the Spirit.²¹⁹ God acts through his Spirit-possession of Jesus to "exercise a kind of irresistible influence over characters in the narrative".²²⁰ Driggers appears to suggest that Jesus is irresistibly dominated by God, like the demons dominate their subjects; and emphasises that God and Jesus are not collapsed into one.²²¹

Driggers also highlights the tension between divine activity and human volition in the call of the disciples (1:16-20) and the remainder of the narrative. The disciples misunderstand (4:13, 6:45-52, 8:14-21) but are also subject to God's hardening activity (6:52, 8:17-18)²²² and God's concealment²²³ which foregrounds the mystery of God.²²⁴ This indicates God's 'transcendent' activity, while at the same time it involves a self-hardening, which creates a tension between God's hardening activity and Jesus' rebuke.²²⁵ Driggers emphasises "God's divergent modes of action" which excludes simplistic explanations.²²⁶ God acts "*both* transcendentally *and* invasively".²²⁷ The narrative tensions need not be resolved.

Mark has an 'invasion logic' where God invades the world through Jesus, and where the opponents try to stop the invasion by crucifying Jesus. But Mark also has a 'transcendent logic' where even the death of Jesus is God's will.²²⁸ Thus the dual invasive and transcendent logic is reflected in both human opposition and God's 'foreordained script'.²²⁹ There is not a single explanation "for God operates on two planes simultaneously."²³⁰

While Driggers has rightly noted the distinctions between God and Jesus, he both minimises the importance of the Son/Father language in light of the opening of the

218. Driggers, (2007), 12-16.

219. Driggers, (2007), 21, 25, 27, 28.

220. Driggers, (2007), 27.

221. Driggers, (2007), 20.

222. Driggers, (2007), 51.

223. Driggers, (2007), 44.

224. Driggers, (2007), 60.

225. Driggers, (2007), 54-56.

226. Driggers, (2007), 57.

227. Driggers, (2007), 59. Emphasis original.

228. Driggers, (2007), 62. Also 72.

229. Driggers, (2007), 81. Also 100.

230. Driggers, (2007), 82.

Gospel, and he neglects the distinction of the Spirit. Driggers rightly demonstrates that the author is content to leave tensions with regard to divine activity and human volition unresolved. This thesis argues that in Mark is there also a unresolved tension between Jesus, God, the Spirit, and monotheisms, which later trinitarian language responds to and explicates.

Joanna Dewey and E.S. Malbon (2009)

In the *Theological Bible Commentary* Joanna Dewey and E.S. Malbon comment on Mark's Gospel. They state that Mark's Gospel is the "story of God's action in Jesus' life, death, and resurrection."²³¹ The narrative operates on three levels: foundational is the background conflict between God and Satan, second is Jesus' conflict with the authorities, and third is Jesus' relation with his followers.²³²

Dewey and Malbon argue that it is theology rather than Christology that is foundational for Mark,²³³ for God is central to the narrative. For on the one hand, Jesus' life, proclamation, and death is centred on God's rule which he brings present, and on the other hand God works powerfully in Jesus.²³⁴

Naturally such a short commentary is too short to cover all important points in depth, but they rightly note the centrality of both God and the kingdom in all that Jesus does and that "Mark's theology is a narrative theology and a theology focused on God".²³⁵ They also point out that at Jesus' baptism, the three 'persons' of the Trinity are present, though "the theology is far from the formal doctrine of the Trinity formulated in later centuries".²³⁶ While they cannot explore this in detail in their short contribution, this thesis will argue for it in depth.

Daniel Johansson (2011)

Daniel Johansson in his 2011 Edinburgh University doctoral thesis examines the overlap between Mark's presentation of Jesus and the OT presentation of God and what this means for Mark's Christology and Jesus' relation to God, while

231. Dewey, Joanna and Elizabeth S. Malbon, "Mark," in *Theological Bible Commentary*. Eds. Gail R. O'Day and David L. Petersen (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2009), 311.

232. Dewey and Malbon, (2009), 311, 323.

233. Dewey and Malbon, (2009), 324.

234. Dewey and Malbon, (2009), 315-317.

235. Dewey and Malbon, (2009), 311.

236. Dewey and Malbon, (2009), 312-313.

simultaneously taking monotheism seriously.²³⁷ He draws insights from narrative criticism, but the analysis is not limited to Mark's 'narrative world',²³⁸ and although he also gleans insights from the Graeco-Roman context,²³⁹ he primarily argues for "a divine christology against a biblical/Jewish background."²⁴⁰

The work is divided into eight parts. The prologue, Jesus' authority to forgive sins, Jesus calming the storm, his power over death, Jesus walking on the sea, his transfiguration, Jesus and God in Mark's eschatology, and the relationship between Jesus and his followers. A basic premise is that the audience would be able to understand Mark's OT allusions²⁴¹ and a central part of Johansson's argument is that YHWH texts from the OT are applied to Jesus. He stresses that the *kyrios* title now applies to both Jesus and God which "links Jesus in the closest possible way to the God of Israel."²⁴²

For example, Jesus' first controversy concerns his authority to act in the capacity of God.²⁴³ Jesus' forgiveness of sins puts him alongside God, while simultaneously the *Shema* is confirmed.²⁴⁴ Johansson writes, "In some mysterious way, then, Jesus is found on the divine side of the distinction between God and the creation, closely identified with the God of Israel, yet distinct from him."²⁴⁵ To give another example, this similarly occurs when Jesus calms the storm. In the Graeco-Roman world, power over nature is a divine prerogative²⁴⁶ and in the OT it is only God, and specifically the God of Israel, the creator, who is the master of the sea and the wind.²⁴⁷ In Mark 4:37-41 Jesus does not pray or do magic but simply orders the wind and the sea, and thus acts in the role of YHWH.²⁴⁸ Jesus is here portrayed "as a visible manifestation of YHWH on earth and intrinsic to the identity of Israel's God."²⁴⁹

237. Johansson, Daniel, "Jesus and God in the Gospel of Mark: Unity and Distinction" (Ph.D., University of Edinburgh, 2011), 2, 23-24.

238. Johansson, (2011), 17.

239. Johansson, (2011), 23.

240. Johansson, (2011), 8.

241. Johansson, (2011), 19.

242. Johansson, (2011), 30.

243. Johansson, (2011), 63.

244. Johansson, (2011), 45. The only possible exception is the angel of YHWH, and this may give a clue to the relationship between God and Jesus. Johansson, (2011), 58.

245. Johansson, (2011), 65.

246. Johansson, (2011), 77.

247. Johansson, (2011), 66-68.

248. Johansson, (2011), 78.

249. Johansson, (2011), 87.

Thus for Johansson, Mark's Jesus is not simply a royal Messiah, nor does Mark associate him with Hellenistic divine beings, nor does Jesus simply exercise divine functions; rather he is ascribed uniquely divine properties from the OT and has the divine name.²⁵⁰ Jesus is closely and directly linked with YHWH on the divine side of the God/creation dichotomy, yet is simultaneously distinguished from God.²⁵¹

Monotheism is maintained by Mark, but Mark's monotheism prevents Jesus being simply a divine being, a second deity next to YHWH.²⁵² Rather, Mark's monotheism "was modified in order to embrace both God and Jesus",²⁵³ even to the extent that "[m]onotheistic confession without christological confession is... incomplete."²⁵⁴

Johansson rightly demonstrates that in Mark Jesus is 'inseparably linked to YHWH' yet is 'distinguished from God', and not a second divine being next to God.²⁵⁵ But these textual pressures that Johansson discusses are not taken to their theological and trinitarian conclusion. Since Jesus' divine sonship is for Mark a key designation of Jesus, it ought to receive greater analysis, especially in relation to God as 'Father' of Jesus and in the context of their shared YHWH identity. In addition, the Spirit does not receive sufficient consideration. Since Johansson covers several key passages in Mark, space does not allow him to examine any of the passages in greater depth. This present thesis rather examines one passage in greater depth: the baptism event.

Tobias Nicklas (2014)

Tobias Nicklas in his recent contribution to the theme also stresses narrative and story as opposed to titles. His main point is that the Gospels, including Mark, are typically read as "God Stories about Jesus"; and here the question is to what extent Jesus can be described as divine or how closely related to God he is. While he considers this legitimate, he wants to read Mark, borrowing a phrase from N.T. Wright, as "Jesus stories about God", because he considers Mark to be a narrative that tells the good news of God through the telling of the story of Jesus.²⁵⁶ For

250. Johansson, (2011), 207-208.

251. Johansson, (2011), ii, 24, 197.

252. Johansson, (2011), 209.

253. Johansson, (2011), 203. Also 209.

254. Johansson, (2011), 210.

255. Johansson, (2011), 37.

256. Nicklas, Tobias, "Mark's 'Jesus Story'. A story about God," in *The Gospels: History and Christology. The Search of Joseph Ratzinger-Benedict XVI/ I Vangeli: Storia e Cristologia. La ricerca di Joseph Ratzinger-Benedetto XVI*. Eds. Bernardo Estrada, Ermenegildo Manicardi and Armand Puig i Tàrrach (Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2014), 40.

Nicklas a key aspect is God's commissioning of his Son at the baptism, through whom he establishes his present rule as king.²⁵⁷ He notes, "the whole following story could be seen as narrating how God establishes his *basileia*".²⁵⁸ Thus while Mark is indeed a 'Jesus story', it is a 'Jesus story' which tells the story of God's action in the world, for it is in Jesus that God comes near and establishes his rule.²⁵⁹

Nicklas has rightly stressed the importance of both the narrative of Jesus and the kingdom, and correctly identifies the baptism episode as critical. While at some points he calls Jesus an 'agent' of God and especially of God's rule in the world, he does not take time to explore this relationship in any depth. Though he suggests that Mark's Christology points to a more Johannine 'I and the Father are one' type of Christology.²⁶⁰ A fuller examination would need to examine the nature of Jesus' divine sonship and the presence of the Spirit.

Conclusions

This analysis of previous research on God in Mark's Gospel has both demonstrated that there has been a response to Dahl's plea and that it is insufficient to simply analyse the terminology used of God. Scholars such as Danove, No, Johnson, and Smith moved beyond this by following the lead of Tannehill to stress narrative and characterisation; with No, Smith, and Johnson seeing God as a major character in the Gospel. However, while this approach is useful and has born fruit, it must not lead to the avoidance of the theological questions. In analysing the Markan God, one can bracket out Jesus as Donahue suggests, but this bracketing out must not be permanent. For one must account for Mark's affirmation of monotheism, as do Gnilka, Smith, Guttenberger, and Johansson, while simultaneously considering Jesus' close relation to God, even to the point of sharing the divine name, as Gnilka, Smith, Guttenberger, and Johansson also do. However, the tension between these affirmations does not seem to merit further analysis by these scholars. In contrast to Donahue, who suggested there might be nothing new or Christian about Mark's God, the affirmation of both the *Shema* and Jesus' divine sonship and lordship, leads to a new revelation of God, both in Jesus himself and in Jesus' relation to God. As van

257. Nicklas, (2014), 45, 48.

258. Nicklas, (2014), 50.

259. Nicklas, (2014), 50-51, 54.

260. Nicklas, (2014), 61.

Oyen stressed, Mark does have something new to say about God that goes beyond the OT. Gnilka also rightly pointed this out, contending that the insistence on both monotheism and Jesus as Lord and Son of God was the beginning of a reflection process on the being of God. There are tensions within the narrative, a feature that narratives can encompass more easily than a treatise can. Driggers and Guttenberger both noted other narrative tensions in relation to God, especially his sovereignty and human responsibility, which are not necessarily resolved within the text itself.

While chapter 12 is an important chapter for Mark's understanding of God, as noted by Donahue, the critical importance of the prologue has sometimes been overlooked. But Danove pointed to the intensity of the God-language in the prologue which also points to its key function for answering the question of God. But while both Johnson and van Oyen note this, they proceed to argue that this close relation between God and Jesus gives way to 'separability' later in the Gospel. But while their observations are right, this need not be read over against the close relation in the prologue, but should rather be held in tandem with it. Key Markan themes such as kingdom, gospel, and the coming of the Lord, are particularly stressed in the prologue and need to be integrated into Mark's view of God, as also Scholtissek underscores in contrast to Vouga who considers these of little importance for the issue at hand. The prologue also contains the key baptism episode which is pivotal not only for understanding Mark's Jesus, but also the God presented in his Gospel. The importance of this episode is pointed out by both Nicklas and Kingsbury, the latter also rightly stressing the importance of seeing Jesus from God's point of view. Nearly all of these contributors neglect the Spirit in their discussion of God, and while Malbon and Dewey note the trinitarian nature of the baptism episode they have no space to develop it. There are still many unanswered questions in relation to God, but there is textual pressure to understand the relation of God with Jesus in light of the kingdom, the gospel, the coming of the Lord, the *Shema* and God's Holy Spirit.

Chapter 1

Reading Mark

This chapter examines two preliminary features that are hermeneutically significant and will influence the interpretation of the baptism episode: Mark's use of the OT and the function of Mark's prologue. Mark opens with an OT citation and the OT is alluded to multiple times in the prologue. It will be demonstrated that this Gospel and its understanding of Jesus' identity is heavily influenced by Scripture, particularly Isaiah, Daniel, Ps 2 and Ps 110. It will be argued that the prologue extends to 1:1-15 and functions as a key for the remainder of the Gospel.

(a) Mark and the Old Testament

Mark opens his Gospel with a citation from the OT. When God speaks at the baptism, he speaks with words from Scripture. When Jesus starts his ministry, his message concerning the good news of the kingdom is strongly linked with the OT. In short, Mark's Gospel is permeated with scriptural allusions and if one wishes to understand what the author is doing, particularly with regard to Jesus' identity and the acts of God, this fact cannot be ignored but must take centre place. While the importance of the Scriptures in the Gospel of Mark can hardly be questioned, nearly every other surrounding issue has been. Which parts of Scripture are most significant for Mark? How do they function? How much of the original context is in view? How many citations are there? What is a citation or an allusion? Is it suitable to ask what the original hearer might have heard? How many echoes would they have heard? Which text does Mark employ in his citations? Why does he not use the LXX consistently? Does his use of Scripture bear relation to *Midrash* or *Pesher*? The list of debated questions could easily fill the page, and needless to say, not all of these can here be examined in adequate detail. The manner in which we answer these questions has a significant bearing on how this Gospel is interpreted and how we understand its theology. John F.A. Sawyer has rightly criticised those who focus mostly on form (i.e. whether the citation is from Hebrew, Greek, or Aramaic, or whether it is midrashic or literalistic, etc) when they examine the role of Scripture in

the earliest Christian movement. Rather than focusing majorly on form, the emphasis should be more on the content of the passages cited.¹ While the purpose of this section is not merely to analyse such technical issues, these will be introduced. The focus, however, will be on the theological function of this usage.

(i) Defining Citations and Allusions

The *Index of Quotations* in the UBS4 lists thirty-one quotations² in the Gospel of Mark. This list is neither exhaustive regarding quotations, nor does it include allusions or echoes.³ E. Boring lists thirty-two Markan passages which have "citations or clear allusions" to the OT.⁴ J. Bowman finds thirty-six quotations and a further twenty-seven allusions.⁵ On the higher end, H. Kee famously said that Mark contains "hundreds of allusions to and quotations from scripture"⁶ and that Mark 11-16 alone contains fifty-seven quotations and hundred and sixty allusions,⁷ while T.R. Hatina finds thirty quotations and up to two hundred allusions in Mark.⁸ When one adds typological usage and 'echoes', one can agree with J. Marcus that for Mark the Scriptures "occupy positions of extraordinary prominence".

Immediately apparent are not only the diverging numbers proffered, but also the categorising of references into citations and allusions. How these are to be defined is debated, because Mark's practice is not uniform in this regard,⁹ and the counting of citations and allusions differs widely. D.L. Stamps suggests there is "confusion" over the terminology,¹⁰ while Stanley E. Porter states that the variety of terminology used is "simply astounding".¹¹ Porter rightly points out that there are other uses of the OT

-
1. Sawyer, John F.A., *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 22. He mentions R. Longenecker, B. Lindars, and C.H. Dodd in particular.
 2. The present author makes no distinction between the terms 'citation' and 'quotation'.
 3. Aland, B. et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament: Fourth Revised Edition*, Stuttgart: United Bible Societies/Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001), 889.
 4. Boring, M. Eugene, *Mark: A Commentary*. NTL. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2006), 404-405.
 5. Bowman, John, *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah*. Studia post-Biblica; v.8. (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 9.
 6. Kee, Howard C., *Community of the New Age*. (London: SCM, 1977), 45.
 7. Kee, (1977), 45. Watts, Rikki. E., *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997), 21.
 8. Hatina, Thomas R., *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative*. JSNT Sup. 232. (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 1.
 9. For R.T. France's six categories see France, R.T., *Jesus and the Old Testament*. (London: Tyndale, 1971), 259-263.
 10. Stamps, Dennis L., "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 12-13. See also Hooker, Morna, "Mark," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Eds. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 224.
 11. Porter, Stanley E., "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and

that do not fall under the rubric of either a citation or an allusion,¹² which could include parallels, prefiguration, and typology. It is important not only to recognise, but also to emphasise that the author's use of Scripture is much wider and deeper than merely citing it. This is by no means trivial, because the author does not use the OT atomistically, for it is rather foundational for his worldview and the basis by which Jesus is understood.¹³

As a basic framework for understanding OT references by the evangelist, the work of Richard B. Hays is useful and will be employed here. He divides scriptural references into three categories; citations, allusions, and echoes, and it should be stressed with Hays these are "points along a spectrum of intertextual reference".¹⁴ 'Quotations' can generally be said to occur with an introductory formula (e.g. "as it is written") and cited *verbatim*;¹⁵ though allowances must be made in variation of *Vorlage*. An 'allusion' has no introductory formula and the words correspond less closely to the surmised *Vorlage*. Hays states that allusions depend on "the assumption that the reader will share with the author the requisite 'portable library' to recognize the source of the allusion".¹⁶ Such references should be considered to be intentional by the author, though a reader may or may not be able to pick up the scriptural reference. For Hays 'echoes' are more faint and may even be unconscious on part of the author.¹⁷ He also notes that his terminology is flexible and that he makes no "systematic distinction" between an allusion and an echo. He would, however, in general, name an "obvious intertextual references" *allusions*, and the "subtler ones" *echoes*.¹⁸

Hays lists seven guidelines for hearing such echoes (which can also serve to identify allusions). Though none is singularly decisive, the more criteria are fulfilled the higher is the probability of an allusion or echo.¹⁹ First the supposed source text must be demonstrated to be 'available' to the author and/or the first readers. Hays calls the

Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Eds. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997)

12. Porter, (1997), 88-92.

13. See also Hays, Richard B., "The Canonical Matrix of the Gospels," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Gospels*. Ed. Stephen C. Barton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

14. Hays, Richard B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 23. Also Hays, Richard B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 10.

15. See for instance Hays, (2016), 10.

16. Hays, (1989), 29.

17. See also Hays, (1989), 29.

18. Hays, (1989), 29.

19. Hays, Richard B., *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 34.

second criterion 'volume'. By this he means the closeness and distinctiveness of the echo in terms of 'syntactical patterns' and repetition of vocabulary, and by how explicit it is. Also important is how much 'rhetorical stress' is laid on the reference, and the prominence and distinctiveness of the source text. The third criterion is 'recurrence', for if an author has already made an allusion to a certain text, this strengthens the claim of a weaker allusion or echo to the same text. Hays says this criterion is "very important".²⁰ Fourthly he lists 'thematic coherence', and whether a possible allusion or echo fits with the author's line of argument and coheres with his overall message and further illuminates the text. Fifth is 'historical plausibility', and Hays argues that if other Jews were reading the text in a similar way elsewhere, this would increase the historical plausibility of another author reading it in the same way. Sixth, if many later readers of this text heard a certain echo, this then increases the probability of that allusions in the text. Seventh, Hays supplies the criterion of 'satisfaction' in reading the text and whether it makes good sense to the text. By this he means that if proposed echoes or allusions illuminate this and other parts of the same text, this then is supporting evidence for the presence of such echoes. For Hays this is both the most important, yet also the most elusive criterion.

While Hays' approach is congenial and will be used here it also suffers from an overemphasis on the receptor as opposed to the writer. It is this type of audience-oriented approach that Porter rightly is cautioning against, both because it is hard to prove what the audience would likely have heard and because it is too restrictive causing some less clear allusions to remain unheard.²¹ However, few scholars actually employ an author-centred or audience-centred approach consistently,²² and Hays confesses the difficulty of determining what the initial hearers/readers actually knew and thus could pick up as an allusion or echo. In practice, however, he does not restrict himself to what the original readers can be proved to have understood, but rather bases his 'echoes' on what can actually be found in the NT and OT texts themselves. The hermeneutical assumption is that the reader, whether modern or ancient, who knows the OT well enough would be able hear these 'echoes' and 'allusions'.²³

20. Hays, (2005), 37.

21. Porter, (1997), 93.

22. Stanley, Christopher D., *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTS. 69. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 34.

23. Hays, (1989), 49.

On the other hand, however, the audience-centred approach could conceivably hear scriptural echoes where none were intended by the author.²⁴ Paul Foster, who is generally sympathetic to Hays, rightly critiques some applications of Hays' work and endeavours to "illustrate some of the worrying excesses of the method, not to reject the whole scholarly agenda."²⁵ He is concerned, however, that Hays' criteria is incapable of rejecting bad uses of the approach, which finds echoes where there in reality are none,²⁶ or where they are hermeneutically inconsequential. There is a danger that echo hunting is turned into a type of reader-response reading of the text.²⁷

William Tooman in his book on the reuse of Scripture in Ezekiel 38-39 also argues in similarity to Hays "that authors can use small discrete markers to evoke an entire context."²⁸ Tooman also divided the references into explicit (i.e. citation, perhaps with formula) and implicit references.²⁹ In contrast to Hays' audience focused approach, Tooman rightly argues that use must be deliberate, and established to be so.³⁰ Unintended echoes are too weak to be of major hermeneutical and interpretive significance. This would also answer Foster's concerns above.

In laying out his approach, Tooman discusses two preliminary problems which are not relevant for our discussion of Mark: the questions of directionality,³¹ that is which text alludes to which, and the question of the (scriptural) authority of the earlier text. In Mark both of these are a given.³² In order to establish whether an allusion is deliberate Tooman lays out five principles that suggest an intentional allusion: First, if an element that is *unique* to a certain source is found in the alluding text;³³ second, if there are *distinctive* elements of a source text is found in the alluding text;³⁴ thirdly, if there is a *multiplicity* of allusions to the same source text or passage; fourthly, if there is *thematic correspondence* between the source text and the alluding text. The fifth principle is *inversion* and which is when "identical or nearly identical elements"

24. Hays, (1989), 29, 49.

25. Foster, Paul, "Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament" *JSNT* 38/1 (2015), 100.

26. Foster, (2015), 104, 109.

27. Foster, (2015), 109. Foster also questions the singular focus on Jewish scripture at the expense of Graeco-Roman canons. Foster, (2015), 98.

28. Tooman, William A., *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38-39*. FAT 2. 52. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 9.

29. Tooman, (2011), 27-31. See also Tooman, William A., "Between Imitation and Interpretation: Reuse of Scripture and Composition in 'Hodayot' (1QH^a) 11:6-19" *DSD* 18/1 (2011), 58-59.

30. Tooman, (2011), 23.

31. Tooman, (2011), 33ff.

32. Tooman, (2011), 25.

33. Tooman, (2011), 27.

34. Tooman, (2011), 28.

of the two texts are inverted. This final principle is not relevant to Mark's use of the OT.³⁵

However, to insist on deliberate allusions does not render the value of putative echoes invalid, for the reverberation could both outlast and outdistance the narrow intent of the author. Morna Hooker suggests that although some echoes were unconscious, "they could nevertheless be important in betraying what was going on in his subconscious mind"; meaning there are unintentional echoes in the text that some readers may hear.³⁶ But while it is quite conceivable that an author would use language that would evoke in a reader certain scriptural echoes that the author did not consciously intend, these cannot be major interpretive keys for understanding the purpose of the author.

Before proceeding with the hermeneutical function of Mark's scriptural references, it is necessary to highlight briefly the methodology problem of accessing Mark's *Vorlage*. First of all, we do not know all the versions available to him as potential sources for his Old Testament citations and allusions. Secondly, while the versions available to us from this period are the Hebrew texts from Qumran, the LXX, and also to a certain extent the Aramaic Targums,³⁷ a further methodological problem in examining Mark's *Vorlage* is that each of these versions have their own textual variants. Thirdly, as will be noted below, the LXX and the Targums also have interpretive tendencies that complicate the matter and which need to be taken into account. Fourthly, it is remarkable that when one examines Mark's use of the OT, he does not appear to employ a singular version of the text. The fact that Mark represents elements of the available Hebrew text, the LXX, and the Targum, rather than clearly being dependant on one tradition, makes this investigation more precarious. For instance, citations or allusions appear to be to the Hebrew text (i.e. proto-Masoretic) in 1:2, 1:9, 14:62, but to the LXX³⁸ in 1:3, 9:7, 12:10-11.³⁹ Mark's rendering at times even agrees with *Tg. Isa* in contrast to both the MT and LXX. For

35. Tooman, (2011), 31.

36. Hooker, (1988), 224.

37. Although the Targum Jonathan to the Prophets in its current form is from a later period, it appears to have earlier traditions embedded within. Flesher, Paul V.M. and Bruce D. Chilton, *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011), 166, 173-174, 405-406. Evans, Craig A., *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005a), 184-185.

38. It must still be remembered that the manuscript traditions of the LXX are complex and that finding the original reading of the LXX can require extensive text-critical work and may at times be inconclusive.

39. Evans, Craig A., "The Beginning of the Good News and the Fulfillment of Scripture in the Gospel of Mark," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 85. Watts, (1997), 61-63, 101, 186-187.

instance, Mark's allusion to Isa 6:9-10 in Mk 4:12 has 'forgiveness' and thus agreeing with the Targum, compared with 'healing' as found in the MT and LXX. Also Mk 9:47-48 uses 'gehenna' in his allusion to Isa 66:24 as does *Tg. Isa.* 66:24 in contrast to the MT and the LXX.⁴⁰ The fact that Mark may not be citing his text verbatim contributes to the complexity of determining his *Vorlage*.⁴¹ He may also have been familiar with several versions and thus being eclectic in his use of them (whether intentionally or unintentionally) or potentially he may have relied on an altogether different version no longer accessible to us.

However, even with this uncertainty it is beneficial to introduce the available versions. Because of its significance for Mark and being the only text cited with an introductory formula, the focus will be on Isaiah. There were twenty-one manuscripts of Isaiah found at Qumran; two from Cave 1, including the complete 1QIsa^a, eighteen from Cave 4, and one from Cave 5, as well as an additional manuscript from nearby Wadi Murabba'at. According to Vanderkam and Flint these manuscripts were produced between 125 BC and AD 60.⁴² There seems to have been one edition of Isaiah, though with variant readings and orthography and with some mss being particularly close to the MT.⁴³ Emanuel Tov states that '[m]ost of the Qumran texts of Isaiah reflect the same consonantal framework as the medieval text of MT.'⁴⁴ There have been some arguments that the Qumran manuscripts have sectarian tendencies;⁴⁵ for instance 1QIsa^a.⁴⁶ But while this cannot be completely dismissed it should be considered to be very rare since some of the differences with the MT are also found in the LXX.⁴⁷

40. Evans, Craig A., "From Gospel to Gospel: The Function of Isaiah in the New Testament," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Eds. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 670. Chilton, Bruce D., *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Own Interpretation of Isaiah*. (London: SPCK, 1984), 90ff.

41. Timothy H. Lim and Susan Docherty note the fluidity of the canonical texts at this time. Lim, Timothy H., *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 12-30. Docherty, Susan E., "New Testament Scriptural Interpretation in its Early Jewish Context" *NovT* 57 (2015a), 3-7.

42. Vanderkam, James and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. (London: T&T Clark, 2002), 131-133.

43. Vanderkam and Flint, (2002), 131-133.

44. Tov, Emanuel, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 2*. Eds. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 505. George J. Brooke argues that an examination of the text of Cave 4 "reveals a largely stable text tradition". Brooke, George J., "On Isaiah at Qumran," in *As Those Who are Taught': The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Eds. Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 82.

45. E.g. E. Ulrich. Brooke, (2006), 75-76.

46. Tov, (1997), 501-502.

47. Brooke, (2006), 75-76.

According to Tov "the MT and LXX are close to each other" and he adds that "even though the LXX translation often differs much from the MT, our analysis of the translator's exegesis and his translation techniques leads us to believe that for reasons of his own the translator often deviated from his parent text, when that was probably identical with the MT."⁴⁸

But while the differences are not as extensive as in the Targums, they do show the method of the translator and sometimes also have interpretive significance. Arie van der Kooij argues that the LXX Isaiah translator makes lexical decisions related to botany, juristicion, and agriculture based on his own local environment⁴⁹ and points to LXX Isaiah 3:18-23 as an instance of acculturation. In this oracle of doom the list of ornaments and garments which will be taken away from the daughters of Zion is in the LXX more clearly divided into two categories than in the MT, while the exact Greek words chosen in the LXX are used in Egyptian papyri concerning the dowry of women.⁵⁰

Another feature of the LXX is that the translator has, as Porter and Pearson note, a "tendency to summarize lists, melting several distinct Hebrew words and their attendant concepts into the one."⁵¹ A notable instance is the translation of מְבַשֵּׁר in Isa 41:27 as παρακαλέσω, rather than the usual εὐαγγελιζόμενος (as in 40:9, 52:7, and 61:1). Ekblad points out that this is unlikely to be due to difference in *Vorlage*, but is rather a theologically motivated rendering, since παρακαλέω occurs in Isa 40-55 fourteen times, rendering five Hebrew words.⁵²

This leads to recognition that variations in the LXX Isaiah are sometimes theologically motivated. As van der Kooij states, "the nuances and differences involved may seem minor, but in some cases the implied interpretation marks a major theological shift."⁵³ An example is the translation of בָּרָא in LXX Isa 40:26, 41:20, 43:15, and 45:18. It is noteworthy that בָּרָא is here translated as καταδείκνυμι, rather than the typical and straightforward ποιέω. In the analysis of Koenig this is

48. Tov, (1997), 504.

49. van der Kooij, Arie, "Isaiah in the Septuagint," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 2.* Eds. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 514.

50. van der Kooij, Arie, "Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions," in *'As Those Who are Taught': The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL.* Eds. Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 51-53.

51. Porter, Stanley E. and Brook W.R. Pearson, "Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 2.* Eds. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 538.

52. Ekblad, Eugene Robert, *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study.* CBET. 23. (Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 50.

53. van der Kooij, (2006), 68.

part of a broader interpretation of creation, and "the theologizing which takes place in these four passages betrays a specific conversation partner: Hellenistic philosophy. The concept of the world as a spectacle made by the gods for human beings was important in Stoic philosophy of the time".⁵⁴ A further noticeable practice of the Isaiah translator is that he 'actualizes' Isaianic prophecies and thus applies them to his present time.⁵⁵ This was also argued by I.L. Seeligmann who pointed to the LXX Isaiah translator's convention of "contemporizing and anachronizing his interpretations".⁵⁶

Thus in overall, as E.R. Ekblad notes, most differences between the MT and LXX can be attributed to "the translator's attempt to render the sacred Hebrew text intelligible both to himself and to his community."⁵⁷ His choices in doing so are influenced by both his theology and his method of intertextual exegesis, and thus he makes lexical links between various portions of Isaiah and even other OT texts in order to specify or clarify the text's meaning.⁵⁸

While the written Aramaic Targums are dated later than the NT, some of the traditions are likely prior to the NT⁵⁹ and thus warrant an introduction here. The Targums are more free, paraphrastic and more obviously applied than the LXX. In describing the method of the *meturgeman* Bruce D. Chilton states that sometimes he "simply reads the association as the text. That is to say: what is there in Hebrew is replaced by what it is held to mean in Aramaic."⁶⁰ For instance, the Hebrew for 'branch' in Isa 4:2 is rendered 'messiah' in *Tg. Isa.* and 'fruit of the land' is rendered 'those who perform the law'.⁶¹ Also in Isa 25:2 the Hebrew says "a palace of aliens is a city no more" but in *Tg. Isa.* it is rendered "a temple of the Gentiles will never be built in the city of Jerusalem". Van der Kooij argues that the *Tg. Isa.* here probably refers to Hadrian's plans to build a temple for Jupiter in Jerusalem.⁶² This practice

54. Cited in Porter and Pearson, (1997), 537. See also Ekblad, (1999).

55. van der Kooij, (1997), 513. Baer, David A., "“It’s all About Us!” Nationalistic Exegesis in the Greek Isaiah (Chapters 1-12)," in *As Those Who are Taught’: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Eds. Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 46.

56. Cited in Porter and Pearson, (1997), 535. See also van der Kooij, (1997), 516, 519.

57. Ekblad, (1999), 267.

58. Ekblad, (1999), 268-269.

59. Evans, (2005a), 184-185. Flesher and Chilton, (2011), 166, 173-174, 405-406.

60. Chilton, Bruce D., "Two in One: Renderings of the Book of Isaiah in Targum Jonathan," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 2*. Eds. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 550.

61. Chilton, (1997), 551.

62. van der Kooij, (2006), 59.

contrasts to *Pesher*; for in the *Tg. Isa.* the lemmata is replaced, while in the *Pesher* the lemmata is preserved and the interpretation is added in addition to the text.⁶³

There is widespread acceptance that there are of two exegetical frameworks for the Targum Jonathan; the Tannaitic (prior to 132 CE) and the Amoraic (4th century).⁶⁴ Chilton argues that the Tannaitic has eschatological and messianic tendencies while the Amoraic renderings have transcendental tendencies.⁶⁵ This should be kept in mind when comparing the Targum with the MT and the LXX.

(ii) Isaiah as Mark's Narrative Framework

The main purpose for identifying the citations, allusions, and echoes in the text is in order to determine how they function in Mark's Gospel. A cursory glance at the citations or allusions listed in UBS4 reveals at least possible references to Isaiah, Deuteronomy, Genesis, Psalms, Daniel, Zechariah, Jeremiah, Malachi, Exodus, Leviticus, Joel, and Numbers. A question that immediately poses itself is whether any of these functions as the main hermeneutical lens through which the rest of Mark's narrative is to be understood.

For instance, W. Roth has argued that the Elijah/Elisha narrative in First and Second Kings, lies behind the Markan narrative, and thus Jesus is presented as the new Elisha. A key argument is that Jesus surpassed Elisha with the same number of miracles as Elisha surpassed Elijah.⁶⁶ But Jesus did not only surpass his predecessors quantitatively, but also qualitatively. Jesus' miracle of feeding five thousand men with five loaves and two fishes (Mark 6:32-44) far surpasses Elisha's feeding of the one hundred with twenty loaves of barley and some grain (2 Kgs 4:42-44). These demonstrate, according to Roth, that Jesus is presented as the greater Elisha.⁶⁷ This example shows the nature of Roth's arguments, which depend on vague parallels rather than on clear citations. While not necessarily denying any link to the Elijah/Elisha narrative, a tighter methodology for determining Mark's use of the OT is needed.⁶⁸

63. Chilton, (1997), 551.

64. Chilton, (1997), 547-550.

65. Chilton, (1997), 561. Flesher and Chilton, (2011), 173-175, 196-197.

66. Roth, Wolfgang, *Hebrew Gospel: Cracking the Code of Mark*. (Oak Park, IL: Meyer Stone Books, 1988), 5-7, 113.

67. Roth, (1988), 8.

68. Others have argued that Exodus is the key book for Mark, including E.C. Hobbs, J. Bowman, and O. Piper. See Watts, (1997), 12-13. Bowman, (1965), Piper, O., "Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New

The book of Daniel has also been suggested as the most significant OT book for Mark. A.C. Sundberg argued for this on the basis of the number of citations or allusions to Daniel per page.⁶⁹ Although it is problematic to simply count the number of references as an indicator of hermeneutical significance, it does show that Daniel has at least some importance for Mark. H. Kee states there is throughout Mark "a disproportionate interest in Daniel"⁷⁰ and that it has an "overwhelming importance" for him.⁷¹ Although Kee sees Mark using a 'synthetic method', which includes use of Isaiah, the Psalms, the Torah and other scriptural texts as well, he suggests that the portrayal of Jesus in Mark may not only be inspired by the Danielic Son of Man, but also by the person of Daniel himself. There are significant parallels between the two figures. Both narratives start with miracle stories, face the question of martyrdom, have cosmic revelations (Mark 13, Dan 7, 9), and are delivered from the power of death (Dan 6:27, Mark 16:6).⁷² In the conclusion of his recent Ph.D. thesis in Edinburgh on the use of Daniel in Mark's Gospel, J.W. Lo concludes that Danielic references are found in significant places in the Markan narrative: the beginning of Jesus ministry, his parables, teaching on eschatology, and standing before the Sanhedrin. But Lo is also right in not making Daniel Mark's only important text.⁷³

Probably the most significant development with regard to finding the OT text that has most influenced Mark is the work of R.E. Watts. Watts argues for the Isaianic New Exodus being *the* hermeneutical lens for understanding Mark. For Watts the prologue of Mark is the key for informing the reader how to read the rest of text. Specifically, the whole introductory citation (1:2-3), although also citing Mal 3:1, is attributed to Isaiah for theological reasons.⁷⁴ The citation from Isaiah announces the inauguration of the long awaited Isaianic New Exodus, a theme that will continue to run through this Gospel. Watts argues that Jesus is therefore presented as the YHWH-Warrior in his performance of deeds of power and in his confrontation with the demonic forces.

Testament" *Int* 11 (1957)

69. Sundberg, A.C., "On Testimonies" *NovT* 3/4 (1959), 273-274.

70. Kee, (1977), 45.

71. Kee, (1977), 45.

72. Kee, (1977), 45. Kee, Howard C., "The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16," in *Jesus und Paulus*. Eds. Earle E. Ellis and E. Grässer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), 187-188.

73. Lo, Jonathan W., "The Contours and Functions of Danielic References in the Gospel of Mark" (Ph.D., University of Edinburgh, 2012), 268-289.

74. Hays, (2016), 21.

In light of the fact that the prologue functions to situate the whole narrative theologically and the fact that the introductory citation is the only citation in the narrator's voice, and is the only citation in which the source text is named, suggests that Isaiah, particularly chs. 40-66, is the most important framework for interpreting Mark's Gospel. It is particularly the book of Isaiah that shapes this Gospel and bestows "the *heilsgeschichtlich* framework" for it.⁷⁵ As D.H. Juel also states: Scripture "introduc(es) the 'script' by which the story will proceed".⁷⁶ However, while it is granted that Isaiah provides an important framework of Mark's narrative, it must be stressed at this point that the hermeneutical function of the other scriptural texts referred to in the text - particularly Daniel, Malachi, and Psalms - should not be overlooked.⁷⁷

(iii) The Theological Function of Mark's Use of Scripture

In order to understand the theological hermeneutics of Mark's Gospel, for example in his presentation of Jesus or God, a grasp of Mark's usage of Scripture is essential. His scriptural citations and allusions are more than mere decorations, but underpin his theological constructions. As Hays writes "[i]f we want to understand what the New Testament writers were doing theologically - particularly how they interpret the relation of the gospel to the more ancient story of God's covenant relationship to Israel - we cannot avoid tracing and understanding their appropriation of Israel's Scriptures."⁷⁸ What Hays refers to here is essential, for it pinpoints exactly the function of Mark's introductory citation, which is to link the story of Jesus with the story and work of God in the past. It is critical that Mark sees a continuity between the Old Scriptures of the past and what has been happening in and through Jesus. L. Hurtado is thus right in saying that "Mark links his story of Jesus with a larger

75. Boring, M. Eugene, "Mark 1:1-15 and the Beginning of the Gospel" *Semeia* 52 (1991), 70.

76. Juel, Donald H., *The Gospel of Mark*. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 63. It is worth noting that Juel argued that the Christian use of the OT was atomistic, and was not primarily concerned with the original meaning of the text. See also Huisenga, Leroy A., "The Old Testament, Intertextuality and Allegory" *JSNT* 38/1 (2015), 21.

77. Hatina, (2002), 23. Dodd, C.D., *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology*. (London: Nisbet, 1952), 109. Docherty, (2015a), 14, 17, 19.

78. Hays, (2005), 27.

'narrative world' of scriptural (Old Testament) prophecy and personages".⁷⁹ The God who speaks and acts in Mark is the same God who speaks and acts in the OT.

Even before the introductory citation, Mark's terminology indicates strong links with Israel's Scriptures. The Gospel begins with the anarthrous and verbless ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. These terms Χριστός and εὐαγγέλιον, and thus the whole clause, cannot be understood without reference to the OT. Thus in order to appreciate Mark's narrative and theology, it has to be read within the context within which it situates itself; as a story inserted "within a larger story".⁸⁰ This relationship is also made clear by the recurrence of phrases such as "let the Scriptures be fulfilled" and "as it is written" (1:15, 13:7, 14:21). Hurtado rightly points out that for the readers of Mark, the OT "functions very importantly in shaping and expressing their 'life world' of religious vocabulary, symbols, and fundamental beliefs."⁸¹ This is consonant with Dodd's older thesis that there is a shared *Weltanschauung* between the prophets and the Gospels. This means there is a commonality between the NT and OT view of the world and in this worldview history does not move by itself, but is dependent upon God's acts in the world.⁸²

As noted above, the use of Scripture by Mark goes beyond the level of merely producing citations and allusions. In his process of writing the εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ the author is doing more than simply writing a *bios*. His writing of this 'intertextual narrative account' of the meaning of Jesus is both an act of doing theology and of proclamation.⁸³ Mark's use of Scripture is therefore more than simply proof-texting or providing colour to the narrative; rather it is at the heart of Mark's hermeneutical process of interpreting the story of Jesus. Correspondingly, our treatment of Mark's employment of the OT must be more than "source-hunting" or "allusion-counting" which are but the start of the "interpretive process."⁸⁴ According to the literary theory of quotations of M. Steinberg, a citation in reality 'serves two masters'; both the original thought it represents as well as its new context. While the original is not lost in the new context, it is nevertheless employed by the quoter for

79. Hurtado, Larry W., *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 306. Also Bryan, Christopher, *A Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in Its Literary and Cultural Settings*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 85. Hays, Richard B., *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness*. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014), 106.

80. Hanson, James S., *Endangered Promises: Conflict in Mark*. (Atlanta: SBL, 2000), 133-134. See also 102.

81. Hurtado, (2003), 307-308. See also Hays, (1989), 16.

82. Dodd, (1952), 128-129. See also Watts, (1997), 48.

83. Hays, (2014), 103. Also Kee, (1975), 166.

84. Hays, (1989), 17.

his own particular purposes (this is especially the case where the audience have no independent access to the original).⁸⁵

The question regarding how much of the literary context is in view when an author makes a citation or allusion can have wide ramifications for the interpretation of the text. According to Dodd, when the early Christian writers were using OT texts, they "were understood as *wholes*, and particular verses or sentences were quoted from them rather as pointers to the whole context than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves"⁸⁶ and he adds that for the NT authors it is "the *total context* that is in view, and is the basis of the argument."⁸⁷ After Dodd such a view was criticised. For instance, with particular reference to Mark, W.S. Vorster argued that the author had no concern for the context of the OT text, and that the author just used the text for his own purpose rather carelessly.⁸⁸ On the contrary, as has already been emphasised and will be shown in more detail in the exegesis, the Markan author can be demonstrated to be a careful reader and interpreter of the ancient text.

R.E. Watts emphasises such a view of Mark's employment of the OT and reads the original literary context of the Markan citations or allusions, especially in 1:2-3 as key for his interpretation of this Gospel. This approach has, however, received criticism.⁸⁹ Hatina, who wants to read Mark as a coherent literary text with an eye on both history and theology, questions this approach because in his view it disregards the Gospel's internal logic. He is concerned that the emphasis on the Isaianic New Exodus in 1:2-3 eclipses the programmatic function of 1:15⁹⁰ and thus skews the understanding of the message of this Gospel.⁹¹ Hatina denies that the so-called New Exodus functions as the controlling paradigm, though he does not deny that it could be present.⁹² What Hatina helpfully warns against is letting the present text and its own literary context be overshadowed by an all too strong light from the OT context; rather (to switch metaphors) the immediate context must bear more weight.⁹³

85. See discussion in Stanley, Christopher D., "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Eds. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 52.

86. Dodd, (1952), 126.

87. Dodd, (1952), 126. R.B. Hays uses the term 'metalepsis'. Hays, (2005), 2.

88. Vorster, Willem S., "The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark" *Neot* 14 (1981), 69-70.

89. Wiarda, Timothy, "Story-Sensitive Exegesis and Old Testament Allusions in Mark" *JETS* 49/3 (2006), 491-493. Juel, Donald, "Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity" (1988), 21. Vorster, (1981), 69.

90. Hatina, (2002), 138.

91. Hatina, (2002), 160.

92. Hatina, (2002), 163.

93. Hatina, Thomas R., "Embedded Scripture Texts and the Plurality of Meaning: The Announcement of the 'Voice from Heaven' in Mark 1.11 as a Case Study," in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels*:

However, he does concede that there could be places where the author may have the context of the citation in view,⁹⁴ and therefore seeks clear criteria for determining whether the extended context of the citation can be a factor in interpreting the text.⁹⁵ While no systematic criteria can be offered here, Hatina is right to insist that the present literary context of, for instance 1:2-3, must be weightier than the original literary context in Malachi and Isaiah. Though this does not mean that the original literary context has no weight at all. This need not be an issue, however, for the contexts of both Mark 1:2-3 and Malachi/Isaiah may well be found to coincide.

As part of giving his interpreted account of the life and meaning of Jesus, Mark does cite Scripture directly but in this process he also interprets Scripture figuratively. That is to say, he sees figural correspondence between acts or events in the life of Jesus and in the OT. Though this does not necessitate that the OT authors were consciously predicting what would happen. It is, to use the language of Hays, a matter of 'reading backwards'; of "reinterpreting Israel's Scripture in light of the story of Jesus."⁹⁶ But here it is important to introduce a caveat. This process cannot simply be described as "prophecy historicized" (to use the terminology of J.D. Crossan),⁹⁷ or as Vorster comments disparagingly concerning Mark: "It also appears that his hermeneutics had no limits. To 'prove' his point he did not hesitate to actualise Old Testament statements to suit his purpose!"⁹⁸ On the contrary, rather than the Scriptures simply functioning as rather questionable proofs, it will be shown that the author of Mark is a careful reader of Scripture. He is both attentive to the literary context of the original text, reads certain texts in combination with other texts, and is also alert to ambiguities within the text itself. For instance, there are tensions within the OT corpus surrounding eschatological hopes in relation to 'messiah', 'servant', 'God's reign', and 'God's Spirit' as well as the anticipated role of God in passages such as Isa 40:3, Mal 3:1 (Exod 23:20), Isa 42:1, and Ps 2, and Dan 7. In short, the OT provided the means for understanding Jesus; his ministry, death and resurrection. M. Goodacre calls the process of retelling the narrative of Jesus (especially the

The Gospel of Mark. Ed. Thomas R. Hatina (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 81-82. See also Gundry, Robert H., *Mark: 1-8*. Vol. 1. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993a), 42.

94. Hatina, (2002), 157.

95. Hatina, (2002), 159.

96. Hays, (2014), 2, 93-94, 104.

97. Crossan, John Dominic, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998). See also Goodacre, Mark, "Scripturalization in Mark's Crucifixion Narrative," in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. Eds. Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 37-42.

98. Vorster, (1981), 71.

passion narrative with its many scriptural references) 'scripturalization'. The narrated Jesus in the Gospel of Mark is not an uninterpreted Jesus, but rather his story is retold in the language of and in the light of Scripture.⁹⁹

In looking at Mark's use of Scripture one cannot be completely silent on the comparative use of Scripture in the different varieties of Judaism at the time. It is important to realise that the Dead Sea Scroll community, Philo, the Pharisees, and the earliest Christians were reading the same and already authoritative texts but were interpreting them differently.¹⁰⁰ In the interpretation and application of these texts they were "extending (their) meaning in new directions".¹⁰¹ Therefore, it is not enough to state that "Mark's main hermeneutical task is to bring OT texts into a relationship with Christian reality."¹⁰² For although Mark does that, he does not do only that. This same issue appears in the following characterising of rabbinic *midrashim* and the NT authors: "While for the rabbis the text is primary, the New Testament writers give primacy to Jesus and to the surrounding messianic events, or tradition of events, and only then use Old Testament texts to explain or illuminate them."¹⁰³ Docherty is right in emphasising that this is a misleading portrayal of both strands of interpretive traditions, both of which exploit ambiguities in the text, and likewise both traditions seek to interpret the sacred text in light of and for present realities or experiences.¹⁰⁴ Thus Mark uses the Scriptures and also ambiguities within and between the texts, in order to understand the Christ-event, but does not do so against the grain of the text. Thus the Scriptures themselves are the hermeneutical tools for understanding Jesus and the events surrounding him, which again in turn illuminate the Scriptures.

F. Watson in his treatment of Paul's hermeneutic rightly stresses Paul's rootedness in Scripture. Although the Christ-event sheds light on Scripture to the extent that Paul can find Christ in surprising places in the OT, this Christ-event is nevertheless not understood as detached from and set over against Scripture, for the Christ-event itself can only be apprehended in conjunction with the latter. This relationship is thus

99. Goodacre, (2006), 37-41.

100. Watson, Francis, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 1, 40.

101. Hays, (1989), 5. See also Anderson, Hugh, "The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*. Ed. James M. Efird (Durham: Duke University Press, 1972), 290.

102. Moyise, Steve, "Is Mark's Opening Quotation the Key to His Use of Scripture?" *IBS* 20 (1998), 157-158.

103. Ellis, Earle E., *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 94. Cited in Docherty, Susan E., *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews*. WUNT2. 260. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 146.

104. Docherty, (2009), 146. Docherty, (2015a), 14. Chilton, (1984), 21-22.

not unilateral, with only Scripture showing how Christ is to be understood, but also bilateral in that the Christ-event affects how Scripture is read.¹⁰⁵ This same hermeneutic is operational in Mark's Gospel. The Gospel is rooted in Scripture, and the gospel kerygma is testified to by Scripture, but this testimony needs the Christ-event in order to be recognised. The Scriptures and its themes are used, applied, interpreted and re-interpreted in the light of God's action. However, Watson rightly adds that "it is more important that scripture should shed light on Christ than that Christ should shed light on scripture."¹⁰⁶ Elsewhere he similarly writes that "there is no question of any one-way, undialectical movement from the New Testament to the Old."¹⁰⁷ There is thus a movement from Scripture to Christ and subsequently from Christ to Scripture. In other words, Scripture helps us to understand Christ, for he cannot be understood without it, yet when Christ is understood he sheds further light on Scripture. However, while there is reciprocity in these two movements, these are not of equal weight and importance. This is also the case in Mark's Gospel, whose engagement with the OT can rightly be termed "genuine exegesis" and not simply a christological application.¹⁰⁸

This section has analysed Mark's use of Scripture. It was argued that he makes use of both citations and allusions, and that the OT contexts of the cited passages is likely to be in view, though it was concluded that the primary weight lies in the Markan context. But Mark does not simply cite the text to serve his purpose and override its meaning. He interprets Jesus in light of the text as well as the text in light of Jesus and thereby clarifies ambiguities and tensions within the text itself. While Mark reads certain texts in conjunction with other OT texts, the book of Isaiah has particular prominence.

(b) The Function of Mark's Prologue

In this section the extent and narrative function of Mark's prologue will be explored. This is necessary because the baptism episode, which is the focal text of this thesis, is imbedded within a narrative context which shapes its meaning. That Jesus is called 'Son of God' and that 'God's Spirit' descends upon him occurs in the context of the

105. Watson, (2004), 14-24.

106. Watson, (2004), 16.

107. Watson, Francis, "The Old Testament as Christian Scripture: A Response to Professor Seitz" *SJT* 52/2 (2009), 229.

108. See e.g. Docherty, (2015a), 4-5.

theme of the 'good news of the coming of the Lord and of his reign'. Not paying attention to this literary context would be to ignore the interpretive clues that the author has placed in the text itself.

(i) The Extent of the Prologue

The importance of the Markan prologue has not gone unnoticed by Markan scholars, with R.H. Lightfoot commenting in 1950 that the matter of the prologue was "not unimportant for the understanding of the book."¹⁰⁹ However, before the full narrative and theological function of the Markan prologue can be assessed, its beginning and end must first be identified. The first few verses of Mark are variously termed 'prologue', 'preface', 'beginning', 'introduction', '*initium*', or '*proem*'.¹¹⁰ Eve-Marie Becker has argued against calling Mark 1:1-13/15 a *prologue*, since it is a term that in classical literature belongs to the genre of drama. She argues that 1:1 is a title (*inscriptio*) and the whole of 1:1-3 is a *prooemium*, after which the narrative of Mark begins. This would make the section 4-13/15 the introductory part of the narrative, but not a 'prologue'. Part of her resistance is rooted in her view that Mark is not biographical but historiographical literature.¹¹¹ It cannot be denied that in Greek technical terminology, the πρόλογος belongs to the theatre where the *Prologsprecher* (or an actor) would introduce the play before the audience. In this technical sense the introductory verses of Mark cannot be termed a *prologue*. However, as H.-J. Klauck points out, the term 'prologue' has now acquired a wider meaning with its usage in literary works beyond the sphere of drama and theatre. Klauck also notes that the question is whether one employs the terminology from drama (prologue), music (overture), rhetoric (exordium), or alternatively the neutral term 'beginning'.¹¹² The word 'prologue' will be preferred here because of its widespread use and functional affinities with Aristotle's view of the term (which will be argued below).¹¹³

109. Lightfoot, R.H., *The Gospel Message of Mark*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950), 16.

110. See e.g. an overview in Klauck, Hans-Josef, *Vorspiel im Himmel? Erzähltechnik und Theologie im Markusprolog*. Biblisch-Theologische Studien. 32. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997), 39.

111. Becker, Eve-Marie, "Mk 1:1 and the Debate of a 'Markan Prologue'" *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 22 (2009), 96, 98, 103.

112. Klauck, (1997), 37-39.

113. The word 'Preface' would be more suitable for Luke and Acts. See Alexander, Loveday, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Smith, Dennis, "Narrative Beginnings in Ancient Literature and Theory" *Semeia* 52 (1991). Contra Anderson who employs the term 'preface' for Mark's opening. Anderson, Hugh, *The Gospel of Mark*. New Century Bible. (London: Oliphants, 1976), 62. C. Focant terms verses 4-13 as a 'prologue' and 1:1 as the 'incipit'. Focant, Camille, "Fonction Intertextuelle et Limites du Prologue de Marc," in *La Bible en récits: L'exégèse biblique à l'heure du lecteur*. Ed. Daniel Marguerat (Genève: Labor et Fides, 2003), 310.

Prior to Lightfoot's influential treatment of 'the beginning' of Mark in his commentary, it was customary to treat 1:1-8 as the prologue to the Gospel¹¹⁴ or at least as a unit.¹¹⁵ In their edition of the Greek New Testament, Westcott and Hort had two substantial breaks in the whole of Mark's Gospel; between verses 8 and 9 of the first chapter and between chapters 13 and 14, and thus indicated that they viewed the first eight verses to be distinct from the rest of the Gospel; functioning as an introduction of some sort.¹¹⁶ This view has more recently been argued by R.H. Gundry and J.W. Voelz¹¹⁷ and assumed by C. Bryan.¹¹⁸

Although Lightfoot is usually credited with shifting the consensus to the view that vv.1-13 constitute the prologue,¹¹⁹ some earlier scholars also held this view, including B.H. Branscomb in his 1937 commentary,¹²⁰ as well as N.B. Stonehouse,¹²¹ and W.H. Bennett.¹²² Lightfoot suggested that the reason for the division between verses 8 and 9 by Westcott and Hort was that from v.9 onwards Jesus is the main character, while in 1-8 it is John. But Lightfoot argued - on the basis of content rather than on linguistic markers - that viewing vv.1-8 as the prologue is untenable since it would only introduce John, while the identity of Jesus - the ultimate subject of the book - is only revealed in vv.9-13. He then drew parallels from John's Gospel and contended that just as the Johannine prologue reaches its climax in 1:14 ("the word became flesh") the apex of the Markan prologue is 1:11 with the statement from heaven, "you are my Son".¹²³ Thus the 'narrative proper' only commences at verse 14.¹²⁴

Lightfoot's position was already picked up by Vincent Taylor in his commentary from 1952¹²⁵ and, for example, by C.E.B. Cranfield (1959)¹²⁶ and J.M. Robinson

114. Gould, Ezra P., *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896), 1. Menzies, Allan, *The Earliest Gospel: A Historical Study of the Gospel According to Mark*. (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1901), 57, 60.

115. Rawlinson, A.E.J., *St. Mark*. 7th. (London: Methuen, 1949), 3. Swete, H.B., *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. (New York: Macmillan, 1898), 1-7.

116. Lightfoot, (1950), 15, 22.

117. Gundry, (1993a), 29, 31, 40. Voelz, James W., *Mark 1:1-8:26*. Concordia Commentary. (St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 2013), 91, 122.

118. Bryan, (1993), 85-86.

119. Matera, Frank J., "The Prologue as the Interpretive Key to Mark's Gospel" *JSNT* 34 (1988), 4. Watts, (1997), 90.

120. Branscomb, Bennett Harvie, *The Gospel of Mark*. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937), 5.

121. Cited in France, R.T., *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002), 54n9.

122. Bennett, W.H., *The Life of Christ According to St. Mark*. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907), 1.

123. Lightfoot, (1950), 17-18.

124. Lightfoot, (1950), 19.

125. Taylor, Vincent, *Gospel According to St Mark*. (London: Macmillan, 1966), 151.

126. Cranfield, C.E.B., *Gospel According to Saint Mark*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 33.

(1957).¹²⁷ This division is also followed by many more recent commentators¹²⁸ including M. Hooker,¹²⁹ W.L. Lane,¹³⁰ and R.T. France.¹³¹ In addition to Lightfoot's arguments based on content, linguistic arguments in favour of the prologue being vv.1-13 have been proffered. While within vv.1-13 πνεῦμα is mentioned three times (1:8, 10, 13), there are only three further references in the rest of the Gospel (3:29, 12:36, 13:11).¹³² Furthermore, ἔρημος plays an important role in the prologue, being the location of the action (1:3, 4, 12, 13) and is used only another five times in the whole book. In addition, this noun is arthrous in the prologue, but anarthrous outside it, and thus indicating its special usage. However, France's conclusion, that these prominent uses of the words πνεῦμα and ἔρημος in the prologue are indicative of a deeper meaning,¹³³ still stands if the prologue extends to 1:15.¹³⁴ In addition to the common argument based on content and linguistic features, Matera adds his own argument based on "literary criticism", arguing that the special information conveyed in vv.1-13 to the reader contrasts with the public nature of the events from v.14 onwards.¹³⁵

But Leander Keck challenged this view in an influential article already in 1966 in which he convincingly argued that the prologue ends at verse 15.¹³⁶ This division was already assumed, but not argued for, by J. Wellhausen,¹³⁷ and is now at least as prominent as the vv.1-13 view, and is advocated by for example J. Marcus,¹³⁸ R.E. Watts,¹³⁹ and R. Pesch.¹⁴⁰ Keck considers the prominence of εὐαγγέλιον in verses 1,

127. Robinson, James M., *The Problem of History in Mark*. (London: SCM, 1957), 21.

128. Unusually, Feneberg considers the prologue to be 1:1-11. Feneberg, Wolfgang, *Der Markusprolog: Studien zur Formbestimmung des Evangeliums*. SANT. (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1974)

129. Hooker, Morna D., *Beginnings: Keys that Open the Gospels*. (London: SCM, 1997), 4. See also Hooker, Morna D., *The Gospel According to St Mark*. (London: A & C Black, 1991), 31-32.

130. Lane, William L., *The Gospel of Mark*. NICNT. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 39.

131. France, (2002), 54. Others include: Donahue, John R. and Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*. Sacra Pagina. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002), 59. Stein, Robert H., *Mark*. BECNT. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 38. Schweizer, Eduard, *The Good News According to Mark*. (London: SPCK, 1970), 28. Edwards, James R., *The Gospel According to Mark*. Pillar. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 23. Matera, (1988). Kuthirakkattel, Scaria, *The Beginning of Jesus' Ministry According to Mark's Gospel (1,14-3,6): A Redaction Critical Study*. (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990), 4-7. Hurtado, Larry W., *Mark*. New International Biblical Commentary. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989), 12.

132. France, (2002), 55.

133. France, (2002), 58.

134. France, (2002), 56-58.

135. Matera, (1988), 5.

136. Keck, Leander E., "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel" *NTS* 12/04 (1966)

137. Wellhausen, J., *Das Evangelium Marci: Übersetzt und Erklärt*. 2nd edition. (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009), 3-8.

138. Marcus, Joel, *Mark 1-8*. AB. (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 137.

139. Watts, (1997), 91-95.

140. Pesch, Rudolf, *Das Markusevangelium I: Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-8,26*. HTKNT. (Freiburg: Herder, 1976), 71. Pesch, Rudolf, "Anfang des Evangeliums Jesu Christi: Eine Studie zum Prolog des Markusevangeliums (Mk 1,1-15)," in *Die Zeit Jesu: Festschrift für Heinrich Schlier*. Eds. Günther

14, 15 to be "decisive",¹⁴¹ and which not only structurally forms an *inclusio*, but is also thematically a key motif.¹⁴² If we see the prologue as extending to v.15 then one can see clear parallels between John's preaching (κηρύσσων) of a baptism of repentance (μετάνοια) for forgiveness of sins in v.4, and Jesus preaching (κηρύσσων) repentance (μετανοεῖτε) in v.15, which portrays a narrative unity from v.1 to v.15.¹⁴³ Following the baptism there is a testing/temptation (v.12-13), but there is no outcome described, except the following announcement of the gospel and that the kingdom has come near; which suggests that the prologue extends to v.15.¹⁴⁴

Thematically the coming of John the baptiser as the forerunner "provides the foil for Jesus' appearance in 1:9-15."¹⁴⁵ In fact, the placement of John's proclamation of the 'stronger one' baptising 'in the Holy Spirit' is purposefully placed at the conclusion of the John material (1:7-8)¹⁴⁶ in order to introduce Jesus - in contrast to John - as the main character of the text. The function of John, whose only recorded words point to the one following him (1:7-8), is clearly subservient to Jesus. To support his view, Keck also reads παραδοθῆναι in v.14 primarily *theologically* rather than *biographically*,¹⁴⁷ which means that the 'handing over' is in accordance to the will of God and which needed to happen before Jesus started his ministry and that the limelight is not shared with John.¹⁴⁸ The work of the forerunner is only complete in v.14 - rather than in v.8 - when he has been handed over to the same fate as his successor; being put to death by the authorities and thus preparing the way also in suffering and death.¹⁴⁹ Although μετὰ δέ in 1:14 is a temporal transition it does not

Bornkamm and Karl Rahner (Freiburg: Herder, 1970), 111. Other include: Boring, (2006), 33. Collins, Adela Yarbro, *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 133-135. Juel, (1999), 53. Witherington, Ben, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 67-68, 71. Gnllka, J., *Das Evangelium nach Markus 1: Mk 1-8.26*. EKK. (Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1978), 39. Mann, C.S., *Mark*. AB. (New York: Doubleday, 1986), 193. Anderson, (1976), 62-65. Guelich, Robert A., "The Beginning of the Gospel' Mark 1:1-15" *BR* 27 (1982), 8-11. Guelich, Robert A., *Mark 1-8:26*. WBC. (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 3. Hatina, (2002), 93-102. Klauck, (1997), 19-27.

141. Keck, (1966), 359.

142. Collins, (2007), 135.

143. Collins, (2007), 134. For more *Stichworte* see Pesch, (1970), 111. Pesch divides the prologue into two parts: vv.1-8, and vv.9-15. Pesch, (1970), 112. J. Drury's structuralist analysis shows a chiasmic structure to the prologue: Gospel, Wilderness, Jordan, Jordan, Wilderness, Gospel. Drury, John, "Mark 1.1-15: An Interpretation," in *Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study*. Ed. A.E. Harvey (London: SPCK, 1985), 28ff. See also Rose, Christian, *Theologie als Erzählung im Markusevangelium: Eine narratologisch-rezeptionsästhetische Untersuchung zu Mk 1,1-15*. WUNT2. 236. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 65.

144. Mansfield, M. Robert, *Spirit and Gospel in Mark*. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987), 15.

145. Guelich, (1982), 7. See also Kampling, Rainer, *Israel unter dem Anspruch des Messias: Studien zur Israelthematik im Markusevangelium*. (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992), 37.

146. Pesch, (1970), 111.

147. Keck, (1966), 360.

148. Anderson also reads this theologically, but still argues that the prologue is vv.1-13. Anderson, (1972), 283-285.

149. Hanson, (2000), 96. Likewise, Schenke, Ludger, *Das Markusevangelium: Literarische Eigenart - Text und Kommentierung*. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2005), 66. Guttenberger also states that the importance of

necessarily indicate that it is the beginning of a new section, for the ἐγένετο in verses 4a and 9a are also temporal transitions without indicating the end of the prologue. Furthermore, μετὰ δέ with accusative is used twenty other times, only nine of which start a new section.¹⁵⁰

While the position that the prologue extends to v.15 is advocated in this thesis, in either case verses 14-15 are significant, whether as the conclusion of the prologue or as the beginning of the narrative proper. J.S. Hanson - holding to the position that the prologue concludes at v.15 - argues that these last two verses (14-15) function both as a conclusion to what proceeds it and as an introduction to what follows it.¹⁵¹ This double function is well expressed by Malbon: "the ending of a beginning is sometimes another beginning rather than a middle."¹⁵² While the strategic location of these words is significant and highlights their importance, the mere fact that they are the first words of Jesus and conclude the prologue (and open the narrative) is not as important as their content. As argued by T.R. Hatina, if these words were a mundane greeting they would not carry the same weight, and therefore it is primarily their content that make them important.¹⁵³ The announcement is that Jesus is now 'proclaiming the gospel of God' and that the 'kingdom of God has drawn near' (1:14-15). The programmatic significance of these words will be examined below.

(ii) The Narrative Function of the Prologue

The type and function of literary introductions varied in both the Jewish and the Graeco-Roman world. Comparative work between gospel-beginnings and other ancient texts has yielded some results.¹⁵⁴ Without implying that Mark set out to construct a *Greek Drama* - whether comedy or tragedy - comparisons between Mark's prologue and the *dramatic prologue* (as opposed to a *preface* or *incipit*) can be fruitfully made,¹⁵⁵ especially since R. Burridge has noted that a βίος may even

John's role was not only his preaching and baptising, but especially his fate in death ("Todesgeschick"). Guttenberger, (2004), 63.

150. Hatina, (2002), 98.

151. Hanson, (2000), 91-92. Also Focant, Camille, *L'évangile selon Marc*. (Paris: Cerf, 2010), 53, 75. Focant, (2003), 310. Lightfoot, (1950), 20.

152. Malbon, Elizabeth S., "Ending at the Beginning: A Response" *Semeia* 52 (1991), 176.

153. Hatina, (2002), 102-104.

154. See e.g. Alexander, (1993), Smith, (1991), Bilezikian, Gilbert G., *The Liberated Gospel: A Comparison of the Gospel of Mark and Greek Tragedy*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977)

155. As argued by Bilezikian, (1977). Hooker notes the prevalence of the Greek drama in the Eastern Mediterranean. Hooker, (1997), 6.

begin with a dramatic prologue.¹⁵⁶ For this purpose Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is frequently invoked, and M. Hooker mentions how for Aristotle the opening scene of a tragedy, i.e. the prologue, "provides the audience with whatever information is necessary to understand the play".¹⁵⁷ It gives "an indication of what is to be said so that hearers can know beforehand what the work is about".¹⁵⁸ In this context Aristotle himself compares the 'prologue' of a drama, the 'prooemium' of a speech or an epic, and the 'prelude' in flute-playing, all of which are "paving the way for what follows".¹⁵⁹

In the genre of classical historiography, it was ideal to state - even in the first sentence - the subject and purpose of the book, so as to leave the reader in no doubt.¹⁶⁰ This is not only for stylistic but also practical reasons, because for physical reasons it was not easy to skim the contents of a scroll. While there is no evidence that Mark's Gospel was a scroll, the writing practices associated with scroll would still be influential. D. Earl therefore states that, "[t]he first sentence and first paragraph performed much of the function of the title page and list of content in a modern codex."¹⁶¹ Mark clearly states what his book is all about, the good news of Jesus the Messiah the Son of God in accordance to Scripture.

The programmatic importance of this opening statement and citation (1:1-3) will be shown at length in Chapter 2. Although 1:14-15 have already been given this label, this is not a contradiction, for these two passages serve different, yet correlating, functions. The latter introduces and defines the nature of the actual ministry of Jesus, the former introduces and defines the book itself and provides a 'pre-narrative' perspective. These verses (1-3) have been termed "Prolog im Prolog"¹⁶² in that they state the subject of the book (v.1) and the context according to which it must be understood (v.2-3). For although Mark had personal information about Jesus' family and background (6:3),¹⁶³ he chose for theological reasons not to begin his Gospel there, but rather with scriptural references and allusions. The importance of Mark's opening has been noted by numerous scholars, with R. Pesch writing: "Das ganze

156. Burridge, Richard A., *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 113.

157. Hooker, (1997), 4. See also Puskas, Charles B and C. Michael Robbins, *An Introduction to the New Testament*. 2nd edition. (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2011), 125. Hatina, (2002), 93.

158. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1414b. Cited in Watts, (1997), 54.

159. Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.14.1. Cited in Smith, (1991), 3, and Klauck, (1997), 37n63.

160. Earl, Donald, "Prologue-Form in Ancient Historiography," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang des Römischen Welt*, I.2. Ed. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972), 856.

161. Earl, (1972), 856. Drawing insights from the psychology of reading, Klauck stresses that the opening of a text heavily influences how one reads what follows. Klauck, (1997), 76.

162. Klauck, (1997), 20.

163. Robinson, (1957), 21. Boring, (1991), 44.

Evangelium soll nach Markus im Licht des Prologs gelesen werden", ¹⁶⁴ while D. Lührmann calls the prologue "einen Schlüssel für das ganze Evangelium". ¹⁶⁵

The important factor here is the theological reasons for Mark's opening. Narratively the prologue is key to Mark's Gospel for it discloses to the reader from the outset who Jesus is, a matter that will be revealed to the other characters as the narrative unfolds. Here the reader is privy to information which is concealed from most of the characters for most of the narrative. ¹⁶⁶ In this sense the prologue functions rather like the first two chapters of Job, providing 'behind the scenes' information crucial for interpreting the narrative, and of which the characters of the story are oblivious. ¹⁶⁷ This involves especially the two divine statements to Jesus in 1:2-3 and 1:9-11 where the reader receives important information regarding Jesus. This contrasts with the Gospel of Thomas (*Saying 13*) where Thomas is revealed something by Jesus, but which is withheld even from the reader. Mark's prologue is "theologically loaded" ¹⁶⁸ and rather than providing family background, Mark provides information about the person and purpose of Jesus, which is key for understanding the rest of the book. ¹⁶⁹ In short, the prologue functions as a "theological commentary on the rest of the narrative." ¹⁷⁰

It is important to keep in mind that the author is not a neutral observer, but has from the outset an 'evaluative point of view' and presents Jesus as the Messiah the Son of God ¹⁷¹ (as John 20:31). As Mussner points out, when the importance of Mark's use of εὐαγγέλιον for introducing the following narrative is recognised, "dadurch will die marcinische Vita Jesu wesentlich mehr als ein „neutraler“ Bericht über Jesus von Nazareth sein; sie will vielmehr als Ganzes Verkündigung sein." ¹⁷² Within this Gospel the narrator takes the role of a "reliable narrator". ¹⁷³ This means he is 'omniscient', i.e.

164. Pesch, (1970), 139.

165. Lührmann, Dieter, *Das Markusevangelium*. HNT. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987), 32. Also Lightfoot, (1950), 17. Hooker, Morna D., "“Who Can This Be?” The Christology of Mark's Gospel," in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 81, 83. Gnllka, (1978), 39. Scott, Bernard Brandon, "The Birth of the Reader" *Semeia* 52 (1991), 84. W. Feneberg is more cautious: "Bei Markus ist der Prolog in gewissen Sinne programmatisch". Feneberg, (1974), 17.

166. See also Hooker, (1991), 32. Keck, (1966), 354.

167. France, (2002), 59. See also Anderson, (1976), 63.

168. Anderson, (1976), 63.

169. Hooker, Morna D., *The Message of Mark*. (London: Epworth, 1983), 5.

170. Hooker, (1983), 16. Similarly Mansfield, (1987), 15.

171. Juel, (1999), 63.

172. Mussner, Franz, "“Evangelium” und ‘Mitte des Evangeliums’: Ein Beitrag zur Kontroverstheologie," in *Praesentia Salutis: Gesammelte Studien zu Fragen und Themen des Neuen Testaments*. Ed. Franz Mussner (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1967a), 167.

173. Petersen, Norman R., "“Point of View” in Mark's Narrative" *Semeia* 12 (1978), 102, 112. See also

knowing the thoughts and feelings of the characters of the story¹⁷⁴ (e.g. Mark 2:6-8, 8:11, 9:33-35). This 'omniscience' is also shared by Jesus¹⁷⁵ and more importantly God.¹⁷⁶ However, as Kingsbury notes, the author does not allow the reader to penetrate into the mind of God, but God's "evaluative point of view" is incorporated by the use of Scripture citations and references,¹⁷⁷ and most importantly by God's own voice at the baptism and the transfiguration. In Mark there is clearly a right and wrong way of understanding Jesus, God, and their relation one to another.¹⁷⁸

(c) Conclusions

This present chapter has put down a number of pillars which will support the following interpretation of Mark's baptismal narrative. It is especially in the prologue where these pillars are introduced and it was emphasised that the prologue as a unit provides the 'script' or 'grammar' according to which the rest of the narrative is to be understood. The prologue provides the reader with the text's frame of reference and worldview. Here the hidden God is revealed in the present world in Jesus his Son. But in the narrative, Jesus' identity as God's Son is a secret that only is lifted for the characters at the end. This revelation of God's identity in Jesus is the fulfilment of OT hopes for the 'good news' of God's own coming and reign, for Jesus in himself makes present God's reign. Jesus can only be interpreted in light of the Scriptures that are cited as an aid for true comprehension. It is precisely the God of Scripture who acts presently, but it is paradoxically in his very acting in Jesus, with his Spirit, and with divine speech that the knowledge of God is radically reinterpreted along trinitarian lines.

Kingsbury, (2002), 84-85.

174. Rhoads, David, *Reading Mark: Engaging the Gospel*. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004), 14. See also Hanson, (2000), 105-106. Vorster, (1981), 68-69.

175. Petersen, (1978), 101.

176. Kingsbury, (1983), 48-49. Kingsbury, (2002), 79-80. A point disputed by Malbon, Elizabeth S., *Mark's Jesus: Characterization as Narrative Christology*. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), 232ff.

177. Kingsbury, (1983), 48.

178. Petersen, (1978), 108.

Chapter 2

The Theological Context of the Baptism Episode

The previous chapter examined the broader themes of Mark's use of the OT and the critical function of the prologue for the whole of Mark. This chapter considers the theological context of the baptism narrative. That heaven is torn, that God's Spirit descends, and God speaks, must be considered in the light of the two passages labelled 'programmatic' above (1:1-3, 14-15). Only in the context of the 'good news' and of the hope of the 'coming of YHWH' and of his 'kingdom' can the theological depth of the baptism episode be appreciated. These two programmatic texts form an *inclusio* and will be examined in detail in this chapter. Since Mark 1:9-11 describes the actions of God in calling a human person his Son as God's Spirit comes on him, it is worth examining the identity of this God in the context of the OT and Jewish monotheism. Building on Hans Frei's work on narrative identity, this chapter claims that God is revealed in his actions and his relations.

(a) The Gospel of Mark and the God of Israel

The knowledge of Mark's author, date, and audience does not form a direct building block of the present argument and the position taken here is that of R. Bauckham: that the intended readership/audience of this Gospel is not a specific 'Markan community' but rather Christians in general.¹⁷⁹ The audience, while not a local congregation, is likely a mixed group comprising both Jews and Gentiles. While G. Guttenberger does suggest a specific 'Markan community', a view too restrictive in my verdict, her comment concerning how the diversity of the recipients has ramifications for God-talk, is nonetheless applicable to a general Christian audience. She writes: "Nur die judenchristliche Teilgruppe konnte ihre traditionelle Gottesvorstellung in die neue Gruppe einbringen; für die heidenchristliche Teilgruppe bedeutete die Zugehörigkeit zur christlichen Gemeinde in der Interpretation dieser Gruppe einen Bruch mit ihren bisherigen

179. See discussion in Bauckham, Richard, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?," in *The Gospel for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Ed. Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998)

Gottesvorstellungen."¹⁸⁰ Guttenberger is further right in noting that although there is continuity for Jewish Christians in their view of God, this view cannot remain unaffected by the further revelations of the true nature of God's identity;¹⁸¹ which in my view must be understood in the light of the coming of Jesus and the descent of the Spirit. This point will be argued for in greater depth below.

