A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE WORLDVIEWS OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK AND Q

Marius Nel
NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY, POTCHEFSTROOM

ABSTRACT

Many scholars accept the existence of Q, a lost source that Luke and Matthew utilised alongside Mark. Q and Mark are then seen as the oldest written sources of Jesus' message and meaning. In a first article, the question was asked as to the contents of the worldview of Q. In this article the question is asked, what is the worldview underlying Mark and in what way do they agree and / or differ? The question is important because it leads to the hypothesis that a Jewish apocalyptic background underlies both sources although with significant differences.

Keywords: Q, Gospel of Mark, worldview, eschatology, apocalyptic

1. WORLDVIEW OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK — PART 2

Jesus does not begin with his ministry until after John's arrest when he starts proclaiming the *euangelion* of God (κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ), that the *kairos* (ὁ καιρὸς) is fulfilled so that the kingdom of God could come near (πεπλήρωται), and that listeners should repent because they believe in the good news (1:15). *Kairos* refers to meaningful time, time with a special content and consequence, and *kairos'* fulfilment implies that history has a specific structure, and in the course of history the time has come for something important to happen.[1] The content of the *euangelion* is the kingdom of God; in an apocalyptic Gospel like Mark the meaning of 'kingdom' must be eschatologically

1 J.P. Louw and E.A. Nida, (eds.) *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988), 648.

ISSN 2222-582X © Unisa Press
pp 76–94

defined.[2] 'Has come near' can refer to 'has come near but has not yet arrived' and 'has become present.' In the Gospel the meaning is probably between the two possibilities; the kingdom has begun to break into history but it cannot fully arrive until the power of Satan is broken and the righteous rescued from an order that will always suppress them in its present state. To accept Jesus' proclamation implies that one must repent (μετανοεῖτε), which means that one must change one's way of thinking, or one's way of looking at the world. The Gospel wants its readers to look at their lives in the light on the imminent kingdom.[3]

After calling his first four disciples, Jesus exorcises unclean spirits who recognise him as the Holy One of God who has come to destroy the evil (1:24). Mark is convinced that it is precisely in and through Jesus' nonviolent mission, voluntary suffering, and ignominious death that God defeats or undoes evil.[4] The people in the synagogue exclaim the authority of Jesus' teaching. Demons belong to the unseen world in which humans have no insight but Jesus has. He then cures Peter's mother-in-law, performs many other cures and castes out many demons, but he would not permit the demons to speak because they knew him (1:34; cp. 3:11–12). Mark describes Jesus' identity as a secret that he protects.

He then chooses his twelve disciples before his family try to restrain him for people were saying that he is out of his mind, or mentally unbalanced. The scribes are of the opinion that he is in cohorts with Satan and his demons, assuming the apocalyptic dualism of good and evil in a conflict that will determine the future of this world.[5] With his exorcisms, Jesus binds the 'strong man,' plundering Satan's house, recalling how Melchizedek rescues people from Belial (*11Q13*).

In the next exorcism, the unclean spirit accuses Jesus of tormenting demons, implying that Jesus will execute judgment over evil angels (5:7). The spirit's name is Legion, referring to the largest division of the Roman army consisting of around six thousand soldiers, and is cast into pigs, unclean animals for Jews but a prized possession for the heathens.

Next Jesus sends out his disciples to preach repentance, cure diseases and exorcise spirits with authority over these unclean spirits (6:7). They do not preach the kingdom because they do not understand it but their preaching of repentance prepares the way for the kingdom and their attack on demons demonstrates God's sovereignty. The

2 John P. Meier, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 289–506 argues the case in detail; cp. also Wendell Willis, *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation* (Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1987).

3 Frederick J. Murphy, *Apocaypticism in the Bible and its World: A Comprehensive Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 233.

4 David J. Neville, 'Moral Vision and Eschatology in Mark's Gospel: Coherence or Conflict?' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127/2 (2008): 360.

5 Cp. Mark 3:22–27 with its 'almost programmatic statement that in Jesus' exorcisms the rule of Satan is being ended as the kingdom of God is being established' (Richard A. Horsley, *Hearing the Whole Story: The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel* (London, Leiden: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 139.

demons serve the narrative function to demonstrate Jesus' absolute power over these transcendent beings, underlining his extraordinary authority and vindication by God.[6]

Exorcisms occur only in the first half of the Gospel, causing the question to be asked, how does Jesus' struggle with Satan and the demons in the first half fit with the overall story and its dominant plot?[7] The two sets of five miracle stories with their allusions to the actions of Moses and Elijah clearly signify that Jesus is engaged in the establishment of the kingdom of God, a reign that leaves no room for illness, uncleanness, death, or demonic possession. The exorcisms are manifestations of the kingdom of God, as the healings and resurrections.[8]

Mark 4 contains several parables and the meaning of these exemplary narratives is limited to those who are initiated. Many assume that Jesus told parables to get his message across but 4:10–12 explains that he uses parables to hide his message, lest his hearers understand, repent, and be forgiven (Isaiah 6:9–10). Isaiah predicts that Israel will not accept his message, and Jesus expects a similar reaction. This passage is supposed to serve Mark's so–called Messianic Secret.[9] He is of the opinion that the

6 J.C. De Klerk and C.W. Schnell, *Jesus deur Ander Oë: Literêre en Sosiologies-historiese Interpretasies van Markus en Johannes* (Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik, 1987), 88.

7 Horsley, *Hearing the Whole Story*, 136.

8 For a discussion of the terms used by Mark in exorcism episodes (*epitaman* and *ekballein* instead of the terms used in Hellenistic exorcism stories) and its relation to the literature of the Qumran community, cp. Horsley, *Hearing the Whole Story,* 137–138. The same term for overcoming the unclean spirits is also used in the description of the stilling of the storm (4:35-41), 'Jesus subdued/ subjected (*epitaman*) the windstorm.' The same term is used for two parallel ways in which Jesus exercises divine power over dangerous and destructive forces to bring about God's rule (Horsley, *Hearing the Whole Story,* 138). Some scholars are of the opinion that Jesus thought his death would force God's hand to introduce the final glorious crisis of history (cp. M. Grant, *Jesus* [London: Rigel, 1977], 135 for discussion).

