

audience members may regard this speech act as a directive point by means of which these characters beg Jesus to save them. Alternatively, they may regard it as praise, i.e. an assertive point. In this case, the object of the praise may be Jesus or God.<sup>1498</sup>

Audience members may interpret Mark 11:1–10 against the backdrop of Mark 1:1.<sup>1499</sup> In that case, they will probably think that these characters praise the one who was elected to proclaim God's presence and to bring about the day of salvation and liberty. In the Gospel of Mark, the hope of salvation and liberty is connected with the kingdom of God, not the kingdom of David. Against this backdrop, audience members may think that these characters do not understand the significance of Jesus, who is the main agent of the kingdom of God. In Mark 1:1 and 1:11 Jesus was presented in a manner which indicated that he could be regarded as a king. Mark 11:1–10 elaborates on this suggestion at a point where audience members probably will understand that Jesus should be related to the kingdom of God, not the kingdom of David.

### 11:11–16:8: Jesus in Jerusalem and the Surrounding Areas

The extradiegetic narrator has previously mentioned Jerusalem, because characters from this town came to Jesus (Mark 3:8; 3:22; 7:1).<sup>1500</sup> In Mark 10:32–33, it became clear that Jerusalem was the final destination of the journey on which Jesus and his disciples set out in Mark 8:27, and through Mark 11:1a audience members learned that “they were approaching Jerusalem.” By means of Mark 11:11a, audience members are informed that Jesus enters Jerusalem. Mark 11:11 constitutes the first of three sequences where Jesus first enters Jerusalem and subsequently goes into the temple (Mark 11:15; 11:27). On the basis of this pattern, it seems that Jesus enters Jerusalem every day,<sup>1501</sup> or on three consecutive days.<sup>1502</sup>

From now on, temporal markers become more prominent with regard to the structure of the Gospel of Mark. Spatial and temporal markers are combined in a manner which creates a more elaborate structure than the less sophisticated spatial framework which constituted the main structure of earlier parts of the gospel.<sup>1503</sup> With regard to this text-sequence, however, temporal markers seem more important than spatial markers. They indicate the days and finally the hours of Jesus' stay in Jerusalem and its environs.

After Mark 11:11a, Jesus exits Jerusalem on several occasions. He returns to Bethany (Mark 11:11b–12; 14:3) and the Mount of Olives (Mark 13:3; 14:26), which were both mentioned together with Jerusalem in Mark 11:1. The main difference between Jesus' first entry into Jerusalem (Mark 11:11) and subsequent entries (Mark 11:15;

1498 See Collins, *Mark*, 520.

1499 See “1:1: Title” on page 111.

1500 See also Mark 1:5 where the phrase οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται πάντες was employed.

1501 See van Iersel, *Mark*, 356.

1502 See “III.2. An Outline of the Gospel of Mark” on page 103.

1503 Temporal markers have been pointed out earlier, but spatial markers have constituted the main structure. See “III.2. An Outline of the Gospel of Mark” on page 103.

11:27) is that Jesus reached his destination in Mark 11:11a.<sup>1504</sup> He is therefore no longer on the way (Mark 11:8). After Mark 11:11, the spatial focus of the narrative is on the temple,<sup>1505</sup> Jerusalem, and its environs.

### 11:11: Jesus Enters the Temple and Departs for Bethany Together with the Twelve

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that Jesus “went into Jerusalem, into the temple” (Mark 11:11a).<sup>1506</sup> Jesus’ followers are not mentioned at this stage.<sup>1507</sup> Jesus is situated with regard to two reference objects, Jerusalem and the temple. The reference frame is thus external, which means that the positional constraints are weak. On the basis of these reference objects, audience members will probably construct a position for the perceiver in the temple in Jerusalem. Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator.

Since the subsequent assertive point uttered by the extradiegetic narrator contains the perceptual verb περιβλέπω (“when he had looked around at everything,” Mark 11:11b), audience members may attribute this perception to Jesus, and this means that the extradiegetic narrator has perceptual access to him. However, the verb περιβλέπω is followed only by the indefinite adjective πᾶς. Because the object of Jesus’ perception is not described, audience members may continue to attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. In either case, Jesus seems to perform an inspection of the temple.<sup>1508</sup>

Through the subsequent assertive point, “since it was already late in the day, he went out to Bethany with the twelve” (Mark 11:11b), audience members are informed about the time, Jesus’ destination, and the fact that the twelve are once more present.

### 11:12–19: The Next Day

This episode is demarcated by means of the temporal marker τῆ ἐπαύριον (Mark 11:12), which connects this episode with the previous event (Mark 11:11).<sup>1509</sup> Mark 11:12–19 is constituted by two minor episodes. The first takes place when Jesus and the disciples travel from Bethany to Jerusalem (Mark 11:12–14), and the second occurs in Jerusalem, in the temple (Mark 11:15–19).

1504 For the fact that Jesus reaches his destination, Jerusalem, in Mark 11:11a, see also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 189. According to Heil, the goal is the sacred temple. Heil, *The Gospel*, 223.

1505 According to Lührmann, Jesus’ entry into the temple prepares for the subsequent focus on the temple. Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 189.

1506 Mark 11:11 contains spatial markers, temporal markers, and character markers through which this episode is demarcated.

1507 For the fact that Jesus is the focus of attention, see Gundry, *Mark*, 635.

1508 Hooker points out that “this inspection of the temple by Jesus is of great importance for Mark, since it leads to its subsequent condemnation.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 260. Gundry suggests that this event sets the stage for the subsequent cleansing of the temple. Gundry, *Mark*, 635. See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 323. Collins, *Mark*, 521. Hartman, *Mark*, 470. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 288.

1509 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 266–267.

## 11:12–14: They Depart from Bethany

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that “on the next day, when they went out of Bethany, he was hungry” (Mark 11:12). This speech act contains the spatial marker ἀπὸ Βηθανίας by means of which this episode is demarcated. This location connects Mark 11:12–14 with Mark 11:11b.<sup>1510</sup> Bethany constitutes the reference object, which indicates that the reference frame is external. Because the positional constraints are weak, audience members will construct a position for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of Bethany. Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. On the basis of the latter part of this assertive point, ἐπείνασεν, audience members may attribute unrestricted knowledge of Jesus’ thoughts and sensory perceptions to the extradiegetic narrator.<sup>1511</sup> Through the narration, audience members too have access to Jesus’ consciousness.

The extradiegetic narrator employs another assertive point to relate what Jesus observes while they were traveling (“Seeing from a distance a fig tree with leaves,” Mark 11:13a). On the basis of the perceptual verb ὁράω, audience members may attribute the perception of the fig tree to Jesus. If they do so, the extradiegetic narrator and audience members have perceptual access to him. The phrase ἀπὸ μακρόθεν indicates that the reference frame is relative, i.e. the distance to the fig tree is determined by the position of the perceiver in the Markan world. If audience members have attributed the perception of the fig tree to Jesus, they will construct the event in a manner where they observe the tree from the position they have constructed for Jesus in the Markan world.

Through the subsequent assertive point, “he went to see whether perhaps he would find something on it” (Mark 11:13b), the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about the intention of Jesus. This information may lead audience members to attribute unrestricted knowledge of Jesus’ thoughts to the extradiegetic narrator. Likewise, the subsequent assertive point, “when he came to it, he found nothing except leaves” (Mark 11:13c),<sup>1512</sup> may indicate that audience members should attribute perceptual access to Jesus to the extradiegetic narrator – in this case, on the basis of the verb εὐρίσκω. This attribution is substantiated by the previous attribution to the extradiegetic narrator of perceptual access as well as access to Jesus’ thoughts. Alternatively, audience members may attribute this perception to the extradiegetic narrator, who subsequently explains to audience members that “it was not the season for figs” (Mark 11:13d).<sup>1513</sup> During this episode, the extradiegetic narrator, audience

1510 For related insights, see Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 289.

1511 I doubt that it is possible for audience members to construct this event in a manner where they are merely observing external manifestations of this thought or perception.

1512 Hooker suggests that Jesus inspects the fig tree in the same manner as he inspected the temple on the previous day. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 267. Collins interprets this episode against the backdrop of Mark 11:1–11. She proposes that “[t]he ‘leaves’ on the fig tree correspond to the acclamations of the crowd, and the lack of fruit corresponds to the missing welcome by the leaders.” Collins, *Mark*, 526.

1513 According to Donahue and Harrington, the effect of this explanation “is to highlight what seems to be irrational behavior on the part of Jesus.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 327.

members, and Jesus have become closely associated because the former have had perceptual access to Jesus. This facet of the gospel may promote identification with Jesus.

The extradiegetic narrator introduces Jesus' subsequent speech act by telling audience members that it is uttered to the fig tree (Mark 11:14a).<sup>1514</sup> Because no perceptual verbs are mentioned, audience members may attribute the perception of the utterance "may no one ever eat fruit from you again" (Mark 11:14b) to the extradiegetic narrator. Audience members may regard this speech act as an assertive point, a wish,<sup>1515</sup> or as a declarative point, a curse.<sup>1516</sup> In the latter case, the tree is consigned "to the evil of God's malediction."<sup>1517</sup> Audience members are subsequently told that "his disciples heard it" (Mark 11:14c). Because the utterance was addressed to the tree, the perceptual verb ἀκούω may indicate to audience members that the disciples overheard the speech act, or that they were intended as side-participants.

As side-participants to this event, audience members are informed by Jesus' speech acts. The significance of this event will not be evident, however, until they have heard the subsequent episodes.<sup>1518</sup>

### 11:15–19: Jesus Is in the Temple in Jerusalem

The extradiegetic narrator introduces this episode by means of the assertive points "they came to Jerusalem. And he went into the temple" (Mark 11:15a). These speech acts contain the spatial markers εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα and εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, by means of which this episode is demarcated.<sup>1519</sup> The reference objects "Jerusalem" and "the temple" indicate that the reference frame is external, and this means that the positional constraints are weak. On the basis of this information, audience members will probably construct a position for the perceiver in the temple in Jerusalem. Because these assertive points do not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator.