It is important to note that Mark assumes a continuity with the history of Israel.¹⁸² But the point to be made presently is that the intended readers likely included people for whom θεός had, or had once had, very different connotations than for the believers from a Jewish background (See also 1 Cor 8:5).¹⁸³ But for Christians familiar with the LXX the matter was different. In the LXX θεός is used almost 4000 times for God; many of which render אֱלֹהִים and at times the Tetragrammaton; but even other deities as well.¹⁸⁴ The most common term for God in Mark's Gospel is θεός. The use of ὁ θεός in the singular and with the article shows that the author has a particular 'god' in mind; the God of Israel, יהוה, and κύριος of the LXX.¹⁸⁵ That the referent is the God of Israel is beyond doubt, for Mark's God is the God of the Genesis creation account (10:6ff., 13:19), who spoke to Moses and the prophets, and is identified as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (1:2-3, 12:26), and is the God of the *Shema* (12:29-30, 32, 10:18¹⁸⁶). While for Jewish Christians this is a familiar God whose oneness is taken for granted,¹⁸⁷ for believers of a non-Jewish background this is a foreign or strange 'god'.¹⁸⁸

But in speaking about the God of the Jews in relation to Mark's conception of God it is unavoidable to examine briefly the nature of Jewish monotheism. The significance of monotheism for faithful Jews is evident by the importance of the *Decalogue* and

180. Guttenberger, (2004), 1.

181. Guttenberger, (2004), 1.

182. Guttenberger, (2004), 49. Scholtissek, (1996), 78, 91-96.

183. See also Hurtado, (2010), 27. "θεός," in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Ed. Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 433-434.

184. (2014), 434. N.T. Wright has pointed to the problem in English of using 'God' with capital which can appear to be a personal name rather than a designation. Wright, N.T., *The New Testament and the People of God. Christian Origins and the Question of God*. 1. (London: SPCK, 1992), xiv.

185. See also Gnika, (1992), 144-145. See also Wright, (1992), xv. Pietersma, Albert, "Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX," in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Eds. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox (Mississauga, ON: Benben Publications, 1984).

186. Possibly, as argued by Hahn, Ferdinand, "The Confession of the One God in the New Testament" *HBT* 2/1 (1980), 72-73.

187. Hahn, (1980), 73. Childs, Brevard S, *Biblical Theology in Crisis*. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 203. Childs, Brevard S, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflections on the Christian Bible*. (London: SCM, 1992), 362.

188. Hahn, (1980), 74. Dahl, Nils A., "The One God of Jew and Gentiles (Romans 3:29-30)," in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Ed. Nils A. Dahl (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977), 180.

the twice-daily-cited *Shema*.¹⁸⁹ In this context of examining monotheism, there are two issues that need discussing. First, whether Jewish monotheism can be characterised as 'exclusive' or 'inclusive' and whether its claims are 'soteriological' or 'ontological'.

Concerning terminology, it is important that what is meant by 'monotheism' when speaking of the OT and NT is not necessarily the same as in modern discussions of the term since the Enlightenment.¹⁹⁰ Hurtado emphasises that when one examines early Jewish monotheism, one must methodologically work with the texts deductively rather than come to the texts with a preconceived notion of its shape and meaning.¹⁹¹ This means looking at how those Jews who can be labeled 'monotheistic' actually practiced their religion.¹⁹² Hurtado shows that exalted language can be, and is, used for intermediary figures, angels, patriarchs, and other 'chief agents' who can be highly exalted. But however highly exalted these may be the barrier of cultic worship is not crossed.¹⁹³ Hurtado writes, "there is clear indication that devout Jews of the Roman era were characteristically concerned about the uniqueness of their God and held strong scruples about reserving worship for this God alone."¹⁹⁴ In such a 'strict' monotheism there is an "absolute difference of kind between God and 'all

189. Bauckham, Richard, "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008g), 153. Bauckham, Richard, "God Crucified," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008b), 5. Dunn, James D.G., "Was Jesus a Monotheist?," in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Eds. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 105. Although the evidence is from the Mishnah, Dunn is probably right in considering it as "already long established". Dunn, (2004), 105.

190. See MacDonald, Nathan, "The Origin of 'Monotheism'," in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Eds. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North (London: T&T Clark, 2004). MacDonald, Nathan, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of 'Monotheism'*. FAT 2. 1. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 6ff. Mauser, Ulrich, "One God and Trinitarian Language in the Letter of Paul" *HBT* 20.2 (1998), 101.

191. Hurtado, Larry W., "First-Century Jewish Monotheism" *JSNT* 71 (1998a), 5-6.

192. Hurtado, (1998a), 9ff.

193. Hurtado, Larry W., *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. 2nd edition. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998b), 17ff. Also Bauckham, Richard, "Devotion to Jesus Christ in Earliest Christianity: An Appraisal and Discussion of the Work of Larry Hurtado," in *Mark, Manuscripts, and Monotheism: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado*. Eds. Chris Keith and Dieter T. Roth (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 178-179.

194. Hurtado, (1998b), x. R. Hayward argues that even the existence of rival Jewish temples, such as the Samaritan, was more than an 'embarrassment', for "nothing less than the very notion of the unity of God was called into question by the existence of these rival shrines." (p.139). He adds: "This plurality of places, each maintaining that it, and not another, was the place where the Divine Name tabernacled on earth, threatened to bring disintegration and division into the very core of Judaism, the affirmation that God is One, that his Name is One and Unique, and that he has chosen one place of dwelling for that Name on earth." Hayward, C.T.R., "'The Lord is One': Reflections on the Theme of Unity in John's Gospel from a Jewish Perspective," in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Eds. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 142.

things".¹⁹⁵ Thus, in summary, the position advocated here is that Jewish monotheism can rightly be termed as 'strict' or 'exclusive monotheism'.¹⁹⁶

While this is not the place to discuss extensively whether the claim of Israel's God is ontological as well as soteriological, a couple of points are in order. N. MacDonald, examining both Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah, argues that the claim of YHWH is primarily soteriological, rather than ontological or metaphysical.¹⁹⁷ Similarly for Bauckham the "essential element" in Jewish monotheism is not that it denies the possible ontological existence of other divine beings but rather that YHWH is unique and is in a "class of his own" and in a "wholly different class" from any other gods.¹⁹⁸ This uniqueness of being is to be reflected by exclusive allegiance and worship. This is also the likely meaning of the *Shema*. While the Hebrew of Deut 6:4 can be variously rendered in English, it is clear that the יהוה is predicated in some sense to YHWH. This means either that YHWH is our God alone (stating something about the particular relationship between this God and his people) or that God is one (stating something about the being of this God himself).¹⁹⁹ W. Moberly points out that the 'oneness' of the 'shema yisrael' is best elucidated by reference to Song 6:8-9 where the אחד means 'one and only' in the sense of 'unique' rather than suggesting the nonexistence of other lovers. What is described is the utter devotion to this one. This, Moberly argues, is also the primary sense of the *Shema*, which demands exclusive devotion to this God alone, rather than commenting on the ontological state of other divinities.²⁰⁰ For N.T. Wright, Jewish monotheism, and especially the *Shema*, had nothing "to do with numerical analysis of the inner being of Israel's God himself"

195. Bauckham, Richard, "The 'Most High' God and the Nature of Early Jewish Monotheism," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008f), 109. See also Bauckham, Richard, "Biblical Theology and the Problems of Monotheism," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008a), 84.

196. Hurtado, (1998a), 23. See also Bauckham, (2008f), 108-109. Bauckham, Richard, "Paul's Christology of Divine Identity," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008e), 182-185. Bauckham, (2008b), 3.

197. MacDonald, Nathan, "Monotheism and Isaiah," in *Interpreting Isaiah: Issues and Approaches*. Eds. David G. Firth and H.G.M. Williamson (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2009), 59. MacDonald, (2003), 122-123, 215. See also Moberly, R.W.L., *Old Testament Theology: Reading the Hebrew Bible as Christian Scripture*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 18-24, 33-35.

198. Bauckham, (2008a), 86-87.

199. Moberly, (2013), 9-10.

200. Moberly, R.W.L., "How Appropriate is 'Monotheism' as a Category for Biblical Interpretation?," in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Eds. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 228. Moberly, (2013), 18-20, 33-35. Moberly, R.W.L., "Toward an Interpretation of the Shema," in *Theological Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs*. Eds. Christopher Seitz and Kathryn Greene-McCreight (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 132-133. Also Mauser, (1998), 101. Mauser, Ulrich, "One God Alone: A Pillar of Biblical Theology" *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 12/3 (1991), 257-258, 262.

and states there were speculations "that the divine being might encompass a plurality".²⁰¹ He argues that it was only after the emergence of Christianity and in a polemical reaction to it, that 'monotheism' was reinterpreted as "the numerical oneness of the divine being".²⁰²

Referring to such 'exclusive monotheism' as noted above, R. Bauckham notes that "[t]his is the kind of Jewish reading of the Jewish Scriptures that the New Testament seems everywhere to presuppose"²⁰³ and that the NT authors' "christological innovations proceed on the basis of this presupposed monotheism, and they do not intend to depart from it."²⁰⁴ One must therefore ask how and why Jesus came to be thought of as divine, and how this affected their view of God or their 'exclusive monotheism'. But it seems that while their monotheism was exclusive, this exclusiveness was not perceived as an insurmountable obstacle by the NT writers.²⁰⁵ For Hurtado, the inclusion of Jesus in religious practice or cultic worship, which ordinarily was exclusive to God, was a 'mutation' or 'innovation' of Jewish monotheism,²⁰⁶ which he terms 'binitarian'. This development is for Hurtado not a break with, but rather a "redefinition of, Jewish monotheistic devotion".²⁰⁷ Bauckham on the other hand argues that just as 'word' and 'wisdom' do not infringe on 'standard monotheism' and are "intrinsic to the unique divine identity".²⁰⁸ Jesus is *included within* the divine identity, in such a way that 'monotheism', even 'strict monotheism', remains intact.²⁰⁹ He calls this "*christological* monotheism."²¹⁰ While there are important differences between Hurtado and Bauckham, they do have this central point in common; that Jewish monotheism could stretch to include Jesus without breaking.

Thus to include someone in the reference of 'God' must be understood in reference to this one God and not simply sharing a vague 'divinity'.²¹¹ For as Meye Thompson writes, "because Judaism is monotheistic, there is no 'divine essence' that God may

201. Wright, (1992), 259. See also Feldmeier, Reinhard, "'Ein Gott und Vater aller'. Exegetische Beobachtungen zum neutestamentlichen Monotheismus" *Early Christianity* 1/2 (2010), 201.

202. Wright, (1992), 259.

203. Bauckham, (2008a), 84.

204. Bauckham, (2008a), 95.

205. Bauckham, (2008b), 19.

206. Hurtado, (1998a), 24. Hurtado, (1998b), 99ff.

207. Hurtado, (1998b), 100. See also Bauckham's description of Hurtado's position. Bauckham, (2015), 179.

208. Bauckham, (2008b), 16-17.

209. Bauckham, (2008e), 182-185. Bauckham, (2008f), 107-109.

210. Bauckham, (2008e), 185. Bauckham, (2008b), 19.

211. Meye Thompson, Marianne, *The God of the Gospel of John*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 42. Boring, M. Eugene, "Markan Christology: God-Language for Jesus?" *NTS* 45/4 (1999), 458.

share with another."²¹² Therefore, divine attributes belong to God, not to 'divinity', and thus "[i]f 'divinity' or 'divine status' is predicated of a figure, it will necessarily imply a relationship to the one God."²¹³ It is therefore critical that Jesus in Mark is not simply called 'god' or 'divine', but specifically takes the role and name of YHWH and thus shares in the identity of YHWH. Thus as S. Gathercole rightly points out, the "discussion of 'divinity' in the NT should not be dealt with *in abstracto* but concretely in relation to the portrayal of YHWH, the one God of Israel."²¹⁴

What will be argued for more extensively below is that in Mark's Gospel there is not only a 'redefinition' of the nature of monotheism, but even a redefinition - or better: a new revelation - of the true identity of God himself. But for the author of Mark to include Jesus within the divine identity is not a violation of Jewish and OT monotheism. J. Schröter rightly states that 'high Christology' was "not a departure from, but a specific development of Jewish monotheism."²¹⁵ The fact that scriptural passages are appealed to - such as Isa 40:3 in Mark 1:3 - suggests that the author saw "an unbroken sense of continuity between the God of Israel and the God worshipped by Christians."²¹⁶ However, for Jesus' opponents the boundaries of monotheism have clearly been crossed when Jesus claims to forgive sins and affirms his divine sonship, and hence they accuse him of blasphemy in 2:7 and 14:61-62.

But is it possible that Mark, the earliest Gospel, would have such a high Christology that Jesus the Messiah is included within the identity of YHWH? M. Hengel argued that a "high Christology" was certainly noticeable within the very first decades of the Christian movement, and even likely prior to Paul's conversion, probably in the 40s and only a few years after the death of Jesus.²¹⁷ In the same vein Bauckham argues that "the earliest Christology was already *in nuce* the highest Christology."²¹⁸ In fact,

212. Meye Thompson, (2001), 47. Cf. 17-19. Boring, (1999), 456-457.

213. Meye Thompson, (2001), 47-48.

214. Gathercole, Simon, "The Trinity in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Eds. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 57. Emphasis original.

215. Schröter, Jens, "Trinitarian Belief, Binitarian Monotheism, and the One God: Reflections on the Origin of Christian Faith in Affiliation to Larry Hurtado's Christological Approach," in *Reflections on the Early Christian History of Religion/Erwägungen zur frühchristlichen Religionsgeschichte*. Eds. Cilliers Breytenbach and Jörg Frey (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 175.

216. Childs, (1970), 205.

217. Hengel, Martin, *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*. (London: SCM, 1983), 31. Though here it excludes preexistence and sending, p.46. Also Hengel, Martin, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish Hellenistic Religion*. (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007), 2, 89. Also Chester, Andrew, "High Christology - Whence, When and Why?" *Early Christianity* 2/1 (2011), 25, 42-43. Eckstein, Hans-Joachim, "Die Anfänge trinitarischer Rede von Gott im Neuen Testament: Jürgen Moltmann 80. Geburtstag," in *Der Lebendige Gott: Auf dem Spuren neueren trinitarischen Denkens*. Ed. Rudolf Wert (Neukirchener: Neukirchener Verlag, 2005), 43. Hurtado, (2003), 136.

218. Bauckham, (2008e), 184. Bauckham also writes: "The earliest Christology was already the highest Christology." Bauckham, Richard, "Introduction," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other*

he contends that this "highest possible Christology - the inclusion of Jesus in the unique divine identity - was central to the faith of the early church even before any of the NT writings were written".²¹⁹ Thus C.F.D. Moule was right in criticising the 'evolutionary' model for the development of early Christology, for it implies a mutation (in this context with import from hellenistic ideas) to a new species. Moule correctly stressed that the development of early Christology is merely "articulating" and "drawing out" what was in the text all along.²²⁰ However, the process, which Moule calls 'developmental' is better described by Hurtado as "more like a volcanic eruption".²²¹ This position, termed Early High Christology (in a Jewish context), is according to A. Chester now a "clear (though not unanimous) scholarly consensus".²²² While the precise dating may be arguable, it is certain that a "high Christology" was common in at least some early Christian circles, especially Paul, long before the writing of Mark's Gospel. One can, therefore, not argue on the basis of chronology that Mark; being the earliest Gospel has the 'lowest' Christology.

(b) God's Narrative Identity

It was argued above that the *Shema* is first of all soteriological, which however does not necessarily exclude ontological implications. Similarly when Jesus is presented in Mark, the author shows no interest in an ontology/function division. This Gospel is not a christological treatise, but rather the identity of Jesus is presented in narrative form.²²³ This entails that the person of Jesus Christ is known first and foremost by his actions, both verbal and non-verbal, as well as by the actions of others in relation to him.²²⁴ E.S. Malbon helpfully highlights the distinction between 'telling' and

Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity. Ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008d), x. Also Hengel, Martin, "Christological Titles in Early Christianity," in *Studies in Early Christology*. Ed. Martin Hengel (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 383, 389.

219. Bauckham, (2008b), 19.

220. Moule, C.F.D., *The Origin of Christology*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 2-4, 22-23.

221. Hurtado, Larry W., *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God: Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 25.

222. Chester, (2011), 38. Also acknowledged by Bauckham, (2015), 176 and Fletcher-Louis, Crispin, *Jesus Monotheism: Christological Origins. The Emerging Consensus and Beyond*. Vol. 1. (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2015), 3-4. Proponents of 'Early High Christology' include L. Hurtado, R. Bauckham, W. Horbury, A. Yarbro and John J. Collins, and A. Chester with the critical influence of Martin Hengel. This is in contrast to the positions of James Dunn, Maurice Casey and Geza Vermes. Later Chester writes "it is clear that although there is and will continue to be real and deep divergence in the accounts we are given of when very high (or divine) Christology emerged, and in what setting, there is in fact a substantial consensus for seeing it as very early and from within a Jewish context." Chester, (2011), 50.

223. France, (2002), 27.

224. See also Tannehill, (1979), 58. Malbon, Elizabeth S., "Narrative Criticism: How Does the Story Mean?," in *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. 2nd edition. Eds. Janice C. Anderson and Stephen D. Moore (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008), 34-35.

'showing': 'telling' involves explicit description by the narrator while all else is 'showing'.²²⁵ She argues that Mark's narrator relies more on the latter. For example, rather than saying that 'Jesus was a great teacher', Mark shows that people were amazed at his teaching.²²⁶

In Mark Jesus is also not simply defined by the titles used for him, by what L. Keck criticised as the "palaeontology of christological titles", which is the reconstruction of the history the titles as definitive for who Jesus is.²²⁷ Rather it is Jesus who defines the true meaning of any title used of him.²²⁸ C.K. Rowe, in discussing the title *kyrios* in Luke's Gospel, rightly argues that the title does not have an independent meaning apart from Jesus and which later is applied to him; rather the meaning of the title is bound up with who Jesus is.²²⁹ However, this is not tantamount to saying the titles, or the OT text associated with them, are of no importance for else the titles would all have identical meanings.²³⁰ If an author privileges a particular title in relation to Jesus, the interpreter would be right in paying special attention to it.²³¹

A foundational position of this thesis is what Hans W. Frei calls the "intention-action description" of identity; that 'being' is constituted by 'action'.²³² For Frei there is no use in separating "*what* one is" from "*that* one is" (emphasis mine). Frei argues that, "it is perfectly proper to describe what a person *is* by what he *does*, and *who* he is by what he is and does."²³³ Later he adds, "[a] person's identity is known to us in the inseparability of who he was and what he did."²³⁴ Thus what a person does cannot be separated from what he is, nor can what a person is be disconnected from what one does.²³⁵

225. Malbon, (2008), 34-35. See also Keck, Leander E., "Christology of the New Testament: What, Then, is New Testament Christology?," in *Who do You Say that I am? Essays on Christology*. Eds. Mark Allen Powell and David R. Bauer (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999), 186.

226. Malbon, (2009), 125.

227. Keck, Leander E., "Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology" *NTS* 32/3 (1986), 368. Also Keck, (1999), 196. An example is Cullmann, (1959).

228. See also Cook, Michael L., *Christology as Narrative Quest*. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 76. Boring, M. Eugene, "The Christology of Mark: Hermeneutical Issues for Systematic Theology" *Semeia* 30 (1984), 131.

229. Rowe, C. Kevin, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), ix.

230. As it seems in Boring's article. Boring, (1984), 132.

231. See e.g. C.K. Rowe who otherwise agrees with Keck. Rowe, (2009), 23-24.

232. Frei, Hans W., *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology*. (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1997), 18.

233. Frei, (1997), 18. Emphasis original. See also 19, 136.

234. Frei, (1997), 30.

235. Henrichs-Tarasenkova has argued that in the ancient Greek, Roman and Jewish contexts, personal identity was bound to personal relations and functions. Henrichs-Tarasenkova, Nina, *Luke's Christology of Divine Identity*. LNTS. 543. (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 74-80.

Frei argues also that in describing Christ's identity, one must "observe the story itself - its structure, the shape of its movement, and its crucial transitions."²³⁶ For "his identity is grasped only by means of the story told about him."²³⁷ His identity cannot be given independently from the story.²³⁸ 'Identity' is dynamic, rather than 'fixed' or 'static', and as argued above, the titles of Jesus cannot be abstracted from the narrative. Identity cannot be extracted from a person's story, for as C.K. Rowe notes, identity "is inextricably bound to narration."²³⁹ P. Ricoeur is thus right in saying concerning Mark: "It is in narrating that he interprets the identity of Jesus."²⁴⁰ The 'narrative identity' emerges by means of the interplay between 'plot' and 'character development'²⁴¹ (i.e. story and action) and one needs to be careful not to separate Jesus' 'identity' from his 'actions'.²⁴² The fact that the Gospels are narratives that focus on the life and actions of a person, justifies the application of this conception to Mark. Hence in Mark it is no use to ask who Jesus *is* apart from what he *does*, for there is in Mark no difference between who Jesus is and what he does. As Bauckham writes: "Who he is and what he does are, in this Gospel, inseparable. What he does reveals who he is, and who he is entails what he does."²⁴³ He is the Messiah and Son of God who brings present the reign of God.

Likewise the identity of God, who God is, is related to what God says and does, rather than 'what' God is, in terms of 'essence' or 'nature'.²⁴⁴ In short, God reveals himself through his actions. Bauckham thus rightly resists the extra-biblical terms 'divine nature' or 'divine essence', and while he acknowledges that he introduces his own extra-biblical terminology, that of 'identity', this term is more suitable to the subject matter of the text, exactly for the reasons noted above: that identity is determined by action (and also relation as seen below). As Bauckham writes, "for the

236. Frei, (1997), 133.

237. Frei, (1997), 133.

238. Frei, (1997), 135.

239. Rowe, (2009), ix, 17-19.

240. Ricoeur, Paul, "Interpretive Narrative," in *Figuring the Sacred: Religion, Narrative, and Imagination*. Ed. Mark I. Wallace (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 185.

241. Ricoeur, (1995), 185.

242. As warned by Malbon, Elizabeth S., "The Christology of Mark's Gospel: Narrative Christology and the Markan Jesus," in *Who do You Say that I am? Essays on Christology*. Eds. Mark Allen Powell and David R. Bauer (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999), 34.

243. Bauckham, Richard, "God's Self-Identification with the Godforsaken in the Gospel of Mark," in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008c), 262. Also Bauckham, Richard, "Christology," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. 2nd edition. Eds. Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown and Nicholas Perrin (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2013), 125.

244. Bauckham, (2008b), 6-7. Also Hooker, Morna D., "Chalcedon and the New Testament," in *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine: Essays in Honour of Maurice Wiles*. Eds. Sarah Coakley and David A. Pailin (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 87.

Jewish religious tradition in general, what is primary is not what God is, or what divinity is (divine nature or essence), but *who God is, who YHWH the God of Israel is*.²⁴⁵ The word 'god' (אֱלֹהִים/θεός) is open to abstraction, polytheism, and idolatry, while YHWH is the self-revelation of God and is at the centre of the OT.²⁴⁶ Therefore, YHWH is not Marduk or any other god, for there is a narrative, involving both actions and relation, that determine who YHWH is known to be.²⁴⁷ The answer to this 'who' question is provided in the narrative action of this Gospel. Mark endeavours to show God, not by a list of attributes, but as an agent in the story.²⁴⁸ Rowe has pointed to the difficulty, even impossibility, of comparing rival traditions such as the Christian and the Stoic, including their idea of 'god'. He argues that scholars have often compared the Christian and Stoic ideas of 'god' (θεός) as if they have an overlapping meaning.²⁴⁹ On the contrary he concludes that "God does not mean anything like the same thing for the Christians and the Stoics".²⁵⁰ A comparison is impossible precisely because each tradition presupposes completely different stories.²⁵¹

But before considering the dynamic identity of God through his actions, there is another aspect that also needs to be drawn in; that of *relation*. *Relation* is also a critical component of the identity of God, for all his actions are done in relation to someone or something. L. Keck sought the renewal of a New Testament Christology that had been more concerned with the history of christological ideas and titles than with the subject-matter of the text itself. He proposed that the way forward is to understand Jesus 'in relation'; to God, creation, and humanity, for the character of New Testament Christology is relational.²⁵² It is especially Jesus' relation to God that is important in this context, for as emphasised by Keck, "the religious and theological significance of Jesus emerges only when one reflects on this event in relation to God,

245. Bauckham, (2008g), 154. Emphasis original.

246. Seitz, Christopher R., *Figured Out: Typology and Providence in Christian Scripture*. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001), 138.

247. See e.g. Seitz, Christopher R., *Word without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Witness*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 253. M.J. Steussy gives a narrative portrayal of God in 1 Samuel by examining God's actions/inactions and his attitudes. Steussy, Marti J., *Samuel and His God*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. (Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 2010), 48ff.

248. Driggers, (2007), 11.

249. Rowe, C. Kevin, *One True Life: The Stoics and Early Christians as Rival Traditions*. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016), 227.

250. Rowe, (2016), 228. See also 209, 223-224. See also the caution by Sandmel, Samuel, "Parallelomania" *JBL* 81/1 (1962)

251. Rowe, (2016), 206ff.

252. Keck, (1986), 362-363, 370-373. However, Keck's proposal was not completely new, for in 1976 it was supported by Moule, C.F.D., "The New Testament and the Doctrine of the Trinity: A Short Report on an Old Theme" *ExpTim* 88 (1976), 19.

world and the human condition and its resolution".²⁵³ Elsewhere he wrote that Christology "never concerns Christ alone, like a Kantian *Ding an sich*, but always understands him in specific relationships or correlations."²⁵⁴ What is needed, therefore, in examining Jesus and God is an emphasis on both their relationality and actions.

The terminology of 'high Christology' was used above for convenience, however Wesley A. Hill has rightly questioned the usefulness of the terms 'high' or 'low' christology and the conceptuality it assumes.²⁵⁵ In this framework God/Father is the fixed point on a vertical axis, and the question is then as to how high or low one places Jesus/Son in relation to God or angelic intermediaries. Hill rather wants to reframe this discussion in *relational* terms, referring to scholars such as L. Keck, C.K. Rowe, N. Dahl and F. Watson who advocate relational language.²⁵⁶ Similarly Dahl states that "according to the New Testament, God the Father, Jesus Christ, and (less clearly) the Holy Spirit each have a discrete identity, and yet none of the three can be described adequately unless the *interrelationship* among them is taken into account."²⁵⁷ A discussion of Jesus necessitates discussion also of God and the Holy Spirit, and to speak of the Spirit one must speak of both Christ and God.²⁵⁸

In the OT the revelation of the divine name is closely connected with the אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה ('I am who I am' or 'I will be who I will be'), which itself is closely connected to God's acts of deliverance from Egypt. Referring to Exod 3:14 Seitz comments that, "we are not learning something about God's substance or essence but something about a personal identity and history he is about to make good on at Sea and Sinai."²⁵⁹ But here lies also an important caveat. The God who becomes known as the God who led the people out of Egypt, was not always identified in this way. In exactly this same narrative, God introduces himself from the bush to Moses as the God of the fathers; of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exod 3:6), an identity apparently forgotten by the sons of Israel (Exod 3:13). God now reveals his personal name YHWH. He is from now on identified by this name as well as by his action of bringing the people

253. Keck, (1986), 372.

254. Keck, (1999), 193. Quote also cited in Rowe, (2009), 21. See also Guttenberger, (2004), 19.

255. See his discussion in Hill, Wesley, *Paul and the Trinity: Persons, Relations, and the Pauline Letters*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 25-30.

256. Hill, (2015), 1-3, 24-25.

257. Dahl, Nils A., "Trinitarian Baptismal Creeds and New Testament Christology," in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*. Ed. Donald H. Juel (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991b), 181. Emphasis mine.

258. Dahl, (1991b), 180.

259. Seitz, (2001), 140.

out of Egypt (Deut 6:20-25, 26:5-9, Josh 24:2-13). Hence, God does not forfeit the identification in relation to the fathers, which is twice referred to in these verses יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵינוּ יְצָחָק וְיַעֲקֹב.²⁶⁰ Knowing God through his actions is not at odds with knowing him through his relations, but concomitant with it.

There is in the OT a modification in the way God is known; as the 'God of the fathers', as the 'God of Israel' and as YHWH. This demonstrates that God is identified through action and relation, for although the God referred to is identical, the knowledge of him is not. For Moberly, Genesis is the 'Old Testament' prior to Moses and the Exodus.²⁶¹ He argues that the 'God of the fathers' becomes known to his people as YHWH only with Moses (Exod 3) and that the name of YHWH was previously unknown.²⁶² This explains why Moses is instructed to say that the "God of your fathers" has sent him²⁶³ and why the name YHWH is yet unknown to the Israelites (Exod 3:13). But now God will be known by both designations (Exod 3:15).²⁶⁴ For Seitz, however, the people of Israel knew God as YHWH while Moses did not.²⁶⁵ For Seitz the issue in Exodus 6 is not the knowledge of the name as such, but that God was only truly revealed through the exodus event.²⁶⁶ While these differences between Moberly and Seitz are important and cannot presently be resolved, they do agree on the main point that there is a distinction between the patriarchs' and Moses' knowledge of God.²⁶⁷

God reveals himself in actions, and salvation-historical actions in particular. Moberly writes, "[t]heologically, it poses the question of continuity and difference within the self-revelation of the one God, and of the legitimacy of different modes of knowledge of God in different contexts."²⁶⁸ By this he explicitly means that this *modus operandi* does not cease in the NT, and that God's revelation in the NT supposes a similar development of the knowledge of God in the New. Moberly writes, "the relationship of patriarchal religion in Genesis 12-50 to Mosaic Yahwism in Exodus onward is analogous to the relationship of the Old Testament as a whole to

260. Exod 3:15-16. See also 6:2-8, Deut 4:1, Ezra 8:28, 10:11, Mark 12:26, Luke 20:37, Acts 3:13, Matt 22:32.

261. See e.g. Seitz, (1998), 231-232.

262. Moberly, R.W.L., *The Old Testament of the Old Testament: Patriarchal Narratives and Mosaic Yahwism*. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 12, 20.

263. Moberly, (1992), 21, 24.

264. Moberly, (1992), 19.

265. Seitz, (1998), 237.

266. Seitz, (1998), 243.

267. Seitz, (1998), 247n18.

268. Moberly, (2004), 227.

the New Testament."²⁶⁹ In a similar way Robert Jenson says that "[a]sked who God is, Israel's answer is, 'Whoever rescued us from Egypt.'"²⁷⁰ And "[t]o the question 'Who is God?' the New Testament has one new descriptively identifying answer: 'Whoever raised Jesus from the dead.'"²⁷¹ The latter does not replace the former. Therefore, as R. Bauckham also argues, "a new narrative of God's acts becomes definitive of his identity."²⁷² God's acts are an expression of his being, as F. Watson also states: "Divine being and divine action are inseparable from one another, and no distinction is drawn between how God is *in se* and *ad extra*."²⁷³

It was noted that W. Hill argued for the use of relational, as opposed to vertical, terminology. Likewise Hays contends that, "we should stop using the terms 'high' Christology and 'low' Christology to characterize the four canonical Gospels. These very categories presuppose an a priori philosophical account of 'God' that the Gospel narratives contradict."²⁷⁴ This is also the criticism of Hill on Dunn, who understands 'God' as a fixed point. "God remains the one God he has always been, and his further self-revelation in and through Christ does not amount to a redefinition of his identity."²⁷⁵ According to Hill, for Dunn "monotheism remains the larger explanatory category that encloses and thereby determines the character of christology."²⁷⁶ This would necessarily mean to bring into the text a foreign definition of monotheism as a controlling factor, and also supposes that God is a 'known' entity in relation to whom Jesus can either be considered as 'high' or 'low'. However, this is precisely what he is not, at least not fully, for there is need for further revelation of God's identity. This same point is also pointed out by N.T. Wright who states: "The christological question, as to whether the statement 'Jesus is God' is true, and if so in what sense, is often asked as though 'God' were the known and 'Jesus' the unknown; this, I suggest,

269. Moberly, (1992), 126.

270. Jenson, Robert W., *Systematic Theology: The Triune God*. 1. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 44. Also Jenson, Robert W., *The Triune Identity: God According to the Gospel*. (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2002), 3.

271. Jenson, (1997), 44. Also Jenson, (2002), 8. Similarly Watson, Francis, "The Triune Divine Identity: Reflections on Pauline God-Language, in Disagreement with J.D.G. Dunn" *JSNT* 80 (2000), 104, 106-107, 111, 116-117. See also Bauckham, (2008b), 52. Bauckham, (2013), 125. Yeago, David S., "The New Testament and the Nicene Dogma: A Contribution to the Recovery of Theological Exegesis" *Pro Ecclesia* 3/2 (1994), 155.

272. Bauckham, (2008b), 52.

273. Watson, (2000), 105. See also 107, 111, 115-116. Jenson, (1997), 59. Hill, (2015), 52-75. Feldmeier, Reinhard and Hermann Spieckermann, *God of the Living: A Biblical Theology*. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011b), 1.

274. Hays, (2014), 108. See also xxi.

275. Words of Hill. Hill, (2015), 7.

276. Hill, (2015), 71.

is manifestly mistaken. If anything, the matter stands the other way around."²⁷⁷ It is critical to realise that for Mark 'God' is not an altogether known entity.

It is thus 'Christology' that determines the nature of 'monotheism', or better, it is Jesus who reveals the true identity of God. What is important here is that 'God' is not a predetermined entity to which Jesus may be attached. Rather the meaning of 'God' is *redefined* in the light of his actions and his relation to Jesus, God's Son (as well as the Spirit, as will be argued below). The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God of the Exodus, of the prophets and the law, the God of Israel, is now also God the Father of Jesus the Christ Son of God.²⁷⁸

In the Gospel of Mark 'God' is never directly described as the performer of narrative acts, but there are numerous places where the activity of God is implied. Statements such as, 'it is written', 'time is fulfilled', and 'heaven is torn', and other 'divine passives'²⁷⁹ all point to the agency of God in the narrative world of Mark and beyond, which prompted L. Schenke to say: "Der heimliche Hauptakteur im MkEv ist Gott"²⁸⁰ and similarly Feldmeier and Spiekermann to describe God as "[d]er verborgene Hauptakteur im Markusevangelium".²⁸¹ But while God is everywhere presupposed, only twice does he take centre stage as an active agent in this narrative: at the baptism and the transfiguration of Jesus. In both cases God declares, with language from Scripture, that Jesus is his Son, and that he is by implication his Father (1:11, 9:7). This is how the author wants the reader to understand both Jesus and God: one in relation to the other, and with the Son receiving God's Spirit.²⁸² Thus the God of creation (10:6, 13:19), of Scripture (12:26-27) and who is confessed in the *Shema* (12:29-32) is now to be irrevocably linked to his Son, Jesus. The answer to the question of who God is, is provided in a narrative with actions that come to define

277. Wright, (1992), xv. Also Wright, N.T., "Jesus and the Identity of God" *ExAud* 14 (1988). Cited 4 Sep 2017. No Pages. Online: ntwrightpage.com/2016/07/12/jesus-and-the-identity-of-god/

278. E.g. see Feldmeier, (2010), 200.

279. See Jeremias, Joachim, *Neutestamentliche Theologie: Erster Teil. Die Verkündigung Jesu*. (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1971), 20-24. Dalman, Gustaf, *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902), 224-226. Danove, (2005), 36-37. The reason for the use of a passive construction is respect for the divine name. Both Dalman and Jeremias focus on the words of Jesus, which explains the omission of 1:9 in Jeremias' list. While Jeremias list 21 examples Donahue lists 30. Donahue, (1982), 566n15. B. Pascut rightly shows that only a few of these qualify as divine passives. Pascut, Benjamin, "The So-Called Passivum Divinum in Mark's Gospel" *NovT* 54 (2012).

280. Schenke, Ludger, *Das Markusevangelium*. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1988), 87. See also 109. Though he also states that "[d]er wirkliche Hauptakteur des MkEv ist Jesus", 89. See also M.L. Cook who writes: "In an ultimate sense the most important character in Mark's story world is God." Cook, (1997), 96. See also Driggers, (2007), 11.

281. Feldmeier, Reinhard and Hermann Spiekermann, *Der Gott der Lebendigen*. WUNT. 1. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011a), 73.

282. Athanasius. See also Yeago, (1994), 156.

the being of God in relation to the world and his people; and especially to Jesus.²⁸³ As Bauckham writes, Jesus' inclusion in the divine identity is "intrinsic to the identity of the unique God"²⁸⁴ and this "identifies Jesus as intrinsic to who God is."²⁸⁵ And therefore "the inclusion of Jesus in the identity of God means the inclusion in God of the interpersonal relationship between Jesus and his Father."²⁸⁶

An important question is whether this oversteps the boundaries of monotheism. At the trial the high priest thinks 'yes' and cries βλασφημία (14:64) and embodies an understanding of God, which cannot include Jesus. There has been much discussion of what exactly constitutes the blasphemy at the trial; whether it is pronouncing the divine name, claiming to be the Messiah, the Son of God, to sit at God's right hand, or the charge concerning the temple.²⁸⁷ It is clear that blasphemy in this text is not narrowly defined as in the Mishnah (*m. Sanh.* 7.5). Nor is the claim to messiahship blasphemous, though it could be subject to rebuke.²⁸⁸ More likely the blasphemy charge is to be understood in a broader sense. In his *Legatio ad Gaium* (368), Philo says that Gaius became angry when the five-member Jewish delegation, which included Philo himself, refused to comply to "his great desire to be declared a god", which Philo calls blasphemy.²⁸⁹ Philo in *De somniis* (2:130-131) similarly refers to an Egyptian governor who "has dared to compare himself to the all-blessed God". This is also blasphemy.²⁹⁰ In *De decalogo* (61-69) Philo discusses the first commandment and states that one cannot give equal honour to a creature as to God, and he includes "worship those who are our brothers by nature" within his definition of 'blasphemy'.²⁹¹ While for Philo 'blasphemy' includes uttering the Divine Name, it is not restricted to that. In these passages 'blasphemy' is understood as usurping the divine power, which for Jews belonged only to the God of Israel.²⁹² Similarly in *b. Sanh* 38.b R. Jose accuses R. Aqiba of profaning the *Shekinah* by saying that God

283. See also Bauckham, (2008g), 153-154. Bauckham, (2008d), ix-x. Bauckham, (2008b), 6-7.

284. Bauckham, (2008b), 19. See also Watson, (2000), 111-112.

285. Bauckham, (2008b), 31.

286. Bauckham, (2008b), 55.

287. Juel, Donald, *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*. (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 98-101. See the review of Bock, Darrell L., *Blasphemy and Exaltation in Judaism and the Final Examination of Jesus*. WUNT. 106. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 5-29.

288. Marcus, Joel, "Mark 14:61: "Are You the Messiah-Son-of-God?"" *NovT* 31/2 (1989), 127-129.

289. Bock, (1998), 61-62.

290. Bock, (1998), 64.

291. Bock, (1998), 65-66.

292. Collins, Adela Yarbro, "The Charge of Blasphemy in Mark 14:64," in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. Eds. Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 156-160, 165-169. Bock, (1998), 202-205, 209, 236.

has prepared one throne for himself and one for David.²⁹³ If Mark is read in this context, Jesus is rightly accused for appropriating for himself a prerogative of God both when he forgives sins (2:7)²⁹⁴ and at the trial (14:61) where Jesus claims to sit on God's throne and participate in his lordship.²⁹⁵ The high priest's and the pharisees' response demonstrates that their understanding of *God* cannot include Jesus,²⁹⁶ and that in Mark the understanding of 'the God of Scripture' has been expanded to incorporate Jesus, the Messiah Son of God, within the identity of YHWH. Thus ironically it is high priest who has incomplete view of God, for he does not allow that Jesus is the divine Son anointed with the Holy Spirit (Mark 3:22, 28-29)²⁹⁷ and is included within the divine identity.

It was seen above that Mark's starting point for the understanding of God, including the hope for God's coming and reign (Isa 63:19,²⁹⁸ 40:3, Mal 3:1, Dan 2:44, 7:13-14, 22, Ps 2:7) and of his Spirit (42:1), is Scripture (1:2-3, 10:6ff., 12:26-32, 13:19). Thus whatever 'new' Mark may say about God, it is rooted in the OT. But the God of Mark's Gospel is not simply a reproduction of a scriptural or Jewish conception of God.

Mark is careful not to make the move that Marcion later made, to separate the God revealed in Jesus from the creator God of the OT, "insist(ing) that there was an irreconcilable incompatibility between the deity present in the OT and the true God now revealed in Jesus and the gospel."²⁹⁹ What Mark does, however, is to contend that God is only truly known through Jesus the Son of God, which leads to the "the relativization of all previous portrayals of and claims about this God".³⁰⁰ When Donahue contends "there is nothing distinctively new or Christian" about Mark's

293. I owe the reference to Marcus, (1989), 140-141.

294. France, (2002), 126. Hays, (2016), 64-66. Schröter, (2013), 182. Pascut, (2012), 323-326. Contra Malbon who says Jesus merely announces God's forgiveness. Malbon, (2009), 152. G. Guttenberger argues that forgiving sins is the domain of God alone, and that there are no instances of priests verbally declaring sins forgiven. In 2 Sam 12:13 the divine passive is not used and clearly expresses that God is the forgiver. In Lev 4:20 where in contrast the passive is used, there is no human speech connected with it and the person has already brought his appropriate sacrifice. Jesus does not offer a sacrifice, pray, nor does he clearly say that God is the one who forgives, rather in 2:10 it is Jesus, the Son of Man who has the authority to forgive, which is also the understanding of the scribes present and hence they cry 'blasphemy'. Guttenberger, (2004), 292-295, 297.

295. Marcus, (1989), 139-140. Hays, (2016), 60-61.

296. Dunn, James D.G., *Jesus Remembered*. Christianity in the Making. 1. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 787-788.

297. Cf. Mansfield, (1987), 131.

298. There are differences in the versification of this verse and chapter 64. Isa 63:19b-64:11 in the BHS and LXX is in the Vulgate and in English translation 64:1-12. In this thesis the versification of the BHS and LXX is followed.

299. Hurtado, (2010), 31. See also 30-33. Hurtado, (2003), 550.

300. Hurtado, (2010), 33.

picture of God,³⁰¹ he fails to take seriously the intimate relation of God as Father with Jesus as Son and the Spirit's relation to both God and Jesus. Rather, in the words of F. Watson, "[t]raditional Jewish God-language is relocated within a framework in which the word 'God' is misunderstood and misused if it is not always and everywhere accompanied by reference to Jesus and to his Spirit."³⁰²

Jesus' identity as God's Son is a central communicative concern of Mark. Since christological statements are inescapably also *theological* statements,³⁰³ the correlative is that the revelation of the identity of Jesus in the gospel narrative also constitutes the revelation of God. As F. Watson states concerning this close relationship in the Second Gospel, "God's identity is inseparable from Jesus', and the revelation of Jesus' identity is the definitive and unsurpassable revelation of God."³⁰⁴ For what is actually revealed in the narrative is not just Jesus as a person, or even God, but Jesus in relation to God, and God in relation to Jesus. For "[i]n revealing his own Son, God reveals *himself* as Father of the Son".³⁰⁵ But whatever Jesus reveals of God, he reveals not of a generic divine being, but specifically of the God of Israel.

Therefore in Mark, in contrast to Paul as noted by Jenson above, it is not so much the resurrection of Jesus that is the prime action through which God is made known, rather it is specifically God's statements at the baptism and the transfiguration. Hence, to the question 'who is God?' Mark has much to say; God is the God of the *Shema* and of the patriarchs (Mark 12:26-30), but more specifically, God is the one who says to Jesus, 'you are my son'. Here both God and Jesus are identified, one in relation to the other, as Father and Son, with God's own Spirit being upon the Son. Here God and Jesus are brought together in the closest possible relation without merging the two into an indistinguishable oneness. In this relational framework "the purpose of the father/son language is to indicate that God and Jesus are identified by their relation to each other, and have no existence apart from that relation."³⁰⁶

The 'paradox' of Jesus' identity is that he is both limited in his knowing (13:32), pointing to God as only good (10:18), yet takes the role of YHWH in Isa 40:3 and is like YHWH the ruler over the sea and the wind (4:39-41. Ps 89:9, 107:23-32, Isa

301. Donahue, (1982), 566.

302. Watson, (2000), 104-105. While Watson here discusses Paul's view of God, his insights are also relevant and right for Mark's Gospel.

303. Hurtado, (2010), 56.

304. Watson, Francis, *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 85.

305. Watson, (1997), 85.

306. Watson, (2000), 115.

51:9-11).³⁰⁷ In this light, Driggers concludes that "[t]he Gospel presents God and Jesus as two distinct characters while also provocatively blurring the lines between them."³⁰⁸ He points out that this is not only a *christological* paradox, but also a *theological* one, since Jesus is not a second God.³⁰⁹ This tension is easily conveyed by a narrative and because it is narrative the tension need not be resolved. However, if propositional and dogmatic statements are to be made, then extra-Markan, and even extra-biblical words are necessary to encapsulate this paradox; whether *homoousios*, *trinity*, or *perichoresis*. Yeago rightly argues that such language is not "imposed on the New Testament texts, nor distantly deduced *from* the texts, but rather describes a pattern of judgements present *in* the texts, in the texture of scriptural discourse concerning Jesus and the God of Israel."³¹⁰ As Moule also states, the development of early Christology was a matter of "articulating" what is in the text.³¹¹

It is now apparent that the 'high' versus 'low' frame of reference is unsuitable for the narrative of Mark which contains the mutually-constituting view of God as Father and Son. Rather, a trinitarian framework is more satisfactory. To use a trinitarian framework is not necessarily to import the later debates concerning ontology and *perichoresis* unto the present text, but rather it is responding to trinitarian pressure within the text itself, even while insisting on the oneness of God (12:32). To the objection that to speak in trinitarian terms is anachronistic, it must be noted that if the trinitarian conception of God arose from an engagement with the Scriptures, it may well be appropriate to use those categories.³¹² R. Feldmeier and H. Spieckermann therefore rightly argue that "despite its ties to the thought processes of a later period, Trinitarian dogma is not a speculative aberration".³¹³ This is not to compromise 'God', as John R. Donahue warns against,³¹⁴ for in the view of Mark the integrity of God, YHWH, is not at risk when the meaning of θεός has been defined in relation to God's Son and his Spirit.

307. On the latter point see Hays, (2016), 66-69.

308. Driggers, Ira Brent, "God as Healer of Creation in the Gospel of Mark," in *Character Studies and the Gospel of Mark*. Eds. Christopher W. Skinner and Matthew Ryan Hauge (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 88. See also Voelz, (2013), 99, 110-111.

309. Driggers, (2014), 82-89.

310. Yeago, (1994), 153. Emphasis original.

311. Moule, (1977), 2-4, 22-23.

312. Watson, (2000), 123.

313. Feldmeier and Spieckermann, (2011b), 96.

314. Donahue, (1982), 574.

(c) The Opening Citation and the Coming of the Lord

The syntax of the opening verses of Mark is both complex and disputed. There are a number of interrelated issues that need to be resolved before interacting more theologically with it. The first issue is the referent and function of ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [υἱοῦ θεοῦ] in 1:1. Many would see this as the intended title of the book.³¹⁵ But v.1 is not freestanding,³¹⁶ but is closely bound to 1:2-3.³¹⁷ The fact that the narrative action only starts in vv.4ff.,³¹⁸ sets of vv.1-3 as a preamble to the book, as a "Prolog im Prolog",³¹⁹ or as Kampling states, these verses give "der hermeneutische Schlüssel zum markinischen Werk an die Hand".³²⁰ The ἀρχή is neither simply the heading of the prologue, nor the story of John,³²¹ nor refers to the prologue itself.³²² For this to be the case the ἀρχή would be an introduction of a document called εὐαγγέλιον which only later became a term for a type of book.³²³ Neither does 'the beginning of the good news' refer to the initial story of Jesus, and a story which is ongoing and open-ended.³²⁴ The ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ rather refers to the scriptural origins of the 'good news' about Jesus, which was precursed by the promised Elijah/John. This, being the first line of the book, also has the function introducing its subject.³²⁵

R.A. Guelich has demonstrated that the formula καθὼς/ὥς γέγραπται elsewhere in the NT and the LXX, as well as its Hebrew counterpart in the Qumran texts, functions as "a semi-technical introductory formula for a quotation."³²⁶ But the main question is how 1:2-3 relates to 1:1. Again Guelich has argued that καθὼς γέγραπται "never appears at the start of a new sentence when used as an introductory

315. Becker, (2009), 103. Becker calls it an 'inscriptio'. Pilgaard, Aage, *Kommentar til Markusevangeliet*. (Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2008), 49. France, (2002), 50. Collins, (2007), 130-132. Boring, (2006), 29. Pesch, (1976), 74-75. Contra Stein who calls it "the theme verse" of the Gospel. Stein, (2008), 40.

316. France, (2002), 50.

317. This makes the view that 1:2-3 is merely a gloss untenable. There is also no textual evidence that it was ever a gloss. Cranfield, (1959), 39. Hooker, (1991), 55. J.W. Voelz argues that "[t]he reader/hearer should...move somewhat directly from 1:1 to 1:4" and that vv.2-3 provides the 'commentary' to verses 1 and 4. Voelz, (2013), 96-97, 100. E. Boring sees vv.2-3 as disconnected from both v.1 and v.4 and represents an episode that takes place offstage and in the heavenly realm. Boring, (2006), 34-35.

318. See also Becker, (2009), 96, 98.

319. Klauck, (1997), 20. R.H. Gundry also argues that vv.2-3 are to be read with v.1. Gundry, (1993a), 30.

320. Kampling, (1992), 29. See also Delorme, Jean, "Commencement de l'Évangile et commencement de Marc (Marc. 1,1)," in *Gelukkig de Mens: Opstellen over Psalmen, exegese en semiotiek aangeboden aan Nico Tromp*. Ed. Pancratius Cornelis Beentjes (Kampen, NL: Kok Pharos, 1991), 162.

321. Voelz, (2013), 96.

322. Cranfield, (1959), 34-35. Lane, (1974), 42.

323. Boring, (1991), 52.

324. The latter position is advocated by e.g. Boring, (2006), 31. Voelz, (2013), 96.

325. Burridge, (1992), 133-134, 161-162.

326. Guelich, (1982), 6. See also Guelich, (1989), 7. Klauck, (1997), 27-30.

formula."³²⁷ Although Guelich may be too bold in claiming that "the formula and quotation always refer back and never forward in the context",³²⁸ the emphasis on the bond between vv.2-3 and v.1 is nevertheless critical. The καθὼς γέγραπται forms "a bridge between what has preceded and the quotation that follows."³²⁹ This would mean altering the punctuation of the Nestle-Aland text, replacing the period at the end of v.1 with a comma, and likewise replacing the comma at the end of v.3 with a period.³³⁰ The function of καθὼς γέγραπται in 1:2, and the quotation following it, is to point backwards to the opening line of the Gospel as well as forwards to the activity of John in 1:4, interconnecting the two parts that precede and follow it.³³¹ The ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου is therefore found in the prophets, in Isaiah, and in Isaiah 40-66 in particular.³³² Thus the ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου refers not simply to the beginning of this narrative, or simply the preaching of John, nor does the εὐαγγέλιον having its source in this text, for it is already hidden and imbedded in the words now cited. As Focant puts it: "La narration n'absorbe pas l'heureuse annonce, elle est bien plutôt absorbée en elle qui la précède et qui se poursuivra après elle dans la mission des disciples."³³³ It has been spoken of before Jesus, and even before John, for the cited words in 1:2-3 are not set in narrative time.³³⁴

The καθὼς γέγραπται also points to the appearance of John, who prepares the way for the one who is to follow and is the one in whom the process of fulfilment has begun. This is seen by the immediate introduction of John and his ministry, which corresponds to the content of 1:2-3 in that John is the messenger in the desert, preparing the way through his preaching.³³⁵ But the 'beginning' is not John *per se*, though he is the beginning of the fulfilment of the ancient word. This is also confirmed by the temporal μετὰ δὲ in v.14 which states that John's preparatory

327. Guelich, (1982), 6. Emphasis original.

328. Guelich, (1982), 6.

329. Guelich, (1982), 6. Also supported by Marcus, Joel, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 17-18. Marcus, (2000), 142. Kampling, (1992), 25-31.

330. See also Watts, (1997), 55-56. Stein, (2008), 42. Marcus, (2000), 139. Marcus, (1992), 17-18. Dillon, Richard J., "Mark 1:1-15: A 'New Evangelization'?" *CBQ* 76 (2014), 5. Focant, (2003), 311. Focant, (2010), 57-58. Contrary to Lane who says 1-4 is a unit. Lane, (1974), 42.

331. See e.g. Jean Delorme who argues that vv.1-4 is a unit that needs to be considered together, and shows interlinks between vv.1-3 and vv.2-4. Delorme, Jean, "Evangile et récit: La narration évangélique selon Marc," in *Recits et Figures dans la Bible*. Ed. Louis Panier (Lyon: Profac, 1999), 55ff.

332. For instance, Betz writes that the beginning of the gospel is "above all proclaimed beforehand by deuterot-Isaiah". Betz, Otto, "Jesus' Gospel of the Kingdom," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Ed. Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 69. See also France, (2002), 61.

333. Focant, (2003), 312. Focant, (2010), 58. See also Delorme, (1999), 67-68.

334. Delorme, (1991), 164.

335. For a good discussion see Hatina, (2002), 171.

ministry is complete and he is 'handed over' to the authorities. Thus while John prepares the way for the coming of Jesus, there is also a sense that he now, having fulfilled his task, stands in the way, and in Mark it is only after his removal that Jesus steps fully into his messianic ministry.

To label the citation of vv.2-3 as a 'scriptural comment' on v.1³³⁶ is, however, to unduly minimise both the shaping character of Scripture itself and the theological importance of introducing the 'forerunner'. John is introduced with *Καθὼς γέγραπται* and not as a regular person as in Matt 3:1 and Luke 3:1-2.³³⁷ Emphasising the links of vv.2-3 with v.1 shifts the focus away from John and his ministry to a focus on the *εὐαγγέλιον* and God's activity in bringing this to pass through his Son the Messiah. Although the citation initially serves to introduce the character and meaning of John, Mark shows no interest in John as such, but only as far as John is in the service of the one who follows him.³³⁸ Thus, as one would expect with an introductory quotation, it is explicative of the whole narrative rather than the few verses concerning John only.³³⁹ The present beginning of the 'good news' is both the appearance of John, who is the subject of vv.2-8,³⁴⁰ but ultimately its beginning is in the prophecy of Isaiah (and the rest of Scripture). This was noted by Origen who says that 1:2-3 is "showing that the beginning of the gospel is connected with the Jewish writings".³⁴¹ But while the 'gospel' is in Isaiah it is not completely there, for it is only complete with the coming of Jesus as God's Son.³⁴²

It is crucial that the coming of Jesus and his forerunner not be detached from the actions and promises of God recorded in Scripture, but are rather deeply rooted in them. As Watts states concerning the usage of this citation: "the emphasis seems not to have been on the figure of the forerunner but instead on the coming of the eschatological deliverance he heralds; namely, Yahweh's coming himself."³⁴³ The very purpose of John's ministry is to shift the focus to the 'coming one'. Thus the composite citation certainly introduces John as the 'preparer of the way', but at the

336. France, (2002), 50.

337. Focant, (2010), 62.

338. Kampling, (1992), 37-38. In contrast Gundry stresses Mark's emphasis on the role of John in vv.1-8. Gundry, (1993a), 30-31.

339. Watts, (1997), 58.

340. Hooker, (1991), 55. Witherington, (2001), 70-71.

341. *Contra Celsum* 2:4. δεικνὺς ὅτι ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἀρχὴ τῶν ἰουδαϊκῶν γραμμάτων ἤρτηται. English translation from Chadwick, Henry, *Origen: Contra Celsum*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953)

342. See also Moyise, (1998), 156.

343. Watts, (1997), 84. Also Marcus, (1992), 29ff. Hooker, (1983), 8.

same time it subordinates him to the one for whom he 'prepares the way'.³⁴⁴ The content statement of the book also alludes to this fact. The fact that the genitive construction is used in Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ instead of a more specific prepositional phrase makes the clause more open to interpretation, and it is likely that it is to be taken both as an objective and subjective genitive.³⁴⁵ This Gospel is simultaneously about and from Jesus.

The opening citation is important for the theology of Mark's Gospel. What is first of interest is which texts are cited and how Mark has understood them and employed them for his own interpretive purposes. That this is a citation is clear by the introductory formula Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφῆτῃ and the closeness of language to Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3. Although Mark has attributed the words of 1:2-3 to Isaiah the prophet, it is well known that only the second part is Isaianic. This is clearly a composite citation. The text reads: v2) ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου· v3) φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ. Verse 3 is identical to the LXX Isa 40:3 except for the last word. The Markan τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ is in the LXX τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν,³⁴⁶ which is equivalent to the MT וַיַּיָּחֲזֵק לְאֵלֹהֵינוּ. It is clear that in this text the one for whom the way is prepared is the κύριος/θεός ἡμῶν (LXX) and וַיַּיָּחֲזֵק/יהוה (MT). The first half of Mark's composite citation is from elsewhere in the biblical corpus. For example, M. Hooker suggests that the ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου stems from Exod 23:20 (LXX), while the ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου is from the Hebrew of Mal 3:1.³⁴⁷ But as A. Yarbro Collins points out, while the wording is closer to Exod 23:20 the context is closer to Mal 3:1 and it thus seems that the latter is in view by Mark.³⁴⁸ Whether Mark was responsible for bringing these scriptural references together, the ascription to Isaiah is not an error, but is intentional and done for theological reasons; indicating that the following text, the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God, should be understood in the context of the promises of Isaiah in particular, especially the

344. Watts, (1997), 58-59.

345. Boring, (2006), 30. Dormeyer, Detlev, "Mk 1,1-15 als Prolog des ersten idealbiographischen Evangeliums von Jesus Christus" *Biblical Interpretation* 5/2 (1997), 182. Cranfield, (1959), 36. France, (2002), 53. Hooker, (1991), 34. Rose, (2007), 81.

346. The fact that θεοῦ ἡμῶν is in Mark 1:3 replaced by αὐτοῦ does not mean Jesus is any less identified with God. Hays, (2016), 64.

347. Hooker, (1991), 35. Also Marcus, (1992), 13-17. These two verses are linked in the OT, being strikingly similar in the MT. The latter is likely to be a reworking of the former. Watts, (1997), 71. Many consider both Exod 23:20 and Mal 3:1 to be in view in Mk 1:2. E.g. Boring, (2006), 35. Witherington, (2001), 71. Watts, (1997), 62-67. Hatina, (2002), 138ff.

348. Collins, (2007), 135-136.

hope of God's return to Zion.³⁴⁹ But not Isaiah alone, for in Mal 3:1 the מַלְאָךְ will appear to prepare a way before the coming of YHWH.³⁵⁰

The phenomena of composite citations is not limited to the Christian use of the OT, but also occurs in both Jewish³⁵¹ and Greek³⁵² texts from this era. In analysing the phenomena of composite citations, Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn have provided a helpful definition, and they argue that for a citation to be a *composite citation*, two or more texts must be fused together without a conjunction (e.g. καί), and it requires a 'citation marker', such as a 'citation formula', which only explicitly indicates one source. With these criteria, Mark 1:2-3 is a composite citation.³⁵³ In the conclusion to the same volume, C.D. Stanley summarises that the "perhaps most common reason for creating composite citations was to support or advance the quoting author's argument."³⁵⁴ But on what basis were these links created, beyond theological expedience? Stanley states that texts are linked because they "share common language or ideas."³⁵⁵ Stanley states that sometimes, though not always, the literary context of the source text is presumed.³⁵⁶ The use of the composite citation in Mark certainly advances his own argument, though not against the grain of the texts themselves. As noted already, these two texts cited in Mark 1:2-3 have a common theme: the coming of YHWH.

349. Hays, (2016), 21. Marcus, (1992), 16-17. Though Snodgrass suggests that Mal 3:1 was itself influenced by Isa 40:3. Snodgrass, Klyne R., "Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and Their Adaptation in the New Testament" *JSNT* 9 (1980), 25.

350. The warning of Hatina that the original context of the scriptural verses must not overrun the present context is important. It will however be shown here that these two context are not contradictory but coalesce. Hatina, (2002), 153-183. The 'way of the Lord' has more to do with the Lord's own return to Zion, than with an ethical way. Marcus, (1992), 29-33. Some scholars identify the מַלְאָךְ of Exod 23:20 with YHWH himself, or as an embodiment of YHWH's presence because YHWH's name is on him. Mark may also have made this connection. Watts, (1997), 69. Owen, Paul, "Jesus as God's Chief Agent in Mark's Christology," in *Mark, Manuscripts, and Monotheism: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado*. Eds. Chris Keith and Dieter T. Roth (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 42-43.

351. See e.g. Allen, Garrick V., "Composite Citations in Jewish Pseudepigraphic Works: Re-Presenting Legal Traditions in the Second Temple Period," in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. Eds. Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn (London: Bloomsbury, 2016)

352. See e.g. Adams, Sean A., "Greek Education and Composite Citations of Homer," in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. Eds. Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn (London: Bloomsbury, 2016)

353. Adams, Sean A. and Seth M. Ehorn, "What is a Composite Citation? An Introduction," in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. Eds. Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 3-4. It is also insufficient to attribute a mixed citation to a *testimonia* or a faulty memory. Nor is it a uniquely Christian or Jewish phenomena. Pp.9-12.

354. Stanley, Christopher D., "Composite Citations: Retrospect and Prospect," in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. Eds. Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 207.

355. Stanley, (2016), 206.

356. Stanley, (2016), 207.

Mark 1:2 is also a so-called 'direct speech citation', a type which is also frequent in the rest of Mark,³⁵⁷ the NT, and in Jewish literature as a whole. Alexander Samely has analysed the translation method of direct speeches in the Pentateuch Targum and argues that the *meturgeman* frequently specifies or clarifies the *who* of the text, both in terms of who speaks and who is addressed.³⁵⁸ For instance, in Ps 42:3 "[w]here is your God" is in the *L.A.B.* placed in the mouth of Penninah who rails against Hannah (*L.A.B.* 50:5).³⁵⁹ Such transpositions also occur in Mark. S. Docherty, who applies Samely's analysis to her own discussion on the use of the OT in the Letter to the Hebrews, shows that these 'direct speech citations' show the perceived continual relevance of Scripture for both the author and the reader and this "intensifies the immediacy of the divine address".³⁶⁰ The God who speaks in the Scriptures is the same who speaks today. In Docherty's own words:

the underlying assumption is that the full significance of these speeches was not confined to the single situation in which they were first uttered. The fact that they are scriptural words – and so ultimately divine communication – makes them suitable for continuous re-application to other appropriate speakers, and particularly for the New Testament authors, to Christ.³⁶¹

The speaker of the scriptural words of Mark 1:2-3 is YHWH,³⁶² but while the words of v.2 are addressed to Jesus, v.3 is a description of John and his message.³⁶³ In Malachi 3:1 YHWH says he will send his messenger before he himself will come to his temple. The messenger of 3:1-2 appears to be identified with the coming Elijah (3:23-24 [4:5-6]), and the one to follow is God himself.³⁶⁴ But in the citation of Mark 1:2 the messenger precedes the arrival of the addressee. Thus according to Mark, the promise of YHWH's own return to his temple is fulfilled in and through Jesus. While the way is said to be prepared for the addressee of 1:2, in v.3 the way is prepared for YHWH. Thus the 'you' and the 'Lord' in Mark 1:2-3 refer to the same figure, which

357. 1:11, 7:6b-7, 11:17, 12:26, 12:36, 14:27.

358. Samely, Alexander, *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targum Exegesis*. TSAJ. 27. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 9-19.

359. Docherty, Susan E., *Use of Scripture in the New Testament and the 'Rewritten Bible' Texts: Some Exegetical Comparisons*. BNTC. Plenary Session 1. 2015b), 14.

360. Docherty, (2015b), 11, 14.

361. Docherty, (2015b), 21.

362. Danove, (2001), 14.

363. Contra Hatina who says it is addressed to John Hatina, (2002), 150.

364. S. Grindheim rightly argues that Elijah was to precede God himself, rather than the Messiah. Grindheim, Sigurd, *Christology in the Synoptic Gospels: God or God's Servant?* (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 98. Grindheim, Sigurd, *God's Equal: What Can We Know About Jesus' Self-Understanding*. LNTS. 446. (London: Bloomsbury, 2011), 53-59.

in the context of the prologue and the wider narrative is shown to be Jesus. This means that Jesus is identified with the coming יהוה of Isa 40:3³⁶⁵ and Mal 3:1.

While J. Marcus sees a strong relationship between Jesus and the *kyrios*/YHWH, he shies away from seeing this as an identification.³⁶⁶ But if Jesus' coming constitutes the arrival of God's kingdom and even of God himself, then it would be more accurate to state that Jesus is indeed identified with YHWH.³⁶⁷ S. Grindheim is right in noting that this puts Jesus "on the same level as God the Father".³⁶⁸ However, in Mark's theology Jesus does not replace the Lord in heaven, for the speaker is differentiated from the addressee in v.2, and also when Jesus is in the Jordan river the voice still comes 'from heaven'. As Hays contends, while Jesus is the "*embodied presence of the God of Israel*"³⁶⁹ there is no "simple undifferentiated equivalence between Jesus and the God of Israel".³⁷⁰ Jesus is not fully identified with YHWH in the sense that YHWH is replaced by Jesus, though Jesus has a special relationship with YHWH and is given the κύριος title.³⁷¹ This unique relationship of God/YHWH with Jesus/the Messiah is expressed in terms of divine sonship. While C.K. Rowe refers specifically to the use of the κύριος title in Luke, his words also express the dynamics of Mark 1:2-3. He notes that the title κύριος is used "in such a way as to narrate the relation between God and Jesus as one of inseparability, to the point that they are bound together in a shared identity as κύριος".³⁷² That Jesus is identified with YHWH, yet without supplanting him, forces the reader to think theologically on the nature of Jesus *vis-a-vis* YHWH. Mark holds these in narrative suspension, rather than giving a 'conceptual solution' to this problem.³⁷³ The 'father' and 'son' language is thus used to bind YHWH and Jesus in the closest relation possible, while simultaneously maintaining a distinction between them.³⁷⁴

In the opening citation Jesus is twice addressed as 'you' (προσώπου σου, ὁδόν σου),³⁷⁵ which Stein takes to be the emphasis of these verses.³⁷⁶ The speaker of the citation in

365. See also e.g. Rose, (2007), 84-85. Hays, (2016), 63-64.

366. Marcus, (2000), 148. Marcus, (1992), 39.

367. Gathercole, Simon, *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 244. Watts, (1997), 87. Grindheim, (2012), 97-98. Hays, (2016), 63-64.

368. Grindheim, (2012), 125.

369. Hays, (2016), 46. See also 75, 78. Emphasis original.

370. Hays, (2016), 76-78.

371. Kampling, (1992), 38-39.

372. Rowe, (2009), 27.

373. Hays, (2016), 78. Johansson, Daniel, "Kyrios in the Gospel of Mark" *JSNT* 33/1 (2010), 102-105.

374. See e.g. Hays, (2016), 77. See also the discussion in Chapter 3 in this thesis.

375. Rather than σου referring to 'God' or 'the people'. A conclusion supported by Hatina, (2002), 150.

376. Stein, (2008), 43-44.

1:2 is God and Jesus is the one addressed. On the contrary, M.A. Tolbert argued that the 'messenger' in 1:2-3 is Jesus while the Markan audience is addressed. Part of her argument is that if the messenger is John, then God would be speaking to Jesus with the OT citation.³⁷⁷ But it is not unusual in Mark for God to speak 'with Scripture'; this occurs at the baptism (1:11) and the transfiguration (9:6). Likewise, in Mark 12:35-37 a 'conversation' between the κύριος and the κυρίος μου is referred to.³⁷⁸ This 'conversation' is similar to 1:2, in that the Father speaks with words of Scripture to the Son. This is outside, and prior to, the text's narrative time.³⁷⁹

Such a 'conversation' also takes place in 1:2. The 'I' of 1:2 and 1:11 is the same, namely God.³⁸⁰ The 'you' in 1:2 is indeterminate, but this 'you' is echoed in v.11 when the 'you' is shown to be Jesus the beloved Son.³⁸¹ In both cases the Father speaks to the Son with the Holy Spirit's words of Scripture (see Mark 12:36). If the address to Jesus in 1:2 is taken seriously then it must be asked when this 'conversation' is taking place. Since the words are already ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ, (though 1:2 is actually from Malachi) it must be prior to the life of Jesus and the narrative time of Mark's Gospel. A generation ago Lohmeyer called v.2 a "Prolog vom Himmel".³⁸² L. Schenke rightly argues that according to Mark, the prophet saw a scene in heaven which had taken place in 'Urzeit', outside narrative time, and suggests it is a 'Vorspiel im Himmel'³⁸³ and elsewhere calls it a "himmlische Szene".³⁸⁴ E. Boring calls this setting "transcendent" and "offstage" and says Jesus "is addressed by God in the metahistorical world".³⁸⁵

The prologue of Mark is at times likened to the opening of Job which also testifies to the heavenly exchange between God and the heavenly hosts.³⁸⁶ This does not indicate preexistence for Job because he is not addressed, but it does suppose the transcendent nature of Satan. In similarity to Job the human characters are not

377. Tolbert, Mary Ann, *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective*. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 240ff.

378. See Bates, Matthew W., *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament & Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 44ff.

379. See Boring, (1984), 348-349. Suggested as a possibility by Gathercole, (2006), 236-238. See the discussion by Bates, (2015), 44-50.

380. Rose, (2007), 85.

381. Delorme, (1991), 164. Delorme, (1999), 67.

382. Lohmeyer, Ernst, *Das Evangelium des Markus*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoe & Ruprecht, 1957), 9.

383. Schenke, Ludger, "Gibt es im Markusevangelium eine Präexistenzchristologie?" *ZNW* 91 (2000), 57. Schenke, (2005), 50. See also Kampling, (1992), 39-42. Pilgaard, (2008), 25, 57-58.

384. Schenke, (1988), 114.

385. Boring, (2006), 33.

386. France, (2002), 59. See also Anderson, (1976), 63.

privileged to listen in and are left in the dark. The transcendent offstage voice speaks to another offstage figure who is addressed as 'you' (v.2). Here God speaks in the first person singular about himself and his work.³⁸⁷ The words of God spoken in the past are re-appropriated in a prosopological manner.³⁸⁸ There is some ambiguity in Mal 3:1 regarding the identity of the persons, for in the LXX there is a κύριος who comes to his temple and the κύριος παντοκράτωρ who speaks. In the MT these are termed יהוה and אדון respectively.³⁸⁹ The statement that the divine 'I' in Mal 3:1 will send a messenger 'before me' (MT: לִפְנֵי. LXX: πρὸ προσώπου μου), has in Mark been split to refer to two persons, a speaker and an addressee (Mark 1:2). Similarly, while the יהוה appears to be the same as the יהוה in Mal 3:1,³⁹⁰ Mark reads this prosopologically and identifies the יהוה with Jesus. Similarly, the יהוה and אֱלֹהֵינוּ (κύριος/θεός ἡμῶν) of Isa 40:3 is now interpreted to be Jesus, and the anonymous 'voice' is in the context John.

H.-J. Klauck notes that preexistence is a possibility in this text, but argues that since vv.1-3 is "Prolog im Prolog" such a chronological reading is not appropriate, since what takes place in v.2 is outside of the time of the narrative. He thus thinks using the word "preexistence" is unnecessary since it is not biblical terminology.³⁹¹ While it is agreed that v.2 does stand outside narrative time, it does not mean that it is not chronological, rather it is presumed to have already taken place at some point prior to the appearance of John in v.4, because it was testified to by the prophet in the past.³⁹² Delorme rightly stresses that the introductory citation is outside narrative time, and thus the beginning of the gospel is to be found in this already written text, and this "autre parole" is "plus fondamentale, plus originelle".³⁹³ Therefore, if Jesus as the 'Son of God', was addressed by God in the heavenly sphere in 'Urzeit', what is implied can be termed 'preexistence.' In the words of H.-C. Kammler.

Der Evangelist versteht diesen Vers dahingehend, daß der Prophet Jesaja Ohrenzeuge eines Wortes geworden ist, das der Vater - vor der im Evangelium erzählten Zeit - in der himmlischen Welt an seinen Sohn gerichtet hat und mit dem er ihm bereits vor seiner Sendung kundgetan hat,

387. Guttenger, (2004), 56-57.

388. On 'Prosopological Exegesis' see Bates, (2015) and Bates, Matthew W., *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Interpretation*. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012), 187-199.

389. Voelz, (2013), 110.

390. Smith, R.L., *Micah-Malachi*. WBC. (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984), 328.

391. Klauck, (1997), 41, 106-108.

392. Even Klauck accepts the presence of a 'weak' concept of preexistence. Klauck, (1997), 107.

393. Delorme, (1991), 164. Also Schweizer, Eduard, "Mark's Theological Achievement," in *The Interpretation of Mark*. Ed. William R. Telford (London: SPCK, 1985), 44.

was dann mit dem geschichtlichen Auftreten Johannes der Täufers Wirklichkeit geworden ist. Vor daher ist evident, daß Markus die reale und personale Präexistenz Jesu voraussetzt.³⁹⁴

Furthermore, if Mark is indeed identifying Jesus with YHWH, then the concept of preexistence is not a problem for preexistence is also assumed of YHWH. That preexistence could be suggested by Mark, cannot be ruled out a priori, since this notion is also found in pre-Markan texts: e.g. Gal 4:4, 2 Cor 8:9, Phil 2:6-7. If the figure of Mal 3:1 has now appeared in Nazareth (1:9) as Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, then, as Schenke writes, "dann ist vorausgesetzt, dass der himmlische Kyrios ein Mensch geworden ist. Das wird aber weder erzählt noch auch nur angedeutet."³⁹⁵ This would mean, against Boring,³⁹⁶ that the concept expressed with the extra-Markan word 'preexistence'³⁹⁷ is implied. Guttenberger is right in thinking that preexistence is a possible, but not a necessary interpretation,³⁹⁸ but since Jesus is being identified with YHWH, this suggests that preexistence is implied. Indeed, C. Rose is right in noting that Mark 1:1-3 and the whole prologue "beinhaltet Theologie in dichtester Form."³⁹⁹

(d) The Gospel and the Kingdom

The opening citation of Mark has indicated that the context of this narrative is the coming of the Lord, but this is in Mark associated with the two interrelated themes of the 'good news' and the 'kingdom of God' (1:14-15). These themes flank the baptism episode and also form an *inclusio* at either end of the prologue and are critical for its interpretation.

394. Kammler, Hans-Christian, "Das Verständnis der Passion Jesu im Markusevangelium" *ZTK* 103/4 (2006), 466-467.

395. Schenke, (2005), 51. See also Schenke, (1988), 114. S. Gathercole, however, is more hesitant with this interpretation, but does not reject it outright. Gathercole, (2006), 250-252.

396. Boring, (1984), 135. Boring says Mark is here only "teasingly provocative".

397. P. Stuhlmacher argues that the preexistence of Jesus is referred to in these verses "in aller Deutlichkeit". Stuhlmacher, Peter, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments: Band 2. Von der Paulusschule bis zur Johannesoffenbarung*. 2nd edition. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 137. See also Stuhlmacher, Peter, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments: Band 1. Grundlegung von Jesus zu Paulus*. 3rd edition. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 62-63. See also Dochhorn, Jan, "Altes und Neues Testament: Zu den religionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen trinitarischer Gottesvorstellungen im frühen Christentum und in der Religion Israels," in *Trinität*. Ed. Volker Henning Drecoll (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 28-29. Bates, (2015), 89-90. Schlatter, Adolf, *Markus: Der Evangelist für die Griechen*. 2nd edition. (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1984), 15. No, (1999), 53-54. Gundry and Rose are more ambivalent: Gundry, (1993a), 41. Rose, (2007), 86, 88, 93-94.