9 W. Wrede first formulated the messianic secret theory in 1901, implying that Jesus' ministry was non-messianic and that Mark or his source created the messianic secret motif to cover up or smooth over this embarrassing fact for his church audience and that the earliest Christians believed in and elaborated on its significance. F.J. Matera, *What are They Saying about Mark?* (New York / Mahwah: Paulist, 1987), 20–23; F.J. Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Mi.: Baker Academic, 2002), 5. It is supposed to be a literary convention by Mark attempting to explain why the church made messianic claims for a man who had not made any claims to messiahship himself. De Klerk and Schnell *Jesus deur Ander Oë,* 252–253 suggest that Mark explains the incomprehension of the disciples to explain how difficult it is to assimilate the notion of Jesus as the suffering Son of man and that his kingdom does not entail power, honour and status but servicehood (cp. Mark 10:24–30). For an introduction to the messianic secret, cp. Howard Clark Kee, 'Christology in Mark's Gospel,' in *Judaisms and their Messiahs* (eds. Jacob Neusner et al; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 187–208; David A. DeSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation* (Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic. Nottingham: Apollos, 2004), 201–204; and H.N. Rosman, *The Purpose of the Gospel of Mark in its Historical and Social Context* (ed. H.N. Rosman; Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2004), 171–187. E.P. Dixon, 'Descending Spirit and Descending Gods: A "Greek" Interpretation of the Spirit's "Descent as a Dove", in Mark 1:10,' *Journal of Biblical*

disciples will only understand Jesus' message upon his death and then, ultimately, all will understand (4:22). In this way, Mark forestalls premature declarations of Jesus' messiahship that will only be misunderstood until he faces the cross; Mark sees that Jesus' messiahship cannot be understood apart from his passion.[10] The disciples lived among various models of messianic expectations in first century Judaism, of which one of the more important is that the messiah will be a divinely anointed military ruler leading Israel to independent rule by defeating its enemies, and raising his followers to positions of influence and power.[11]

As John the Baptist represents Elijah, so Jesus is pictured in terms recalling Elijah and Elisha. He preaches repentance (Malachi 4:6), multiplies food, and raises the dead (1 Kings 17:8–24; 2 Kings 4:18-37, 42-44; cp. Mark 6:14). Jesus never identifies himself as the Son of God or Messiah in Mark but he accepts the appellation when others use it (8:29; 14:62), as he also accepts the role of prophet (6:4).

He also stills a storm (4:35–41), displaying divine power (Psalm 89:9). The sea is a frequent image in apocalypses (Daniel 7:4; 4 Ezra 13; Revelation 13), springing from the combat myth.[12] By dominating the sea, Jesus acts for God and opposes God's ancient mythological enemy. Mark 6:45–52 echoes Psalm 77:19, originally a reference to the Red Sea miracle. The apostles do not understand because they have not understood the preceding miracle of the multiplication of food, pointing to Jesus' identity as God's eschatological agent and carrying overtones of Moses' work in the desert, as well as of Elijah and Elisha. Mark's plot presents Jesus as a Moses– and Elijah–like prophet engaged in the renewal of Israel through a sustained program of proclaiming the

Literature 128/4 (2009): 776 discusses the Markan secret in terms of Mark's extensive use of the common Greek mythological *topos* of a god in human form that would have explained to his listeners what the real identity of Jesus is, representing a viewpoint that is not supported by this study. Cp. K.R. Iverson, '"Wherever the Gospel is Preached": The Paradox of Secrecy in the Gospel of Mark,' in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect* (eds. K.R. Iverson and C.W. Skinner; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 181–210 who explores how the secrecy theme functions as an audience–elevating device that serves a missional purpose within the Gospel. J. Marcus, 'Mark and Isaiah,' in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday* (eds. A.B. Beck et al; Grand Rapids, Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1995), 449–466 refers to 'a trancelike state' in which God's chosen people have fallen in which they are not only unwilling but also unable to hear the divine voice, leading to Jesus' use of parables. Cp. D. Wenham's, *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1984) study that compares Mark's parallel parables in the other synoptic Gospels.

10 DeSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament,* 201.

11 B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1983), 127.

12 A.Y. Collins, 'The Book of Revelation,' in *The Continuum History of Apocalypticism* (eds. B.J. McGinn, J.J. Collins and S.J. Stein; New York, London: Continuum, 2003), 197.

kingdom of God and manifesting God's renewing power for the people in healings and exorcisms.[13] Like the God of order in the combat myth, Jesus controls the sea.[14]

The title 'Son of man' occurs 44 times in Mark[15] and Bultmann[16] already suggested that the sayings could be arranged into three groups. Bultmann[17] divided these pronouncements into three categories: those that refer to Jesus' earthly activity (2:10, 28); those that refer to his passion (8:31; 9:9, 12, 31; 10:33, 45; 14:21a, 21b, 41); and those that refer to his second coming (8:38; 13:26; 14:62). The earthly group applies the title to Jesus when he claims to forgive sins (2:10) and exercises authority over the Sabbath (2:28). The group of suffering Son of man references refers to Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection; and the eschatological group refers to the end of time to judge (8:38; 13:26; 14:62). In 8:38, Jesus warns that those who are ashamed of him and his words will find that the Son of man is ashamed of them when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels, alluding to Daniel 7:13–14 and with Jesus assuming the identity of the one who judges people at the end of time according to whether they were scandalised by his arrest, trial, suffering, and death and afraid to undergo suffering and

13 Horsley, *Hearing the Whole Story*, xiii.

14 Strauss in his 1853 book, *Das Leben Jesu Kritisch Bearbeitet,* defines 'myth' as a narrative relating directly or indirectly to Jesus, which may be considered not as the expression of a fact, but the product of an idea of his earliest followers. Strauss identifies three basic kinds of myths: historical mythi are narratives of real events coloured by the lights of antiquity, which confounded the divine and the human; philosophical mythi, where a historical narrative contains a precept, or an idea of the time; and poetical mythi, where historical and philosophical mythi are blended together and embellished by the creations of the imagination. P. Kennedy, *A Modern Introduction to Theology: New Questions for Old Beliefs* (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2006), 154.

15 Cp. A.Y. Collins, 'The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as "Son of Man,"' *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 391-407 for a comprehensive introduction to the issue of the 'Son of man.' E. Van Eck, 'Eschatology and Kingdom in Mark,' in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents* (ed. J.G. Van der Watt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 65 thinks that Mark uses the Son of man–sayings in a non-titular way to describe Jesus' activity of replacing the temple with a new inclusive household. B.E. Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 68–69 shows that the Son of man in Mark shares a number of characteristics with the Jewish apocalyptic interpretation of the Danielic Son of man: the Markan Son of man is described and acts similarly to God in his ability to forgive sins (2:7), his coming with the clouds (13:26; 14:62), and his lordship over the Sabbath (2:28); the Son of man is the Messiah (8:27–38; 14:61-62); the Son of man is not explicitly described as a judge but 13:26–27 might suggest this judgment role; the Son of man gives his life as a ransom for many (10:45), hinting at his role in salvation; he gathers his elect, the righteous; he will be recognized for who he is through being seen; he is a heavenly figure as suggested by his earthly authority; and he possibly has a pre-existence as suggested by his coming from heaven (10:45).