By means of several assertive points, the extradiegetic narrator utters a highly visual description of actions which Jesus performs in the temple. He "began to drive out those who were selling and those who were buying in the temple, and he overturned the tables of the money-changers and the seats of those who were selling the doves" (Mark 11:15b).<sup>1520</sup> Because the discourse aspect does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will continue to attribute the perception of this event to the

1514 According to Telford, the fig tree may symbolise Israel, Jerusalem, and its temple. See W. R. Telford, *The Barren*, 162–163. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 262, 267.

1515 See van Iersel, *Mark*, 356. According to van Iersel, "[a] wish of Jesus is very near an order, and may be expected to come true, as has been the case with earlier orders of his. Does it also mean that Jesus' pronouncement will cause the intended effect? In that case we would be dealing here with a curse, but as long as the reader does not know Peter's reaction (v. 21), other interpretations are just as valid."

1516 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 191. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 261, 267. Gundry, *Mark*, 635–637. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 327. Collins, *Mark*, 526.

1517 Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations*, 209.

1518 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 191.

1519 The spatial marker ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (Mark 11:15b) substantiates this demarcation.

1520 Heil interprets this event against the backdrop of Mark 11:12–14, which he regards as an authoritative prophetic gesture. "Just as the fig tree, although it has leaves, has failed to produce fruit and thus fulfill

extradiegetic narrator. This description is succeeded by the following indirect content paraphrase: “and he would not allow anyone to carry objects through the temple” (Mark 11:16). By means of this assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members that Jesus also uttered a directive point.<sup>1521</sup> Audience members may infer the intended perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ prohibition, i.e. to prevent people from carrying anything through the temple. The actual perlocutionary effect is not pointed out to audience members.

Not unlike previous events, Jesus’ deeds and teaching are interrelated.<sup>1522</sup> By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that Jesus was teaching some anonymous characters (αὐτοῖς, Mark 11:17a).<sup>1523</sup> Subsequently, the extradiegetic narrator cites two speech acts voiced by Jesus. The first is a directive point, a rhetorical question which aims at affirmation. The propositional content of this question consists of an introductory phrase, οὐ γέγραπται, and a quote from written cultural memory, ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Mark 11:17b). Through the question “is it not written, ‘My house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations?’” (Mark 11:17b), Jesus points out the ideal state of the temple. The intended perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ question is probably that his addressees should affirm that this ideal is drawn from written cultural memory. As side-participants, audience members are informed by means of Jesus’ speech act. Audience members who are familiar with the tradition cited here may affirm Jesus’ speech act. In this manner, Jesus’ directive point also functions as an assertive point, by means of which he utters a claim. Audience members may regard this claim as an indication that prayer is more important than sacrifice and that Gentiles are welcomed.<sup>1524</sup> Jesus’ claim about the ideal state of the temple is followed by an assertive point which communicates Jesus’ opinion about the current state of the temple, “but you have made it a den of robbers” (Mark 11:17c).<sup>1525</sup> If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they may realize that both claims uttered by Jesus draw on cultural memory. Jesus contrasts Isa 56:7 (the ideal) with Jer 7:11. Accordingly, cultural memory is employed to illuminate the current situation as well. Through his negotiation of cultural memory, Jesus com-

---

its expected, God-given purpose, so the temple, although it conducts the business in preparation for sacrificial worship, evidently has not fulfilled its expected, God-given purpose.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 226.

1521 For indirect content paraphrase, see Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 109. Bortolussi and Dixon, *Psychonarratology*, 215.

1522 Gundry points out that Jesus was simultaneously teaching and performing the actions which were mentioned in Mark 11:15b–16. Gundry, *Mark*, 640.

1523 According to Hooker, Jesus was teaching “everyone in the temple precinct.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 268.

1524 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 193. “Der Vordersatz zeigt, daß es nicht bloß um eine ‚Reinigung‘ des Tempels von finanziellen oder anderen Unsitten geht, sondern um eine andere Bestimmung der Funktion des Jerusalemer Heiligtums: nicht vom Opfer her bestimmter Tempel, sondern ... opferlose Synagoge, offen auch für die ‚Heiden‘, nicht nur für Israeliten.” According to Collins, “[m]embers of the audience familiar with the context of the citation would probably not conclude that its use here implies that Gentiles would participate in the service of the temple as Gentiles. Rather, the saying implies, also in its Markan context, the ideal that the Gentiles will turn to the God of Israel and adopt Jewish practices. Like the saying in Isa 56:7 itself, however, the Markan context implies a shift of emphasis from sacrifice to prayer.” Collins, *Mark*, 531.

1525 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 531.

bines two prophetic scripts, which contrast an ideal (Isa 56:1ff.) with a state that was condemned by God (Jer 7:11).

Mark 11:17 is constituted by two contrasts; more precisely, “my” is contrasted with “you” and “a house of prayer” is contrasted with “a den of robbers.” Both houses obviously refer to the temple. The first claim pertains to the manner in which the temple was intended to function by the one who owns it, i.e. God.<sup>1526</sup> As side-participants to speech acts uttered in the Markan world and addressees of the extradiegetic narrator, audience members have acquired knowledge which may suggest to them that the pronoun “my” could also refer to Jesus,<sup>1527</sup> the Son of God (Mark 1:11; 9:7). In the Markan world, Jesus seems to represent God. Markan characters who characterized Jesus as “he who comes in the name of the Lord” (Mark 11:9) have recently confirmed this aspect of Jesus’ identity.

The second claim uttered by Jesus seems to be addressed to the anonymous characters, who are referred to by the pronoun “you.” Through his claim about their current practice in the temple, Jesus seems to accuse them of undermining the ideal state of the temple.<sup>1528</sup> If audience members interpret Jesus’ actions and speech acts in the temple against this backdrop, they may infer that Jesus, who is God’s agent, is attempting to restore the temple to its original purpose. By drawing on written cultural memory, Jesus endeavors to legitimate his authority to alter the spatial practice in the temple. Audience members may infer that Jesus’ speech acts and actions are intended to prepare the temple for the arrival of the Lord. In that case, they may conclude that Jesus behaves in a manner which will contribute to realization of the goal of the first plot.

By means of the assertive point “the chief priests and the scribes heard it” (Mark 11:18a), the extradiegetic narrator introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ speech acts. On the basis of the perceptual verb ἀκούω, audience members may attribute the perception of Jesus’ speech acts to these characters. Because the communication situation, which was sketched in Mark 11:17, did not reveal the identity of Jesus’ addressees, audience members may infer that the chief priests and the scribes constitute addressees, side-participants, or overhearers. The extradiegetic narrator relates the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ speech acts through the following assertive points: “they were looking for a way to put him to death; for they were afraid of him” (Mark 11:18b). On the basis of these speech acts, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the thoughts and conscious feelings of the chief priests and the scribes.<sup>1529</sup> These clues, which constitute the discourse aspect, may encourage increased involvement or even identification with

1526 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 227. Heil elaborates on this point. “With its future formulation (‘shall be called’) Jesus’ proclamation can be heard by the reader not only as an expression of God’s intention of what the temple should be but also as a future promise for a ‘temple’ that can truly be a place of genuine prayer to God for all human beings.”

1527 On this pronoun, see also Gundry, *Mark*, 640.

1528 According to Heil, Jesus levels a direct accusation at those who were taking part in the business of the temple cult. Heil, *The Gospel*, 227.

1529 Audience members may construct the latter assertive point as an external manifestation of emotions; however, previous indications of perceptual access and access to the thoughts of these characters will probably point to the solution suggested above.

the chief priests and the scribes. In this manner, this episode facilitates simulation of the second plot.

Speech acts which constitute Mark 11:18b indicate that the intended perlocutionary effect of Jesus' speech acts (Mark 11:17), viz. to restore the temple to its original purpose, is contrasted by the actual perlocutionary effect: ἐζήτουν πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν (Mark 11:18b). The reaction of the chief priests and scribes may prime or activate Mark 3:6, which introduced the second plot of the Gospel of Mark. At that point, the Pharisees and the Herodians conspired to destroy Jesus. Jesus' predictions about his death and resurrection (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33–34) have informed audience members about the role played by various characters with regard to the plot that leads to his death. Audience members may therefore conclude that Jesus' attempts to alter spatial practice in the temple may eventually lead to his death.

Through the assertive point constituting Mark 11:18c (“because the whole crowd was amazed at his teaching”), the extradiegetic narrator explains the reaction of the chief priests and the scribes. This speech act also informs audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' teaching on the crowd.<sup>1530</sup> Audience members may construct this information in two manners, either as external manifestations of emotions or as conscious feelings. Because the crowd seems to support Jesus rather than the chief priests and the scribes,<sup>1531</sup> these leaders may perceive Jesus as a potential threat to their leadership and authority over the temple and over the crowd.<sup>1532</sup>

The extradiegetic narrator concludes this episode by means of an assertive point, telling audience members Καὶ ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύοντο ἔξω τῆς πόλεως (Mark 11:19). The “city” constitutes the reference object; hence, the reference frame is external. The positional constraints are weak, which means that audience members will construct a position for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of this event. Because this information does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator.

As invisible witnesses and side-participants to Jesus' actions and speech acts, audience members learn that Jesus attempts to alter spatial practice in the temple, as well as the function of the temple. Through this event, Jesus challenges the Jewish leaders, who respond by seeking to eliminate Jesus. In this manner, the extradiegetic narrator relates the two plots constituting the Gospel of Mark to each other.

### 11:20–13:37: The Next Day

Mark 11:20–13:37 is demarcated by means of an implied temporal marker. This major episode encompasses several minor episodes, which all take place on the same day, in the temple or outside of this building.

1530 It is peculiar, however, that the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' teaching on those who are buying, selling, changing money, or selling doves is not mentioned at all.

1531 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 194.

1532 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 228.