398. Guttenberger, (2004), 65n83.

399. Rose, (2007), 122.

Mark 1:14-15 is a summary passage that encapsulates the ministry of Jesus⁴⁰⁰ and has widely been recognised as being 'programmatic'.⁴⁰¹ It functions to connect the prologue with the main narrative and simultaneously closes the prologue and sets the stage for the beginning of Jesus' ministry proper. It is not only a general statement of the content of Jesus' preaching, which in this instance is not addressed to any particular person, but it also provides the proper context for Jesus' subsequent actions of calling disciples, healing the sick, and casting out demons.⁴⁰² Robert C. Tannehill has rightly argued that vv.14-15 "relates the whole mission of Jesus to the coming of God's kingdom."⁴⁰³ To label 1:14-15 as 'programmatic' is not to take away from the importance of vv.2-3 and 9-11; as these passages function on different levels. While vv.14-15 are 'programmatic' for the public ministry of Jesus, the citation of vv.2-3 roots it in Scripture and gives important hints concerning Jesus' identity. The baptismal passage, which is the central concern of this thesis, does not describe the ministry of Jesus, but rather concerns his identity *vis-a-vis* God and the Spirit and also prepares and launches him into his public ministry. These passages, each with its own emphasis, are intertwined and belong together in Mark's prologue and not only introduce the remainder of the narrative, but invite the reader to understand this narrative in their combined light.

(i) The Gospel

The noun εὐαγγέλιον occurs seven times in Mark, with an additional reference in the longer ending,⁴⁰⁴ however the εὐαγγελίζω verb form is not used as Mark prefers κηρύσσω.⁴⁰⁵ G. Stanton notes that the author uses identical terminology, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, for both the pre-Easter and post-Easter proclamation of Jesus because

400. Pesch, (1976), 100. Stuhlmacher, Peter, *Das paulinische Evangelium: I. Vorgeschichte*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), 236. Guelich, (1989), 41. Et al.

401. Hanson, (2000), 102. Hatina, (2002), 102. Frankemölle, Hubert, *Evangelium. Begriff und Gattung*. SBB. 15. (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994), 150. Focant, (2010), 75. Pesch, (1970), 110. Watts, (1997), 99. Chilton, Bruce D., *God in Strength: Jesus' Announcement of the Kingdom*. Studien zum Neuen Testament und Seiner Umwelt. (Freistadt: Plöchl, 1979), 53. Schenke, (2005), 68, and especially Marshall, Christopher D., *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 36-43. However, although Guelich agrees that it is a summary statement, he does not think it is 'programmatic'. Guelich, (1989), 43.

402. See also Guelich, Robert A., "The Gospel Genre," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Ed. Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 197.

403. Tannehill, (1979), 64.

404. 1:1, 14, 15, 8:35, 10:29, 13:10, 14:9, 16:15.

405. Especially 1:14, 13:10, 14:9. It is unnecessary to posit with Betz "two kinds of gospel" in Mark: 1) The rule of God expected from Isaiah 52:7 which is fulfilled with Jesus' coming and proclamation and 2) the gospel of the suffering Servant which is fulfilled by Jesus' death and the disciples's proclamation of it. Betz, (1991), 72.

for him these are the same.⁴⁰⁶ In contrast to F. Vouga, who argued that Jesus is simply the proclaimer of the gospel and the kingdom and that they are not tied to him as a person,⁴⁰⁷ all that Mark relates about the life and teaching of Jesus is part of the meaning of 'gospel'.⁴⁰⁸ R.A. Guelich writes concerning Mark

since the 'gospel of God' preached by Jesus (1:14-15) finds its expression for the evangelist not only in Jesus' preaching but above all in his ministry of teaching, exorcisms, healings, and table fellowship with the sinners, which show him to be the 'Messiah' (8:29) whose way must lead to the cross and resurrection (e.g. 8:31), the 'gospel of God' is at the same time the 'gospel concerning Jesus Messiah'.⁴⁰⁹

In Mark the absolute τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is found only on the lips of Jesus, while the two modified occurrences belong to the voice of the narrator in the prologue: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [υἱοῦ θεοῦ] (1:1) and εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ (14).⁴¹⁰ For Mark there is no difference between the 'gospel' Jesus preaches and the 'gospel' about Jesus. It was suggested above that the εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 1:1 has the sense of both an objective and subjective genitive, in that the 'gospel' is simultaneously about Jesus as well as preached by Jesus. The same applies in 1:14 where the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ is both objective⁴¹¹ and subjective⁴¹² and the 'gospel' is both from God and about God.⁴¹³ The fact that the genitive construction is used instead of a more specific prepositional phrase makes the clause more open-ended. The nearest one comes to a definition of the εὐαγγέλιον in Mark is in the programmatic statement in v.15, which is exegetical of the εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ in the narrator's voice in v.14.⁴¹⁴ Consequently, the εὐαγγέλιον can be defined as: ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. It is therefore vital to keep εὐαγγέλιον and βασιλεία together in Mark.

However, before examining the Isaianic background of εὐαγγέλιον, it is worth noting the centrality of the theme of the expected arrival of God's reign/kingdom in Mark. That ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is the subject of Jesus' preaching is hardly a point that needs to be argued in detail; it occurs fourteen times in Mark, thirteen of which are

406. Stanton, Graham, *Jesus and Gospel*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 19-20. Schenke, (2005), 67.

407. Vouga, (1995), 93-94, 99-100.

408. Mussner, (1967a), 168. Kampling, (1992), 32-33.

409. Guelich, (1991), 197.

410. Stanton, (2004), 18.

411. I.e. the gospel about God. Supported by Marcus, (2000), 172. Voelz argues that it is primarily objective, but a subjective nuance can also be present. Voelz, (2013), 146.

412. I.e. the gospel from God. Supported by Pilgaard, (2008), 72. Hooker, (1983), 54. Rose, (2007), 156.

413. France, (2002), 91. Keck, (1966), 359n1.

414. Guelich, (1989), 43. Pesch, (1976), 101, 103. Watts, (1997), 100. Hatina, (2002), 114.

by Jesus.⁴¹⁵ What it actually means is a different question. When Jesus speaks about the εὐαγγέλιον and ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ these are not new concept or symbols, empty of meaning for the audience, but rather have a context of their own.⁴¹⁶ I will argue that their roots lay especially in Isaiah, though these concepts have also been influenced by later texts and traditions, such as Psalms, Daniel, and the *Tg. Isa.*

G. Stanton has argued that the context of the origin of the early Christian usage of the term εὐαγγέλιον is to be found in the Roman emperor cult.⁴¹⁷ Mark's opening words are sometimes compared to the *Priene Calendar Inscription* which mentions the appearance (φανεῖν) of Augustus Caesar as saviour (σωτήρ) and his birthday as the beginning of the good news to the world (ἤρξεν δε τῷ κόσμῳ τῶν δι' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίων ἡ γενέθλιος ἡμέρα τοῦ θεοῦ).⁴¹⁸ Following this trajectory, Evans argues that by opening his narrative in a way that echoes the Roman imperial cult, Mark makes the claim that it is Jesus the Christ, and not Caesar, who is the true 'son of God'.⁴¹⁹ However, Evans adds: Thus while "it seems clear that the evangelist has deliberately echoed an important theme of the Roman Imperial Cult. However... Second Isaiah is also in view."⁴²⁰ These are not mutually exclusive.⁴²¹ While Stanton and Evans are right in stating that Mark could, and likely was, in some circles understood in the light the imperial context, it is unlikely to be the primary emphasis of Mark. It has already been emphasised that the Gospel's opening words give a clear indication of what frame of reference it is to be understood.

(ii) The Good News of God's Reign in Isaiah

Although the hope for YHWH's return finds expression throughout Isaiah, it is particularly in the section labelled 'Second Isaiah' (chs. 40-55) that it comes to prominence. But this expectation has its own context in Isaiah and one must start with the beginning of the book. For although modern scholars may divide the book into three sections (1-39, 40-55, 56-66) each with its own historical context, the

415. See the summary of Dunn, (2003), 383-387.

416. Becker, Jürgen, *Jesus of Nazareth*. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), 86ff., and Dunn, (2003), 387ff. R.E. Watts highlights *Pss. Sol.* 11:1 which also juxtaposes κήρυξ and εὐαγγελ-: "Sound in Zion the signal trumpet of the sanctuary; announce in Jerusalem the voice of one bringing good news, for God has been merciful to Israel in watching over them." Watts, (1997), 98. It is usually dated to 50 BC. Evans, (2005a), 58.

417. Stanton, (2004), 22-35.

418. Cited in Evans, Craig A., "Mark's Incipit and the Priene Calender Inscription: From Jewish Gospel to Greco-Roman Gospel" *JGRChJ* 1 (2000), 69. Hays, (2016), 92.

419. Evans, (2000), 70. Evans, (1997), 676-682.

420. Evans, (2000), 77.

421. Hatina, (2002), 113.

passages cited and alluded to in Mark are not only connected to their immediate context, but also to the theological progression of the book as a whole. This merits a comment on the book in its final form. But the fact that we neither know which versions of the OT were available to Mark nor have a clear indication of what he used, complicates the matter of examining the context of his scriptural citation and allusions.

H.G.M. Williamson argues that the hope in Isaiah 1-32 is centred on a coming human and Davidic king (9:1-7, 11:1-5, 32:1)⁴²² which gives way to a hope for the return of YHWH himself as king of Zion in the latter part of the book.⁴²³ This harks back to the beginning of the book where Isaiah sees God in his temple (ch. 6)⁴²⁴ and God is confessed to be both 'king' (v.5) and 'the LORD of hosts' (v.3). Williamson shows that when the hope centres on the coming of God himself as king the hope for the human king "has dropped out of Deutero-Isaiah's scheme altogether".⁴²⁵

One does not need at this point to be concerned with dating or locating the various oracles in Isaiah in order to appreciate Williamson's main proposal. For the point which he makes *historically*, can also be appreciated *literarily*: that there is a movement in Isaiah away from human kingship to a hope for the kingship of God himself. Therefore rather than the focal point being a human king of Davidic lineage, there is a democratisation of the kingship role, the function of which will be taken up by the royal servant, who represents Israel as a nation⁴²⁶ and "Israel as a whole now assumes the role which the human king once played".⁴²⁷ But it is God alone who is entitled to be called king.⁴²⁸ This increased expectation of God as king of Israel as the object of hope is what J. Becker calls "the eschatologizing of the Zion tradition",⁴²⁹ and this contributed to the enormous influence the book of Isaiah exerted on

422. E.g. see Williamson, H.G.M., *Variations on a Theme: King, Messiah and Servant in the Book of Isaiah*. (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 70-72. See also Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 59-64, 134.

423. Williamson, (1998), 128. God is expressly called king in 41:21, 43:15, 44:6 and 52:7.

424. A scene which is quickly transposed to God's heavenly temple. Childs, Brevard S., *Isaiah: A Commentary*. OTL. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001), 54-55.

425. Williamson, (1998), 128.

426. Williamson, (1998), 128, 139-141.

427. Williamson, (1998), 128.

428. Williamson, (1998), 164.

429. Becker, (1998), 90. See also Evans, (1997), 660-661.

subsequent Judaism;⁴³⁰ including the later OT prophets and the future expectation of YHWH's return expressed in Malachi 3:1-4.⁴³¹

In this context 'the good news of the reign of God' in the latter part of Isaiah is critical. The five passages in Isaiah that refer to בשר are: 40:9, 41:27, 52:7, 60:6, 61:1. P. Stuhlmacher has shown that the early Christian usage of εὐαγγέλιον had its roots in the Hebrew *piel* participle of בשר (מְבַשֵּׂר) of Isa 40:9, 41:27 and 52:7 as well as the *piel* infinitive construct לְבַשֵּׂר of 61:1.⁴³² In this context it is important to note that the LXX consistently translates the בשר root with the εὐαγγελ- stem - except when a negative meaning is demanded by the text. The participle מְבַשֵּׂר is translated with the participle εὐαγγελιζόμενος (LXX 40:9, 52:7),⁴³³ while the *piel* infinitive construct לְבַשֵּׂר of 61:1 has become the aorist middle infinitive εὐαγγελίσασθαι.⁴³⁴

The clearest text is Isa 52:7 which in the MT reads "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger who announces peace, who brings good news, who announces salvation, who says to Zion, 'Your God reigns.'"⁴³⁵ The LXX reads: ὥς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, ὥς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, ὥς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθὰ, ὅτι ἀκουστήν ποιήσω τὴν σωτηρίαν σου λέγων Σιών Βασιλεύσει σου ὁ θεός. Here the content of the good news is described as the reign of God which brings salvation and peace.⁴³⁶ In the LXX rendition of Isa 52:7 the

430. There is an unusually high number of Isaiah scrolls (or fragments) among the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a total of twenty-one mss. (as well as a further one from Murabba'at nearby). Flint, Peter W., "The Isaiah Scrolls from the Judean Desert," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Eds. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 481. Hannah, Darrell D., "Isaiah within Judaism of the Second Temple Period," in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Eds. Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 8. On the contrary, there were only six copies of Jeremiah and five of Ezekiel. In addition there are six *pesharim* on Isaiah among the scrolls. While Ezekiel and Jeremiah are both cited explicitly four times each in sectarian citations, Isaiah is cited twenty-three times. Even allowing for the accident of history in manuscript preservation, these numbers are indicative of Isaiah's importance for the Qumran community. Brooke, George J., "Isaiah in the Pesharim and Other Qumran Texts," in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Eds. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 610-611. For an overview of Isaiah in other NT books see Moyise, Steve and Menken, Maarten J.J., eds., *Isaiah in the New Testament*, London: T&T Clark, 2005) and Sawyer, (2000), 30. For a wider overview see Snodgrass, (1980), 31-33. To summarise, one may state with John F.A. Sawyer that "Isaiah seems always to have had a prominent place in Jewish Bible use, in all varieties of Judaism". Sawyer, (2000), 23.

431. Which according to Snodgrass can be shown to be dependant on the book of Isaiah, because the *piel* of פנה with דרך is used only in Isa 40:3, 57:14, 62:10 and Mal 3:1. This indicates that the Malachi text is connected to Isa 40:3. It is worth noting that exactly these texts are combined in Mark's opening citation. Snodgrass, (1980)

432. Stuhlmacher, (1968), 116-121.

433. Stuhlmacher, (1968), 163-164.

434. G. Strecker argued that its origin lay in the Hellenistic tradition. Strecker, G., "εὐαγγέλιον, ου, τό," in *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Eds. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 71.

435. מִהֲנָאוּ עַל־הַקְּרִים רַגְלֵי מְבַשֵּׂר מְשֻׁמֵּעַ שְׁלוֹם מְבַשֵּׂר טוֹב מְשֻׁמֵּעַ יְשׁוּעָה אִמֵּר לְצִיּוֹן מְלֶךְ אֱלֹהֶיךָ.

436. See e.g. Stuhlmacher, (1968), 118. This connection between YHWH's kingship and salvation is common in the prophets. Schreiber, Stefan, *Gesalbter und König: Titel und Konzeptionen der königlichen Gesalbtenenerwartung in frühjüdischen und urchristlichen Schriften*. BZNW. 105. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 58.

eschatological orientation is evident for it translates the perfect מְלֶךְ אֱלֹהֶיךָ with the future tense βασιλεύσει σου ὁ θεός. R.N. Whybray notes that the message in Isa 52:7-8 and 40:9-10 is "essentially the same".⁴³⁷ In 40:9 the good message that is to be proclaimed is: "here is your God" (הִנֵּה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם - LXX: Ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν.) As Stuhlmacher points out, "Zion/Jerusalem sollen den Advent Gottes über das Land hin ausrufen."⁴³⁸ In the context of v.10-11 his presence, which is the context of the good news, clearly involves his reign for he will come with might and will shepherd his flock.⁴³⁹ Isa 40:9 is closely connected with Isa 40:3. Not only are these verses merely a few verses apart, but they are also linked 'thematically', for as Marcus writes "the announcement of Yahweh's coming completes the admonition to prepare a way before him."⁴⁴⁰

In the rendition of *Tg. Isa.* there is an even closer connection between these verses. The *meturgeman* due to his anti-anthropomorphism,⁴⁴¹ is reticent to speak directly of 'the coming of God' and thus frequently employs circumlocutions.⁴⁴² The *meturgeman* in 40:9 replaces the הִנֵּה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם in Hebrew with "the kingdom of your God has been revealed", while the verb 'he comes' (יָבוֹא) 40:9 in the *Tg. Isa.* reads "is revealed". Likewise while Isa 52:7 has מְלֶךְ אֱלֹהֶיךָ the *Tg. Isa.* has the identical phrase as in 40:9; "the kingdom of your God has been revealed." In MT Isa 52:8, YHWH himself will return: "they see the return of the LORD to Zion".⁴⁴³ In the Targum it is "his *Shekinah*" that will return to Zion.⁴⁴⁴ This phrase "the kingdom of (your) God has been (or: will be) revealed" is distinctive to *Tg. Neb.* and appears in Isa 24:23, 31:4, 40:9, 52:7, Zech 14:9, Mic 4:7, Ob 21. In each case it 'translates' a Hebrew reference to God's reign⁴⁴⁵ or coming,⁴⁴⁶ which demonstrates how connected these expressions are in *Tg. Isa.*⁴⁴⁷ According to B.D. Chilton, this rendition is a "periphrasis for God

437. Whybray, R.N., *Isaiah 40-66*. NCB. (London: Oliphants, 1975), 167.

438. Stuhlmacher, (1968), 120. See also Hays, (2016), 30.

439. See also e.g. Koole, Jan L., *Isaiah III: Volume 1 / Isaiah 40-48*. (Kampen, NL: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1997), 75.

440. Marcus, (1992), 19.

441. Flesher and Chilton, (2011), 45-46. Chilton, Bruce D., *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum*. (Sheffield: JSOT, 1983), 49.

442. E.g. 35:4, 40:9, 10, 52:8.

443. כִּי עֵין בְּעֵין יֵרָאוּ בְּשׁוּב יְהוָה צִיּוֹן.

444. See also Chilton, Bruce D., "Regnum Dei Deus Est" *SJT* 31/3 (1978), 267. Evans, Craig A., "Inaugurating the Kingdom of God and Defeating the Kingdom of Satan" *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 15/1 (2005b), 53. Rowe, Robert D., *God's Kingdom and God's Son: The Background to Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms*. (Leiden: Brill, 2002b), 116.

445. Isa 24:23, 52:7, Mic 4:7, Zech 14:9, Obad 21.

446. Isa 31:4, 40:9.

447. This discussion is loosely based on Chilton, (1983), 77-81.

himself, employed in respect of divine and saving revelation"⁴⁴⁸ or as he puts it elsewhere, "the saving revelation of God Himself".⁴⁴⁹ He concludes that "the Targumic understanding of the 'Kingdom' (is) a substitution for God's very name, (and) refers to his dynamic presence"⁴⁵⁰ and that "'the kingdom of God' refers to God himself, as it were, personally."⁴⁵¹ While all the Targumic evidence cannot be provided here, these examples serve to illustrate how the *Tg. Neb.* understands the 'kingdom of God' as the 'appearance of God'.

In Isa 40:9 (40:1-11) and 52:7 (52:7-10) of both the MT and the *Tg. Isa.* the links between the *בִּשְׂר* and the 'reign of God' are strong,⁴⁵² and B.S. Childs calls them "striking".⁴⁵³ According to the analysis of Lim H. Bo, Isa 40:1-11 functions as a 'summation' of the whole message of Isa 40-55, which is the 'good news' of the coming of YHWH and his salvation.⁴⁵⁴ Both 40:9-11 and 52:7-8 are about the good news of God coming to reign on Zion. In examining the use of *בִּשְׂר* in Isaiah, C. Evans writes: "It is significant that in all five passages in which *בִּשְׂר* appears YHWH is himself the subject of the good tidings. The theocentric dimension of these oracles is primary. It is the presence and reign of God that constitute the 'good tidings' or 'gospel'".⁴⁵⁵ While he may be overstating his case regarding 41:27, the emphasis on the coming of God is especially strong in Isa 52:7 and 40:9, and it is the reign of God that is the object of hope, not a Davidic restoration. In Isa 41:27 the good news is the message of redemption that comes from God, and is connected to the coming Servant in Isa 42.

While it could be suitable at this point to provide a more general description of eschatological expectations in Second Temple Judaism, this is outside the limits of this project and such analyses have been done by several scholars and need not be presently redone. In his analysis N.T. Wright lists a large number of verses, mainly from Isaiah, that envision the return of YHWH.⁴⁵⁶ Wright concludes his section by

448. Chilton, (1983), 77.

449. Chilton, (1979), 283.

450. Chilton, (1979), 87.

451. Chilton, (1978), 266.

452. Goldingay, John and David Payne, *Isaiah 40-55*. ICC. Vol. 2. (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 262. Koole, Jan L., *Isaiah III: Volume 2 / Isaiah 49-55*. (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 232. Fichtner, Johannes, "Jes. 52, 7-10 in der Christlichen Verkündigung," in *Verbannung und Heimkehr: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie Israels im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Ed. Arnulf Kuschke (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1961), 53.

453. Childs, (2001), 406. Rowe argues that Jesus' proclamation was dependant on both Isa 52:7 and *Tg. Isa.* 40:9. Rowe, (2002b), 128.

454. Lim, Bo H., *The 'Way of the Lord' in the Book of Isaiah*. (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 52. See also Childs, (2001), 301.

455. Evans, (1997), 656. See also Rowe, (2002b), 115-119.

456. Including Isa 24:23, 25:9-10, 35:3-6, 10, 40:3-5, 9-11, 52:7-10. *I En.* 1:3-4, 9, *T. Mos* 10:1, 3. *11Q19* 29:3-9.

stating that there is "ample evidence that most second-Temple Jews who have any thought to the matter were hoping for YHWH to return, to dwell once again in the Temple in Jerusalem as he had done in the time of the old monarchy."⁴⁵⁷ Likewise, J. Becker in his treatment of the same theme states there was in Early Judaism a basic agreement with regard to eschatological hopes.⁴⁵⁸ This hope - mostly influenced by Isa 40-55 - consisted of an expectation of God's new and final act within history. Becker writes, "whatever one expected to happen in detail, it was clear that God himself would have to appear and bring about a fundamental change from evil to good."⁴⁵⁹ Central to Israel's future hope was the coming/return of God to his people as in the Exodus theophany and the establishment of his reign.⁴⁶⁰ These texts from Isaiah are interpreted eschatologically in other Jewish texts, and became important for the NT.⁴⁶¹

Mark's prologue expresses a hope for the return of YHWH to Zion, but also that this is through Jesus the Messiah, Son of God. In Mark there is similarly a close relationship between the 'good news' and the 'reign/coming of God' for Mark 1:14b-15a states: ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λέγων ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Jesus' programmatic announcement of the fulfilment of time and the drawing near of God's kingdom is the announcement of the coming and reign of God himself. But the nearness is not only temporal, but also spatial. For in Jesus' coming and his proclamation of God's reign, God himself comes and is made known,⁴⁶² since the kingdom cannot be separated from God himself.⁴⁶³ In the prologue Mark draws together the Isaianic themes of 'good news', 'servant', 'reign', and 'God's coming'.⁴⁶⁴

et. al.

457. Wright, N.T., *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. 2. (London: SPCK, 1996), 623.

458. Becker, (1998), 105-106.

459. Becker, (1998), 106.

460. Webb, Robert L., *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study*. JSNT Sup. 62. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 222-227.

461. Evans, (1997), 660-661. C. Evans emphasises that Isa 52:7 and 61:1ff. are interpreted and applied eschatologically. See also Beasley-Murray, G.R., *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 75. Stuhlmacher, (1968), 116. Friedrich, G., "εὐαγγελίζομαι, εὐαγγέλιον, προεὐαγγελίζομαι, εὐαγγελιστής," in *TDNT*. Ed. G. Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 2:708, 727. France, (2002), 91. Watts, (1997), 97-99.

462. Chilton, (1979), 285.

463. Chilton, (1979), 287.

464. The close thematic links between Mark 1:14-15 and *Tg. Isa.* 40:9 and 52:7 in particular, suggest a connection between them. Chilton in a redaction-critical analysis of the language of Mark 1:14-15 concludes that the tradition behind this text is *Tg. Isa.* Chilton, (1979), 88. See also Evans, (1997), 670-672. It thus seems likely that Mark or his source has access to a proto-Targumic tradition. The Targum Jonathan was likely of Palestinian origin despite being redacted in Babylon. Alexander, Philip S., "Targum, Targumim," in *ABD*. Ed. D.N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 325. Chilton, (1984), 38. Evans, (1997), 670, 672.

But as has been seen, Mark does not make his interpretation against the grain of the Isaianic text itself, for the relation of εὐαγγέλιον with βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ has its roots in the book Isaiah itself.

(iii) The Kingdom in Daniel

While it has been argued that the 'good news' and 'coming reign of God' primarily stems from Isaiah, the Danielic link must not be underplayed.⁴⁶⁵ Though it would be too narrow to suggest that Daniel is the only book of the OT which plainly focuses on the coming of God's kingdom,⁴⁶⁶ or to suggest that Daniel is the primary background for the 'kingdom of God' in Mark.⁴⁶⁷ This next section will demonstrate the influence from the Book of Daniel that are detectable in Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom God in Mark.⁴⁶⁸

The texts that are particularly relevant in Daniel are his revelation and interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great statue (Dan 2:31ff.) and the vision of the four beasts (ch. 7). In the former text, the statue of gold, silver, bronze, iron, and iron and clay, is crushed when a stone is "cut out, not by human hands" (v.34) - indicating a divine act - and "became a great mountain and filled the whole earth" (v.35). In the interpretation it becomes clear that there is a polarity between the human kingdoms which are represented by the statue and the one kingdom which is depicted by the stone. The former kingdoms only rule by God's permission (2:37, 47), while the latter kingdom will never be destroyed and will stand forever bringing the other kingdoms to destruction (v.44).

The vision in ch. 7 of the four beasts has much in common with the vision of ch. 2⁴⁶⁹ and there is a "general agreement that the kings in question correspond to the four

465. See for example the Ph.D. thesis on this subject by Lo, (2012). This is contrary to B.L. Mack who argued that the theme of the kingdom of God should be understood in light of Hellenistic rather than Jewish traditions. Mack, Burton L., *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 73. Cited in Evans, Craig A., "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Eds. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint (Boston: Brill Academic, 2002), 491. While Psalms is an important book with regard to divine kingship, it does not seem to have a major importance for Mark. On divine kingdom in Psalms see: Evans, (2005b), 52. Rowe, (2002b).

466. As suggested by Pitre, Brant J., "Apocalypticism and Apocalyptic Teaching," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. 2nd edition. Eds. Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown and Nicholas Perrin (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2013), 24.

467. Wenham, David, "The Kingdom of God and Daniel" *ExpTim* 98 (1987), 132. See also Pilgaard, (2008), 74. Lo, (2012), 268-269.

468. See Evans, (2002), 509.

469. Collins, John J., *Daniel: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993b), 277. Lacocque, André, *The Book of Daniel*. (London: SPCK, 1979), 124-125. Wright, (1992), 293. Goldingay, John, *Daniel*. WBC. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 157-259. Goldingay sees a chiasmus between the visions of chs. seven and two. See also Goldingay, John, *Daniel*. Word Biblical Themes. (Dallas: Word, 1989), 2, 4.

kingdoms of ch. 2".⁴⁷⁰ These four beasts in ch. 7 also represent human kingdoms, which are likewise destroyed, and whose rule is superseded by the 'one like a son of man' who has received dominion by the 'Ancient of Days' (7:9-14). R.D. Rowe has rightly noted that "[t]he principal theme of the book of Daniel is the kingship of God"⁴⁷¹ and both ch. 2 and 7 express an eschatological hope for the appearance of a future kingdom which is brought about by God and will be established forever and will crush any rival kingdom (2:44, 7:13-18).⁴⁷² In ch. 7 the 'son of man' is given the same function as the stone in ch. 2. That the stone is 'cut without human hands' shows it is a divine intervention (2:34, 45) and refers to the kingdom set up by God (2:44-45)⁴⁷³ and refers also to "God's own sovereign power".⁴⁷⁴ As R.D. Rowe notes, "[t]he book of Daniel shows the kingship of God becoming effective on earth by means of his interventions from heaven".⁴⁷⁵ But while the kingdom in Dan 2 is on earth, in Dan 7 it is 'the one like son of man' who receives it in a heavenly context.

A critical passage is 7:13-14 and while there are many interpretive issues, the position advocated here is that 'the one like a son of man' appears to be a divine figure.

As I watched in the night visions, I saw one like a human being coming with the clouds of heaven. And he came to the Ancient One and was presented before him. To him was given dominion and glory and kingship, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that shall not pass away, and his kingship is one that shall never be destroyed.

A. Feuillet has argued persuasively that the Dan 7 vision is dependent on Ezekiel's throne vision (Ezek 1). While his evidence cannot be given in full, they include the commonalities of a reference to a cloud (Dan 7:13/Ezek 1:4), of the 'wheels' before the throne (which are 'burning' in Dan 7:9 and 'moving' and 'full of eyes' in Ezek 1:15-21 and 10:12). In addition, there are the animals of Daniel's vision and the four living creatures in Ezekiel (1:5-14).⁴⁷⁶ However, the main factor is the description of

470. Collins, (1993b), 312. Goldingay, however, argues that the kings/kingdoms of these two chapters are not necessarily identical. Goldingay, (1989), 68.

471. Rowe, Robert D., "Is Daniel's 'Son of Man' Messianic?," in *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*. Ed. Harold H. Rowdon (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1982), 82. Also Schreiber, (2000), 75, 77.

472. Goldingay, (1989), 2. See also Becker, (1998), 93.

473. Rowe, (1982), 85, 89.

474. Goldingay, (1996), 52. See also Goldingay, (1989), 88.

475. Rowe, (1982), 91.

476. Feuillet, André, "Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la Tradition Biblique (1)" *RB* 60 (1953), 182-185. Also Rowe, (1982), 84. Goldingay, (1996), 149. Black, Matthew, "The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the 'Son of Man'," in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity, Essays in Honor of William David Davies*. Eds. Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs (Leiden: Brill, 1976),

the one sitting on the heavenly throne in Ezek 1:12 as כְּמִרְאֵה אָדָם (in the likeness of a man), who clearly has potential links with the Dan 7:13 figure. Feuillet concludes, in light of Ezekiel 1, that "[l]e personnage mystérieux du Fils de l'homme de Daniel est une sorte de manifestation visible de Dieu invisible."⁴⁷⁷ He adds "le Fils de l'homme de Daniel appartient à la catégorie du divin et est comme une sorte d'incarnation de la gloire divine, au même titre que la silhouette humaine contemplée par Ézéchiél".⁴⁷⁸ In this light the Danielic figure appears to be a divine figure. This conclusion is also reached by Michael Segal, who compares the language used in the reception of eternal kingship in the doxologies of Dan 3:31-33, 4:31, 6:26-27, 7:14, 7:27, and he concludes that "the one like a man can be identified with YHWH himself."⁴⁷⁹

Looking more closely at Dan 7:13 itself the 'son of man' figure also appears to have divine functions. The Old Greek has the 'son of man' riding ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, while the Aramaic and the Θ have the equivalents עַל and μετὰ, respectively. While it has been suggested that the Aramaic עַל was originally על (on)⁴⁸⁰ this cannot be proved. But the Gospels also have a variety of prepositions used with reference to coming by means of a cloud: 1) ἐπὶ in Matt 24:30, 26:64. 2) ἐν in Mark 13:26, Luke 21:27 and 3) μετὰ in Mark 14:62. It has been questioned whether these varying prepositions carry different theological significance. The use of ἐπὶ may have connections with the Canaanite motif of gods riding *on* clouds,⁴⁸¹ a motif which is found elsewhere in the OT, e.g. Ps 18:10ff., 104:3, and Isa 19:1 and which indicates a divine status.⁴⁸² While this is likely to be the origin of the motif, it is probably at this point unnecessary to attach any theological distinctions between the use of these prepositions.⁴⁸³ Whether travelling 'on', 'in', or 'with' the clouds it suggests "a theophany of Yahweh himself".⁴⁸⁴ While Dan 7:13 could describe a

60-61.

477. Feuillet, (1953), 186-187.

478. Feuillet, (1953), 189.

479. Segal, Michael, "Who is the 'Son of God' in 4Q246? An Overlooked Example of Early Biblical Interpretation" *DSD* 21 (2014), 292-293. Rather than concluding that there are two deities in Dan 7:13-14, as argued by Black, (1976), 61.

480. Charles, R.H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel: with Introduction, Indexes and a New English Translation*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), 186.

481. McLay, R. Timothy, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 156.

482. Lust, J., "Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint," in *Messianism and the Septuagint: Collected Essays by J. Lust*. Ed. K Hauspie (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 7. Montgomery, James, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927), 303. Hartman, Louis F. and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 206. Reynolds, Benjamin E., *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. WUNT2. 249. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 29. Feuillet, (1953), 187-188.

483. Collins, (1993b), 8, 311. Reynolds, (2008), 35.

484. Caragounis, Chrys C., *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation*. WUNT. 38. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,

movement from heaven to earth⁴⁸⁵ or from earth to heaven,⁴⁸⁶ B.E. Reynolds is likely to be right in suggesting that neither is implied, since the throne of the Ancient One is in heaven and the text simply states that 'one like a human being' was brought before him.⁴⁸⁷

It appears that 'the one like a son of man' is given a seat on the throne together with the 'Ancient of Days' as he receives the kingdom and the glory and as the nations will serve (פלה) him. Although John J. Collins identifies the 'one like a human being' with Michael, he rightly points out that this figure "is given a kingdom, so it is reasonable to assume that he is enthroned, even though his enthronement is not actually described."⁴⁸⁸ The reign (מלך) of the 'son of man' is the same reign as that of God since both are described as an eternal (עלם) kingdom. (3:33, cf. 7:27).⁴⁸⁹ Furthermore, פלה is in Daniel only used in reference to God⁴⁹⁰ and as B.E. Reynolds summarises: "Since the son of man figure receives cultic service typically rendered to deity in Daniel, his similarity with God, which was already indicated by his approach with the clouds of heaven, becomes more conspicuous."⁴⁹¹ There is thus a strong link between 'the one like a son of man' and 'the Ancient of Days' in 7:13, especially in the Old Greek.⁴⁹²

The question is how this can best be configured. C. Caragounis has argued that the one like a son of man in Dan 7 "is portrayed as a heavenly Being with honors and

1986), 72. See especially Feuillet, (1953), 186-189.

485. Goldingay, (1996), 167.

486. E.g. Wright, (1996), 361.

487. Reynolds, (2008), 30.

488. Collins, (1993b), 301. Lacocque, (1979), 145.

489. Schreiber, (2000), 77.

490. Feuillet, (1953), 189. Reynolds, (2008), 30-31. It appears that 'the one like the son of man' is also in view in 7:27 because of the singular הֵן (him), though it is not explicitly mentioned Feuillet, (1953), 189.

491. Reynolds, (2008), 30-31.

492. In the Old Greek of 7:13 the υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου comes ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν and is thus identified with him in some sense. Conversely the Θ reads: ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν. This difference cannot simply be attributed to a scribal error as suggested by Collins and McLay, since the following word is in the nominative or the genitive case respectively as grammatically appropriate. Collins, (1993b), 311. McLay, (2003), 156. This 'error' is also emended in Ziegler's Göttingen edition of the LXX of Daniel which thus has ἕως παλαιοῦ, though it should be noting that he did not have access to Papyrus 967, a second or early third century *ms.* of the OG. Ziegler, Joseph, Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Susanna; Daniel; Bet et Draco*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. 16.2. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1954). F.F. Bruce states, "[I]f the Septuagint reading is indeed a corruption, the corruption is not wholly accidental". Bruce, F.F., "The Oldest Greek Versions of Daniel" *OTS* 20 (1977), 25. For while the ὡς / ἕως could easily be confused, the second part of the verse conceptually coheres with the change. While Bruce is right in acknowledging that Christian influence on the OG Daniel 7:13 cannot be ruled out, this reading may also be original; not only to the Old Greek, but could even be based on an even older *Vorlage*. Bruce, (1977), 25. Lust, (2004), 1-3, 7. In the reading of the OG which has ὡς there is a very close alignment between these two figures without melding them into one. Bruce calls this "an astonishing statement". Bruce, (1977), 25. While Lust calls it an "amazing statement". Lust, (2004), 5.

powers normally predicated of God",⁴⁹³ though not being the Ancient of Days himself.⁴⁹⁴ His distinction between 'the one like a son of a man' and the 'Ancient of Days' is based on an unwarranted separation of the 'Most High' of 7:25 (אֵלֹהִים in the singular) from the 'Most High' in 7:18, 22, 25, 27 (אֱלֹהִים in the plural), suggesting they refer to two divine beings.⁴⁹⁵ There can hardly be an equation of the 'son of man' with the 'ancient of days'⁴⁹⁶ for in v.14 the former is given authority by the latter. Although the 'son of man' figure is enigmatic, it seems clear that he is divine in some sense, and yet is distinct from the 'ancient of days'. In 7:13-14 the 'son of man' comes with the clouds, a divine mode of transport, and comes to the Ancient of Days. In 17-18 the Ancient of Days is the one who *comes* (mode of transport is not identified); likely to earth and destroys the fourth beast and its large horn. While the kingdom is then given to the 'holy ones of the most high' it is still said to be God's kingdom (7:27). It can thus be concluded that there is ambiguity in the text, which has lent itself to varying interpretations.⁴⁹⁷

R.D. Rowe rightly suggests the figure of Dan 7:13 is a 'partaker' of divinity but "without being identified completely with God".⁴⁹⁸ The earliest interpretations of this figure conceive of him in similar ways,⁴⁹⁹ for in the *Similitudes of Enoch* the 'son of man' figure is clearly the one who will vanquish kings and kingdoms (*I En.* 46:1-8), and seems to be "assimilated to the Deity" yet is also "equated with the messiah"⁵⁰⁰ (*I En.* 48:10, 52:4. These features are likewise evident in *4 Ezra* 13). Therefore, in the earliest known interpretations of this passage, the one called 'like a son of man' appears to be both a heavenly and a preexistent figure, and even a messianic figure.⁵⁰¹

493. Caragounis, (1986), 81.

494. The merging of the two figures in Dan 7:13-14 seems to occur in Rev 1:13-14.

495. Caragounis, (1986), 74-75.

496. As suggested by Lust, (2004), 7. See also Reynolds, (2008), 37.

497. Collins, Adela Yarbro, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament," in *Daniel: A Commentary*. Ed. John J. Collins (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993a), 81-82.

498. Rowe, (1982), 91.

499. Since it seems clear that there is a close connection between the 'one like a son of man' and the coming of God's kingdom in Daniel 7, several scholars have also argued for a messianic reading of the 'son of man' figure. Feuillet, (1953), 182-185. Bock, Darrell L., "The Use of Daniel 7 in Jesus' Trial, with Implications for His Self-Understanding," in *'Who is this Son of Man?': The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus*. Eds. Larry W. Hurtado and Paul L. Owen (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 93-94. See also Shepherd, M.B., "Daniel 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man" *WTJ* 68/1 (2006). Deines, Roland, "Pre-Existence, Incarnation, and Messianic Self-Understanding of Jesus in the Work of Martin Hengel," in *Acts of God in History: Studies Towards Recovering a Theological Historiography. Collected Essays by Roland Deines*. Eds. Christoph Ochs and Peter Watts (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 425-426. Black states that while there is no messianic interpretation of the 'son of man' in Daniel, it is the next logical step. Black, (1976), 63.

500. Collins, (1993a), 81.

501. Collins, (1993a), 90. See also 84. Collins, (1993b), 306-307. Stuhlmacher, (2005), 118. There are, however, other interpretations of this figure. For instance the 'son of man' has been identified with Michael, as argued by Collins, (1993b), 304-310. Collins, John J., *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish*

What is of highest importance, however, is how Mark employs this terminology. In Mark the 'one like a son of man' is understood as a singular figure⁵⁰² and there is no doubt that Jesus is the Son of Man.⁵⁰³ In at least two, and likely three, places - often called the apocalyptic Son of Man sayings - the link is explicitly made with the Daniel 7 figure in that Jesus will come with the clouds of heaven (13:26-27; 14:62 and likely also 8:38).⁵⁰⁴ Of particular importance is how these texts are brought into the context of, and conflated with, other YHWH texts. Such conflation of texts is typical for Mark⁵⁰⁵ as has been demonstrated with regard to 1:2-3, and 1:9-11. For instance, Leim comments that the Son of Man in 8:38 "is ashamed not of idolatry and adultery against YHWH but of sins such as these committed against *himself*".⁵⁰⁶ Jesus also says he comes in the glory of his Father, the glory which belongs to YHWH alone (Isa 42:8) and which is connected to God's return to Zion (35:2, 40:5, 60:2).⁵⁰⁷ In Mark 13:26-27 (see also 14:62) the Son of Man comes in the clouds and in glory, which have already been identified as divine prerogatives, and he will be gathering his own elect, which traditionally is the role of YHWH himself (Isa 45:4, 65:9 et.al.).⁵⁰⁸ This is in contrast to L. Schenke who has argued that the Son of Man refers to the human side of the Son of God,⁵⁰⁹ the Son of Man has the unique privileges of the Lord himself. It is important that each of these Markan 'apocalyptic Son of Man' sayings is closely tied to divine sonship language.⁵¹⁰ Thus in 8:38 it is the Son of Man who will come in the "glory of his Father", and his described appearance in 13:26-27 is closely followed by the statement that concerning that hour only the Father, and not the Son, knows (13:32). Finally, before the high priest in 14:62, Jesus answers in the affirmative that he is the 'Son of the Blessed One'

Matrix of Christianity. (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 101-107. Or seen as 'a human representative of Israel' as argued by Stuhlmacher, (2005), 117-118. Wright, (1992), 296. Or a "personification of the righteous People" as argued by Lacocque, (1979), 145. See also 132-133. Some scholars argue that the 'son of man' is identified with 'the holy ones of the Most High' because in the interpretation of the vision in 7:17-18 they are the ones who receive possession of the kingdom forever (See also 7:22, 27). Hartman and Di Lella, (1978), 218-219.

502. See also Leim, Joshua E., "In the Glory of His Father: Intertextuality and the Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of Mark" *JTI* 7/2 (2013), 217.

503. Mark 2:10, 28, 8:31, 38, 9:9, 12, 31, 10:33, 45, 13:26, 14:21, 41, 62.

504. This allusion to Daniel 7:13-14, 22 is denied by Lo, (2012), 235ff. While E. Adams sees a combination of Dan 7:13 and Zech 14:5 in which the latter predominates. Adams, Edward, "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel" *TynBul* 56.2 (2005), 50-52.

505. Leim, (2013), 218.

506. Leim, (2013), 221. Emphasis original.

507. Leim, (2013), 221-222.

508. Leim, (2013), 226. See also Bock, (2011), 95-96.

509. Schenke, (1988), 112.

510. On the debate whether the reference is to *parousia* or vindication see e.g. Adams, (2005), France, R.T., *Divine Government: God's Kingship in the Gospel of Mark*. (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1990), 73-82. Wright, (1996), 341-343, 360-365.

before giving his statement concerning the coming Son of Man.⁵¹¹ This means that Jesus, even as the Son of Man, is the "filial embodiment of YHWH" while yet being distinct from him.⁵¹²

It has been argued that Mark makes use of both Isaianic and Danielic traditions to interpret the person of Jesus and the kingdom. This coheres well with Leim's own conclusion that "Jesus is not merely the Danielic Son of Man... he is the Danielic Son of Man transfigured by the eschatological hope of the Jewish Scriptures - the return of YHWH to his people."⁵¹³ While the eschatological hopes are more varied and diverse, this expresses well the conflation of traditions in Mark. The link between the 'son of man' and the 'kingdom' in Daniel has already been demonstrated, and in Daniel the emphasis on the kingdom is on its opposition and eventual defeat of all rival kingdoms (Dan 10:13-4, 2:44).⁵¹⁴ J. Schröter has argued that, "the decisive designation with which the claim that Jesus is the representative of the βασιλεία is expressed is ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου."⁵¹⁵ While Schröter emphasises an important aspect, the role of Isaiah as argued above should not be neglected. As will be argued in greater depth in Chapter 5, it is critical for Mark that Jesus is the 'stronger one' who casts out demons and 'binds the strong man'.

(iv) The Meaning of the Kingdom of God

More could be said concerning the background of the Markan 'Kingdom of God', especially from the Psalms.⁵¹⁶ The main emphasis, however, has been on the Isaianic and Danielic hope for the manifestation of the coming rule of God. This expectation is also mediated through other Jewish texts, particularly the *Tg. Isa.* In Jesus' first public announcement, that ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 1:15b),⁵¹⁷ it appears that the kingdom has come near in both a spatial a temporal sense.⁵¹⁸ Jesus' announcement of the good news of the presence of God's reign is intimately

511. Leim, (2013), 228, 231.

512. Leim, (2013), 213. See also 225, 231.

513. Leim, (2013), 219.

514. See e.g. Evans, (2005b), 54.

515. Schröter, Jens, "The Son of Man as the Representative of God's Kingdom: On the Interpretation of Jesus in Mark and Q," in *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records*. Eds. Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 54. See also 43.

516. See especially Rowe, (2002b).

517. The link between Mark 1:14-15 and Dan 7:22 is also strong, because this is the only place in the OT, or any other known text prior to Mark, which combines the καιρὸς and βασιλεία language. Lo, (2012), 130-131, 141-142. Lo sees Dan 7:22 as the primary text reference of Mark 1:15. He argues that the fulness of time is not just a decisive moment, but 'that time' referred to in this Daniel text. Lo, (2012), 199ff, 267.

518. Rose, (2007), 158. Lane, (1974), 64-65. Cranfield, (1959), 67-68 says spatial.

connected with the hope of the coming of God that is indicated in 1:2-3. Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom is also closely linked to the proto-trinitarian baptism scene where the Isaianic plea that the heavens be torn asunder and for God to descend (Isa 63:19) is answered. The long-awaited Spirit of God comes upon Jesus who is revealed to be God's Son, a designation that draws meaning from the scriptural allusions to the Servant of Isa 42 and the messianic king of Ps 2. It would be inaccurate to label either v9-11 or v14-15 as christocentric and the other theocentric, for both texts emphasise Jesus and God and their close relation. While Jesus is passive and God speaks to and about Jesus in v9-11 it is Jesus who is active and speaks about God in v14-15. This must also be related to v2-3 where it is God who speaks to Jesus concerning Jesus' coming in God's stead.

In Jewish texts, both within and outside the OT, God himself is the king of Israel⁵¹⁹ and of the whole world.⁵²⁰ The coming good news of God's presence and reign expressed in Isaiah 40:9-10 and 52:7-8 is in the Gospel of Mark realised in the 'kingdom of God' that comes precisely in and with Jesus, who is acclaimed as Messiah, Son of God, and also the Danielic Son of Man. Jesus is himself the fulfilment of the Isaianic and Danielic promises of God's coming reign.⁵²¹ In his ministry Jesus is both proclaiming and bringing near God's kingdom. This is possible because God's kingdom "is identified in the closest possible way with his own person and ministry"⁵²² so that "[i]n Jesus of Nazareth the kingdom of God makes a personal appearance."⁵²³ There is a relationship between τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ (v.14) and ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (v.15), that has its origins in Isaiah 40:9-10 and 52:7-8 in particular and which needs to be stressed in order to understand the meaning of the 'kingdom'.⁵²⁴ Jesus is himself the content of the gospel,⁵²⁵ as expressed

519. 1 Sam 8:5-7, Isa 44:6.

520. Pss. 22:28, 29:10, 47:2, 8-9, 93:1-2, 95:3, 96:10, 99:1-5, Jer 10:7. See e.g. Grindheim, (2011), 6 and especially the extensive discussion of Rowe, (2002b), 13-114.

521. Cranfield, (1959), 66. Becker, (1998), 93.

522. Edwards, (2002), 46.

523. Edwards, (2002), 47. See also Cranfield, (1959), 66. Though it would be wrong to conclude as does E. Boring that when Jesus has died and is absent, the kingdom is absent as well. This view fails to take into account both the inaugurated nature and the communal aspect of the kingdom. Boring, M. Eugene, "The Kingdom of God in Mark," in *The Kingdom of God in 20th Century Interpretation*. Ed. Wendell Willis (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987), 144. See e.g. Hatina, (2002), 116ff., and Ratzinger, Joseph Pope Benedict XVI, *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration*. (New York: Doubleday, 2007), 49, 55ff.

524. Mussner, Franz, "Gottesherrschaft und Sendung Jesu nach Mk 1, 14f: Zugleich ein Beitrag über die innere Struktur des Markusevangeliums," in *Praesentia Salutis: Gesammelte Studien zu Fragen und Themen des Neuen Testaments*. Ed. Franz Mussner (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1967b), 83. Also some major mss. have the additional qualifier in v.14. ΤΟ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΣ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ: E.g. A D W Δ.

525. See also K. Kertelge: "im Evangelium des Markus wird Jesus selbst als der eigentliche Inhalt des Evangeliums präsent." Kertelge, Karl, "Die Epiphanie Jesu im Evangelium (Markus)," in *Das Markus-*

by M. Hengel: "The good news from God is identical with the proclamation of the dawn of God's rule as the embodiment of the proclamation and activity of Jesus in Galilee."⁵²⁶

The question, then, is whether Origen was right in stating that Jesus is ἡ αὐτοβασιλεία;⁵²⁷ i.e. that Jesus is himself the kingdom, the kingdom in person, and as put by Cranfield: "the kingdom of God is Jesus and... he is the kingdom."⁵²⁸ However, while the 'reign of God' and 'Jesus the Messiah and Son of God' cannot be separated from each other in Mark, these are not simply identical. In Mark 12:34 one of the scribes is 'not far from the kingdom of God' and in 14:25 the 'kingdom of God' is presented as a future reality, which precludes a conclusion that Jesus and the kingdom are the same.

It has been argued that in OT texts such as Daniel, Isaiah, the *Tg. Isa.*, as well as other Jewish texts like the *T. Mos.*, the coming of God and the appearance of his reign are identical. However, in the Gospel of Mark it is Jesus who is the one in whom the kingdom, the reign of God - God's saving presence - comes. One can therefore summarise with Hatina, that "[t]he kingdom of God is the coming of God in Jesus".⁵²⁹ While Mark has apocalyptic undertones, the hope for the arrival of God's kingdom does not suggest a "hope for a deliverance from history itself" as suggested by N. Perrin.⁵³⁰ Rather this hope and deliverance occurs within the realm of history.⁵³¹ It is in the life, teaching, miracles, exorcisms, and suffering of Jesus that the kingdom of God is revealed in the present, rather than through teachings on the nature and being of God in the abstract.⁵³² Thus as noted by Guelich, "Jesus not only

Evangelium. Ed. Rudolf Pesch (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979), 261, 278.

526. Hengel, Martin, "Literary, Theological, and Historical Problems in the Gospel of Mark," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Ed. Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 244.

527. *Hom. Mt. 14.7*. Klostermann, Erich, *Origines Werke: Zehnter Band. Origines Matthäuserklärung*. GCS. 40. (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1935) 303. This has been translated variously: 'very kingdom itself in person', 'the kingdom himself' by McKnight, Scot, *The King Jesus Gospel: The Original Good News Revisited*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 100. 'self-lordship' by Pannenberg, Wolfhart, *Jesus - God and Man*. 2nd edition. (Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox, 1982), 369n10, and 'absolute kingdom' as translated in Roberts, Alexander, James Donaldson and A. Cleveland Coxe, eds. *Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. 9. (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1885) or 'the kingdom in person' Soulen, R. Kendall, *The Divine Name(s) and the Holy Trinity: Distinguishing the Voices*. (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2011), 234.

528. Cranfield, (1959), 66. Emphasis original. Similarly, Mansfield, (1987), 79.

529. Hatina, (2002), 117. It is sometimes argued that the ἦλθεν in v.14 is epiphanic. E.g. Pesch, (1976), 101 and Mussner, (1967b), 82. But this interpretation is too strong. Guelich, (1989), 42. This is not an 'I have come' saying and nor does it have a purpose clause. See also Gathercole, (2006), 84ff.

530. Perrin, Norman, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom*. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 27. Cited in Boring, (1987), 133.

531. Boring, (1987), 133-134.

532. Feldmeier and Spieckermann, (2011b), 519. As J. Becker rightly notes (in the context of the historical Jesus, though it applies equally to Mark's Jesus): "Other than the Kingdom of God, there is simply no other central concept, no other overarching theme, that could define Jesus' message. Jesus' theme is, quite simply, God

proclaimed that the Kingdom had come into history; his work was effecting God's rule in history".⁵³³ The problem of the identification of both God and Jesus with the 'reign of God' needs to be considered within a trinitarian framework, because Mark has already indicated that the coming of Jesus constitutes the awaited arrival of God himself (1:2-3).

Likewise the arrival of God's Holy Spirit and its effect on humans and demons alike is significant. The coming of God's reign happens in the realm presently dominated by a usurper.⁵³⁴ J. Becker rightly stresses the connection between the eschatological hope for the return of YHWH and the resulting salvation. For Jesus salvation meant the defeat of Satan's reign occurring in the present time (Mark 3:22-30, *T. Mos.* 10:1),⁵³⁵ and in Mark the Satanic reign manifested in demon-possession and sickness is immediately challenged by him.⁵³⁶ The cosmic dimension of the coming of the kingdom is evident in Dan 10:13 when the angelic messenger is hindered by 'the prince of the kingdom of Persia' until he is aided by Michael. Furthermore, the kingdoms represented by the beasts in ch. 7 may also have spiritual aspects.⁵³⁷ This theme of the defeat of Satan with the advent of God will be explored in further detail in Chapter 5 in the context of the coming of God's Spirit. But it is worth stressing at this point the close association of the kingdom and the Spirit, for as Dunn notes "[t]he manifestation of the Spirit is the manifestation of the kingdom."⁵³⁸ Though it is too much to state that Jesus and the kingdom are identical, the relation is so close that for Mark the kingdom of God comes in and through Jesus on whom the Spirit of God dwells, and is evidenced by the casting out of demons and binding the 'strong man'.⁵³⁹

There have been many translation attempts to capture the meaning of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and it is frequently rendered as the 'kingdom', 'reign' or 'rule' of God. J.

and his kingdom." Becker, (1998), 101.

533. Guelich, (1989), 46.

534. Boring, (2006), 52.

535. Becker, (1998), 107-110.

536. Mussner, (1967b), 92.

537. Caragounis, (1986), 68-70. Goldingay, (1996), 161. J. Marcus may also be right in hearing an echo of Ps 2 in Mark 1:15 and in stressing the close links between the rule of God and his Messiah, which is in opposition to the rule of earthly kings. Marcus, (1992), 66. This may also be linked with the YHWH-warrior motif. In the LXX YHWH is warring against the demonic gods of the nations. Watts, (1997), 168-169. For a fuller analysis of this theme see the discussion in Evans, (2005b).

538. Dunn, James D.G., "Spirit and Kingdom," in *The Christ & the Spirit: Pneumatology*. Ed. James D.G. Dunn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 138.

539. See e.g. Hooker, Morna, "Mark's Parables of the Kingdom (Mark 4:1-34)," in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 97-98.

Ratzinger calls it "the lordship of God";⁵⁴⁰ and Beasley-Murray used the expression: "the sovereignty of God among men" and "the saving sovereignty".⁵⁴¹ These definitions or translations may be helpful, but they don't explain the meaning of the phrase. On the basis of *Tg. Isa.* B. Chilton has argued that God's kingdom is "God's dynamic presence"⁵⁴² and it is "a means of expressing *God's activity in the world*".⁵⁴³ This is also expressed in the dictum-like title of one of his articles: "Regnum dei deus est".⁵⁴⁴ Many other scholars have expressed similar notions. J. Jeremias for instance wrote: "When Jesus announces *engiken he basileia tou theou*, his meaning is virtually 'God is near'";⁵⁴⁵ Or in the words of L. Hartman who states that the kingdom coming is "a kind of reverent circumlocution of that God 'is coming'".⁵⁴⁶ Therefore, as has been argued thus far, the 'kingdom of God' is not a thing or entity that can be separated from God himself. The coming of God's βασιλεία is not an abstraction, but is intimately tied to the 'king' himself.⁵⁴⁷ This is well expressed in P. Stuhlmacher's words, "βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ bedeutet also in erster Linie *die aktive Regentschaft Gottes, Gottes Herrschen als König*".⁵⁴⁸ But it has also been argued that while Jesus is closely bound to the 'kingdom', Jesus and the kingdom are not identical. The Spirit is paramount in the announcement of the presence of the kingdom, but is neither the kingdom itself nor identical to Jesus. For this reason trinitarian language captures well the essence of this thick theological point of Mark; that the kingdom of God the Father of Jesus, is present in the Spirit-anointed Jesus the Messiah Son of God. The kingdom therefore must be understood in a trinitarian way.

(e) Conclusions

This chapter has examined four critical points for understanding the presentation of God in the Gospel of Mark. First of all, the God who speaks from heaven at the baptism of Jesus is not a different God than the one called YHWH in the Jewish

540. Ratzinger, (2007), 59.

541. Beasley-Murray, (1986), 74, 343-344.

542. Chilton, (1979), 89.

543. Chilton, Bruce D., *Pure Kingdom: Jesus' Vision of God*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 10. Emphasis original. See also Witherington who says it is "God's divine saving activity". Witherington, (2001), 78.

544. Chilton, (1978)

545. Cited in France, (1990), 23. Emphasis original. See also Jeremias, Joachim, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus*. Vol. 1. (London: SCM, 1971), 102.

546. Hartman, Lars, *Markusevangeliet 1:1-8:26*. KNT. 2a. (Stockholm: ESF-förlaget, 2004), 55. In Swedish: "ett slags vördnadsfull omskrivning för att Gud 'kommer'".

547. France, (1990), 13. Boring, (2006), 52-53. Witherington, (2001), 78.

548. Stuhlmacher, (2005), 66. Emphasis original.

Scriptures. The 'god' known to the patriarchs, was known anew with Moses, and again to a fuller extent in Mark's Gospel, but without the newness contradicting what was known before. While the monotheism of the *Shema* and the wider OT is exclusive, in that the worship of other deities is excluded, the main orientation is more soteriological than ontological. It was also concluded, relying on the work of Hans Frei, that identity is constituted in action, rather than in abstract statements of God's attributes. To know the *being* of God, the actions of God must be considered. But his actions do not stand in isolation, and are always done in relation to something or someone. It was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob who brought the people out from Egypt, and precisely this event and action became constitutive of the known identity of YHWH.

In this chapter God's narrative action as an agent was examined. For although 'God' is never directly described as the performer of narrative acts, there are numerous places where the activity of God is implied. Statements such as, 'it is written', 'time is fulfilled', and 'heaven opened', all point to the agency of God in the narrative world of Mark and beyond. While God is everywhere presupposed, he rarely takes centre stage; and in the only two occasions that he does do so, it is only as the rather impersonal 'voice from heaven'. These two instances - God speaking at the baptism and at the transfiguration of Jesus - are critical in determining God's view of Jesus and his work, and thus consequently Mark's understanding of God himself. Therefore, the infrequency of God's direct actions belie their importance for the theology of the book. In these texts God identifies himself as the Father of Jesus and Jesus as his Son.

If Frei is right in arguing that *being* is determined by action, then it would follow that if Jesus does what God only is supposed to do, then Jesus can be identified with God. As Bauckham writes: "The inclusion of Jesus in the unique, divine identity had implications not only for who Jesus is but also for who God is." This, however, does not cancel or contradict the previous revelations of God in the OT or other Jewish conceptions of God.⁵⁴⁹ Nor is God simply replaced by Jesus, but God becomes known as both Father and Son. This close relation is brought home by the opening citation in Mark 1:2-3 where Jesus takes the role that was anticipated of God.

549. Bauckham, (2008d), x.

This Gospel concerns a revelation, an epiphany, of God. The coming of God is expressed as the present reign of God, and when Jesus starts his public proclamation, it is the good news of the presence of God's reign (1:14-15). This has its roots particularly in Isaiah and Daniel, texts which speak of the future coming of God's kingdom and even God himself. This ruling presence of God is manifest in the Spirit-anointed Jesus in that all enemies are defeated; the demons and the prince of demons. As Hays notes, there is a "proleptic revelation of God's kingdom in the story of Jesus".⁵⁵⁰ Jesus as the Danielic Son of Man will later come in the cloud in the glory of his Father and with great power and the holy angels and be seen seated at the right hand of God.⁵⁵¹

550. Hays, (2016), 19.

551. 8:38, 13:26, 14:62.

Chapter 3

The Torn Heaven

The baptism scene proper begins when Jesus is baptised by John and immediately sees heaven torn: εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς (1:10).¹ Before examining the meaning of the descent of the Spirit and the heavenly voice, it is necessary to note the apocalyptic literary motif that introduced them. This will be followed an analysis of Mark's allusion to Isa 63:19.

(a) The Open Heaven Motif

The notion of 'open heaven' is an important motif in both Second Temple Jewish and early Christian texts. In order to appreciate the role of this apocalyptic motif in Mark, a brief analysis of its use in other texts is needed. The opening or closing of heaven is a regular expression in OT and para-biblical texts, and is often simply an expression referring to the giving (Gen 7:11, Ps 78:23, 2 *En.* 73:4) or holding back of rain (Deut 11:17, 1 Kgs 8:35, 2 Chr 6:26, Luke 4:24), or other 'meteorological phenomena' (1 *En.* 33:2-36:3). The notion of an open heaven can by extension also signify either judgment (Isa 24:18) or blessing (Mal 3:10).

Examining the occurrences of heaven opening across the literature of Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity reveals that the notion of 'open heaven' is frequently also associated with two further elements: seeing and/or hearing. Given that the torn heaven of Mark 1:10 is followed by both a vision and a voice, the references to 'open heaven' that are followed by these phenomena are of particular interest. While the general concern is with how the 'open heaven' motif functions within the various texts in its own right rather than to identify its origin,² the particular interest is with how its use elsewhere can shed light on Mark's use of the motif. For this reason the emphasis will be on the earliest texts and those that link the 'open heaven' motif with

-
1. Codex Bezae D05 reads ηνυγμένους and the Vulgate has *apertos*. But the oldest *mss.* (8 01, A02, B03, E07, F09 etc.) support σχιζομένους. Furthermore, the change from σχιζομένους to ηνυγμένους can be explained as harmonisation influenced Matthew and Luke's versions of the baptismal event (Matt 3:16 and Luke 3:21).
 2. As does Lentzen-Deis, Fritzleo, "Das Motiv der 'Himmelsöffnung' in verschiedenen Gattungen der Umweltliteratur des Neuen Testaments" *Bib* 50/3 (1969)

a call: these are Ezekiel, 1 Enoch, T. Levi - which may depend on the earlier Aramaic Levi Document - and the contemporaneous 2 Baruch.

(i) Ezekiel and the Conceptual Background

The way the world was construed varied markedly between the Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, and Canaanites, and their *Weltbild* and *Weltanschauung* were competing models of making sense of the world.³ What is of present interest is the *Weltbild* presupposed by the 'open heaven' motif in general, which reflects a clear separation between 'heaven' as the abode of God who is accompanied by his heavenly servants on the one hand, and the 'earth' and those who dwell on it, on the other.⁴

The first instance of the 'open heaven' motif across the literature is Ezekiel's vision of 1:1-3:15, which also is the only such occurrence in the OT. Its importance is based on the antiquity, authority, and stature of the text,⁵ and which accordingly stands in a position of influence over later texts that express the same theme; especially apocalyptic ones⁶ such as Dan 7, 10:5-6, *1 En.* 14:18, and Rev 4.⁷

The book first locates itself within space and time, which is immediately followed by: "In the thirtieth year, in the fourth month, on the fifth day of the month, as I was among the exiles by the river Chebar, the heavens were opened, and I saw visions of

-
3. For a summary of a variety of Graeco-Roman cosmologies and cosmogonies see Adams, Edward, "Graeco-Roman and Ancient Jewish Cosmology," in *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*. Eds. Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough (London: T&T Clark, 2008). For an introduction to Babylonian and Egyptian cosmology and cosmogony see Lucas, Ernst C., "Cosmology," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*. Eds. Alexander T.D and David W. Baker (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2003)
 4. Oden Jr, Robert A, "Cosmogony, Cosmology," in *ABD*. Ed. D.N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 1164-1168. Pennington, Jonathan T., *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*. (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 172-182, Tsumura, David T., "A 'Hyponymous' Word Pair: *rs* and *thm(t)* in Hebrew and Ugaritic" *Bib* 69/2 (1988), 269. See also Keel, Othmar, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 26-35. Adams, (2008), 19-21. See also Lucas, (2003), 137-138. Oden Jr, (1992), 1168-1169.
 5. The dating of either the oracle of 1:1-3:15 or the compilation of the whole book is a complex matter and the precise dates are uncertain. However, from the book's own testimony it can be deduced that Ezekiel began his prophetic ministry in 593 BC, but it is likely that the book underwent a later process of redaction, and was arguably complete by the end of the sixth century BC. See Joyce, Paul M., *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 3-16. Zimmerli, Walther, *A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24*. Hermeneia. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 9-11. Greenberg, Moshe, *Ezekiel 1-20*. AB. (New York: Doubleday, 1983), 12-17.
 6. Allen, Leslie C., *Ezekiel 1-19*. WBC. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1994), 22. Joyce, (2007), 53. Rowland, Christopher, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. (London: SPCK, 1982), 199. It is noteworthy that while H. Gese, cited in Stuhlmacher, famously labeled Deutero-Isaiah "the father of apocalyptic". A. Feuillet called Ezekiel "le père de l'apocalyptique". Stuhlmacher, (1968), 119. Feuillet, (1953), 182. Also in Feuillet, André, "Le Baptême de Jésus d'après l'évangile selon Saint Marc (1,9-11)" *CBQ* 21 (1959), 469. Ezekiel is considered to be one of 'the prophets' in *4 Macc* 18:10-18. Dated to the first century BC. Evans, (2005a), 55. Its influence is also seen in Josephus, Philo, *Ezekiel the Tragedian, Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, as well as in the Dead Sea Scrolls. For an excellent survey see Joyce, (2007), 53-60.
 7. Block, Daniel I., *The Book of Ezekiel: 1-24*. NICOT. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 109.

God." (נִפְתָּחוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְרָאָה מִרְאֹת אֱלֹהִים). Although the book has an additional introduction (1:2-3) and the vision proper begins only in v.4, in its current form the whole of 1:1-3:15 functions as a unified visionary experience.⁸ The locution 'visions of God' can be understood as an objective genitive (referring to what Ezekiel sees)⁹ or as a genitive of quality (referring to his visions as divine visions (See Ezek 8:3, 40:2)).¹⁰ Ezekiel's vision extends from vv.4-28. From v.4 onwards he recounts the heavenly vision in the first person, describing first the four living creatures (vv.4-14) and their wheels (vv.15-21). Above the four living creatures is a רָקִיעַ [a dome, expanse, firmament]; (vv.22-25) above which is the throne of God (vv.26-28). After this vision of God and his throne, he hears a voice from above the רָקִיעַ and is commissioned as a prophet to a rebellious Israel (2:1-3:11) and a Spirit enters him (2:2),¹² after which he sees a further vision of a scroll that God tells him to eat (2:8-3:3). Ezekiel is stunned and sits among the exiles in Tel-Abib at Chebar for seven days, which serves as the conclusion to this passage (3:12-15). As the text stands, it is clear that the commissioning in 2:1-3:11 is directly related to the vision in ch. 1.¹³ Taken as a literary unit, this passage has two halves: the vision and the commissioning.

This notion of heaven opening reflects ancient Jewish cosmology found, for example, in Genesis. In the creation account, whether it envisioned a bipartite or tripartite structure of the world, God places a רָקִיעַ to separate the waters above from the waters below and calls it שָׁמַיִם (Gen 1:6-8).¹⁴ God then installs the lights in the 'dome of the sky' (בְּרָקִיעַ הַשָּׁמַיִם Gen 1:14-17). A variation of this is probably reflected in *Apoc. Ab.* 20:1-3 where Abraham is taken above the seven heavens and sees the stars beneath him. In Job 37:18 the verb form of רָקַע is used and it clearly refers to a hard surface: "Can you, like him, spread out the skies, hard as a molten mirror?"

8. Zimmerli, (1979), 95. Allen, (1994), 14.

9. Cooke, G.A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936), 5. *Tg. Ezek.* reads "the heavens opened and I beheld, in the prophetic vision that rested upon me, a vision of the glory of the Shekinah of the Lord." In Levey, Samson H., *The Targum of Ezekiel: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. ArBib. 13. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 20.

10. As argued by Greenberg, (1983), 4. Block, (1997), 85. Allen, (1994), 22. See Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew: Third Reprint of the Second Edition, with Corrections*. (Roma: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2011), 436-437.

11. Translated variously as 'dome' NRSV, 'firmament' AV, or 'expanse' ESV, NASB, NIV.

12. Although הָרוּחַ means 'wind' in 1:4, and refers to the spirit of the four living creatures in 1:12, 20, 21, it here refers to the Spirit of God, for in the parallel 11:5 the Spirit of YHWH falls upon Ezekiel (cf. 11:24). God also promises to put his Spirit in them in Ezek 36:26-27, 37:1, 37:14, and 39:29. See also Block, (1997), 115.

13. Joyce, (2007), 76.

14. Therefore, when Levi enters the first heaven in *T. Levi* 2:7 he finds water there.

(תִּרְקִיעַ עָמַו לְשָׁחֲקִים חֲזָקִים כְּרָאִי מִצָּק). This is likely also related to the expression in Lev 26:19 and Deut 28:23, that in the time of drought the heavens shall be like iron or bronze.¹⁵ A similar expression is found in Isa 40:22 (See also Ps 104:2) where God is described as sitting above the circle of the earth (עַל־חֹג הָאָרֶץ). In light of the second half of the verse: "who stretches out the heavens like a curtain and spreads them like a tent to live in", the first half most likely refers to the vault of heaven as in Job 22:14,¹⁶ as opposed to the circle of the horizon (Prov 8:27).¹⁷ Job 22:14 also states: "Thick clouds enwrap him, so that he does not see, and he walks on the dome of heaven." (עָבִים סָתְרֻּלוֹ וְלֹא יֵרָאֶה וְחֹג שָׁמַיִם יִתְהַלֵּךְ). Within this cosmology God's abode is beyond the רִקִּיעַ, an idea which comes to clear expression in the vision of Ezek 1. Ezekiel states that 'over the heads of the living creatures there was something like a dome (רִקִּיעַ) shining like crystal, spread out above their heads' (Ezek 1:22). After describing the wings of the four creatures below the dome, he hears "a voice from above the dome over their heads" (1:25), and in narrating what he sees he states: "and above the dome over their heads there was something like a throne, in appearance like sapphire, and seated above the likeness of a throne was something that seemed like a human form" (1:26). After describing the throne, Ezekiel adds that "this was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD" (1:28b).¹⁸ Thus in Ezekiel's vision God is patently envisioned as being beyond the 'dome'.¹⁹

Thus the רִקִּיעַ functions to separate that which is above from what is below; especially God and human beings. Thus to put the matter succinctly: "Wer von einer 'Öffnung' des Himmels redet, denkt sich 'Himmel' und 'Erde' getrennt".²⁰ In light of the above discussion, when Ezek 1:1 speaks of heaven opening and visions ensuing, the reference - in light of the cosmological imagery - is to the separating רִקִּיעַ above which God resides (1:25-28). The opening of the separating רִקִּיעַ allows for a temporal interchange between the two segregated spheres. This interchange can be

15. Lucas, (2003), 138.

16. See also Sir 43:12.

17. Oswalt, John N., *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*. NICOT. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 66-67.

18. The same imagery is expressed in Ezekiel's vision on 10:1 in a shorter form.

19. This is also clearly illustrated in *Jub.* 19:27, which expresses the notion of God being "above the firmament". In *Ascension of Isaiah*, Isaiah is first taken "up into the firmament" (7:9, also 11:23) by the Angel and this is where Satan is found. Then Isaiah is taken "up above the firmament" (7:13), which is also the first heaven, and then further up into the second, third, and until the seventh heaven. Similarly, when Christ is sent by the Most High, his descent will be through the heavens, then through the firmament, through the world, and down to Sheol, though not as far as to 'perdition' (10:7-8, 29). It is clear that here the 'firmament' is a separator between the earthly and the heavenly realms.

20. Lentzen-Deis, (1969), 301-302. Similarly, Lohmeyer, (1957), 21. See also Unnik, Willem Cornelis van, "Die »Geöffneten Himmel« in der Offenbarungsvision des Apokryphons des Johannes," in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964*. Ed. Walther Eltester (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964), 279-280. Taylor, (1966), 160.

expressed in either an upward or downward movement, or by visions or heavenly journeys.

Within the context of Ezek 1 the 'open heaven' serves as a preamble to the following revelation, but it not only introduces the revelations but enables the seeing of heavenly realities and hearing the divine call.²¹ This initial vision is critical in Ezekiel's commissioning as a prophet, and all the following prophecies are thus dependent on it.

(ii) Other Call Narratives

There are numerous places in early Jewish and Christian literature where heaven opens. In several of these the opening of heaven is followed by a divine/human interaction: a vision and/or a voice, something coming down or going up, a call to be a prophet, or a heavenly journey. There are also significant variations in the open heaven motif, such as open gates in heaven, or further open gates in heaven following an initial accent. In many of these texts the 'open heaven' motif plays an important function, for instance in a call narrative, conversion, divine intervention or gnostic salvation. The call narratives will be in focus here because of their thematic similarity with the Synoptic baptismal episode.

The Testament of Levi

In *T. Levi* 2-5²² the opening of heaven has a critical function in establishing Levi's priestly credentials. The vision of open heaven in *T. Levi* 2:5ff. will be treated in its own right, in relation to its own literary integrity. However, there are many questions regarding the provenance of *T. 12 Patr.* The key question is whether the work is a Jewish work with later Christian interpolations,²³ or if it is a Christian work based on Jewish sources.²⁴ The answer given to this question does relate to the question of

21. Unnik, (1964), 271.

22. John J. Collins rightly states in contrast to de Jonge that there seems to be "little evidence of Christian influence in these chapters." Collins, (1989), 138. See also Jonge, Marinus de, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Texts, Composition and Origins*. (Assen, NL: Van Gorcum, 1953), 46-51. *T. Levi* 2-5 has close similarities with Enoch's vision in *1 En.* 14-16. Nickelsburg, George W.E., "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee" *JBL* 100/4 (1981), 588-590. Milik, J.T., "Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen: Fragment de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân (Pl. IV.)" *RB* 62 (1955), 404-405. Collins, (1989), 138.

23. Kee, Howard C., "The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*. Ed. J.H. Charlesworth (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985), 777.

24. Jonge, (1953), 52, 117-121. Kugler, Robert A., *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 82-85, 35-38. Kugler, Robert A., "Patriarchs, Testaments of the Twelve," in *The*

dating which ranges from around second century BC in the former view²⁵ and AD 190-225 for the latter view.²⁶

As the text presently stands,²⁷ with the twelve testaments united in a large unified work, it is significant that in most of the other testaments the patriarchs Levi and Judah are singled out for special honour and leadership and as the origin of a significant coming figure or figures. As stated by Judah in *T. Jud.* 21:3 "[t]o me he gave earthly matters and to Levi, heavenly matters."²⁸ and in *T. Iss.* 5:7 "[a]nd Levi and Judah were glorified by the Lord among the sons of Jacob. The Lord made choice among them: To one he gave the priesthood and to the other, the kingship."²⁹ And as to their progeny, *T. Sim.* 7:2 states "[f]or the Lord will raise up from Levi someone as high priest and from Judah someone as king [God and man]. He will save all the gentiles and the tribe of Israel."³⁰

The *T. Levi* itself begins as the other testaments with locating the text in the context of Levi's final days and him recounting certain aspect of his life to his sons. From the

Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism. Eds. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 1033. Kugler, Robert A., "Testaments," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Eds. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 1296. Himmelfarb, Martha, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 30.

25. Kee, (1985), 777-778.

26. Kugler, (2001), 36. Jonge, Marinus de, "Patriarchs, Testaments of the Twelve," in *ABD*. Ed. D.N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 183.

27. The occurrences of heaven opening in *T. Levi* is complex because of its link with the *Aramaic Levi Document*. The date of *ALD* has been debated. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel argue that it is at least prior to the *Damascus Document* and *Jubilees* and thus date it to the third century or very early second century BC (Greenfield, Jonas C: Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel., *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 19-20). James Davila is more hesitant in giving it a specific date and states that it "could have been composed any time between the fourth century and about 100 BC. (Davila, James R., "Aramaic Levi: A New Translation and Introduction," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*. Eds. Richard Bauckham, James R. Davila and Alexander Panayotov (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 127.)