16 R. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1972), 38.

17 R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition* (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprech, 1933); R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1948).

death as the price of following him.[18] In 14:61, the high priest asks Jesus whether he is the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One, and Jesus answers affirmatively that people will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven (14:62). The quotation is from Daniel 7 and Psalm 110. As in Daniel 7, the Son of man comes with the clouds of heaven, and as in Psalm 110, the Son of man sits at the right hand of God. The images of the Son of man condemned to death and the Son of man coming with the clouds of heaven explain one another. The roles assigned to the Son of man in Daniel 7:13-14 are royal — he will have dominion, glory, and

18 Horsley (*Hearing the Whole Story,* 127–128) does not agree that Mark's utilisation of the concept of the Son of man is derived from Daniel 7 and he argues that in Mark the Son of man has nothing to do with judgment or the gathering of the elect, as is the case in Daniel 7. Horsley evidently does not take Mark 13:26–27 into account. He thinks that Mark uses the term 'son of man' in three ways: In the first place, the term is used to indicate humankind or people generally "in their authority 'to forgive sins' and 'over the Sabbath'" (2:10, 27–28). Van Eck ('Eschatology and Kingdom in Mark,' 86) uses a narrative analysis of the Gospel and writes that the question is not whether the evangelist made use of Daniel 7 in 13:26–27 but the way in which 13:26–27 fits into the narrative structure of Mark. Horsley (*Hearing the Whole Story,* 127–128) thinks that in those passages Jesus may also be using the term in reference to himself as representative of 'humankind.' I do not think that Horsley is correct in his opinion that the passages refer to humankind in general; it is evident that Jesus applies the term to himself in v. 10, and in v. 28 he distinguished 'Son of man' from 'man' in v. 27, indicating that he refers again to himself by the first term. A second use of the term in Mark, according to Horsley, is as a mode of self–reference (8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34, the three announcements of Jesus' suffering and death). A third use is of the son of man appearing as more of an accuser than a judge (8:38), although the context is clearly one of divine judgment with angels in attendance. Compared with the figure in Daniel 7:13, the one like a son of man in Mark is 'less a symbolic representative of the people and more of an eschatological judge or deliverer,' as in 1 Enoch 62 (Horsley, *Hearing the Whole Story,* 128). Cp. also the discussion in G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), 183; G. Vermes, *The Changing Faces of Jesus* (New York: Penguin, 2000), 42–45 where he argues for interpreting 'son of man' as 'one/someone' in the sense of 'yours truly,' used in the place of 'I.' B.D. Chilton, 'The Son of Man: Human and Heavenly,' in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (eds. C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle and J. Verheyden; Leuven: Peeters, Leuven University Press, 1992), 204 opines that Vermes' viewpoint has rightly been attacked and that 'son of man' in Aramaic is generic in the sense that, insofar as it is self-referential, the speaker is included in the class (of a class) of human beings, but the class normally refers to mortal humanity (or a group of people), not to one human being alone. Lietzmann was the first to consider the son of man-sayings as simply referring to 'humankind,' although he later withdrew his opinion (cp. A. Van Aarde, *Fatherless in Galilee: Jesus as Child of God* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 2001), 61.

kingship.[19] Zimmermann[20] emphasises that 'Son of man,' like the other designations of Jesus, should be interpreted as metaphors. 'So bedeutet "Christus" im Wortsinn "der Gesalbte" … , das wirkmächtige "Sohn" —Prädikat kann als Familienmetaphor gelesen werden und "Kyrios" war in der hellenistischen Antike die gewöhnliche Anrede an einen Haus- oder Eheherrn'[21]

The apocalyptic Son of man appears in 13:26, when he will come back in clouds with great power and glory following disturbances of the sun, moon and stars. A striking resemblance comes from a contemporary source, Pseudo-Philo's *Book of Biblical Antiquities*: 'I will command the years and charge the times, and they shall be shortened, and the stars shall be hastened, and the light of the sun make speed to set, neither shall the light of the moon endure' (*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 19:13).[22] Jesus will send out his angels to gather the elect from the ends of the earth to the ends of the heaven (13:26–27), a reference to Daniel 7. The eschatological scenario represents the *parousia* with the final separation implied in the dualistic view of humankind divided between those who accepted Jesus and his ministry and those who rejected him.[23] The *parousia*

19 B. Witherington, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Historical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2001), 51. The question of who the son of man is, is obfuscated by the issue of the authenticity of the sayings. Chilton, 'The Son of Man,' 208–209 uses the distinctions between performances, transformations, and construals as heuristic, in respect of the readers' cognition. A performance is not something actually said; it is a distinctive, autonomous conveyance of meaning within the language of early Judaism. A transformation is not a tradent's attempt to alter a performance, any more than a construal is a deliberate effort at nuances; they are simply the names used to describe greater or lesser degrees of congruence in the promulgation of performance, which is known as tradition. Chilton's, 'The Son of Man,' 218 conclusion is that the literarily historical Jesus sayings as the son of man feature as a generic and / or angelic reference. The angelic reference is predicated upon the understanding of a close analogy between people and angels, which is well established within the Hebrew Scriptures, and is still discernible in the Gospels. Subsequently, both types of references were transformed within the literary construals of the Synoptic Gospels, so that 'son of man' refers to Jesus as the disciples' authority, their paradigm of suffering, and eschatological judge. Cp. G. Vermes, *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (London: SCM, 1983), 89–99 for a discussion of the state of debate about the 'son of man' in the first forty years after the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered.

20 R. Zimmermann, 'Paradigmen einer metaphorischen Christologie. Eine Leseanleitung,' in *Metaphorik und Christologie* (eds. J. Frey, J. Rohls and R. Zimmermann; Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 2.

21 Zimmermann, 'Paradigmen einer metaphorischen Christologie. Eine Leseanleitung,' 2–3.

22 G. Vermes, *The Authentic Gospel of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 2003a), 298.

23 J.P. Heil, *The Gospel of Mark as a Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary* (New York / Mahwah: Paulist, 1992), 13. Traditionally, Mark 8:38; 13:26; and 14:26 is interpreted as referring to the *parousia*. Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John,* 66 thinks that the Danielic Son of man stands in the background of these Markan Son of man sayings. Neville, 'Moral Vision,' 372 contests John Carroll's acceptance that Mark 13 refers to the *parousia*; texts that refer to the future coming of the Son of man do not self-evidently refer to a return to the realm of history and nature, but may instead refer to a coming of God. Even if such texts are construed as referring to a so-called second coming to earth, Mark's depiction of Jesus' past mission must be so dramatically different from his second coming that the way of Jesus is not God's way of working in the world. Neville does not, to my opinion, consider the evidence contained in 13:26–27 in making this conclusion.