## 11:20–25: In the Morning

Mark 11:20–25 is demarcated by means of the temporal marker *πρωῖ* (Mark 11:20). On the basis of this temporal marker and the assertive point, *Καὶ ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο* (Mark 11:19a), audience members will probably infer that Mark 11:12–19 and 11:20–13:37 take place on two consecutive days. When audience members hear the assertive point “early in the morning as they were passing by, they saw the fig tree withered from the roots” (Mark 11:20), they may therefore deduce that the curse Jesus uttered the previous day took effect immediately. Because of the perceptual verb *ὀράω*, audience members may attribute the perception of the withered fig tree to the characters who passed by it, and this in turn means that the extradiegetic narrator has perceptual access to these characters. During this event, these characters and audience members all witness the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ curse. Audience members may alternatively attribute the perception of all these events to the extradiegetic narrator. The description provided by the extradiegetic narrator may prime or activate Greco-Roman cultural memory. Against this backdrop, audience members may conclude that Jesus’ curse was successful, and this implies that Jesus had the power and authority to change the world in the intended manner.<sup>1533</sup>

The extradiegetic narrator subsequently tells audience members that Peter remembered and spoke to Jesus (Mark 11:21a).<sup>1534</sup> The verb *ἀναμνησῶ* constitutes a diegetic summary of Peter’s thoughts. Accordingly, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of Peter’s thoughts. Through this device, audience members too are reminded of the previous event.

Peter subsequently utters an assertive point which explicitly reminds his addressee as well as side-participants of Jesus’ previous encounter with the fig tree (Mark 11:13–14). “‘Rabbi, look! The fig tree which you cursed has withered’” (Mark 11:21b). By means of the vocative *ῥαββί* and the interjection *ἴδε*, Peter attracts Jesus’ attention. Then he points out to Jesus and to side-participants that the fig tree which Jesus cursed has withered.<sup>1535</sup> Peter’s speech act thus identifies the type of illocutionary act which was performed by Jesus on the previous day.<sup>1536</sup> Moreover, the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ speech act, which was described in Mark 11:20, is repeated and thus emphasized.

The extradiegetic narrator subsequently informs audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of Peter’s speech act. “Jesus answered and said to them,

1533 Telford points out the fig-tree’s connection with Greco-Roman religion and cultus. Greco-Roman cultural memory thus constitutes the backdrop of the following claim: “To Gentile readers, then, as for their Jewish counterparts, the blasting of this tree with its cultic connections would have been viewed at the very least as an exhibition of superior power on the part of the founder of the Christian cult. The tree that served temple or cultus should serve him – or no one.” W. R. Telford, “More Fruit,” 301–302. “The fact that the founder of Christianity is himself the agent of the tree’s destruction is a bold expression of his superior power and sovereignty over the Jewish Holy City and its Temple.” Telford, “More Fruit,” 303.

1534 This remark ties Mark 11:21 to 11:14, see also Collins, *Mark*, 534.

1535 Audience members may alternatively regard Peter’s utterance as a rebuke or an expression of astonishment. Heil, suggests that Peter expresses surprise or bewilderment. Heil, *The Gospel*, 229.

1536 According to Collins, Peter defines Jesus’ exclamation. Collins, *Mark*, 534. See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 329.



‘Have faith in God’ (Mark 11:22).<sup>1537</sup> By means of this directive point, Jesus exhorts,<sup>1538</sup> urges, or commands his addressees to have faith in God,<sup>1539</sup> but he also indicates that faith in God enabled him to perform this mighty deed.<sup>1540</sup> The noun πίστις may prime or activate previous events where this noun has been related to Jesus’ mighty deeds (Mark 2:5; 4:40; 5:34; 10:52).<sup>1541</sup> Because lexical entries are content addressable, events where the verb πιστεύω has been employed may be primed or activated as well (Mark 1:15; 5:36; 9:23–24). In Mark 1:15b and 5:36b, Jesus made directive points resembling the speech act which is uttered in Mark 11:22. In Mark 1:15b, people were urged or commanded to “believe in the good news.” In Mark 5:36b, Jesus told Jairus: “Do not be afraid, only believe.” Audience members probably inferred that the speech act which Jesus addressed to Jairus encouraged Jairus to believe in Jesus’ powers to change the world.<sup>1542</sup> In Mark 5:36, the object of belief was not mentioned. In Mark 11:22, however, Jesus’ addressees are urged to believe in God.<sup>1543</sup> A specific object is thus mentioned, as in Mark 1:15. If some of these events are primed or activated, Mark 11:22 will remind audience members of the manner in which miracles, faith, and trust are interrelated.<sup>1544</sup>

Because the imperative is inflected in the second person plural, some audience members may process the directive point uttered by Jesus in Mark 11:22 as if he addresses them. As a result, they will not consider themselves merely as side-participants who are informed by Jesus’ speech act. The tendency to process Jesus’ speech act as if it were addressed to them can be reinforced by the words ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,<sup>1545</sup> which introduce Jesus’ subsequent speech acts (Mark 11:23a).

Jesus’ directive point is succeeded by the following utterance: “Truly I tell you, that whoever says to this mountain, ‘Be lifted up and thrown into the sea,’ and does not doubt in his heart, but believes that what he says will happen, it will be (so) for him” (Mark 11:23). Audience members may recognize that Jesus makes an assertive point, i.e. a claim, or a commissive point, that is, a promise. This main argument in turn contains a directive point, which seems to symbolize what is humanly impossible.<sup>1546</sup> Through his utterance, Jesus claims or promises that those of his addressees

1537 Collins points out that this verse has a transitional quality. Collins, *Mark*, 534.

1538 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 230.

1539 Donahue and Harrington suggest that this “discourse points to God as the source of power for Jesus and for all believers.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 329.

1540 For related insights, see Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 293.

1541 According to Collins, Jesus instructs his disciples on how they could perform mighty deeds (Mark 11:22–23). Collins, *Mark*, 534.

1542 See “5:35–43: Jesus and Jairus” on page 243.

1543 On the fact that the genitive θεοῦ is an objective genitive, see also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 195. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 329.

1544 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 534–535.

1545 For this phrase, see comments on Mark 3:28.

1546 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 230. According to van Iersel, the mountain is the Mount of Olives. “Since to be thrown into the sea means certain death (5.13; 9.42), the fate of the Mount of Olives covered in trees presents a hyperbolic analogue of the destruction of the fig tree. The introduction in v. 22, ‘Have faith in God’, as well as the last words of v. 23, ‘it will be done for you’ (ἔσται αὐτῷ) [error in van Iersel], leave no doubt that the cursing of the mountain depends for its fulfillment on God.” van Iersel, *Mark*, 359–360,

who do not doubt, but trust that his directive or declarative speech act(s) will enable him to change the world, will experience the intended perlocutionary effects of their speech act(s). Mark 11:22–23 thus indicate that faith or trust in God<sup>1547</sup> will enable Jesus' addressees to change the world, i.e. to do the humanly impossible.<sup>1548</sup> The attitude, which Jesus commends, corresponds to the belief which was illustrated by many characters who were healed by Jesus previously. In addition to the previously mentioned events, Mark 11:22–23 may prime or activate Mark 9:23 ("All things are possible for the one who believes") and Mark 10:27 ("for all things are possible to God"). Belief and trust is thus a theme which is repeated in various contexts and ways in the Gospel of Mark.

The phrase διὰ τοῦτο connects Mark 11:24 to the preceding speech acts: "For this reason I say to you, whatever you pray and ask for, believe that you have received it, and it will be (so) for you." Through this speech act, Jesus explicitly relates faith and trust to prayer.<sup>1549</sup> If the previous verses activated Mark 9:23, the context of this verse was probably primed or activated. In that case, audience members may remember that prayer and mighty deeds were associated earlier too (Mark 9:14–29).<sup>1550</sup> In Mark 9:28, the disciples asked Jesus why they were unable to cast out the unclean spirit. Jesus answered, "this kind can come out by nothing but prayer" (Mark 9:29b). At that point, audience members who had realized the importance of faith or trust with regard to mighty deeds probably deduced that faith and prayer were important factors in order to change the world. At this point, Jesus' speech act is more explicit. Audience members may regard this speech act as an assertive point, a claim, or a commissive point, i.e. a promise. By means of this speech act, Jesus claims or promises his addressees that everything they pray and ask for will be realized if they have the appropriate attitude, i.e. faith.

Jesus' utterance contains the pronoun ὑμῖν (Mark 11:24). Moreover, the subsequent verbs are inflected in the second person plural. On the basis of these indications, some audience members may process Jesus' utterance as if it were addressed to them. The general content of this speech act may promote this mechanism.

The verb προσεύχομαι connects Mark 11:25 to the preceding utterance.<sup>1551</sup> By means of Mark 11:25, Jesus relates prayer to forgiveness. Through the directive point which constitutes Mark 11:25a, Jesus instructs his addressees: "When you stand praying, forgive, if you have anything against anyone." Subsequently Jesus states the reason why they should forgive their fellows, i.e. "in order that your Father in the heavens may also forgive you your trespasses" (Mark 11:25b). By means of Mark 11:25, Jesus situates his addressees in a larger context, where their conduct towards other

---

at 360. Cf. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 329. Collins, *Mark*, 535. They argue against tying this saying to a specific mountain.

1547 "Was in 23 über den Glauben überhaupt gesagt wird, ist durch die Überschrift in 22 präzisiert auf den Glauben an Gott hin." Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 195.

1548 According to Collins, "the saying of v. 23 is an invitation to imitate or appropriate divine power." Collins, *Mark*, 536.

1549 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 195.

1550 See "9:28–29: Jesus and His Disciples in a House" on page 334.

1551 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 330.

human beings will determine the manner in which God will treat them. The phrase ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς seems to indicate that God is the father of his addressees. This utterance may explain why Jesus did not mention fathers in Mark 10:30.

Once more, the pronoun employed by Jesus (ὑμῶν) and the fact that the verbs are inflected in the second person plural may lead at least some audience members to process these speech acts as if they are uttered to them by Jesus.<sup>1552</sup>

Mark 11:12–14 and 11:20–21 constitute a sandwich.<sup>1553</sup> According to Edwards, the key to interpret these sandwiches is the middle story.<sup>1554</sup> As a result, the cursing of the fig tree should be interpreted in connection with Jesus' actions in the temple (Mark 11:15–19). From a Greco-Roman perspective, William R. Telford points out that “[a] mystical bond was deemed to exist between individuals or cities and the trees associated with them. The blossoming of a tree was a portent of good fortune. Its sudden withering was an omen of impending disaster.”<sup>1555</sup> Against the backdrop of Greco-Roman cultural memory, Jesus' curse and its subsequent effect do not merely demonstrate Jesus' general power over nature: “[t]he tree's withering is an omen concerning the fate of the city and its Temple.”<sup>1556</sup> By cursing the fig tree, Jesus thus demonstrates his superiority to Jerusalem and its temple.<sup>1557</sup> Alternatively, the fig tree does not symbolize Jerusalem or the temple, but rather the cult practiced there and its officials.<sup>1558</sup> The latter alternative is better able to explain the emphasis Jesus puts on prayer in Mark 11:24–25. This emphasis may prime the ideal worship in the temple (Mark 11:17b), which Jesus contrasted with the current practice (Mark 11:15–16; 11:17c).