The current text of *ALD* is fragmentary, with two nearly full leaves and a fragment of a third from Cairo Geniza, as well as seven fragments from the Dead Sea Scrolls. There is also additional interpolated material in Greek from the *ALD* in the Athos manuscript of the *T. 12 Patr.*, which corresponds to the *ALD* but not to other manuscripts of the *T. Levi*. While it is likely that *ALD* was a source of the *T. Levi*. (Greenfield, Stone and Eshel., (2004), 1-6, 10) it is not advisable to utilise the 4Q213a fragment for our purposes as an independent witness to the 'open heaven'. The relevant section reads (line 15 col. II.) ... אֲדִין חֲזִיוֹן אֲחֵיטָה and (line 16 col. II) has ... בְּחֵזֶיט חֲזִוִּיָּא וְחֵזֶיטָה שֶׁמֶּ. That this is the beginning of a new section or paragraph is clear from the indentation of the manuscript at line 15. The ending of both lines are missing, but it is very likely that שֶׁ at the end of line 16 is the beginning of שְׁמִיָּא (the heavens). In reconstructing this fragment, J.T. Milik translates it as: (line 15): Alors une vision me fut montrée [... (line 16) en voyant les visions, et je vis les cieux... (Milik, (1955), 400. See also Greenfield, Stone and Eshel., (2004), 66-67. Stone, M.E. and Greenfield, J.C., "The Second Manuscript of *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran (4QLevi(b) aram)" *Le Muséon* 109 (1996), 6-7.) While this is not problematic, his further reconstructions are problematic for our purposes since it is based on the *T. Levi*. and it is too uncertain as to what was originally written in the present lacuna. (Milik, (1955), 404.) While this reconstructed text is provided in Wise, Michael O., Abegg, Martin G., Jr. and Cook, Edward M., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, San Francisco: Harper, 2005) this reading has rightly been omitted in J. Davila's edition of *ALD* Davila, (2013), 134-135.

28. Charlesworth, James H., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*. (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985)

29. Charlesworth, (1985)

30. See also *T. Reu.* 6:7-12, *T. Levi* 2:11, 8:14, *T. Dan* 5:4, 5:10, *T. Gad* 8:1, *T. Naph* 8:2, *T. Jos.* 19:11, *T. Benj.* 11:2. Text from Charlesworth, (1985).

very beginning he narrates how as a twenty-year old he was tending the flocks and it was given to him to see the wickedness of men, which caused him to grieve and to pray (2:2-4). As he sleeps he sees heaven being opened and is invited to enter (2:5-6). At this point there are traces of later redaction with regard to the enumeration of the heavens, which seems to be expanded from three to seven,³¹ and as a result the description of the heavens is rather confusing. But it appears that the three lower heavens are associated with judgment (3:1-3), while the upper four are described from top downward and "constitute the heavenly temple".³²

Important for present concerns is the function and the opening of heaven *per se*, and the visionary experience as a whole. Examining the latter question first, the whole experience is fundamental for Levi and his subsequent role as a priest. Levi first sees heaven open (2:5-6).

(5) τότε ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὕπνος, καὶ ἐθεασάμην ὄρος ὑψηλόν· τοῦτο ὄρος Ἀσπίδος ἐν Ἀβελμαούλ. (6) καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεώχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ ἄγγελος θεοῦ εἶπε πρὸς με· Λεὺί, εἴσελθε.³³

Further the angel says to Levi: "[y]ou shall be his priest and you shall tell forth his mysteries to men. You shall announce the one who is about to redeem Israel. Through you and Judah the Lord will be seen by men, [by himself saving every race of humankind]. Your life shall be from the Lord's provision; he shall be to you as field and vineyard and produce, as silver and gold." (2:10-12, See also 4:2, 5:2).

Again in 5:1-2 Levi sees the gates of heaven opening. The text reads

(1) Καὶ ἠνοιξέ μοι ὁ ἄγγελος τὰς πύλας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καὶ εἶδον τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἅγιον, καὶ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης τὸν ὕψιστον. (2) καὶ εἶπέ μοι· Λεὺί, σοὶ δέδωκα τὰς εὐλογίας τῆς ἱερατείας, ἕως οὗ ἔλθῶν παροικήσω ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.³⁴

While the problem of the double opening of heaven (2:6, 5:1) and double statement of Levi's priesthood could be examined on a source-critical and redactional level, as the text currently stands these two episodes belong to the same event and reinforce each other, for in 2:6 Levi is invited to enter heaven and in 5:1 further gates in heaven are opened so that he sees the 'Most High' sitting on his throne; perhaps entering from the third to the fourth heaven. In 5:3 Levi is brought back to earth.

31. Collins, (1989), 138. Jonge, Marinus de, "Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII," in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Ed. Marinus de Jonge (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 248-251, 259. This problem is masked by Kee's translation which omits the numerical references τέσσαρας οὐρανοὺς (2:9) and ἐπτὰ οὐρανῶν in (3:1).

32. Himmelfarb, (1993), 31.

33. Jonge, Marinus de et al., *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. PVTG. (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 25-26.

34. Jonge et al., (1978), 30.

Thus at the beginning of the testament, Levi's role as a priest is announced and is foundational, not only for the rest of his testament, but for the testaments of his brothers as well, for Levi is a leader among his brethren. That Levi is to be given the mysteries of God and is to proclaim them to men, is probably a reference to his later teaching role reflected in *T. Levi 13* where he teaches the law to his sons.³⁵

The opening of heaven functions first as the means by which Levi enters heaven and sees the things therein (2:6-8, 3:1, 5:1). The vision itself clearly functions as legitimating Levi's priestly role. As John J. Collins notes, "the primary purpose of this little apocalypse is to legitimate Levi as priest and one chosen by God. The legitimation presumably extends to his successors, and so elevates the office of the priesthood."³⁶ This election in the first vision (*T. Levi 2:3-5:7*) is accomplished in the following vision (8:1-19) where he is given the priestly garments and is anointed, and it is said to him, "[f]rom this moment be a priest of the Lord, you and your seed for eternity (8:3).³⁷ This is further confirmed by Isaac's own vision, who, Levi states, "saw a vision concerning me, that I would be a priest to God for them." (9:2-3).

In *T. Levi*, after a troubled period in ch. 17 where the priesthood will fail, the Lord will raise up a new priest who will speak the words of the Lord, and execute judgment, and 'his star shall rise in heaven like a king', and heaven shall rejoice over him. Heaven will be opened and a fatherly voice will speak and he shall receive the spirit of understanding, he shall have no successors, and the nations will benefit at the expense of Israel, he shall open the gates of paradise, and will bind Beliar (*T. Levi 18:1-14*). Similarly, *T. Jud.* 24 prophesies that a star shall rise from Jacob, who has no sin, and the heavens will open for him and the Spirit will be poured on him. Here the parallels with Jesus' baptism are obvious and are secondary, however while there is no vision or heavenly speech in this narrative, the open heaven in *T. Jud.* 24:2 enables the pouring of the blessing of the Spirit from the Holy Father and in *T. Levi 18:6-7* it precedes the fatherly voice, the Spirit, and the coming sanctification. Thus the open heaven in these texts also functions to introduce the messianic figure and inaugurate his ministry.

35. Hollander, H.W. and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 135, 165-167. Also *T. Reu.* 6:8.

36. Collins, (1989), 138-139.

37. R.A. Kugler argues that these two visions were originally one vision in the *ALD*. Kugler, (2001), 53.

The apocalyptic work known to us as Second Baruch is fully extant only in Syriac. The work is widely recognised to be Jewish and has been dated to the aftermath of the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70, but before the Bar Kochba revolt in AD 135.³⁸ Second Baruch begins with a narrative prologue which situates the text on the eve of the destruction of Jerusalem at the time of king Jeconiah and prophet Jeremiah (2 *Bar.* 1:1, 2:1). Immediately, Baruch functions as a prophet in that "the word of the Lord" comes upon him (1:2) and lets him know of the impending destruction of the city by the Chaldeans (1:2-5ff., 6:1, 8:4). Baruch is then sent to relay the message to the people (5:4-6). Although Baruch is never mentioned as such, it is clear that he functions as a prophet before the opening of heaven in 22:1.³⁹ He is told to remember God's word and is to fast and purify himself for seven days (20:5). Then God says, "[a]nd after this time, come to that place and I will reveal myself to you. And I will tell you true things, and I will command you concerning the course of times; for they are coming and will not delay."⁴⁰ (20:6). In the context of the book this promise clearly looks forward to what will follow the open heaven of 22:1, but the fulfilment is interrupted by Baruch's prayer in 21:1-26. In verses 21:26-22:2 we read:

And when I had finished the words of this prayer, I was weakened greatly. And it happened after these things that, behold, the heavens were opened and I saw, and power was given to me, and a voice was heard from on high, and it said to be, "Baruch, Baruch, why are you troubled?"⁴¹

The similarities between this text and Ezek 1:1 are immediately apparent:⁴² The open heaven, the seeing (although what was seen is not reported), and the divine speech (Ezek 2:1). The dialogue that commences at 22:1 extends to 30:5 and some of the things revealed therein are a direct response to the concerns voiced by Baruch in his

38. Davila, James R., *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 126-131. Gurtner, Daniel M., *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text*. (London: Continuum, 2009), 13-15. Charlesworth, James H., "Baruch, Book of 2 (Syriac)," in *ABD*. Ed. D.N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 621-622. Collins, (1989), 195, 212. Henze, Matthias, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 10. Gurtner, (2009), 16-18. Gurtner suggests the more specific date of AD 95 based on his reading of 2 *Bar.* 1:1. Contra Nir who argues for a Christian origin. Nir, Rivka, *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2003).

39. Besides receiving "the word of the Lord" (1:1), he specifically hears a voice "from on high" (13:1) and is in an extended dialogue with God regarding the grounds for the present disaster and God's justice (13:1-20:6). See summary in Henze, (2011), 45.

40. Translation of Gurtner, (2009), 53.

41. Translation of Gurtner, (2009), 57.

42. Henze argues that 2 *Bar.* 22:1 is literarily dependent on Ezek 1:1. While this is possible, my argument does not rest on demonstrating literary dependence, but rather on how the motif functions in the texts in which it is found. Henze, (2011), 101. See also Rowland, (1982), 54.

prayer in ch. 21.⁴³ But first he is told not to concern himself with things he does not understand (22:2-23:2).

In this speech God promises that to Baruch is given "to hear what things will come after these times" (23:6). What is revealed to Baruch is that between the time of Adam and the time of the end there are a set number of people who are to be born; a number not yet attained (ch. 23). When Baruch expresses his dismay of not knowing the time of the end, God reveals the sign of the end of days (24-25) which are the coming times of tribulations and torment (25). After inquiring regarding its length (26), God reveals that the time of the end is divided into twelve parts (27) that progress according to God's will.⁴⁴ Asking about the fate of those who are 'corruptible' and whether the signs will encompass the whole of the earth (28), God replies that the whole world will be affected, but those who are found 'in those days in this land' (29:2) will be protected. After all has been accomplished, 'the Messiah will then begin to be revealed' (29:3) and return in glory (30:1), and there will be resurrection for those who have died hoping in him (30:2). The souls of the righteous will rejoice, while the souls of the wicked will be tormented because the end has come (30:3-5).

John J. Collins calls this dialogue following the open heaven a 'transitional unit', for "[u]p to this point, there had been no extensive eschatological revelation."⁴⁵ It is clear that in Second Baruch it is only *after* the opening of heaven that the mysteries of the end are revealed;⁴⁶ a hidden matter which God alone knows (69:2). The opening heaven is thus the preamble to a revelation. Although it is not made explicit, this divine revelation functions for Baruch as the initiation into his role as a public prophet, for immediately after the conclusion of the dialogue in 30:5 one reads for the first time that Baruch "went to the people and said to them..." (31:1). One can thus conclude that the open heaven motif in 2. *Bar.* not only introduces a revelation, but also functions in a transitional sense.

43. Henze, (2011), 136.

44. Henze, (2011), 46.

45. Collins, (1989), 218.

46. Two further extended visions, and their interpretations, are given to Baruch, following the opening of heaven. (36:1-43:3, 53:1-76:5). See outline in Henze, (2011), 42 and Murphy, Frederick James, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 19-23.

*The Book of the Watchers*⁴⁷ of 1 Enoch has been dated to the third century BC.⁴⁸ The section from chs. 12-16 describes Enoch's commissioning as a messenger to the fallen Watchers (12:4, 13:1-3) and even as an intercessor on their behalf (13:3-6). When Enoch intercedes for the fallen Watchers by the waters of Dan, he falls asleep and sees a vision (13:8). The content of the vision is narrated immediately afterwards (14:1). He describes his heavenly ascent and passes both the clouds and the stars until he reaches a wall of white marble (14:8-9). When he enters this house, i.e. the heavenly temple, he finds it empty, falls to his feet, and then he sees doors opening before him. The following passage reads (14:13-15):

(13) And I went into that house—hot as fire and cold as snow; and no delight of life was in it. Fear enveloped me, and trembling seized me; (14) and I was quaking and trembling, and I fell upon my face. And I saw in my vision, (15) And behold, another open door before me: and a house greater than the former one; and it was all built of tongues of fire.⁴⁹

Enoch then sees the throne room of God and even God himself, and is bid to come near and to hear God's voice (14:16-25) and is then commissioned to speak against the wicked Watchers (15:2, 16:2).

In this case there is a door in heaven after an initial heavenly journey that is opened, rather than heaven itself or the firmament, however this text is relevant because it is a variation of the same theme and is also a type of call narrative like Ezekiel, *T. Levi*, and *2 Bar*. The presence and function of the open door in heaven has an important function in this text. Firstly, its purpose is revelatory since after the doors are opened Enoch states "I observed and saw inside it a lofty throne" (14:18). Thus the opening of the heavenly doors enables what follows to take place: the seeing of God and the hearing of his voice. As F. Lentzen-Deis writes: "Es handelt sich also nicht um eine in sich bedeutsame Eigenschaft jenes 'Hauses', sondern die Türen stehen auf, damit der Seher hineinschauen kann."⁵⁰ Thus Enoch is led in his vision past the clouds, the

47. The Book of the Watchers is also itself a composite text - consisting of an introduction (chs. 1-5), the Watchers Myth (6-11), the commissioning of Enoch (12-16) and Enoch's travels (17-36).

48. Stokes, Ryan E., "Watchers, Book of (1 Enoch 1-36)," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Eds. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 1332-1334. Nickelsburg, George W.E., "Enoch, First Book of," in *ABD*. Ed. D.N. Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 509.

49. Translation by Nickelsburg which is based on his own critical text. Nickelsburg, George W.E., *1. Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch 1-36. 81-108*. Hermeneia. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 258. εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἐκεῖνον, θερμὸν ὡς πῦρ καὶ ψυχρὸν ὡς χιὼν, καὶ πᾶσα τροφή ζωῆς οὐκ ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ· φόβος με ἐκάλυπεν καὶ τρόμος με ἔλαβεν. καὶ ἤμην σειόμενος καὶ τρέμων, καὶ ἔπεσον. ἐθεώρουν ἐν τῇ ὀράσει μου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄλλη θύρα ἀνεωγμένη κατέναντί μου, καὶ ὁ οἶκος μείζων τοῦτου, καὶ ὅλος οἰκοδομημένος ἐν γλώσσαις πυρός. Greek text from Black, M., *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. PVTG. (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 28.

50. Lentzen-Deis, (1969), 319.

stars, and eventually into God's own presence, which demonstrates that the "flow of the narrative in vv.8–23 is climactic"⁵¹ and it climaxes with the seeing of God enthroned in his heavenly temple which follows the opening of the gates. This is, as Nickelsburg notes, "the heart of Enoch's vision".⁵²

This whole vision (chs. 12-14) is also critical for the whole of the Enochic corpus, for it legitimates both Enoch as a person and his vision, and thus the text as well.⁵³ This is precisely because Enoch receives his commission directly from God in God's own throne room (15:1-2, 16:2).

(iii) The Function of the Open Heaven Motif

In examining the function of the open heaven motif, the first and most basic point is that the open heaven motif introduces a revelation. In short, the 'open heaven' is a prelude to a revelation,⁵⁴ revealing what is previously hidden or unknown, and which can take the form of a vision or 'audition' or both. The 'open heaven' is both a signal that something is about to be revealed and enables it to be revealed.⁵⁵ It is thus not only a prelude but a precondition for a revelation. There are, of course, many revelations in these and other texts that do not include an open heaven and in this sense an open heaven is not strictly necessary for a revelation or divine intervention to occur. Also to be stressed is the fact that the open heaven is not itself the thing revealed; as Lentzen-Deis writes: "Die 'Himmelöffnung' ist als Gattungselement in der Vision verwendet. Sie hat nicht eine darüber hinausgehende, besondere inhaltliche Bedeutung als Object des Gesichtes."⁵⁶ It is rather what follows the open heaven that is of critical importance.

While the 'open heaven' motif can be described as an apocalyptic motif, the text in which it appears is not necessarily apocalyptic and is found in both apocalypses and other genres. Although the 'open heaven' motif can be employed in an eschatological context, it is not inherently eschatological, and the motif does not have an

51. Nickelsburg, (2001), 259. See also 254.

52. Nickelsburg, (2001), 264.

53. Nickelsburg, (2001), 32.

54. Aune, David E., *Revelation 1-5*. WBC. (Dallas: Word Books, 1997), 280.

55. Unnik, (1964), 271-276.

56. Lentzen-Deis, (1969), 314. Although he says this in relation to its function in Acts it also applies to his general view on the function of the open heaven motif.

independent theological or eschatological meaning in and of itself.⁵⁷ This must be inferred from the context.

The symbolism of heaven opening is set against the background of basic ancient Jewish cosmology in which the firmament, also known as the sky or heaven, functions as a boundary between what is above and what is below.⁵⁸ However, this segregation may temporarily be broken and thus the opening of heaven facilitates the interaction between the earthly and the heavenly spheres, between humans on the one side and angels and God on the other. In the wider usage of the open heaven motif, this breaking of the boundaries may take a variety of forms; frequently with either an upward movement of the human characters (Rev 4:1) or Jesus' ascent to heaven (*Ethiopic Apoc. Pet* 17, *Epistula Apostolorum* 51). The open heaven can also be followed by a downward movement of heavenly entities; whether angels (3 *Macc.* 6:18, *Apoc. Mos.* 35:1-4, *Gos. Pet.* 35-36) or God's Spirit (Mark 1:10). Sometimes the movement of either the visionaries or angels is described as both ascending and descending (*T. Levi* 2:5-6, 5:1-2, John 1:51) or vice versa (*Jos. Asen.* 14:2-4, *T. Ab.* 7:3), and can also involve heavenly journeys.

In a significant majority of the texts where the 'open heaven' occurs it plays a critical role and is rarely found more than once in a single text. Particularly relevant for the Synoptic Gospels is the usage of the motif in the context of a person's commissioning as in Ezek 1:1, *T. Levi* 2:5-6, 5:1-2, *1 En.* 14:13-15, and *2 Bar.* 22:1 as has been demonstrated above. In these texts the opening of heaven is a critical moment that legitimates the prophetic ministry of the person concerned and thus also the book in his name. Other significant occurrences are in relation to 'conversion' as in (*Jos. Asen.* 14:2-4), the reception of a person's soul (*Apoc. Mos.* 35:1-4) or gnostic salvation (*Coptic Apoc. Paul* 23:20-24:5). The 'open heaven' motif can introduce divine revelations that will comprise the remainder of a book (Rev 4:1, *Ap. John* 1:30-2:8, *Pistis Sophia* 1:4) or is used as a means of divine intervention (3 *Macc.* 6:18). It is found in strategic introductory (Mark 1:10, John 1:51), central (*2 Bar.* 22:1, Acts 7:56, 10:11) or climactic moments in a text (Rev 11:19, 19:11). In some texts it appears in the context of Jesus' resurrection (*Gos. Pet.* 35-36) or ascension (*Ethiopic Apoc. Pet.* 17, *Epistula Apostolorum* 51). At times the open heaven is

57. Lentzen-Deis, (1969), 309. Contra Lohmeyer who terms the 'open heaven' "eine eschatologische Offenbarung" Lohmeyer, (1957), 21.

58. In some texts the cosmology is more developed and complex and includes three, seven, ten heaven. In the Coptic *Apoc. Paul* the opening of heaven is between the seventh and the eighth heaven, while in *Apoc. Ab.* heaven opens beneath the seer who is already in the seventh heaven (*Apoc. Ab.*).

linked with divine instruction through either a direct divine voice (Ezek 1:1, 2 Bar: 22:1, Acts 10:11), through the medium of an angel (*Jos. Asen.* 14:2-4, *T. Ab.* 7:3, and *Herm. Vis. V.1.1.4*) or as part of a heavenly journey (*T. Levi* 2:5-6, 5:1-2 and *1 En.* 14:13-15). In several texts the opening of heaven also involves seeing God (Ezek 1:1, 26, *T. Levi* 5:1-2, *3 Macc.* 6:18, *1 En.* 14:13-20, Rev 4:2-3, Acts 7:56⁵⁹).⁶⁰

In conclusion the opening of heaven basically signals a revelation of some kind to the recipient whether by vision, audition, or journey and this revelation often has a strategic function in the text. This frequently involves divine intervention, instruction, or seeing God.

(b) Mark's Torn Heaven and Isaiah's Plea

Having briefly examined the role and function the 'open heaven' motif, a number of important conclusions were made, and these will illuminate our examination of the function of Mark's torn heaven. Its basic role is to introduce a revelation, while not being the revelation itself. This is also its basic function in the context of Mark. Following the tearing of heaven there follows a short vision and an 'audition'. Both of these can be described as revelations. The text reads:

καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν· σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. (1:10-11)

An important conclusion to the above analysis of the 'open heaven' motif is that in most cases it appears only once and at a critical juncture of the text. Since one cannot stipulate that an 'open heaven' is always a key structural marker - and does at times function merely as a standard apocalyptic motif simply introducing a revelation - the literary and theological context of the work in question is critical. The open heaven in Mark is of a preparatory nature and introduces the revelations and act of God that follow. With regards to Mark, it will be argued that its literary and theological context points to the structural importance of this episode; not only in the Gospel as a whole as it launches Jesus into his public ministry of inaugurating the kingdom of God, but also in the context of the prologue where it is to be interpreted in light of the introductory citation. It will be argued that Mark intentionally alludes to Isa 63:19 which provides both a context and a framework for understanding what happens to Jesus at his baptism and for how the reader should understand this in light

59. Seeing Jesus at God's right hand.

60. Other texts with the open heaven motif include *Apoc. Zeph.* 10:2 and *Apoc. Ab.* 19:4.

of the rest of the Gospel. In addition, the apocalyptic *inclusio* between Mark 1:10-11 and 15:38-39 is hermeneutically critical for understanding Mark's presentation of God and his Son. This apocalyptic *inclusio* is also closely linked with the transfiguration with the announcement of divine sonship and the cloud of God's presence. The torn veil is also an act of God for it is described as being 'from top to bottom'. These three episodes are strategically placed at the beginning, middle, and end of the narrative and should be considered mutually interpretive.⁶¹

Of all the occurrences of open heaven, the parallel with Ezekiel is the closest in form to Mark's Gospel. In Ezekiel the introductory vision of the cherubim and God above the firmament is an integral part of Ezekiel's call narrative, and therefore, the catalyst for inaugurating his prophetic ministry. As Ezekiel is "by the river" (1:1, 3:15), he sees heaven open, a vision, and then a voice comes from above the firmament and calls him to be a prophet to the rebellious people of Israel (1:25, 28, 2:1-3:15). As God speaks with him a Spirit enters him (תְּבִיאָה בִּי רוּחַ)⁶² raises him on his feet and eventually carries him away (2:2, 3:12, 14, 24). Ezekiel then receives the commission to be a watchman to Israel (3:16-21). It is not hard to see the similarities with the beginning of Mark. Jesus is by the Jordan (1:9), sees heaven torn and the descent of the Spirit who comes to him (1:10), and hears God's voice inaugurating him for this task (1:11). Jesus is then driven to the desert by the Spirit (1:12), after which Jesus preaches the message of repentance (1:15). These parallels, which also follow the same sequence, are both clear and important, and demonstrates that the form of Jesus' inauguration is in line with the calling of a prophet, and points to the divine authorisation and origin of his task. It is not unusual for the 'open heaven' motif to be linked with a commissioning, as in *T. Levi*, *I En.*, as well as the Synoptic Gospels.

61. See also Black, C. Clifton, "The Face is Familiar - I Just Can't Place it," in *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God: Essays in Memory of Donald Harrisville Juel*. Eds. Beverly R. Gaventa and Patrick M. Miller (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2005), 35.

62. LXX: καὶ ἦλθεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ πνεῦμα. Vulgate: et ingressus est in me spiritus. It is likely that the Spirit that enters Ezekiel and raises him, is the same Spirit that lifts him up and gives him a vision in 11:1, and is in 11:5 called the רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים and is said to fall upon (על) him. In 11:24 the Spirit is called רוּחַ יְהוָה. This can be identified with the רוּחַ יְהוָה of 37:1 which in 37:14 is called רוּחַ יְהוָה and gives life. Also in 39:29 רוּחַ יְהוָה is to be poured on (על) Israel. This is supported by Allen, (1994). It is to be noted here that Ezekiel refers to both the Spirit as coming upon and as entering the prophetic person.

Many have therefore argued that the scriptural allusion in Mark 1:10 is to Ezek 1:1.⁶³ This is not unlikely since the form of Jesus' baptismal narrative is close to Ezekiel. However, Mark has also associated this passage with Isaiah, which is indicated by; 1) The use of σχίζω in 1:10 in relation to heaven which alludes to Isa 63:19;⁶⁴ 2) the reference to Isaiah and to the idea of the coming of YHWH in the opening citation in Mark 1:2-3; 3) and to the coming of God's Spirit in Mark 1:10 which allude to Isa 42:1; 4) the coming of God's Messiah/Servant in 1:1, 10-11, and finally 5), the good news of the coming of God's kingdom in 1:14-15 and Isa 40:9, 52:7-8. The previous chapter focussed on the points 2 and 5, while the remainder of this chapter will discuss point 1. Points 3-4 will be examined in the next chapter.

The fact that Mark in 1:10 uses σχίζω rather than ἀνοίγω with reference to the opening of heaven draws attention to the Hebrew text of Isaiah 63:19 which is the only text of the OT that refers to the heavens tearing. Its use of קרע corresponds to Mark's σχίζω,⁶⁵ while Ezek 1:1 in contrast has פתח. The LXX, however, has translated both texts with the conventional ἀνοίγω. This suggests that Mark alludes to the Hebrew text of Isa 63:19 or it could be posited that he had access to an alternative Greek text of Isaiah, as Mark may choose his *Vorlage* or text to suit his theological purpose.⁶⁶

However, a deliberate allusion is likely as demonstrated by the following points. First of all the text is both available and authoritative for Mark, fulfilling Hays' first criterion for an allusion. Mark has also already explicitly referred to and cited from Isaiah and in the next verse will again allude to a nearby passage (Isa 42:1), which fulfils both Hays' criterion of *recurrence* and Tooman's criterion of *multiplicity*. Hays' criterion of *volume* and Tooman's criteria of *uniqueness* is satisfied by the distinctiveness of heaven tearing, which occurs only in Isaiah 63:19. This allusion

63. France, (2002), 77. Rowland, (1982), 359. Rowland, Christopher, "Apocalypse, Prophecy and the New Testament," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning*. Eds. Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 158-159. Stein, (2008), 57. It is unclear to me why Stein insists that since 1:10 is an eschatological event it does not refer to Isa 63:19. Also Pesch, (1976), 90-91 calls the allusion to Isa 63:19 "fraglich".

64. Guelich, (1989), 32. Hooker, (1991), 46. Schneck, Richard, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VIII*. (Vallejo, CA: BIBAL, 1994), 44ff. Lane, (1974), 55. Marcus, (2000), 159. Boring, (2006), 45. Hurtado, (1989), 19. Myers, Ched, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1988), 128. Edwards, (2002), 35-36. Witherington, (2001), 75. Gnlika, (1978), 52. Lührmann, (1987), 37. Focant, (2010), 73. Hooker, Morna D., *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. (London: SPCK, 1959), 68. Feuillet, (1959), 470-471, 485. Buse, Ivor, "The Markan Account of the Baptism of Jesus and Isaiah LXIII" *JTS* 7/1 (1956), 74. Hays, (2016), 17.

65. Although, Aseneth's vision of the torn heaven also uses σχίζω the whole passage does not have the strong Isaianic flavour and context as does Mark's prologue.

66. See e.g. Docherty, (2015a), 4-5.

has been noted by many authors, as the footnotes show, and thus fulfilling Hays' sixth criterion. Of great significance is the *thematic coherence* (Hays) and the *thematic correspondence* (Tooman) between these two texts, since Mark has already introduced the theme of the coming of the Lord in the introductory citation (referring also to Isaiah). This is also the theme of the 'good news' and the coming 'kingdom' as emphasised in Mk 1:14-15. Mark also significantly connects the tearing of the temple veil with the tearing of heaven as will be expanded on below, and thus also fulfilling the subjective criteria of *satisfaction* for it illuminates the reading of this passage.

As was seen in the discussion of the prologue, the Markan opening citation has important hermeneutical implications and opens the Gospel in such a way as to lead the reader to expect more fully and clearly what previously was only hinted at. In citing Isa 40:3 and Mal 3:1 Mark indicates that the person of Jesus is to be understood in light of the expected arrival of God, which is the theme of Isa 63:19.

Form-critically the plea of 63:19 is part of a larger psalm (63:7-64:11),⁶⁷ which has the form of a community lament, imbedded in the text of Isaiah.⁶⁸ The Isaianic psalmist starts with asserting that he will remember YHWH's gracious deeds towards Israel; his people (63:7-9). However, they rebelled and made him their enemy (63:10), but then they remembered again YHWH's deeds through Moses when he brought them through the sea and gave them rest (63:11-14). The psalmist continues with a plea for God to look down from heaven and dispense his compassions again (63:15) because he is their Father (63:16). This prompts the question as to why they as a people have been separated from God and why his sanctuary has been trampled down by their enemies (63:17-19a). The psalmist then cries to God for the heavens to be torn and for God to come down, which would make mountains quake and nations tremble at his presence (63:19b-64:2). For no one has ever seen a God like YHWH who meets those who remember him, while those who sin will fade like

67. It is recognised that the poem in 63:7-64:11 was at this point not considered to be an identifiable literary unit, a notion based on modern critical scholarship. However, this designation is useful because it points to the near-context of the text in question. Additionally, both the 1Qsa Great Isaiah Scrolls, as well the Codex Leningradensis, have a clear paragraph break at 63:7 and 65:1 thus marking 63:7-64:11(12) as a literary unit. See also Goldingay, John, *Isaiah 56-66*. ICC. (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014), 381.

68. Oswalt, (1998), 603-604. Watts, John D.W., *Isaiah 34-66*. Revised edition. WBC. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005), 893, 898-901. Brueggemann, Walter, *Isaiah 40-66*. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1998), 228. Achtemeier, Elizabeth, *The Community and Message of Isaiah 56-66: A Theological Commentary*. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1982), 112. Westermann, C., *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. (London: SCM, 1969), 386. Hanson, Paul D., *Isaiah 40-66*. Int. (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1995), 235. McKenzie, John L., *Second Isaiah*. AB. (New York: Doubleday, 1968), 192. Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Isaiah 56-66*. AB. (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 258.

leaves (64:3-5). Yet, God has hidden his face because of their iniquity (64:6), and Jerusalem and its holy place are in ruins (64:9-11). The psalmist appeals to God as both Father and potter that he would relinquish his anger (64:7-8).

The core concern of this poem is with the present state of the temple which is trampled down (63:18, 64:11) - which has made God distant in heaven (63:15)⁶⁹ - and the holy city which has become a desolation (64:10-11). This is set against the backdrop of God's redemptive presence (פְּנִיּוֹ הוֹשִׁיעֵם) in the days of old (63:9). The appeal is first for God to 'look from heaven' (הִבֵּט מִשָּׁמַיִם), which is described as זֶבֶל וְתַפְאֶרֶת (you holy and glorious habitation, 63:15). The sanctuary which had been the dwelling place of God is described in exactly the same way בֵּית קֹדֶשׁנוּ וְתַפְאֶרֶתנוּ (our holy and glorious house) (64:11):⁷⁰ and which are the only places this description is used in the MT. Now God's face is hidden (64:7), his voice silent (64:12) and the psalmist passionately asks: "Where is the one who brought them up out of the sea" and "[w]here is the one who put within them his Holy Spirit"? (63:11). The plea is for God to tear open the heavens and to come down,⁷¹ which forms the climax of the poem⁷² and "portrays the awesome advent of Yahweh himself."⁷³ The appeal for God to 'look down' in 63:15 perhaps alludes to how God at the crossing of the Sea 'looked down' and destroyed the Egyptians (Exod 14:24).⁷⁴ The petition in 63:19 goes beyond 63:15 and hopes for a theophany like on Sinai⁷⁵ that will make the nations and the mountains tremble in his presence (מִפְּנֵיךָ - 64:2-3). This appeal must be understood in the context of the recital of the past; of God's former action of being with his people with his presence (פָּנִים - 63:9) and his Spirit (רוּחַ - 63:10-11).⁷⁶ In *Tg. Isa.* the appeal of 63:15 is now for God not simply to "look

69. Lau, Wolfgang, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes 56-66: Eine Untersuchung zu den literarischen Bezügen in the letzten elf Kapiteln des Jesajabuches*. BZAW. 225. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 295. Muilenburg, J., "The Book of Isaiah," in *The Interpreter's Bible*. Ed. George A. Buttrick (New York: Abingdon, 1956), 736.

70. Goldenstein, Johannes, *Das Gebet der Gottesknechte: Jesaja 63,7 - 64,11 im Jesajabuch*. WMANT. 92. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001), 143.

71. Contra Aejmelaeus who argues that since the 'perfect' is used in 63:19 the passage is a 'Irrealis der Vergangenheit' and thus not a plea for a future intervention. Aejmelaeus, Anneli, "Der Prophet als Klageliedsänger: Zur Funktion des Psalm Jer 63,7-64,11 in Tritojesaja" *ZAW* 107 (1995), 43-44.

72. Westermann, (1969), 394-395.

73. Koole, Jan L., *Isaiah III: Volume 3 / Isaiah 56-66*. (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 385.

74. While in the MT the root is different, in the Targum Onkelos and Jonathan the root used is the same.

75. Brueggemann, (1998), 233. Blenkinsopp, (2003), 264. Lau, (1994), 300-301. See Exod 19:11, 16-20, Ps 18:9-15, 4 Ezra 3:18-19, and *L.A.B.* 15:6.

76. Clifford, Richard J., "Narrative and Lament in Isaiah 63:7-64:11," in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* Eds. Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 95-101.

down from heaven and see..." as in the MT, but to "[l]ook down from heaven and be revealed from you holy dwelling" and which anticipates the plea of 63:19b.

F. Lentzen-Deis has disputed the notion that Mark 1:9 is an allusion to Isaiah, and argues that since in Mark the descent, which follows tearing of heaven, is not by God as in Isa 63:19 but rather the Spirit. But the function of the Spirit in this poem and in Mark (which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5 makes the sharp distinction that Lentzen-Deis posits between God and his Spirit unviable.⁷⁷ The plea what God would tear the heavens, is continued by יִרְדָּה and thus the appeal is also for YHWH to *come down*.⁷⁸

The main concern of Lentzen-Deis, however, is that 'the consequences' of the torn heaven in Mark and Isa 63:19-64:4 are too dissimilar. For while the Isaiah text appeals to God to end his patience towards their enemies and make himself known with a sudden, powerful and visible appearance,⁷⁹ this notion of the defeat of Israel's enemies is beyond the purview of Mark's context. While this may be strictly right, it fails to take into account the redefinition of 'the enemy' in Mark, for now the enemies are no longer the nations, but Satan and his demons who precisely are confronted immediately after Jesus' baptism and in the early stages of his ministry (1:23-23, 3:23-27).⁸⁰

There are several further points of contact between Mark's baptismal narrative and the Hebrew text of this poem which suggests a strong link between them. For example, MT 63:11b has "where is he who puts in his midst the Holy Spirit"⁸¹, which differs from the LXX's ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. Mark's εἰς αὐτόν is thus the same as the singular MT as opposed to the plural of LXX (ἐν αὐτοῖς),⁸² and it is the one who comes up from the water who receives the Spirit. In addition, the poem's references to the Spirit of God as the Holy Spirit (63:10, 11) is rare. It only occurs three times in the OT; twice in this psalm and once in Ps 51:11. In the latter it is also linked with God's presence (פָּנָיִךְ). In Isa 63:7-64:11 God is also unusually called "our Father" three times (63:16, 64:7). These multiple points of contact between this Isaianic psalm and the Markan baptismal narrative indicate not

77. Lentzen-Deis, Fritzleo, *Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern: Literarkritische und gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. (Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht, 1970), 102. See also Watts, (1997), 102-108.

78. This is omitted by the LXX in 63:19. In the *Tg. Isa.* it is no longer a plea but a past statement using "bend down" instead of "tear". But in *Tg. Isa.* 63:17 a plea is added for the restoration of the *Shekinah*.

79. Lentzen-Deis, (1970), 102.

80. See also Watts, (1997), 106-107.

81. אֵיךְ הָשֵׁם בְּקִרְבּוֹ אֶת־רוּחַ קָדְשׁוֹ

82. Schneck, (1994), 46.

only that Mark alludes to Isaiah, but also gives credence to the claim that the whole psalm has interpretive significance for Mark.⁸³

As already argued, the title, the opening citation, John's testimony, Jesus' baptism scene, the temptation, and the summary description of Jesus' ministry in the prologue, all point to the Isaianic substructure of the good news of the coming reign of YHWH, with the agency of the Spirit-anointed Son/Servant/Messiah. This is not an arbitrary reading of Isaiah against the grain of the text, for the eschatological hopes of Isaiah were not segregated but unified. B.S. Childs writes, "when viewed as a whole, Third Isaiah continues to hold to a coming, eschatological change brought about by divine intervention into the created world and in direct continuity with Second Isaiah".⁸⁴ The expectation of Isa 63:7-64:11, and Isa 63:19-64:4 in particular, is closely connected with the other expressions of the eschatological hope of the return of YHWH in Isaiah. The hope for the coming of YHWH in 63:19-64:1 in the manner of an Exodus theophany (Exod 19) is associated with the imagery of the coming of YHWH as the Divine Warrior in 63:1-6 which is immediately prior to our present poem (63:7-64:11).⁸⁵ In both LXX of Isa 63:1 and 42:13 YHWH is said to come μετὰ ἰσχύος, which is also used in 40:10 speaking of the 'good news' of the coming of YHWH in strength. This is in Mark's Gospel applied to Jesus who is the stronger one (1:7) who binds the strong one (3:27). In the poem of Isa 63:7-64:11 the hope for the descent of God necessitates the opening, or in this case tearing, of heaven. As argued above and also put by Zapff: "Der Himmel bildet quasi eine Scheidewand zwischen Gott und Israel, sein Zerreißen ist die Voraussetzung für Gottes Kommen".⁸⁶ But the cry of Isa 63:19 is still unanswered. As J. Blenkinsopp notes: "There is no response to the impassioned final appeal. The skies do not open, God does not come down or even look down, and there is no answer to the complaint."⁸⁷ The expectation in Isaiah's poem lies wholly in the future.

That Mark employs σκίζω in 1:10 is no accident and has connotations of both violence and force.⁸⁸ For as Focant rightly points out "ce qu'on ouvre peut être refermé, mais il n'en va pas de même d'une déchirure qui est difficile à réfermer".⁸⁹

83. See discussion above on Mark's use of the OT.

84. Childs, (2001), 442.

85. Contra Blenkinsopp, (2003), 257.

86. Zapff, Burkard M., *Jesaja 56-66*. Die Neue Echter Bibel. (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 2006), 413.

87. Blenkinsopp, (2003), 258.

88. Maurer, C., "σκίζω," in *TDNT*. Eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971).

89. Focant, (2010), 73. E.g. also Eckert, Lowell Edgar, "The Baptism of Jesus in the Canonical and Jewish-Christian Gospels: An Intertextual Study" (Ph.D., The Lutheran School of Theology, 2000), 119.

But more than that, it specifically suggests that Isaiah's unanswered plea is now being answered,⁹⁰ for - as noted by Donald Juel - the heavens functions as "the great cosmic curtain that separates creation from God's presence".⁹¹ That Mark is using the term 'to tear' indicates that he envisions something more, but not less, than a vision which is associated with the heavens opening (See Ezek 1:1, Rev 4:1). What is expected in Isaiah is the reappearance of God as on Sinai. The plea is for the advent or the revelation of God, or rather his revelatory advent. The plea of Isaiah is more than just for tearing the heavens, which is merely a prelude to what is to follow: that God would reveal himself on earth. Thus Mark, in expressing the response to the first half of the plea, also indicates that the second part is now also being answered.⁹² This needs to be understood in the context of the prologue, and the introductory citation especially, where Jesus is introduced as both Christ and Son of God before whom a way is prepared in the wilderness.

It is misleading to call Mark 1:9-11 a theophany⁹³ as far as *Gattung* is concerned, for the telltale signs are absent: there are no mountains melting or valleys bursting open (Mic 1:3-4).⁹⁴ There seems to be some unclarity in the discussion of Mark's baptism narrative, for there are three elements that need to be distinguished. First, it is clear that what the Markan Jesus sees has the form of a 'vision', not a 'theophany' or 'epiphany'.⁹⁵ But while it is a 'vision' on Jesus' part, it is still presented as a real yet eschatological event.⁹⁶ Secondly, it is important to analyse the function of this event in the Markan presentation of God and the divine sonship of Jesus, for it is closely connected with the literary strategy of Mark: 'the messianic secret'. The text's human characters gradually come to know the real identity of Jesus and the baptism scene can be described as a 'secret epiphany' and the book may rightly be called "*a book of*

90. E.g. Stanton, Graham, *The Gospels and Jesus*. 2nd edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 42. Vögtle, Anton, "Herkunft und ursprünglicher Sinn der Taufperikope Mk 1,9-11," in *Offenbarungsgeschehen und Wirkungsgeschichte*. Ed. Anton Vögtle (Freiburg: Herder, 1985), 97. C. Rowland suggests the answer to this plea is found in apocalyptic texts. Rowland, (1982), 11.

91. Juel, Donald H., *A Master of Surprise: Mark Interpreted*. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 35.

92. See also Marcus, (1992), 58.

93. As do Marcus, (1992), 57. Bird, Michael F., "Tearing the Heavens and Shaking the Heavens: Mark's Cosmology in its Apocalyptic Context," in *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*. Eds. Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 50. Schenke, (2005), 55. Dormeyer, (1997), 192. Payot, Christian, "Le baptême de Jésus dans les évangiles synoptiques" *Foi et Vie* 68/3 (1969), 3-4, 11ff. Lee, Aquila H.I., *From Messiah to Preexistent Son*. (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009), 166, and to some extent Lohmeyer, (1957), 21.

94. Lentzen-Deis, (1970), 100. See also Jeremias, Jörg, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung*. 2. WMANT. 10. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977), 7-16, 100-111. Likewise, Schlatter, (1984), 32.

95. Lentzen-Deis, (1969). Contra Pilgaard, (2008), 62.

96. Contra Dibelius, Martin, *From Tradition to Gospel*. (Cambridge: James Clark, 1971), 271n2.

secret epiphanies" - in the parlance of M. Dibelius⁹⁷ - as far the text's characters are concerned.

Thirdly, for the reader the book is a narration of an epiphany of God from start to finish, and the reader only comes to know its full meaning as further revelations are made in the rest of the Gospel.⁹⁸ In his commentary on the Pastoral letters, Dibelius writes regarding a divine epiphany that, "[e]igentlich bedeutet der religiöse Terminus ἐπιφάνεια das Sichtbarwerden der sonst verborgenen Gottheit... Dabei denkt man in Zusammenhängen wie dem unsrigen nicht an die Offenbarungen im Mythos, sondern an Ereignisse der Geschichte und der Gegenwart..."⁹⁹ This, Frenschkowski rightly says, can be said concerning Mark as a whole.¹⁰⁰ It was argued above that the 'open heaven' motif functions as a prelude to a revelation and in the first instance the content of the revelation is the descending Spirit of God and the heavenly statement regarding the Son.¹⁰¹ But this 'open heaven' scene has strategic importance in the whole Gospel and is in the second instance a revelation of the true being of God. So while the torn heaven signal an apocalyptic vision on Jesus' part, this is not the full answer to Isaiah's plea, but the whole narrative is, and in this way the whole Baptism episode is functionally strategic in Mark. What takes place is a divine - yet secret - epiphany,¹⁰² and thus the anticipated coming of YHWH hinted at in the opening citation is coming to realisation.

(c) The Torn Veil and the Divine Presence

The opening of a text gives the reader critical information as how to approach it.¹⁰³ Analysing the Gospel of Mark, the unity of its beginning and ending becomes apparent. It was argued that in Mark the three episodes of baptism, transfiguration, and the centurion's confession at the beginning, middle, and end of the Gospel respectively are thematically intertwined and are high points in Mark's narrative. Each highlights

97. Dibelius, (1971), 230. Emphasis original. See also Dillon, (2014), 18.

98. See also Dibelius, (1971), 278.

99. Cited in Frenschkowski, Marco, *Offenbarung und Epiphanie: Band 2. Die verborgene Epiphanie in Spätantike und frühem Christentum*. WUNT2. 80. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1997), 149.

100. Frenschkowski, (1997), 149.

101. It could also suggest an epiphany of the Spirit, but this is more muted and doubtful in Mark than in Matt, Luke and John. Frenschkowski, (1997), 157-158. Lohmeyer, (1957), 22.

102. Dibelius, (1971), 230. Kertelge, (1979), 274.

103. On the basis of literary scholars, especially R. Funk and B. Uspensky, M.C. Parsons stresses the role of a book's ending which together with its opening make a 'frame' and are related in well-constructed texts. Parsons, Mikael C., "Reading a Beginning/Beginning a Reading: Tracing Literary Theory on Narrative Opening" *Semeia* 52 (1991), 11-18.

Jesus' divine sonship. But while the Spirit is present at the baptism, there is a cloud present at the transfiguration.¹⁰⁴ Likewise at the death of Jesus the temple curtain, which hitherto has hidden the divine presence, is torn. There is thus the common theme of God's presence in each of these, but the cloud and the temple do not act as the Spirit acts (1:12, 3:29, 13:11) which indicates personal qualities.¹⁰⁵

The opening of heaven typically has a revelatory function,¹⁰⁶ and usually serves a strategic role in the text in which it is found. It was argued that with reference to heaven being 'torn', as well as a number of additional parallels, Mark has put forward 1:9-11 and Mark as a whole, as a specific answer to the plea of the poem of Isa 63:7-64:11.

Mark associates the torn heaven at the inauguration of his ministry with the torn veil at Jesus' death, for in Mark σχίζω is used only in 1:10 and 15:38. In both cases God is the implied actor and both contain statements regarding Jesus' divine sonship. Both have an important downward movement: of the Spirit and the tearing of the veil ἀπ' ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω. The first available commentary on Mark, previously falsely attributed to Jerome but likely from the seventh century,¹⁰⁷ already states that the torn veil means that heaven is open.¹⁰⁸ Both heaven and the temple are the place of God's abode. Many commentators also see further links between the two pericopes: the association of baptism (1:9) and death (15:37),¹⁰⁹ the language of τὸ πνεῦμα (1:10) and ἐξέπνευσεν (15:39),¹¹⁰ as well as a connection to Elijah-symbolism with John the Baptist in 1:4-8 and the onlookers in 15:35-36 who think Jesus is calling for Elijah.¹¹¹ While the latter two links may be more tenuous, these texts are clearly intentionally

104. See also Mark 8:38, 13:26, and 14:62.

105. Wainwright, Arthur W., *The Trinity in the New Testament*. (London: SPCK, 1962), 200. Witherington, Ben and Laura M. Ice, *The Shadow of the Almighty: Father, Son, and Spirit in Biblical Perspective*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 107.

106. See the Appendix for a detailed analysis.

107. Cahill, Michael, ed. *The First Commentary on Mark: An Annotated Translation*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 6.

108. (1998), 123.

109. In Mark Jesus is said to undergo two baptisms; the first by John (1:9) and the other at his death (10:38-39). In this latter passage 'baptism' is equated with 'drinking the cup' that Jesus drinks, and James and John are challenged to drink it. But the image of drinking the cup (ποτήριον) is in Mark a potent image that will be associated with the last supper, and which symbolises the blood of the covenant (14:23-24). Prior to his death Jesus also prays that this 'cup' may be taken away from him (14:36) and which is also clearly linked with his death (14:34-36, 41-42). Thus later in Mark both the 'baptism' and the 'cup' are associated with the death and suffering of Jesus. See e.g. Feldmeier, Reinhard, "Der Gekreuzigte im 'Gnadenstuhl'," in *Le Trône de Dieu*. Ed. Marc Philonenko (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 218.

110. Ulansey, David, "The Heavenly Veil Torn: Mark's Cosmic Inclusio" *JBL* 110/1 (1999), 123. Bird, (2008), 53. Gundry, Robert H., *Mark: 9-16*. Vol. 2. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993b), 949-950. Jackson, Howard M., "The Death of Jesus in Mark and the Miracle from the Cross" *NTS* 33/1 (1987), 27. Both Gundry and Jackson argue that the Spirit which Jesus received at the baptism leaves him at the end of his ministry as Son of God, and the force of which tears the temple veil.

111. Motyer, Stephen, "The Rending of the Veil: A Markan Pentecost?" *NTS* 33 (1987), 155.

bound together with shared vocabulary and connotations at the precise beginning and end of Jesus' ministry,¹¹² thus forming an *inclusio*.¹¹³

While this link with the baptismal narrative is certain, there is much debate as to which veil is in view by the locution τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ, with Markan scholars arguing for either the outer¹¹⁴ or the inner veil of the temple.¹¹⁵ One of the recurring arguments for the outer veil is that the centurion must have seen the miracle of the tearing which prompted him to confess Jesus' divine sonship.¹¹⁶ However, this supposition must get around the traditional view of Golgotha being west of the east-facing temple, which would make the temple veil unseeable by the centurion if he were at the foot of the cross. It has therefore been suggested that Golgotha be relocated from its traditional place in the west to the Mount of Olives east of the temple,¹¹⁷ or that the centurion was outside the temple rather than on Golgotha and thus had a complete view of the temple.¹¹⁸ While this latter suggestion is initially attractive, it is unlikely because the same term is used for both mockers at the cross (τινες τῶν παρεστηκότων, 15:35) and the centurion (ὁ παρεστηκώς, 15:38), and since the centurion is summoned by Pilate to verify Jesus' death (15:44) it is likely that he was present on Golgotha and supervised the soldiers who executed Jesus (15:16-28). It may be that the author was not too concerned with the "logistics of the situation", as Jackson puts it.¹¹⁹ However, the main point of the torn temple veil is not that it is seen by the centurion,¹²⁰ but rather as Yarbrow Collins states, "[i]t is the audiences of Mark who are expected to reflect on its significance."¹²¹ The text would be smoother if v.39 followed v.37, and the parenthetical nature of v.38 highlights its theological nature and importance. Given the intentional *inclusio* between Mark 1:10-11 and 15:38-39 and Mark's penchant for significant OT allusions, the inclusion

112. Contra Lamarche, Paul, "La mort du Christ et le voile du temple selon Marc" *NRTh* 96/6 (1974), 586.

113. See Gurtner, Daniel M., *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*. SNTSMS. 139. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007b), 172. See also Gray, Timothy C., *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in its Narrative Role*. WUNT2. 242. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 190-192.

114. Those arguing for the outer curtain include: Lane, (1974), 575. Ulansey, (1999), 124-125. Edwards, (2002), 478. Juel, (1977), 140-143. France, (2002), 656-657. Jackson, (1987), 24. Lohmeyer, (1957), 347. Pelletier, André, "La Tradition Synoptique du 'Voile Déchiré' à la Lumière des réalités archéologiques" *RSR* 46 (1958).

115. Those arguing for the inner curtain include: Collins, (2007), 760. Evans, Craig A., *Mark 8:27-16:20*. WBC. (Nashville: Nelson, 2001), 510. Marcus, Joel, *Mark 8-16*. AB. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 1057. Witherington, (2001), 400. Hooker, (1991), 377. Marcus, (2009), 1057. Schenke, (2005), 346. Klauck, (1997), 91.

116. Ulansey, (1999), 124-125. Jackson, (1987), 23-24. Gundry, (1993b), 950.

117. Jackson, (1987), 24-25.

118. Gundry, (1993b), 950.

119. Jackson, (1987), 24.

120. Contra Ulansey, (1999), 124, and Jackson, (1987).

121. Collins, (2007), 760.

of the tearing of the veil from top down is best understood primarily for theological reasons.

The use of the term καταπέτασμα in the LXX is less specific than the corresponding Hebrew term פָּרֹכֶת, which always refers to the curtain that separated the Holy Place from the most Holy Place in the tabernacle or the temple.¹²² While καταπέτασμα more commonly refers to the inner veil, in the LXX it can also refer to the outer curtain of the tabernacle as well as the curtains which constitute its walls. The fact that the veil in 15:38 is called τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ does not necessarily indicate it is the outer veil as posited by J.R. Donahue, for it could just as well refer to the veil inside the temple as to the one at its entrance.¹²³ In describing the temple of Jerusalem, Josephus tells of the two veils (καταπέτασμα): the outer one at the entrance of the temple building itself (ὁ ναὸς)¹²⁴ and the inner veil before the Holy of Holies.¹²⁵ However, while Philo uses καταπέτασμα for the inner curtain and κάλυμμα for the outer curtain in *Mos.* 2:101, his precision is not maintained throughout his *Laws*, where καταπέτασμα is used for the outer veil (1:171, 231, 274, 296). According to R.E. Brown, the author of Mark - and much less the audience - would not have been aware of the temple structure and its possible significance, and thus rejects such "esoteric" interpretations which go beyond interpreting the torn veil as a portent of destruction.¹²⁶ He nevertheless suggests the vocabulary "slightly favors" the inner veil "if specificity was intended".¹²⁷ Similarly, Gurtner states that in the LXX the καταπέτασμα "is the 'default' term for the inner veil (פָּרֹכֶת), and that where καταπέτασμα is used for any other curtain, the LXX translator employed syntactical qualification, in particular a locative genitive, to clarify which of the three curtains designated καταπέτασμα is in view."¹²⁸ However, the matter cannot be decided on vocabulary alone, but theological factors also need to be considered.¹²⁹

122. Gurtner, (2007b), 44. See his Appendix 3, 214-215.

123. Donahue, John R., *Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark*. SBLDS. 10. (Missoula, MT: SBL, 1973), 202.

124. *J.W.* 5. §212.

125. *J.W.* 5. §212, §219, §232, 7. §162. *Ant.* 8. §75, 12. §250, 14. §107.

126. Brown, Raymond E., *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 2. (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 1098-1102, 1109-1113.

127. Brown, (1994), 1111.

128. Gurtner, (2007b), 46.

129. As argued by Billerbeck and noted by Donahue, (1973), 202. Cf. Allison, Dale C., *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus*. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 30-31.

While God was said to dwell in heaven,¹³⁰ he was also said to dwell in the temple in Jerusalem or on Zion,¹³¹ and the tabernacle was believed to be modelled on the heavenly pattern.¹³² As Jon D. Levenson states, "what we see on earth in Jerusalem is simply the earthly manifestation of the heavenly Temple".¹³³ In Isa 63:7-64:11 God's throne in heaven and his earthly sanctuary are both described as holy and beautiful (63:16, 64:11). Similarly, Ps 11:4 can say "[t]he LORD is in his holy temple; the LORD's throne is in heaven" without contradiction.

A connection between the firmament of heaven and the veils of the temple was made by Josephus¹³⁴ who, in describing the temple of Jerusalem in *The Jewish War*, tells of the two καταπέτασματα: the outer one at the entrance of the temple building itself (ὁ ναὸς) (*J.W.* 5. §212) and the inner veil before the Holy of Holies (*J.W.* 5. §219). It is illuminating that while Philo's description of the inner veil (*Mos.* 2:87-88, *Prelim. Studies* §117) matches the scriptural portrayal of the inner veil of the tabernacle (Exod 26:31, 36:35, 36:37) and the temple (2 Chr 3:14), the description of Josephus (a former priest who likely had seen it) is different. He reports the outer curtain as blue, scarlet and purple and embroidered with considerable skill, and states that the tapestry has a 'mystic meaning'; it typified the universe (τῶν ὅλων): with the 'scarlet' representing the fire, the 'fine linen' the earth, 'blue' the air, and 'purple' the sea. Further he says, "[o]n this tapestry was portrayed a panorama of the heavens" (*J.W.* 5. §213-214). Having described the outer καταπέτασμα in detail, Josephus is less descriptive when he mentions the inner curtain immediately afterwards. Busink suggests it is out of reverence,¹³⁵ and Gurtner supposes the inner καταπέτασμα also had the same pattern. However, though there is no positive evidence for either of these.¹³⁶

Furthermore, the heavenly imagery is expanded by Josephus who notes that the seven-branched lamp-stand represents the seven planets, and the twelve loaves of the table represent the circle of the Zodiac (*J.W.* 5. §217). The gate into the temple building which had no doors, is said to be "displaying unexcluded the void of

130. 1 Kgs 8:27, 2 Chr 30:27, Sir 24:4, 2 Macc 3:39, 3 Macc. 2:15, Isa 63:15, Deut 26:15.

131. Ezek 43:7, 1 Kgs 8:12-13, Ps 74:2, Isa 8:18, Joel 3:17, 21.

132. Exod 25:9, 4. Levenson, Jon D., *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. (New York: HarperOne, 1987), 140.

133. Levenson, (1987), 140.

134. *J.W.* 5. §214 (§207-214).

135. Busink, Theodor A., *Der Tempel von Jerusalem: Von Ezechiel bis Middot*. Vol. 2. (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 1123.

136. Gurtner, (2007b), 94.

heaven" (τοῦ γὰρ οὐρανοῦ τὸ ἀφανὲς καὶ ἀδιάκλειστον ἐνέφαινε·) (*J.W.* 5. §208). In his *Antiquities*, Josephus states that it is the inner sanctuary that is an imitation of heaven, "devoted to God".¹³⁷ In describing the tabernacle, Josephus says:

When Moses distinguished the tabernacle into three parts, and allowed two of them to the priests, as a place accessible and common, he denoted the land and the sea, these being of general access to all; but he set apart the third division for God, because heaven is inaccessible to men. (*Ant.* 3.181)

Thus for Josephus both the Holy of Holies and the Holy Place are both representations of heaven, the abode of God.

O. Hofius distinguishes between two types of heavenly veils in contemporaneous Jewish literature. First, the veil that conceals the heavenly throne of God, second, the veil that separates heaven from earth.¹³⁸ An example of the first is *Tg. Job* 26:9 which states concerning God: "He holds tightly the thick darkness about his throne so that the angel(s) will not see him; he spreads the clouds of his glory over it like a curtain".¹³⁹ The late *3 En.* (45:1-2a) speaks of "the curtain of the Omnipresent One" which is spread before him.¹⁴⁰ But while these types are distinct, they are nevertheless thematically linked, as seen both in Josephus and in Mark.

The notion of the correspondence between the heavenly and the earthly is explicit in the Letter to the Hebrews (8:1-5), where the heavenly sanctuary is divided into two, with the καταπέτασμα separating the inner from the outer sanctuary.¹⁴¹ Here the sanctuary is - as it were - upended, and Christ ascends through the first καταπέτασμα (not mentioned in Hebrews, and corresponds to the firmament) to the δεύτερον καταπέτασμα (6:19, 9:3, 10:20). This typological construction works best when the link between the firmament and the first veil is taken for granted.

This two two-step arrangement also seems to be evident in *T. Levi*, though the vocabulary of 'veil' is absent. In this text heaven opens and Levi is invited to enter (2:5ff.) and passes both the first and second heaven *etc.* In 5:1 Levi reaches to what is presumably the seventh heaven, and again another sets of gates are opened in heaven and he sees the 'holy temple' with the Most High sitting on the throne of

137. Loeb, *Antiquitates Judaicae*, 3.6.4. §122-123. Cf. Collins, (2007), 759.

138. Hofius, Otfried, *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19f. und 10,19f.* WUNT. 14. (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1972), 4ff.

139. Cited in Gurtner, Daniel M., "The Rending of the Veil and Markan Christology: 'Unveiling' the Υἱὸς Θεοῦ (Mark 15:38-39)" *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007a), 301. Gurtner, (2007b), 89-90. Emphasis in Gurtner. See also Hofius, (1972), 6-7.

140. Cited in Gurtner, (2007b), 89.

141. Hofius, (1972), 18-19, 50-57. Esp. 56-57.

glory. This also is displayed in *I En.*, where Enoch in 14:2, 8 sees a vision in his sleep and embarks on a heavenly journey. First he passes the clouds and the stars (corresponding to the firmament and the outer temple curtain), then he enters God's heavenly temple in heaven (14:13-15). In contrast, in *Num. Rab.* 12:13 (on Num 7:1) the whole of creation itself is compared to the tabernacle: the firmament is closely associated with the inner veil, while heaven, the abode of God, is the Most Holy Place.¹⁴²

The association of a 'tent' with God's abode in heaven is made explicit in Isaiah 40:22, where God is the one "who stretches out the heavens like a curtain, and spreads them like a tent to live in" (LXX: ὁ στήσας ὡς καμάραν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ διατείνας ὡς σκηνὴν κατοικεῖν). *Tg. Isa.* paraphrases the last phrase as: "tent of glory for the house of his *Shekinah*" and thus makes an implicit reference to the temple. Similarly, Ps 104:2 states "You stretch out the heavens like a curtain" (נֹפֶתָה נִשְׂתַּחֲצָהּ). In the allusion to Isa 63:19 argued for above, where God is pleaded to tear the heavens, the imagery is a variation of the presumably hard 'firmament' and the heavens are envisioned as a cloth or tent curtain;¹⁴³ though the separating function is the same.

In contrast to Hebrews, Mark shows no interest in separating the inner sanctuary from the rest of heaven. Rather, heaven is simply the abode of God from which God speaks (1:11, 9:7) and is said to dwell (11:25-26). This may account for the discrepancy between Lohmeyer's two suggestions, that the veil is likely the outer one,¹⁴⁴ while the heaven which is torn can be compared with the Holy of Holy in the Jewish temple.¹⁴⁵ Following Lamarche, it seems to be "un faux problème" and a misstep in the first instance to search for the historical torn veil or even to try to determine which veil is in mind, for what is of first importance is to determine its literary function in this text.¹⁴⁶

This conclusion appears also to be supported by historical evidence, for while the inner veil, the פְּרֻכָּה/καταπέτασμα seems to be more prominent in the OT (Exod

142. Gurtner, (2007a), 301. Gurtner, (2007b), 89.

143. Beuken, W.A.M., *Jesaja: deel III B.* (Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1989), 64.

144. Lohmeyer, (1957), 347.

145. Lohmeyer, (1957), 21.

146. Lamarche, (1974), 586. Matera, Frank J., *The Kingship of Jesus: Composition and Theology in Mark 15.* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 139. N. Willert notes that Mark does not differentiate clearly between the two veils, nevertheless he still argues for the inner veil. Willert, Niels, *Den korsfæstede konge: Kristologi og discipelbillede i Markusevangeliet's passionsfortælling.* Vol. 1. (Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 1997), 216, 218.

26:33), the outer veil appears to gain more or equal significance in the reconstructed temple. Although R. Feldmeier eventually argues for the inner veil, he notes that "bei den späteren, nachsalomonischen Tempelbauten die Abgrenzung zwischen dem Heiligen ... und dem... Allerheiligsten... abgeschwächt wird und infolgedessen zunehmend das Heilige im Verhältnis zum Allerheiligsten an Bedeutung gewinnt."¹⁴⁷ Busink, to whom Feldmeier also refers, further states that the development of the temple and its reconstruction minimised the distinction between the "holy" and the "most holy". He writes: "Die Durchbrechung der Trennungswand zwischen dem Heiligen und dem Allerheiligsten, das Zumachen der Türöffnung mittels einem Vorhang statt Türflügeln, deutet darauf, dass nun dem Heiligen eine grössere Heiligkeit zugesagt wurde als zur des salomonischen Tempels".¹⁴⁸ Further Busink writes: "Durch die Änderungen, welche die Anlage des Allerheiligsten in seiner Entwicklung erfahren hatte, ist die sakrale Bedeutung des Heiliges... erhöht worden."¹⁴⁹ Thus just as the sanctuary as a whole, including the outer and inner parts, came to be understood as the place of the presence of God, so also for Mark 'heaven' without other distinctions was understood as the place of God's abode.

Based on Josephus's description of the tripartite division of the temple and of the universe, and his description of the outer veil (both cited above), Feldmeier notes that both veils signify the separation of heaven from the earth, and thus the godly from the human sphere. Regarding the latter he says: "So wie das Himmelsgewölbe den himmlischen Sitz und Thron Gottes von der irdischen Welt abgrenzt, so trennt eine Abbildung des Himmels in Form eines Vorhanges des irdischen Ort der Gegenwart Gottes, das Tempelgebäude, von der übrigen Welt ab."¹⁵⁰ While this may not be its original symbolic function, this was likely the perceived function for the priestly Josephus in the first century and likely also contemporary Jews.

E. Linnemann argues that it is important to go to the OT for the understanding of the function of the veil,¹⁵¹ and contends that since it is only the inner veil that has any explicit theological significance it is likely that the inner καταπέτασμα is here in view. She writes: "Nur die symbolische Bedeutung des inneren Vorhanges konnte das

147. Feldmeier, (1993), 218-219.

148. Busink, (1980), 821. Cited in Feldmeier, (1993), 218n25.

149. Busink, (1980), 1125. Also cited in Feldmeier, (1993), 218n25.

150. Feldmeier, (1993), 224-226.

151. Linnemann, Eta, *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970), 160. Cf. Sommer, Urs, *Die Passionsgeschichte des Markusevangeliums: Überlegungen zur Bedeutung der Geschichte für den Glauben*. WUNT2. 58. (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1993), 212.

Zeichen eindeutig machen; deshalb kann mit dem καταπέτασμα nicht der äußere, sondern nur der innere Vorhang gemeint sein."¹⁵² However, if Busink is right in his argument that the importance of the 'holy place' has risen to come to be considered nearer to the 'holy of holies' and is thus considered as the place of God's presence, then Linnemann's argument loses its force; for now the outer veil has appropriated some of the function of the inner veil.

There are many proposals for the meaning of the torn veil, and while R.T. France is sympathetic of reading it theologically and symbolically, rather than historically, he lacks confidence and suggests there is an "absence of any indication" in Mark, as to its meaning (but is in favour of reading it in light of Mark's 'temple theology').¹⁵³ However, the above analysis has shown the close association of the temple veil with the firmament of heaven, which is significant for the interpretation of both Mark 1:10-11 and 15:38-39. When Mark refers to τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ, this also brings the reader back to the trial scene. For Mark there seems to be a distinction between the use of ἱερόν and ναός. The former is the location of Jesus' expulsion of the money-changers and his teaching and hence refers to the temple complex.¹⁵⁴ Ναός, on the other hand, occurs in the accusation in the trial (14:58) and the mocking at the cross (15:29); both of which are referring to Jesus' purported statement of destroying and rebuilding¹⁵⁵ the ναός, which appears to refer to the central temple building.¹⁵⁶

Therefore, τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο ἀπ' ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω, is to be read in light of both the tearing of heaven and Jesus' alleged condemnation of the ναός. Mark's trial narrative is complicated by the fact that this statement is never on Jesus' lips and that the testimony is characterised as false (ἐψευδομαρτύρουν) in 15:56-57. However, there is more to the testimony than meets the eye, for Mark's use of irony has been well documented.¹⁵⁷ On one level the charge is false in that Jesus never directly said those things. But on another level the false witnesses are ironically true witnesses in that they bear witness to a higher theological truth and to

152. Linnemann, (1970), 159. Cf. Hooker, (1991), 377.

153. France, (2002), 658.

154. 11:15-16, 27, 12:35, 13:1, 14:49.

155. An action that was typically expected of God (Ezek 37:26, Exod 15:17). Mansfield, (1987), 131. France, (2002), 607.

156. Juel, (1977), 127-128. Stein, (2008), 681. Contra Edwards, (2002), 477, and regardless of Michel, Otto, "ναός," in *TDNT*. Eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967).

157. Camery-Hoggart, Jerry, *Irony in Mark's Gospel: Text and Subtext*. SNTSMS. 72. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

the significance of the coming and death of Jesus. D. Juel notes that many have pointed out the strangeness of the wording in 14:58 which refers to the temple as χειροποίητος and that Jesus would build ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον. The accusation in 15:29 would seem more fitting at the trial.¹⁵⁸ Characterising the Jerusalem temple as χειροποίητος is a criticism of its present corruption and thus its impending obsolescence.¹⁵⁹ This sense is also communicated by the torn temple veil. Pelletier thus rightly states that the tearing of the veil "est bel et bien présenté comme un résultat immédiat de la mort de Jésus, avec l'intention de nous dire que *dès cet instant* le culte ancien est périmé. La déchirure du voile est donnée là comme un *signe* de cette abrogation."¹⁶⁰

Though the tearing of the veil εἰς δύο is without doubt destructive and signals the end of the temple,¹⁶¹ it is important that it occurs in the context of the eschatological coming of YHWH himself through his Son Jesus the Messiah. What is destroyed is not the temple building, but rather it is the function of the veil that is destroyed.¹⁶² This was also hinted to at the opening citation which was partly from Mal 3:1, the context of which concerns the coming of YHWH against his temple.¹⁶³ Thus Lamarche is right in emphasising that the image of the torn veil need not be restricted to either a positive or a negative interpretation, but that it can be both simultaneously.¹⁶⁴ The ripping of the temple veil is not only destructive, but also a sign of revelation or the "unveiling of heavenly realities"¹⁶⁵ as noted by Gamal, or as Origen stated (referring to the outer veil): "by the tearing of the curtain the mysteries were disclosed, which with good reason had been hidden until the coming of Christ."¹⁶⁶ In describing this aspect of its function Gurtner writes (referring to the inner veil) that "God's heavenly secrets, kept behind the veil, are disclosed only

158. Juel, (1977), 123.

159. Cf. Acts 7:48, 17:24. In the LXX the term frequently refers to handmade idols, e.g. Lev 26:1, Is 2:18, 10:11, 19:1.

160. Pelletier, (1958), 173. Emphasis original. Also Donahue, (1973), 203.

161. Allison, (1987), 31-32. Cf. Eckey, Wilfried, *Das Markusevangelium: Orientierung am Weg Jesu; ein Kommentar*: (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1998), 395. Lohmeyer, (1957), 347.

162. Sommer, (1993), 213.

163. Cf. Watts, (1997), 67-75, 86-90.

164. Lamarche, (1974), 586-587, 589. Matera, (1982), 139. Dowd, Sharyn and Elizabeth S. Malbon, "The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience," in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. Eds. Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 29-30. Cf. Feldmeier who also emphasises the atoning function of the temple. Feldmeier, (1993), 228-229.

165. Gamel, Brian K., "The Centurion's Confession as Apocalyptic Unveiling: Mark 15:39 as a Markan Theology of Revelation" (Ph.D., Baylor University, 2014), 166. Cf. 140-141.

166. Simonetti, Manlio, *Matthew 14-23*. ACCS. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2002), 296.

when the barrier is breached".¹⁶⁷ Thus in order for that which lies behind it to be revealed, the veil/firmament must either be opened (or torn) or alternatively a person must be invited to enter beyond it.

In this light, the torn heaven and torn veil in Mark also serve a revelatory function,¹⁶⁸ for that which was hidden and cut off is now open and accessible. But it must be stressed that while the opening of heaven can reveal many things, here there are no generic heavenly realities revealed, but rather God himself and God's Son.¹⁶⁹ The role of the temple veil/firmament is not only to separate the Holy from the unholy, but it also hides that which lays behind it, namely the presence of God (Exod 33:11, 14).¹⁷⁰ In fact now God's 'presence' has been manifest.¹⁷¹ Thus the torn veil signals both the end of the temple as the place of God's unique presence and positively that God's presence has now been manifest on earth in the Spirit-anointed person, Jesus God's Son, and in whom the true character and nature of God is revealed.¹⁷²

It is significant that the Isaianic text alluded to at the tearing of heaven not only pleads for a theophanic experience of God like on Sinai amid the state of the destroyed temple - which has made God distant - but also that the memories of the experiences of God's redemption in the past are of the exodus, when God was present with them and led them through his Holy Spirit as their Father. Thus the longing of the Isaianic poem is not simply for a rebuilding of the temple and the reinstitution of the cult, but a knowing and a worship of God that was akin to - and even beyond - his personal relationship with them in the past at Sinai and the exodus. The opening of heaven and the corresponding torn temple veil is therefore a theological construct that depicts what the whole Gospel of Mark is about. The temple 'not made with hands' does not refer to the Christian community,¹⁷³ but signifies the presence of God.¹⁷⁴ But now God's presence on earth is no longer through the temple, but God is present with his people through the coming of his Spirit-anointed Son.¹⁷⁵ In Mark's Gospel, as Bird contends, "[t]he divine voice and the

167. Gurtner, (2007b), 171. See also 96.

168. Gurtner, (2007b), 173.

169. E.g. see also Gamel, (2014), 143, 152, and Gurtner, (2007a), 303. Motyer states that "in both cases the rending involves a theophany, an opening of the Holy Place". Motyer, (1987), 155.

170. Cf. Chronis, Harry L., "The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37-39" *SBL* 101/1 (1982), 110. Schenke, (2005), 346. Linnemann, (1970), 158-162. Though they argue for the inner veil.

171. Chronis, (1982), 110. Cf. Schenke, (2005), 346. Contra Evans, (2001), 509 who thinks this is 'too far'.

172. Lamarche, (1974), 587-588. Also Focant, Camille, "Une christologie de type 'mystique' (Marc 1.1-16.8)" *NTS* 55/1 (2009), 11. Feldmeier, (1993), 229.

173. See Juel, (1977), 145 for an overview of a range of similar proposals.

174. Bird, (2008), 55.

175. Bird, (2008), 55. Cf. Schenke, (2005), 346. Donahue, (1982), 594. Denied by Pesch, Rudolf, *Das*

centurion's confession become moments of revelation".¹⁷⁶ What they reveal is the true relational identity of God as Son and Father.¹⁷⁷

The revelation of God is both in and through the person designated as God's Son. Thus the revelation of Jesus as the Son is at the same time a revelation of God as the Father. The God of Mark's Gospel is no longer merely identified as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (12:26) or the God of the *Shema* (12:30), but rather becomes identified as the Father of Jesus who reveals his true identity. While this may seem to disconnect the God of Mark from the God of Israel's Scriptures, it is not so for Mark. The whole passage is infused the scriptural allusions and the heavenly voice speaks only with words of Scripture. This new revelation is precisely of the God known as YHWH the God of Israel, and is thoroughly connected with the OT itself.

The rending of the heaven/veil reveals God, which is precisely what the Isaianic plea calls for. It is essential for Mark that neither the torn heaven nor the torn veil is followed by fantastic visions of heaven, God, or his throne, but rather - in pure contrast to the Sinai theophany - is followed by the simple statements "you are my Son, the beloved" (1:11) and "truly this man was God's Son" (15:39). The torn heaven, therefore, has a wider hermeneutical significance in Mark than merely enabling the Spirit to come down.¹⁷⁸ These hidden epiphanies at the baptism, transfiguration and at the cross are key points in revealing, to both the text's characters and to the reader, the true identity of Jesus as God's Son and of God as his Father, each of these has the common theme of God's presence; in the Spirit, the cloud, and the open temple. However, the cloud and the temple do not have personal qualities and actions as the Spirit (1:12, 3:29, 13:11).

Thus, in line with the opening citation of Mark, the whole Gospel concerns the eschatological hope of the coming of YHWH. Therefore, the rending of the veil which is a destructive act, is also to be understood positively.¹⁷⁹ At least some circles of Judaism expressed the eschatological hope of a new temple that will replace the

Markusevangelium II: Kommentar zu Kap. 8.27 - 16.20. HTKNT. (Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 499.

176. Bird, (2008), 53.

177. See also Feldmeier, (1993), 227-228. Willert notes that the typical function of a temple veil, also pagan ones, is to conceal the gods. Willert, (1997), 218-219.

178. Gnllka, (1978), 52, Guelich, (1989), 32.

179. The darkness at Jesus' death (15:33) and the tearing of the temple veil is possibly associated with the eschatological 'Day of the Lord' (cf. Amos 8:2-10). Allison, (1987), 29, 32. Cf. Lamarche, (1974), 591.

old temple,¹⁸⁰ but in the context of Mark the divine presence is not longer limited to a temple, for God himself comes present.