will come soon: this generation will not pass away until all these things have taken place (13:30), although Jesus emphasises that neither the angels in heaven nor the Son of man knows when that hour will be.[24]

The Son of man theology contains the concept of Jesus' humility during his ministry, coming to serve others, and his self-sacrifice, coming to present himself as a ransom for others.[25]

Jesus' last journey is to Jerusalem, to confront its authorities (11:1–16:8). His entrance is triumphant and the crowds take his arrival as the signal of the advent of David's kingdom (11:10). The next day Jesus enters the Temple and attacks the system of trade necessary to sponsor the sacrifices at the Temple. Jesus' justification for his actions comes from Jeremiah 7:11, 26, that those in charge of the Temple have turned it into a den of thieves (11:19; cp. also Zechariah 14:21). Van Aarde & Joubert[26] reminds that the Temple in Jerusalem was — to a significant extent — an economic institution. The scene is framed by Jesus cursing a fig tree (11:13–14, 20–21), and obviously symbolising his condemnation of Israel as signified by the temple authorities, and the resultant destruction of the temple that would follow from their actions.[27] He indicts

His motivation is that Mark's eschatology, traditionally interpreted, allows for a violent judgment, in contrast to the relatively clear, if counterintuitive description of how God's reign is exercised in the mission of Jesus who, although authoritative, was not autocratic and although potent to effect transformation, was voluntarily vulnerable in the face of coercive violence. Neville's argument with eschatology flows from his interpretation of the Gospel, with Mark's eschatology evidently not suiting his viewpoint.

24 E. Brandenburger, *Das Recht des Weltenrichters: Untersuchung zu Matthäus 25,31–46* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1980), 52. Cp. G. Vermes', *Jesus in His Jewish Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003b), 22 argument that the *parousia* speculation is incompatible with Jesus' essential religious outlook although he admits that it originated in his own eschatological and apocalyptic teaching rather than in later Christian apologetics. The consensus among scholars that the delay of the *parousia* was the most important motif in the development of early Christian theology has been widely abandoned. J. Frey, 'New Testament Eschatology — An Introduction: Classical Issues, Disputed Themes, and Current Perspectives,' in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents* (ed. J.G. Van der Watt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 5. The apocalyptic nature of the *parousia* expectation is strongly supported by the eschatology of the Dead Sea Scrolls where the consecutive postponements of the Day of the Lord are also attended by exhortations to patience and perseverance. An example from the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab vii.1–14) will suffice: 'The final age shall be prolonged and shall exceed all that the Prophets have said; for the mysteries of God are astounding. *If it tarries, wait for it, for it shall surely come and shall not be late* [Habakkuk 2:3]. Interpreted, this concerns the men of truth who keep the Law, whose hands shall not slacken in the service of truth when the final age is prolonged. For all the ages of God reach their appointed end as he determines for them in the mysteries of His wisdom.'

25 Witherington, *The Gospel of Mark,* 52.

26 A.G. Van Aarde and S. Joubert, 'Social-Scientific Criticism,' in *Focusing on the Message: New Testament Hermeneutics, Exegesis and Methods* (ed. A.B Du Toit; Pretoria: Protea, 2009), 429.

27 The Jewish ruling classes in the Gospel are represented by three groups, according to C. Myers, *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988), 423: the Herodian nobility; the scribes; and the Jerusalem clerical aristocracy, consisting of the chief priests, elders and Sadducees. The Gospel pictures these groups as unequivocally opposed to Jesus.

the temple's administrators for not fulfilling God's purpose with the Temple (Isaiah 56:7); the Court of Gentiles is so empty and irrelevant to their concern that it serves as a convenient place for the moneychangers and vendors to offer animals for sale as sacrifices.[28] The priests, scribes, and elders want to know by what authority he acts, and Jesus associates himself with John the Baptist. Jesus knows that the leaders are reluctant to criticise John because the people view him as a true prophet (11:27–33).[29]

The Herodians represent the old nobility of the half–Jewish house of Herod, whose political power had largely dissipated under direct Roman administration of the colony, although Herodian wealth and privilege had not disappeared. The royal aristocracy was more concentrated in Galilee, south of Capernaum in the Hellenistic city of Tiberius on the Sea of Galilee. The Gospel repudiates the entire traditional Jerusalem power structure, argues Myers, *Binding the Strong Man*, 425. Jesus is taking on the politics of domination itself. W. Wink, *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 104–105 argues that the spiritual powers should not be interpreted as separate heavenly or ethereal entities but as 'the inner aspect of material or tangible manifestations of power.' The powers should not be reserved for the special category of spiritual powers but seen under the dual aspect of their physical or institutional concretion on the one hand, and their inner essence or spirituality on the other. Popular speech refers to these powers as 'the powers that be.' In all these cases, the simultaneity of heavenly and earthly events witnesses to the perception, mythically couched, that there is more to events than what appears. The physical actors and institutions are only the outer manifestation of a whole field of powers contending for influence' (Wink, *Naming the Powers*, 107). The battle is against the spirituality of institutions, against the ideologies and legitimations that prop them up, against the greed and covetousness that give them life, and against the idolatry of individual egocentricities (Wink, *Naming the Powers*, 140).

28 DeSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament,* 216. John 2:13–17 places this incident at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and describes how he makes a whip out of cords, and drives all from the Temple area, scattering the coins of the moneychangers and overturning their tables. B. Ehrman, *Jesus, Interrupted: Revealing the Hidden Contradictions in the Bible (And Why We Don't Know About Them)* (HarperCollins e-books, 2009), 14, 26, 132 emphasises that Mark places the event at the end of Jesus' career and John at the beginning. Jesus' motif was not anger but zeal and his motivation was the suffering of the poor from the racketeering in the name of religion. C.A. Schwarz, *The 3 Colors of Community* (St. Charles: Church Smart Resources, 2012), 76. G. Vermes, *The Passion: The True Story of an Event that Changed Human History* (London: Penguin, 2005), 29 calls this incident the cause of the real conflict between Jesus and the authorities.

29 E.P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1993) argues that the study of the historical Jesus should start with Jesus' behaviour when he removes the moneychangers and vendors from the Temple terrain. Jesus' motif can only be understood in terms of his attitude towards the Temple. He sees himself as the one who has come to replace the Temple. His action is a symbolic pronouncement that he has come to destroy the Temple and to replace it with his body. For this reason, the statement that no stone would be left upon another can be found in all the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 13:2; Matthew 24:2; Luke 21:5–6). H. Wansbrough, *The Lion and the Bull: The Gospels of Mark and Luke* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1996), 64 warns that not all scholars agree what the meaning of Jesus' action in the Temple is. Some see it as a mere cleansing of offensive practices, money changing and the sale of sacrificial victims although there is not good evidence that these activities were real abuses. Jesus' action in the Temple was (part of) the cause of the violent reaction of the Jerusalem authorities against Jesus and their determination to kill him. 'The Temple and its rites were the glory of Jerusalem' (Wansbrough, *The Lion and the Bull*, 64) as well as of Second–Temple Judaism.