### 11:27–12:44: They Enter Jerusalem and Jesus Walks in the Temple

This episode is demarcated by means of the spatial markers εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα and ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (Mark 11:27). This demarcation is substantiated by the subsequent spatial marker ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ (Mark 12:35). Mark 11:27–12:44 takes place on the same day as the previ-

1552 According to Lührmann, this scene addresses hearers or readers who no longer worship God in the temple. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 195.

1553 See van Iersel, *Mark*, 358–359. Edwards, “Markan Sandwiches,” 206–208. Shepherd, “The Narrative,” 522, 531, 535–537. According to Shepherd, the incident taking place in the temple may be interpreted as a cleansing or as a curse. He concludes that “[i]t would be more appropriate to call Jesus' action a cleansing of the temple, but with the ironic twist that the cleansing actually becomes a curse as the temple falls as a result of the leaders' plot against Jesus.” Shepherd, “The Narrative,” 537. Telford, *The Theology*, 25, 100.

1554 Edwards, “Markan Sandwiches,” 196. On the basis of insights from recent studies on orality, Collins argues that “[m]odern literary critics should then be cautious about exaggerating the degree to which the intercalated stories are intended to interpret one another. The discernment of complex literary designs may indeed be illuminating of the Markan text, but they probably should not be attributed to the author's intention.” Collins, *Mark*, 524–525.

1555 Telford, “More Fruit,” 302. See also 296–300.

1556 Telford, “More Fruit,” 302.

1557 See Telford, “More Fruit,” 303.

1558 According to Collins, the fig tree represents the leaders of the people. Collins, *Mark*, 533–534.

ous and the subsequent episodes. This is the third time Jesus enters Jerusalem and the temple.

### 11:27–12:12: Jesus Debates with the Chief Priests, Scribes, and Elders

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the spatial position of characters in the Markan world. “Again they came to Jerusalem. While he was walking around in the temple, the chief priests and the scribes and the elders came to him” (Mark 11:27). This assertive point contains character markers, by means of which this episode is demarcated. The adverb *πάλιν* draws attention to the fact that audience members have heard similar information before (Mark 11:11; 11:15). Because audience members are told that Jesus was walking in the temple, they may infer that he had previously entered the temple. The main reference objects are Jerusalem and the temple, and this means that the reference frame is external. Audience members will therefore construct a position for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of these locations. Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute these observations to the extradiegetic narrator. Because audience members are told that the chief priests, scribes, and elders came to Jesus, they may regard Jesus as the geographic center of the event.

The above-mentioned character constellation may prime or activate Jesus’ first passion prediction (Mark 8:31), which mentioned all these characters. Moreover, Mark 10:33 and 11:18,<sup>1559</sup> where only the chief priests and scribes were mentioned, may be primed or activated because the character constellation and the themes are similar. All the events that may be primed or activated by this character constellation are related to different aspects of the second plot and the intention of these characters to destroy Jesus. If some of these events are activated, the second plot will constitute the backdrop of this episode.

Audience members are informed that these characters address two speech acts to Jesus (Mark 11:28): *ἐν ποία ἐξουσία ταῦτα ποιεῖς; ἢ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῆς*; By means of these interrelated directive points, these characters ask Jesus about the nature and source of his authority. Audience members may infer that these characters ask about Jesus’ authority to perform the actions which were described by the extradiegetic narrator in Mark 11:15–18.<sup>1560</sup> In this manner, Jesus’ authority to alter the spatial practice in the temple is challenged by those who believe that they possess this power. Under normal circumstances, speakers who ask a question do not know the answer, they believe that the addressee knows it, they believe that the addressee will not provide this information if the question is not posed, and they want to know the answer to their question.<sup>1561</sup> Under such circumstances, these questions would reveal the plan and goal of the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders, and this in turn would enable audience members to simulate the event

1559 For Mark 8:31 and 11:18, see also Heil, *The Gospel*, 232. For Mark 11:18, see also Collins, *Mark*, 538.

1560 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 198. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 271.

1561 On the appropriateness conditions for questions, see Pratt, *Toward*, 82.

from their perspective. On the basis of previous episodes, however, audience members may consider the possibility that the aim of these characters is not to obtain information, but rather to challenge Jesus. If audience members regard this communicative situation as a challenge, they may conclude that these characters primarily want to question Jesus' authority.

Mark 11:28 may prime or activate previous events where Jesus' authority has been mentioned (Mark 1:22; 1:27; 2:10).<sup>1562</sup> If these events are primed or activated, they may constitute the backdrop against which audience members will interpret the current event. In Mark 1:22, the extradiegetic narrator described Jesus as a person who taught with authority, in contrast to the scribes, and in Mark 1:27 Jesus' teaching was characterized as "a new teaching with authority!" In Mark 2:10 Jesus stated, "the Son of Man has authority on earth to forgive sins." Accordingly, he presented himself as someone with divine authority. Furthermore, this event may prime or activate Mark 3:22–30. Audience members, who heard the voice from heaven state: "You are my beloved Son; with you I am well pleased" (Mark 1:11),<sup>1563</sup> have probably deduced that Jesus' identity as the Son of God is the source of his authority. In contrast to the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders, they therefore know the answer to the questions posed by these characters.

Through Mark 11:29a, the extradiegetic narrator introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of the directive points uttered by the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders. Jesus' preliminary response consists of three interrelated speech acts (Mark 11:29b): "I will ask you one question; answer me, and I will tell you with what authority I do these things." Because Jesus does not answer their question, the actual perlocutionary effect of the directive points uttered in Mark 11:28 does not correspond to its intended perlocutionary effect. First, Jesus utters an assertive point by informing his addressees that he intends to ask them a question. Then he utters a directive point, which functions as a condition. If Jesus' addressees decide to carry out the requested action, Jesus commits himself to reveal the source of his authority. On the basis of this utterance, audience members will probably deduce that Jesus gives his addressees the opportunity to know the answer to their question. Jesus' response also indicates, however, that he regards the questions uttered in Mark 11:28 as challenges posed by the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders.<sup>1564</sup>

Jesus continues his utterance by voicing two directive points. First, he asks them: "Was the baptism of John from heaven, or from humans?" (Mark 11:30). Then he underscores his question by telling them to answer him. Through his question, Jesus seems to imply that John's baptism originated in heaven.<sup>1565</sup>

The extradiegetic narrator subsequently tells audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' speech acts, i.e. "they discussed with one another"

1562 See also Tolbert, *Sowing*, 233.

1563 See also Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 295. See also Mark 11:9, which points out that Jesus represents God. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 232.

1564 According to Collins, "Jesus responds cleverly and evasively, or better, in a challenging manner, with a counterquestion." Collins, *Mark*, 539.

1565 See Collins, *Mark*, 539. According to Collins, Jesus' reply also "suggests that the question of the leaders of the people concerned whether or not Jesus' authority derived from God."

(Mark 11:31a). Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. Audience members will probably regard the information that these characters were arguing with each other as an indication that Jesus did not hear the following speech acts. As addressees of the extradiegetic narrator and as side-participants to the following speech acts uttered by the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders, audience members get access to information which is not heard by Jesus. The first speech act uttered by the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders introduces a hypothetical condition which explores the possible effects of choosing the first alternative proposed by Jesus. “If we say, ‘From heaven,’ he will say, ‘Why did you not believe him?’” (Mark 11:31b).

In Mark 11:32a, another hypothetical condition is introduced, which refers to Jesus’ second alternative: “But shall we say, ‘From humans?’” Accordingly, a divine and a human origin are contrasted. Audience members do not hear the possible outcome of the latter alternative. At that point, however, the extradiegetic narrator reveals that these characters “were afraid of the crowd, for they all thought that John was really a prophet” (Mark 11:32b). On the basis of this information, audience members will probably attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the conscious feelings and thoughts of these characters. Furthermore, this speech act informs them about the crowd’s opinion of John.

The extradiegetic narrator then tells audience members that the communication situation changes. Instead of discussing among themselves, these characters direct their subsequent speech act to Jesus (Mark 11:33a). The phrase οὐκ οἴδαμεν contrasts sharply with the deliberations audience members have just heard as side-participants. By uttering this assertive point, these characters allege that they are not able to meet Jesus’ condition. The extradiegetic narrator subsequently informs audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of their speech act. Jesus states: “Neither will I tell you with what authority I do these things” (Mark 11:33b). In this manner, the intended perlocutionary effect of the questions posed by the chief priests, scribes, and elders is not achieved. If audience members have simulated this event on the basis of their plan and goal, they will conclude that these characters failed.

If audience members regard this event as a challenge, they may consider the possibility that the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders want Jesus to claim that God was the source of his authority.<sup>1566</sup> By means of his clever answer, Jesus avoids their trap. The manner in which the conversation proceeded has demonstrated the superiority and authority of Jesus to audience members, not least because Jesus declined to answer the questions posed by this powerful character constellation.

Through Mark 12:1a, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that Jesus addressed some anonymous characters by means of parables. Audience members will probably infer that Jesus’ addressees are “the chief priests and the scribes and the elders” (Mark 11:27).<sup>1567</sup> Jesus’ parable is introduced by the following assertive

<sup>1566</sup> See also Collins, *Mark*, 539–540.