The 'open heaven' motif announces both that a revelation is about to transpire and this is typically functionally important in the development of the book as a whole. The intentional allusion to Isa 63:19, conjoined with the opening citation, the divine voice, and the descent of the Spirit, shows that this revelation of God's Son constitutes the revelatory advent of God himself, so that Jesus can be said to be "the true locus of the divine 'presence'".¹⁸¹ This is precisely what is also indicated by both the coming of God's kingdom, which in essence concerns God's presence, and the 'good news', the content of which is God's presence and reign.

(d) Conclusions

This chapter has noted briefly that the 'open heaven' motif functions to introduce a revelation, and that the event which is connected to it is typically a critical factor in the whole text. This is also the case in Mark. But by the choice of the word σκίζω the author makes a deliberate allusion to the plea to tear the heavens in Isa 63:19 and this Gospel thus functions as an answer to this plea. In Mark the word σκίζω appears one more time: when the temple curtain is torn from top to bottom at Jesus' death and as the centurion confesses Jesus' divine sonship. These two occurrence signal that a revelation is taking place, a revelation of God.

180. *1 En.* 90:28-29, *Jub.* 1:27, *Tob* 13:16-18, 14:5, 11QTemple XXIX, 8-10, 4QFlor 1.1-3, Tg. Isa. 53:5, *Midr. Ps* on 90:17, and possibly *Mek.* on Exod 15:17. Allison, (1987), 32.

181. Chronis, (1982), 112.

Chapter 4

The Divine Sonship of Jesus

The two previous chapters have examined the key context of the baptism episode in Mark,¹ especially the 'coming of YHWH', the Isaianic בִּשְׁרָא/εὐαγγέλιον, and the 'coming of God's kingdom'. It was also argued that the 'open heaven' motif introduces and makes possible a revelation, which Mark by his choice of vocabulary links with the torn heaven of Isaiah 63:19. This chapter will relate these critical constituents with the Markan baptismal narrative that follows the 'torn heaven': the descent of the Spirit on Jesus and the heavenly utterance concerning the 'son'. It will be demonstrated that the heavenly voice alludes to both Psalm 2 and Isa 42, which function as hermeneutical keys for both this event itself and the persons involved.

It is important to emphasise from the outset that this is a narrative account, a fact that should by no means be taken as a given, because Mark could well have chosen an alternative format, such as a sayings-gospel like the Gospel of Thomas. In this narrative Mark shows no interest in theological definitions per se, but rather in narrating the story of Jesus. But this Gospel is no 'pure description', or 'report', and in the terminology of G. Lohfink it is 'Erzählung' rather than 'Bericht'. As G. Lohfink states: "Die Erzählung selbst ist Theologie."² The gospel narrative is already theological in its narration, and as Christian Rose states; theology is "kein Anhängsel".³ But even in narrating the story of Jesus, Mark is in fact narrating "Jesus stories about God".⁴ The narrative form is important for the meaning of the text, and is not merely a container to be discarded once the theological results have been translated to propositional statements, for narrative allows for unresolved tensions and paradoxes.⁵ A tension that extends to both the person of Jesus and to God

-
1. Due to limited space it is not possible to pursue the meaning and significance of the water baptism in Mark.
 2. Lohfink, Gerhard, "Erzählung als Theologie: Zur sprachlichen Grundstruktur der Evangelien," in *Studien zur Neuen Testament*. Ed. Gerhard Lohfink (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989), 23.
 3. Rose, (2007), 27. C. Rose also refers to Lohfink.
 4. Nicklas, (2014), 40n6. Nicklas acknowledges indebtedness to N.T. Wright.
 5. Boring, (1984), 137-138. Focant, (2010), 43. See also Bourquin, Yvan, "Le «Soleil Noir», ou l'oxymore implicite dans l'évangile selon Marc," in *Raconter, interpréter, annoncer: Parcours de Nouveau Testament: mélanges offerts à Daniel Marguerat pour son 60ème anniversaire*. Eds. Emmanuelle Steffek and Yvan Bourquin (Genève: Labor et Fides, 2003) who is also cited by Focant.

himself.⁶ All too often the questions with regard to the baptism narrative are dominated by a concern for history, or even literary concerns, but being too light on theological matters.

(a) The Father's Voice at the Baptism

It could be desirable to follow the progression of the text itself: torn heaven, the descent of the Spirit, and the divine voice. However, it is necessary to deviate from this order and discuss the content of the divine voice - and hence divine sonship before analysing the role of the Spirit. The meaning of the descent of the Spirit is so closely linked to the scriptural allusions of the voice that these must be established beforehand.

The baptismal narrative begins with Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. Both parts of this expression are reminiscent of biblical language,⁷ and which is often not simply a reference to time, but often introduces that acts of God in the OT.⁸ Sometimes the divine voice of Mark 1:11 is thought to be a *bath qôl*⁹ (daughter of a voice, often translated as 'echo of a voice').¹⁰ A *bath qôl* was considered to be an inferior substitute to a direct word from God by the Holy Spirit and as noted by Bockmuehl is "by no means an *equivalent* replacement of prophecy".¹¹ But the divine voice in Mark is not presented as a substitute or echo, but is directly spoken to Jesus without intermediacy,¹² and the voice is not in the absence of the Spirit but the Spirit is even said to come down to Jesus.

That the baptism scene is infused with scriptural language is beyond dispute. It has already been argued that with the reference to the rending of the heavens the prayer in Isaiah 63:19 is answered, and what follows - the coming of God's Spirit and the identification of Jesus as God's Son - is a further unfolding of this 'answer'. It is

6. Malbon sees a 'significant gap' between the 'christologies' of Mark's Jesus and that of the narrator, a distinction which she considers 'crucial' for understanding Mark's narrative Christology. Malbon, (2009), 163. Malbon, (1999), 37-39.

7. LXX Exod 18:13, Num 10:11, Isa 37:1 and Judg 18:1, 1 Sam 3:1, Joel 3:1 et.al.

8. Voelz, (2013), 123-124, 128.

9. See *t. Soṭa* 13.2-3; *b. Yoma* 9b. Often Scripture is cited e.g. *b. Soṭa* 21a and *b. Sanh.* 104b.

10. Argued by Cranfield, (1959), 54-55. Rawlinson, (1949), 10. Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. ICC. Vol. 1. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 335-336. Juel, (1988), 79.

11. Bockmuehl, Markus, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT2. 36. (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990), 107. Emphasis original. See also Keener, Craig S., *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997), 15-16.

12. Davies and Allison, (1988), 335-336. See also Gnilya, (1978), 52-53. Feuillet, (1959), 478. Mansfield, (1987), 28.

highly significant that when God speaks, it is only with scriptural language, which underscores that whatever transpires is in intimate relation to, and in continuity with, the OT. The words of the heavenly voice are σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα (1:11). The clearest verbal link is with Psalm 2:7, although the σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου of Mark 1:11 has a different word-order from the LXX which reads Κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με Υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.¹³ The Hebrew is כִּנִּי אֶתָּה אֲנִי הַיּוֹם יְלִדְתִּיךָ. The fact that Mark 1:11 is a direct address strengthens the verbal link to Ps 2:7.

This text is both available and authoritative for Mark as Scripture (12:35), which is Hays' first criterion listed above. Secondly, the closeness of language, as well as the prominence of Ps 2 in Early Christianity, speaks to Hays' criterion of *volume* as well as Tooman's criterion of *distinctiveness*. The fact that Ps 2 is interpreted messianically and eschatologically in 4Q174 (Florilegium)¹⁴ and its widespread use in earliest Christianity¹⁵ corresponds to Hays' criterion of *historical plausibility*. The fact that numerous later readers have noted the reference to Ps 2 at the baptism is another of Hays' criterion and strengthens the plausibility of an allusion.

The repeated calling of Jesus as the Christ in Mark (1:1, 8:29, 12:35, 14:61 and 15:32) fulfils the *thematic coherence* criterion of Hays as well as the *thematic correspondence* principle of Tooman. Further thematic links are the theme of the kingdom and its effect in vanquishing its enemies. This *thematic correspondence* gives *satisfaction* in that it further elucidates the meaning of divine Sonship and messiahship.

This allusion to Ps 2:7 does not exhaust the content of the heavenly voice, since it does not account for the second half of the speech and which rather alludes to Isa 42:1. Besides being both available and authoritative and thus fulfilling the first criteria, the language of υἱός, ἀγαπητός and εὐδόκησα corresponds to the παῖς (עֶבֶד), ἐκλεκτός (בְּחֵירָה) and προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἢ ψυχὴ μου (יָצָא לִי נַפְשִׁי) and the anticipation of the coming Spirit of God on him (ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν / עָלֵי רוּחִי עָלֶיךָ)

13. The Matthean reading has Οὗτος in place of Σὺ (Matt 3:17), while the Western reading of Luke 3:22 makes the allusion to Ps 2:7 into a citation, adding ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Aland et al. eds., *The Greek New Testament: Fourth Revised Edition*, 112-113.

14. Gillingham, Susan, *A Journey of Two Psalms: The Reception of Psalms 1 and 2 in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 21-22. Yadin, Y., "A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4Q Florilegium)" *IEJ* 9/2 (1959).

15. Acts 4:25-28, 13:33, Heb 1:5, 5:5. It is often considered to be one of the most important texts for early Christology. Hengel, (1995), 375. Lee, (2009), 279ff. Dunn, James D.G., *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. (London: SCM, 1980), 35-36.

is close to Isa 42:1. While the vocabulary differs there is semantic overlap and this fulfils the *distinctive* criterion of Tooman and Hays' criterion of *volume*.

The fact that Mark has introduced his gospel with a Isaianic citation, and that Isaiah is also alluded to in the previous verse, satisfies the criterion of *recurrence* (Hays) and *multiplicity* (Tooman). There is also a *thematic coherence* (Hays) and *thematic correspondence* (Tooman) between Mark 1:11 and Isa 42:1 in that in both texts the Holy Spirit is on the figure as well as there being an utterance of divine pleasure (also 9:7). This furthermore satisfies the subjective criterion of *satisfaction* because this allusion illumines this passage and helps the reader to understand better the person and mission of Jesus. These elements, as well as the fact that many later readers have noted this allusion - thus fulfilling another criterion of Hays - are strong evidence that Isa 42:1 is intentionally alluded to here.

An important factor in the present argument is that the two allusions are mutually interpretive and together they receive their full meaning in relation to Jesus. There are many scholars who see one of the two passages alluded to in Mark 1:11. Joachim Jeremias argued that it was exclusively the Isaianic παῖς that is behind the υἱός of Mark 1:11, and that υἱός reflects a hellenisation.¹⁶ This argument, which had precedence in W. Bousset, rests upon the fact that παῖς can be ambiguous and can either mean 'son', 'child', or 'servant'.¹⁷ This suggestion, however, is not only undermined by the lack of evidence for an early Christian Servant-theology as opposed to a Son-of-God-theology, but also by the regular use of παῖς in Acts 3:13, 26, 4:27, 30; a Hellenistic work.¹⁸ Furthermore, as I.H. Marshall also notes, the LXX never translates עֶבֶד as υἱός.¹⁹ For these reasons the explicit language of Jesus' sonship cannot be a development from παῖς alone, but must have its origin elsewhere; namely Ps 2:7.

M. Hooker on the other hand opposes the view of Jeremias and rejects Isa 42:1 as a key background text for Mark 1:11,²⁰ and rightly points out that none of the words in

16. Jeremias, Joachim, "παῖς θεοῦ in the New Testament," in *TDNT*. Eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 701-702. This same argument was made by Bousset, Wilhelm, *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926), 57n2 cited in Marshall, I. Howard, "Son of God or Servant of Yahweh? A Reconsideration of Mark 1.11" *NTS* 15 (1968), 326. Supported by Cranfield, C.E.B., "The Baptism of Our Lord - A Study of St. Mark 1.9-11" *SJT* 8/1 (1955), 60-61.

17. Marshall, (1968), 326-327. Gnilka, (1978), 50-51.

18. Watts, (1997), 110. See also Hengel, (2007), 66.

19. Marshall, (1968), 329. Also confirmed by Muraoka, T., "A Greek ≈ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint" (2010), 120, 294.

20. Hooker, (1991), 47-48. See also Schweizer, Eduard, "υἱός: New Testament," in *TDNT*. Eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 367-368 and Rose, (2007), 143. Guttenberger, (2004), 92.

LXX Isa 42:1 are used.²¹ While Hooker's arguments are noteworthy and certainly undermine Jeremias' claim that Isa 42:1 is the sole text behind Mark's allusion, they do not necessarily demand that the Isaianic text is not in view at all. In addition, it is significant that the Hebrew יְהוָה נִבְרָא is represented by εὐδοκέω in the other Greek versions: Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, as well as in the closer citation of Isa 42:1 in Matt 12:18.²²

However ὁ ἀγαπητός μου is used in Matt 12:18 in contrast to LXX's ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου. This indicates that there is a tradition of understanding יְהוָה as ὁ ἀγαπητός μου. While this evidence may seem slender, it is further supported by the close connection of Isa 42:1 with 41:8, which in the MT reads: "But you, Israel, my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, the offspring of Abraham, my friend".²³ In the LXX: Σὺ δέ, Ἰσραὴλ, παῖς μου Ἰακωβ, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην, σπέρμα Ἀβρααμ, ὃν ἠγάπησα). The יְהוָה is especially noteworthy and could be understood as "my friend",²⁴ or "who has loved me".²⁵ However, the LXX translated it as ὃν ἠγάπησα, and thus making the Servant the object of God's love.²⁶ The ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, παῖς μου and ὃν ἠγάπησα of Isa 41:8 and 42:1 are all closely interconnected in the text of Isaiah itself.

But rather than seeing only Ps 2 or Isa 42 in Mark 1:11 it is better to notice the conflated allusion to both these texts. While the majority of scholars support this view, there is more doubt whether Gen 22:2 is also in view.²⁷ The fact that 1:11 uses the term ὁ ἀγαπητός, (as opposed to the MT יְהוָה or the LXX ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου), has led some scholars to suggest that the language stems from Gen 22:2.²⁸ While this is

21. Hooker, (1991), 47. Hooker, (1959), 70-73.

22. France, (2002), 82. This point is enhanced by the fact that in Mark's previous use of Scripture he does not correspond consistently to the LXX. C.K. Barrett called the allusion to Isa 42:1 "unmistakable". Barrett, C.K., *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. (London: SPCK, 1966), 41. The citation is also explicit in Acts 13:33 where it is introduced with the statement that it is from the second psalm. The first part of 13:33 has the same word order as Ps 2:7 and also includes the second half of the verse: ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. In Heb 1:5 the citation is also verbatim.

23. וְאָתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל עַבְדִּי יַעֲקֹב אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְתִּיךָ נָרַע אֲבְרָהָם אֹהֲבִי

24. NASB, NRSV, ESV, NIV, as well as Goldingay, John, *The Message of Isaiah 40-55: A Literary-Theological Commentary*. (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 102. *Aquila* also has ἀγαπητοῦ μου and Vulg. *amici mei*. Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Isaiah 40-55*. AB. (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 199. The *Tg. Isa.* has "my friend".

25. Koole, (1997), 155. Westermann, (1969), 70.

26. This sense also corresponds to the suggestion by the BHS Editor who re-points it - without textual support beyond the LXX - to the passive יְהוָה, i.e. 'whom I have loved'.

27. Those who deny the allusion to Gen 22:2 include e.g. Collins, (2007), 150. And Gnllka, (1978), 53. Gnllka writes. "Eine Anlehnung an die Isaaktypologie ist schwerlich auszumachen".

28. Those who support an allusion to Gen 22:2, with varying degrees of certainty and influence, include: Guelich, (1989), 34. Stein, (2008), 58-59. Boring, (2006), 45. Hurtado, (1989), 19-20. France, (2002), 81-82. Schenke, (2005), 54. Lane, (1974), 58n65. Donahue and Harrington, (2002), 65. Lee, (2009), 172-173. Klauck, Hans-Josef, "Die Himmelfahrt des Paulus (2 Kor 12,2-4) in der koptischen Paulus-apokalypse aus Nag Hammadi (NHC V/2)" *Studien zum Neuen Testament und Seiner Umwelt* A-10 (1985), 51-54. Edwards, James R., "The Baptism of Jesus According to the Gospel of Mark" *JETS* 34/1 (1991), 53. S. Down and E.S. Malbon draw extended parallels to the *aqeda* from the ἀγαπητός, including the testing, the voice from heaven, and the 'sacrifice'. See Dowd and Malbon, (2006), 4. M.N. Sabin thinks the Isaac

possible, especially as an echo, the suggestion suffers from a lack of an explicit Isaac typology in both the prologue and the Gospel as a whole.²⁹ In light of the fact that the בְּיָרִי of the MT or the ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου of the LXX is rendered ὁ ἀγαπητός in Matthew's citation of this text,³⁰ and Mark's previous dependance on Isaiah, the allusion to Isaiah 42:1 with ὁ ἀγαπητός in Mark 1:11 seems more probable.³¹

The following will explore how Ps 2 and Isa 42 interpret each other and how both are to be understood in light of Jesus himself. Mark is doing more than simply lifting vocabulary from Isaiah but uses it as an interpretive lens to perceive the true identity of Jesus. This view is warranted by how Mark leads the reader to read the whole Gospel in light of the expected coming of God in Isa 40:3 and Mal 3:1. Furthermore, the application of the psalm of Isaiah 63:7-64:11 also supports this claim since it builds up a picture wherein the expected coming of God is being fulfilled by the arrival of Jesus who is being revealed as God's Son, the arrival of whom constitutes the arrival of God himself. Thus any interpretation of the heavenly voice at Jesus' baptism must pay attention to two factors: the literary context of the original text and how this text is used in its new context.

(i) The Allusion to Psalm 2

While the word-order differs it was argued above that the closest text to the σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου in Mark 1:11 is Ps 2:7, which in the LXX reads Υἱός μου εἶ σύ . But before examining the use of this psalm in Mark, it is necessary to note the psalm's original context and its pre-Markan reception history.

The origins of Ps 2 remain obscure, but its theme is more determinable. This psalm is a so-called 'royal psalm' - one of a group of psalms that are linked together by a common royal theme - and is usually thought to be associated with a coronation ceremony of a Davidic king.³² This psalm recounts the opposition of the nations

allusion is the strongest allusion in Mark 1:11. Sabin, Marie Noonan, *Reopening the Word: Reading Mark as Theology in the Context of Early Judaism*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 126-127.

29. This is also the position of Hatina who suggests that while the Isaac connection is not the strongest in the text, it is "not inconceivable" that this echo would be heard by some readers of Mark who were familiar with the wider Isaac tradition and who thus would consider it important. Hatina, (2006), 88-93.

30. Contra Watts, (1997), 113.

31. M. Robert Mansfield argues that Mark does not intend an allusion to Ps 2 and Isa 42. Mansfield, (1987), 27.

32. Craigie, Peter C., *Psalms 1-50*. WBC. (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983), 65, 67. Mays, J.L., *Psalms*. Int. (Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1994), 45-47 and Declaissé-Walford, Nancy, Rolf A. Jacobson and Beth Laneel Tanner, *The Book of Psalms*. NICOT. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 65, 71. Rowe, (2002b), 33, 37. Goldingay, John, *Psalms 1-41*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms. Vol. 1. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 100-101. Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger, *Die Psalmen I*:

against God's chosen king (1-3), and God warns them (5-6) because God's king is God's son (7) and he will subdue them (8-11). While the Davidic king is the speaker throughout the psalm,³³ he cites the words of other speakers: of the kings of the earth (3), YHWH's words against these kings (6), and YHWH's words to the Davidic king (7-9).³⁴ The words alluded to in Mark are the divine words that the psalmist cites. The question is what the statement "you are my son" (Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, LXX) (בְּנִי אֱתָהּ) means in this context. It seems clear that these words are linked to the installation of מְשִׁיחַ (v.2b) as king in Zion (v.6), and is the only place in the OT where messiah is called 'son'.³⁵

Research on the psalm often invokes parallels from Egypt and Mesopotamia; notable examples are H. Gunkel and S. Mowinckel.³⁶ In Egypt the king was considered to be a son of god; and at times even as a result of copulation. This was also the case, though to a lesser extent, in Mesopotamia, especially in Sumerian traditions.³⁷ There is no hint that the literal sense was intended in Ps 2.³⁸ In contrast to the other Near Eastern notions of kingship, the Davidic king, although designated a son of god, is not a god but a human being.³⁹ If Davidic kings were honoured as divine, this would surely be condemned by the prophets.⁴⁰ It is therefore better to speak of 'sacral kingship',⁴¹ rather than 'divine kingship'.

It is often argued that Ps 2 borrows conceptuality from Egypt/Mesopotamia, and what takes place on the day of the enthronement of the Davidic king is an adoption.⁴² Although Mettinger points to Egyptian parallels or even origin, he also states that the Israelite use of this concept was subject to an interpretation or adaptation of it, and thus while Ps 2 could be interpreted as an adoption, he concedes that this was not

Psalms 1-50. Die Neue Echter Bibel. (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1993), 53-54.

33. Eaton, John H., *Kingship and the Psalms*. (London: SCM, 1976), 111.

34. Craigie, (1983), 66.

35. Mays, (1994), 44. Sometimes Israel is called a divine son in the OT, e.g. in Exod 4:22, Hos 11:1.

36. See Mowinckel, Sigmund, *He That Cometh*. (New York: Abingdon, 1954), 23ff. Esp. 78. See Collins, Adela Yarbro and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 2-3, and Cooke, Gerald, "The Israelite King as Son of God" *ZAW* 73/2 (1961)

37. Collins and Collins, (2008), 3-9. Also pp.12-15. They see especially Egyptian influence in the divine sonship language, though not directly.

38. Terrien, Samuel, *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 84. Eaton, (1976), 148-149.

39. Craigie, (1983), 68.

40. Rowe, (2002b), 52.

41. Rowe, (2002b), 52.

42. E.g. Mettinger, Tryggve N., *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*. (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976), 261-262.

practiced by the Israelites.⁴³ While R.D. Rowe states it is "clearly an adoption formula",⁴⁴ it is difficult to insist that what takes place is an adoption, for first of all there is no suitable adoption formula one can use as a comparison. The laws of Hammurabi are sometimes invoked (§170-171), but the 'adopted' children in this context are the children of a slave-woman and are likely to be the masters' children anyway.⁴⁵ Furthermore, there are textually no grounds for understanding בָּרָא (beget) as adoption, for reproduction is always in view.⁴⁶

Ps 2 thus alludes to a metaphorical begetting, rather than a metaphorical or literal adoption. The 'anointed one' becomes God's son though a metaphorical birth.⁴⁷ This, however, does not imply that the king is divine, but rather the language indicates a special relationship, though not equality, with God.⁴⁸ The metaphorical sonship language denotes that the king is especially close to God,⁴⁹ often receives God's Spirit⁵⁰ and is endowed with special rights and responsibilities as God's king.⁵¹ Regardless whether adoption or begetting is in view, the critical point for our purpose is that "[t]he language emphasizes the special relationship that the king has with God".⁵² The important thing here is not the begetting, but the implied relationship.

Although Ps 2 was for the early Christians "a messianic psalm par excellence",⁵³ there is no indication that Ps 2 was originally understood messianically, in the sense of a coming figure,⁵⁴ nor were 'son of God' and 'messiah' understood as synonymous in Jewish literature in the first century. However, in some later texts the future the

43. Mettinger, (1976), 265-266.

44. Rowe, (2002b), 51. See also Rowe, (2002b), 38, 61. Goldingay, (2006), 100. Mowinkel, (1954), 78. Cooke, (1961), 208-211. Terrien, (2003), 84. Cooke, (1961), 208-211. Eaton, (1976), 148-149. Hossfeld and Zenger, (1993), 53.

45. Mettinger, (1976), 266-267. On the latter point see Collins and Collins, (2008), 20.

46. Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson and Tanner, (2014), 69. Collins and Collins, (2008), 20. Contra Goldingay, (2006), 101.

47. See also 2 Sam 7:8-16, Ps 89:26-27, Isa 9:2-7. Craigie, (1983), 68. Collins and Collins, (2008), 20. Moberly, (2013), 172-173.

48. Collins and Collins, (2008), 22.

49. Rowe, (2002b), 38, 61.

50. Rowe, (2002b), 50. Eaton, (1976), 156-157. See, e.g. 1 Sam 10:6, 10, 16:13, 2 Sam 23:2.

51. Mays, (1994), 47. See also Collins and Collins, (2008), 22. Eaton, (1976), 146.

52. Declaissé-Walford, Jacobson and Tanner, (2014), 69. See also Fitzmyer, Joseph A., "The Palestinian Background of 'Son of God' as a Title for Jesus," in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Eds. Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 570. Eaton, (1976), 146.

53. Craigie, (1983), 69.

54. Fitzmyer, (1995), 571. Contra Gerstenberger who calls it a "messianic hymn". Gerstenberger, Erhard S., *Psalms: Part One, with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*. FOTL. XIV. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 48. Also cited in Collins and Collins, (2008), 11. Though for Schaper the Ps 2 of LXX is interpreted more messianically. Schaper, J., *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. WUNT2. 76. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 72-76. Cited in Lee, (2009), 244.

king of Israel or its 'messiah' can be described as 'son of God'.⁵⁵ The document 4Q246 refers to someone who will be called 'son of God' and 'son of the Most High' (ברך די) (אל יתאמר ובר עליון יקרונה) (ii:1) and will be called "great" and appears to lead the people of God in victory over national enemies (i:3-7, ii:2-4), which will inaugurate a peace and an eternal kingdom (מלכות) and justice (ii:5-7), and this kingdom will somehow be linked with God's eternal rule (שלטן). Whether this person can be described as messianic has been debated,⁵⁶ but this text seems to have clear connections to Ps 2 and Dan 7.⁵⁷

The 4Q174 (Florilegium) has been described as a *Midrash* on Pss 1-2, and 2 Sam 7 combined.⁵⁸ While this may be debated, it is certain that Ps 2 has a significant role. These texts, and many others as well, are interpreted eschatologically, which for this community means for their present time. The 'son' of 2 Sam 7:11-14 is identified as 'the interpreter of the law' (f1 2i:11-12), while 'his anointed' (מְשִׁיחֹו) in Ps 2:2 is rendered "the chosen of Israel" (f1 2i:19).⁵⁹ The translation of Ps 2:7 in the *Tg. Ps.-J.* has "I have created you" rather than "I have begotten you", substituting the Hebrew ילד (beget) with the Aramaic for create (ברי). Further it has "you are dear to me as a son to a father" rather than the MT "you are my son". In both of these renditions the *meturgeman* minimises the implications of divine sonship of the 'anointed one' in Ps 2:2.⁶⁰ But since *Tg. Ps.-J.* is late⁶¹ it may be consciously anti-Christian. In *Midrash Tehillim*⁶² on Ps 2 the 'son' of 2:7 is interpreted to be the children of Israel, but it significantly employs exactly the same scriptural texts as earliest Christianity: Isa 42:1, 52:13, Exod 4:22, Ps 110:1, and Dan 7:13-14.⁶³

To understand Ps 2 eschatologically is thus not unprecedented, and has been associated with other messianic and eschatological texts, for instance 2 Sam 7 and Dan 7 in Qumran. It is the mutual interpretation of these texts, together with their new interpretive context, that enables them to be understood in new light.

55. Hooker, (1991), 360.

56. Collins and Collins, (2008), 65-73, esp. 71. Also Ferda, Tucker S., "Naming the Messiah: A Contribution to the 4Q246 'Son of God' Debate" *DSD* 21 (2014)

57. Segal, (2014). Segal also argues that Psalm 82:6 is alluded to.

58. Gillingham, (2013), 21-22. Yadin, (1959).

59. Gillingham, (2013), 21-22.

60. Gillingham, (2013), 75.

61. Gillingham says fourth-sixth centuries AD. Gillingham, (2013), 70.

62. Probably third century AD.

63. Gillingham, (2013), 80.

(ii) The Allusion to Isa 42:1

It was established above that the divine voice of Mark 1:11 not only alludes to Ps 2, but also to Isa 42, which reads: "Here is my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights; I have put my spirit upon him; he will bring forth justice to the nations."⁶⁴ This verse is usually described as being part of Isaiah's first 'Servant Song' (vv.1-4,⁶⁵ or vv.1-9⁶⁶). However, this designation is unhelpful, not only because it inaccurately suggests these passages are more poetic than other parts of Isa 40-55,⁶⁷ but especially because it leads the reader too quickly to connect the 'song' of Isa 42:1-4(9) with the other so-called 'Servant Songs' at the expense of its own literary context and other connected themes.

Looking briefly at the content and immediate context Isa 42:1, it describes a figure who is called YHWH's Servant, who will receive his Spirit, and will establish justice. But this figure does not stand in isolation; he needs to be connected with the return of YHWH that takes a prominent position two chapters previously (40:3, 5, 9, 10, 11).⁶⁸ There are extensive debates concerning the identity of the עֶבֶד in Second Isaiah. The debate concerns how the עֶבֶד of 41:8, 9, 44:1, 45:4, 49:3 - who is called Israel/Jacob - relates to the Servant in the so-called Servant Songs - 42:1, 49:5-7, 50:10, 52:13, 53:11 - the identity of whom is more ambiguous; though in LXX 42:1 the servant is identified as Jacob. While we need not presently trace this critical debate, at least it reveals that the identity of the עֶבֶד in Isaiah is by no means clear.⁶⁹ While there have been attempts to identify the servant as a unified figure - Isaiah, Messiah, Israel/Jacob,⁷⁰ and Cyrus have been prominent answers - an in-depth analysis of all the texts and positions is not possible at this point. It is right to mention that the language is "highly individualized",⁷¹ and that the identity of this servant is often argued to be the same as in 61:1-4.⁷² In *Tg. Isa.* the Servant is stated explicitly to be

64. BHS: עֶבְדִּי אֲחַמְדֵּהוּ בְּיָמֵי רָצָה נִפְשִׁי נִתְּתִי רוּחִי עָלָיו מְשַׁפֵּט לְגוֹיִם יוֹצֵא אוֹתוֹ: Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτόν ἡ ψυχὴ μου· ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει.

65. The original proposal by B. Duhm. See Childs, (2001), 323.

66. Goldingay, (2005), 149. Blenkinsopp, (2000), 208. Westermann, (1969), 92.

67. Goldingay, (2005), 149-150.

68. Watts, Rikki. E., "Consolation or Confrontation? Isaiah 40-55 and the Delay of the New Exodus" *TynBul* 41.1 (1990), 33.

69. See e.g. Watts, (1990), 53.

70. Rendtorff, Rolf, *The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament*. (Leiden: Deo, 2005), 189-192. Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 252.

71. Blenkinsopp, (2006), 252.

72. Blenkinsopp, (2006), 254.

the Messiah (43:10, 52:12, and 53:10). In this context it must be stressed that in Isaiah 52:7-8, 13 there is a close connection between the 'good news' of the return of YHWH to reign on Zion and his Servant. P. Stuhlmacher also rightly maintains that the so-called Servant Songs and the prophecy of Isa 61:1ff. are a "concretizing" of the בִּשְׂרָא, and which are the textual referents and basis for New Testament christological claims.⁷³ This connection is not only highlighted by Mark, but occurs also in 11Q13 (Melchizedek), which explicitly links the one who brings the good news of Isa 52:7 with the one who receives the Spirit in Isa 61:1.⁷⁴ In relation to Isa 42:1 what is most important for our present purposes is to consider how Mark interprets the Servant and connects him with the theme of God's return,⁷⁵ God's reign,⁷⁶ and the 'good news' which is proclaimed.⁷⁷ Thus irrespective of whether these can be related to each other in present critical scholarship on Isaiah, it is important that Mark seems to draw these threads together and that he may be affected by other construals in contemporaneous Judaism.

(iii) The Function of the Divine Voice

Having established that the words of the divine voice are taken from Isa 42:1 and Ps 2:7, it remains to be considered what theological meaning these have in the baptismal episode. As has already been argued in Chapter 1, and demonstrated in the context of the introductory citation of 1:2-3 and the tearing of the heavens in 1:9, the larger context of the cited passage is likely to have interpretive significance. There is surely a danger that this could lead to over-interpretation and thus importing too much of the context of the cited text to the detriment of following the cues of the book of Mark itself, and one must therefore emphasise the Markan context.⁷⁸ But Frenschkowski goes too far in denying any importance for the context of the OT passages.⁷⁹ He writes: "*Der Sinn der Himmelsstimme muß für die Theologie des Markus ganz aus den innermarkinischen Parallelen der Sohn-Gottes-Christologie*

73. Stuhlmacher, (1968), 121-122. See also Marcus, (1992), 18-20.

74. See also Blenkinsopp, (2006), 269.

75. Isa 24:23, 25:9-10, 35:3-4, 40:3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 52:7-10, 59:19, 21, 63:1, 66:15, 18.

76. Isa 41:21, 43:15, 44:6, 52:7.

77. Isa 40:1-11, 41:21-29, 52:7-12, 60:1-7, 61:1-11. K. Scholtissek argues that there is no competition between the coming of YHWH and YHWH's agent or representatives such as Messiah or Servant. Scholtissek, Klaus, "Der Sohn Gottes für das Reich Gottes: Zur Verbindung von Christologie und Eschatologie bei Markus," in *Der Evangelist als Theologe: Studien zum Markusevangelium*. Ed. Thomas Söding (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995), 64.

78. Hatina, (2002), 49.

79. Frenschkowski, (1997), 160.

erhoben werden."⁸⁰ However, while both Frenschkowski and Hatina claim to privilege the literary context of the baptismal narrative, over and above the OT context, their position actually undermines the Markan context itself which already has given the indication that the appropriate context for understanding the present narrative is the coming of the Lord (1:2-3, Isa 40:3, Mal 3:1, Isa 63:19) and the Isaianic 'good news' and God's reign (1:14-15, Isa 52:7-8, Dan 2, 7). In order to provide a sufficiently 'thick' description of what takes place in 1:9-11, it needs to be associated with the beginning and end of the prologue: 1:2-3 and 1:14-15. Therefore Mark's identification of Jesus in 1:11 with both the 'servant' of Isa 42:1 and the 'messiah' and 'son' in Ps 2:2, 7 should be understood in light of his introductory citation.⁸¹ The baptism of Jesus also should be connected with the conclusion of Mark's prologue where the arrival of Jesus also brings near ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ which itself is associated with the εὐαγγέλιον (1:14-15). Also significant in this regard is the *inclusio* between the baptism and the death of Jesus, where the tearing of both heaven and the temple veil proclaim the revelation and presence of God. These interrelated themes: the good news, the coming of Jesus and him being revealed as God's Son, and the coming of God and his kingdom, are critical for Mark's whole theology.⁸²

(1) Calling/Commission

A common description of what happens at the baptism is 'calling' or 'commissioning'⁸³ to a specific task. In this argument the similarities with the OT call narratives are usually noted, although J. Gnilka draws support from the calling of Samuel in *L.A.B.* 53 and from *T. Levi* 18.⁸⁴ For C. Drew Smith "[t]he baptismal scene functions in Mark as the point at which Jesus is given authority from God"⁸⁵ and Robert C. Tannehill describes it as Jesus' 'commission', and thus "[t]hat Jesus is Son of God means that he has been chosen and authorized by God to do what he is doing and thereby accomplish God's saving purpose." But the meaning of the designation is only fully known in relation to Jesus' actions of healing, casting out demons,

80. Frenschkowski, (1997), 160. Emphasis original.

81. Guelich, (1982), 8, 10. Marcus, (1992), 20.

82. It has frequently been argued that since the word-order is σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου as opposed to Υἱός μου εἶ σὺ as in Ps 2 LXX, the emphasis is on the fact that it is Jesus rather than John, or anyone else, who is the Son of God. Klauck, (1997), 52, 103. Schenke, (2000), 55. Dillon, (2014), 10. Davies and Allison, (1988), 337. Stein, (2008), 58. Lee, (2009), 178. Vögtle, (1985), 96, 105-106.

83. Nicklas, (2014), 45.

84. Gnilka, (1978), 53. *T. Levi* 18 is likely dependant on the Synoptics as argued in the Appendix.

85. Smith, (2002), 75.

calling disciples, and his death.⁸⁶ While the OT call narratives typically include a vision or audition, as in Mark, they often also include an objection on the part of the called, e.g. Moses and Jeremiah, and the overcoming of this objection as well as further task-descriptions, but here there is no response by Jesus, nor any instructions for the task at hand.⁸⁷ Mark also lacks the typical statement "the word of God came to.." It was shown above that Mark's baptism event has clear similarities with Ezekiel's call narrative; including the opening of heaven, call, location by the river, and the Spirit. These parallels with Ezekiel, which also follow the same sequence, demonstrate that the form of Jesus' inauguration is in line with the calling of a prophet. Hurtado argues that the 'form' of this episode is a call narrative and emphasises the prophetic calling of Jesus and that the baptism narrative commences his ministry; though he stresses that the "substance of the call is to serve as God's chosen Son".⁸⁸ While there are typological correspondences between Jesus' baptism and OT call narratives, in Mark the event that reveals Jesus' relational identity is specifically tied to the Father's voice concerning Jesus' divine sonship as well as the descended Spirit.⁸⁹ In the context of Mark's prologue the event is tied to the fulfilment of the prophetic promises in 1:2-3 and the 'good news' of God's present reign in 1:14-15 which occurs in and through Jesus.

(2) Adoption

While these texts are applied to Jesus and interpret his identity, the question remains as to what actually the divine voice effects. It has frequently been argued on the basis of the proposed adoption of the Israelite king in Ps 2 that what takes place in Mark 1:9-11 is an adoption of Jesus by God. This claim is strengthened by the fact that the divine voice addresses Jesus alone. In the first edition (1903) of his commentary on Mark, Wellhausen wrote "[a]uf alle Fälle liegt die wesentliche Bedeutung der Taufe Jesu darin, daß sie ihn zum Messias umwandelt, daß er als simpler Mensch in das Wasser hinabsteigt und als der Sohn Gottes wieder heraufkommt."⁹⁰ Similarly, M.

86. Tannehill, (1979), 74-75. See also 61, 72.

87. Feuillet, (1959), 487. Rose, (2007), 145.

88. Hurtado, (1989), 19-20.

89. Vögtle, (1985), 92-93.

90. J. Wellhausen, but only in the first edition from 1903. P.7. Cited in Klauck, (1997), 100, and in Kampling, (1992), 61. For second edition see: Wellhausen, (2009).

Dibelius, stressing the descent of the Spirit, argues that one cannot maintain that this episode merely describes who Jesus already is.⁹¹

While many scholars have argued for adoption, there are different ways in how it has been understood. P. Vielhauer maintained in a well-known article that the context of understanding the adoption in Mark is the ancient Egyptian enthronement ceremony⁹² and argued for a progression in Mark from adoption, to proclamation, and finally to acclamation in 1:11, 9:7 and 15:39 respectively.⁹³ By contrast, M. Peppard has linked the baptism of Jesus with the Roman emperors who were believed to be adopted sons of god. A key point for Peppard is that adopted sons were not second-class sons or had lower status, for an adoption could be prestigious depending of the prestige of the adopter.⁹⁴ For in the Roman view the idea of 'sonship' or 'father-son' relationship did not primarily refer to 'generation' or 'begottenness' but rather to 'rule' and 'dependence'.⁹⁵ Therefore, according to Peppard, divinity "was not an essence but a status - a status honored because of powerful benefactions."⁹⁶ Thus Octavian Augustus was a son of god both by being adopted by Julius Caesar and by being son of Apollo.⁹⁷ Peppard argues that to be a son of God in this era basically meant to be son of the emperor; whether begotten or made.⁹⁸ In this context Mark's Gospel is understood as proclaiming Jesus as a 'counter-emperor'.⁹⁹ The baptism is thus compared to Roman imperial accession,¹⁰⁰ and the adoption that takes place is made public at the transfiguration at Caesarea Philippi,¹⁰¹ while the spirit that comes to Jesus is likened to the *genius* or *numen* of the emperor.¹⁰² Peppard has certainly

91. Dibelius, (1971), 231, 271-272. Also Willert, Niels, *Den korsfæstede konge: Kristologi og discipelbillede i Markusevangeliets passionsfortælling*. Vol. 2. (Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 1997), 394-395. Willert, (1997), 220. Dunn, James D.G., *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. (London: SCM, 1975), 65. Donahue and Harrington, (2002), 67. Schröter, (2001), 64.

92. Vielhauer, Philipp, "Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums," in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag im Auftrage der Alten Marburger*. Ed. Erich Dinkler (Tübingen: Mohr, 1964), 161, 167.

93. Vielhauer, (1964), 166-167.

94. Peppard, Michael, *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in its Social and Political Context*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 30, 54, 94. "The adopted son was really to become the son and agent of the adoptive father; he was not a substitute son, nor some kind of second-class son. The adopted son also exchanged his own [status] and took over the status of the adoptive father." Peppard, (2011), 54.

95. Peppard, (2011), 61. Peppard relies on J. Rufus Fears.

96. Peppard, (2011), 35.

97. Peppard, (2011), 48. Peppard, Michael, "The Eagle and the Dove: Roman Imperial Sonship and the Baptism of Jesus (Mark 1.9-11)" *NTS* 56/4 (2010), 435.

98. Peppard, (2011), 48.

99. Peppard, (2011), 123. Peppard, (2010), 455ff.

100. Peppard, (2011), 92.

101. Peppard, (2011), 130.

102. Peppard, (2011), 113-115.

demonstrated a way Mark could and sometimes would have been interpreted by some.¹⁰³

However, the question is whether the author of Mark has provided alternative keys for unlocking the narrative's theological content. First of all, as has been shown, there is even doubt whether Ps 2 itself can be said to involve an adoption. Frenschkowski rightly points out that the argument for an adoption would only be strong if there was evidence that Ps 2:7 was understood in this way before Mark, of which there is no evidence. Secondly, there is no messianic adoption formula with which one can compare Mark 1:9-11.¹⁰⁴ Thirdly, if Mark would have wanted to emphasise that Jesus became the Son of God through the baptismal event, then he would likely have included the second part of Ps 2:7 'today I have begotten you'.¹⁰⁵ Fourthly, if the divine voice would indicate adoption, then Jesus would be adopted twice: at the baptism and the transfiguration.¹⁰⁶ Fifthly, a close reading of Mark 1:2, 1:11, 12:1-12, 12:35-37 suggests that the person of Jesus is preexistent in some sense, and lastly, the author with his introductory citation in 1:2-3 and the other allusions in 1:9-11 and 14-15 has already indicated that the primary conceptual context for understanding Jesus, God and the descended Spirit is Isaiah in particular, but also Psalm 2 and likely also Daniel.

(3) Coronation/Installation/Consecration

It is also common to describe the baptismal event as a 'coronation', 'installation', or 'consecration'. This is related to the adoptionistic view above, but here the focus is especially on Jesus' messiahship. For example, Adele Yarbro Collins states that God 'establishes' or 'recognises' Jesus as his Son and 'appoints' him as Messiah.¹⁰⁷ R. Feldmeier argues that the baptism event is Jesus' 'instalment' (Einsetzung) as Son,¹⁰⁸ while R. Bultmann argues that Jesus is 'consecrated'¹⁰⁹ as Messiah. While it may sometimes be unclear what exactly is meant, it becomes problematic if the baptism episode is taken to mean that Jesus becomes God's Son at this point, because of the

103. Peppard, (2011), 28. Collins, Adela Yarbro, "Mark and His Readers: The Son of God among Greeks and Romans" *The Harvard Theological Review* 93/2 (2000), 86.

104. Frenschkowski, (1997), 160-161.

105. See e.g. Davis, Philip G., "Mark's Christological Paradox" *JSNT* 35/1 (1989), 12. Dillon, (2014), 10. Schenke, (2000), 55. Schenke, (2005), 54. Eckstein, (2005), 52. Nicklas, (2014), 45n16.

106. Boring, (2006), 46. Hooker, (1991), 45. Schenke, (2005), 54. Boring, (1984), 136.

107. Collins, (2007), 150. See also Collins and Collins, (2008), 127.

108. Feldmeier and Spieckermann, (2011b), 232. In German Feldmeier and Spieckermann, (2011a), 234.

109. Bultmann, Rudolf, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), 252-253.

reasons shown above and the preexistence that is indicated by the opening citation. But while the baptism event is not adoptionistic it is still performative. The baptism episode is "decisive for everything which follows",¹¹⁰ for at the baptism Jesus the Messiah-designate¹¹¹ is identified as such and is launched into his public ministry as both Messiah¹¹² and Servant¹¹³ through the anointing by the Spirit¹¹⁴ and the Father's confirmation.

It was discussed in Chapter 1 that in direct speech translations/citations in the Targum, *L.A.B.*, and also in the NT, there is frequently a process of 'reinterpretation' or 'specification' in relation to the *who* of the text, concerning both speaker and addressee.¹¹⁵ S. Docherty argues that it is especially poetic texts that lend themselves most easily to such reinterpretations or 'specifications'. A text which is ambiguous or can be seen to have ambiguous elements in terms of speaker and addressee, can be "tied down" to a specific interpretation.¹¹⁶ Docherty shows that these 'direct speech citations' demonstrate the continual relevance of Scripture for the author, which amplifies God's speech for the present time because God speaks with Scripture which are thus re-applied for new contexts or situations.¹¹⁷ This same can be said to occur in Mark's allusions to Ps 2 and Isa 42, so that words originally spoken about a Davidic king and Isaiah's Servant, are now reapplied to Jesus by God, who is now identified as his Father.

The nature and function of composite citations was also discussed, and according to the definition provided there, Mark 1:11 does not qualify as a 'composite citation' since there is no citation formula; however, one can rather describe it as a composite allusion.¹¹⁸ Nevertheless, the functionality is the same, in that two disparate texts are brought together on the basis of shared linguistic features or theological ideas.¹¹⁹ In this text the Isaianic 'servant' and the 'anointed one' and 'son' of Ps 2 are united. But

110. Nicklas, (2014), 46-47.

111. The term Messiah-designate is here used in distinction from the position of James Robinson, who argued on the basis of the *kerygma* of Acts, that Jesus was the 'Christ-elect' who would be inaugurated as Messiah at the *parousia*. Robinson, J.A.T., "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" *JTS* 7 (1956), 181.

112. Feuillet, (1959), 476, 489. Contra W.E. Bundy who says that there is "nothing distinctly messianic" in the Markan baptism narrative. Bundy, Walter E., "The Meaning of Jesus' Baptism" *JR* 7/1 (1927), 60. Also supported by Eckert, (2000), 221-224.

113. Hatina, (2006), 84-88.

114. Pilgaard, (2008), 66.

115. Samely, (1992), 9-19.

116. Docherty, (2009), 147.

117. Docherty, (2015b), 11, 14, 21.

118. Adams and Ehorn, (2016), 3-4.

119. See also Stanley, (2016), 206-207.

while it is a 'tailored saying' that supports the author's argument, his reading does not run against the grain of the text, but brings the two texts in conversation, as mutually interpretative, and relates them to Jesus. Such an application of these texts is perceived as legitimate because on the understanding of Scripture as still speaking today, and disparate texts can also legitimately be brought together since they are God's words.

Mark's God identifies Jesus with the Servant of Isa 42:1 and thus as the inaugurator of God's own return (Mark 1:2-3, Isa 40:3) and the coming of his kingdom (Mark 1:14-15, Isa 52:7-8). Stressing the 'function' rather the 'identity' of the Servant of Isa 42:1-4, modern scholars are in 'strong agreement' in seeing this in royal terms.¹²⁰ Mark also makes this royal link by associating the Servant with the 'son' of Ps 2 and thus notes the royal and messianic identity of Jesus.¹²¹ Because of these links, Hays calls the baptism event a "*disguised* royal anointing" and Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom a "veiled announcement of his own claim to the throne".¹²² In this hermeneutical process the vague address of Ps 2:7 and the unidentified Servant of Isa 42:1-4 are 'specified' in Mark 1:11 as Jesus. The kingdom of God for Mark is closely linked with Isaiah, Daniel, and perhaps also Ps 2 and in each of these passages there is an agent of God's rule; Servant, stone, Messiah, Son, and in Mark these are united in the person of Jesus. As J. Gnllka writes, "Gottesherrschaft und Jesus sind jetzt so eng miteinander verknüpft, daß man Gottes Wirken nur wahrnimmt, wenn man begreift, wer Jesus ist. Gottesherrschaft und Gottessohn gehören zusammen."¹²³ In 1:11 it is Jesus' identity as Son of God that comes to particular prominence, and who being anointed by God's Spirit brings present God's reigning presence.

Jesus is indeed interpreted in reference to these texts as they are applied to him, but the logic is not simply that Jesus is the anointed king and divine son of Ps 2¹²⁴ as well as Isaiah's Servant. Rather these two figures are combined so that the kind of anointed king Jesus is, is moderated by the Isaianic Servant. Hence the *anointed one*, will not simply crush his earthly enemies as in Ps 2, but he will also bring justice, release prisoners, bind up the broken-hearted (Isa 42:1-9, 61:1-3), bring God's rule

120. Williamson, (1998), 132, 135, 164. Goldingay, (2005), 150-153. Watts, (1997), 115.

121. Cranfield, (1955), 55. Cranfield, (1959), 55. Goldingay, John, "Servant of Yahweh," in *Dictionary of the Old Testament Prophets*. Eds. Mark J. Boda and J. Gordon McConville (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2012), 702.

122. Hays, (2016), 48. Emphasis original.

123. Gnllka, (1992), 154.

124. Aquila Lee argues that the Ps 2 allusion serves mainly to introduce Jesus as Son of God rather than as Messiah. Lee, (2009), 174.

(42:1-9), receive God's Holy Spirit (Isa 42:1); yet he himself will be crushed for the sins of many (Isa 53:10).¹²⁵ The composite allusion provides a composite image of the Son's identity. While in Mark divine sonship is closely associated with messiahship in 1:1, 1:11, 8:32-9:7, and 14:62, these are not identical descriptions.¹²⁶ The specific manner in which Jesus is this Servant/Messiah/Son is yet again moderated by Jesus' own narrative and relationships.

(4) Revelation of the Son of God

The philosopher Gilbert Ryle noted that actions can be described with various levels of complexity, which he labeled as 'thick' or 'thin' descriptions. A 'thin description' is when an action is described without reference to intentionality and context,¹²⁷ and thus, as Vanhoozer notes, "suffer from a poverty of meaning."¹²⁸ In contrast, "[a] description is sufficiently thick when it allows us to appreciate everything the author is doing in a text."¹²⁹ The 'thinnest' description of the baptism event would solely describe the immersion in water, but Mark has gone beyond this and described it as a 'baptism' and included the context of the torn heaven, the descent of the Spirit, and the heavenly voice. A 'thicker' description of the baptism event notes that Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah-designate, is anointed with God's Spirit to be launched into his 'messianic' and 'servant' ministry. But there is more that takes place in this passage, and therefore this foundational event needs a still 'thicker' description, for as Karl Barth famously wrote in the preface to the second edition of his Romans commentary, an interpreter must beware of focussing solely on background issues, lexical details, literary sources etc, for these are merely 'a first step towards a commentary'.¹³⁰ An interpretation must consider 'Die Sache' of the text. While the former details are important and helpful they fall short of a sufficiently 'thick description'.

125. See also Focant, (2010), 69. Stuhlmacher, (2012), 137. Scholtissek, Klaus, *Die Vollmacht Jesu: Traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Analysen zu einem Leitmotiv markinischer Christologie*. NTAbh. 25. Aschendorff Münster, 1992), 135.

126. As argued by Juel, (1988), 81, and Juel, (1977), 82, 111. Though he also suggests that there is more to the designation 'Son of God' and that it goes beyond a messianic meaning to a relational meaning.

127. Ryle, Gilbert, "The Thinking of Thoughts: What is 'Le Penseur' doing?," in *Collected Papers: Collected Essays 1929-1968*. Ed. (London: Hutchinson, 1971), 480ff.

128. Vanhoozer, Kevin J., "Exegesis and Hermeneutics," in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Eds. Alexander T.D and B.S. Rosner (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000), 62.

129. Vanhoozer, Kevin J., *Is there a Meaning in this Text? The Bible, the Reader and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. (Leicester: Apollos, 1998), 284. Emphasis original.

130. Barth, Karl, *The Epistle to the Romans*. 6th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 6 and Thiselton, Anthony C., *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description*. (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1980), 317.

There is more than one label that can rightly be applied to this event, e.g. 'identification',¹³¹ 'confirmation' (Vergewisserung),¹³² and 'calling'. But the voice at the baptism does more than simply identify Jesus' occupation or function, for it also concerns his identity, who he is; especially in relation to God, and this needs to be addressed in order for the description to be sufficiently 'thick'. Boring notes that both 1:11 and 9:7 "announce something that already is, without answering the question of when the reality it announces came into being, or if it had a beginning at all."¹³³ The baptism event gives answer to the question "who is Jesus?".¹³⁴

The baptism episode is also a revelatory event; an 'Offenbarungsszene'.¹³⁵ Not only of Jesus as the Son of God and the carrier of God's Spirit, but also of God as his Father and the relationship between the two. But this revelation is not perceived by all, and thus Dibelius' description 'a hidden epiphany' is apt. What takes place at the baptism is not an adoption, but the identification of Jesus as God's Son and his inauguration to his role as Messiah and Servant. However, that Jesus is God's Son means more than simply in a functional sense,¹³⁶ for divine sonship is not "act" (Akt) but position (Setzung).¹³⁷ While the functional description is not wrong, it is not adequately 'thick' for describing the meaning of Jesus' divine sonship and the baptismal event.¹³⁸

M. Hengel noted that υἱός in Greek "is almost completely limited to physical descent, and a transferred meaning is only marginal."¹³⁹ However, the Hebrew בן has a much wider sense that includes physical descent, but also 'subordination'.¹⁴⁰ Thus heavenly beings can be called 'sons of God', as well as David and the Davidic king in 2 Sam 7, Ps 2, and Ps 110.¹⁴¹ Hengel rightly rejects the view that the origin of Jesus' divine sonship was in mystery cults, divine men, or gnostic redeemer myths or other Hellenistic analogies,¹⁴² and calls these explanations "entirely unsatisfactory".¹⁴³

131. Kazmierski, Carl R., *Jesus, Son of God: A Study of the Markan Tradition and its Redaction by the Evangelist*. (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982), 39. Owen, (2015), 56.

132. Frenschkowski, (1997), 159-161. Pilgaard, (2008), 26. Rawlinson, (1949), 10-11. Hanson, (2000), 127. Cranfield, (1955), 55. Cranfield, (1959), 55. See also Rose, (2007), 145. Taylor, (1966), 162.

133. Boring, (1984), 136.

134. Bundy, (1927), 63.

135. Vögtle, (1985), 70, 98. Guttenberger, (2004), 88.

136. See e.g. Tannehill, (1979), 75. Malbon, (2009), 65, 174.

137. Frenschkowski, (1997), 159-161, 165. Though Frenschkowski argues it is not ontic.

138. Another important aspect of divine sonship that has not be possible to discuss here is the importance of death and suffering. E.g. Focant notes: "la filiation divine de Jésus n'est comprise correctement que si elle intègre sa Passion." Focant, (2009), 17.

139. Hengel, (2007), 21.

140. Hengel, (2007), 21.

141. Hengel, (2007), 22.

142. Hengel, (2007), 25-41.

143. Hengel, (2007), 41.

Hengel argued that one must turn to Jewish sources and that while Mark is written in Greek its conceptuality is Hebraic.¹⁴⁴ The notion of divine sonship is not rare in Second Temple Judaism and finds expression in connection with royal messianism in Qumran,¹⁴⁵ Jewish mysticism, preexistent wisdom,¹⁴⁶ and is also found in Philo.¹⁴⁷ Without minimising the important differences between them, Hengel noted some of the salient analogies in the varied functions or qualities of the Son of God in these texts, such as preexistence, sending into the world, involvement in creation, which he described as "substantial building material" for the first christian believers.¹⁴⁸ Divine sonship does not necessarily indicate preexistence or even deity,¹⁴⁹ but in the context of Mark Jesus' preexistence and divinity is indicated by him being included within the identity of YHWH.

While both the original context and subsequent traditions of Isa 42:1 and Ps 2:7 are informative, their meaning in 1:11 is ultimately shaped by its use in this verse and in the rest of Mark. Wainwright notes that 'son of God' does not necessarily denote divinity in the OT, but in the NT is it used "in such a way as to explain the relationship between Jesus and his Father."¹⁵⁰ The use of the description ἀγαπητός also emphasises Jesus' special filial relationship with God¹⁵¹ and the 'Son of God' language brings Jesus as close to God as possible without equating them. For as Bauckham contends, this "title indicates Jesus' unique relationship to God as one who participates in the divine identity."¹⁵²

The relational aspect in the term 'son' also implies that the speaker is 'father'. Concerning the terminology C. Rose rightly notes: "Die Termini „Vater“ und „Sohn“ sind aufeinander hingeordnet; wird der eine verwendet, verweist er immer zugleich

144. Hengel, (2007), 42.

145. Likely the Aramaic Apocalypse, 4Q246 and the 4QFlorilegium, 4Q174, see above.

146. Hengel, (2007), 41-51, 89.

147. Hengel, (2007), 51-56.

148. Hengel, (2007), 57, 89. For how a Greek or Roman might have heard this passage see Collins, (2000) and Peppard, (2011).

149. Dunn, (1980), 22, 64.

150. Wainwright, (1962), 175.

151. Kampling, (1992), 57. See also Feuillet, (1959), 480. Rowe, (2002b), 249. Based on the LXX of Gen 22:2 which translates the יָחִיד (only) with ἀγαπητός, C.H. Turner has argued that ἀγαπητός has the nuance of 'only' and that the point is 'unique sonship'. Turner, C.H., "O YIOC MOY O ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ" *JTS* 27/106 (1926), Gundry, (1993a), 49. This point was also made by Athanasius who wrote: "'Only-begotten' and 'well-beloved' are the same, as in the words 'this is my well-beloved Son.' For not as wishing to signify his love towards him did he say 'well-beloved,' as if it might appear that he hated others, but he made plain thereby his being only-begotten, that he might shew that he alone was from him." Athanasius, *Contra Arius* IV, 24. I owe this reference to Turner, (1926), 126.

152. Bauckham, (2008c), 265. While 'Son of God' has a royal meaning, it is not limited to this. Juel, (1994), 99-100.

auf den anderen".¹⁵³ Rose further notes that by this the author expresses their relation. He states that the Son of God language,

bringt das „Zugehörigkeitsverhältnis" von Gott zu Jesus Christus und umgekehrt zum Ausdruck. Der Titel „Sohn Gottes" ist von daher aus der Relation „der Vater - der Sohn" zu verstehen:... Zugleich drückt der Erzähler die Innigkeit und Verbundenheit beider aus, die enger kaum vorstellbar ist.¹⁵⁴

Malbon has claimed that the divine voice at the baptism (and transfiguration) is "impressively high in drama, but amazingly low in content concerning what it means for Jesus to be called God's son."¹⁵⁵ But this is not right, for the meaning of sonship is not understood in abstract and philosophical terms, but rather in a unique relationship. It is precisely this - his relationship to God - that is the fundamental question concerning his identity.¹⁵⁶ This same point has been stressed by L. Schenke who writes: "Die Himmelsstimme macht Jesus nicht zu etwas, sondern identifiziert ihn als den „geliebten/einzigen Sohn“, und zwar vor den Lesern!"¹⁵⁷ What therefore transpires is a statement of who Jesus already is, which is defined in relation to God as Father, rather than on what he has now become or will be in the future.¹⁵⁸

In Chapter 1 it was argued that the use of the citation in 1:2-3 identifies Jesus with the YHWH of both Malachi 3:1 and Isa 40:3, yet being distinct from him. The divine words of v.2 are addressed in a supra-temporal occasion: YHWH speaks to Jesus prior to narrative time, which suggests a relationship that precedes this narrative time, and thus implies Jesus' preexistence in some sense. In the statement "you are my son" in Ps 2:7 it is the anointed one who reports the prior words of YHWH concerning him.¹⁵⁹ But when these words are said to Jesus at his baptism the exchange differs, for now it is not Jesus reporting the statement of the psalmist, but rather God speak them, echoing an original affirmation that is prior to even Ps 2.¹⁶⁰

153. Rose, (2007), 144.

154. Rose, (2007), 144. Also Guttenberger, (2004), 85.

155. Malbon, (2009), 174. Emphasis original.

156. Cook, (1997), 78. Witherington, Ben, "The Christology of Jesus," in *Who Do You Say that I Am? Essays on Christology*. Eds. Mark Allen Powell and David R. Bauer (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999). 8.

157. Schenke, (2005), 54. Emphasis original. See also Schenke, (2000), 55. Schenke, (1988), 109.

158. Rose, (2007), 143, 148.

159. Bates, (2015), 64n49.

160. Susan Docherty in her book on the use of the OT in Hebrews discusses Ps 2, and suggests that the author could have interpreted the parallelism in Ps 2:4, "the one who sits in heaven" and "the lord" as two different figures; God and Jesus. This could also be the case for Mark. However, while her argument is possible, it remains weak unless further evidence is offered. Docherty, (2009), 145.

While the present tense εἶ describes the current status of Jesus' relation to the Father,¹⁶¹ the question is how εὐδόκησα in 1:11 should be interpreted.¹⁶² C.E.B. Cranfield and Stanley E. Porter call it a "timeless aorist"¹⁶³ while Daniel Wallace calls it a "gnomic aorist"¹⁶⁴ (which is also termed "omnitemporal"¹⁶⁵). Robertson says εὐδόκησα could be either "gnomic" or "timeless"¹⁶⁶ and does not distinguish between them, saying that the gnomic aorist is "universal" or "timeless".¹⁶⁷ The distinction between the "gnomic" or the "timeless" may not be significant for our purposes, but rather the notion that the "temporal reference" of εὐδόκησα in Mark 1:11 is "unrestricted" and that "it is a statement that is always true".¹⁶⁸ Whether timeless and gnomic, it does not describe past action from a narrative point of view, for the Father's delight for Jesus is not for a particular deed or the baptism,¹⁶⁹ but is omnitemporal and is for his person as a whole.¹⁷⁰ In short, Jesus is not made Son because God was well-pleased, but rather God is well-pleased because Jesus is his Son. While Decker thinks it unlikely that this is an "ontological statement of eternal relationship", he concedes it is a linguistic possibility.¹⁷¹

The divine voice is the means of an epiphany that hints at the transcendent origins of the Son of God.¹⁷² The baptism event is performative without being an adoption, for the voice confirms the identity of Jesus as the Son of God and launches him into his ministry. The baptism event is pivotal for the whole of Mark and the divine voice is the climax of the baptism event. The hidden identity of Jesus is revealed, and is

161. Vögtle argues that both parts of the heavenly voice indicate that Jesus was already the Son of God before the baptism. Vögtle, (1985), 106-107.

162. See Stagg on the abused aorist especially if it is understood as punctiliar. Stagg, Frank, "The Abused Aorist" *JBL* 91/2 (1972)

163. Cranfield, (1959), 56. Porter, Stanley E., *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd edition. (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 39.

164. Wallace, Daniel B., *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: A Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 562.

165. Porter, (1994), 38.

166. Robertson, A.T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 836-837.

167. Robertson, (1934), 836.

168. Decker, Rodney J., *Mark 1-8: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014), 14. Decker, Rodney J., *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect*. Studies in Biblical Greek. 10. (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 98. R. Decker, analysing the indicative aorist in Mark's Gospel, found that the majority of occurrences refer to a past action 88.6% (453 of 511) of the time, while being temporally unrestricted 9% (46 of 511) of the time (including in 1:11). Decker, (2001), 95.

169. As suggested in Voelz, (2013), 127.

170. Campbell, Constantine R., *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 36-38.

171. Decker, (2001), 224n38.

172. Frenschkowski, (1997), 159-161, 165. Feuillet says this episode is indisputably trinitarian and that there is an emphasis on the revelation of the divine sonship of Jesus. Feuillet, (1959), 482. See also France, (2002), 74.

revealed in such a way as not to be perceived, it is "a secret epiphany".¹⁷³ But Jesus' relation to God is revealed to the reader who is privy to special knowledge in the Gospel and the whole baptismal episode is an epiphany or revelation to the reader who is invited to witness it and is addressed by it.¹⁷⁴ While there are no secrets for the readers, the paradox of Jesus' identity as both YHWH and distinct from YHWH still persists. As Boring writes, "[t]he identity of Jesus is a matter of revelation, not deduction. Mark is concerned to communicate the reality of Jesus as he truly is, that is, as seen in the eyes of God."¹⁷⁵ Thus a sufficiently thick description of this text would be: Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah-designate and preexistent Son of God, is anointed with God's Spirit to be launched into his 'messianic' and 'servant' ministry. The heavenly voice reveals Jesus to be God's Son and God's as his Father.

(5) Conclusion

It has been argued that the designation of Jesus as God's Son must be understood in the context of the fact that God is revealed in the narrative through his actions and relations. It is Jesus as the Spirit-anointed Son of God who constitutes the coming of God's long-awaited presence and reign. As C. Breytenbach notes, "[d]ie markinische Christologie ist kein selbständiges Thema. Sie muß im weiteren Horizont der markinischen Darstellung des eschatologischen Gotteshandelns gesehen werden!"¹⁷⁶ But Mark does not speak of God's act only but of God's coming, and thus while the notion that Jesus fulfils the roles of Son of Man, the Isaianic Servant, and the anointed Son of Ps 2, is important for understanding his work and identity, these designations are in the shadow of Jesus' unique divine sonship.¹⁷⁷ As J. Marcus writes, "[i]n Markan Christology, therefore, there can be no dichotomy between a royal interpretation of Jesus' divine sonship and a concept of that sonship that sees Jesus as participating in some way in God's very power and being."¹⁷⁸ While divine

173. See also Williamson Jr, Lamar, *Mark. Int.* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1983), 35. Schenke, (1988), 109.

174. Focant, (2010), 70. As M. Hooker argues, it is not adoption but a "declaration of Jesus' identity". Though she does not specify for whom the declaration is made. Hooker, (1991), 48. See also Stein, (2008), 58. Rose, (2007), 147.

175. Boring, (2006), 46.

176. Breytenbach, Cilliers, "Grundzüge Markinischer Gottessohn-Christologie," in *Anfänge der Christologie: Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag*. Eds. Cilliers Breytenbach and Henning Paulsen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 173.

177. Marshall, I. Howard, "The Divine Sonship of Jesus" *Int* 21 (1967), 93, 100. Cranfield, (1955), 61ff. These should not be divided into separate christologies. Stuhlmacher, (2012), 136. See also Cranfield, (1955), 61ff.

178. Marcus, (1992), 72.

sonship does have messianic connotations, one must privilege Mark's own narrative above its background and history of religion¹⁷⁹ and emphasise its relational nature.

It was argued that this episode needs a 'thicker description', because divine sonship in Mark is also a way of describing Jesus' close relationship with God as Father, which brings them in the closest possible relation to each other. This relational term is important because it shows us that Jesus is only truly understood in relation to the Father, and also the Father is only truly revealed in Jesus, for Jesus' divine sonship is not merely functional; it concerns his identity.¹⁸⁰ Divine sonship denotes more than "quasi-divinity" as suggested by Marcus,¹⁸¹ and the baptism does not highlight a distance or separation between God and Jesus, as argued by Driggers¹⁸² but rather as Hays writes "[t]he Father/Son language binds Jesus in the closest possible relationship with God, whose glory and authority Jesus shares, while maintaining a distinction of roles and persons."¹⁸³ Guttenberger thus rightly states that in the prologue "Gott wird vorgestellt als der auf Jesus Christus als bezogene Gott." and adds "[b]ereits hier wird deutlich, dass, über Gott im Markusevangelium zu reden, heißen wird, über ihn in seiner Beziehung zu Jesus zu reden."¹⁸⁴ But Mark gives no "conceptual solution" to the problem of Jesus being identified with YHWH and also distinct from him, but "his narrative holds these truths in taut suspension."¹⁸⁵ One cannot simply separate Son and Father and look at each in isolation for they belong together. This relationship needs to be embedded in Mark's unfolding narrative.¹⁸⁶

(b) The Narrative Revelation of Divine Sonship

"Mark's primary concern is to communicate the significance of Jesus as *God* sees him."¹⁸⁷ So writes Cook, referring to the whole Gospel, rather than simply to the baptism episode. In this section it will be explored how Jesus' divine sonship is known. In order to perceive how the divine disclosure of Jesus' identity functions within the narrative world of Mark, the important feature traditionally known as 'the

179. Dunn, (1980), 14-15.

180. Edwards, (1991), 53. Davis, (1989), 13.

181. Marcus, (1989), 140-141.

182. Driggers, (2007), 14.

183. Hays, (2016), 77. Also Smith, (2003), 159.

184. Guttenberger, (2004), 56.

185. Hays, (2016), 78.

186. Meye Thompson, Marianne, *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*. (Louisville, KY: WJK, 2000), 91.

187. Cook, (1997), 70. Emphasis original.

'messianic secret' needs to be addressed. This will help in seeing how a variety of components within Mark contribute to present Jesus' identity as being imperceptible to human beings apart from God's revelation and how this revelation of Jesus as God's Son in fact also functions as a revelation of God.

Critical to Mark's Gospel is the identity of Jesus. As Jesus emerges on the scene people wonder "what is this? A new teaching—with authority! He commands even the unclean spirits, and they obey him." (1:27) and "who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" (4:41). The identity of Jesus which is a mystery to the human characters of the narrative is on the contrary known by the demons who oppose him (1:24-25, 3:11-12). As was noted in the section in Chapter 1 concerning 'the narrative function of the prologue', the reader knows from the introduction of the Gospel who this Jesus really is: Χριστός [υἱὸς θεοῦ], whose appearance fulfils the prophecy of Isaiah 40:3-4 and Malachi 3:1. At critical junctures God speaks from heaven to confirm and reveal Jesus' identity; first to the reader (1:11), then to the three inner disciples (9:7). Thus in Mark the reader is given privileged information withheld from the human characters of the narrative. This contrasts, for example, with *Gos. Thom.* where Thomas is privileged above the other disciples as well as the reader to receive secret knowledge of Jesus' identity (*Saying* 13). These observations on the interplay in Mark between the hiddenness and 'revealedness' of Jesus' identity are intricately connected to the notion of the 'messianic secret' as first identified by W. Wrede.

In his original work W. Wrede noted a series of rather curious features which he argued needed to be taken together: the injunction to silence to people whom Jesus had healed¹⁸⁸ and to demons he encountered,¹⁸⁹ the command not to tell anyone following both Peter's confession¹⁹⁰ and the transfiguration.¹⁹¹ While Jesus frequently gives private and special teaching to his disciples,¹⁹² they often fail to understand¹⁹³ or even oppose him.¹⁹⁴ Moreover, Jesus frequently avoids the crowds¹⁹⁵ and refuses to

188. 1:44, 5:43, 7:36, 8:26.

189. 1:24-25, 34, 3:11-12.

190. 8:30.

191. 9:9.

192. 4:10-11, 34, 9:28-29, 9:30-32, 10:10, 10:32, 13:3-37.

193. 6:52, 8:14-21.

194. 8:32-33, 9:32, 9:38, 10:13-14.

195. 1:45, 6:31, 45-47, 7:24, 9:30.

oblige the Pharisees who ask for a sign¹⁹⁶ or to reveal the source of his authority.¹⁹⁷ In addition, Jesus states that the puzzling purpose of parables is to confound and conceal, rather than to clarify and reveal.¹⁹⁸

The basic thesis of Wrede's work is well known and need not be recounted in full here; likewise the intricacies of the 'messianic secret' debate - such as whether it goes back to the historical Jesus,¹⁹⁹ Mark²⁰⁰ or to the Markan community²⁰¹ - need not presently concern us. However, a few points are in order. First, what Wrede claims is not that the messianic secret is Mark's invention, but that it originated from the earliest Christian community, in order to explain why Jesus had not been recognised as the Messiah.²⁰² Second, the cornerstone of Wrede's proposal is that he takes all of the above features together to make a unified argument; a proposal which has been a point of contention ever since;²⁰³ with some scholars like E. Trocmé, R. Pesch, and H. Räisänen viewing Wrede's assemblage of texts to be "really only a hotchpotch of unrelated material."²⁰⁴

However, while accepting that the function of parables, miracles, and the lack of perception of the disciples are legitimate individual motifs in their own right, it is a mistake to assume that for this reason they neither overlap nor inform each other in Mark's Gospel.²⁰⁵ In order to pay critical attention to Mark's narrative moves and the book as a whole, it is necessary to take these varied components together. The text was written to be read and understood as a unified piece of work, and while the various secrecy themes can legitimately be analysed individually, they are mutually informative when the complete narrative is taken seriously. The secrecy motif has the primary purpose of directing the reader to an understanding of Jesus, based not on partial human recognition but on God's own affirmation and revelation, which in turn

196. 8:11-12.

197. 11:27-33.

198. 4:11-12. References indebted to Telford, William R., *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 42.

199. E.g. see Dunn, James D.G., "The Messianic Secret in Mark" *TynBul* 21 (1970)

200. Bultmann, Rudolf, *Theology of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. (London: SCM, 1952), 32.

201. As argued by W. Wrede himself. See Tuckett, Christopher, "Introduction: The Problem of the Messianic Secret," in *The Messianic Secret*. Ed. Christopher Tuckett (London: SPCK, 1983), 6, 12.

202. Telford, William R., *Mark*. T&T Study Guides. (London: T&T Clark, 1995), 129-130. Telford, (1999), 46-47. Tuckett, (1983). Aune, David E., "The Problem of the Messianic Secret" *NovT* 11 (1969), 4-8. Dunn, (1970), 92-93.

203. Räisänen, Heikki, *The 'Messianic Secret' in Mark*. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 242-243.

204. Tuckett, (1983), 20. See e.g. Trocmé, E., "Is There a Markan Christology?," in *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of C.F.D. Moule*. Eds. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 8-10.

205. Kingsbury, (1983), 11.

will shed light on Mark's presentation of God. Accepting that Wrede was right in looking at the above features in unity²⁰⁶ does not necessarily entail accepting his wider argument. What is of primary interest presently is not the correlation between history and text as such, but rather the narrative progression of the unveiling of Jesus' identity as God's Son in Mark. The secrecy theme functions as a literary device.²⁰⁷ Just as the first followers encountered Jesus in a hidden revelation of his true identity, so also subsequent readers of this Gospel will encounter him in a similar fashion.²⁰⁸

What then is it about Jesus' identity that is being unveiled? Memorably Wrede termed it the 'messianic secret' and thereby clearly identifying the nature of the secret. However, this is also a matter which has garnered discussion. While E. Lohmeyer argued for a 'Son of Man' secret,²⁰⁹ many scholars have rather argued for a 'Son of God' secret, while for K. Iverson the point is not the content of the secret but the notion of secrecy itself.²¹⁰ While D. Garland argues that the secret is the *death* of the Messiah,²¹¹ R. Bauckham refers to the secret of Jesus 'divine identity'.²¹² Martin Hengel used the term "Persöngeheimnis", as a reference to Jesus' hidden identity as God's Son (Sohnesgeheimnis) and his knowing God and doing his will (Gottesgewißheit), and argued that the secret was revealed at the resurrection.²¹³ C. Focant on the other hand prefers to call it "un christologie 'mystique' de Marc".²¹⁴

Though some of the above themes overlap, it seems that the main secret as far as Mark is concerned is Jesus' divine sonship. Despite being used sparingly, the title - or better: identification - which takes prominence in Mark is 'Son of God'. This, as will be shown, can be seen both in the voice of the narrator as well as within the narrative world of the Gospel itself. The reader is in the prologue shown the true identity of Jesus. First - possibly - in the opening sentence where Jesus is identified as Jesus Christ, Son of God (1:1).²¹⁵ While the originality of the phrase 'Son of God' in 1:1 is

206. See e.g. Collins, (2007), 172 and Watson, Francis, "The Social Function of Mark's Secrecy Theme" *JSNT* 24 (1985), 51, 55.

207. Stuhlmacher, (2012), 146.

208. Childs, Brevard S, *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction*. (London: SCM, 1984), 84-85.

209. Tuckett, (1983), 10.

210. Iverson, Kelly R., "Wherever the Gospel is Preached': The Paradox of Secrecy in the Gospel of Mark," in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*. Eds. Kelly R. Iverson and Christopher W. Skinner (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 189.