This is followed by more clashes between Jesus and the leaders with Jesus prophesying that they would be ousted, demonstrated by his parable about the wicked tenants of a vineyard (12:1–12, alluding to Israel as God's vineyard according to Isaiah 5). Pharisees and Herodians tempt him with the question whether one should pay taxes to the Roman oppressor, and Jesus exposes their hypocrisy for they carry Roman coins bearing the emperor's likeness: 'Give to the emperor what is his due and to God what is his due.' The implication is that the leaders fail to do that; they accept Roman sovereignty and deny God's sovereignty.

Jesus takes the initiative by asking the Sadducees a question about the resurrection (12:18–27); they do not believe in the resurrection because it is not stated explicitly in the *Torah*. Jesus defends the eschatological view of the resurrection against the Jerusalem leaders. The most important commandments in the *Torah* (12:28–34) and whether the Messiah is David's son (12:35–37) are discussed next.[30]

This is the foundation for the prediction of the Temple's destruction, with Jesus attacking the scribes' usage of their status for prideful purposes (12:38–40); they devour widows' 'houses' or provisioning. The next scene sees a widow deposit a tiny amount into the temple treasury. Her contribution amounts to her whole *bios*, all she has, in contrast to the rich giving out of their abundance.[31] This leads directly to Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the Temple. If this passage is seen in this context, the narrative of the widow's contribution to the temple treasury makes a point different from what is normally heard when the widow is used to demonstrate the virtue of generosity and self–sacrifice, as something that should be imitated by disciples of Jesus.[32] Mark's point

30 J. Dewey, *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1–3:6* (Chico, CA.: Scholars, 1980); cp. S. Dowd, *Reading Mark: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Second Gospel* (Macon, GA.: Smyth & Helwys, 2000), 12 who shows how the controversy stories in Mark 2:1–3:6 manifest linear development as well as chiastic structure, and how it brings human agency into focus. In the series of controversy stories in Mark 12, the same features are noted, and Jesus' death is foreshadowed once in the centre and again at the end. Cp. S. Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text: Interpreting and Preaching Biblical Literature* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988), 292–293 discussion of chiasm in Mark. 'The "Son of Man" represented a transcendent, apocalyptic messianic figure in contrast to the traditional Davidic, earthly and political messiah' (Heil, *The Gospel of Mark*, 17).

31 Mark 12:41–44 is often used in sermons to motivate church members to contribute generously to church finances. The text does not render assistance to fund raisers but it is rather a demonstration of the critique of Jesus on temple authorities and their unfaithfulness to God's purposes by insisting on being greeted respectfully in the market places, taking the front seats in the synagogues and the places of honour at banquets, and devouring the property of widows while offering long prayers for show (12:38–40). The reference to 'widows' in the passage preceding the story of the widow's mite determines that the succeeding story should be read in its light.

32 Cp. S. Dowd and E.S. Malbon's, 'The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience,' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125/2 (2006): 290 remark that the story of the widow's contribution hinges on the force of the final phrase, πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν ἔβαλεν, ὅλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς, and that it refers to what the 'Markan Jesus sees what lies before him: giving his whole life. Do the disciples see? Does the audience see? The Markan implied author hopes that the implied audience sees more than the disciples do as he moves on with his story'. I do not think that it is

is rather that the temple leaders abuse contributions, even from those who cannot afford it, demonstrating their unconcern for the values represented by the God of the temple.[33] They devour widows' subsistence, the rich exploit the poor, leading to the God of the prophets in the Hebrew Bible visiting God's people and temple with due punishment.

Jesus' discourse on the end of Jerusalem and the end of the world is introduced by the example of the widow who gave her whole life (12:44), but it is also framed by the account of another woman whose action in anointing Jesus' body will be remembered wherever the good news is preached (14:9).[34] The 'framing' of the eschatological discourse by the two women, the one who gives her life and the other sharing in the death of Jesus, highlights the fact that 13:1–37 is aimed at the disciples, according to Moloney.[35] The framing also introduces hope in the face of increasing opposition to Jesus (11:27–28; 12:12–13), and the disciples' inability to understand Jesus' invitation to carry the cross and follow him through suffering and death to resurrection (8:22–10:52).

Jesus crosses the Kidron Valley to the Mount of Olives with his disciples, where Jesus delivers a discourse about eschatological expectations concerning the Temple

feasible to hope that any audience would make the link between the widow's gift to the Temple and Jesus' offering of his life. R.L. Humphrey, *Narrative Structure and Message in Mark: A Rhetorical Analysis* (New York, Ontario: Edwin Mellen, 2003), 218 observes that the eschatological discourse is framed by two episodes concerning women. In the first, a widow puts in her whole life, and in the succeeding episode, a woman anoints Jesus' feet with expensive oil before his burial. The message of both episodes is clear: giving one's life is more than temple donations, as the Temple itself will be destroyed. In the same sense, Jesus and his followers will have to suffer and give their lives before Jesus will come to gather his elect into his kingdom.

33 Murphy, *Apocaypticism in the Bible*, 240.

34 E.S. Malbon, *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark's Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 215–217. Malbon with her works, *In the Company of Jesus* and E.S. Malbon, *Mark's Jesus: Characterization as Narrative Christology* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2009) has distinguished herself as a leading authority on characters and characterisation in Mark.

35 Moloney, *The Gospel of Mark,* 273. This represents the first full–length exegetical commentary on Mark from an explicitly narrative framework. He resolves the tension in the narrative by the application of two principles: he takes for granted that Mark the storyteller attempted to write an account of the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus that coherently communicated what he wanted to say to the original readers. Secondly, he attempts to fit everything together into a consistent pattern for his own readers. Cp. C.W. Skinner, 'Telling the Story: The Appearance and Impact of *Mark as Story*,' in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect* (eds. K.R. Iverson and C.W. Skinner; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 13. Moloney demonstrates how the Gospel possesses unity, structure, and coherence that instruct an original first-century audience and a twenty–first century audience. Cp. also J. Schröter's, '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. M. Labahn and A. Schmidt; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 2001), 35 remark that the Gospel must be seen 'as a coherent literary work with a narrative structure.'

(13:9–13).[36] The Mount of Olives is higher than the Temple Mountain and offers a good view of the Temple precincts, and the city.[37] The *eschaton* is near and the disciples should use the time available to preach the good news, despite persecution by Jewish and gentile authorities (13:9–13). Those who obey and endure to the end will be saved when the Son of man comes back. What is important to remember is to remain ready for the coming of the Son of man, to keep awake (13:37).