<sup>1567</sup> By means of this parable, Jesus offers an indirect answer to the questions posed in Mark 11:28. See Lüthmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 198. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 275. Heil, *The Gospel*, 234. Collins, *Mark*, 544–545. Hartman, *Mark*, 479. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 298.

point: “A man planted a vineyard and placed a fence around it and dug a wine trough and built a watchtower” (Mark 12:1b). Jesus merely presents the source input of the parable. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, this assertive point may prime or activate Isa 5:1–7.<sup>1568</sup> In that case, audience members may recognize that Jesus elaborates on an entrenched metaphor. If Isa 5:1–7 is activated, audience members may remember the cross-space mappings which were pointed out in Isa 5:7a (LXX).<sup>1569</sup> “For the vineyard of the Lord Sabaoth is the house of Israel, and the man of Judah is the beloved new-grown.” These entrenched mappings may suggest the target input of the parable.

Audience members may perform cross-space mappings on the basis of this entrenched metaphor, or they may consider other cross-space mappings suggested by the context of the parable in the Gospel of Mark.<sup>1570</sup> On the basis of this text-external and text-internal backdrop, audience members may perform the following cross-space mappings: “A man” maps onto “God.”<sup>1571</sup> “The vineyard” maps onto “Israel,”<sup>1572</sup> “Jerusalem,”<sup>1573</sup> or the “Jewish people.”<sup>1574</sup> Alternatively, the text-internal backdrop may suggest that the “vineyard” maps onto the “temple.” It seems to me that the vineyard may map onto all the abovementioned elements. In that case, the measure the owner takes to establish the vineyard illuminate God’s concern for the people and his intention that they should produce results (see the Parable of the Sower).<sup>1575</sup>

Provided that the conceptual integration network of Isa 5:1–7 is activated, audience members may anticipate that the vineyard will not produce the expected grapes, but rather thorns (Isa 5:2b; 5:4b). That is, Israel and its inhabitants will not conduct themselves with the expected justice and righteousness, but rather with lawlessness and a cry (Isa 5:7). However, in his parable Jesus elaborates on the entrenched source input by introducing the following components from the agricultural domain:<sup>1576</sup> “He leased it to vine-dressers and went on a journey. At the proper time, he sent a slave to the vine-dressers in order to collect from the vine-dressers a share of the fruit of the vineyard” (Mark 12:1b–2). In this manner, the frame of the source input is changed and new elements are introduced. The quality of the fruit is no longer in focus, but rather the fact that the vineyard is leased to vine-dressers, who should give the owner a share of the produce. The altered source input suggests that audience

1568 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 198. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 275. van Iersel, *Mark*, 364. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 337. Collins, *Mark*, 544–545.

1569 For the entire conceptual integration network, Figure 34 in the appendix.

1570 See figures 35–36 in the appendix.

1571 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 198. Heil, *The Gospel*, 235. Gundry, *Mark*, 659. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 338. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 802.

1572 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 198. Heil, *The Gospel*, 235. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 338. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 802.

1573 See Collins, *Mark*, 545, 547.

1574 See Gundry, *Mark*, 659.

1575 According to Marcus, “[a]ncient Jewish and Christian texts interpret the tower and wine vat in Isaiah 5 as the Temple and its altar.” Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 802.

1576 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 198. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 274. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 337–338. Collins, *Mark*, 545. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 299.



members should consider an appropriate cross-space mapping for the vine-dressers in the target input.

If audience members infer that Jesus directs his parable to “the chief priests and the scribes and the elders” (Mark 11:27), they may consider the possibility that these characters constitute a specific element of the target input. Because the Gospel of Mark seems to present them as the leaders of the people, they may map these characters onto the vine-dressers in the source input, i.e. the characters who are responsible for the production of fruit<sup>1577</sup> and for handing an amount of it over to the representatives of the owner of the vineyard. In the target input, Mark 12:1b thus illuminates the way God entrusts the land and its people, including the temple, to their leaders and withdraws from Israel.<sup>1578</sup>

Given that Isa 5:1–7 was activated earlier, this prophetic tradition may have primed other prophetic scripts. Because primed traditions are easily activated, a new input is probably recruited to the conceptual integration network, i.e., the cultural memory of God’s former interactions with his people. These scripts may indicate another plausible cross-space mapping. According to 4 Kgdms 17:13, Ezra 9:11, Jer 25:4–5; 42:15 (LXX); 51:4 (LXX) and Zech 1:3–6, prophets are regarded as slaves or servants of the Lord. Audience members who are familiar with this cultural memory may therefore map the individual slaves sent by the owner of the vineyard in source input 1 onto prophets sent by God<sup>1579</sup> in the cultural memory input. In the target input constituted by characters and events in the Markan world, these elements map onto former prophets. Furthermore, the vine-dressers and the share of the produce in the source input map onto former Israelites and good deeds in the cultural memory input.

Through Mark 12:3, Jesus describes the manner in which the slave is treated by the vine-dressers. “They seized him, and beat him and sent him away empty-handed.” If prophetic scripts are activated, audience members may interpret this element of source input 1 against the backdrop of 3 Kgdms 19:9–10.<sup>1580</sup> In that case, the structure of the cultural memory input indicates an escalation of the violence by suggesting that God’s prophets may be killed.

By means of Mark 12:4–5, Jesus elaborates on the theme of violence in source input 1, and the brutality against the slaves escalates, as expected. The man’s persistence in sending his slaves in source input 1 may prime or activate another facet

1577 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 235. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 337–338. Collins, *Mark*, 545. For related insights, see Tolbert, *Sowing*, 238. Tolbert furthermore suggests that “any group in power that obstructs the fruitfulness of God’s good earth is a manifestation of the evil tenants in the vineyard.” Gundry suggests that the tenant farmers stand for the Sanhedrin. Gundry, *Mark*, 659.

1578 For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 338.

1579 For related insight, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 199. Heil, *The Gospel*, 235. Gundry, *Mark*, 659–660. van Iersel, *Mark*, 365. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 338. Collins, *Mark*, 546. Hartman, *Mark*, 477–478. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 299. Marcus, *Mark* 8–16, 811. According to Tolbert, the procession of servants is illustrated by the prophets, John the Baptist, and Jesus. Tolbert, *Sowing*, 238.

1580 “At that place he entered into the cave and lodged there. Look, the word of the Lord came to him and said, ‘What are you doing here, Elijah?’ And Elijah answered, ‘I have been very zealous for the Lord, the Almighty, for the sons of Israel have forsaken you, demolished your altars, and killed your prophets with the sword. I alone am left, and they seek my life, to take it away’” (3 Kgdms 19:9–10).

of the prophetic traditions constituting the cultural memory input, i.e., Jer 7:25–26 (LXX): “From the day their fathers went out of the land of Egypt and until this day, I sent all my servants, the prophets, to you. I sent them night and day; yet they did not listen to me, and their ear did not listen, but they stiffened their necks more than their ancestors.” In the cultural memory input constituted by God’s former interactions with his people, God persistently sends his prophets to Israel, but they respond by beating or killing the prophets.

Through Mark 12:6, Jesus introduces a new element to source input 1. “He still had one, a beloved son. He sent him to them last, saying, ‘They will respect my son.’” This element of source input 1 may prime or activate Mark 1:11 and 9:7, and through these events, cultural memory constituted by Ps 2:7 will perhaps be primed or activated. If these events are activated, audience members may map the beloved son onto Jesus.<sup>1581</sup>

The verb ἐντρέπομαι (Mark 12:6) thematizes the question of authority. In source input 1, the father expects the tenants to respect his son, but it appears that the son’s authority is not appreciated, as Jesus’ authority is unappreciated by the Jewish leaders in the target input.<sup>1582</sup> In Mark 12:7, Jesus informs his addressees about the response of the vine-dressers to the son: “But those vine-dressers said to one another, ‘This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and the inheritance will be ours.’” Their speech acts indicate that they know the identity of the character, but they choose not to pay him the proper respect. Moreover, they plan to kill him in order to get hold of his inheritance.<sup>1583</sup> The word “inheritance” may recruit a new source input to the conceptual integration network. This source input is constituted by inheritance and heirs. The habitual frame of this input suggests that children inherit the property of their parents when they die. However, the actions of the vine-dressers in source input 1 indicate that they want to kill the son in order to procure the vineyard, even before the owner of the vineyard is dead. The inheritance in source input 2 is mapped onto the vineyard in source input 1. Furthermore, these elements are both mapped onto the land of Israel, its people, and the temple in the target input.

Through Mark 12:8, audience members hear how the vine-dressers treat the son: “they seized him and killed him and threw him out of the vineyard.”<sup>1584</sup> The first part of this information indicates that the son is treated in a similar manner to the slaves who were sent earlier. However, he is also thrown out of the vineyard. In source input

1581 For a similar point, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 199. Tolbert, *Sowing*, 239. Heil, *The Gospel*, 235. van Iersel, *Mark*, 365. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 338. Collins, *Mark*, 547. Hartman, *Mark*, 478. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 299.

1582 Collins points out that Jesus “is the ‘son’ who has authority over the ‘vineyard’ because of his relationship to the Father, whereas the leaders who question his authority are only ‘tenants.’” Collins, *Mark*, 547.

1583 According to Gundry, “[t]hey would not think that by killing the son the inheritance will be theirs unless they also think that the owner has died.” Gundry, *Mark*, 662.

1584 The implication of this act is that the heir is not buried. See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 276. Heil, *The Gospel*, 236. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 339. Collins, *Mark*, 546. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 300. As Collins points out, “[t]he murder of the son and the casting out of his body in v. 8 do not have a close allegorical relationship to the crucifixion of Jesus, to be described later in the narrative of Mark.” Collins, *Mark*, 547.

2, these acts correspond to the final separation of the heir from his inheritance. At this point, the vine-dressers therefore seem to carry out their plan successfully.