211. Garland, David E., *A Theology of Mark's Gospel*. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015), 383.

212. Bauckham, (2008c), 265.

213. See Deines, (2013), 418-419.

214. Focant, (2009), 1.

215. Text-critically it is uncertain whether the phrase 'Son of God' is original. This reading (with slight orthographical variations) is found in Ⲙ (margin) B D L W, while Ⲙ* 0038 28c lack 'Son of God', and 28*

debated, its presence or absence does not affect the overall view that the narrator gives privileged information concerning the identity of Jesus in the prologue, and that 'Son of God' is a key term in Mark. The perceptive reader will notice the author's identification of the coming of Jesus with the coming of God himself (1:2-3). Importantly in Mark's Gospel, the only instances of God acting as an active agent in the narrative are the divine speeches at Jesus' baptism (1:11) and at the transfiguration (9:7). In both cases the reliable voice of God identifies Jesus as his Son, and the reader - being privileged to eavesdrop on this private communication - is early on made aware of God's own view of his own relation to Jesus. Therefore it would be better to speak of the secret of divine sonship, rather than the 'messianic secret'.²¹⁶

(i) Non-Human Knowledge of Jesus' Divine Sonship

The human characters in the narrative are in the dark regarding Jesus' true identity: whether the public (1:27), his disciples (4:41), his family, (3:21), the people of his home town (6:2-3), or the scribes (3:22). However, his identity is clearly known by the supernatural beings: the demons (1:24, 34, 3:11, 5:7) and God (1:11, 9:7). There are two instances of the divine voice identifying Jesus as God's Son (1:11, 9:7), while the demons also twice disclose the secret of Jesus' sonship (3:11, 5:7). These revelatory moments - together with both Jesus' and the centurion's confessions - are all pivotal in Mark and constitute an essential part of the 'Son of God secret'. An analysis of these developments reveals who the true custodian of the secret is and how and by whom it is permitted to be disclosed.

The knowledge of the secret divine sonship of Jesus belongs to God who is the only one who has the rightful authority to reveal it; first to the reader (1:1, 1:11) and then to Jesus' disciples (9:7). Any other revelation of Jesus' identity is either derivative of

has only 'Jesus'. Unfortunately there are no extant papyri of this verse. While the textual evidence for its inclusion is strong, the practice of expanding book titles has also been documented. See Metzger, Bruce, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd edition. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 63 and Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 270-271. Its absence can be explained by *homoioteleuton* because of all the genitive endings in verse 1. While it is often considered unlikely for such an omission to creep in so early when the scribe is unlikely to be affected by fatigue, the G.Thom, P.Oxyrhynchus, 654, has two mistakes in its first sentence, including in the first word, writing οἱ instead of οὗτοι or possibly τοῖτοι and an additional unnecessary οἱ after the first οἱ. However, the evidence is not conclusive and scholars are quite evenly divided between regarding it as original or as a later addition. For original: Boring, (2006), 30. Donahue and Harrington, (2002), 60. Stein, (2008), 52. Edwards, (2002), 26. France, (2002), 49. Hurtado, (1989), 23. Gnilka, (1978), 43. Focant, (2010), 56. As a later addition: Marcus, (2000), 141. Schweizer, (1970), 30. Collins, (2007), 130. Collins, Adela Yarbro, "Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism" *Semeia* 36 (1986).

216. Keck, (1966), 368. Also Telford, (1999), 41.

God's authority or is prohibited. Therefore, when the demons - who have the similarity with God of being non-human beings - publicly reveal the correct identity of Jesus (1:24-25, 3:11-12, 5:6-8) they are forbidden to speak (1:25, 3:11-12). But it is not only his identity they know, but also his role in destroying them (1:24).²¹⁷

A close examination of these passages reveals important similarities and differences between them. In 1:24-25 and 3:11-12 Jesus rebukes the demons and orders them to be silent. In 1:24-25 and 5:6-8 Jesus tells the demons to come out of the man they are possessing. In 3:11-12 and 5:6-8 the demons fall down before Jesus even before he utters a word, and in these same passages Jesus is identified as the Son of God: *σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* and *Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου*, respectively. However, in 1:24 the demons identify Jesus as *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*. The meaning of this unusual reference is unclear and may function as a loose synonym for Son of God in Mark.²¹⁸ Or possibly, as Procsch suggests, Jesus is the Holy One of God because he has the Holy Spirit.²¹⁹

The view from beyond human perception is crucial, even when it includes the testimony of hostile forces. Some of the patristic authors were uneasy in accepting the testimony of demons. For example, Ambrose stated that he could only accept this confession because it was obtained through torment, and not a free confession on the demon's part.²²⁰ However, in Mark's Gospel even though the demons are seen as enemies, the text itself gives the indication that their testimony is true, for the narrator states that Jesus silenced the demons *ὅτι ἤδεισαν αὐτόν* (1:34. See also 1:24). While the demon's testimony is correct and reliable, it is also illegitimate and unauthorised because they do not possess God's authority for revealing it.²²¹ Furthermore, the demon's 'correct' testimony is separated from God's own definition of its meaning and Jesus forbids them to speak for they "try to use their knowledge of his identity only for sinister purposes."²²² The open declaration of the secret of his divine sonship would likely also hinder his way to the cross.

217. Robinson, (1957), 37.

218. A reading supported by Stein, (2008), 88. Lane, (1974), 74, and Kingsbury, (1983), 86.

219. Procsch, Otto, "ἅγιος," in *TDNT*. Ed. G. Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 101-102.

220. Oden, Thomas C. and Christopher A. Hall, *Mark*. ACCS. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2005), 22.

221. Stein, (2008), 97. Hengel, Martin, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. (London: SCM, 1985), 43. Kingsbury, (1983), 86-87.

222. Garland, (2015), 373. Though he denies that these are true confessions of Jesus' identity. P. 375. See also Schenke, (1988), 112.

But why and how do the demons know Jesus? It may be as J. Marcus suggests, that they are spiritual beings²²³ or part of the unseen world.²²⁴ This would be supported by the *T. Sol.*,²²⁵ but in this much later text the demons also have very different characteristics than in the Gospels, such as being seen and carrying stones for the temple. It is also possible that the demons' familiarity with Jesus is because they overheard God's voice - just as the reader - and were witnesses to the confirmation of his identity as God's beloved Son at the testing immediately afterwards (1:13).²²⁶ However, E.S. Malbon's suggestion that the demons have firsthand combatant knowledge is more attuned to the narrative²²⁷ and ties well with Lane's proposal that they recognise him as the bearer of the Holy Spirit - the antithesis of πνεῦμα ἁκάθαρτον (1:23).²²⁸ This could explain why they call him 'Son of God' (3:11-12, 5:6-8) and 'Holy One of God' (1:24), for Jesus' identity as 'Son' is closely linked with the Spirit that came on him and their knowledge may originate from the testing episode (1:13). In any case, the demons know who Jesus is and Jesus quiets them. Even the failure to keep the demons quiet reveals his identity, for "Jesus' stature is so great that it cannot be hidden; paradoxically the silencing serve the purpose of revelation".²²⁹

(ii) Human Knowledge of Jesus' Divine Sonship

In Mark when human characters perceive the true nature of Jesus' identity, these constitute significant epiphanic moments.²³⁰ However, it must be stressed at this point that although human confession of the identity of Jesus are key moments in Mark, they are not complete: John's identification of Jesus as the "stronger one" and the one

223. Marcus, (2000), 188. Also suggested by Collins, Adela Yarbro, "Messianic Secret and the Gospel of Mark: Secrecy in Jewish Apocalypticism, the Hellenistic Mystery Religions, and Magic," in *Rending the Veil: Concealment and Secrecy in the History of Religions*. Ed. Elliot R. Wolfson (New York: Seven Bridges, 1999), 26.

224. Marcus, Joel, "Mark 4:10-12 and Marcan Epistemology" *JBL* 103/4 (1984), 559.

225. Here the demon Ornias claims that the demons know the time of the death of a certain person because "[w]e demons go up to the firmament of heaven, fly around among the stars, and hear the decisions which issue from God concerning the lives of men." (*T. Sol.* 20:12). Dated to between the first and third centuries AD in Evans, (2005a), 44.

226. Hooker hints that the demons know Jesus because of the temptation episode. Hooker, (1991), 64.

227. Malbon, (2009), 80-81, 126, 132.

228. Lane, (1974), 74.

229. Words of Marcus, summarising H.J. Ebeling. Cited in Marcus, Joel, "Identity and Ambiguity in Markan Christology," in *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*. Eds. Beverly R. Gaventa and Richard B. Hays (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 136. M. Hooker also notes that this command "*functions in precisely the opposite way to what one expects*: it serves as a means of revelation to the hearer/readers of the gospel." Hooker, (1991), 67. Emphasis original.

230. N.T. Wright calls these "revelatory moments" Wright, N.T., *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. 3. (London: SPCK, 2003), 620, and "climactic moments" in Wright, (1992), 394.

who will "baptise in the Holy Spirit" (1:7-8) is significant yet partial and falls short of identifying Jesus as God's Son. Peter's confession of Jesus' messiahship is immediately supplemented by Jesus' teaching on his death and resurrection (8:29-31) and the divine utterance of Jesus' divine sonship (9:7). On the other hand, however, Jesus' own confession before the high priest is significant yet unrecognised (14:60-62). It is only at the end of the Markan narrative that a human being - a Roman centurion - perceives the true identity of Jesus as God's Son; even at the point of Jesus' death (15:39).²³¹ A 'thick description' of the baptismal narrative will include not only the identifying of Jesus as the Messiah and Isaianic Servant, but also the revelation of Jesus' filial relationship with God. While the demons, as well as the reader, know his identity as Son of God, the remainder of the narrative will reveal that the human characters are not privy to this information until it is revealed.

The main secret of Mark's Gospel is Jesus' divine sonship, and hence also God's divine fatherhood, and this is what the Gospel endeavours to reveal to the reader and that which is becoming known by revelation to human characters in the narrative. However, the question that remains is why some people come to recognise this secret, while others do not; even when given abundant evidence, for instance hearing the demons' cry or seeing Jesus walking on the water. The first point to make is that 'to perceive' is a divine gift as stated in 4:11-12, which distinguishes between two groups of people, those to whom the 'mystery of the kingdom has been given' (τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ) and 'those outside' (ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω) (4:11).²³² Likewise, the parable of the sower distinguishes between those who receive the word and bear fruit, and those who do not.

The first point to emphasise is that to know (the identity of Jesus) is to be given knowledge from God. Marcus rightly states that "[t]hroughout the Gospel of Mark, knowledge of vital truth - particularly knowledge of the most vital truth of all, the secret of Jesus' identity - is a gift of God."²³³ This is also indicated by the passive construction of δέδοται in 4:11²³⁴ and with the opposite result in 6:52 ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη. The opposite of belief and revelation in Mark is hardness of heart, blindness, and unbelief, all of which are interconnected in this Gospel. One

231. E.g. see Focant, (2010), 68-69. Contra Stein, (2008), 719.

232. Contra Hartman who argues that the disciples have received the secret (i.e. the secret kingdom), without having been given to know it. Hartman, (2004), 148-149.

233. Marcus, (1984), 558-559.

234. Hooker, (1991), 128. Marcus, (2000), 298.

may ask why the onlookers in 3:11-12 did not recognise Jesus' divine sonship after the demons had declared it. Gamel rightly points out that the problem with the disciples is not that they are especially stupid, but that they are human.²³⁵ The words of the demons are unintelligible to those who don't already believe and thus are still blind.²³⁶

In Mark's Gospel there is a 'tension' "between revelation and secrecy"²³⁷ According to Aune, "[i]n the ancient world, *misunderstanding* was understood as a characteristic human response to divine revelation."²³⁸ This is precisely that transpires in Mark. Jesus' true identity as the Son of God is hidden until it is revealed and received by faith, and must be revealed in order to be believed. As Boring notes: "The identity of Jesus is a matter of revelation, not deduction."²³⁹ But the revelation of Jesus as the Son of God is simultaneously also a revelation of God as the Father of Jesus.²⁴⁰

(1) Peter's Confession and the Voice from the Cloud

In exploring the meaning of the divine voice and thus to think about Jesus as God thinks of him, it is necessary to hear the second heavenly voice as well. But Peter's confession must be introduced first, for although it is not directly concerned with Jesus' divine sonship, it does have great importance for Mark's presentation of Jesus and is intimately connected with the transfiguration passage.

In this passage (8:27-30), in response to Jesus' question who he thinks Jesus is, Peter answers σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός (v.29) in contradistinction to others who say Jesus is John, Elijah, or one of the prophets. In Mark this confession of Jesus' identity is seen in a positive light and is thus 'correct' and not 'false' as argued by some Markan scholars.²⁴¹ However, while this confession is 'correct' it is 'incomplete' as J.D. Kingsbury has rightly argued, or in the terminology used above, is not 'thick' enough.

This confession needs to be supplemented by two elements that follow it in the narrative: a definition of what messiahship would mean for Jesus (8:31) and that

235. Gamel, (2014), 203.

236. Hooker, (1991), 67.

237. Watson, Francis, "Ambiguity in the Marcan Narrative" *King's Theological Review* 10 (1987), 11.

238. Aune, David E., *The New Testament in its Literary Environment*. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987), 55. Emphasis original.

239. Boring, (2006), 46.

240. Driggers, (2007), 1.

241. Kelber, Werner H., *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time*. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 82-85. Weeden, Theodore J., *Mark: Traditions in Conflict*. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 56, 64-69, and Tyson, Joseph B., "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark" *JBL* 80/3 (1961).

Jesus' identity as ὁ χριστός needs to be augmented by his divine sonship (9:7. Also 1:1, 15:39, 14:61-62). The designations Christ and Son of God do not stand "in opposition to"²⁴² one another, nor can these designations used of Jesus be collapsed into one, as does Boring, who argues that 'Christ' in all of its occurrences can be "equated with" "the king of Israel"²⁴³ as well as being "interchangeable" with "Son of God".²⁴⁴

In this passage Peter and Jesus rebuke each other in turn and the word ἐπιτιμάω appears three times: in v.30, when Jesus orders them to keep silent concerning his messiahship, in v.32 in describing Peter's opposition to Jesus' mention of suffering, and again when Jesus in v.33 rebukes Peter for his objection with the words "get behind me, Satan!". In this context it is significant that this is the same word used in describing Jesus' silencing of the demons in 1:25 and 3:12, and thus highlighting the parallel theme of silence with respect to Jesus' identity. Jesus' prohibition of the announcement of his messiahship not because Peter's confession was untrue, but on the contrary because it was true; as was also the case with the demons.²⁴⁵ Here the description 'messianic secret' is apt. The demons are silenced for they are unauthorised to speak it, and here Jesus is reticent to openly be understood in messianic terms that are not qualified by his suffering. A perception of his messianic role was also in danger of being understood in purely militaristic terms.²⁴⁶ While there is truth to the claim that Jesus redefines the meaning of true messiahship (v.31), there is more to the injunction. For while the confession is 'correct' Mark is careful to tie it to Jesus' divine sonship as revealed by God. Since, as J.D. Kingsbury argues, 'messiah' is the "most general of Mark's christological categories", it needs to be qualified.²⁴⁷ A proclamation of Jesus as Messiah without recognising his divine sonship would be 'incomplete' and would not be viewing Jesus as God views him. Though it is too drastic to state that "Peter's confession is accurate only in its vocabulary,"²⁴⁸ the 'christ' designation needs to be connected to the Son of God title.²⁴⁹

242. Kelber, (1974), 85.

243. Boring, (1984), 129.

244. Boring, (1984), 130-131.

245. Marcus, (2009), 612.

246. Dunn, (1970), 111-112, 115. Nineham, D.E., *Saint Mark*. Pelican New Testament Commentaries. (London: Penguin, 1963), 225. France, (2002), 330. Wright, (1996), 481-486. Wright, (1992), 319-20. Marcus, (2009), 613-114, 1104-1107. Dunn, (2003), 619-622.

247. Kingsbury, (1983), 15. See also France, (2002), 331. Wright, (1996), 482. Wright, (1992), 307-308, 319-320.

248. Camery-Hoggart, (1992), 157. Cited in Garland, (2015), 382.

249. Frenschkowski, (1997), 156.

Peter's confession and the following dialogue should not be read in isolation, for it is intimately connected with the following 'transfiguration' passage. Gregg S. Morrison has argued extensively for the interconnectedness of 8:27-38 and 9:2-13 with 9:1 as a 'hinge', and argues that these together form the turning point of the book.²⁵⁰ His arguments include vocabulary and grammatical links²⁵¹ as well as thematic links. He notes that besides Jesus, Peter is the main character in both passages, though the other disciples are present. Both texts also have a reference to Elijah, other prophets/Moses, and include the command to silence after the revelation of Jesus' identity. Both passages also contain anti-triumphalist teaching concerning the suffering Son of Man. But most importantly, both texts contain a revelation of Jesus' identity.²⁵² In the former passage it is as Christ and in the latter as the Son of God.²⁵³

While Wellhausen source-critically labelled the transfiguration episode a 'misplaced resurrection account',²⁵⁴ this view has also been appropriated narratively by Marcus who, on the basis of 9:9, sees the transfiguration as the expectation of the resurrection.²⁵⁵ An alternative view is that it is a preview of Jesus' future *parousia*. A notable example of this view is C. Breytenbach who refers to the transfiguration as a 'prolepsis' and writes: "Hier wird auf die endzeitliche Würde Jesu vorgegriffen."²⁵⁶ But the question is whether the transfigured Jesus shows who he is or who he will be. In light of the secrecy motif and the divine voice at both the baptism and in this episode, Childs seems to be right in claiming that the transfiguration is "a momentary unveiling of Christ's true identity".²⁵⁷ This can also rightly be described as an epiphany, or as Schenke describes the passage: "Die Epiphanie der wahren Identität Jesu".²⁵⁸ But this does not exclude that the transfiguration also points to the *parousia* or to his post-resurrection heavenly state, but here the disciples and the reader are given insights into "Jesu wahre Wirklichkeit".²⁵⁹ The epiphany does not

250. Morrison, Gregg S., *The Turning Point in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in Markan Christology*. (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014), 81.

251. Morrison, (2014), 84-85, 104-118.

252. Morrison, (2014), 85-91, 118ff.

253. See also Hooker, (2000), 82.

254. Stein, Robert H., "Is the Transfiguration (Mark 9:2-8) a misplaced resurrection-account?" *JBL* 95/1 (1976), 79.

255. Marcus, (2009), 637. Also Thrall, Margaret E., "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration" *NTS* 16/4 (1970), 310-313. Garland, (2015), 362-363.

256. Breytenbach, (1991), 180. Also Focant, (2009), 5.

257. Childs, (1984), 90.

258. Schenke, (2005), 214. Also Heil, John Paul, *The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-36*. AnBib. 144. (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000), 38-49, 51-73. Guttenberger, (2004), 88.

259. Schenke, (1988), 110, 113. See also Schenke, (2000), 62. Gathercole, (2006), 49-50. Fletcher-Louis, Crispin, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 49.

make him a divine Son, for this he has already been revealed to be.²⁶⁰ In this context it is right to interpret 9:1 as a promise of revelation²⁶¹ which is immediately, yet only partly, fulfilled in the following episode.²⁶² The promise in 9:1 does not need to be restricted to a singular fulfilment, and can also anticipate the resurrection and the *parousia*.²⁶³

This interpretation is also suggested by the location on the mountain, which is often a place of divine presence, revelation, and divine encounter both in the OT and the ancient orient more widely.²⁶⁴ The appearance of Elijah and Moses is likely for the reason that both met God on Sinai/Horeb,²⁶⁵ and the point may be that they now speak to Jesus like they spoke to God on the mountain in the past.²⁶⁶ The narrative detail that this happened 'after six days', which is the only such reference in Mark, could also be an allusion to the theophany in Exod 24:16.²⁶⁷ The statement that Jesus' clothes are so white as no one on earth could bleach them (9:3) indicates his heavenly identity.²⁶⁸ Furthermore, the cloud indicates the divine presence,²⁶⁹ which was typical on Sinai²⁷⁰ as well as in the tent of meeting,²⁷¹ in the desert²⁷² and the Temple.²⁷³ As Samuel Terrien notes: "the Markan audience could not miss the parallel between the transfiguration of Jesus and the Horeb theophanies."²⁷⁴

As Focant also notes: "La parole prononcée par cette voix constitue la pointe du récit, de la révélation."²⁷⁵ The voice from the cloud says in a clear echo of 1:11 οὗτός

260. Schenke, (2000), 62.

261. Marcus, (2009), 635.

262. Black, (2005), 39. R.T. France argues that the perfect shows that the kingdom has already come. France, (2002), 344.

263. Morrison, (2014), 142. See also Marcus, (2009), 635. France, (2002), 345. Cranfield, (1959), 287-288. France, (1990), 73. France suggests one should think in terms of "process" rather than "single event".

264. Exod 19:3-25, 24:12-18, 1 Kgs 19:8. Guttenberger, (2004), 85-87. Black, (2005), 39. Focant, (2010), 334.

265. Marcus, (2009), 632. Evans, (2001), 36. Gundry, (1993b), 458-459. Not because it refers to the law and the prophets, as suggested by Nineham, (1963), 235 and Focant, (2010), 335.

266. Johansson, (2011), 129-130.

267. Black, (2005), 40.

268. Heil, (2000), 76ff. No, (1999), 107. Bauckham, (2008c), 264. Gundry, (1993b), 459. Telford says both 8:30 and 9:7 are revelations. Telford, (1999), 41-42.

269. Focant, (2010), 339. Heil, (2000), 27, 31. Guttenberger, (2004), 89. It is unlikely that the cloud has a "vehicular function" transporting Elijah and Moses to heaven as suggested by Heil, (2000), 143-149, 169, 315.

270. For instance in Exod 16:10-11, 19:9, 19:16, 24:15-18.

271. Exod 33:9-10.

272. Exod 40:36-38.

273. 1 Kgs 8:10-12. Gundry, (1993b), 460. Marcus, (2009), 634. Montague, George T., "The Fire in the Word: The Holy Spirit in Scripture," in *Advents of the Spirit: An Introduction to the Current Study of Pneumatology*. Eds. Bradford E. Hinze and D. Lyle Dabney (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2005), 41. Heil, (2000), 132ff. Rowe, (2002b), 143.

274. Terrien, Samuel, *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), 423.

275. Focant, (2010), 336. Also Heil, (2000), 69-70.

ἐστὶν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. But this time it is addressed to the three disciples on the mountain. The following clause ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ is likely an allusion to Deut 18:15, 18 which refers to the coming prophet promised to Israel after they requested a mediator on Horeb.²⁷⁶ But here the emphasis is that it is Jesus, and not Elijah or Moses, who is the divine son. This scene, similar to the baptism episode, is a revelation of Jesus' identity as the Son of God to both the inner circle of disciples and to the reader.

Peter's suggestion to build three tents (σκηνή) probably refers to the feast of booths or tabernacles (Lev 23:39-43) but could also be a reference to the tabernacle, the place of God's presence.²⁷⁷ L. Schenke thinks that Peter's suggestion indicates that they see this events "als Einbruch des Himmlischen in die irdischen Welt" and he thus desired to remain in that condition continually and thus suggested raising the tents.²⁷⁸ But three tabernacles or tents, would indicate equality between Moses, Elijah, and Jesus, which is Peter's misunderstanding.²⁷⁹ J.P. Heil is likely right in seeing a deliberate and ironic connection between Peter's suggestion to build three tents (σκηνάς) and the cloud which immediately overshadowed or 'tents over' them (ἐπισκιάζουσα).²⁸⁰ The cloud is "symbolic of God's presence"²⁸¹ and it is precisely God's presence which is manifest at the transfiguration scene, in similarity with the baptism episode, the tearing of heaven, the coming of the Spirit, and the torn temple veil at the conclusion of the narrative. But while God's presence is a temporary phenomenon on this mountain, the Gospel of Mark communicates the coming of God and his reign in the Son Jesus.

Peter's confession and the voice from heaven, with their respective injunction to silence, are brought together with the rather precise 'after six days' (9:2),²⁸² and the statement that those "standing here" will see the coming of the kingdom with power

276. Stuhlmacher, (2012), 142. Marcus, (2009), 634. Johnson cites Deut 4:36-37. Johnson, Andrew M., "Error and Epistemological Process in the Pentateuch and Mark's Gospel: A Biblical Theology of Knowing from Foundational Texts" (Ph.D., University of St. Andrews, 2011), 164.

277. Black, (2005), 41.

278. Schenke, (2000), 61.

279. Thrall, (1970), 308-309.

280. Heil, (2000), 164, 315.

281. Heil, (2000), 165.

282. Lightfoot, R.H., *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), 92. France, (2002), 326, 345-348.

(9:1).²⁸³ The 'some' are Peter, James, and John and they 'see' what was promised.²⁸⁴ The voice at the Transfiguration which is directed towards the disciples not only "endorses"²⁸⁵ but also "completes" Peter's confession. The relationship between Jesus' sonship and messiahship also comes to the fore in other places in Mark, namely at the baptism (1:11) and especially the trial (14:61-62).²⁸⁶

(2) The Parable of the Vineyard

Another text that is important in this context is Jesus' parable of the vineyard. What makes it stand out is the designation of the vineyard owner as ὁ κύριος (12:9) and his Son as υἱὸς ἀγαπητός (12:6). Internal to the narrative of the parable there is nothing noteworthy about this, perhaps except the foolishness of the father to send his son to the intransigent tenant farmers after his servants had all been beaten or killed (12:2-5). However, within the context of the whole book this parable takes on an added significance because the description υἱὸς ἀγαπητός echoes God's view on Jesus in 1:11 and 9:7. The vineyard is a common image of Israel in the OT²⁸⁷ and in particular Isa 5:1-10 is alluded to in Mark 12:1-12. In the Isaiah text Israel is the vineyard that did not produce the desired fruit and hence came under judgement from its planter, who is God.

In its Markan context the chief priests, scribes, and the elders (11:27) know that the parable is about them (12:12). That the planter of the vineyard, called ὁ κύριος, (12:9) is God, is strengthened by the use of κύριος in the LXX for YHWH.²⁸⁸ The beloved son is Jesus, whom ὁ κύριος (12:9) calls υἱός μου (12:6). Thus Jesus sees himself as sent from God, and in a unique relationship with God which surpasses that of the prophets.²⁸⁹ Thus while the fact of Jesus' divine sonship has been indicated, it is only the reader who perceives this truth, because the chief priest, scribes, and

283. Witherington, (2001), 261. Elizabeth E. Shively argues that the kingdom coming in power is not the transfiguration, which though is a "proleptic manifestation of the power of the kingdom of God" and "[w]hat is hidden is, for the moment, revealed." Shively, Elizabeth E., *Apocalyptic Imagination in the Gospel of Mark: The Literary and Theological Role of Mark 3:22-30*. BZNW. 189. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 236. See also 232-238. Also similarly Feldmeier and Spieckermann, (2011a), 74.

284. Rowe, (2002b), 143.

285. See Hooker, (1991), 201.

286. On the close connection between these three passages and the kingdom theme see: Hooker, (2000), 82. Hooker, Morna D., "Good News about Jesus Christ, the Son of God," in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*. Eds. Kelly R. Iverson and Christopher W. Skinner (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 168-169, 172-173. Also Iverson, (2011), 192. Black, (2005), 40.

287. Isa 27:2-6, Ps 80:8-18.

288. Marcus, (2009), 804.

289. S. Gathercole argues that if the parable is read in the context of the whole narrative, especially 1:11 and 9:7 which shows the heavenly identity of the Son, then the parable can be understood as inferring preexistence. Gathercole, (2006), 188. See also Schenke, (2000), 64-65.

elders hear the secret of divine sonship, but do not responded by faith, but rather with hard hearts and blindness.²⁹⁰

(3) Mark 13:32

Mark 13:32 is also an important reference to Jesus' relation to God as Son. The apparent contradiction between v.31 (that Jesus' words shall never pass away) and v.32 (that the Son does not know the hour) is often pointed out, and it is asked how Jesus can be understood as divine if his knowledge of the future is limited. This is a valid concern, but then one could also ask why Jesus needed to eat, drink, and rest. What is striking in this verse is the absolute use of both ὁ υἱός and ὁ πατήρ. This use of mutually constituting relational language to refer to the identity of Jesus and God reflects a highly theological construction of the relationship. Although both are identified ὁ κυριός in Mark, this text is also hierarchical and reveals the difference between ὁ υἱός and ὁ πατήρ.

(4) Jesus before the High Priest and Pilate

At the first trial the characters are exactly the same as those who heard his parable of the vineyard (14:53, 11:27); the chief priests, elders, and the scribes, and who are now also joined by the high priest. When the high priest asks Jesus: σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ; (14:61) it echoes the beginning of the Gospel in 1:1 as well as the divine speeches at the baptism (1:11) and the transfiguration (9:7). Here Jesus' response is clearly in the affirmative. Stating: ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.²⁹¹

It has already been argued that although there are links between the terms Messiah and Son of God, these should not be understood as synonymous.²⁹² The relationship between ὁ χριστὸς and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ stand in what J. Marcus calls a "restrictive" rather than "non-restrictive apposition".²⁹³ This means that the latter title clarifies the former and "indicates *what sort* of messianic expectation is in view: *not*

290. Hatina, (2002), 223. Kingsbury, (1983), 116-117. Pesch, (1977), 223.

291. J. Marcus supports the reading of Mark 14:62 which adds σὺ εἶπας ὅτι ἐγώ which would make Jesus response more muted or even possibly denies it. This reading is weak and is supported by Θ038 13 69 124 346 565 700 788 f13 - none of which are prior to the ninth century - as well as by Origen. However, this reading, rather than being original to the Gospel, is clearly influenced by Matt 26:64 which has σὺ εἶπας. Marcus, (2009), 1016.

292. As does Hooker, (1991), 360.

293. Marcus, (1989), 130.

the Messiah-Son-of-David, not the Messiah as the son of any other human being, but rather the Messiah-Son-of-God."²⁹⁴ It is well known that the messianic expectations of the era were varied; with some hoping for a Messiah-son-of-David, and possibly Messiah-son-of-God, Messiah-son-of-Joseph, Messiah-son-of-Aaron, or a Messiah-son-of-Israel.²⁹⁵

The designation ὁ εὐλογητός is a circumlocution for God out of respect to the divine name.²⁹⁶ In Mark Jesus answers with the affirmative ἐγώ εἰμι, which in light of its usage elsewhere in Mark may be a reference to the divine name,²⁹⁷ and is thus upending the theological sensibilities of the high priest.²⁹⁸ Although Jesus' reply is frank, the high priest and those with him do not believe it and accuse him of blasphemy and thus do not perceive who Jesus really is and hence remain with those 'outside' (4:12). On one level the text shows the developing recognition of Jesus' identity as Christ and Son of God by the human characters of the story, moving from un-recognition to recognition. However, not all who see perceive and thus rather than confessing his divine sonship the council condemns him.

Jesus replies that he as the Son of God has divine prerogatives and will be seated at the right hand of power (Ps 110:1, 5) and come in the clouds of heaven (Dan 7:13). This has frequently been interpreted as two events, referring to the resurrection and future *parousia* respectively.²⁹⁹ Since this is a question that cannot be discussed in detail here, only a couple of matters can be pointed out. Firstly, the bifurcation based on the two OT texts is too neat. Since Dan 7:13 in its context concerns the coming of the Son of Man before the Ancient of Days, France is right to read the reference not as the coming of Christ to earth, but as his coming before God at his heavenly throne to receive power and authority.³⁰⁰ Ps 110:1 appears to describe the installation of a king in his office.³⁰¹ The whole psalm also has eschatological elements, especially noteworthy is 110:5ff. "The Lord is at your right hand; he will shatter kings on the

294. Marcus, (1989), 130. Emphasis original. However, I argue below that the Markan Jesus is not rejecting the Son of David title, but rather indicates that it is insufficient (Mark 12:35-37).

295. Marcus, (1989), 131-134. Collins, John J., *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd edition. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 79-109, 171-185. See also Stuckenbruck, Loren T., "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism," in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. Ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007).

296. Stein, (2008), 683.

297. Contra Stein, (2008), 684.

298. Donahue and Harrington, (2002), 422.

299. Stein, (2008), 684-685. Donahue and Harrington, (2002), 423. Hooker, (1991), 362.

300. France, (2002), 611-613.

301. Mays, (1994), 353.

day of his wrath...."³⁰² Secondly, in contrast to E. Adams who interprets 14:64 in light of 8:38, and 13:24-27,³⁰³ it appears that Mark is not interested in drawing hard and absolute distinctions between the resurrection and the (probably immanent) *parousia*. Thirdly, that Jesus claims to sit - which iconologically is a sign of power and rulership - at the right hand of God is a claim to share in divine power,³⁰⁴ and thus also divine identity.³⁰⁵ All this is taken by Jesus' opponents as blasphemy and as compromising the oneness of God.³⁰⁶

Pilate's question σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; (15:2) - which also concerns Jesus' identity - is met with the muted response: σὺ λέγεις.³⁰⁷ Although the use of this title for Jesus at this significant point in the narrative seems to be far removed from the theme of the unveiling of Jesus as the Son of God, it does have theological significance. There is a consistent theme throughout Mark regarding Jesus' messiahship³⁰⁸ and the use of 'king' in this context is connected to this. Pilate's question in 15:2 whether Jesus is the 'king of the Jews' is according to F. Watson "unrelated to the unspecified charges brought by the Jerusalem authorities".³⁰⁹ However, Messiah, king of the Jews, and the king of Israel are in the passion narrative correlated,³¹⁰ with the 'king of the Jews' being a 'translation' of Jesus' messianic claims to more political Roman concerns.³¹¹

However, what is of concern presently is Jesus' rather unenthusiastic response to Pilate's question; the differences between ἐγώ εἰμι (14:62) and σὺ λέγεις (15:2) is stark and must be accounted for. To say that Jesus' rejects³¹² the title ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων is to miss both its importance in the remainder of the Passion narrative³¹³ and its connection to the term ὁ χριστὸς which is made explicit in 15:32, where Jesus is referred to as ὁ χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ.³¹⁴ However, to argue that Jesus is

302. Mays, (1994), 353.

303. Adams, (2005), 59-60.

304. Guttenger, (2004), 301-302.

305. Bauckham, (2008g), 172. Bauckham, (2008c), 265.

306. Guttenger, (2004), 304. Marcus, (2009), 141.

307. See Matt 27:22, Luke 23:3.

308. 1:1, 1:11, 8:29.

309. Watson, Francis, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 389. See also 374, 381.

310. Breytenbach, (1991), 179. Willert, (1997), 127-128.

311. France, (2002), 628. Hooker, (1991), 367. Edwards, (2002), 458. Pilgaard, (2008), 362. Lohmeyer, (1957), 335.

312. Gundry, (1993b), 924, 932.

313. 15:9, 12, 18, 26, 32.

314. Wright states that 'Messiah' means 'king of the Jews'. Wright, (1996), 482.

'positive' in his reply to Pilate³¹⁵ does not do justice to Jesus' actual words. This text needs to be read in light of the other *σὺ εἶ* statements and questions in Mark, particularly 8:29 and 14:61. In the former, as has been shown above, Jesus accepts the title, yet Mark connects *ὁ χριστός* with both the theme of suffering and is followed by the divine voice who declares Jesus' divine sonship. In the latter Jesus answers the question in a clear affirmative. Thus to state that Jesus is 'the Christ' or 'king of the Jews' is simultaneously correct yet incomplete, since the 'Son of God' aspect is missing. Thus to the high priest's question, which combines both messiahship with the divine sonship, Jesus can say an emphatic *ἐγώ εἰμι*, however, in response to Pilate's question, Jesus' main concern is not simply that the term 'king' is too political or too dangerous,³¹⁶ but rather that it is divorced from Jesus' identity as God's Son. For this same reason Jesus gives a warning to his disciples that *ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· ἴδε ὧδε ὁ χριστός, ἴδε ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύετε* (13:21). Any designation of a *χριστός* that is unaccompanied by God's own revelation is inauthentic and is not to be believed: they are *ψευδόχριστοι* (13:22).

(5) The Centurion's Confession

The centurion's confession is another important passage where the true nature of Jesus' identity is revealed, this time to the gentile Roman centurion who has given oath to Caesar as *divi filius*.³¹⁷ As the very one who is likely responsible to put Jesus to death he confesses *ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν* (15:39).

There are a number of issues connected to this exclamation which need to be considered. Since the Greek lacks the definite article, the text could conceivably be translated as 'a son of God' or 'a son of a god', thus reflecting the still Gentile and incomplete perception of the centurion.³¹⁸ Alternatively, others would see these words as a mockery on the centurions's part.³¹⁹ However, E.C. Colwell influentially argued for a definite rule for the use of the article, especially when the predicate precedes

315. Stein, (2008), 699. Though Stein goes on to add that Jesus redefines the term. M. Hooker states that Jesus "makes no claims for himself". Hooker, (1991), 367-368.

316. Edwards, (2002), 458-459.

317. Black, (2005), 44.

318. Pesch, (1977), 500. Gould, (1896), 295. Johnson, Earl S. Jr., "Is Mark 15.39 the Key to Mark's Christology?" *JSNT* 31 (1987), Shiner, Whitney T., "The Ambiguous Pronouncement of the Centurion and the Shrouding of Meaning in Mark" *JSNT* 78 (2000). Willert suggests that since the centurion in 15:39 uses the imperfect in *ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν* this indicates that Jesus stopped being God's Son after his death. Willert, (1997), 220, 222-223.

319. Blount, Brian K., "Is the Joke on Us? Mark's Irony, Mark's God, and Mark's Ending," in *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God: Essays in Memory of Donald Harrisville Juel*. Eds. Beverly R. Gaventa and Patrick M. Miller (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2005), 29.

the verb. While one cannot at this point examine each of his examples, his conclusion is important: "Definite predicate nouns which precede the verb usually lack the article".³²⁰ It must be stressed at this point, - as Colwell concedes - that the said noun, in contrast to the general rule, could be interpreted as indefinite when the context demands it.³²¹ And thus E. Johnson rightly points out that reference to grammar alone will not decide this issue and the context will be critical.³²² But the absence of the article is not a grammatical problem,³²³ for the article is also missing in the longer title of 1:1.³²⁴ One can thus rightly view the centurion's statement to be definite (i.e. the Son of God) and thus as a confession Jesus' divine sonship.³²⁵ This reading makes better sense of Mark's Gospel and the narrative development of the human recognition of Jesus; especially considering the *inclusio* between 1:9-11 and 15:38-39.³²⁶

C. Myers argues against this position because he can see no real change in the centurion who continues to be part of the Roman garrison rather than defecting from it as he should (15:44f). Myers also associates the 'confession' of the centurion with the 'confessions' of the demons who oppose Jesus.³²⁷ However, it is precisely here the weakness of Myers's position is revealed, for although the demons are rendered as enemies their testimony concerning Jesus' identity is correct and revelatory. Thus the words of the centurion, whether converted or not, within the Gospel serve to identify the true nature of Jesus' relationship with God. In the same way, W.T. Shiner's view that the centurion was not truly converted,³²⁸ and E.S. Johnson's objection that the centurion's conversion is too unrealistic,³²⁹ are besides the point. The centurion does not appear to see the tearing of the veil (nor feel the earthquake as in Matt 27.54)³³⁰ and has no good reason to confess Jesus' divine sonship. But this is, in fact, precisely

320. Colwell, E.C., "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament" *JBL* 52.1 (1933), 20-21.

321. Colwell, (1933), 21.

322. Johnson, (1987), 6-7. See also Collins, (2000), 93.

323. For a treatment of the fluctuation in the use of the article see Smyth, Herbert Weir, *Greek Grammar*: (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), §1126-1153 and Robertson, (1934), 790-796.

324. See e.g. Collins, (2007), 766.

325. Collins, (2007), 766. See also Hooker, (1991), 378. France, (2002), 660. Stein, (2008), 718-719. Kingsbury, (1983), 132-133. Iverson, Kelly R., "A Centurion's 'Confession': A Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15:39" *JBL* 130/2 (2011), 350.

326. Ryou, Philip Ho-Young, "Apocalyptic Opening, Eschatological 'Inclusio': A Study of the Rending of the Heaven and the Temple Curtain in the Gospel of Mark with Special Reference to the Motif of 'Seeing'." (Ph.D., University of Glasgow, 2004). Motyer, (1987), 155.

327. Myers, (1988), 393-394. Blount, (2005)

328. Shiner, (2000), 12.

329. Johnson, (1987), 13.

330. Gamel, (2014), 98, 100, 134-135. Black, (2005), 43.

the point, for his confession is on the basis of a revelation rather than proof. Gamel writes: "It is through revelation that the centurion sees the same event as the others at the cross yet understands the meaning of that event differently."³³¹ There is in Mark not a straight link between 'seeing' and 'believing'. Jesus warns in 13:21-22 about belief based on sight only and which will merely result in faith in false christs. This is also the problem of the request at the cross in 15:32, when the chief priests and the scribes demand a miracle before they will believe. They ask "Let the Messiah, the King of Israel, come down from the cross now, so that we may see and believe" (ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν). Belief that is dependant on *seeing* the miraculous is not the type of belief that is so integrally linked with revelation.

The real point of the centurion's confession is on a narrativ level; finally a human being perceives the true identity of Jesus.³³² It is precisely having seen Jesus die that prompts him to make his confession; a 'privilege' denied to Jesus' own disciples because they abandoned him. In the narrative the characters are brought on a journey of discovering who Jesus really is and his particular relation to the God of Israel. Throughout the text, people - especially the disciples - are at a loss as to who Jesus truly is, and only at the end, when hopes have failed, does the sole human confessor of Jesus' divine sonship utter his words. J.D. Kingsbury points out that although the high priest gets the terms right in his question, it is the centurion who "becomes the first human being in Mark's story truly to penetrate the secret of Jesus' identity."³³³ One can hardly fail to notice the reversal theme: the one who (in all likelihood) is responsible for carrying out the execution of Jesus is the first person to recognise his divine sonship, while the exalted high priest does not perceive. While Rome tries to extinguish the 'good news', it is a Roman soldier who becomes the first to make the confession of the central tenant of the 'good news': ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν.

As has been argued thus far, God is the only legitimate revealer of Jesus' true identity, and thus any further dissemination of this secret must be derived ultimately from God's own revelation. This is precisely what happens at the centurion's confession; his confession is theologically, though not logically, connected with the

331. Gamel, (2014), 134-135. Also 167.

332. Boring argues that the confession is incomplete from a Christian perspective since it was made prior to Jesus' resurrection. Boring, (2006), 434.

333. Kingsbury, (1983), 18, 133.

tearing of the curtain ἀπ' ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω (15:38); an event which in Mark is closely associated with the baptism scene in the beginning of the Gospel.

In Mark there is an outward movement in the human knowledge of Jesus' divine sonship. In 1:11 it only Jesus; in 9:7 the three disciples are added, and the high priest in 14:61-64 knows the claim but does not believe, and in the centurion in 15:39.³³⁴ While this confession is the apex of Mark's *narrative* unveiling of Jesus' identity as the Son of God, Collins statement that it "is the climax of the Markan *theme* of Jesus as the Son of God"³³⁵ unduly minimises the importance of the two 'divine voice' passages, as well as Jesus' own confession of his sonship before the high priest.³³⁶ Especially the divine voice episodes must be central in perceiving Jesus' identity, particularly because God makes his declaration of Jesus' identity in relation to himself.

(6) Conclusion

Central to Mark's Gospel is the question of Jesus' identity. The above analysis has demonstrated that there is a strong concern for the proper source or agent of the revelation of the Son of God secret. When the demons declare this ostensibly correct fact, they are gagged because their revelation is illegitimate. The true and legitimate revealer of Jesus' divine sonship is God himself and any subsequent revelation of Jesus' identity much derive from the original divine disclosure. The Son of God secret coupled with the narrator's openness about Jesus' identity to the reader is an important heuristic feature in relating who Jesus is. While the reader learns early that Jesus is God's Son, this discovery is only made by the centurion by revelation at the end of the narrative.

It is particularly God's identification of Jesus which is fundamental for establishing his true identity.³³⁷ In his narrative analysis of Mark's Gospel, drawing heavily from the work of Boris Uspensky, N.R. Petersen emphasises the "Point of View" of the author. Significant for our present purposes is his stress that Mark is not a neutral observer. Rather, "[f]or the narrator... there are two ways of perceiving things, two

334. Pesch, (1970), 142.

335. Collins, (2007), 764. Emphasis mine. See also Collins, Adela Yarbro, "Mark and His Readers: The Son of God among Jews" *The Harvard Theological Review* 92/4 (1999), 406. Also Boring, (2006), 434. Davis, (1989), 4-5. Garrett, Susan R., *The Temptations of Jesus in Mark's Gospel*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 64. For example Dunn calls 14:61 the climax of the Gospel. Dunn, (1980), 47.

336. R. Bauckham calls 1:9-11, 9:2-8, and 15:34-39 "three key events of revelation" Bauckham, (2008c), 263-264. On 14:61-62 see France, (2002), 610, 659.

337. See e.g. Matera, Frank J., *New Testament Christology*. (London: Westminster/John Knox, 1999), 6-8.

perspectives from which to construe them; one is right and the other is wrong; one divine, and one human."³³⁸ The view of the author is aligned with that of God. Thus in Mark's Gospel, God's point of view receives hermeneutical significance, and any declaration of Jesus' identity which lack God's point of view is incomplete, even if it is ὁ χριστός or ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

In this light, God's declaration that Jesus is his Son, and that he is by implication Jesus' Father, is paramount. Describing Jesus' relation to God with the relational term 'son' has ramifications for Mark's presentation of God and reveals his identity as the Father of Jesus. Whereas Jesus cannot be understood without reference to his Father, so no longer can God rightly be understood except in relation to his Son. God is no longer simply portrayed as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (12:26).

(c) God as Father

Since Jesus is revealed to be God's Son, then God is also revealed to be Jesus' Father. This relationship is noted by Jesus elsewhere in Mark. In 8:38 Jesus says of the Son of Man: ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. In 13:32 the use of the absolute ὁ πατήρ and ὁ υἱός signifies their relation, but the distinction between the Son and the Father is also stressed by the οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ. What is of particular importance is the way Jesus addresses God. God spoke to Jesus σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός (1:11) while Jesus in Gethsemane prays and addresses God as ἀββα ὁ πατήρ (14:36).³³⁹ T. Nicklas notes that while ἀββα is only once explicitly stated, Jesus actually says it twice for 14:39 states that Jesus utters the same words again, and rightly suggests that this echoes God's two-fold statement concerning Jesus' divine sonship.³⁴⁰

Joachim Jeremias argued that the historical Jesus addressed God as *abba* in all his prayers, and that this was a unique way of addressing God which sprung from his singular experience of God. He argued that nowhere in the OT or ancient Jewish literature from Palestine is God addressed as 'father' or 'my father',³⁴¹ and thus it was highly unusual that Jesus should address God as 'my father' and even more

338. Mark's purpose is to convey that Jesus is Messiah and the Son of God. Petersen, (1978), 109. See Hatina, (2002), 90.

339. *Abba* is typically understood as Aramaic. Jeremias, (1971), 68. Kittel, G., "ἄββᾶ," in *TDNT*. Ed. G. Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 1:5. Dalman, (1902), 192. Schrenk, Gottlob, "Father in the New Testament," in *TDNT*. Eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 5:984. But James Barr is doubtful and argues that it could just as well be Hebrew. Barr, James, "'Abba isn't 'Daddy'" *JTS* 39/1 (1988), 30-31. The communal fatherhood of God is expressed in Mark 11:25.

340. Nicklas, (2014), 57, 57n34.

341. Jeremias, (1971), 68-70.

extraordinary that he used the word *abba* which occurred nowhere else in ancient Judaism.³⁴² Jeremias wrote: "Es wäre für das Empfinden der Zeitgenossen Jesu unehrerbietig, ja undenkbar erschienen, Gott mit diesem familiären Wort anzureden."³⁴³ An important and influential part of Jeremias' argument is that *abba* had its origin in the babbling of infants.³⁴⁴ But adds that "[i]n Jesu Tagen war 'abba längst nicht mehr auf die Kleinkindersprache beschränkt. Auch die erwachsenen Kinder, Söhne wie Töchter, redeten jetzt ihren Vater mit 'abba an."³⁴⁵ James Barr reacted especially against the former point and argued that *abba* did not have its origin as "Lallwort" (babbling sound of infants), and even if it did, it would be in the mists of time and thus would in no way be relevant to the use and meaning in the NT.³⁴⁶ In all the instances where *abba* occurs in the NT³⁴⁷ it is in conjunction with the Greek ὁ πατήρ, which could also function vocatively. Barr argues that ὁ πατήρ is a literal rendering of *abba*, for while there did exist infant words like 'daddy' in Greek, these are not used when *abba* is translated.³⁴⁸ Barr concluded: "[a]s an account of 'abbā in the New Testament, infantile babbling is nonsensical."³⁴⁹ Later he adds that "'abbā in Jesus' time belonged to a familiar or colloquial register of language, as distinct from more formal and ceremonious usage...in any case it was not a childish expression comparable with 'Daddy': it was more a solemn, responsible, adult address to a Father."³⁵⁰ Yet while it was an adult word, it was much used by children.³⁵¹ But since it is primarily an intimate and familiar word, it would be unusual to address God as *abba*.³⁵²

But addressing God as 'father' may not be as unprecedented in Hebrew/Aramaic as Jeremias claimed. For in a prayer from Qumran (4Q372. f1:16) Joseph prays: "O Father, my God, leave me not forsaken" (אֲבִי וְאֱלֹהֵי). The petitioner in 4Q460 also

342. Jeremias, (1971), 70-71. Jeremias' conclusion was anticipated by A. Feuillet, G. Schrenk, and G. Kittel. Feuillet stated that Jesus' address to God as *abba* "user d'un langage absolument nouveau" Feuillet, (1959), 483. Schrenk wrote "*abba* is the babbling of an infant". Schrenk, (1967), 985. G. Kittel also argued that it would be "familiar and disrespectful" to address God in this way. Kittel, (1964), 1:6.

343. Jeremias, (1971), 72.

344. Jeremias, (1971), 72.

345. Jeremias, (1971), 72. Cf. 73.

346. Barr, (1988), 32-35.

347. Mark 14:36, Rom 8:15 and Gal 4:6 all have αββα ὁ πατήρ.

348. Barr, (1988), 38, 40-41.

349. Barr, (1988), 34. Also supported by D'Angelo, Mary Rose, "Abba and 'Father': Imperial Theology and the Jesus Tradition" *JBL* 111/4 (1992), 615-616.

350. Barr, (1988), 46. Cf. 37. See also Dunn, (1980), 28.

351. Barr, (1988), 36, 46. This was already the position of G. Dalman who concluded that while *abba* is used by children to their father, it was not childish. Dalman, (1902), 192.

352. Dunn, (1980), 26-28, 32.

certainly addresses God when he says אֲבִי וְאֵלֹהֵי.³⁵³ James Barr also argued that *πάτερ* in Sir 23:1, 4 may in Hebrew also be an address to God. Here Ben Sira prays κύριε πάτερ καὶ δέσποτα ζωῆς μου and κύριε πάτερ καὶ θεὸς ζωῆς μου.³⁵⁴ Thus while Jeremias overstated his case, the use of *abba* was certainly unusual³⁵⁵ and likely also striking,³⁵⁶ and while it was not childish it expressed intimacy.³⁵⁷

That God is called 'father' in the OT is clear, but these passages are mainly concerned with God's relationship with Israel.³⁵⁸ It is frequently supposed that fatherhood in ancient Israel connoted authority and care, and sometimes this becomes the basis for understanding the fatherhood of God.³⁵⁹ But this generic fatherhood of God of Israel is sometimes particularised in the Israelite king as in Ps 2.³⁶⁰

But in Mark the corporate sonship of Israel is overshadowed by Jesus' divine sonship. Jesus' divine sonship and God's fatherhood is not primarily soteriological as God's fatherhood of Israel,³⁶¹ or concerns Jesus' obedience as Son.³⁶² Rather the language 'my son' (1:11, 9:7) and Jesus' *abba* response reveals a relationship.³⁶³ Although A. Feuillet has the older view in mind, that the *abba* language is totally unique, his observation on the connection between the baptism event and Jesus' address to God as *abba* is correct. He states: "C'est parce qu'il est le Fils bien-aimé de Dieu que Jésus pourra, pour s'adresser à lui, user d'un langage absolument nouveau : il dira *Abba*, Père"³⁶⁴ and thus "[a]insi donc le scène du Baptême nous donne déjà la clé de l'attitude filiale de Jésus dans ses rapports avec Dieu."³⁶⁵ God's address at the baptism and the transfiguration and Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane

353. Translation from Wise, Abegg and Cook eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. References noted by Meye Thompson, (2000), 50.

354. Barr, (1988), 46. There are numerous texts in Second Temple Judaism where an individual addresses God as 'father'. For instance, Wis 2:16, 14:3, Sir 23:1, 4; 3 *Macc.* 6:3, *Jub.* 19:29, 4Q460, 4Q372 I, 16-17, 20-22. Cf. Meye Thompson, (2000), 48-49. Mengestu, Abera M., *God as Father in Paul: Kinship Language and Identity Formation in Early Christianity*. (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013), 138-142.

355. Evans, (2001), 412. Hooker, (1991), 348. Stein, (2008), 662.

356. Dunn, (1980), 26-27, 32. France, (2002), 584.

357. Witherington, (2001), 379. Lee, (2009), 123.

358. E.g. Deut 32:6, Jer 3:4, 19, Isa 63:16, 64:7.

359. Schrenk, (1967), 991-992. Dalman, (1902), 184. Quell, Gottfried, "The Father Concept in the Old Testament," in *TDNT*. Eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), 972-974. Meye Thompson, (2000), 38-39.

360. Meye Thompson, (2000), 48. Also Mengestu, (2013), 125-127.

361. As argued by Meye Thompson, (2000), 43, 74.

362. Meye Thompson, (2000), 88.

363. Also Childs, (1992), 371.

364. Feuillet, (1959), 483.

365. Feuillet, (1959), 483. Cf. Smith, (2003), 157. James Dunn notes that '*abba*' "expressed a sense of sonship." Dunn, (1980), 28. Emphasis original.

demonstrates that Jesus has a uniquely close relationship with God,³⁶⁶ and God's fatherhood is not simply an extension of God's fatherhood in the OT.³⁶⁷

What is new is not that God is called 'father', but that God is the Father particularly of Jesus and that Jesus is God's Son. The Father-Son language is relational, but does not connote biological relation,³⁶⁸ and as rightly stressed by F. Watson, there is "no projection of human fatherhood onto God".³⁶⁹ Since God is Jesus' Father, there is no human father in view in Mark and Jesus is simply known as the 'son of Mary' (6:3), and this both "accentuates the narrative presence and significance of Jesus' heavenly father",³⁷⁰ as Johnson points out, and stresses their intimate relation.

(d) Conclusions

This chapter has argued that the divine voice at the baptism alludes to both Ps 2:7 and Isa 42:1 which relate the identity of Jesus as both Messiah and Servant, designations which both have eschatological pedigrees. Mark understands these in light of the good news of the coming of God's present reign. These titles are to be taken together as they interpret each other, so that Jesus is not simply the 'anointed one' or 'son' from Ps 2 or the 'servant' from Isa 42, rather Jesus is the Son who is anointed with the eschatological Spirit of God. He brings present God's rule which is characterised by justice and salvation, and will defeat Satan and his demons.

The baptism episode is decisive for the narrative that follows, but a 'thicker description' is needed, because God's declaration of Jesus' divine sonship is the affirmation of a relationship. The baptismal episode is better taken as a revelation and affirmation than an adoption or a calling, for Jesus has already in the opening citation been included within the identity of YHWH. While the demons have knowledge concerning Jesus' divine sonship, and while it is affirmed at several points in the narrative, it is only comprehended by the centurion by revelation at the cross (15:39).

366. Witherington III, Ben, "The Trinity in the Johannine Literature," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Eds. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 69-70. Cf. Witherington and Ice, (2002), 36.

367. Witherington III, (2011), 36, 59-60.

368. Meye Thompson, (2000), 155-156.

369. Watson, Francis, "Trinity and Community: A Reading of John 17" *IJST* 1/2 (1999), 174. Similarly, Seitz, (1998), 259.

370. Johnson, (2000). 219.

The baptism episode is foundational both for revealing Jesus as the Son of God and God as the Father of Jesus. That Jesus addresses God as *abba* is thus best read as his response to the Father's statements at the baptism and the transfiguration. This unique and intimate relationship between God and Jesus precludes one from comprehending one without also referring to the other.³⁷¹

371. Danove, (2001), 26.

Chapter 5

The Spirit's Descent

This chapter will examine the role and identity of the Spirit in Mark's Gospel. This cannot be achieved without analysing Mark's OT allusions, and therefore the Spirit of the latter part of Isaiah, in particular Isa 42 and 63, is foundational. It will be argued that the eschatological Spirit anoints Jesus at the baptism and launches Jesus into his public ministry. It has already been demonstrated that Jesus brings present God's presence and reign; this, however, should not be divorced from the Spirit which in on him. It is Jesus the 'stronger one' who casts out demons and binds the 'strong man', and to attribute this to Beelzebul is to blaspheme the Spirit. Because of the independent action of the Spirit, and the distinguishing of the Spirit from the divine voice, the Spirit's identity will be explored in more detail. It will be argued that the Spirit is more than simply the action or presence of God, but is better described as hypostasis and perhaps even approaching personhood.

(a) The Spirit's Anointing of Jesus

As Jesus comes up from the water he sees the Spirit come down from the torn heaven. Although the Spirit is mentioned before the divine voice, the voice was treated earlier because it gives the context for understanding the descent of the Spirit. Although τὸ πνεῦμα is at first unidentified in Mark 1:10 the allusions to Isa 42:1 and 63:7-64:12, as well as the mention of το πνεῦμα ἅγιον in John's announcement in 1:8, make it clear that the reference is to the Spirit of God in the OT.¹

Following John's announcement in 1:8 an act of the Spirit is not surprising. What is surprising, however, is that the one who was to be the agent of a superior baptism of the Holy Spirit is now undergoing the same water baptism of repentance as everyone

1. It has sometimes been argued that the absolute τὸ πνεῦμα is a Christian term from a Hellenistic - rather than Palestinian - environment. A more common Jewish way of referring to the 'Spirit' would be 'Spirit of God' or 'Holy Spirit.' It was supposed that this Hellenistic expression would therefore represent a Hellenistic understanding of the 'spirit'. E.g. Bultmann, (1963), 251. However, even suggesting that the absolute use of τὸ πνεῦμα or הָרוּחַ is evidence for Hellenistic influence runs against the evidence, because for instance 'the Spirit' who falls on the seventy elders in both the MT and LXX of Numbers 11:17, 25, 26 is in the absolute. L. Keck argues for a Palestinian context. Keck, Leander E., "The Spirit and the Dove" *NTS* 17/1 (1970), 57-62.

else. The baptism of John with water (in the dative)² and Jesus' baptism ἐν the Holy Spirit could be understood either in a locative or instrumental sense, or even both.³ What exactly the baptism in the Spirit means is unclear and can only be interpreted in light of the rest of the Gospel, and it is likely, as Hooker argues, that baptising in the Holy Spirit is something Jesus does during his ministry, such as bringing forgiveness and renewal of life.⁴

(i) *The Eschatological Spirit of Isaiah*

It was argued in detail above that although the exact vocabulary differs, the heavenly voice clearly alludes to Isa 42:1. These words are addressed to the Lord's Servant in whom God takes delight, and hence God's Spirit is given to come upon him. In Isaiah the language of רוּחַ is varied,⁵ and there is, as Morales writes, no "monolithic program concerning the role and function of the Spirit throughout the book."⁶ However, one important stream is the association of the Spirit with eschatological hopes for particular figures: the messianic king (Isa 11:1-5), the Servant (42:1-4) and the figure of 61:1-3.⁷ In the matrix of Isaianic eschatological hopes these figures are all closely linked with each other⁸ and they need the Spirit to perform their roles for the benefit of the whole people.⁹

It was argued in more detail in Chapter 2 that many of the themes in Isaiah are interconnected; including that בִּשְׁר in 40:9-11, 41:27, 52:7-10 and in 61:1 are significant for their eschatological hopes and express a hope for the good news of the return of YHWH to Zion. The anointed figure of Isa 61:1ff. is clearly associated with the בִּשְׁר. The presentation of the Spirit-carrying עֶבֶד in 42:1ff. is in response to the

2. Some late *mss.* have ἐν. L019 69 124 346 565 579 788.

3. Wallace, (1996), 32. Decker says it is locative. Decker, (2014), 11. Hooker says instrumental Hooker, Morna D., "John's Baptism: A Prophetic Sign," in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D.G. Dunn*. Eds. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker and Stephen C. Barton (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 27-28.

4. Hooker, (2004), 27-30. Contra Barrett, (1966), 125.

5. The statement that the stronger one will baptise the people with the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:8), likely refers to the wider outpouring of the Spirit on the people as a whole as expressed in Isa 32:15, 44:1-5 and Joel 3:1-5.

6. Morales, Rodrigo J., *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel*. WUNT2. 282. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 28. See also 75.

7. MacDonald, Nathan, "The Spirit of YHWH: An Overlooked Conceptualization of Divine Presence in the Persian Period," in *Divine Presence and Absence in Exilic and Post-Exilic Judaism: Studies of the Sofia Kolalevskaja Research Group on Early Jewish Monotheism*. Eds. Nathan MacDonald and Izaak J. de Hulster (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 111. Morales, (2010), 16, 19, 25-26. Oswalt, (1998), 110, 562.

8. Boring, (2006), 45. Focant, (2010), 69. Westermann, (1969), 365. Blenkinsopp, (2003), 221. MacDonald, (2013), 113. Ma, Wonsuk, *Until the Spirit Comes: The Spirit of God in the Book of Isaiah*. JSOTS 271. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 151, 153, 200, 201, 213.

9. C.K. Barrett rightly stressed that for Mark and his audience there is no second or third Isaiah, and that these passages were understood to refer to the same person. Barrett, (1966), 41.

question in 41:27-28 three verses previously which promised a herald of 'good news' but no one was found. While there are important differences between each of these passages, there is a common thread that links them all together: the theme of the coming of YHWH himself or of his Spirit-carrying Servant/Messiah who will inaugurate God's reign. R.T. France rightly states that the hope for the 'pouring out' of this Spirit is a hope for God's own presence and not simply for a spiritual renewal.¹⁰ But in Mark the presence of the Spirit is primarily manifest in Jesus.

These themes are not only intertextually related within Isaiah itself, but are also unified in Mark's prologue. While Isa 42 is clearly alluded to, Isa 61:1-3 is never directly cited or alluded to in Mark (as in Luke 4:18-21), but one can still say with A. Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins that the "narrative context of Mark suggests an intertextual relationship with Isaiah 61."¹¹ The *χριστός* of 1:1 echoes the *ἔχρισεν* of Isa 61:1b, while the *εὐαγγελίσασθαι* and *καλέσαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν* of Isa 61:1-2 is related to *κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ* and *μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* in Mark 1:14-15, which in Mark is immediately followed by physical healing (1:29-34) and delivery (1:23-27), as in Isa 61:1-2.¹²

That Mark has associated the 'good news' and the 'reign of God' with the one who receives the Spirit is not unprecedented, for in 11Q13 (Melchizedek) the one who brings the good news of Isa 52:7 is explicitly linked with the one who receives the Spirit in Isa 61:1.¹³ Furthermore, both *Pss. Sol.* 17:32-36 and *The Similitudes of Enoch* (1 En. 49:2-4, 61:12-13) describe a messianic figure to whom the Spirit is given while alluding to Isa 11:2.¹⁴

The fact that the coming of the Spirit of God in Mark is introduced with an allusion to Isaiah Isa 63:19 specifically (and the poem of 63:7-64:11 more broadly) and Isa 42:1 (and 11:2 and 61:1 more broadly), strongly indicates that in view here is the coming of the promised eschatological Spirit of God.¹⁵ The coming of the Spirit is an

10. France, (2002), 72.

11. Collins and Collins, (2008), 127. Also Collins, (2007), 149. Voelz, (2013), 125.

12. See also Collins, (2007), 149. See also Dunn, (1980), 138, 140.

13. See also Blenkinsopp, (2006), 269.

14. See also Morales, (2010), 61-64. See also *T. Jud.* 24:2 which is likely to be interpolated.

15. Schweizer, (1970), 39. Gnika, (1978), 52. J.R. Levison rightly criticises the notion of the cessation of prophecy from Israel after Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. There is nevertheless the sense that there has been a temporary withdrawal of the Holy Spirit. Levison, John R., "Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel? An Evaluation of the Earliest Jewish Data" *NTS* 43/1 (1997), 49.

eschatological event,¹⁶ and Jesus the anointed one is both the bearer of the end-time Spirit of God and is the one through whom the Spirit will be poured to others.

(ii) *The Manner of the Spirit's Descent*

Mark 1:10b reads τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν.¹⁷ There are two exegetical questions here that merit a few comments. The question is whether the Spirit descends 'into' or 'upon' Jesus, and whether the descent of the dove is used adjectivally or adverbially. The εἰς αὐτόν has led several scholars to argue that the preposition εἰς suggests that the Spirit enters Jesus and possesses him.¹⁸ This could be indicated by the common use of ἐκβάλλω for Jesus' confrontation with the δαιμόνιον (1:34, 1:39, 3:15, 3:22, 6:13, et.al. 7:29-30 has ἐξέρχομαι) which indicates that the unclean spirits enter their subjects: Mark 1:26 states that an unclean spirit comes out of (ἐκ) the man; while in 5:8 Jesus commands that the spirits come out of the man (ἐξελθε), which is followed by their coming out and entering the swine (ἐξελθόντα, εἰσῆλθον. 5:13). It could thus be argued that a comparable phenomena happens at the baptism where Jesus receives the Spirit and the same Spirit is breathed out at his death and leaves him (ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀφείξ φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσεν. 15:37). This argument is supplemented by the fact that φωνὴν μεγάλην is indicative of exorcism in 1:26.¹⁹ There are problems with this view, however, for if Jesus was alive and well before the Spirit comes to him, why should the departure of the Spirit be indicative of his death? Thus while the author has likely used this vocabulary deliberately to strengthen his *inclusio*, one should not read ἐξέπνευσεν in 15:37 as a reference to the Holy Spirit.

Furthermore, the description of the possession and exorcism of unclean spirits is not uniform, Mark 1:23 and 5:2 speak in contrast of ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ. Jesus is also in 3:22 and 3:30 accused of having (ἔχω) Beelzebul; an expression also

16. Marcus, (1992), 57. Marcus, (2000), 165. Hanson, (2000), 126-127. Guelich, (1989), 26, 32. Morales, (2010), 39-40, 75-77. Focant, (2010), 73. As Focant writes: "Le déchirement des cieux et la descente de l'Esprit sont des événements eschatologiques."

17. While NA28 has εἰς there are some significant and early textual variants which have ἐπ' αὐτόν, including ⲛ 01, A02, E07, Φ09. Εἰς αὐτόν is supported by e.g. B03, D05, 13 etc. The former is more likely to be original for it is the harder reading and the latter reading can easily be explained as an assimilation to Matt 3:16, Luke 3:22 and John 1:32-33. The reverse is not easily explained.

18. Collins, (2007), 149. Driggers, (2007), 15, 25, 27. Boring, (2006), 45. Gundry, (1993a), 48. Juel, (1994), 36, 69. Juel, (1999), 109. Voelz, (2013), 126, 131. For a Hellenistic interpretation see Dixon, Edward P., "Descending Spirit and Descending Gods: A 'Greek' Interpretation of the Spirit's 'Descent as a Dove' in Mark 1:10" *JBL* 123/1 (2009).

19. Breytenbach, (1991), 178. Driggers, (2007), 101-102. Shively, Elizabeth E., "Characterizing the Non-Human: Satan in the Gospel of Mark," in *Character Studies and the Gospel of Mark*. Eds. Christopher W. Skinner and Matthew Ryan Hauge (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 148.

used in 7:25 and 9:17. Therefore, the fact that some texts speak of spirits entering people is not sufficient to conclude that this happens with regard to Jesus and the Holy Spirit.²⁰

In Greek many prepositions have overlapping semantic domains.²¹ C.H. Turner argued that εἰς was often used instead of ἐν,²² while A.T. Robertson found there was an increasing number of instances of εἰς where ἐπὶ or πρὸς would be expected; especially when used with 'verbs of motion'; and he lists Mark 1:10 as an example.²³ Edward P. Dixon argues that when εἰς is used with a 'verb of motion', as in Mark 1:10, it means 'to/into' and not 'upon'.²⁴ He argued that in Mark εἰς consistently means 'to/into' except in two instances; 11:8 and 13:3 where people put their cloak εἰς the road and Jesus is sitting εἰς the Mount of Olives and thus εἰς clearly here means 'on/upon'. However, Dixon contends that these examples are not sufficient for explaining Mark 1:10, for they are not used with the necessary of 'verbs of motion'.²⁵ However, M. Botner has shown that in the parable of the sower and its interpretation εἰς is used interchangeably with ἐπὶ with a verb of motion. In 4:8 one reads:...πίπτειν, εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν while the parallel in the interpretation in 4:20 has ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν. Since πίπτειν is a verb of motion εἰς with a verb of motion can carry the sense of ἐπὶ.²⁶ This opens up the possibility that this is the sense that is intended in Mark 1:10 when the Spirit descends εἰς αὐτόν. In this case it the context that will determine the conclusion. Since Isa 42:1 is alluded to and has the sense of 'upon' (עָלָיו רִיחַי הִנַּחְנִי. LXX: ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν) this is likely also the best way to understand Mark 1:10.²⁷

20. For R.T. France such a literal reading of 'into' would be an "absurdity". France, (2002), 78. But Gundry writes "Mark seems to mean that Jesus sees the Spirit descend and disappear into himself (i.e. into Jesus)." Gundry, (1993a), 48.

21. C.H. Turner argued that εἰς is sometimes used instead of ἐν, and notes that in Mark 13:3 εἰς means ἐπὶ and concludes that εἰς was encroaching on other prepositions. Turner, C.H., "εἰς and ἐν in St Mark," in *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*. Ed. J.K. Elliott (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 20.

22. Turner, C.H., "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel (continued)" *JTS* 25/100 (1924). O'Rourke, John J., "A Note Concerning the Use of ΕΙΣ and ΕΝ in Mark" *JBL* 85/3 (1966).

23. Robertson, (1934), 593, 596, 1393. That εἰς can have the meaning of ἐπὶ is supported by Wallace, (1996), 362-363, 369. Lentzen-Deis, (1970), 46. France, (2002), 78. Marcus, (2000), 160.

24. Dixon says the use in 5:34 and 10:17 are idiomatic expressions. Dixon, (2009), 772n48.

25. Dixon, (2009), 771-772.

26. That Matt 3:16 and Luke 3:22 (as well as John 1:32) have ἐπ' αὐτόν should not be considered as corrections but as interpretations or alternatives. Botner, Max, "How Do the Seeds Land? A Note on εἰς αὐτόν in Mark 1:10" *JTS* 66/2 (2015), 350.

27. It should be noted, however, that in Ezekiel's call a Spirit enters him (רִיחַי בִּי רוּחַ) and raises him on his feet and carries him away (2:2, 3:12, 14, 24). The LXX, however, has καὶ ἦλθεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ πνεῦμα.

The question is also whether Mark compared the Spirit to the dove²⁸ itself or to the manner of its descent. It has been suggested that Mark used ὡς περιστερὰν because something is described as seen, which would indicate that the Spirit is seen in the form of a dove (which is how it is explicitly described in Luke 3:22).²⁹ But it could also simply describe the manner of its descent.³⁰

(iii) *The Spirit-Anointed Jesus*

While the voice and the Spirit's descent belong together and need to be interpreted in relation to each other, it also needs to be asked, what actually happens when the Spirit comes down, besides fulfilling eschatological hopes. While Mark does not explicitly say what this means, what he does is to allude to Isa 42:1 and in a weaker sense to Isa 63:7-64:11. Drawing on its allusion to Isa 42 (and 11:2 and 61:1 by extension), one can first of all state that Jesus is anointed with God's Spirit. R.T. France rightly argues that this refers to a permanent anointing for a task and equipping for a role. However, France unhelpfully groups together different types of Spirit anointments.³¹ In Judg 3:10, 13:25, 14:6, 19, 15:14-15 and 1 Sam 11:6 et.al. the Spirit is given not for an office but for a singular task.³² In contrast, in 1 Sam 16:13 David is more than simply anointed for a single task, but is anointed for a position and an identity - as king - for it is described as "from that day forward" (מֵהַיּוֹם הַהוּא וּמִמָּוֶלָה).³³ This is also the function of the Spirit in Isa 11:2, 42:1, and 61:1. The Davidic link between 1 Sam 16:13 and Isa 11:1ff. is not to be missed, for in Isa 11 the Spirit "rests" on him and the Spirit is given not for a single task but for fulfilling a royal and messianic role. Likewise the Servant of Isa 42:1ff. is given the Spirit for a ruling function and in Isa 61:1ff. the anointing is for a continual ministry rather than a single task. In each of these texts the Spirit is described as coming על (upon) that person. The coming of the Spirit at the baptism thus looks to be an anointing with the

28. L. Keck links the action of the Spirit in Mark 1:10 with the 'hovering' (מרחפת) 'Spirit of God' of Gen 1:2. Keck, (1970), 63ff. For Dixon an allusion to Gen 1:2 is implausible, for he understands the 'spirit' in an hellenistic and Homeric sense. Dixon, (2009). Supported by Collins, (2007), 149. C. Focant references the dove in Gen 8:1, 10-11 and notes the new world after the flood. Focant, (2010), 73. C.K. Barrett and J. Palachuvattil note that both Rashi and the fifth century *Midrash Rabbah Genesis* identify the Spirit in Gen 1:2 with a dove. Barrett, (1966), 38. Palachuvattil, Joy, 'He saw': the Significance of Jesus' Seeing Denoted by the Verb *eiden* in the Gospel of Mark. *Tesi gregoriana. Serie teologia* ; 84. (Roma: Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana, 2002), 73-74.

29. Guelich, (1989), 32-33. Taylor, (1966), 160. Gundry, (1993a), 49. France, (2002), 78. Haenchen, Ernst, *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen*. 2nd edition. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986), 53-54. Lohmeyer, (1957), 23.

30. See also Keck, (1970), 63ff. Witherington, (2001), 74.

31. France, (2002), 76-77. Also Edwards, (1991), 48. Barrett, (1966), 41.

32. MacDonald, (2013), 105.

33. In 1 Kgs 19:16 Elisha is anointed to the role of a prophet, but the Spirit is not mentioned.

Spirit and he is here "anointed by the very presence and power of God".³⁴ Reminiscent of Acts 10:38 (ἐχρίσεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει), the Spirit comes upon him - in contrast to the anointing oil - and anoints him for a role and a position and even identity. This is part and parcel of Jesus being called the Christ (1:1, 8:29, 14:61, 15:32).

While P. Stuhlmacher on the one hand refers to the descent of the Spirit - particularly in light of Isa 61:1 - as "Begabung mit der Geist",³⁵ E. Lohmeyer in contrast states that the Spirit here is not "Begabung". For he writes, "[d]enn er ist hier nicht Gabe, sondern Gestalt" and adds "[d]er Vorgang bezeichnet nichts anderes als die ebenso verhüllte wie offenbare Gegenwärtigkeit des Geistes Gottes."³⁶ Lohmeyer is right in what he affirms, but wrong in what he denies, for there is no need to treat these as mutually exclusive.³⁷ Considering the allusion to Isa 42:1 (and 11:2 and 61:1) and the context of the ministry of Jesus in Mark, it is hard to deny that a gifting is implied. However, in similarity to Lohmeyer, Stuhlmacher's statement above is right but also not complete. The association with Isa 63:7-64:11 with the reference to the tearing of the heavens, the role that the Spirit plays in this poem, and the notion of divine presence is also important for Mark, as shall be seen below.

Rather than stating the present role of Jesus, the future of βαπτίσει in 1:8 shows that John's statement is a prophecy that is fulfilled - or rather that the precondition of its fulfilment is fulfilled - in 1:10. There is a clear movement of the Spirit in 1:10 and it changes something and it launches Jesus into his ministry, and it is not simply a revelation of Jesus as the 'Spirit-carrier'.³⁸ As R. Kampling writes: "Durch die Bindung des Geistes an Jesus ist er als der Messias identifiziert...Die Herabkunft des Geistes bewirkt nicht, daß Jesus zum Messias wird, sondern sie demonstriert, daß dieser als der Sohn Gottes zugleich der Messias ist."³⁹ That Jesus is the anointed one has already been made clear to the reader in 1:1, and will be ratified in the latter half of the Gospel (esp. 8:29, 14:61), and he is identified as the one who will baptise others in the Spirit. The coming of the Spirit is a bestowal on the Messiah-designate, which indicates that the divine presence is on him. Mansfield rightly stresses that all that Jesus subsequently does in the narrative is in the power of the Spirit which is on

34. Witherington, (2001), 75. Similarly Feldmeier and Spieckermann, (2011b), 232.

35. Stuhlmacher, (2012), 137.

36. Lohmeyer, (1957), 23.

37. V. Taylor also contrasts endowment with the Spirit with the coming down of the Spirit. Taylor, (1966), 160.

38. Schenke, (1988), 109.

39. Kampling, (1992), 54.

him, even when it is not specifically stated.⁴⁰ As has already been argued in detail, the tearing of heaven also introduces a revelation and enables a heaven-earth interaction, however it would be erroneous to describe this baptism episode as a theophany which is mediated by the Spirit⁴¹ since all the telltale signs of theophanic events are absent, such as earthquakes, mountains melting, or valleys bursting open.⁴² Jesus is more than simply one powered by the Spirit,⁴³ for as has already been argued in depth, the designation 'Son of God' has a relational aspect that needs a thick description.