Now Jesus celebrates Passover with his disciples, and during the course of the meal he tells them that he will not drink wine again until that day when he drinks it new in the kingdom of God (14:25). This is not a spiritualised kingdom Jesus is talking about but one in which he will drink wine, after his death and resurrection. When he is delivered into the hands of the high priest Jesus admits that he is the messiah and refers to the coming of the Son of man at the *eschaton* (14:62).[38] In this way, the good news is brought into view by framing it eschatologically.

36 G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse* (Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1993). 'Discourse' is used in the sense defined by B. Lategan, 'New Testament Hermeneutics (Part I): Defining Moments in the Development of Biblical Hermeneutics,' in *Focusing on the Message: New Testament Hermeneutics, Exegesis and Methods* (ed. A.B Du Toit; Pretoria: Protea, 2009), 72 as the result of what is generated by sentences (or *colon*) in its combination with other sentences, forming larger units and eventually constituting a more comprehensive text with a specific thrust towards meaning as expressed in the text.

37 E. Schweizer, *The Good News according to Mark* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1970), 267; E.S. Malbon, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), 162. Malbon, *Narrative Space,* 84 reminds readers that the theological significance of the mountain underlies many narratives of the Jewish Scriptures, which in turn underlie Mark's Gospel. 'The biblical image of the mountain, and Mark's appropriation of it, is composite.' The final mountain on which Jesus is located is the Mount of Olives (11:1; 13:3; 14:26), and three aspects of biblical imagery of 'mountain' are engaged, according to Malbon, *Narrative Space,* 86: 'mountain' as a place of divinely authoritative teaching; as a place of encounter between God and God's spokespersons, the prophets; and as place of the initiation of the catastrophes of the Day of YHWH, the end time. At the end of time, the temple mountain will be higher than the Mount of Olives and all other mountains, according to Isaiah 2:2 and Micah 4:1. These prophecies highlight Jesus' prediction that the Temple would be destroyed completely, thus reversing physical reality as well as prophetic expectations (Malbon, *Narrative Space,* 162). Another association with 'mountain' comes from 11:23, where Jesus speaks about the faith to command 'this mountain' to be thrown into the sea. 'The throwing of a mountain into the sea is as useless and destructive an act as causing the death of a fig tree, and is best seen as merely a proverbial type saying for the impossible.' R.T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 448. The reference is to a specific mountain, as the fig tree is a particular tree. The Mount of Olives is the mountain the closest to Jesus, and the Dead Sea is almost within view from the eastern side of the Mount of Olives. R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978), 208. Or perhaps 'this mountain' refers to the Temple mount, and the 'mountain cast into the sea' refers to the judgment upon the Temple. T.C. Gray, *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in its Narrative Role* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 49–50.

38 Cp. Dowd and Malbon, 'The Significance of Jesus' Death,' 295.

Jesus' death is described in terms that remind of the apocalypses, with darkness covering the land and the curtain before the Holy of holies torn in two.[39] Given Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the Temple, the tearing of the curtain may symbolise that destruction and connect it to the temple authorities' rejection of Jesus and his realisation of God's kingdom, along with the idea that access to God is no longer through the temple cult and its sacrifices but through Jesus' death.[40] '... the destruction of the veil is the proleptic destruction of the temple, the cancellation of the cult that had been prophetically enacted by the Markan Jesus in 11:15-16 and explicitly predicted by him in 13:2 ... The positive aspect of the tearing of the curtain is the release of the divine presence into the world.'[41] His resurrection is also pictured as an apocalyptic event, as a vindication of Jesus and a foretaste of the *eschaton* (16:6).

Mark frequently uses δεῖ and it conveys the idea that God decrees what transpires in the Gospel. Several times δεῖ is used in key events, and it changes the perspective so that it can be called end-time events foreordained by God. For example, 8:31 declares that Jesus must suffer, die, and rise from the dead;[42] 13:10 declares that the good news must be preached to all the nations; 13:14–16 declares that no one should delay fleeing from Jerusalem when they notice certain signs coming true; and 14:31 explains that Peter thinks he also must die.

After discussing several elements in the Gospel of Mark, it is possible to conclude that the evangelist utilises an apocalyptic worldview consisting of a dualism demonstrated in Jesus' battle against enemies in the visible world representing the real enemies existing and functioning in the unseen world. He confronts and battles Satan and his demons, the unclean spirits, because he has insight in this unseen world. And only the inhabitants of the unseen world, the angels, demons, and God, really know and understand who Jesus is and why he battles with the unseen forces. Not even his disciples have this insight until after his death and resurrection.

---

39 'The curtain ripping in half shows that with the death of Jesus, God is made available to his people directly and not through the Jewish priests' sacrifice in the Temple' (Ehrman, *Jesus, Interrupted,* 60), according to Mark's account. In Luke's account, darkness comes over the land and the curtain is ripped while Jesus is still alive, marking the judgment of God against the Jewish Temple. The ripped curtain appears to indicate that God is rejecting the Jewish system of worship, symbolised by the Temple (Ehrman, *Jesus, Interrupted,* 61).

40 Dowd and Malbon 'The Significance of Jesus' Death,' 296 reminds that the only other usage of σχιζομένους occurs in Mark 1:10, referring to the splitting of heaven at Jesus' baptism.

41 Dowd, *Reading Mark,* 162.

42 S.P. Ahearne-Kroll, 'Audience Inclusion and Exclusion as Rhetorical Technique in the Gospel of Mark,' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129/4 (2010): 726–727 asks why it is necessary that the Son of man should suffer many things, and mentions that Mark leaves unexplained why Jesus must suffer. Is this a divine mandate, a choice that Jesus must make under external compulsion, something he (or Mark?) interprets from the Hebrew Scriptures that he must accomplish, the logical consequence of his ministry, or something else? All of these possibilities are raised by δεῖ, but Mark does not clearly point to any one as *the* reason, leaving his audience at a loss. 8:31 is in response to Peter's correct but misapprehended identification of Jesus as the Messiah (Horsley, *Hearing the Whole Story,* 15).

Jesus' expectation of eschatological events corresponds with those pictured in apocalypses, with its use of typical signs of Hebrew and Ancient Near Eastern theophanies like wars, earthquakes, famine; suffering and persecution of the initiated; disturbance of heavenly bodies; a general resurrection; and a separation between the elect and the wicked ending in a final judgment and post-mortem rewards and punishments to satisfy the demands of the theodicy. In these terms, Jesus introduces the last days culminating in the coming back of the Son of man on the clouds of heaven, in terms reminding of Daniel 7. These eschatological events have been set in motion with his coming to earth.