If audience members are familiar with Isa 5:1–7, they may expect Jesus' addressees to be asked to act as judge or jury. Instead, Jesus focuses solely on the man's reactions. The man's response is enhanced by Jesus' rhetorical question, which he himself answers:<sup>1585</sup> "What then will the owner of the vineyard do?" (Mark 12:9a). If audience members are familiar with Isa 5:1–7, they will probably expect the man to destroy the vineyard.<sup>1586</sup> However, in this case they learn that "he will come and destroy the vine-dressers and give the vineyard to others" (Mark 12:9b), a decision which underlines the focus of the parable on the responsibilities of the vine-dressers, not the quality of the fruit. If audience members have mapped the vineyard onto Israel, its people, and the temple, they probably know that others already occupy this territory in the Markan world. Furthermore, text-external information points out that the temple is destroyed. Accordingly, audience members may infer that the retribution has already occurred.<sup>1587</sup>

In the blend, God's establishment of Israel/Jerusalem/the temple is the owner's construction of the vineyard. God's prophets/the owner's slaves who are sent to demand good deeds/a share of the produce receive violent treatment. Furthermore, the role of the leaders in Jesus' predicted death corresponds to the vine-dressers role in killing the son/the heir. In the future, God/the owner/the father will destroy the leaders/the vine-dressers. God/the owner/the father will give Israel/Jerusalem/the temple/the inheritance/the vineyard to others. If audience members employ these insights to illuminate the target input, they will probably conclude that Jesus' addressees in the Markan world respond to God's current representatives, John the Baptist and Jesus, in the same manner as their ancestors reacted to the former prophets.<sup>1588</sup> Accordingly, John the Baptist<sup>1589</sup> and Jesus belong to the line of prophets who have preceded them, but Jesus is also characterized as unique. He is not only a slave or a servant (Mark 10:45); he is also the Son of God. Because Jesus is the Son of God, he has authority over Israel, Jerusalem, their inhabitants, and the temple. However, his

1585 See also Robbins, "Interfaces," 136. Collins, *Mark*, 547. Cf. van Iersel, *Mark*, 367. According to Heil, Jesus asks his listeners, i.e., the chief priests, scribes, and elders. Heil, *The Gospel*, 236. Heil proposes the following interpretation of this event: "Having subtly and cleverly disclosed to his opponents his knowledge of their plan to kill him, Jesus is in effect asking the Jewish leaders, the wicked 'tenants,' what God, the 'owner' of the vineyard, will do to them after they kill Jesus, God's beloved Son."

1586 See also Collins, *Mark*, 547.

1587 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 199–200, at 200. "Hier endet die Geschichte in der Gegenwart der Leser und reicht damit weit über die erzählte Zeit hinaus: die Römer haben das Land übernommen." See also Hartman, *Mark*, 478–479. Heil suggests that "Jesus sternly warns that the owner (God) himself will come, put the tenants to death, and give the 'vineyard,' the community of God's people whom the tenants (Jewish leaders) have misguided by killing not only God's prophets but his beloved Son, to others (12:9)." Heil, *The Gospel*, 236. According to Pilgaard, this event suggests that Jewish leaders will be replaced by others, which in the Markan context means the twelve. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 300. For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 368. Gundry proposes that leadership will be transferred from the Sanhedrin to Jesus and his disciples. Gundry, *Mark*, 663. For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 342.

1588 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 546.

1589 For related insight, see Collins, *Mark*, 546.

authority is not undisputed. The way in which the Jewish leaders treat Jesus, the Son of God, underlines their disregard for the one who represents God, the creator and owner of Israel. Jesus' death and the role of the leaders with regard to his death are predicted in this parable, but so is likewise the retribution of God.

With regard to Mark 12:9, the arrival of the owner of the vineyard, i.e. the Lord, may prime or activate Mark 1:2–3, which in turn may prime or activate Mal 3:1. If these traditions are primed or activated, audience members may interpret Mark 12:9 against this backdrop. In the target input, audience members may thus infer that God will come to his temple. Furthermore, the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders will be unable to rule, because Israel, its people, and the temple are entrusted to others. The new leaders will consist of people who accept that Jesus is the messiah<sup>1590</sup> and the Son of God.

In Mark 12:10–11, Jesus illuminates the parable by referring to scripture, i.e. to written cultural memory. "Have you not read this scripture passage: 'The stone which the builders rejected has become the cornerstone; this was the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?'" Through this speech act, Jesus draws on the authority of written cultural memory by implying that he has read a portion of the scripture. Moreover, this speech act may contain a challenge by implying the possibility that his addressees, who audience members may infer are still "the chief priests and the scribes and the elders" (Mark 11:27), have not read this scripture.<sup>1591</sup>

Jesus cites Ps 117:22–23 (LXX). By adding this scripture to the parable, he indicates that his role is authorized by God. If audience members interpret the parable in light of this quotation, a hybrid integration network is created which includes different types of input spaces. With regard to this conceptual integration network, "the stone which the builders rejected" maps onto "the beloved son," "the heir," and "Jesus," respectively, but "the beloved son," "the heir," and "Jesus" also map onto "the cornerstone." Furthermore, there is a cross-space mapping between "the builders," "the vine-dressers," and "the chief priests and the scribes and the elders." In this case, the frame constituting the cultural memory input, which consists of two elements, i.e., construction and reversal of fates<sup>1592</sup> through (over-)compensation, is projected to organize the blend. In the blend Jesus is the beloved son, the heir, and the stone which the builders rejected. The chief priests, the scribes, and the elders (the leaders) are the vine-dressers and the builders. Jesus/the beloved son/the heir/the stone which the builders rejected has become the cornerstone of a building. This reversal of fate was the Lord's doing.<sup>1593</sup> By means of this appendix to the previously presented parable, Jesus/the beloved son/the heir is restored to honor through the intervention of the Lord/the owner of the vineyard/the father.

1590 See Collins, *Mark*, 547.

1591 See also Robbins, "Interfaces," 136.

1592 For similar insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 548.

1593 Heil regards the chief priests, scribes, and elders as builders who were commissioned by God to build the temple. They reject Jesus by throwing him out of the vineyard. "But by raising Jesus from the dead and exalting him to glory (8:31, 38; 9:2–4, 31; 10:34, 37) God will marvelously and triumphantly establish the 'rejected stone,' his beloved Son, as the crucial 'cornerstone' of a new edifice or 'house,' the community of disciples who pray effectively with a confident trust in God and forgiveness of others (11:20–25), the new 'house of prayer for all peoples.'" Heil, *The Gospel*, 236–237, at 237.

When the insights of this blend are translated to the target input, both elements of Jesus' passion predictions, i.e. his rejection, suffering, and death and his resurrection are explained.<sup>1594</sup> According to Collins, "[t]he implication may be that, with the resurrection of Jesus, God will begin to build a living temple that will consist of the communities founded in Jesus' name."<sup>1595</sup>

Through Mark 12:12, the extradiegetic narrator relates the response of Jesus' addressees. Based on the assertive point "they sought to arrest him, and yet they feared the crowd, for they knew that he had told the parable with reference to them" (Mark 12:12a), audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the thoughts and conscious feelings of the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders.<sup>1596</sup> With regard to audience members, this information facilitates the continued simulation of the second plot of the gospel (Mark 3:6) from the point of view of its protagonists.<sup>1597</sup> At this point, audience members are informed about a current plan which these characters discard out of fear. The extradiegetic narrator concludes this episode by means of the following assertive point: "they left him and went away" (Mark 12:12b). On the basis of this information, audience members may conclude that their fear takes precedence over their intent to destroy Jesus (Mark 3:6; 11:18), but Jesus' parable has seemingly not persuaded them to abandon their joint project.<sup>1598</sup>

If audience members were unfamiliar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, Mark 12:12 as well as 12:6 may indicate to them that Jesus was presenting this parable in order to illuminate the relationship between the Son of God (Mark 1:11; 9:7), who leads his community by serving it (Mark 10:45), and the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders. Against this backdrop, the parable explains earlier conflicts over spatial practice which occurred when Jesus healed and performed exorcisms, which indicated the spatial practice characteristic of the presence of the kingdom of God. Jesus' conflicts with Jewish leaders in the temple illustrate what happens when the Son of God, the heir, comes to inspect his inheritance and attempts to alter the spatial practice in the temple. In neither case is Jesus' authority respected. Instead, Jesus' assertion of his authority is met with attempts to destroy him (Mark 3:6 and 11:18). By means of this parable, Jesus indirectly answers the questions uttered in Mark 11:28.

---

1594 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 199. van Iersel, *Mark*, 369. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 300. According to Pilgaard the death of Jesus indicates that the leaders have discarded him, whereas his resurrection means that God has made him the cornerstone. Pilgaard relates the death and resurrection of Jesus to the temple. Thus, Jesus' resurrection legitimizes his authority with regard to the temple. Moreover, it has made him the foundation of a new and different temple.

1595 Collins, *Mark*, 548.

1596 For related insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 664.

1597 See "3:1–6: Jesus Enters a Synagogue" on page 173. According to Tolbert, this parable functions as a plot synopsis. Tolbert, *Sowing*, 233.

1598 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 237.

## 12:13–17: Jesus Debates with Some of the Pharisees and Herodians

By means of the assertive point, “they sent to him some of the Pharisees and the Herodians in order to trap him in what he said” (Mark 12:13), the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the joint plan and goal of a number of anonymous characters, some Pharisees, and some Herodians.<sup>1599</sup> This assertive point contains the character markers *τινας τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν* through which this episode is demarcated. Audience members may infer that the anonymous characters are the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders who previously failed in their attempt to challenge and arrest Jesus (Mark 11:27–12:12).<sup>1600</sup> Alternatively, they will refrain from constructing inferences with regard to the identity of these anonymous characters on-line. If audience members choose the first alternative, this character constellation may prime or activate events which are related to the second plot.<sup>1601</sup> If these events are activated, audience members will be more attentive to the plot to destroy Jesus. This mechanism is probably enhanced by the parable which Jesus told at the end of the previous episode. That parable allowed audience members to simulate the second plot, but they were also enabled to reflect on the manner in which the first and the second plots are intertwined. At the end of the previous episode, the relationship between the hypodiegetic world and the Markan world was pointed out to audience members by Jesus’ addressees (Mark 12:12).<sup>1602</sup>

In this episode, the characters who first came up with the idea to destroy Jesus, i.e. the Pharisees and the Herodians, are sent to ensnare Jesus. This character constellation may prime or activate Mark 3:6, where the conspiracy against Jesus was mentioned for the first time. If audience members have inferred the identity of those who sent the Pharisees and the Herodians, they may realize that this joint plan contributes to the realization of the joint project of the characters who aim at destroying Jesus (Mark 3:6; 8:31; 10:33; 11:18).<sup>1603</sup> Audience members who have not inferred the identity of these anonymous characters will probably interpret this event against the backdrop of Mark 3:6 and previous events where Jesus interacted with the Pharisees (Mark 2:16; 2:24; 3:1–6; 7:1ff., 8:11f; 10:2f.). If some of these events are primed or activated, audience members may regard this episode as yet another encounter between Jesus and his antagonists. Accordingly, they may perceive the interaction taking place in this episode as a challenge.