As Jesus comes up out of the water (ἀναβαίνων) the Spirit descends upon him (καταβαῖνον). While Isa 63:19 calls for God to 'come down', Mark 1:10 has the Spirit come down, so it is not only Jesus who is the answer to the plea but also the Spirit.⁴⁴ In 63:14 the verb (יָרַד) is connected with the previous noun so that it is the cattle that go down into the valley. But in the LXX the verb καταβαίνω is referenced to the Spirit so that it is the Spirit that descends (κατέβη πνεῦμα παρὰ κυρίου καὶ ὠδήγησεν αὐτούς),⁴⁵ and this is the only instance of the Spirit descending on the OT.⁴⁶ However, that the Spirit comes upon (עָלָה) the figures of 11:1, 42:1 and 61:1 also indicates a descent. As will be shown below, the 'Spirit' in Isa 63:7-64:11 is closely associated with the saving activity and presence of God, and also with Jesus when he is endowed with the Spirit at the baptism.

There is a close connection between the coming of the Spirit at the baptism and Jesus' subsequent ministry. The royal overtones of Ps 2:7 indicate that here the Messiah-designate is anointed by the Spirit for his kingly role. James Dunn has rightly stressed the close link between the Spirit and the kingdom. While he presses it too much when he describes them as identical,⁴⁷ he rightly points out that "[t]he manifestation of the Spirit is the manifestation of the kingdom."⁴⁸ It will be argued in

40. Mansfield, (1987), 38-39.

41. Lohmeyer, (1957), 21-22.

42. Lentzen-Deis, (1970), 100. Jeremias, (1977), 7-16, 100-111.

43. However, he goes too far when he argues that Jesus' primary identity is as the one endowed with the Spirit, above being Christ, Son of God, or Son of Man. Mansfield, (1987), 19, 27, 33.

44. Clifford, (1989), 98-99, 101.

45. In the MT there is a parallel between the respite of the animal in the valley and the rest which the Spirit gives. See also Schneck, (1994), 46, 60-61.

46. Feuillet, (1959), 472. Mark 1:10 has the singular of ἀναβαίνων corresponding to Isa 63:11 LXX (ὁ ἀναβιβάσας), while the MT has the plural יְהַמְצִיחֵם. As noted in Chapter 1, Mark's use of the OT is complex, both with regard to his *Vorlage* as well as its hermeneutical role in the present text. R. Schneck may be right in arguing that Mark employs both the LXX and the Hebrew text of Isaiah. Schneck, (1994), 46.

47. Dunn, (1998), 136, 138. Also Keener in reference to Mark. Keener, (1997)

48. Dunn, (1998), 138-139.

detail below that Jesus' exorcisms are by the Spirit, and that this demonstrates the presence of God's kingdom.

(b) The Spirit and the Defeat of Satan

The conflict between the Spirit-anointed Jesus and Satan becomes immediately apparent in the temptation scene which reveals from the outset the animosity between them (1:12-13).⁴⁹ This 'cosmic conflict' is the framework or background of Mark, and is foundational for this Gospel, and which at times comes to the foreground.⁵⁰ Jesus calls his first disciples (1:16-20) and the conflict resumes as soon as Jesus starts his public ministry. The unclean spirits know the identity of Jesus: as the one who has authority over them (1:23-27, 1:32-34, 39, 3:11) and will destroy them (1:24, 5:7-8).

Jesus' exorcisms lead the scribes to declare: Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια (3:22). An important aspect of Mark is that the human and cosmic worlds do not simply run in parallel but intersect in Jesus' ministry.⁵¹ While the presence and guidance of the Holy Spirit on Jesus is clear (v.12), this passage (3:22-30) interprets his exorcisms and miracles. As both James M. Robinson and Elizabeth E. Shively contend, 3:22-30 explicates Jesus' exorcisms as part of a cosmic battle between Satan and the Spirit.⁵² Demon-possession in Mark should not be understood simply as capricious and isolated acts by the spirits of the dead as in 'popular Greek belief'. On the contrary, the demons are "completely subject to Satan"⁵³ and instances of demon-possession are "simply manifestations of the one power hostile to God".⁵⁴ Shively notes that this text (3:22-30) has the same characters as the temptation text - Jesus, Satan and the Holy Spirit - and states that the present passage "expands upon their conflict".⁵⁵

Before we can consider 3:22-30 in greater depth, the notion of 'Satan' needs to be considered. The idea of leading demons is not unique to Mark, but is also known

49. Evans, (2005b), 66. Shively, (2012), 72, 159. Robinson, (1957), 28.

50. Rhoads, David and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 74-75. Malbon, (2009), 43-45, 50. Dewey and Malbon, (2009), 311-312.

51. Shively, (2012), 153, 259-260.

52. Robinson, (1957), 35. Shively, (2012), 27.

53. Dunn, James D.G. and Graham H. Twelftree, "Demon-Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament," in *The Christ & the Spirit: Volume 2. Pneumatology*. Ed. James D.G. Dunn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 176, 179. Foerster, Werner, "δαίμων, δαιμόνιον," in *TDNT*. Ed. G. Kittel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 6-8, 18.

54. Dunn and Twelftree, (1998), 179.

55. Shively, (2012), 42-43.

from Qumran and other Jewish texts; for instance 'Melki-reša',⁵⁶ the 'Angel of Darkness',⁵⁷ 'Mastema',⁵⁸ or simply "prince of this world".⁵⁹ More frequent is 'Beliar'⁶⁰ and 'Satan',⁶¹ while 'Beelzebul' is called the 'prince of demons'.⁶²

The view that the world is under the power of a chief opponent is also evident in Mark's Gospel.⁶³ L. Schenke notes that Satan is the "heimlicher Gegenspieler Gottes und Jesu".⁶⁴ Satan is characterised as the enemy of Jesus (1:13), and his opposition is also apparent in his interference in the sowing of the seeds (4:15) and in Peter's opposition to Jesus' suffering (8:33).⁶⁵ In Mark the most commonly used designation is 'Satan' (1:13, 3:26, 4:15, 8:33), who is also identified as Beelzebul⁶⁶ in 3:22 ("devil" does not occur in Mark). He is also described as the ruler of demons (ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων 3:22) and the 'strong one' (ἰσχυρός 3:27). While God is the real ruler of the world, Beelzebul is - in the words of Shively - the "pseudo-lord of heaven who rules over a cosmic horde of demons".⁶⁷ A comparison of the charges in 3:22 and 30 suggests that Beelzebul is an unclean spirit and the chief of unclean spirits.⁶⁸ To describe Satan as the 'pseudo-lord' is a correct description because Satan is a usurper. Mark 10:42 describes the human rulers of the gentiles as merely being 'thought to rule' (οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν), for behind them operate Satan and his demons.⁶⁹

56. 4Q544 2I, 3.

57. 1QS III, 20-21.

58. *Jub.* 10:8, 11:5.

59. *Ascen. Isa.* 1:3, 10:29.

60. *Ascen. Isa.* 2:4, 4:2, 4:4, *T. Iss.* 7:7, *T. Dan* 1:7, *T. Naph.* 2:6, 3:1, *T. Ash.* 6:4, *Jub.* 1:20. et.al.

61. E.g. *1 En.* 53:3, *T. Dan* 5:5, 6:1. Sometimes as a proper name or more generally as an 'accuser'.

62. *T. Sol.* 2:9, 3:5, 6:1. See also Stuckenbruck, Loren T., "Satan and Demons," in *Jesus among Friends and Enemies: A Historical and Literary Introduction to Jesus in the Gospels*. Eds. Chris Keith and Larry W. Hurtado (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 176-180. Guttenberger, (2004), 227-228.

63. Stuckenbruck, (2011), 181.

64. Schenke, (1988), 90.

65. In contrast to Davis who says Satan does not play a major role in Mark. Davis, (1989), 6-7.

66. J. Dochhorn rightly states that this name is not important for Mark's Satanology. Dochhorn, Jan, "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark," in *Evil and the Devil*. Eds. Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskeniemi (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013), 103-104. As for the origin of the name, Shively shows that "Baal Zebul" means "Lord of the flies" in Hebrew (2 Kgs 1:1-17). It is likely a deriding terms for "Baal Zebul". Zebul means in later Hebrew an "exalted dwelling" or "lofty abode", i.e. a place of God's abode as in Isa 63:15, Hab 3:11. Shively suggests that against this background "Baal Zebul" or Beelzebul may be understood as "Lord of the dwelling." Shively, (2012), 61. See also Collins, (2007), 229-230.

67. Shively, (2012), 61. See also Dochhorn, (2013), 104.

68. Shively, (2012), 59-60.

69. See also Dan 10:13-14, 20-21. Marcus, (1984), 558. Lohmeyer, (1957), 223. In contrast to R.T. France who argues that the phrase means they are in fact recognised as rulers, rather than questioning the actuality of their rule. France, (2002), 418.

(i) *The Parables of Beelzebul*

This is an important text, for it is one of only two places in Mark where Jesus explains his purpose (the other is 10:45).⁷⁰ R. Pesch rightly divides 3:20-30 into two scenes; first Jesus family's accusation and second the scribe's accusation with Jesus' answer. Jesus' reply in this second scene can further be divided into three portions (vv.23b-26, 27, 28-29).⁷¹ Shively notes that the *inclusio* between 3:22b and 30 and the synonymous accusations indicate that the passage is a literary whole.⁷² In this passage the scribes do not dispute 'what' Jesus has done, but rather 'how'; not whether he has authority, but whence. D. Juel notes that even the demons know better than the scribes, for while the latter attribute his power to Satan, the former know his true identity.⁷³ Jesus answers with two parables; the first in the Gospel. In the first short parable Jesus asks the rhetorical question; "how can a satan cast out a satan?"⁷⁴ (v.23b) and says that it is not through an "internal division" that Satan's dominion will come to an end. He immediately proceeds with a second parable that shows that Satan's dominion will rather be destroyed through an "external attack" (v.27).⁷⁵

It is absurd to suggest that Satan's kingdom is undergoing a civil war; not only because Satan's kingdom is obviously still standing, as Marcus notes,⁷⁶ but also because it would be completely foolish and likely also impossible. This point is disputed by Marcus who argues that nothing is said about Satan's thought-process, nor is it a hypothetical situation.⁷⁷ But an actual description of Satan's thought-

70. Shively, (2012), 221, 231-232. Shively relates the two texts and argues that both refer to the conflict between Satan and Jesus.

71. Pesch, (1976), 211.

72. Shively, (2012), 57-58.

73. Juel, (1994), 69.

74. Dochhorn notes that 'satan' is not used with the article in 3:23 and is thus an equivalent to a demon. While there are many satans there is but one Satan (with the definite article). Thus the phrase means 'how can a satan cast out a satan'. Dochhorn, (2013), 104. This is in contrast to Shively who understands the phrase as 'how can Satan cast out a satan'. Shively, (2012), 62. Shively, (2014), 140.

75. See also Shively, (2012), 67. Barrett, (1966), 60.

76. Marcus, Joel, "The Beelzebul Controversy and the Eschatologies of Jesus," in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*. Eds. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 248-249, 255-256. Marcus, (2000), 274. E. Best argues that the conquering of Satan was complete after the testing in the wilderness. But Jesus does not do anything but is remarkably passive in 1:12-13 and it is only after the testing that Jesus proclaims the presence of the kingdom which initiates Jesus' response to Satan's test. Best, Ernest, *The Temptation and the Passion: The Marcan Soteriology*. SNTSMS. 2. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 15.

77. Marcus argues that $\epsilon\iota$ + aorist indicative (in 3:26) would naturally indicate past tense, and the point is that this has not yet happened for else his kingdom would not still stand. Marcus, (1999), 257-258. Marcus, (2000), 273-274. But R. Decker argues that all the ten aorist - two in the indicative mood - in 3:23-27 are "temporally unrestricted" (S. Porter calls it "timeless") and thus Jesus' remark refers to the "general principle" rather than "a specific division". The point of Jesus' remark is both that Satan's kingdom obviously still stands, and therefore it is absurd to suggest the it has imploded. The only way it will fall is through an external assault. Decker, (2001), 97-98. Porter, Stanley E., *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek. 1. (New York: Peter Lang, 1989),

process is unnecessary because the suggestion that Satan would be divided against himself is absurd in itself. In the second short parable Jesus describes what is actually taking place. That one must bind the strong man before one plunders his house suggests that, rather than an in-house rebellion, Satan's kingdom will and is undergoing an assault from without.⁷⁸ As summarised by C. Focant, who also rightly stresses the role of the Spirit in this defeat. "La vraie défaite de Satan ne vient pas d'une division interne dans le monde du mal, mais de la victoire d'un plus fort. Et ce plus fort, le lecteur sait depuis le récit de la tentation que c'est Jésus poussé par l'Esprit".⁷⁹

J. Marcus stresses the contradiction between the two parables (vv.23-26 and v27); the former implies that Satan's kingdom still stands, while the other would implicate its overthrow.⁸⁰ But rather than emphasising a potential tension between the two texts, it seems better to suggest how they both work together to illustrate the two sides of the same point: That Satan's rule will come to an end, not through internal conflict but through an external assault. Malbon writes, "Satan's kingdom, surely under stress with Jesus' successful exorcisms as part of the in-breaking rule of God, is not in danger of an internal breakup but is being attacked from outside - by God."⁸¹ The exorcisms show that the kingdom of Satan is starting to fall, this is not due to internal strife but to pressure from outside. While Marcus describes this solution as "clever", it seems to be a rather plain reading. But the main issue for Marcus is that it "does not lead to an absurdity" which Marcus considers necessary for Jesus' argument; an 'absurdity' because Satan's kingdom still stands. However, it is not only absurd, it is also impossible, for how can a satan cast out a satan?

The temptation scene should not be understood as a decisive victory over the power of Satan,⁸² but rather as an event in the beginning of Jesus' ministry that demonstrates

299. Davies and Allison rightly call the argument an *reductio ad absurdum*. Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. ICC. Vol. 2. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 337. France and Voelz thus rightly understand the statement as hypothetical. France, (2002), 172. Voelz, (2013), 258.

78. It is worth noting with Driggers that the parable of the strong man should not be read too allegorically, so as to concede that God is actually breaking into Satan own house and plundering Satan's own possessions. In reality Satan is a usurper. Driggers, (2014), 91-92.

79. Focant, (2009), 10. Also Best, (1965), 14.

80. Marcus, (1999), 251.

81. Malbon, (2009), 154. E.g. also Shively, (2012), 149.

82. As does E. Best and who then argues that Jesus proclaims his victory in 3:27. Best, (1965), 15. Similarly, Garland says that the emphasis on 'first' shows that Satan is already defeated at the temptation episode in 1:13. What remains to be done is the release of the captives. Garland, (2015), 365. Similarly, Grindheim, (2012), 103-104, 109-110, and Guttenberger, (2004), 245.

the ongoing conflict between them.⁸³ The parable of the 'Strong Man' and the surrounding narrative functions as a lens into the whole story of Jesus and describes the plundering of Satan's house as an ongoing event which is now merely in the beginning stages. Likewise, the 'binding' is not a single event in the ministry of Jesus, but refers to Jesus' ministry as a whole.⁸⁴ Mark 3:27 refers to the attack against Satan and breaking into his house, which is not a past but a present event; Satan's kingdom is being overcome although his power is ongoing after 3:22-30. While the beginning of the assault is at the start of Jesus' ministry, the present parables explain both Jesus' ongoing ministry and mission.⁸⁵

(ii) *Jesus the Stronger One*

It is Jesus, introduced as the stronger one (ὁ ἰσχυρότερός) in 1:7, who is the one who will enter the strong man's house (ὁ ἰσχυρὸς), bind him, and overthrow his rule.⁸⁶ In Isa 40:10 YHWH is the "strong one" who comes.⁸⁷ The demons know that Jesus has come to destroy them (1:24) and thus evidently recognise that Jesus is stronger than them. It is likely that Mark 3:27 alludes to Isa 49:24-26 and thus Jesus is presented as the 'Mighty One of Jacob' who contends with those who contend with him and his people.⁸⁸ At issue here is that Jesus is revealed as the one who does the work of God in liberating the oppressed ones from the power of Satan. Since in Isa 49:24-25 it is God himself who will liberate the captives of the tyrant, the inference can be drawn that Jesus is taking the role expected of God.⁸⁹ The tyrant is no longer Babylon, but Satan as established in 1:12 and in 3:23-27. In the vision of Dan 7 the beasts represent kingdoms, but the first and third beasts have features of more than one animal. Since Goldingay notes that in "Hellenistic Palestine, hybrid creatures on

83. Shively, (2012), 159. Robinson, (1957), 32.

84. Shively notes that in apocalyptic discourses evil spirits and their chiefs are dealt with by 'binding' them, which is often done through God's chief agents. She also points out that 'binding' is not identical to destruction and all 'bindings' in various texts do not entail the same thing. For instance, the agents, the purpose, and also the timing differs. Shively, (2012), 140-141. See also Evans, (2005b), 55-63. In some texts, e.g. *T. Mos.* 10:1-3 and *1 En.*, the coming of God's reign involves the defeat or binding of Satan. In some texts the demons are defeated by the messiah or a messianic type figure (*T. Levi* 18:11ff., *T. Reu.* 6:10-12, *T. Jud.* 25:3, *T. Zeb.* 9:8, *T. Dan* 5:10f, *1 En.* 55:4. See e.g. Barrett, (1966), 58-59.

85. Shively, (2012), 149. E.g also, 76.

86. See e.g. Robinson, (1957), 29-31.

87. Voelz, (2013), 115.

88. Watts, Rikki E., "Jesus' Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Eds. Jr. William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998), 128, 149. Shively, (2012), 47. Watts, Rikki E., "Mark," in *Commentary of the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Eds. G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 146.

89. Watts, (1997), 151. Watts, (2007), 148. Guttenberger, (2004), 246.

charms and amulets symbolize demonic forces",⁹⁰ it would not be a big leap to interpret the beasts as demonic. Thus in Mark the conflict is a cosmic conflict,⁹¹ but it is also an unequal conflict and one should not think in dualist terms.⁹²

The first actions of Jesus after announcing the coming of God's kingdom (1:14-15) are calling the disciples (1:16-20), teaching in the synagogue with peculiar authority (1:21-22), and casting out an unclean spirit (1:23). This is part and parcel of the coming kingdom of God. Dunn and Twelftree write "Jesus saw his exorcisms not so much as cures of some merely physical ailment or mental illness, but as the wrestling of particular individuals and personalities from the grip of the dominating influence of Satan."⁹³ Thus while the power of Satan is evident in demon-possession and sickness, this power is now being broken by Jesus the Son of God in whom kingdom of God is manifest.⁹⁴

This power is manifest in Mark 5:1-20 which is Mark's longest miracle story and the first exorcism after 3:22-30.⁹⁵ There are a number of important linguistic links between these two passages. In the description of the exorcism of 5:1-20 it is stated that no one was able to bind him (οὐδείς ἐδύνατο αὐτὸν δεῖσαι 5:3b) for no one was strong enough to subdue him (οὐδείς ἴσχυεν αὐτὸν δεσμεύσαι 5:4b); which clearly echoes the previous discourse of 3:22-30 with δύναμις, δέω, and ἰσχυρός.⁹⁶ While 'legion' is a military term, Shively rightly argues that the primary reference is not Rome but Satan's demons,⁹⁷ and as Horsley notes, the demoniac episode and Jesus casting out demons in general is a manifestation of their defeat due to the coming of God's own kingdom.⁹⁸ The casting out of evil spirits is evidence of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. This episode, and all the other exorcisms, can be described as a "skirmish" in Jesus' war with Satan and his demons and as an act of plundering his house.⁹⁹

90. Goldingay, (1996), 161.

91. Shively, (2012), 47.

92. Scholtissek, (1995), 74.

93. Dunn and Twelftree, (1998), 181. While they write this particularly in the context of the historical Jesus, it is also a correct description of the Markan Jesus.

94. Mussner, (1967b), 92. Scholtissek, (1995), 73.

95. Shively, (2012), 172-173. Also noted by Juel, (1999), 111-113. Focant, (2010), 63.

96. Shively, (2012), 175-176.

97. Shively, (2012), 179-180. In contrast, R. Horsley interprets both 3:22-30 and the Mark 5:1-20. demoniac episode as ultimately concerning Rome and thus the name Legion is a "demystification" of the demons. Horsley, Richard A., *Hearing the Whole Story: The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel*. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001), 147. See also 140-141.

98. Horsley, (2001), 136-138.

99. Shively, (2012), 177. See also Schenke, (2005), 121.

(iii) *The Spirit and the Kingdom*

The meaning and importance of the kingdom of God was discussed in Chapter 2, and it was stressed that an important element was God's presence in and through Jesus. It is critical that Jesus' exorcisms and his defeat of Satan are not disconnected from his proclamation of the kingdom. The exorcisms are not magic, but are intrinsic to the coming of God's kingdom.¹⁰⁰ C.K. Barrett states that the exorcisms "were a signal instance of the power of the Kingdom of God in subduing the empire of the adversary."¹⁰¹ That the proclamation of the coming of God's kingdom (1:14-15) is followed by the casting out of demons shortly after is no coincident. As has been argued above and as Malbon writes, "[t]he background conflict underlying Mark's Gospel is that between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan. The 'kingdom of God has come near' (1:15) and for Satan's kingdom the 'end has come' (3:26). Everything else that happens in Mark is to be understood against this transcendent background."¹⁰² However Malbon also wrongly adds that although Jesus is the one who brings present God's rule, he cannot be said to be God himself.¹⁰³ This minimises the theological importance of 1:2-3 where Jesus is presented as the coming of YHWH himself, and also the indissoluble connection between Jesus and the kingdom, this is the 'good news' of the coming and reign of God.

It was not the Messiah who was expected be the healer, but rather God himself (Isa 35:5-6) and hence Jesus appropriates the role of God as is expressed in Mark 7:37.¹⁰⁴ The deeds of Jesus - the healings, exorcisms, and calling sinners - all signal the presence of the kingdom of God in both word and deed, which is good news.¹⁰⁵ Jesus, who has already been identified as the Son of God, Messiah, and the carrier of God's Spirit, is also identified through his actions. He is the one who defeats Satan and brings present the kingdom of God.

The two dreams of Dan 2:31ff. and Dan 7 of the great statue and the four beasts respectively, were noted above. In the former the statue is crushed when a stone is "cut out, not by human hands" (v.34) and which represented an eternal kingdom

100. E.g. Juel argues that there is a "direct link" between them. Juel, (1994), 71. Barrett says they are "intimately related". Barrett, (1966), 62. Also Scholtissek, (1995), 74.

101. Barrett, (1966), 68. See also Juel, (1994), 71. Dunn and Twelftree, (1998), 182. See also Evans, (2005b), 49.

102. Malbon, (2009), 43.

103. Malbon, (2009). 48. Also Rhoads and Michie, (1982), 74-75.

104. Grindheim, (2012), 114-116. Hays, (2016), 32, 73-75. Rowe, (2002b), 236-237.

105. See also Mussner, (1967b), 91-92.

(v.44). In the corresponding dream in ch. 7 the four kingdoms represented by the four beasts will also be destroyed and superseded by the 'one like a son of man' (7:9-14). Both dreams express an eschatological hope for the appearance of a divine eternal kingdom/king and which will crush any rival kingdom (2:44, 7:13-18). This also serves as a background for understanding Jesus' proclamation of God's present reign and his defeat of the kingdom of Satan.

(iv) Blasphemy Against the Spirit

The importance of the Spirit in the prologue was stressed above; with John's prophecy that Jesus would baptise others in the Holy Spirit (1:8), Jesus' anointing with the Spirit at the baptism (1:10), which is immediately followed by an instance where Jesus is controlled by the same Spirit (1:12). But the indication that Jesus' whole ministry is in the presence and power of the Spirit comes not only from the prologue, but also from 3:22-30.¹⁰⁶ The fact that Jesus inaugurates the kingdom and that his ministry of healing and exorcism is done through the Holy Spirit is critical, for it is through the Holy Spirit that Jesus manifests the presence of God's kingdom; for as Dunn writes "[t]he manifestation of the Spirit is the manifestation of the kingdom."¹⁰⁷

This explains the seriousness of the blasphemy against the Spirit.¹⁰⁸ It was argued above that blasphemy involves usurping and appropriating for oneself the place of God.¹⁰⁹ This is precisely what transpires in this passage, for the real conflict is between Satan and the Holy Spirit who then are presented as opposing alternatives in 3:22-30.¹¹⁰ Confusing them is blasphemy, for it entails calling the Spirit of God - and thus God himself - 'Satan', and calling God's kingdom Satan's kingdom. As Pesch expresses it, it is a "[v]erteufelung des heiligen Geistes" and thus "der Verteufelung Gottes".¹¹¹ The comment at the end of this passage ὅτι ἔλεγον· πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει (3:30 and omitted in both Matt and Luke), makes clear the connection between Jesus' exorcisms and the blasphemy. To say that Jesus on whom the Spirit of God from Isa 42:1 and likely also of Isa 11:2, 61:1, and 63:10¹¹² has come, is doing the

106. For example see Focant, (2010), 63. Hartman, (2004), 129. Shively, (2012), 163.

107. Dunn, (1998), 138. See also Dunn, (1975), 49. Mansfield, (1987), 34.

108. Dunn, (1998), 139.

109. Collins, (2006), 156-160, 165-169. Bock, (1998), 202-205, 209, 236.

110. See also Dochhorn, (2011), 60. Robinson, (1957), 33.

111. Pesch, (1976), 218.

112. As suggested by Barrett, (1966), 104-105. See also Watts, (2007), 149.

deeds of Satan is blasphemy. E.S. Malbon rightly notes, "[t]he unforgivable sin involves confusing the two powers opposed in a cosmic struggle - God and Satan - by linking the Markan Jesus with the wrong one."¹¹³ While this thesis argues for a proto-trinitarian understanding of the baptism episode (1:9-11), this passage (3:22, 28-30) could also be described in a similar way for here one has presumably God the Father forgiving or not forgiving (cf. 11:25), and Jesus as the one who casts out demons by the power of the Holy Spirit.¹¹⁴

(c) The Spirit Speaks

Besides the prologue and the Beelzebul episode, there are two more important references to the Spirit in Mark. In Jesus' dialogue with the scribes he asks "how can the scribes say that the Messiah is the son of David?" (12:35b). Leaving aside the theological importance of this statement, as well as the bulk of Jesus' reply, it is important to note how Jesus introduces the citation: αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ (12:36b. Cf. 2 Sam 23:2). The phrase ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ could be understood in at least two ways; first that David has spoken the words of Scripture in a trance-like state, as in Rev 1:10 ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Second, ἐν can be understood instrumentally. These need not be mutually exclusive and the main point is that Scripture is Spirit-inspired. B. Witherington rightly argues that this does not simply indicate the presence of God at the time of speaking or writing, but also that the text itself now has an inspired quality.¹¹⁵ Furthermore, as Jesus' further statement shows, the text is not only inspired Scripture but the Spirit-led Jesus is its right interpreter.¹¹⁶ The Scriptures which announced the coming of YHWH (1:2-3) and by which God's speaks from heaven (1:11, 9:7) has its authority only because it was spoken by the Spirit. That God should speak from heaven with Spirit-inspired words also demonstrates the Spirit's closeness to God.

Mark has already made clear that Jesus is the Messiah (1:1), and this will be confirmed later by Jesus himself (14:61-62). Since it is the Spirit who speaks in Ps 110, it is the Spirit who says the Messiah is greater than simply a human son of David. This however does not necessarily repudiate the Messiah's Davidic sonship,¹¹⁷

113. Malbon, (2009), 111. See also 154.

114. G. Guttenberger notes this without developing it in any way. Guttenberger, (2004), 248.

115. Witherington and Ice, (2002), 108.

116. Powery, Emerson B., "The Spirit, the Scripture(s), and the Gospel of Mark: Pneumatology and Hermeneutics in Narrative Perspective" *JPT* 11/2 (2003), 197.

117. Witherington, (2001), 333. Stein, (2008), 571. Juel, (1988), 142-143.

which is accepted by Jesus in 10:48-49 and 14:61. The point of the statement in 12:35-37 is primarily that Jesus is greater than the Son of David. That Jesus is both Messiah and Lord of David and is seated at the right hand of God's throne implies that Jesus is more than a mere human being (Ps 110:5. Cf. Dan 7:9-14).¹¹⁸

The other important reference to the Spirit is Mark 13:10-11, where Jesus promises that when the disciples are under pressure and stand before kings and governors his disciples will be given words to speak by the Holy Spirit. Shively has noted that while 'that hour' (ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦτο 13:11) is "eschatological time", "that hour" (αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα) is already happening in Gethsemane (14:35), for "the hour has come" (ἤλθεν ἡ ὥρα 14:41).¹¹⁹ In the next two chapters of Mark Jesus himself stands before ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων (14:53-65, 15:1-5), and the attentive reader will surmise that what Jesus speaks before both the high priest and Pilate - namely that he is the Messiah, Son of the Blessed One, Son of Man, and King of the Jews - is given and authorised by the Holy Spirit. In both these cases the Spirit speaks and confirms Jesus as both the Messiah and more than the Messiah.¹²⁰

There are other possible references to the Spirit in Mark, but these are more doubtful. When Jesus cries αββα ὁ πατήρ (14:36) he also says τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής (14:38b) and some argue that this is the Holy Spirit of God.¹²¹ The proponents often argue that there is a reference to the 'willing spirit' in Ps 51:12 which they interpret as God's Holy Spirit.¹²² If this is right, then one would again have the triadic God addressed as αββα, Jesus' prayer, and the Spirit within him.

James W. Voelz argues that when Jesus knows the opponents' thoughts or sighs in his spirit (τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ. 2:8, 8:12), that this is a reference to the Holy Spirit within

118. Marcus, (2009), 850. Marcus, (1992), 145. Bauckham, (2008g), 163. Hengel, Martin, *Studies in Early Christology*. (London: T&T Clark, 1995), 179. Bates, (2015), 49, 53-54.

119. Shively, (2012), 164-166.

120. Shively, (2012), 166.

121. This is opposed by e.g. France, (2002), 587. Donahue and Harrington, (2002), 409. Strauss, Mark L., *Mark*. ZECNT. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 635. Hartman, Lars, *Markusevangeliet 8:27-16:20*. KNT. 2b. (Stockholm: ESF-förlaget, 2005), 527. Focant, (2010), 541.

122. Schweizer, (1970), 313-314 and Schweizer, Eduard, "πνεῦμα, πνευματικός," in *TDNT*. Eds. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 397. Mansfield, (1987), 128. Lane, (1974), 520. Witherington, (2001), 380. Smith, (2003), 130. Pilgaard, (2008), 350. Pilgaard is noncommittal. There is also disagreement among Old Testament commentators whether the רוּחַ in Ps 51:12 is the Spirit of God as in Ps 52:11. For: Tate, Marvin E., *Psalms 51-100*. WBC. (Waco, TX: Thomas Nelson, 1990), 22. J. Goldingay notes it could be read either way, but opts for 'human spirit'. Goldingay, John, *Psalms 42-89*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms. Vol. 2. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 135. Against: Weiser, Artur, *The Psalms*. OTL. (London: SCM, 1962), 407-408. Delitzsch, Franz, *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes: Psalms*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 139.

him.¹²³ But if the Holy Spirit was intended the definite would be expected,¹²⁴ and the presence of αὐτοῦ makes is unlikely to be a reference to the Holy Spirit. This makes it likely that the reference is to his heart or equivalent,¹²⁵ and thus refers to Jesus knowing within himself, or in his heart, which in the OT is often parallel with 'spirit'.¹²⁶

(d) The Identity of the Spirit

This chapter has investigated the role of the Spirit in Mark's Gospel, but the critical question with regard to the Spirit's identity remains. When Mark refers to the Spirit of God it is nearly always in the context of the OT, and therefore the OT passages cited by Mark cannot be left out of this discussion. The crucial question is not so much whether the Spirit is divine, which is taken for granted, but whether the Spirit is conceived of as a distinguishable entity or person.

(i) *The Spirit in Isa 63:7-64:11*

It has already been argued in detail that Mark 1:9-11 alludes to the Isaianic poem of Isa 63:7-64:11 as well as to Ps 2:7 and Isa 42:1. In Isaiah the Spirit is particularly associated with the messianic king (Isa 11:1-5) and the Servant (42:1-4) and the figure of 61:1-3, but since the eschatological Spirit of these passages has already been examined, this section will focus on Isa 63, which was alluded to when the heavens were torn.

The term רוּחַ קֹדֶשׁ appears only three times in the MT, including twice in Isa 63 - vv.10 and 11 - and in each case it does not stand alone, but the Holy Spirit is identified as God's Spirit with the suffixes "your" and "his" Holy Spirit. In addition, Isa 63:14 has the expression רוּחַ יְהוָה.¹²⁷ That this same Isaianic psalm has already been alluded to makes a further allusion to the Spirit of Isa 63:7-64:11 more likely; for although Mark simply has τὸ πνεῦμα in v.10 he has πνεῦμα ἅγιον in v.8. The overall theme of this psalm concerns a time when the place of God's presence is

123. Voelz, (2013), 191, 194, 505.

124. Stein, (2008), 120.

125. Gundry, (1993a), 113.

126. Wainwright, (1962), 212. Guelich, (1989), 88. Marcus, (2000), 217.

127. The LXX has in addition: Wis 9:17 (ἐπεμψας τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστου) and Songs 17:37 (ὅτι ὁ θεὸς κατεργάσατο αὐτὸν δυνατὸν ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ). Dan 5:12 has 'holy spirit' for the MT 5:11 'spirit of the holy gods' and 6:4 translates the 'excellent spirit' (Aramaic ܕܝ ܪܘܚܐ ܕܝܗܝܪܐ ܒܗ) as 'a holy spirit'.

destroyed, and the psalmist first recounts the exodus event before pleading for a renewed coming of God himself and his salvation. In the MT of this text יהוה is their saviour (מוֹשִׁיעַ) (63:8) and the following verse states that the 'angel of his presence' (מַלְאָךְ הַפָּנִי) saved them (הוֹשִׁיעַם) (v.9).¹²⁸ But in the next verse which describes the people's rebellion, the rebellion it is now against his Holy Spirit (רוּחַ קְדֹשׁ) (v.10) and the people are said to have rebelled against and grieved God's Holy Spirit (רוּחַ קְדֹשׁ), which he had put in their midst (הַמְעַלֵּם) (v.11b).¹²⁹ In v.14 it is the רִיחַ יְהוָה who gives them rest. The 'angel of the presence' is in this passage identified with the Holy Spirit,¹³⁰ both of whom are closely aligned with YHWH, yet also distinct from him.¹³¹ While YHWH in general redeems his people, it is the Holy Spirit and the angel of the presence who seem to represent God's salvific action on the ground (vv.11, 15).

But in the LXX the deliverance is not from a messenger or an angel, but by the Lord himself (63:9. οὐδὲ ἄγγελος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς κύριος ἔσωσεν αὐτοῦς) and thus making a contrast between them.¹³² However when the people resist, they resist his Holy Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ) and then the Lord himself contends against them (αὐτὸς ἐπολέμησεν αὐτούς v.10). It is the Holy Spirit who comes down from the Lord and upon the leaders of the people to lead them (v11, 14) (κατέβη πνεῦμα παρὰ κυρίου καὶ ὠδήγησεν αὐτούς). What appears from this translation is that the 'angel of the presence' is contrasted to the Lord, while the Holy Spirit is closely aligned with the Lord, though is described separately and as the one coming down from the Lord. Thus while in the Hebrew the 'angel of the Lord', 'his Holy Spirit', and the Lord himself are not distinguished as separate entities, in the LXX there is a clearer distinction between the angel and the Spirit.

(ii) *The Angel of His Presence*

Isaiah 63:9 has the unique מַלְאָךְ הַפָּנִי which harks back to the Exodus narrative, as made clear by the context of the redemption of the people of Israel in the days of old

128. The *Ketiv* has אֵל while the *Qere* has יְהוָה. For the problems of reading the *Ketiv* see Blenkinsopp, (2003), 254, 260.

129. See also Feuillet, (1959), 473.

130. See e.g. Briggs, Charles A., "The Use of רוח in the Old Testament" *JBL* 19/2 (1900), 144. Contra Ma, (1999), 127, 200. Levison, John R., "The Spirit in Its Second Temple Context: An Exegetical Analysis of the Pneumatology of N.T. Wright," in *God and the Faithfulness of Paul*. Eds. Christoph Heilig, J. Thomas Hewitt and Michael F. Bird (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 455.

131. See Whybray, (1975), 258.

132. The אֵל of the *Ketiv* is translated by the LXX, but has a different function. In the *Ketiv* it negates the affliction of God for his people, while in the LXX the οὐ and οὐδὲ negate the salvific involvement of the messenger or the angel.

and bringing up the people from the sea. In the Exodus narrative one encounters the מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה and מַלְאָךְ הָאֱלֹהִים and מַלְאָכִי¹³³ who meets Moses and will be with God's people but never מַלְאָךְ פָּנָיו. However, Exod 33:14 says it is פָּנָי (my face or my presence) that will go (See also Deut 4:37), and thus in Exodus there is an alignment between the מַלְאָכִי and פָּנָי. While it is sometimes argued that this מַלְאָךְ is Moses, especially in 23:20,¹³⁴ it is mostly agreed that the reference is in some sense to God himself.¹³⁵ The מַלְאָךְ פָּנָיו in Isa 63:9 refers to this same figure who can be described as the personal presence of God himself.¹³⁶ But Goldingay states that the מַלְאָךְ פָּנָיו ("the aide of his face" Goldingay) "points to an entity identifiable enough with Yhwh to connote Yhwh's personal presence yet distinguishable enough from Yhwh not to be fatally electrifying."¹³⁷ 'The angel of his presence' refers to God himself, to God's own active presence with his people. Similarly the רוּחַ is God's action and presence and in no way less than YHWH, yet without supplanting YHWH. The text first associates the מַלְאָךְ with פָּנָיו (Isa 63:9), and then with קִדְשׁוֹ רוּחַ (Isa 63:10, 11) and זְרוֹעַ תְּפָאֲרָתוֹ (Isa 63:12: his glorious arm) and finally the רוּחַ יְהוָה (Isa 63:14). All these terms refer to God's saving and guiding presence in their midst.

The question is how the רוּחַ קִדְשׁ should be understood in relation to YHWH. The 'Spirit' as the 'divine presence' is a notion one finds in both Isa 63:7-64:11 and elsewhere.¹³⁸ The 'angel of the presence' is in this passage identified with the Holy Spirit,¹³⁹ both of which are closely aligned with YHWH. The Holy Spirit in this passage is usually understood as God's presence. For instance, Feldmeier and Spieckermann note concerning Isa 63:9-10: "Beim Geist geht es nicht um eine Mittlerinstanz, sondern um Gott selbst".¹⁴⁰ With reference to this Isaianic poem B.M.

133. Exod 3:2, 14:19, 23:20, 23, 32:34, 33:2. This 'messenger' has a unique role in Deuteronomistic History in that he speaks to Hagar (Gen 16:7-14), Moses (Exod 3:2), Balaam (Num 22:22-35), and Samson (Judg 13) *et al.* and is a guide to the people of God in the wilderness. Dozemann, Thomas B., *Eerdmans Critical Commentary*. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 556.

134. Janzen, J. Gerald, *Exodus*. WBC. (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1997), 179-180.

135. E.g. Cassuto, U., *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1967), 305-306. Enns, Peter, *Exodus*. NIVAC. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 471. Goldingay, (2014), 393. Propp, William H.C., *Exodus 19-40*. AB. (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 287-288. Childs, Brevard S., *Exodus: A Commentary*. OTL. (London: SCM, 1974), 487. Hamilton, Victor P., *Exodus: An Exegetical Commentary*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 435.

136. E.g. see Koole, (2001), 356. Neve, Lloyd R., *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*. (Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2011), 74.

137. Goldingay, (2014), 393.

138. N.T. Wright suggests there is in 1 Cor 3:16ff. "some kind of identification of the divine spirit with the long-awaited returning Shekinah." Wright also makes this identification in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 (p.715) and Eph 2:19-22 (p.716). Wright states that "[i]n second-temple Jewish terms there cannot be a higher pneumatology than this. The spirit is incorporated within the divine identity, the identity which is shaped particularly by the eschatology of YHWH's 'return'". p.716.

139. See e.g. Briggs, (1900), 144. Contra Ma, (1999), 127, 200. Levison, (2016), 455.

140. Feldmeier and Spieckermann, (2011a), 214.

Zapff notes that the designation 'Holy Spirit' "ist häufig eine Umschreibung für das heilvolle und machtvolle Wirken Gottes".¹⁴¹ While J. Goldenstein also states that 'his presence' and 'Holy Spirit' is "ein Ausdruck für Jahwe selbst."¹⁴² Analysing רִיחַ קָדֵשׁ in Isaiah, Wonsuk Ma defines it within monotheism and as "one of Yahweh's instruments in dealing with humans and the created world."¹⁴³ Ma favours A.R. Johnson's expression that the Spirit is an "extension of God's personality"¹⁴⁴ for it is not only 'activity', but 'being' that is referred to, and because the Spirit is "something closely associated with God himself".¹⁴⁵ Ma argues that in Isaiah the רִיחַ קָדֵשׁ "is a substitution for the direct revelation of God himself to his people".¹⁴⁶ Ma further states that in 63:11 the רִיחַ קָדֵשׁ is "an awesome power linked to the divine presence"¹⁴⁷ and in 63:14 the Spirit is "almost the substitution of God himself".¹⁴⁸ Referring to Isa 63, Brevard Childs states: "The spirit here is the holy presence of Yahweh".¹⁴⁹ J.R. Levison states that it is the "manifestation of God's personal presence",¹⁵⁰ and W.A.M. Beuken says the Holy Spirit is "God's personal presence in Israel".¹⁵¹ What all these scholars have concluded, is that the Spirit is basically God's presence and God himself.

The link between God's Spirit and God's presence is also known elsewhere in both the OT and other Jewish texts. In the only other OT text where רִיחַ קָדֵשׁ appears, Ps 51:11 (MT, 51:13), it occurs in a parallelism with God's presence (פָּנָה). In Ps 104:29-30 פָּנִיךָ and רִיחֶךָ are used as equivalents, which in the Targum are rendered 'Shekinah' and 'your holy spirit' respectively. In Ps 139:7-10 the presence of God is closely linked with God's Spirit and they function as parallels in v.7. Similarly in Ezek 39:29, the hiding of the face (פָּנִי) is contrasted with pouring out the Spirit (רִיחֶי).¹⁵² In Ps 143:10 the psalmist yearns for God's good Spirit (רִיחֶךָ טוֹבָה) to lead

141. Zapff, (2006), 408.

142. Goldenstein, (2001), 61. Also Lau, (1994), 291. Dumbrell, W.J., "Spirit and Kingdom of God in the Old Testament" *The Reformed Theological Review* 33/1 (1974), 2. Levison, (2016), 454.

143. Ma, (1999), 15.

144. Ma, (1999), 29, 32, 85, 129, 200, 204. See Johnson, Aubrey R., *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*. (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961), 2.

145. Ma, (1999), 32. It is important to point out here that what Johnson means by an 'extension' is like a messenger extends the personality of his master. That this clearly is a distinct person, this does not seem to be reflected in Ma's treatment. Johnson, (1961), 5.

146. Ma, (1999), 131.

147. Ma, (1999), 129.

148. Ma, (1999), 154.

149. Childs, (2001), 524. See also Routledge, Robin, *Old Testament Theology: A Thematic Approach*. (Nottingham: Apollos, 2008), 113. Ma, (1999), 112.

150. Levison, (2016), 456. Also Witherington and Ice, (2002), 104.

151. Beuken, (1989), 14. "een nieuwe, jonge uitdrukking voor Gods persoonlijke aanwezigheid in Israël en zijn werkzame leiding tijdens de uittocht, waarneembaar in de profetische gestalte van Mozes."

152. As also noted by MacDonald, (2013), 96. Routledge, (2008), 112. Briggs, (1900), 144-145.

him, which indicates God's presence. That God put his Holy Spirit in their midst (בְּקִרְבּוֹ, Isa 63:11) also indicates that the Spirit is here closely associated with God's own presence, as in vv.9-10.

Isaiah 63:9-14 refers three times to the Spirit, but the Exodus account (Exod 19:19-20) rather refers to the cloud, thus indicating that the Isaianic author understood or interpreted the cloud as the Spirit.¹⁵³ There is an overlap between the 'angel of YHWH', 'cloud', 'glory' and 'Spirit' which are also nevertheless distinct.¹⁵⁴ Greene notes that while 'cloud' or 'glory' was typically used for God's presence in the tabernacle/temple, the word 'spirit' "was usually reserved for Yahweh's presence or empowerment among the people outside the sanctuary."¹⁵⁵

After the destruction of the temple, the 'spirit' became the term or concept that could express both God's presence transcending the temple and his presence with his people.¹⁵⁶ While no OT text refers explicitly to the Spirit dwelling in the temple,¹⁵⁷ Solomon's dedication of the temple in 1 Kgs 8:11-12 is reminiscent of the cloud in the Exodus narrative, for the cloud fills the house (v.11)¹⁵⁸ and God is said to dwell in 'thick darkness' (בְּעֶרְפֶּל, v.12).¹⁵⁹ In Josephus's version of the dedication of the temple, he states that although the ark was already there (99), as well as the thick cloud (106), Solomon prays that God would let even some portion of God's Spirit to dwell there as well (*A.J.* 8:114).¹⁶⁰ Craig S. Keener also notes that for some Rabbis the destruction of the temple marked the departure of the Spirit;¹⁶¹ and in a similar vein the Qumran community regarded the Holy Spirit as having departed from the polluted temple.¹⁶² In these texts there is a clear association between the Spirit and God's presence in the temple.

153. Greene, Joseph R., "The Spirit in the Temple: Bridging the Gap between Old Testament Absence and New Testament Assumption" *JETS* 55/4 (2012), 726.

154. See also Greene, (2012), 723.

155. Greene, (2012), 717. Also MacDonald, (2013), 96.

156. Greene, (2012), 718. Goldingay, (2014), 394-395. Moule also says that in the NT the Spirit mediates the presence of God. Moule, C.F.D., *The Holy Spirit*. (London: Mowbray, 1978), 50.

157. Greene, (2012), 717, 725.

158. This is omitted in the LXX of 1 Kgs, but is repeated in 2 Chr 6:1 in both in MT and LXX; while the Targum has *Shekinah*.

159. The notion of God dwelling in 'thick darkness' (בְּעֶרְפֶּל) is not rare. Exod 20:21, Deut 4:11, 5:22, 2 Sam 22:10, Ps 18:10, Ps 97:2.

160. Reference cited in Turner, Max, "'Trinitarian' Pneumatology in the New Testament?—Towards an Explanation of the Worship of Jesus" *Asbury Theological Journal* 58/1 (2003), 169.

161. *Num. Rab.* 15:10 and *Song Sol. Ran* 8:9 §3. Keener, (1997), 16.

162. Charlesworth, James H., "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 21. However, the understanding of the Holy Spirit in Qumran differs from the NT.

Therefore as John R. Levison notes, "a pneumatology which understands the spirit as the *Shekinah*, angel, or divine presence of the exodus tradition is rooted undoubtedly in Second Temple Jewish belief."¹⁶³ For Levison the Spirit here is God's presence, but he also rightly notes that "the identification is not a simple one".¹⁶⁴ He states that Isa 63:7-64:11 represents an "early, high pneumatology" without compromising monotheism.¹⁶⁵ But the question was never whether the Spirit is God or divine, but to what extent the Spirit is distinct or distinguishable from YHWH. While the 'angel of YHWH' and the 'angel of his presence' refer to God's own saving activity and God himself, there is also an distinctness to the angel that seems to suggest that the angel and YHWH are not identical. R.N. Whybray argues that the Spirit in Isa 63:10 "is on its way to its later full development as a distinct hypostasis in late Jewish and in Christian thought."¹⁶⁶ To this question we now turn.

(iii) The Spirit as Hypostasis of God and Beyond

Before progressing, a definition of terms is necessary for there is confusion in the usage of the terms 'hypostasis', 'personification', and 'person'.¹⁶⁷ The discussion of Dodson is helpful in defining the terms. "Personification" is defined as "*the attribution of human characteristics to any inanimate object, abstract concept or impersonal being*."¹⁶⁸ He adds that a personification "is ontologically the same as or part of that being."¹⁶⁹ A 'hypostasis' on the other hand "falls between a personification and an autonomous being"¹⁷⁰ and is thus "part personification and part independent agent".¹⁷¹

It was argued above that there is an overlap between the 'angel of YHWH's presence', 'cloud', 'glory' and 'Spirit'. While one may suppose that the Holy Spirit in Isa 63:7-64:11 is in no way different from the 'arm' (v12) or the 'cloud', there is a difference in the way they are personalised. Generally עֶזְבֵּל has the meaning of

163. Levison, (2016), 456.

164. Levison, (2016), 454.

165. Levison, (2016), 456.

166. Whybray, (1975), 258. Also Ma, (1999), 204, 208.

167. Dodson, Joseph R., *The 'Powers' of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans*. BZNW. 161. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 28. Lee, (2009), 37ff.

168. Dodson, (2008), 30. Dodson further distinguishes between 'casual', 'general', and 'representative' personification, each of which is stronger than the former. It is the 'Representative personification' which is of interest here, and how it differs from 'hypostatisation', 31-32.

169. Dodson, (2008), 32.

170. Dodson, (2008), 38.

171. Dodson, (2008), 39. This distinction is also made by Lee, (2009), 38, and Hurtado, (1998b), 36-37, 47. Both Lee and Hurtado, however, criticise of use of the concept 'hypostasis'.

'grieving', but the question is whether עֲצַב in the *piel* also has the meaning of 'grieving' or possibly has the more impersonal sense of 'frustrating'. The only other use of the *piel* of עֲצַב, except Isa 63:10, is in Ps 56:6 where it has the sense of 'frustrating'. This could also be the case in Isa 63:10, however, the context is completely different. However Ps 78:40, where עֲצַב occurs in the *hiphil* stem, has the same Exodus context as Isa 63:10 and likewise follows the same verb מָרָה (rebel. *qal* in Isaiah and *hiphil* in Ps 78:40). This would suggest that the meaning is similar in these two texts.¹⁷² In the LXX the עֲצַב in Isa 63:10 is translated with the παροξύνω which clearly is understood in emotional terms. It could be said this is merely an "anthropomorphism",¹⁷³ but Ma argues that Isa 63:10-14 (and 40:13) "show a slight hint to imply a separate being like an agent of God with some personal element."¹⁷⁴ But this formulation is too weak for the emotional aspect of רוּחַ makes the 'Spirit of God' different from his 'glorious arm' (Isa 63:12), and also the fact that the Holy Spirit is put to *dwell* in their midst as God's own presence (63:11) is more than a reference to God's individual mighty action. In v.14 the Spirit is also described as the one who gives the people rest and is central to the hopes of 63:11-14.¹⁷⁵ This is a level of personification that is not attributed to the 'arm' or the 'glory' and is pointing towards a hypostatisation,¹⁷⁶ though it would be too much to suggest that it anticipates the trinity.¹⁷⁷

John Goldingay argues that the Spirit is a way of expressing the presence of God in Israel, but also that it is wrong to imagine a 'hypostasis' or some personification that is in some sense 'separate' from God.¹⁷⁸ However, while the issue is not whether the Spirit is divine, the issue is also not whether the Spirit is 'separate' from God, but rather to what extent the Spirit can be said to be "distinct *within* God."¹⁷⁹

In his influential *Christology in the Making*, Dunn identified 'wisdom' and 'word' as 'intermediate beings' in Hellenistic Judaism, while in Palestinian Judaism this role was fulfilled by angels. In Rabbinic Judaism, in contrast, it was rather the 'name', the

172. Goldingay, (2014), 394-396. Neve disputes 'personalisation' and 'hypostatisation' and translates the word עֲצַב as 'resisting' rather than 'grieving'. Neve, (2011), 123-124.

173. Koole, (2001), 359.

174. Ma, (1999), 204, 208.

175. Levison, (2016), 454.

176. Muilenburg, (1956), 732, Routledge, (2008), 113, and Eichrodt, Walter, *Theology of the Old Testament*. Vol. 2. (London: SCM, 1961), 60. Which Goldingay denies. Goldingay, (2014), 396.

177. As argued by Fischer. Cited in Koole, (2001), 359.

178. Goldingay, (2014), 394-396.

179. Rowe, C. Kevin, "Luke and the Trinity: an Essay in Ecclesial Biblical Theology" *SJT* 56/1 (2003), 15n40.

Shekinah, and 'torah' that had this function.¹⁸⁰ Dunn also recognises that the Spirit is also an important category, though he deems it less influential than 'wisdom' and 'word'. He states that the Spirit in the OT "is simply the power of God"¹⁸¹ and thus "[t]o experience the Spirit of God is to experience God as Spirit."¹⁸² Dunn notes that it could be argued that the Spirit came to be understood as something like a hypostasis in later OT texts (such as Ps 104:30, Isa 63:10), though eventually decides against it. He argues rather that the Spirit just means the divine *I*,¹⁸³ or the "*effective power of God himself*."¹⁸⁴

In their work Pitts and Pollinger seek an antecedent for the divine identity of the Christian Messiah, and argued that mediating angels or exalted patriarchs are "too ontologically dissimilar to Yahweh" while the divine attributes - wisdom and the word - are "too ontologically similar to Yahweh" to serve as antecedents. Angels or other mediating agents do not share in the identity of YHWH or in the work of creation and redemption.¹⁸⁵ The 'word' or 'wisdom' are personalised divine attributes that share in the divine identity, though are not distinct from YHWH.¹⁸⁶ Pitts and Pollinger argue for what they call "functional Spirit-monotheism".¹⁸⁷ The Spirit shares in divine functions like creation¹⁸⁸ and redemption¹⁸⁹ and they write that the Spirit is a "quasi-distinct instantiation of the divine identity."¹⁹⁰ But although the Spirit participates in the exclusively divine functions of YHWH, the Spirit is not "undifferentiateable" from YHWH.¹⁹¹ For instance, in the song of Jdt 16:14 the Spirit is named as being sent from God and taking part in creation, while Wis 9:17 and Isa 48:16 also speak of the Holy Spirit/Spirit being sent from God.

These texts and Isa 63:7-64:11 do indicate some precedence for the Spirit being distinct *within* God, which is beyond an anthropomorphism such as the arm of

180. Dunn, (1980), 129.

181. Dunn, (1980), 133. Emphasis original.

182. Dunn, (1980), 133.

183. Dunn, (1980), 133-134, 136.

184. Dunn, (1980), 145. Emphasis original.

185. Pitts, Andrew W. and Seth Pollinger, "The Spirit in Second Temple Jewish Monotheism and the Origins of Early Christology," in *Christian Origins and Hellenistic Judaism: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*. Eds. Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 152.

186. Pitts and Pollinger, (2013), 153. See also Dunn, (1980), 176. While both Lee and Hurtado rightly criticise of use of the concept 'hypostasis' for 'word', 'wisdom', and 'name', they fail to discuss the 'Spirit'. Lee, (2009), 38, and Hurtado, (1998b), 36-37, 47.

187. Pitts and Pollinger, (2013), 135, 162, 176.

188. Dochhorn, (2011), 53-54.

189. Pitts and Pollinger, (2013), 153-154, 159.

190. Pitts and Pollinger, (2013), 153.

191. Pitts and Pollinger, (2013), 153, 159.

YHWH, but is not considered to be independent from YHWH. Blenkinsopp thus rightly argues that by the time of Isa 63:7-64:11, the Spirit has developed to mean "a kind of hypostasis" similar to the *פְּנִים*, the *מְלָאךְ* and the *memra'* of the Targum, and which contributed to the origins of the Christian understanding of the Holy Spirit.¹⁹² While it would be too much to describe the Spirit of God in the OT as a person, the Spirit - especially in Isa 63:7-64:11 - is more than simply a euphemism for the actions of God in the world. On the contrary, what has been argued here is that Mark's, and also later Christian, understanding of the Spirit was not utterly radical, but was based on a Jewish conception of the Spirit. But in contrast to Judaism, in early Christianity the Spirit had an "ungewöhnlich hohe Bedeutung"¹⁹³ and thus later received more analytical attention.

While the Spirit is the presence of God, Mark distinguishes the 'Spirit' from 'God'. For at the baptism the Spirit is not the voice; for while the Spirit has descended the voice still comes from heaven. The descended Spirit becomes an distinguishable actor in v.12 and drives Jesus into the desert. Witherington and Ice argue that the Spirit in Mark is a person and not simply a power or presence,¹⁹⁴ but they also point out that the language of 'person' has different connotations from 'hypostasis' or 'persona'. The Greek and Latin terms do not have the same connotation of separate self-consciousness, as does the English term.¹⁹⁵ Concerning the Spirit in early Christianity Dochhorn writes: "Seine Identität als Hypostase war relativ klar; der Geist ist von Haus aus eine Entität, die von Gott kommt und göttliches Handeln repräsentiert."¹⁹⁶ But this, Dochhorn notes, hardly amounts to personhood.¹⁹⁷ Though the Spirit in Mark cannot be said to be an independent being or a person in the modern sense of the word, the Spirit in Mark is at least a hypostasis and points towards personhood. As noted by C.K. Rowe the point is not that the Holy Spirit is "distinct *from* God", but rather "distinct *within* God."¹⁹⁸ In Mark the Spirit is not Jesus, the Spirit is not the heavenly voice, and nor is the Spirit the one whom Jesus calls 'abba Father' (14:36). While the Father is in heaven (11:25) the Spirit speaks, descends, and leads Jesus, and can also be blasphemed.

192. Blenkinsopp, (2003), 261.

193. Dochhorn, (2011), 53.

194. Witherington and Ice, (2002), 107.

195. Witherington and Ice, (2002), 101.

196. Dochhorn, (2011), 53.

197. Dochhorn, (2011), 62-63.

198. Rowe, (2003), 15n40.

(e) Conclusions

This chapter has argued that the allusion in the divine voice at the baptism is to the eschatological Spirit of Isa 42:1 as well as Isa 11:2 and 61:1 by extension. The Spirit which comes on Jesus anoints him, and is instrumental in Jesus' bringing present God's reign. The effects of this are healing and especially the expulsion of demons. To suppose that this is done in the power of God's enemy is to blaspheme God. Jesus is the 'stronger one' who binds the 'strong one' who is Satan.

This chapter has also discussed the presence of God in the 'cloud', the 'angel of his presence', and particularly the 'Spirit' in Isa 63:7-64:11. But there also appears to be a distinction between the Spirit on the one side and the 'cloud' and the 'angel of his presence' on the other. The 'Spirit' in Isa 63:7-64:11 is best understood as something more than an anthropomorphism, and hypostasis is probably the most suitable word to describe the Spirit's identity *vis-a-vis* God, for the Spirit is distinct, not from God, but *within* God.

In Mark the Spirit is differentiated from God and is not simply another word for God, and is yet in no sense less than God. The Spirit has independent actions and personal qualities that merit the word 'hypostasis', and also points towards personhood.

Chapter 6

Towards a Trinitarian Conception of God?

This final concluding chapter will try to unite the varied yet interconnected themes of the previous chapters together into a unified whole. The central concern is the revelation of God's triune identity through his actions and relations. The prologue of Mark's Gospel (1:1-15), which has the Gospel's highest concentration of references to 'God', functions to orient the reader and provides key information concerning the identity of both God and Jesus. The key for understanding both the book and the person of Jesus is in relation to the opening citation about the promise of the good news of the coming of YHWH which is taking place in Jesus the Spirit-anointed beloved Son of God, which is linked with Jesus' preaching of the presence of the kingdom of God. In Mark the coming of YHWH is by means of both Jesus - who is God's Messiah and Son - as well as God's Spirit through whom Jesus does his work. This constitutes the 'good news' of the arrival of God's kingdom, which results in the defeat of Satan and the tearing of the temple veil. The opening of heaven prepares for a heaven/earth interaction and the revelation of heavenly secrets, namely the revelation of God. This is both in the objective and the subjective sense, in the same way that the 'good news' is both by and about God (1:14). Here the true nature of God as Father, Son and Spirit is revealed.¹

Jesus is the Spirit-anointed Messiah and likely also Servant, as indicated by the allusions of the divine voice in 1:10 to Ps 2 and Isa 42. But the identification as the beloved Son of God needs a thicker description than simply being a synonym for Messiah, for the term has relational connotations especially because Jesus responds with *abba* in his communication with God and because by calling Jesus 'Son' God identified himself as the Father of Jesus. The opening citation, as well as other texts as seen above, indicate Jesus' inclusion within the divine identity as Lord YHWH, as well as his preexistence. Jesus also has the audacity to utter ἐγώ εἰμι at the moment of divine epiphany and is accused of blasphemy and thus of usurping the prerogative of God by forgiving sins.

1. Contra Unnik, (1964), 273.

The presence of the Spirit is prominent in the prologue and is critical for understanding the identity and ministry of Jesus as the one anointed, led, and who will baptise with the Spirit. But the Spirit is more than simply the presence or power of God, but appears to be an independent hypostasis *within* God, even pointing towards personhood. However, the Spirit is not less than the presence of God, which is a significant theme both at the transfiguration with the presence of the cloud and at the cross with the opening the temple veil.

In broad terms Mark has written a *bios* of Jesus, but the book stands in the tradition of OT historiography where God is always the critical factor, even when unnamed. Mark's book about Jesus is simultaneously about God acting in the world. Mark stresses this link when he opted to begin the book with an Isaianic citation concerning the coming the YHWH and by identifying Jesus as Messiah, Servant, and Son of Man. The story of Jesus, God's Spirit-anointed Son, is the climax of redemptive history within which God acts.

(a) *Is Mark Trinitarian?*

Nils A. Dahl in his now famous article on God as a neglected factor in New Testament research noted that scholars have paid "astonishingly little attention... to the emergence of 'trinitarian' formulations."² Trinitarian explorations are still minority endeavours and not infrequently suspected by being somewhat anachronistic. Dahl considers it strange, and an unhappy neglect, that "New Testament scholars have, by and large, left it to historians of Christian doctrine and theologians to discuss the relationship between the dogma and the New Testament data that were discussed in the later trinitarian and christological controversies."³ While this thesis is not a complete analysis of this kind, it argues that Mark's affirmations exert pressure towards trinitarian doctrine.

Part of the reason for this neglect may be an impression, as with Donahue over three decades ago, that there may be "nothing distinctively new or Christian" in Mark's view of God.⁴ The tide may be turning as new publications on the trinity in various New Testament books have appeared.⁵ There is also greater recognition that the

2. Dahl, (1991a), 155.

3. Dahl, (1991b), 166. Cf. 179. Also Watson, (1999), 168.

4. Donahue, (1982), 566.

5. E.g. Hill, (2015). Köstenberger, Andreas J. and Scott R. Swain, *Father, Son and Spirit: The Trinity and John's Gospel*. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2008).

evangelists are theologians in their own right and do have something to contribute concerning the questions of 'who' God is. Wendy North and Loren T. Stuckenbruck have rightly suggested that it is exactly with regard to *theology* "where the dynamic of New Testament thought may be fruitfully explored."⁶

It was argued above that God makes himself known through his actions and relations, and particularly in Jesus, his Son. Thus one cannot begin with supposing that God is a known entity, and that one only needs to figure out where to place Jesus in relation to God. On the contrary it was argued that one needs to start with Jesus as the one who reveals God.⁷ YHWH is not only - yet also still - the God of the patriarchs, but is also the Father of Jesus who as the divine Son is included within the divine identity. It is not enough simply to look at what Jesus does, or even the all-important question of his relation to God,⁸ but one must also proceed further to ask what this relationship does to the understanding of who God is. Jesus is not only revealed to be God's beloved son, but God reveals himself as the loving Father of Jesus.⁹ For as stated by Yeago: "When YHWH and Jesus are identified as Father and Son, then their mutual relationship is inscribed constitutively into the identity of each."¹⁰ For Mark this does not constitute a change within the very being of God, but is rather a revelation of God's true relational identity, for if Jesus is indeed conceived of as preexistent, then the revelation of God is a revelation of who God has always been.¹¹

This thesis has argued that Mark's baptism episode is trinitarian, a view not often championed by the commentaries or other specialised studies on the pericope.¹² Even A.W. Wainwright's book on the Trinity in the NT refrains from calling the baptism episode 'trinitarian', stating: "This is not Trinitarianism, for nothing is said about the divinity of the Son and Spirit, and there is no question of interaction between Father and Spirit or even between Son and Spirit. But the event itself is one which has a threefold pattern. It is not just a formula but an important story in which the triad is

6. North, Wendy and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Introduction," in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. Eds. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 2.

7. Originally published Wright, (1988). Cited 4 Sep 2017. No Pages. Online: ntwrightpage.com/2016/07/12/jesus-and-the-identity-of-god/ North and Stuckenbruck, (2004), 2. Hill, (2015), 3ff.

8. See Cook, (1997), 78. Bauckham, (2008b), 31.

9. Feldmeier, (2010), 210. See also Fitzmyer, (1995), 567.

10. Yeago, (1994), 156.

11. See e.g. Hill for Paul. Hill, (2015), 64, and Yeago, (1994), 156.

12. A. Feuillet in his article says this episode is indisputably trinitarian. Feuillet, (1959), 482. Also Dewey and Malbon, (2009), 312-313.

prominent."¹³ However, on the one hand he expects too much from the text, rather than reading it on its own terms. The divinity of the Son is established elsewhere in Mark and is presupposed in the baptismal text. Furthermore, there is indeed interaction between the Father and the Son, and the Son and the Spirit in a narrative trinitarian sense as Father, Son, and Spirit, act within this narrative. Thus while Mark is not trinitarian as later defined at Nicaea, it can be described as proto-trinitarian or narrative trinitarian.¹⁴

Mark does provide trinitarian insights. The Father is the source or principle, in that the Father is Father of the Son, and sends and speaks about the Son. The Spirit descend from heaven, which means from God. There is also reciprocity between the Son and the Spirit, in that the Spirit sends the Son (1:12) and the Son baptises in the Spirit (1:8). While it is Jesus the Son who proclaims the good news of the present rule of God, its power is demonstrated by the Spirit (3:20-30). But while there is a very close alignment between God and Jesus, even sharing the divine name there is a clear distinction between them, and the Son is at least at present subordinate to the Father, in that the Son does not know the appointed hour (13:32).¹⁵

In Chapter 2 it was argued that Jewish monotheism was both exclusive and foundational for Mark's view of who God is. It should also be noted that the insistence on the oneness of God is, in fact, prerequisite for trinitarian doctrine.¹⁶ Seitz rightly argues that the stress on monotheism was necessary for the development of the doctrine of the trinity, because Jesus was not simply declared *a god*, but *that God*.¹⁷ It is thus the insistence on the *Shema* that precludes tritheism, and thus necessitated the coinage of a new word to express the paradox. In Mark's Gospel the *Shema* is affirmed, while simultaneously Jesus is identified with YHWH and the Spirit is distinct *within* God. Thus while monotheism is not 'abandoned' it is 'redefined'¹⁸ to include Jesus and the Spirit as independent within the identity of the one God. Noting both the importance of monotheism for Mark and the exalted

13. Wainwright, (1962), 251.

14. It is worth noting the links between baptism and trinitarian confessions, with Matt 28:19 being a clear example. The earliest trinitarian creeds, both declarative and interrogative, are also trinitarian in nature and were from a very early stage associated with baptism. Dahl, (1991b), 171-172.

15. See also Boring, (1999), 452-3, 456-458.

16. Rowe, C. Kavin, "Biblical Pressure and Trinitarian Hermeneutics" *Pro Ecclesia* 11/3 (2002a), 299, 301. Miller, Patrick D., "Editorial: A Strange Kind of Monotheism" *ThTo* 54/3 (1997), 294. Seitz, Christopher, "The Trinity in the Old Testament," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Eds. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 31.

17. Seitz, (2011), 31.

18. Dunn's terminology. Dunn, James D.G., "Was Christianity a Monotheistic Faith from the Beginning?" *SJT* 35/4 (1982), 336.

position of Jesus, J. Gnilka points out that here "[w]ir stehen an den Anfängen eines christologisch-theologischen Reflexionsprozesses":¹⁹ meaning 'theological' in the narrow sense. In Mark reflection on God cannot be done without including Jesus and the Spirit.

(b) Narrative Trinity

This thesis has argued for the critical importance of narrative as the vehicle of Mark's theology and Christology. Mark has not written a treatise on the triune God, nor is God presented with abstract reasoning concerning God within himself. Rather Mark presents the story of Jesus who inaugurates the kingdom of the one God of Israel by the Holy Spirit and in this way reveals who God is.²⁰ God's narrative is imbedded within the narrative of Jesus, and *vice versa*. Mark's theology is narrative-trinitarian and proto-trinitarian, and in theological terms what can be seen in Mark is the economic, rather than the immanent trinity.²¹ Although there are no discussions on metaphysics, ontology, or substance, Mark's theology is nonetheless trinitarian, for merely different categories are in use. God is known in his actions and relations, and in Mark God the Father of Jesus sends and speaks to Jesus, the Spirit descends, and leads and empowers Jesus, and Jesus acts in the Spirit and addresses God as his Father with the word *abba*.

Mark is a narrative and narrative has the positive ability to hold paradoxical notions together. As pointed out by Boring, in Mark there is tension between Jesus' divinity/humanity, eschatology/history, presence/absence, pre-Easter/post-Easter, all of which contribute to Mark's Christology. These are held together in and by the narrative, for as Boring states, "Jesus' 'divinity' and 'humanity' cannot be treated *seriatim*."²² A prime example is the centurion at the cross who witnesses the suffering and death of Jesus and yet confesses him as the Son of God. Though Mark does not write in terms of two natures, this "could be taken as a proleptic Chalcedon *in nuce*".²³ Narrative allows simultaneous paradoxical affirmations to be held in tandem.²⁴

19. Gnilka, (1992), 151-154.

20. See also Boring, (1984), 128.

21. Early trinitarian theology was soteriologically rather than philosophically driven. Hille, Rolf, "Gottes Dreieinigkeit - Reichtum und Tiefe der Erkenntnis Gottes," in *Wer ist Gott? Unser Glaube an den Vater, den Sohn und den Heiligen Geist*. Ed. Rolf Hille (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 2007), 27-29, 36.

22. Boring, (1984), 140.

23. Boring, (1984), 136. M. Hengel also wrote, "with regard to the development of all the early Church's christology... more happened in the first twenty years than in the entire later, centuries-long development of dogma." Hengel, (1995), 383. See also 389.

Mark's narrative holds together seemingly paradoxical elements: Jesus is included within YHWH's identity and the Spirit is distinct *within* God, yet Mark wholeheartedly affirms the *Shema*. These cannot be 'treated seriatim'. But Mark's Gospel is no stranger to paradox. For instance, Mark is a book of secret epiphanies, and Jesus teaches in parables simultaneously to both hide and reveal (4:10-12), one finds salvation by losing one's life (8:34-39), and authority and power is found in weakness (10:42-44). Also paradoxical is the question of who is responsible for Jesus' death, whether man or God, and possibly also the ending in 16:8.²⁵ Laura Sweat in her work on the theological role of paradox in Mark, while not discussing the trinity, is right in stressing that in Mark paradoxes do not need to be resolved, but "[i]nstead, both elements that create the paradox are necessary in order to recognize the truth to which they point"²⁶ and that "[t]he *recognition* of a paradox, not its *resolution*, is significant for Mark."²⁷ This is precisely what was stressed above and as Boring writes: "[t]he narrative form may be chosen intentionally in order to make affirmations that pose difficulties for logic."²⁸ Thus the double paradox of Jesus' humanity and his identification with YHWH and the oneness of YHWH are not only the essential building blocks of trinitarian doctrine, but notions that taken to their logical conclusion, necessarily lead to a trinitarian theology. For "[n]arrative allows paradox without synthesis, Chalcedonian theology without discursive language."²⁹ We may add that it allows for trinitarian theology without discussion of *substantia*, *ousia*, *persona*, and *hypostasis*. Narrative is no less theological than any other form of discourse.

This is also relevant for the relation between God, Jesus, and the Spirit in Mark. Mark affirms the *Shema*, yet Jesus is included within the identity of YHWH, and the Spirit is separate *within* God. It is precisely this, as also argued by N.T. Wright, "which the early Fathers then struggled to recapture in the very different categories of hellenistic philosophy."³⁰ There is no gradual ascent from a 'low' Jewish theology, to a high view influenced by Greek philosophy. N.T. Wright rightly states that the

24. Boring, (1984), 138. Cf. 140-142.

25. E.g. see also Sweat, Laura C., *The Theological Role of Paradox in the Gospel of Mark: Profiles from the History of Interpretation*. LNTS. 492. (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 179, 181.

26. Sweat, (2015), 177. Emphasis original. Cf. 179-180.

27. Sweat, (2015), 180. Emphasis original.

28. Boring, (1999), 462.

29. Boring, (1984), 138.

30. Wright, N.T., *Paul and the Faithfulness of God: Book II. Parts III and IV*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. 4. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013), 710.

NT writers "offer an incipient trinitarian theology without needing to use any of the technical terms that later centuries would adopt for the same purpose."³¹

The inclusion of Jesus as *kyrios* and the independent hypostasis of the Spirit *within* God, and the simultaneous affirmation of the oneness of God exerts "exegetical pressure" to which the trinitarian doctrine is "a response".³² C.K. Rowe similarly states that "the trinitarian understanding of God is a response to the pressure exerted by the biblical text itself"³³ and calls trinitarian doctrine an "exegetical necessity".³⁴ Trinitarian doctrine is thus a faithful reflection of the witness of the text and translates the textual pressures into Greek categories. As Yeago rightly argues concerning the word *homoousion*: it "is neither imposed *on* the New Testament texts, nor distantly deduced *from* the texts, but rather describes a pattern of judgements present *in* the texts, in the texture of scriptural discourse concerning Jesus and the God of Israel."³⁵ The same could be said about the Trinity in Mark, which is achieved by including Jesus within the identity of YHWH, by applying scriptural texts referring to YHWH to Jesus and by using the strongest relational language available: Father and Son. The trinity is not 'imposed' or 'distantly deduced', but is present already in the narrative, though not presented formally. For there is a difference between a theology and the language in which this theology is expressed.³⁶

(c) *Can the Word Trinity be Used?*

If one poses the question whether the New Testament is trinitarian, the answer hinges partly on what is meant by the term. Naturally if the question is trinitarian doctrine as it developed in the third and fourth centuries, then the answer is a definitive 'no', or 'inconceivable' as J. Frey puts it.³⁷ Few would be so unequivocal as B.B. Warfield in his famous article on the 'Trinity' in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, who stated that the New Testament "is Trinitarian to the core; all its

31. Originally published Wright, (1988). Cited 4 Sep 2017. No Pages. Online: ntwrightpage.com/2016/07/12/jesus-and-the-identity-of-god/. See also Wright, (2013), 710.

32. Holmes, Stephen R., *The Holy Trinity: Understanding God's Life*. (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2012), 53. See also Edwards, Mark, "Exegesis and the Early Christian Doctrine of the Trinity," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Eds. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 80. Childs, (1992), 375. Cf. 368. Bates, (2015), 203. Miller, (1997), 294.

33. Rowe, (2003), 23.

34. Rowe, (2003), 5.

35. Yeago, (1994), 153. Emphases original.

36. Yeago, (1994), 159.

37. Frey, Jörg, "How Did the Spirit Become a Person?," in *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Eds. Jörg Frey and John R. Levison (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014), 370.

teaching is built on the assumption of the Trinity" and "[t]he doctrine of the Trinity does not appear in the New Testament in the making, but as already made."³⁸ It is safe to say most NT scholars agree there is no developed doctrine of the Trinity in the NT. However, many acknowledge to a greater or lesser extent the presence of a proto-trinitarian structure.