2. A COMPARISON BETWEEN MARK AND Q IN TERMS OF THEIR WORLDVIEWS

The analysis of Q showed that the conclusion to Q is a little 'apocalypse' on the end of the world (Q^{Lk} 17:22-35), warning against false eschatological expectations of a messiah and announcing that Jesus' second coming will be unexpected and that it will inaugurating a period of peace when he will establish his kingdom. Q might have ended with the assurance the disciples will rule over all in the new world (Q^{Lk} 22:28–30).

Q is defined by the motive of the kingdom of God consisting of the renewal of Israel, or the creation of an idealised form of Israel. Q is in other words concerned with a renewed social order. This observation allows the researcher to speculate about the first readers / listeners of Q, a Palestinian Jewish Christianity which was an eschatological and enthusiastic movement with a glowing imminent expectation. The conclusion is that the oldest Q community knew itself as a community of the end-time. The Q community did not resist hostility and oppression because they were aware of the cosmic struggle with Satan and his imminent judgment. They accepted their poverty, loved their enemies, practiced mercy, and proclaimed the kingdom.

Q functions with an apocalyptic worldview whose typical features consist of a dualism between righteous and unrighteous people signifying good and bad forces functioning in the unseen and determining what happens on earth, a feature of many Jewish apocalyptic works; exorcism as a sign of the coming of the kingdom that implies the defeat of Satan and the eventual destruction of the bad forces that function in the unseen and that determines what happens on earth, also in the lives of believers; the emphasis on a renewed community consisting of a totally new world and world order with a resulting eschatological reversal; post–mortem rewards and punishments implying resurrection as a precondition; the characterisation of the entire contemporary generation as evil; and secret knowledge reserved for insiders, the initiated or chosen ones. Q presupposes a belief in heaven and hell, an imminent judgment, revelation of secrets to an initiated group, and the eschatological role of the Holy Spirit.

Q also has specific apocalyptic content, in material relating to John the Baptist, with the apocalyptic features in John's preaching more vivid in Q than in Mark; in Jesus confronting Satan in the desert, enabling the reader to understand the battle in the unseen

world between the forces of good and evil and that predetermines what happens before one's senses; in Jesus sketching the renewed community embodying eschatological reversal, with post-mortem rewards and punishments as the hallmark of eschatological eschatology; in the missionary discourse in Q 9:57–10:16 with an apocalyptic 'harvest' indicating that the climax has come and judgment is next; in Jesus' condemning his opponents, including the entire present generation who are evil and demonic; in the insiders identified by Q as facing hostility and persecution and reassuring them of God's support; in Jesus' coming to cast fire on earth, not to bring peace but familial conflict and persecution from within and without. Q is permeated with apocalypticism as the product of an early apocalyptic community and describing Jesus as a prophet who commands a certain way of living representing the renewed Israel, battling with the established religious authorities and Satan, and warning of imminent judgment and punishment for evil ones.

The analysis of the Markan narrative showed that Mark is a Gospel utilising an apocalyptic worldview. The Gospel starts with the announcement of good news, a politically loaded term used in relation to Jesus' coming, ministry, trial, suffering, death, and resurrection, in terms of promises made in the Hebrew Bible, indicating that all is going to happen according to God's preordained and determined plan. History is predetermined by God's plan, explained and visible in the apocalyptic programme, and interpreted in reference to the prophets in the Hebrew Bible. And what happens on earth is being decided by what happens in the unseen world. According to the evangelist, Jesus announces the imminence of the kingdom, that is, the establishment of God's sovereignty, and the kingdom is already arriving but not yet established. Jesus battles with Satan and his demons, as well as earthly forces opposing the kingdom, consisting of the temple establishment and Roman oppressors, in order to establish the kingdom of God. In the same sense, Jesus controls the sea, with the sea associated apocalyptically with chaos threatening the existing order. Jesus' transfiguration before three of his disciples gives his disciples a clue to his heavenly identity, reinforced by Jesus having them promise to make knowledge about what transpired during his conversation with Moses and Elijah known only after his death. This is part of the Messianic secret that no one knows who Jesus really is and what he has come to do until after his death. Jesus' parables are also concealing Jesus' message of the kingdom to outsiders. However, he also declares that all will eventually know and understand the secret knowledge of the kingdom; what is hidden will be revealed. Jesus is depicted as the Messiah in terms of his suffering, and his suffering is connected to the *eschaton*. Jesus is resurrected from the dead, a further sign of the coming of the apocalyptic kingdom, and Jesus defends the idea of a general resurrection against the Sadducees who base their belief only on the *Torah*. Lastly, the promise is made that the Son of man will come at the end to judge over all people, separating the righteous from the wicked, and the elect from the rejected. The discourse relating to the time of the end is found in Mark 13. The signs signalling the end are described in apocalyptic terms: the temple will be destroyed; wars and rumours

of wars will multiply; earthquakes and famines will be experienced worldwide; false prophets and false messiahs will lead many believers astray; heavenly bodies will be disturbed; and then the Son of man will come to sit in judgement of all people.

John the Baptist's coming is pictured as the fulfilment of the prediction found in the prophets. He is the one preparing the way for the Lord in his judgment of the earth, and looking like the prophet Elijah, according to Malachi's expectation that Elijah will come before the day of God's judgment. The drama concludes with John the Baptist being handed over and dying, in the same manner as Jesus will be handed over and die; and the expectation is created that the disciples of Jesus will also be handed over and die for their faith. These sufferings are described in apocalyptic terms because they are interpreted as signs signalling the end-times.

The inhabitants of the earth are depicted in typical apocalyptic fashion in dualistic terms, of those acceptable to the Lord because of their obedience to the Lord's Son, and the people who do not please God, with the rich finding it nearly impossible to enter the kingdom (10:17-25).

By way of conclusion, a profile of the community in which Q originated shows that the Q community differed from the Markan community in their commitment to the covenant, *Torah*, and the Temple. They remained in close touch with the Pharisees although they differed from them in certain respects; relating to some aspects of the *Torah* they were even more conservative. Their Jewishness and separateness from the Gentiles were important for them but that did not exclude their involvement in preaching to fellow-Jews although they experienced rejection and even persecution from their people. They saw themselves as a reform movement working within Jewish religion rather than as a sect separated by rigid demarcation. Their outlook was Jerusalem–centred, their theology was *Torah*-centred and their worship Temple-centred, although they tied these commitments with their belief in Jesus as the Messiah.

Both Q and Mark utilise an apocalyptic worldview although each emphasises its own focus points, as indicated. Although the Q and Markan communities existed in separate cultural worlds both are apocalyptically defined, as the texts addressed to them indicate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahearne-Kroll, S.P. 'Audience Inclusion and Exclusion as Rhetorical Technique in the Gospel of Mark.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129 no. 4 (2010): 717–735.

Beasley-Murray, G.R. *Jesus and the Last Days: The Interpretation of the Olivet Discourse.* Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1993.