Because the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the intention of the Pharisees, the Herodians (Mark 12:13), and possibly the chief priests, the

1599 Collins suggests that “[t]he intention of catching Jesus in a statement (v. 13) continues the theme expressed in v. 12, that the chief priests and the others were trying to arrest Jesus.” Collins, *Mark*, 550. See also 556.

1600 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 201. Heil, *The Gospel*, 238. Gundry, *Mark*, 692. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 343. van Iersel, *Mark*, 370. Collins, *Mark*, 550. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 301. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 822.

1601 See also “11:27–12:12: Jesus Debates with the Chief Priests, Scribes, and Elders” on page 400.

1602 See also “11:27–12:12: Jesus Debates with the Chief Priests, Scribes, and Elders” on page 400.

1603 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 238.

scribes, and the elders, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the thoughts of these characters. Audience members are informed about their intention through the narration, which facilitates simulation of this event according to the plans and goal of these characters. This attribution may promote simulation based on identification, if it is sustained by similar devices.<sup>1604</sup>

At this moment, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point, by means of which he tells audience members that “they came and said to him” (Mark 12:14a). On the basis of the verb ἔρχομαι (Mark 12:14) and the phrase ἀποστέλλουσιν πρὸς αὐτόν (Mark 12:13), audience members will probably regard Jesus as a geographic center and reference object in the Markan world. Accordingly, the reference frame is external, and audience members will construct a position for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of Jesus. Because these assertive points do not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator.

The Pharisees and Herodians subsequently utter several speech acts by means of which they praise Jesus (Mark 12:14b): “Teacher, we know that you are truthful, and court no man’s favor; for you do not regard the opinion of human beings, but teach the way of God in accordance with the truth.” According to Heil, these utterances constitute a chiasm. The two utterances characterizing Jesus’ sincere teaching activity frame utterances that describe his lack of concern for human opinion and status.<sup>1605</sup> On the surface, these speech acts indicate that the Pharisees and the Herodians are expressing their approval of Jesus and his teaching. However, the intention of these characters (Mark 12:13) and previous interactions between Jesus and the Pharisees suggest that audience members should question the sincerity of the Pharisees and the Herodians.<sup>1606</sup> On another level, audience members who have been persuaded by the extradiegetic narrator may recognize that Mark 12:14b fits their general impression of Jesus, which was created during earlier episodes. If audience members interpret Mark 12:14b against the backdrop of events that took place on the way, as well as other events where Jesus healed, exorcised, taught, or discussed with other characters, they may realize that these characters are ironically speaking the truth about Jesus.<sup>1607</sup>

The Pharisees and Herodians conclude their utterance by means of the following directive points: “Is it permitted to pay tax to Caesar, or not? Should we pay, or should we not?” (Mark 12:14c–15a). If audience members simulate this event according to the plan and goal of these characters, they may realize that the Pharisees and

1604 See “II.5.4. Involvement with Characters: Empathy and Identification” on page 68.

1605 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 238–239. For a similar chiasm, see also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 344. For a different chiasm, see Gundry, *Mark*, 692.

1606 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 344.

1607 “Their statement that Jesus sincerely teaches the ‘way of God’ expresses an ironic understatement for the reader, who knows that indeed Jesus not only truly ‘teaches’ the ‘way of God’ in direct contrast and opposition to the Jewish leaders (1:22, 27; 11:17–18; 11:27–12:12) but also through his teaching, healing miracles and suffering, death and resurrection accomplishes the salvific ‘way of the Lord’ God (1:2–3)” Heil, *The Gospel*, 239. For related insights, see also Hartman, *Mark*, 497.



Herodians probably praised Jesus in order to trap him by putting him off-guard.<sup>1608</sup> Against this backdrop, audience members may infer that the intended perlocutionary effect of their subsequent directive points is to lure Jesus into uttering an assertive point which will provoke those who listen to this conversation, as side-participants or as overhearers. On the basis of Mark 12:12, audience members will probably assume that the crowd is still present; it may include representatives of the emperor, or people who would report to these representatives. Against this backdrop, audience members may infer that Jesus could be reported to the Roman authorities if he argued against paying taxes. If he argued that such taxes should be paid, on the other hand, he could lose the support of the crowd, who indirectly protected him against the high priests, scribes (and elders) (Mark 11:18; 11:27; 12:12).<sup>1609</sup> Both alternatives may help in the realization of the aim of the second plot.

Through the assertive point constituting Mark 12:15b, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that Jesus knows about their hypocrisy. On the basis of the verb οἶδα audience members will probably attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of Jesus' thoughts.<sup>1610</sup> This information indicates to audience members that Jesus is aware that these characters have come to challenge him.<sup>1611</sup> Moreover, this speech act reminds audience members of the nature of the communication situation which is taking place in the Markan world.

Two directive points constitute the actual perlocutionary effect of the directive points uttered by the Pharisees and the Herodians. Jesus responds to their questions by asking them: τί με πειράζετε; (Mark 12:15c). The verb πειράζω may prime or activate three earlier events (Mark 1:13; 8:11; 10:2).<sup>1612</sup> In the first case, Satan, Jesus' opponent on a cosmic level, tempted him. In Mark 8:11, the Pharisees tempted Jesus by "asking him for a sign from heaven." In Mark 10:2, the Pharisees also tempted Jesus by asking him about divorce. This third episode resembles the present one, but this time their test pertains not to the issue of divorce, but to how Jesus relates Israelite cultural memory to interaction with the Roman government.<sup>1613</sup> Jesus' question seems to be rhetorical, and it is not answered. It is succeeded by the following command: "Bring me a denarius in order that I may see it" (Mark 12:15d).

1608 See also Collins, *Mark*, 556. According to Donahue and Harrington, "[t]hese flattering expressions are designed both to ingratiate the questioners with Jesus and to put him 'on the spot' so that he would have to give a truthful and straightforward response (and get himself into trouble)." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 344.

1609 For related insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 693. van Iersel, *Mark*, 371. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 344–345. Hartman, *Mark*, 497. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 302.

1610 If sustained, this device may promote audience involvement with Jesus. See "II.5.4. Involvement with Characters: Empathy and Identification" on page 68.

1611 On the basis of this information, audience members may attribute to Jesus unrestricted knowledge of the thoughts of the Pharisees and Herodians. "With his superior power of perception Jesus knows the 'hypocrisy' of their insincere inquiry." See Heil, *The Gospel*, 239.

1612 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 345.

1613 The impersonal verb ἔξεστιν probably indicates that their question pertains to the will of God. For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 239. Donahue and Harrington point out that in the Gospel of Mark this verb refers to the OT Law. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 344.

By means of the assertive point which constitutes Mark 12:16a, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' directive point: "And they brought one." The fact that the actual perlocutionary effect corresponds to the intended perlocutionary effect may signify Jesus' authority with regard to his addressees.<sup>1614</sup> In other words, they perform the requested action. Because this speech act does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute the observation of this action to the extradiegetic narrator.

Audience members subsequently learn that Jesus utters another directive point. "Whose portrait is this, and whose legend?" (Mark 12:16b). This speech act does not meet all the appropriate conditions for the illocutionary act of posing a question.<sup>1615</sup> In this case, Jesus actually knows the answer to his question; he is even able to see the coin that visualizes this answer.<sup>1616</sup> The immediate perlocutionary effect of Jesus' speech act is that his addressees assert *Καίσαρος* (Mark 12:16c). In this manner, the actual perlocutionary effect seems to correspond to the intended one. The fact that these characters respond to Jesus' directive points in the appropriate manner suggests to audience members that these characters accept Jesus as an authoritative teacher.<sup>1617</sup>

The actual perlocutionary effect of their assertion is the following directive point uttered by Jesus (Mark 12:17a): "Give back to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." By means of the first half of this speech act, Jesus answers the question uttered by the Pharisees and Herodians (Mark 12:14) in the affirmative. The actual perlocutionary effect may thus correspond to its intended perlocutionary effect. Jesus' answer is based on the information provided by his addressees, who are probably the Pharisees and the Herodians. This directive point may provoke the crowd; but Jesus adds a second directive point, which concludes his utterance. Because this utterance is not asked for, audience members may pay particular attention to it. Heil has suggested that coins bear the image of the emperor, whereas human beings, according to biblical traditions, bear God's image and likeness (Gen 1:26–27). Against this backdrop, Jesus can say that the coins belong to the emperor and human beings belong to God.<sup>1618</sup> By including the entire human being in God's domain, his domain encompasses the domain of the emperor. Jesus is thus able to escape from the trap of the Pharisees and Herodians by affirming the emperor's claim to taxes, but this claim is relativized by Jesus' final point which concerns the relationship of human beings with God.<sup>1619</sup> Hartman argues that the image of the emperor on the coin indicated that the area in which the coin was used belonged to his territory. But the idea that "the earth is the Lord's and its fullness, the world, and

1614 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 239.

1615 On the appropriateness conditions for questions, see Pratt, *Toward*, 82.

1616 According to Collins, "Jesus' question, 'Whose portrait is this and whose legend?' implies that he has taken the coin from one of the interlocutors and looked at it." Collins, *Mark*, 556.

1617 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 556.

1618 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 240. For related insights based on Tertullian, see Collins, *Mark*, 557.