While others call it differently, the sentiment is the same. For instance, K.-L. Schmidt freely conceded that there is no formal trinitarian doctrine in the NT³⁹ but goes on to note the doctrine's triadic roots in the NT.⁴⁰ Volker H. Drecoll refers to "Grundstrukturen" in the NT that prepare for later trinitarian dogma,⁴¹ while Jan Dochhorn refers to "Dreierkonstellation".⁴² Dahl states that the NT texts "reflect an underlying trinitarian pattern."⁴³ Peter C. Phan points to its presence in the NT in 'embryonic' form,⁴⁴ while Witherington and Ice refer to the "raw data".⁴⁵ N.T. Wright speaks of "incipient trinitarian theology"⁴⁶ and Michael Bird states the NT "gives us the ingredients for a Trinitarian theology"⁴⁷ and starts the "trajectory towards the Trinity".⁴⁸ A.W. Wainwright in his book on the Trinity in the NT clearly concedes that there is no developed trinitarian doctrine in the NT, but argues that texts have a trinitarian or triadic formula.⁴⁹ Many would concur with Hahn's assessment that "[s]tatt von einer Trinitätslehre ist von einer impliziten trinitarischen Struktur der neutestamentlichen Texte zu sprechen."⁵⁰

What this shows is that while it is common to accept a triadic structure in the NT, there are few who would claim the NT is Trinitarian as defined by later theologians.

38. Warfield, Benjamin B., "Trinity," in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*. Ed. James Orr (Chicago: The Howard-Severance Company, 1915), 3014-3015.

39. Schmidt, Karl-Ludwig, "Le Dieu trinitaire, sujet et objet de la foi," in *Le Problème du Christianisme primitif: quatre conférences sur la forme et la pensée du Nouveau Testament*. Ed. Karl-Ludwig Schmidt (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1938), 61.

40. Schmidt, (1938), 74-75.

41. Drecoll, Volker Henning, "Einführung in das Thema," in *Trinität*. Ed. Volker Henning Drecoll (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 3.

42. Dochhorn, (2011), 64.

43. Dahl, (1991b), 165, 178.

44. Phan, Peter C., "Developments of the doctrine of the Trinity," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Trinity*. Ed. Peter C. Phan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 3. E.g. also Moule, (1978), 24, 50.

45. Witherington and Ice, (2002), xi.

46. Originally published Wright, (1988). Cited 4 Sep 2017. No Pages. Online: ntwrightpage.com/2016/07/12/jesus-and-the-identity-of-god/

47. Bird, Michael F., "The Biblical Foundations of the Trinity: Evaluating the Trinitarian Exegesis of Stephen R. Holmes," in *The Holy Trinity Revisited: Essays in Response to Stephen R. Holmes*. Eds. Thomas A. Noble and Jason S. Sexton (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2015), 116.

48. Bird, (2015), 116.

49. Wainwright, (1962), 237-247.

50. Hahn, Ferdinand, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments: Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments. Thematische Darstellung*. Vol. 2. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 289.

Part of the issue, as Dahl notes, is that the trinitarian pattern can be interpreted minimally or maximally.⁵¹ Returning to Mark specifically,⁵² this thesis may be seen to be more on the maximalist side. However, it is not sufficient simply to note that the 'ingredients' and 'raw data' are present if one neglects the internal pressure of the text towards a trinitarian understanding. If one lets the text, in the present case Mark, speak for itself, and define its own trinitarianism, then the critical drivers for a trinitarian doctrine are present. While the text insists on the *Shema*, it also relates the narrative of God the Father, Jesus the Messiah the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit. The components are there and the text holds them together even if they may seem paradoxical.

The textual pressures eventually resulted in new terminology, which are attempts to capture in one word the complex understanding of the nature of God. It is worth noting that the terms 'monotheism' and 'trinity' are foreign to both the NT and OT.⁵³ This is also rightly stressed by W. Moberly, who, discussing the term 'monotheism', writes "[w]hat matters is less whether the category is biblical or post-biblical than whether it (negatively) does not force the biblical content into inappropriate moulds but (positively) enables penetrating grasp of the nature and content of the biblical text".⁵⁴ This is precisely where trinitarian language is helpful, rather than triadic or something else, for the term is created in response to the pressure of the New Testament texts themselves; even if mostly from John's Gospel. As F. Watson notes concerning the wider NT: "The doctrine of the Trinity attempts to uncover the underlying logic of the New Testament's pervasively triadic God-language."⁵⁵

While Mark or the rest of the NT has none of the technical language of 'substance' or 'nature' the theological pressures from the text "compelled the later theologians to engage in that kind of discussion"⁵⁶ and they did "their best to express the same ideas

51. Dahl, (1991b), 166.

52. It is sometimes supposed that since Mark is the earliest of the Gospels it is the least theological and thus unlikely to be trinitarian. But this forgets the trinitarianism of Paul who writes prior to Mark. See Hill, (2015). Eckstein writes on the basis of 1 Cor 8:6 that the origin trinitarian thought is evident "at least" (zumindest) in the 40s of the first century. Eckstein, (2005), 36.

53. Mauser, (1998), 99.

54. Moberly, (2004), 218.

55. Watson, (1999), 169. K. Rowe in the context of Paul and Hebrews refers to the trinitarian 'theological logic' and to the 'internal logic' that is not articulated but presupposed. Respectively in Rowe, C. Kevin, "The Trinity in the Letters of St Paul and Hebrews," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Eds. Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 42, 48, and in Rowe, (2002a), 296. For example he argues that Romans 5:1-8 "requires a Trinitarian grammar for its intelligibility." Rowe, (2011), 51.

56. Wright, (2013), 721. 709-710.

in the language of Greek philosophy."⁵⁷ The shift is from the question of 'who God is' to 'what God is'; from God's identity to God's nature.⁵⁸ Later trinitarian doctrine is an attempt to respond to the pressure of the text, as well as contemporaneous philosophical concerns, and articulate in analytical and logical language what is already present in the text. The ontological questions are "pressed" from the text because of the insistence on the oneness of God, Jesus' inclusion within the divine identity, yet also his humanity.⁵⁹

This is neglected by John Goldingay when he argues that "the doctrine of the Trinity seriously skews our theological reading of Scripture."⁶⁰ Naturally later trinitarian language is foreign, but has arisen from an engagement with these texts. W. Moberly acknowledges the danger of importing later doctrinal categories or dogma that distorts the reading of a text, but at the same time later theology "may contain precisely or substantially the same dynamic that is present in the biblical text".⁶¹ Since trinitarian doctrine arises from engagement with Scripture, it may well assist in the further reading of Scripture, and thus a reciprocal relationship between theology and exegesis may well be the best hermeneutic.⁶²

A trinitarian understanding of Mark is not an imposition on the text from foreign irrelevant concerns or categories, but rather the text itself exerts pressure in this direction, with the insistence on the oneness of God, while at the same time Jesus the Son of God is included within the identity of YHWH who is his Father, while the Spirit is separate within, but not from, YHWH.

57. Wright, (2013), 721. C. Braaten argues that the appropriation of metaphysical language happened when the meaning of the gospel was translated into a new context. Braaten, Carl E., "The Significance of New Testament Christology for Systematic Theology," in *Who Do You Say that I am? Essays on Christology*. Eds. Mark Allen Powell and David R. Bauer (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999), 220.

58. Bauckham, (2008b), 58. Andrew Louth notes the difference between 'nature' and 'person' in the context of the Chalcedon, stating: "Person is contrasted to nature: it is concerned with the way we are (mode, or *tropos*), not what we are". Cited in Köstenberger and Swain, (2008), 112n4. Originally in Louth, Andrew, *Maximus the Confessor: The Early Church Fathers*. (Abingdon: Routledge, 1996), 59.

59. Rowe, (2002a), 307. Also France, R.T., "The Worship of Jesus: A Neglected Factor in Christological Debate," in *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*. Ed. Harold H. Rowdon (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1982), 33.

60. Goldingay, John, "Biblical Narrative and Systematic Theology," in *Between Two Horizons*. Eds. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 131.

61. Moberly, (1992), 125.

62. Hill, (2015), 171. Edwards, (2011), 81.

Bibliography

Achtemeier, Elizabeth. *The Community and Message of Isaiah 56-66: A Theological Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1982.

Adams, Edward, "The Coming of the Son of Man in Mark's Gospel." *TynBul* 56.2 (2005): 39-61.

———, "Graeco-Roman and Ancient Jewish Cosmology." Pages 5–27 in *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*. Edited by Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Adams, Sean A., "Greek Education and Composite Citations of Homer." Pages 17–34 in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. LNTS 525. Vol. 1. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Adams, Sean A. and Seth M. Ehorn, "What is a Composite Citation? An Introduction." Pages 1–16 in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. LNTS 525. Vol. 1. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Aejmelaesus, Anneli, "Der Prophet als Klageliedsänger: Zur Funktion des Psalm Jer 63,7-64.11 in Tritojesaja." *ZAW* 107 (1995): 31-50.

Aland, B. et al., eds. *The Greek New Testament: Fourth Revised Edition*. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies/Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001.

Alexander, Loveday. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Alexander, Philip S., "Targum, Targumim." Pages 320–330 in *ABD*. Vol. 6. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Allen, Garrick V., "Composite Citations in Jewish Pseudepigraphic Works: Re-Presenting Legal Traditions in the Second Temple Period." Pages 140–157 in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. LNTS 525. Vol. 1. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Allen, Leslie C. *Ezekiel 1-19*. WBC. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1994.

Allison, Dale C. *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.

Anderson, Hugh, "The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel." Pages 280–306 in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring*. Edited by James M. Efird. Durham: Duke University Press, 1972.

———. *The Gospel of Mark*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1976.

Aune, David E., "The Problem of the Messianic Secret." *NovT* 11 (1969): 1-31.

———. *The New Testament in its Literary Environment*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987.

———. *Revelation 1-5*. WBC. Dallas: Word Books, 1997.

Baer, David A., "'It's all About Us!' Nationalistic Exegesis in the Greek Isaiah (Chapters 1-12)." Pages 29–47 in *'As Those Who are Taught': The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Barr, James, "'Abba isn't 'Daddy'." *JTS* 39/1 (1988): 28-47.

Barrett, C.K. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1966.

Barth, Karl. *The Epistle to the Romans*. 6th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

Bates, Matthew W. *The Hermeneutics of the Apostolic Proclamation: The Center of Paul's Method of Scriptural Interpretation*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012.

———. *The Birth of the Trinity: Jesus, God, and Spirit in New Testament & Early Christian Interpretations of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Bauckham, Richard, "For Whom Were the Gospels Written?" Pages 9–48 in *The Gospel for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

———, "Biblical Theology and the Problems of Monotheism." Pages 60–106 in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008a.

———, "God Crucified." Pages 1–59 in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008b.

———, "God's Self-Identification with the Godforsaken in the Gospel of Mark." Pages 254–268 in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on*

- the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008c.
- , "Introduction." Pages ix–xii in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008d.
- , "Paul's Christology of Divine Identity." Pages 182–232 in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008e.
- , "The 'Most High' God and the Nature of Early Jewish Monotheism." Pages 107–126 in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008f.
- , "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus." Pages 152–181 in *Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008g.
- , "Christology." Pages 125–134 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. 2nd edition. Edited by Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown and Nicholas Perrin. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2013.
- , "Devotion to Jesus Christ in Earliest Christianity: An Appraisal and Discussion of the Work of Larry Hurtado." Pages 176–200 in *Mark, Manuscripts, and Monotheism: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado*. LNTS 528. Edited by Chris Keith and Dieter T. Roth. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R. *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Becker, Eve-Marie, "Mk 1:1 and the Debate of a 'Markan Prologue'." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 22 (2009): 91-106.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Jesus of Nazareth*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
- Bennett, W.H. *The Life of Christ According to St. Mark*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907.
- Best, Ernest. *The Temptation and the Passion: The Marcan Soteriology*. SNTSMS. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Betz, Otto, "Jesus' Gospel of the Kingdom." Pages 53–74 in *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Edited by Peter Stuhlmacher. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Beuken, W.A.M. *Jesaja: deel III B*. Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1989.

Bilezikian, Gilbert G. *The Liberated Gospel: A Comparison of the Gospel of Mark and Greek Tragedy*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977.

Bird, Michael F., "Tearing the Heavens and Shaking the Heavens: Mark's Cosmology in its Apocalyptic Context." Pages 45–59 in *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*. Edited by Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

———, "The Biblical Foundations of the Trinity: Evaluating the Trinitarian Exegesis of Stephen R. Holmes." Pages 110–119 in *The Holy Trinity Revisited: Essays in Response to Stephen R. Holmes*. Edited by Thomas A. Noble and Jason S. Sexton. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2015.

Black, C. Clifton, "The Face is Familiar - I Just Can't Place it." Pages 33–49 in *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God: Essays in Memory of Donald Harrisville Juel*. Edited by Beverly R. Gaventa and Patrick M. Miller. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2005.

Black, M. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. PVTG. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Black, Matthew, "The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the 'Son of Man'." Pages 57–71 in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity, Essays in Honor of William David Davies*. Edited by Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Isaiah 40-55*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 2000.

———. *Isaiah 56-66*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

———. *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

———. *David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel: 1-24*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Blount, Brian K., "Is the Joke on Us? Mark's Irony, Mark's God, and Mark's Ending." Pages 15–32 in *The Ending of Mark and the Ends of God: Essays in Memory of Donald Harrisville Juel*. Edited by Beverly R. Gaventa and Patrick M. Miller. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2005.

Bock, Darrell L. *Blasphemy and Exaltation in Judaism and the Final Examination of Jesus*. WUNT. 106. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

———, "The Use of Daniel 7 in Jesus' Trial, with Implications for His Self-Understanding." Pages 78–100 in *'Who is this Son of Man?': The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Larry W. Hurtado and Paul L. Owen. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

- Bockmuehl, Markus. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT2. 36. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990.
- Boring, M. Eugene, "The Christology of Mark: Hermeneutical Issues for Systematic Theology." *Semeia* 30 (1984): 125-154.
- , "The Kingdom of God in Mark." Pages 131–145 in *The Kingdom of God in 20th Century Interpretation*. Edited by Wendell Willis. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987.
- , "Mark 1:1-15 and the Beginning of the Gospel." *Semeia* 52 (1991): 44-83.
- , "Markan Christology: God-Language for Jesus?" *NTS* 45/4 (1999): 451-471.
- . *Mark: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2006.
- Botner, Max, "How Do the Seeds Land? A Note on εἰς αὐτοὺς in Mark 1:10." *JTS* 66/2 (2015): 547-552.
- Bourquin, Yvan, "Le «Soleil Noir», ou l'oxymore implicite dans l'évangile selon Marc." Pages 92–104 in *Raconter, interpréter, annoncer: Parcours de Nouveau Testament: mélanges offerts à Daniel Marguerat pour son 60ème anniversaire*. Edited by Emmanuelle Steffek and Yvan Bourquin. Genève: Labor et Fides, 2003.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.
- Bowman, John. *The Gospel of Mark: The New Christian Jewish Passover Haggadah*. Studia post-Biblica; v.8. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Braaten, Carl E., "The Significance of New Testament Christology for Systematic Theology." Pages 216–227 in *Who Do You Say that I am? Essays on Christology*. Edited by Mark Allen Powell and David R. Bauer. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Branscomb, Bennett Harvie. *The Gospel of Mark*. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.
- Breytenbach, Cilliers, "Grundzüge Markinischer Gottessohn-Christologie." Pages 169–184 in *Anfänge der Christologie: Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and Henning Paulsen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Briggs, Charles A., "The Use of רוח in the Old Testament." *JBL* 19/2 (1900): 132-145.

Brooke, George J., "Isaiah in the Pesharim and Other Qumran Texts." Pages 609–632 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———, "On Isaiah at Qumran." Pages 69–85 in *'As Those Who are Taught': The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 2. New York: Doubleday, 1994.

Bruce, F.F., "The Oldest Greek Versions of Daniel." *OTS* 20 (1977): 22-40.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Isaiah 40-66*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1998.

Bryan, Christopher. *A Preface to Mark: Notes on the Gospel in Its Literary and Cultural Settings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. London: SCM, 1952.

———. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.

Bundy, Walter E., "The Meaning of Jesus' Baptism." *JR* 7/1 (1927): 56-71.

Burridge, Richard A. *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Buse, Ivor, "The Markan Account of the Baptism of Jesus and Isaiah LXIII." *JTS* 7/1 (1956): 74-75.

Busink, Theodor A. *Der Tempel von Jerusalem: Von Ezechiel bis Middelton*. Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1980.

Michael Cahill, ed. *The First Commentary on Mark: An Annotated Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Camery-Hoggart, Jerry. *Irony in Mark's Gospel: Text and Subtext*. SNTSMS. 72. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Campbell, Constantine R. *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.

Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation*. WUNT. 38. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.

Cassuto, U. *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1967.

Chadwick, Henry. *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Charles, R.H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel: with Introduction, Indexes and a New English Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.

Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.

———, “Baruch, Book of 2 (Syriac).” Pages 620–622 in *ABD*. Vol. 1. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

———, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus.” Pages 1–74 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Chester, Andrew, “High Christology - Whence, When and Why?” *Early Christianity* 2/1 (2011): 22-50.

Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology in Crisis*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.

———. *Exodus: A Commentary*. OTL. London: SCM, 1974.

———. *The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction*. London: SCM, 1984.

———. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflections on the Christian Bible*. London: SCM, 1992.

Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001.

Chilton, Bruce D., “Regnum Dei Deus Est.” *SJT* 31/3 (1978): 261-270.

———. *God in Strength: Jesus’ Announcement of the Kingdom*. Studien zum Neuen Testament und Seiner Umwelt. Freistadt: Plöchl, 1979.

———. *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.

———. *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus’ Own Interpretation of Isaiah*. London: SPCK, 1984.

———. *Pure Kingdom: Jesus’ Vision of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

———, “Two in One: Renderings of the Book of Isaiah in Targum Jonathan.” Pages 547–562 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Chronis, Harry L., “The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37-39.” *SBL* 101/1 (1982): 97-114.

Clifford, Richard J., "Narrative and Lament in Isaiah 63:7-64:11." Pages 93–102 in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* Edited by Maurya P. Horgan and Paul J. Kobelski. New York: Crossroad, 1989.

Collins, Adela Yarbro, "Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism." *Semeia* 36 (1986): 2-13.

———, "The Influence of Daniel on the New Testament." Pages 90–123 in *Daniel: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Edited by John J. Collins. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993a.

———, "Mark and His Readers: The Son of God among Jews." *The Harvard Theological Review* 92/4 (1999): 393-408.

———, "Messianic Secret and the Gospel of Mark: Secrecy in Jewish Apocalypticism, the Hellenistic Mystery Religions, and Magic." Pages 11–30 in *Rending the Veil: Concealment and Secrecy in the History of Religions*. Edited by Elliot R. Wolfson. New York: Seven Bridges, 1999.

———, "Mark and His Readers: The Son of God among Greeks and Romans." *The Harvard Theological Review* 93/2 (2000): 85-100.

———, "The Charge of Blasphemy in Mark 14:64." Pages 149–170 in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. CBET. 45. Edited by Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

———. *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Collins, Adela Yarbro and John J. Collins. *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1989.

———. *Daniel: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993b.

———. *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Colwell, E.C., "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament." *JBL* 52.1 (1933): 12-21.

Cook, Michael L. *Christology as Narrative Quest*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997.

Cooke, G.A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936.

Cooke, Gerald, "The Israelite King as Son of God." *ZAW* 73/2 (1961): 202-225.

Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1-50*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.

- Cranfield, C.E.B., "The Baptism of Our Lord - A Study of St. Mark 1.9-11." *SJT* 8/1 (1955): 53-63.
- . *Gospel According to Saint Mark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1959.
- D'Angelo, Mary Rose, "Abba and 'Father': Imperial Theology and the Jesus Tradition." *JBL* 111/4 (1992): 611-630.
- Dahl, Nils A., "The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology." *Reflections* 75 (1975): 5-8.
- , "The One God of Jew and Gentiles (Romans 3:29-30)." Pages 178–191 in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Edited by Nils A. Dahl. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.
- , "The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology." Pages 153–163 in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*. Edited by Donald H. Juel. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991a.
- , "Trinitarian Baptismal Creeds and New Testament Christology." Pages 165–186 in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*. Edited by Donald H. Juel. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991b.
- Dalman, Gustaf. *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.
- Danove, Paul L., "The Narrative Function of Mark's Characterization of God." *NovT* XLIII/1 (2001): 12-30.
- . *The Rhetoric of Characterization of God, Jesus, and Jesus' Disciples in the Gospel of Mark*. JSNT Sup. 290. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. ICC. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. ICC. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Davila, James R. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- , "Aramaic Levi: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 121–142 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*. Vol. 1. Edited by

- Richard Bauckham, James R. Davila and Alexander Panayotov. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Davis, Philip G., "Mark's Christological Paradox." *JSNT* 35/1 (1989): 3-18.
- Decker, Rodney J. *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect*. Studies in Biblical Greek. 10. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- . *Mark 1-8: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014.
- Declaissé-Walford, Nancy, Rolf A. Jacobson and Beth Laneel Tanner. *The Book of Psalms*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.
- Deines, Roland, "Pre-Existence, Incarnation, and Messianic Self-Understanding of Jesus in the Work of Martin Hengel." Pages 407–445 in *Acts of God in History: Studies Towards Recovering a Theological Historiography. Collected Essays by Roland Deines*. WUNT 317. Edited by Christoph Ochs and Peter Watts. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Delitzsch, Franz. *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes: Psalms*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Delorme, Jean, "Commencement de l'Evangile' et commencement de Marc (Marc. 1,1)." Pages 159–168 in *Gelukkig de Mens: Opstellen over Psalmen, exegese en semiotiek aangeboden aan Nico Tromp*. Edited by Pancratius Cornelis Beentjes. Kampen, NL: Kok Pharos, 1991.
- , "Evangile et récit: La narration évangélique selon Marc." Pages 49–71 in *Recits et Figures dans la Bible*. Edited by Louis Panier. Lyon: Profac, 1999.
- Dewey, Joanna and Elizabeth S. Malbon, "Mark." Pages 311–324 in *Theological Bible Commentary*. Edited by Gail R. O'Day and David L. Petersen. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2009.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Cambridge: James Clark, 1971.
- Dillon, Richard J., "Mark 1:1-15: A 'New Evangelization'?" *CBQ* 76 (2014): 1-18.
- Dixon, Edward P., "Descending Spirit and Descending Gods: A 'Greek' Interpretation of the Spirit's 'Descent as a Dove' in Mark 1:10." *JBL* 123/1 (2009): 759-780.
- Docherty, Susan E. *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews*. WUNT2. 260. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- , "New Testament Scriptural Interpretation in its Early Jewish Context." *NovT* 57 (2015a): 1-19.

- . *Use of Scripture in the New Testament and the 'Rewritten Bible' Texts: Some Exegetical Comparisons*. BNTC. Plenary Session 1. 2015b.
- Dochhorn, Jan, "Altes und Neues Testament: Zu den religionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen trinitarischer Gottesvorstellungen im frühen Christentum und in der Religion Israels." Pages 11–79 in *Trinität*. Edited by Volker Henning Drecoll. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- , "The Devil in the Gospel of Mark." Pages 98–107 in *Evil and the Devil*. LNTS 481. Edited by Ida Fröhlich and Erkki Koskenniemi. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- Dodd, C.D. *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- Dodson, Joseph R. *The 'Powers' of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans*. BZNW. 161. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Donahue, John R. *Are You the Christ? The Trial Narrative in the Gospel of Mark*. SBLDS. 10. Missoula, MT: SBL, 1973.
- , "Jesus as the Parable of God in the Gospel of Mark." *Int* 32 (1978): 369-386.
- , "A Neglected Factor in the Theology of Mark." *JBL* 101/4 (1982): 563-594.
- , "The Revelation of God in the Gospel of Mark." Pages 157–183 in *Modern Biblical Scholarship: Its Impact on Theology and Proclamation*. Edited by Francis A. Eigo. Villanova, PA: The Villanova University Press, 1984.
- Donahue, John R. and Daniel J. Harrington. *The Gospel of Mark*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002.
- Dormeyer, Detlev, "Mk 1,1-15 als Prolog des ersten idealbiographischen Evangeliums von Jesus Christus." *Biblical Interpretation* 5/2 (1997): 181-211.
- Dowd, Sharyn and Elizabeth S. Malbon, "The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience." Pages 1–31 in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. CBET. 45. Edited by Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- Dozemann, Thomas B. *Eerdmans Critical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Drecoll, Volker Henning, "Einführung in das Thema." Pages 1–10 in *Trinität*. Edited by Volker Henning Drecoll. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

- Driggers, Ira Brent. *Following God through Mark: Theological Tension in the Second Gospel*. London: Westminster/John Knox, 2007.
- , “God as Healer of Creation in the Gospel of Mark.” Pages 81–106 in *Character Studies and the Gospel of Mark*. LNTS 483. Edited by Christopher W. Skinner and Matthew Ryan Hauge. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Drury, John, “Mark 1.1-15: An Interpretation.” Pages 25–36 in *Alternative Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by A.E. Harvey. London: SPCK, 1985.
- Dumbrell, W.J., “Spirit and Kingdom of God in the Old Testament.” *The Reformed Theological Review* 33/1 (1974): 1-10.
- Dunn, James D.G., “The Messianic Secret in Mark.” *TynBul* 21 (1970): 92-117.
- . *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1975.
- . *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. London: SCM, 1980.
- , “Was Christianity a Monotheistic Faith from the Beginning?” *SJT* 35/4 (1982): 303-336.
- , “Spirit and Kingdom.” Pages 133–141 in *The Christ & the Spirit: Pneumatology*. Vol. 2. Edited by James D.G. Dunn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *Jesus Remembered*. Christianity in the Making. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- , “Was Jesus a Monotheist?” Pages 104–119 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. JSNT Sup. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Dunn, James D.G. and Graham H. Twelftree, “Demon-Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament.” Pages 170–186 in *The Christ & the Spirit: Volume 2. Pneumatology*. Edited by James D.G. Dunn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Earl, Donald, “Prologue-Form in Ancient Historiography.” Pages 842–856 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang des Römischen Welt, I.2*. Edited by Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972.
- Eaton, John H. *Kingship and the Psalms*. London: SCM, 1976.
- Eckert, Lowell Edgar, “The Baptism of Jesus in the Canonical and Jewish-Christian Gospels: An Intertextual Study.” Ph.D. The Lutheran School of Theology, Chicago 2000.

- Eckey, Wilfried. *Das Markusevangelium: Orientierung am Weg Jesu; ein Kommentar*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1998.
- Eckstein, Hans-Joachim, "Die Anfänge trinitarischer Rede von Gott im Neuen Testament: Jürgen Moltmann 80. Geburtstag." Pages 31–59 in *Der Lebendige Gott: Auf dem Spuren neueren trinitarischen Denkens*. Edited by Rudolf Wert. Neukirchener: Neukirchener Verlag, 2005.
- Edwards, James R., "The Baptism of Jesus According to the Gospel of Mark." *JETS* 34/1 (1991): 43-57.
- . *The Gospel According to Mark*. Pillar. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Edwards, Mark, "Exegesis and the Early Christian Doctrine of the Trinity." Pages 80–91 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Eichrodt, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Vol. 2. London: SCM, 1961.
- Ekblad, Eugene Robert. *Isaiah's Servant Poems According to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study*. CBET. 23. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Ellis, Earle E. *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.
- Enns, Peter. *Exodus*. NIVAC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Evans, Craig A., "From Gospel to Gospel: The Function of Isaiah in the New Testament." Pages 651–691 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- , "Mark's Incipit and the Priene Calender Inscription: From Jewish Gospel to Greco-Roman Gospel." *JGRChJ* 1 (2000): 67-81.
- . *Mark 8:27-16:20*. WBC. Nashville: Nelson, 2001.
- , "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom." Pages 490–527 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. 2. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Boston: Brill Academic, 2002.
- . *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005a.
- , "Inaugurating the Kingdom of God and Defeating the Kingdom of Satan." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 15/1 (2005b): 49-75.
- , "The Beginning of the Good News and the Fulfillment of Scripture in the Gospel of Mark." Pages 83–103 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

- Feldmeier, Reinhard, "Der Gekreuzigte im 'Gnadenstuhl'." Pages 213–232 in *Le Trône de Dieu*. Edited by Marc Philonenko. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.
- , "'Ein Gott und Vater aller'. Exegetische Beobachtungen zum neutestamentlichen Monotheismus." *Early Christianity* 1/2 (2010): 195-217.
- Feldmeier, Reinhard and Hermann Spieckermann. *Der Gott der Lebendigen*. WUNT. 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011a.
- . *God of the Living: A Biblical Theology*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011b.
- Feneberg, Wolfgang. *Der Markusprolog: Studien zur Formbestimmung des Evangeliums*. SANT. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1974.
- Ferda, Tucker S., "Naming the Messiah: A Contribution to the 4Q246 'Son of God' Debate." *DSD* 21 (2014): 150-175.
- Feuillet, André, "Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la Tradition Biblique (1)." *RB* 60 (1953): 170-202, 321.
- , "Le Baptême de Jésus d'après l'évangile selon Saint Marc (1,9-11)." *CBQ* 21 (1959): 468-490.
- Fichtner, Johannes, "Jes. 52, 7-10 in der Christlichen Verkündigung." Pages 51–66 in *Verbannung und Heimkehr: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie Israels im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Edited by Arnulf Kuschke. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1961.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., "The Palestinian Background of 'Son of God' as a Title for Jesus." Pages 567–577 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- Flesher, Paul V.M. and Bruce D. Chilton. *The Targums: A Critical Introduction*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011.
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- . *Jesus Monotheism: Christological Origins. The Emerging Consensus and Beyond*. Vol. 1. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2015.
- Flint, Peter W., "The Isaiah Scrolls from the Judean Desert." Pages 481–489 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Focant, Camille, "Fonction Intertextuelle et Limites du Prologue de Marc." Pages 303–315 in *La Bible en récits: L'exégèse biblique à l'heure du lecteur*. Edited by Daniel Marguerat. Genève: Labor et Fides, 2003.

- , “Une christologie de type ‘mystique’ (Marc 1.1-16.8).” *NTS* 55/1 (2009): 1-21.
- . *L'évangile selon Marc*. Paris: Cerf, 2010.
- Foerster, Werner, “δαίμων, δαιμόνιον.” Pages 1–20 in *TDNT*. Vol. 2. Edited by G. Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Foster, Paul, “Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament.” *JSNT* 38/1 (2015): 96-111.
- France, R.T. *Jesus and the Old Testament*. London: Tyndale, 1971.
- , “The Worship of Jesus: A Neglected Factor in Christological Debate.” Pages 17–36 in *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*. Edited by Harold H. Rowdon. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1982.
- . *Divine Government: God's Kingship in the Gospel of Mark*. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1990.
- . *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002.
- Frankemölle, Hubert. *Evangelium. Begriff und Gattung*. SBB. 15. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994.
- Frei, Hans W. *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1997.
- Frenschkowski, Marco. *Offenbarung und Epiphanie: Band 2. Die verborgene Epiphanie in Spätantike und frühem Christentum*. WUNT2. 80. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1997.
- Frey, Jörg, “How Did the Spirit Become a Person?” Pages 343–371 in *The Holy Spirit, Inspiration, and the Cultures of Antiquity: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Ekstasis 5. Edited by Jörg Frey and John R. Levison. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014.
- Friedrich, G., “εὐαγγελίζομαι, εὐαγγέλιον, προεὐαγγελίζομαι, εὐαγγελιστής.” Pages 707–737 in *TDNT*. Vol. 2. Edited by G. Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Gamel, Brian K., “The Centurion's Confession as Apocalyptic Unveiling: Mark 15:39 as a Markan Theology of Revelation.” Ph.D. Baylor University, 2014.
- Garland, David E. *A Theology of Mark's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.
- Garrett, Susan R. *The Temptations of Jesus in Mark's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Gathercole, Simon. *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

———, “The Trinity in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts.” Pages 55–68 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Gerstenberger, Erhard S. *Psalms: Part One, with an Introduction to Cultic Poetry*. FOTL. XIV. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Gillingham, Susan. *A Journey of Two Psalms: The Reception of Psalms 1 and 2 in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Gnilka, J. *Das Evangelium nach Markus 1: Mk 1-8.26*. EKK. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1978.

Gnilka, Joachim, “Zum Gottesgedanken in der Jesusüberlieferung.” Pages 144–162 in *Monotheismus und Christologie: Zur Gottesfrage im hellenistischen Judentum und im Urchristentum*. Edited by Hans-Josef Klauck. Freiburg: Herder, 1992.

Goldenstein, Johannes. *Das Gebet der Gottesknechte: Jesaja 63,7 - 64,11 im Jesajabuch*. WMANT. 92. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.

Goldingay, John. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Themes. Dallas: Word, 1989.

———. *Daniel*. WBC. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

———, “Biblical Narrative and Systematic Theology.” Pages 123–142 in *Between Two Horizons*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

———. *The Message of Isaiah 40-55: A Literary-Theological Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.

———. *Psalms 1-41*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

———. *Psalms 42-89*. Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

———, “Servant of Yahweh.” Pages 700–707 in *Dictionary of the Old Testament Prophets*. Edited by Mark J. Boda and J. Gordon McConville. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2012.

———. *Isaiah 56-66*. ICC. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014.

Goldingay, John and David Payne. *Isaiah 40-55*. ICC. Vol. 2. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

- Goodacre, Mark, "Scripturalization in Mark's Crucifixion Narrative." Pages 33–47 in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. CBET. 45. Edited by Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- Gould, Ezra P. *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Mark*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896.
- Gray, Timothy C. *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in its Narrative Role*. WUNT2. 242. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 1-20*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Greene, Joseph R., "The Spirit in the Temple: Bridging the Gap between Old Testament Absence and New Testament Assumption." *JETS* 55/4 (2012): 717-742.
- Greenfield, Jonas C: Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Grindheim, Sigurd. *God's Equal: What Can We Know About Jesus' Self-Understanding*. LNTS. 446. London: Bloomsbury, 2011.
- . *Christology in the Synoptic Gospels: God or God's Servant?* London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Guelich, Robert A., "'The Beginning of the Gospel' Mark 1:1-15." *BR* 27 (1982): 5-15.
- . *Mark 1-8:26*. WBC. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- , "The Gospel Genre." Pages 173–208 in *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Edited by Peter Stuhlmacher. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Mark: 1-8*. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993a.
- . *Mark: 9-16*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993b.
- Gurtner, Daniel M., "The Rending of the Veil and Markan Christology: 'Unveiling' the Υἱὸς Θεοῦ (Mark 15:38-39)." *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007a): 292-306.
- . *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*. SNTSMS. 139. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007b.
- . *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text*. London: Continuum, 2009.
- Guttenberger, Gudrun. *Die Gottesvorstellung im Markusevangelium*. BZNW. 123. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen*. 2nd edition. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.

- Hahn, Ferdinand, "The Confession of the One God in the New Testament." *HBT* 2/1 (1980): 69-84.
- . *Theologie des Neuen Testaments: Die Einheit des Neuen Testaments. Thematische Darstellung*. Vol. 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Hamilton, Victor P. *Exodus: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Hannah, Darrell D., "Isaiah within Judaism of the Second Temple Period." Pages 7–33 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Hanson, James S. *Endangered Promises: Conflict in Mark*. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.
- Hanson, Paul D. *Isaiah 40-66*. Int. Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1995.
- Hartman, Lars. *Markusevangeliet 1:1-8:26*. KNT. 2a. Stockholm: ESF-förlaget, 2004.
- . *Markusevangeliet 8:27-16:20*. KNT. 2b. Stockholm: ESF-förlaget, 2005.
- Hartman, Louis F. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.
- Hatina, Thomas R. *In Search of a Context: The Function of Scripture in Mark's Narrative*. JSNT Sup. 232. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- , "Embedded Scripture Texts and the Plurality of Meaning: The Announcement of the 'Voice from Heaven' in Mark 1.11 as a Case Study." Pages 81–99 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels: The Gospel of Mark*. Vol. 1. Edited by Thomas R. Hatina. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- . *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- , "The Canonical Matrix of the Gospels." Pages 53–75 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Gospels*. Edited by Stephen C. Barton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- . *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014.
- . *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.

Hayward, C.T.R., “‘The Lord is One’: Reflections on the Theme of Unity in John’s Gospel from a Jewish Perspective.” Pages 138–154 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. JSNT Sup. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Heil, John Paul. *The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-36*. AnBib. 144. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2000.

Hengel, Martin. *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*. London: SCM, 1983.

———. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. London: SCM, 1985.

———, “Literary, Theological, and Historical Problems in the Gospel of Mark.” Pages 209–251 in *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Edited by Peter Stuhlmacher. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

———, “Christological Titles in Early Christianity.” Pages 359–389 in *Studies in Early Christology*. Edited by Martin Hengel. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

———. *Studies in Early Christology*. London: T&T Clark, 1995.

———. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish Hellenistic Religion*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007.

Henrichs-Tarasenkova, Nina. *Luke’s Christology of Divine Identity*. LNTS. 543. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016.

Henze, Matthias. *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Hill, Wesley. *Paul and the Trinity: Persons, Relations, and the Pauline Letters*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

Hille, Rolf, “Gottes Dreieinigkeit - Reichtum und Tiefe der Erkenntnis Gottes.” Pages 23–47 in *Wer ist Gott? Unser Glaube an den Vater, den Sohn und den Heiligen Geist*. Edited by Rolf Hille. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 2007.

Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Hofius, Otfried. *Der Vorhang vor dem Thron Gottes: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Hebräer 6,19 f. und 10,19 f.* WUNT. 14. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1972.

Hollander, H.W. and Marinus de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

- Holmes, Stephen R. *The Holy Trinity: Understanding God's Life*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2012.
- Hooker, Morna, "Mark." Pages 220–229 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- , "Mark's Parables of the Kingdom (Mark 4:1-34)." Pages 79–101 in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Hooker, Morna D. *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 1959.
- . *The Message of Mark*. London: Epworth, 1983.
- . *The Gospel According to St Mark*. London: A & C Black, 1991.
- , "Chalcedon and the New Testament." Pages 73–93 in *The Making and Remaking of Christian Doctrine: Essays in Honour of Maurice Wiles*. Edited by Sarah Coakley and David A. Pailin. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- . *Beginnings: Keys that Open the Gospels*. London: SCM, 1997.
- , "John's Baptism: A Prophetic Sign." Pages 22–40 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.
- , "'Who Can This Be?' The Christology of Mark's Gospel." Pages 79–99 in *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- , "Good News about Jesus Christ, the Son of God." Pages 165–180 in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Kelly R. Iverson and Christopher W. Skinner. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Hearing the Whole Story: The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar and Erich Zenger. *Die Psalmen I: Psalm 1-50*. Die Neue Echter Bibel. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1993.
- Huisenga, Leroy A., "The Old Testament, Intertextuality and Allegory." *JSNT* 38/1 (2015): 17-35.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

- . *Mark*. New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989.
- , “First-Century Jewish Monotheism.” *JSNT* 71 (1998a): 3-26.
- . *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998b.
- . *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God: Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- . *God in New Testament Theology*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2010.
- Iverson, Kelly R., “‘Wherever the Gospel is Preached’: The Paradox of Secrecy in the Gospel of Mark.” Pages 181–209 in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Kelly R. Iverson and Christopher W. Skinner. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- , “A Centurion’s ‘Confession’: A Performance-Critical Analysis of Mark 15:39.” *JBL* 130/2 (2011): 329-350.
- Jackson, Howard M., “The Death of Jesus in Mark and the Miracle from the Cross.” *NTS* 33/1 (1987): 16-37.
- Janzen, J. Gerald. *Exodus*. WBC. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1997.
- Jenson, Robert W. *Systematic Theology: The Triune God*. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- . *The Triune Identity: God According to the Gospel*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2002.
- Jeremias, Joachim, “παῖς θεοῦ in the New Testament.” Pages 701–718 in *TDNT*. Vol. 5. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- . *Neutestamentliche Theologie: Erster Teil. Die Verkündigung Jesu*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1971.
- . *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus*. Vol. 1. London: SCM, 1971.
- Jeremias, Jörg. *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung*. 2. WMANT. 10. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977.
- Johansson, Daniel, “Kyrios in the Gospel of Mark.” *JSNT* 33/1 (2010): 101-124.
- , “Jesus and God in the Gospel of Mark: Unity and Distinction.” Ph.D. University of Edinburgh, 2011.
- Johnson, Andrew M., “Error and Epistemological Process in the Pentateuch and Mark’s Gospel: A Biblical Theology of Knowing from Foundational Texts.” Ph.D. University of St. Andrews, 2011.

- Johnson, Aubrey R. *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961.
- Johnson, Earl S. Jr., "Is Mark 15.39 the Key to Mark's Christology?" *JSNT* 31 (1987): 3-22.
- Johnson, Philip Reuben, "God in Mark: The Narrative Function of God as a Character in the Gospel of Mark." Ph.D. Luther Seminary, 2000.
- Jonge, Marinus de. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of Their Texts, Composition and Origins*. Assen, NL: Van Gorcum, 1953.
- , "Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII." Pages 247–260 in *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Edited by Marinus de Jonge. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- , "Patriarchs, Testaments of the Twelve." Pages 181–186 in *ABD*. Vol. 5. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Jonge, Marinus de et al. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. PVTG. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew: Third Reprint of the Second Edition, with Corrections*. Roma: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2011.
- Joyce, Paul M. *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Juel, Donald. *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- , "Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity." (1988):
- Juel, Donald H. *A Master of Surprise: Mark Interpreted*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- . *The Gospel of Mark*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.
- Kammler, Hans-Christian, "Das Verständnis der Passion Jesu im Markusevangelium." *ZTK* 103/4 (2006): 461-491.
- Kampling, Rainer. *Israel unter dem Anspruch des Messias: Studien zur Israelthematik im Markusevangelium*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992.
- Kazmierski, Carl R. *Jesus, Son of God: A Study of the Markan Tradition and its Redaction by the Evangelist*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982.
- Keck, Leander E., "The Introduction to Mark's Gospel." *NTS* 12/04 (1966): 352-370.
- , "The Spirit and the Dove." *NTS* 17/1 (1970): 41-67.

- , “Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology.” *NTS* 32/3 (1986): 362-377.
- , “Christology of the New Testament: What, Then, is New Testament Christology?” Pages 185–200 in *Who do You Say that I am? Essays on Christology*. Edited by Mark Allen Powell and David R. Bauer. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Kee, Howard C., “The Function of Scriptural Quotations and Allusions in Mark 11-16.” Pages 165–185 in *Jesus und Paulus*. Edited by Earle E. Ellis and E. Grässer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- . *Community of the New Age*. London: SCM, 1977.
- , “The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction.” Pages I: 775–781 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Apocalyptic Literature & Testaments*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985.
- Keel, Othmar. *The Symbolism of the Biblical World: Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997.
- Kelber, Werner H. *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Kertelge, Karl, “Die Epiphanie Jesu im Evangelium (Markus).” Pages 259–282 in *Das Markus-Evangelium*. Edited by Rudolf Pesch. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1979.
- Kingsbury, Jack D. *The Christology of Mark's Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- , “‘God’ within the Narrative World of Mark.” Pages 75–89 in *Forgotten God: Perspectives in Biblical Theology: Essays in Honor of Paul J. Achtemeier on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by A. Andrew Das and Frank J. Matera. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2002.
- Kittel, G., “ἁββᾱ.” Pages 5–6 in *TDNT*. Vol. 1. Edited by G. Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef, “Die Himmelfahrt des Paulus (2 Kor 12,2-4) in der koptischen Paulus-apokalypse aus Nag Hammadi (NHC V/2).” *Studien zum Neuen Testament und Seiner Umwelt* A-10 (1985): 151-190.
- . *Vorspiel im Himmel? Erzähltechnik und Theologie im Markusprolog*. Biblisch-Theologische Studien. 32. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997.

- Klostermann, Erich. *Origines Werke: Zehnter Band. Origines Matthäuserklärung*. GCS. 40. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1935.
- Koole, Jan L. *Isaiah III: Volume 1 / Isaiah 40-48*. Kampen, NL: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1997.
- . *Isaiah III: Volume 2 / Isaiah 49-55*. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- . *Isaiah III: Volume 3 / Isaiah 56-66*. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. and Scott R. Swain. *Father, Son and Spirit: The Trinity and John's Gospel*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2008.
- Kugler, Robert A. *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- , "Patriarchs, Testaments of the Twelve." Pages 1031–1033 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- , "Testaments." Pages 1295–1297 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Kuthirakkattel, Scaria. *The Beginning of Jesus' Ministry According to Mark's Gospel (1,14-3,6): A Redaction Critical Study*. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1990.
- Lacocque, André. *The Book of Daniel*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- Lamarche, Paul, "La mort du Christ et le voile du temple selon Marc." *NRTh* 96/6 (1974): 583-599.
- Lane, William L. *The Gospel of Mark*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Lau, Wolfgang. *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes 56-66: Eine Untersuchung zu den literarischen Bezügen in the letzten elf Kapiteln des Jesajabuches*. BZAW. 225. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- Lee, Aquila H.I. *From Messiah to Preexistent Son*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.
- Leim, Joshua E., "In the Glory of His Father: Intertextuality and the Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of Mark." *JTI* 7/2 (2013): 213-232.
- Lentzen-Deis, Fritzleo, "Das Motiv der 'Himmelsöffnung' in verschiedenen Gattungen der Umweltliteratur des Neuen Testaments." *Bib* 50/3 (1969): 301-327.
- . *Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern: Literarkritische und gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht, 1970.

- Letham, Robert. *The Holy Trinity: In Scripture, History, Theology, and Worship*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2004.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. New York: HarperOne, 1987.
- Levey, Samson H. *The Targum of Ezekiel: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes*. ArBib. 13. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.
- Levison, John R., “Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel? An Evaluation of the Earliest Jewish Data.” *NTS* 43/1 (1997): 35-57.
- , “The Spirit in Its Second Temple Context: An Exegetical Analysis of the Pneumatology of N.T. Wright.” Pages 439–462 in *God and the Faithfulness of Paul*. WUNT2. 413. Edited by Christoph Heilig, J. Thomas Hewitt and Michael F. Bird. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Lightfoot, R.H. *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- . *The Gospel Message of Mark*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.
- Lim, Bo H. *The ‘Way of the Lord’ in the Book of Isaiah*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Lim, Timothy H. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Linnemann, Eta. *Studien zur Passionsgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970.
- Lo, Jonathan W., “The Contours and Functions of Danielic References in the Gospel of Mark.” Ph.D. University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh 2012.
- Lohfink, Gerhard, “Erzählung als Theologie: Zur sprachlichen Grundstruktur der Evangelien.” Pages 11–25 in *Studien zur Neuen Testament*. SBAB. 5. Edited by Gerhard Lohfink. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Das Evangelium des Markus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- Louth, Andrew. *Maximus the Confessor: The Early Church Fathers*. Abingdon: Routledge, 1996.
- Lucas, Ernst C., “Cosmology.” Pages 130–139 in *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*. Edited by Alexander T.D and David W. Baker. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2003.
- Lührmann, Dieter. *Das Markusevangelium*. HNT. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.

Lust, J., "Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint." Pages 1–8 in *Messianism and the Septuagint: Collected Essays by J. Lust*. BETL. Edited by K. Hauspie. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.

Ma, Wonsuk. *Until the Spirit Comes: The Spirit of God in the Book of Isaiah*. JSOTS 271. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

MacDonald, Nathan. *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of 'Monotheism'*. FAT 2. 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

———, "The Origin of 'Monotheism'." Pages 204–215 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. JSNT Sup. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

———, "Monotheism and Isaiah." Pages 43–61 in *Interpreting Isaiah: Issues and Approaches*. Edited by David G. Firth and H.G.M. Williamson. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2009.

———, "The Spirit of YHWH: An Overlooked Conceptualization of Divine Presence in the Persian Period." Pages 95–119 in *Divine Presence and Absence in Exilic and Post-Exilic Judaism: Studies of the Sofia Kolalevskaja Research Group on Early Jewish Monotheism*. FAT2. Vol. 2. Edited by Nathan MacDonald and Izaak J. de Hulster. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Mack, Burton L. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

Malbon, Elizabeth S., "Ending at the Beginning: A Response." *Semeia* 52 (1991): 175-184.

———, "The Christology of Mark's Gospel: Narrative Christology and the Markan Jesus." Pages 33–48 in *Who do You Say that I am? Essays on Christology*. Edited by Mark Allen Powell and David R. Bauer. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.

———, "Narrative Criticism: How Does the Story Mean?" Pages 29–57 in *Mark and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies*. 2nd edition. Edited by Janice C. Anderson and Stephen D. Moore. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

———. *Mark's Jesus: Characterization as Narrative Christology*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Mann, C.S. *Mark*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1986.

Mansfield, M. Robert. *Spirit and Gospel in Mark*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1987.

Marcus, Joel, "Mark 4:10-12 and Marcan Epistemology." *JBL* 103/4 (1984): 557-574.

- , “Mark 14:61: “Are You the Messiah-Son-of-God?”.” *NovT* 31/2 (1989): 125-141.
- . *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.
- , “The Beelzebul Controversy and the Eschatologies of Jesus.” Pages 247–277 in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . *Mark 1-8*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- , “Identity and Ambiguity in Markan Christology.” Pages 133–147 in *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*. Edited by Beverly R. Gaventa and Richard B. Hays. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- . *Mark 8-16*. AB. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Marshall, Christopher D. *Faith as a Theme in Mark's Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Marshall, I. Howard, “The Divine Sonship of Jesus.” *Int* 21 (1967): 87-103.
- , “Son of God or Servant of Yahweh? A Reconsideration of Mark I.11.” *NTS* 15 (1968): 326-336.
- Matera, Frank J. *The Kingship of Jesus: Composition and Theology in Mark 15*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.
- , “The Prologue as the Interpretive Key to Mark's Gospel.” *JSNT* 34 (1988): 3-20.
- . *New Testament Christology*. London: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.
- Maurer, C., “σχιζω.” Pages 959–964 in *TDNT*. Vol. 7. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Mauser, Ulrich, “One God Alone: A Pillar of Biblical Theology.” *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 12/3 (1991): 255-265.
- , “One God and Trinitarian Language in the Letter of Paul.” *HBT* 20.2 (1998): 99-108.
- Mays, J.L. *Psalms*. Int. Louisville, KY: John Knox, 1994.
- McKenzie, John L. *Second Isaiah*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 1968.
- McKnight, Scot. *The King Jesus Gospel: The Original Good News Revisited*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.
- McLay, R. Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

- Mengestu, Abera M. *God as Father in Paul: Kinship Language and Identity Formation in Early Christianity*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2013.
- Menzies, Allan. *The Earliest Gospel: A Historical Study of the Gospel According to Mark*. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1901.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*. Lund: CWK Glerup, 1976.
- Metzger, Bruce. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Meye Thompson, Marianne. *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*. Louisville, KY: WJK, 2000.
- . *The God of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Michel, Otto, “*ναός*.” Pages 880–890 in *TDNT*. Vol. 4. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Milik, J.T., “Le Testament de Lévi en Araméen: Fragment de la Grotte 4 de Qumrân (Pl. IV).” *RB* 62 (1955): 398-406.
- Miller, Patrick D., “Editorial: A Strange Kind of Monotheism.” *ThTo* 54/3 (1997): 293-297.
- Moberly, R.W.L. *The Old Testament of the Old Testament: Patriarchal Narratives and Mosaic Yahwism*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- , “Toward an Interpretation of the Shema.” Pages 124–144. in *Theological Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs*. Edited by Christopher Seitz and Kathryn Greene-McCreight. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- , “How Appropriate is ‘Monotheism’ as a Category for Biblical Interpretation?” Pages 216–234 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. JSNT Sup. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- . *Old Testament Theology: Reading the Hebrew Bible as Christian Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Montague, George T., “The Fire in the Word: The Holy Spirit in Scripture.” Pages 35–64 in *Advents of the Spirit: An Introduction to the Current Study of Pneumatology*. Edited by Bradford E. Hinze and D. Lyle Dabney. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2005.

- Montgomery, James. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927.
- Morales, Rodrigo J. *The Spirit and the Restoration of Israel*. WUNT2. 282. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Morrison, Gregg S. *The Turning Point in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in Markan Christology*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014.
- Motyer, Stephen, "The Rending of the Veil: A Markan Pentecost?" *NTS* 33 (1987): 155-157.
- Moule, C.F.D., "The New Testament and the Doctrine of the Trinity: A Short Report on an Old Theme." *ExpTim* 88 (1976): 16-20.
- . *The Origin of Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- . *The Holy Spirit*. London: Mowbray, 1978.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*. New York: Abingdon, 1954.
- Moyise, Steve, "Is Mark's Opening Quotation the Key to His Use of Scripture?" *IBS* 20 (1998): 146-158.
- Moyise, Steve and Menken, Maarten J.J., eds. *Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Muilenburg, J., "The Book of Isaiah." Pages 5:382–773 in *The Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 5. Edited by George A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon, 1956.
- Muraoka, T., "A Greek \approx Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint." (2010):
- Murphy, Frederick James. *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Mussner, Franz, "'Evangelium' und 'Mitte des Evangeliums': Ein Beitrag zur Kontroverstheologie." Pages 159–177 in *Praesentia Salutis: Gesammelte Studien zu Fragen und Themen des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by Franz Mussner. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1967a.
- , "Gottesherrschaft und Sendung Jesu nach Mk 1, 14f: Zugleich ein Beitrag über die innere Struktur des Markusevangeliums." Pages 81–98 in *Praesentia Salutis: Gesammelte Studien zu Fragen und Themen des Neuen Testaments*. Edited by Franz Mussner. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1967b.
- Myers, Ched. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1988.
- Neve, Lloyd R. *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*. Cleveland, TN: CPT Press, 2011.

Nickelsburg, George W.E., "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *JBL* 100/4 (1981): 575-600.

———, "Enoch, First Book of." Pages 508–516 in *ABD*. Vol. 2. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

———. *1. Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch 1-36. 81-108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

Nicklas, Tobias, "Mark's 'Jesus Story'. A story about God." Pages 37–61 in *The Gospels: History and Christology. The Search of Joseph Ratzinger-Benedict XVI/ I Vangelo: Storia e Cristologia. La ricerca di Joseph Ratzinger-Benedetto XVI*. Vol. 2. Edited by Bernardo Estrada, Ermenegildo Manicardi and Armand Puig i Tàrrach. Rome: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2014.

Nineham, D.E. *Saint Mark*. Pelican New Testament Commentaries. London: Penguin, 1963.

Nir, Rivka. *The Destruction of Jerusalem and the Idea of Redemption in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch*. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2003.

No, Kisun, "The Narrative Function of God in the Gospel of Mark." Ph.D. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1999.

North, Wendy and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Introduction." Pages 1–13 in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*. JSNT Sup. 263. Edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy North. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

O'Rourke, John J., "A Note Concerning the Use of ΕΙΣ and ΕΝ in Mark." *JBL* 85/3 (1966): 349-351.

Oden Jr, Robert A, "Cosmogony, Cosmology." Pages 1163–1172 in *ABD*. Vol. 1. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Oden, Thomas C. and Christopher A. Hall. *Mark*. ACCS. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2005.

Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Owen, Paul, "Jesus as God's Chief Agent in Mark's Christology." Pages 40–57 in *Mark, Manuscripts, and Monotheism: Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado*. LNTS 528. Edited by Chris Keith and Dieter T. Roth. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.

Oyen, Geert van, "The Meaning of the Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark: A Real Reader Perspective." Pages 49–68 in *The Trial and Death of Jesus: Essays on the Passion Narrative in Mark*. CBET. 45. Edited by Geert van Oyen and Tom Shepherd. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.

———, “Dieu: Un Personnage Surprenant dans l’évangile selon Marc.” Pages 191–208 in *La Surprise dans la Bible: Hommage à Camille Focant*. Edited by Geert van Oyen and A. Wénin. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Palachuvattil, Joy. *‘He saw’: the Significance of Jesus’ Seeing Denoted by the Verben in the Gospel of Mark*. Tesi gregoriana. Serie teologia ; 84. Roma: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2002.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Jesus - God and Man*. 2nd edition. Philadelphia: Westminster/John Knox, 1982.

Parsons, Mikael C., “Reading a Beginning/Beginning a Reading: Tracing Literary Theory on Narrative Opening.” *Semeia* 52 (1991): 11-32.

Pascut, Benjamin, “The So-Called Passivum Divinum in Mark’s Gospel.” *NovT* 54 (2012): 313-333.

Payot, Christian, “Le baptême de Jésus dans les évangiles synoptiques.” *Foi et Vie* 68/3 (1969): 3-20.

Pelletier, André, “La Tradition Synoptique du ‘Voile Déchiré’ à la Lumière des réalités archéologiques.” *RSR* 46 (1958): 161-180.

Pennington, Jonathan T. *Heaven and Earth in the Gospel of Matthew*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Peppard, Michael, “The Eagle and the Dove: Roman Imperial Sonship and the Baptism of Jesus (Mark 1.9-11).” *NTS* 56/4 (2010): 431-451.

———. *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in its Social and Political Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Perrin, Norman. *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

Pesch, Rudolf, “Anfang des Evangeliums Jesu Christi: Eine Studie zum Prolog des Markusevangeliums (Mk 1,1-15).” Pages 108–144 in *Die Zeit Jesu: Festschrift für Heinrich Schlier*. Edited by Günther Bornkamm and Karl Rahner. Freiburg: Herder, 1970.

———. *Das Markusevangelium I: Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1.1-8.26*. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1976.

———. *Das Markusevangelium II: Kommentar zu Kap. 8.27 - 16.20*. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.

Petersen, Norman R., “‘Point of View’ in Mark’s Narrative.” *Semeia* 12 (1978): 97-121.

Phan, Peter C., “Developments of the doctrine of the Trinity.” Pages 3–12 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Trinity*. Edited by Peter C. Phan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Pietersma, Albert, “Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX.” Pages 85–101 in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox. Mississauga, ON: Benben Publications, 1984.

Pilgaard, Aage. *Kommentar til Markusevangeliet*. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 2008.

Piper, O., “Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New Testament.” *Int* 11 (1957): 3-22.

Pitre, Brant J., “Apocalypticism and Apocalyptic Teaching.” Pages 23–33 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. 2nd edition. Edited by Joel B. Green, Jeannine K. Brown and Nicholas Perrin. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2013.

Pitts, Andrew W. and Seth Pollinger, “The Spirit in Second Temple Jewish Monotheism and the Origins of Early Christology.” Pages 135–176 in *Christian Origins and Hellenistic Judaism: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Porter, Stanley E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. Studies in Biblical Greek. 1. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

———. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd edition. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

———, “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology.” Pages 79–96 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. JSNT Sup. 148. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Porter, Stanley E. and Brook W.R. Pearson, “Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah.” Pages 531–546 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Powery, Emerson B., “The Spirit, the Scripture(s), and the Gospel of Mark: Pneumatology and Hermeneutics in Narrative Perspective.” *JPT* 11/2 (2003): 184-198.

Procksch, Otto, “ἄγιος.” Pages 88–115 in *TDNT*. Vol. 1. Edited by G. Kittel. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Propp, William H.C. *Exodus 19-40*. AB. New York: Doubleday, 2006.

- Puskas, Charles B and C. Michael Robbins. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2011.
- Quell, Gottfried, "The Father Concept in the Old Testament." Pages 959–974 in *TDNT*. Vol. 5. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Räisänen, Heikki. *The 'Messianic Secret' in Mark*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990.
- Ratzinger, Joseph Pope Benedict XVI. *Jesus of Nazareth: From the Baptism in the Jordan to the Transfiguration*. New York: Doubleday, 2007.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J. *St. Mark*. 7th. London: Methuen, 1949.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *The Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Deo, 2005.
- Reynolds, Benjamin E. *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. WUNT2. 249. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Rhoads, David. *Reading Mark: Engaging the Gospel*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2004.
- Rhoads, David and Donald Michie. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Ricoeur, Paul, "Interpretive Narrative." Pages 181–199 in *Figuring the Sacred: Religion, Narrative, and Imagination*. Edited by Mark I. Wallace. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson and A. Cleveland Coxe, eds. *Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. 9. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1885.
- Robertson, A.T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.
- Robinson, J.A.T., "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" *JTS* 7 (1956): 177-189.
- Robinson, James M. *The Problem of History in Mark*. London: SCM, 1957.
- Rose, Christian. *Theologie als Erzählung im Markusevangelium: Eine narratologisch-rezeptionsästhetische Untersuchung zu Mk 1,1-15*. WUNT2. 236. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Roth, Wolfgang. *Hebrew Gospel: Cracking the Code of Mark*. Oak Park, IL: Meyer Stone Books, 1988.
- Routledge, Robin. *Old Testament Theology: A Thematic Approach*. Nottingham: Apollos, 2008.

- Rowe, C. Kavin, "Biblical Pressure and Trinitarian Hermeneutics." *Pro Ecclesia* 11/3 (2002a): 295-312.
- , "Luke and the Trinity: an Essay in Ecclesial Biblical Theology." *SJT* 56/1 (2003): 1-26.
- . *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
- , "The Trinity in the Letters of St Paul and Hebrews." Pages 41–54 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . *One True Life: The Stoics and Early Christians as Rival Traditions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Rowe, Robert D., "Is Daniel's 'Son of Man' Messianic?" Pages 71–96 in *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*. Edited by Harold H. Rowdon. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1982.
- . *God's Kingdom and God's Son: The Background to Mark's Christology from Concepts of Kingship in the Psalms*. Leiden: Brill, 2002b.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- , "Apocalypse, Prophecy and the New Testament." Pages 149+166 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Ryle, Gilbert, "The Thinking of Thoughts: What is 'Le Penseur' doing?" Pages 480–496 in *Collected Papers: Collected Essays 1929-1968*. Vol. 2. Edited by London: Hutchinson, 1971.
- Ryou, Philip Ho-Young, "Apocalyptic Opening, Eschatological 'Inclusio': A Study of the Rending of the Heaven and the Temple Curtain in the Gospel of Mark with Special Reference to the Motif of 'Seeing'." Ph.D. University of Glasgow, Glasgow 2004.
- Sabin, Marie Noonan. *Reopening the Word: Reading Mark as Theology in the Context of Early Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Samely, Alexander. *The Interpretation of Speech in the Pentateuch Targums: A Study of Method and Presentation in Targum Exegesis*. TSAJ. 27. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Sandmel, Samuel, "Parallelomania." *JBL* 81/1 (1962): 1-13.

- Sawyer, John F.A. *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Schaper, J. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. WUNT2. 76. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995.
- Schenke, Ludger. *Das Markusevangelium*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1988.
- , “Gibt es im Markusevangelium eine Präexistenzchristologie?” *ZNW* 91 (2000): 45-71.
- . *Das Markusevangelium: Literarische Eigenart - Text und Kommentierung*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2005.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Markus: Der Evangelist für die Griechen*. 2nd edition. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1984.
- Schmidt, Karl-Ludwig, “Le Dieu trinitaire, sujet et objet de la foi.” Pages 57–75 in *Le Problème du Christianisme primitif: quatre conférences sur la forme et la pensée du Nouveau Testament*. Edited by Karl-Ludwig Schmidt. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1938.
- Schneck, Richard. *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I-VIII*. Vallejo, CA: BIBAL, 1994.
- Scholtissek, Klaus. *Die Vollmacht Jesu: Traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Analysen zu einem Leitmotiv markinischer Christologie*. NTAbh. 25. Aschendorff Münster, 1992.
- , “Der Sohn Gottes für das Reich Gottes: Zur Verbindung von Christologie und Eschatologie bei Markus.” Pages 63–90 in *Der Evangelist als Theologe: Studien zum Markusevangelium*. SBS. 163. Edited by Thomas Söding. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995.
- , “‘Er ist nicht ein Gott der Toten, sondern der Lebenden’ (Mk. 12,27). Grundzüge der markinischen Theo-logie.” Pages 71–100 in *Der Lebendige Gott: Festschrift für Wilhelm Thüsing zum 75. Geburtstag*. Edited by Thomas Söding. Münster: Aschendorf, 1996.
- Schreiber, Stefan. *Gesalbter und König: Titel und Konzeptionen der königlichen Gesalbtenervartung in frühjüdischen und urchristlichen Schriften*. BZNW. 105. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.
- Schrenk, Gottlob, “Father in the New Testament.” Pages 982–1022 in *TDNT*. Vol. 5. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Schröter, Jens, “The Son of Man as the Representative of God’s Kingdom: On the Interpretation of Jesus in Mark and Q.” Pages 34–68 in *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

———, “Trinitarian Belief, Binitarian Monotheism, and the One God: Reflections on the Origin of Christian Faith in Affiliation to Larry Hurtado’s Christological Approach.” Pages 171–194 in *Reflections on the Early Christian History of Religion/ Erwägungen zur frühchristlichen Religionsgeschichte*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. 81. Edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and Jörg Frey. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Schweizer, Eduard, “πνεῦμα, πνευματικός.” Pages in *TDNT*. Vol. 6. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

———. *The Good News According to Mark*. London: SPCK, 1970.

———, “ὁῖός: New Testament.” Pages 364–400 in *TDNT*. Vol. 8. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

———, “Mark’s Theological Achievement.” Pages 42–63 in *The Interpretation of Mark*. Edited by William R. Telford. London: SPCK, 1985.

Scott, Bernard Brandon, “The Birth of the Reader.” *Semeia* 52 (1991): 84-103.

Segal, Michael, “Who is the ‘Son of God’ in 4Q246? An Overlooked Example of Early Biblical Interpretation.” *DSD* 21 (2014): 289-312.

Seitz, Christopher, “The Trinity in the Old Testament.” Pages 28–40 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Seitz, Christopher R. *Word without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Witness*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *Figured Out: Typology and Providence in Christian Scripture*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001.

Shepherd, M.B., “Daniel 7:13 and the New Testament Son of Man.” *WTJ* 68/1 (2006): 99-111.

Shiner, Whitney T., “The Ambiguous Pronouncement of the Centurion and the Shrouding of Meaning in Mark.” *JSNT* 78 (2000): 3-22.

Shively, Elizabeth E. *Apocalyptic Imagination in the Gospel of Mark: The Literary and Theological Role of Mark 3:22-30*. BZNW. 189. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2012.

———, “Characterizing the Non-Human: Satan in the Gospel of Mark.” Pages 126–151 in *Character Studies and the Gospel of Mark*. LNTS 483. Edited by Christopher W. Skinner and Matthew Ryan Hauge. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

“θεός.” Pages 433–446 in *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Vol. 2. Edited by Moisés Silva. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

Simonetti, Manlio. *Matthew 1-13*. ACCS. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001.

———. *Matthew 14-23*. ACCS. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2002.

Smith, C. Drew, “‘This is My Beloved Son; Listen to Him’: Theology and Christology in the Gospel of Mark.” *HBT* 24 (2002): 53-86.

———, “The Theology of the Gospel of Mark: A Literary-Theological Investigation into the Presentation of God in the Second Gospel.” Ph.D. University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh 2003.

Smith, Dennis, “Narrative Beginnings in Ancient Literature and Theory.” *Semeia* 52 (1991): 1-10.

Smith, R.L. *Micah-Malachi*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Snodgrass, Klyne R., “Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and Their Adaptation in the New Testament.” *JSNT* 9 (1980): 24-45.

Sommer, Urs. *Die Passionsgeschichte des Markusevangeliums: Überlegungen zur Bedeutung der Geschichte für den Glauben*. WUNT2. 58. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1993.

Soulen, R. Kendall. *The Divine Name(s) and the Holy Trinity: Distinguishing the Voices*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 2011.

Stagg, Frank, “The Abused Aorist.” *JBL* 91/2 (1972): 222-231.

Stamps, Dennis L., “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal.” Pages 9–37 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTS. 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

———, “The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method.” Pages 44–58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

———, “Composite Citations: Retrospect and Prospect.” Pages in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Jewish, Graeco-Roman, and Early Christian Uses*. LNTS 525. Vol. 1. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

- Stanton, Graham. *The Gospels and Jesus*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- . *Jesus and Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Stein, Robert H., “Is the Transfiguration (Mark 9:2-8) a misplaced resurrection-account?” *JBL* 95/1 (1976): 79-96.
- . *Mark*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Steussy, Marti J. *Samuel and His God*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia, SC: The University of South Carolina Press, 2010.
- Stokes, Ryan E., “Watchers, Book of (1 Enoch 1-36).” Pages 1332–1334 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Stone, M.E. and Greenfield, J.C., “The Second Manuscript of *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran (4QLevi(b) aram).” *Le Muséon* 109 (1996): 1-15.
- Strauss, Mark L. *Mark*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
- Strecker, G., “εὐαγγέλιον, ου, τό.” Pages 70–74 in *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 2. Edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T., “Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism.” Pages 90–113 in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- , “Satan and Demons.” Pages 173–197 in *Jesus among Friends and Enemies: A Historical and Literary Introduction to Jesus in the Gospels*. Edited by Chris Keith and Larry W. Hurtado. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Das paulinische Evangelium: I. Vorgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
- . *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments: Band 1. Grundlegung von Jesus zu Paulus*. 3rd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005.
- . *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments: Band 2. Von der Paulusschule bis zur Johannesoffenbarung*. 2nd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Sundberg, A.C., “On Testimonies.” *NovT* 3/4 (1959): 268-281.
- Sweat, Laura C. *The Theological Role of Paradox in the Gospel of Mark: Profiles from the History of Interpretation*. LNTS. 492. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
- Swete, H.B. *The Gospel According to St. Mark*. New York: Macmillan, 1898.

- Tannehill, Robert C., "The Gospel of Mark as Narrative Christology." *Semeia* 16 (1979): 57-95.
- Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms 51-100*. WBC. Waco, TX: Thomas Nelson, 1990.
- Taylor, Vincent. *Gospel According to St Mark*. London: Macmillan, 1966.
- Telford, William R. *Mark*. T&T Study Guides. London: T&T Clark, 1995.
- . *The Theology of the Gospel of Mark*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Terrien, Samuel. *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- . *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1980.
- Thrall, Margaret E., "Elijah and Moses in Mark's Account of the Transfiguration." *NTS* 16/4 (1970): 305-317.
- Tolbert, Mary Ann. *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Tooman, William A., "Between Imitation and Interpretation: Reuse of Scripture and Composition in 'Hadayot' (1QH^a) 11:6-19." *DSD* 18/1 (2011): 54-73.
- . *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38-39*. FAT 2. 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Tov, Emanuel, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran." Pages 491–511 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Trocmé, E., "Is There a Markan Christology?" Pages 3–13 in *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honour of C.F.D. Moule*. Edited by Barnabas Lindars and Stephen Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Tsumura, David T., "A 'Hyponymous' Word Pair: *rš* and *thm(t)* in Hebrew and Ugaritic." *Bib* 69/2 (1988): 258-269.
- Tuckett, Christopher, "Introduction: The Problem of the Messianic Secret." Pages 1–28 in *The Messianic Secret*. Edited by Christopher Tuckett. London: SPCK, 1983.
- Turner, C.H., "Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel (continued)." *JTS* 25/100 (1924): 377-386.
- , "O YIOC MOY O AGAIIHTOC." *JTS* 27/106 (1926): 113-129.

———, “εἰς and ἐν in St Mark.” Pages 16–22 in *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*. NovTS. Edited by J.K. Elliott. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Turner, Max, “‘Trinitarian’ Pneumatology in the New Testament?—Towards an Explanation of the Worship of Jesus.” *Asbury Theological Journal* 58/1 (2003): 167-186.

Tyson, Joseph B., “The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark.” *JBL* 80/3 (1961): 261-268.

Ulansey, David, “The Heavenly Veil Torn: Mark’s Cosmic Inclusio.” *JBL* 110/1 (1999): 123-125.

Unnik, Willem Cornelis van, “Die »Geöffneten Himmel« in der Offenbarungsvision des Apokryphons des Johannes.” Pages 269–280 in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964*. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1964.

van der Kooij, Arie, “Isaiah in the Septuagint.” Pages 513–529 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition. Vol. 2*. Edited by Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———, “Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in Other Ancient Versions.” Pages 49–68 in *‘As Those Who are Taught’: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Edited by Claire Mathews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Vanderkam, James and Peter Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. London: T&T Clark, 2002.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Is there a Meaning in this Text? The Bible, the Reader and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. Leicester: Apollos, 1998.

———, “Exegesis and Hermeneutics.” Pages 52–64 in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Edited by Alexander T.D and B.S. Rosner. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000.

Vielhauer, Philipp, “Erwägungen zur Christologie des Markusevangeliums.” Pages 155–169 in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag im Auftrage der Alten Marburger*. Edited by Erich Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.

Voelz, James W. *Mark 1:1-8:26*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis, MO: Concordia, 2013.

Vögtle, Anton, “Herkunft und ursprünglicher Sinn der Taufperikope Mk 1,9-11.” Pages 70–108 in *Offenbarungsgeschehen und Wirkungsgeschichte. Neutestamentliche Beiträge*. Edited by Anton Vögtle. Freiburg: Herder, 1985.

- Vorster, Willem S., "The Function of the Use of the Old Testament in Mark." *Neot* 14 (1981): 62-72.
- Vouga, François, "'Habt Glauben an Gott'. Der Theozentrismus der Verkündigung des Evangeliums und des christlichen Glaubens im Markusevangelium." Pages in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts: Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*. Edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- Wainwright, Arthur W. *The Trinity in the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 1962.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: A Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Warfield, Benjamin B., "Trinity." Pages 3012–3022 in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 5. Edited by James Orr. Chicago: The Howard-Severance Company, 1915.
- Watson, Francis, "The Social Function of Mark's Secrecy Theme." *JSNT* 24 (1985): 49-69.
- , "Ambiguity in the Marcan Narrative." *King's Theological Review* 10 (1987): 11-16.
- . *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- , "Trinity and Community: A Reading of John 17." *IJST* 1/2 (1999): 168-184.
- , "The Triune Divine Identity: Reflections on Pauline God-Language, in Disagreement with J.D.G. Dunn." *JSNT* 80 (2000): 99-124.
- . *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- , "The Old Testament as Christian Scripture: A Response to Professor Seitz." *SJT* 52/2 (2009): 227-232.
- . *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Watts, John D.W. *Isaiah 34-66*. Revised edition. WBC. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005.
- Watts, Rikki E., "Mark." Pages 111–249 in *Commentary of the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Watts, Rikki. E., "Consolation or Confrontation? Isaiah 40-55 and the Delay of the New Exodus." *TynBul* 41.1 (1990): 31-59.
- . *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1997.

———, “Jesus’ Death, Isaiah 53, and Mark 10:45: A Crux Revisited.” Pages 125–151 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by Jr. William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998.

Webb, Robert L. *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study*. JSNT Sup. 62. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Weeden, Theodore J. *Mark: Traditions in Conflict*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.

Weiser, Artur. *The Psalms*. OTL. London: SCM, 1962.

Wellhausen, J. *Das Evangelium Marci: Übersetzt und Erklärt*. 2nd edition. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009.

Wenham, David, “The Kingdom of God and Daniel.” *ExpTim* 98 (1987): 132-134.

Westermann, C. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. London: SCM, 1969.

Whybray, R.N. *Isaiah 40-66*. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1975.

Wiarda, Timothy, “Story-Sensitive Exegesis and Old Testament Allusions in Mark.” *JETS* 49/3 (2006): 489-504.

Willert, Niels. *Den korsfæstede konge: Kristologi og discipelbillede i Markusevangeliets passionsfortælling*. Vol. 1. Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 1997.

———. *Den korsfæstede konge: Kristologi og discipelbillede i Markusevangeliets passionsfortælling*. Vol. 2. Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag, 1997.

Williamson Jr, Lamar. *Mark*. Int. Atlanta: John Knox, 1983.

Williamson, H.G.M. *Variations on a Theme: King, Messiah and Servant in the Book of Isaiah*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.

Wise, Michael O., Abegg, Martin G., Jr. and Cook, Edward M., eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: Harper, 2005.

Witherington III, Ben, “The Trinity in the Johannine Literature.” Pages 69–79 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Trinity*. Edited by Gilles Emery and Matthew Levering. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Witherington, Ben, “The Christology of Jesus.” Pages 1–13 in *Who Do You Say that I Am? Essays on Christology*. Edited by Mark Allen Powell and David R. Bauer. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.

———. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Witherington, Ben and Laura M. Ice. *The Shadow of the Almighty: Father, Son, and Spirit in Biblical Perspective*. Grand Rapid, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Wright, N.T., "Jesus and the Identity of God." *ExAud* 14 (1988): 42-56.

———. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. 1. London: SPCK, 1992.

———. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. 2. London: SPCK, 1996.

———. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. 3. London: SPCK, 2003.

———. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God: Book II. Parts III and IV*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. 4. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013.

Yadin, Y., "A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4Q Florilegium)." *IEJ* 9/2 (1959): 95-98.

Yeago, David S., "The New Testament and the Nicene Dogma: A Contribution to the Recovery of Theological Exegesis." *Pro Ecclesia* 3/2 (1994): 152-164.

Zapff, Burkard M. *Jesaja 56-66*. Die Neue Echter Bibel. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 2006.

Ziegler, Joseph. Joseph Ziegler, ed. *Susanna; Daniel; Bet et Draco*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. 16.2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1954.

Zimmerli, Walther. *A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.