Brandenburger, E. *Das Recht des Weltenrichters: Untersuchung zu Matthäus 25,31–46.* Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1980.

Bultmann, R. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition.* Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprech, 1933.

———. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1948.

———. *History of the Synoptic Tradition.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1972.

Chilton, B.D. 'The Son of Man: Human and Heavenly.' Pages 203-218 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck.* Edited by C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle and J. Verheyden, Leuven: Peeters, Leuven University Press, 1992.

Collins, A.Y. 'The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as "Son of Man."' *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 391–407.

———. 'The Book of Revelation.' Pages 195-217 in *The Continuum History of Apocalypticism.* Edited by B.J. McGinn, J.J. Collins and S.J. Stein. New York. London: Continuum, 2003.

De Klerk, J.C. and C.W. Schnell. *Jesus deur Ander Oë: Literêre en Sosiologies-Historiese Interpretasies van Markus en Johannes.* Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik, 1987.

DeSilva, D.A. *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation.* Downers Grove, Ill.: IVP Academic; Nottingham: Apollos, 2004.

Dewey, J. *Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure, and Theology in Mark 2:1-3:6.* Chico, CA.: Scholars, 1980.

Dixon, E.P. 'Descending Spirit and Descending Gods: A "Greek" Interpretation of the Spirit's "Descent as a Dove" in Mark 1:10.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128 no. 4 (2009): 759–780.

Dowd, S. & Malbon, E.S. 'The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125 no. 2 (2006): 271–297.

Dowd, S. *Reading Mark: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Second Gospel.* Macon, GA.: Smyth & Helwys, 2000.

Ehrman, B. *Jesus, Interrupted: Revealing the Hidden Contradictions in the Bible (And Why We Don't Know About Them).* HarperCollins e-books, 2009.

France, R.T. *The Gospel of Mark.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Frey, J. 'New Testament Eschatology — An Introduction: Classical Issues, Disputed Themes, and Current Perspectives.' Pages 3–32 in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents.* Edited by J.G. Van der Watt. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Grant, M. *Jesus.* London: Rigel, 1977.

Gray, T.C. *The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in Its Narrative Role.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Greidanus, S. *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text: Interpreting and Preaching Biblical Literature*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988.

Heil, J.P. *The Gospel of Mark as a Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary.* New York / Mahwah: Paulist, 1992.

Horsley, R.A. *Hearing the Whole Story: The Politics of Plot in Mark's Gospel.* London, Leiden: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

Humphrey, R.L. *Narrative Structure and Message in Mark: A Rhetorical Analysis*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 60. New York, Ontario: Edwin Mellen, 2003.

Iverson, K.R. "'Wherever the Gospel is Preached': The Paradox of Secrecy in the Gospel of Mark." Pages 181–210 in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect.* Edited by K.R. Iverson and C.W. Skinner, Resources for Biblical Study 65, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Kee, H.C. 'Christology in Mark's Gospel.' Pages 187–208 in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs.* Edited by J. Neusner et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Kennedy, P. *A Modern Introduction to Theology: New Questions for Old Beliefs.* London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2006.

Lategan, B. 'New Testament Hermeneutics (Part I): Defining Moments in the Development of Biblical Hermeneutics.' Pages 13–63 in *Focusing on the Message: New Testament Hermeneutics, Exegesis and Methods.* Edited by A. Du Toit. Pretoria: Protea, 2009.

Lindars, B. *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1983.

Louw, J.P. and Nida, E.A. (eds.) *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament based on Semantic Domains.* New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.

Malbon, E.S. *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark.* San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

———. *In the Company of Jesus: Characters in Mark's Gospel.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000.

———. *Mark's Jesus: Characterisation as Narrative Christology.* Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Marcus, J. 'Mark and Isaiah.' Pages 449–466 in *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday.* Edited by A.B. Becket et al. Grand Rapids, Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.

Matera, F.J. *What Are They Saying about Mark?* New York / Mahwah: Paulist, 1987.

Meier, J.P. *Mentor, Message, and Miracles.* New York: Doubleday, 1994

Moloney, F.J. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary.* Grand Rapids, Mi.: Baker Academic, 2002.

Murphy, F.J. *Apocaypticism in the Bible and Its World: A Comprehensive Introduction.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.

Myers, C. *Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus.* Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988.

Neville, D.J. 'Moral Vision and Eschatology in Mar''s Gospel: Coherence or Conflict?' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127:2 (2008): 359–384

Pesch, R. (ed.), *Das Markusevangelium.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978.

Reynolds, B.E. *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Rosman, H.N. (ed.) *The Purpose of the Gospel of Mark in its Historical and Social Context.* Leiden/ Boston: Brill, 2004.

Sanders, E.P. *The Historical Figure of Jesus.* London: Penguin, 1993.

Schröter, J. '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 M. Labahn and A. Schmidt. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 2001.

Schwarz, C.A. *The 3 Colors of Community.* St. Charles: ChurchSmart Resources, 2012.

Schweizer, E. *The Good News according to Mark.* Atlanta: John Knox, 1970.

Skinner, C.W. 'Telling the Story: The Appearance and Impact of *Mark as Story*.' Pages 1–16 in *Mark as Story: Retrospect and Prospect.* Edited by K.R. Iverson and C.W. Skinner. Resources for Biblical Study 65. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Van Aarde, A. *Fatherless in Galilee: Jesus as Child of God.* Harrisburg: Trinity, 2001.

Van Aarde, A.G. and S. Joubert. 'Social-Scientific Criticism.' Pages 419–455 in *Focusing on the Message: New Testament Hermeneutics, Exegesis and Methods.* Edited by A.B. Du Toit. Pretoria: Protea, 2009.

Van Eck, E. 'Eschatology and Kingdom in Mark.' Pages 64–90 in *Eschatology of the New Testament and Some Related Documents.* Edited by J.G. Van der Watt. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Vermes, G. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.

———. *Jesus and the World of Judaism.* London: SCM, 1983.

———. *The Changing Faces of Jesus.* New York: Penguin, 2000.

———. *The Authentic Gospel of Jesus.* London: Penguin, 2003a.

———. *Jesus in His Jewish Context.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003b.

———. *The Passion: The True Story of an Event that Changed Human History.* London: Penguin, 2005.

Wansbrough, H. *The Lion and the Bull: The Gospels of Mark and Luke.* London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1996.

Wenham, D. *The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse.* Sheffield: JSOT, 1984.

Willis, W. *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation* Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1987.

Wink, W. *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Witherington, B. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Historical Commentary.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2001.

Zimmermann, R. 'Paradigmen einer metaphorischen Christologie. Eine Leseanleitung.' Pages 1–36 in *Metaphorik und Christologie.* Edited by J. Frey, J. Rohls and R. Zimmermann. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.