1619 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 240.

all who dwell in it” (Ps 24:1/23:1 LXX) encloses the domain of the emperor within the domain of God.<sup>1620</sup>

Audience members are subsequently informed about the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ speech acts (Mark 12:17b): “They were utterly amazed at him.” On the basis of this assertive point, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted access to the conscious feelings of these characters. Alternatively, they may construct this information as external manifestations of emotions. In both cases, the eliciting condition of these emotions is Jesus’ teaching. The identity of the characters who respond in this manner is not explicitly stated, but audience members will probably infer that the Pharisees and Herodians react in this manner.<sup>1621</sup> The verb ἐκθαυμάζω may prime or activate previous events where Jesus’ teaching, proclamation or deeds, or proclamations of what Jesus had done (θαυμάζω: Mark 5:20; θαμβέω: Mark 1:27; 10:24; 10:32; ἐξίστημι: Mark 2:12; 5:42; 6:51), have elicited similar emotions. The emotions displayed by characters in the Markan world may mirror the emotions felt by audience members.<sup>1622</sup> In this case, the solution which Jesus presents in order to escape the trap may elicit amazement, but also admiration.

### 12:18–27: Jesus Debates with the Sadducees

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that “some Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, came to him and asked him a question” (Mark 12:18). This speech act contains the character marker Σαδδουκαῖοι, by means of which this episode is demarcated. Audience members may infer that these characters are sent in the same manner as the Pharisees and the Herodians were sent previously. The phrase ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν may indicate that Jesus still constitutes a geographic center in the Markan world. This is the first time the Sadducees have been mentioned by the extradiegetic narrator, and they are defined to audience members as characters “who say that there is no resurrection” (Mark 12:18a).<sup>1623</sup> This information may indicate that the extradiegetic narrator considers the possibility that at least some audience members have never heard of this character group before.<sup>1624</sup>

The noun ἀνάστασις may prime or activate earlier events where the verb ἀνίστημι has been employed to denote resurrection (Mark 5:42; 8:31; 9:9–10; 9:31; 10:34). If this information is activated, audience members will know that the belief of the Sadducees is contrary to the teachings and mighty deeds performed earlier by Jesus. They may therefore deduce that this episode will treat conflicting views with regard to the topic of resurrection.<sup>1625</sup> When audience members hear that these characters

1620 See Hartman, *Mark*, 498.

1621 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 557.

1622 On the intricate relationship between audience emotion and character emotion, see “II.6.1.2.2.1. Emotions Caused by Means of Empathy and Its Subgroup Identification” on page 78.

1623 On the definition of characters, see Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 98.

1624 According to Lührmann, the addressees possess elementary knowledge of Jewish groups. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 203.

1625 For a related inference, see also Heil, *The Gospel*, 242.

ask Jesus a question, they may infer that the Sadducees intend to challenge Jesus' authoritative teaching, in a manner reminiscent of the Pharisees and the Herodians.<sup>1626</sup> In that case, they may simulate this episode based on this inferred plan.

The Sadducees do not begin their argument by posing a question; rather, they make an assertive point by stating: "Teacher, Moses wrote for us that if someone's brother dies and leaves behind a wife and does not leave a child, his brother shall take the wife and raise up a child for his brother" (Mark 12:19).<sup>1627</sup> The vocative διδάσκαλε indicates to audience members that Jesus is approached as a teacher, in a manner reminiscent of the previous episode. As side-participants, audience members are informed by the assertive point uttered by the Sadducees.<sup>1628</sup> If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, this assertion may prime or activate Deut 25:5–10 and Gen 38:8.<sup>1629</sup> If these traditions are activated, audience members are reminded of them, not informed. Audience members who are not conversant with this cultural memory are merely informed by this speech act. Moreover, this assertion may prime or activate Mark 6:18. The beginning of their speech indicates that the Sadducees think Moses wrote these guidelines for their benefit: Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν (Mark 12:19a). Accordingly, these characters merge memory grounded in the past with the present situation in the Markan world.<sup>1630</sup>

Mark 12:20–22 constitute the second component of the argument. By means of several assertive points, the Sadducees tell Jesus a simplistic story, a hypothetical case<sup>1631</sup> which explores the consequences of Moses' guidelines in a manner which borders on the absurd.<sup>1632</sup> The problem in the narrative, i.e. the failure to produce offspring, is introduced in the following manner: "There were seven brothers; and the first took a wife, and when he died, he did not leave a child" (Mark 12:20).<sup>1633</sup> This problem is not resolved in the narrative. "The second took her and died, without leaving behind a child; and the third likewise; and the seven did not leave any child. Last of all, the woman also died" (Mark 12:21–22).

After their reference to Moses and their illustration of the possible consequences of Moses' guidelines, the Sadducees finally pose the question which the extradiegetic narrator has introduced already in Mark 12:18. Their directive point concerns the resurrection: "In the resurrection [when they rise] whose wife will she be?" (Mark 12:23a). Accordingly, the identification of the Sadducees by means of the characteris-

1626 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 242.

1627 This speech act may also be interpreted as a way to remind Jesus of these traditions. See Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations*, 185.

1628 Hartman claims that one cannot assume that the addressees of the Gospel of Mark were familiar with Deut 25:5–10, Hartman, *Mark*, 500.

1629 For these traditions, see also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 203–204. van Iersel, *Mark*, 373. Collins, *Mark*, 559. Van Iersel suggests that levirate marriage is related to the question about life and death because "the purpose of the levirate marriage is to prevent a man's name being blotted out in Israel and thus protect him from permanent death (Deut. 25.6)." van Iersel, *Mark*, 373.

1630 Audience members may emulate their approach to cultural memory by subsequently employing the Gospel of Mark in the same manner.

1631 See Collins, *Mark*, 560.

1632 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 242.

1633 This example may prime or activate Tobit 6:14. See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 374.

tic οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι was hardly coincidental.<sup>1634</sup> Their subsequent assertive point (“For the seven had her as a wife,” Mark 12:23b) draws attention to the problem which the Sadducees assume will arise if the guidelines of Moses are combined with the idea of resurrection.<sup>1635</sup> In this manner, they attempt to demonstrate the absurdity of resurrection,<sup>1636</sup> which in their opinion seems to imply that there is no resurrection.

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of the speech acts uttered by the Sadducees (Mark 12:24a). Jesus responds by voicing the following rhetorical question: “Is it not for this reason that you are mistaken, that you do not know the scriptures and not the power of God?” (Mark 12:24b).<sup>1637</sup> If audience members have inferred that the intent of the Sadducees is to trap Jesus, the intended perlocutionary effect of their directive point does not correspond to its actual perlocutionary effect. Jesus seemingly questions the ability of the Sadducees to understand the scriptures and the power of God. Side-participants, such as the crowd and audience members, may conclude that these two characteristics form the basis for their mistaken interpretation of the scripture, which led to the creation of the example they presented to Jesus. In sum, their argument backfires and they are instead challenged and accused by Jesus.<sup>1638</sup>

By means of several assertive points, Jesus informs the Sadducees about what happens “when they rise from the dead” (Mark 12:25a). First, Jesus denies the concept of marriage after the resurrection (Mark 12:25b). Then he states that they “are like angels in the heavens” (Mark 12:25c).<sup>1639</sup> Through this verse, Jesus explains a characteristic of life after the resurrection, and by doing so he shows that the Sadducees’ conception of this concept is limited by earthly categories.<sup>1640</sup> In contrast to their belief, “[t]he proper understanding of resurrection is the spiritual one, not the bodily one.”<sup>1641</sup> By way of his teaching, Jesus thus attempts to correct their belief. As side-participants, audience members are informed about the resurrection, but from their perspective Jesus does not only talk about the resurrection. He also expands his earlier teaching on marriage and divorce (cf. Mark 10:1–12) by pointing out that marriage is limited to life before death.

1634 See comments on Mark 12:18. Their question may confirm inferences made by audience members with regard to the intention of the Sadducees.

1635 According to Lührmann, the woman was the wife only of the first man. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 204.

1636 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 204. van Iersel, *Mark*, 374. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 349. Collins, *Mark*, 560.

1637 According to Hooker, the power of God refers to God’s power to raise the dead and create life. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 284.

1638 Van Iersel suggests that they are rebuked. See van Iersel, *Mark*, 374. He claims that it is highly pertinent to rebuke them for not knowing the Scriptures, because the Sadducees recognize only the written Torah. According to Collins, “[t]he questioners are rebuked indirectly for taking as a premise a caricature of belief in resurrection.” Collins, *Mark*, 561.

1639 See van Iersel, *Mark*, 375. According to Hooker, Jesus is rejecting the thesis that marriage as a social contract continues after the resurrection. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 284.

1640 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 243. For related insights, see Hartman, *Mark*, 501.

1641 Collins, *Mark*, 561.

Having shed light on the problem of marriage after the resurrection, Jesus turns to the topic of resurrection *per se* (Mark 12:26). He makes a directive point by asking the Sadducees whether they had read the passage about the thorn-bush in the book of Moses. When the Sadducees are referred to this tradition, audience members may infer that Jesus wants to teach them which traditions they should draw on and how they should interpret them. The Sadducees quoted Moses, but Jesus outdoes them by citing an utterance that God addressed to Moses:<sup>1642</sup> “I am the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob” (Mark 12:26b) At the time God uttered this speech act to Moses, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were dead. However, God stated that he was their God. Jesus’ subsequent claim, “he is not a God of the dead, but of the living” (Mark 12:27a), indicates that he finds it absurd that God would utter this phrase if he had not raised Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob from the dead.<sup>1643</sup> Jesus concludes his argument against the Sadducees by stating *πολὸν πλανᾶσθε* (Mark 12:27b). In the Gospel of Mark, the verb *πλανᾶσθαι* may indicate to audience members that these characters are not following the way of the Lord.

During this episode, audience members have been informed of two different opinions about the resurrection. Because this theme has been mentioned previously, Jesus’ argument in favor of resurrection has much support within the Gospel of Mark. However, Jesus and the extradiegetic narrator have not explained the concept of the resurrection earlier. In the Markan world, even Peter, James, and John, who were present when Jesus raised the little girl (Mark 5:21–24; 5:35–43), were subsequently unable to understand the idea of resurrection (Mark 9:10).

By simulating this event on the basis of the Sadducees’ plan and by processing these speech acts as side-participants, audience members learn about the resurrection. If they hold the values of the Sadducees or similar ones, they may identify with these characters and process Jesus’ speech acts as if they were addressed to them. In that case, they may perceive that Jesus indirectly attempts to correct their belief as well. As side-participants, audience members are informed about both opinions on the resurrection. The fact that Jesus seemingly wins the debate<sup>1644</sup> may recommend his belief to audience members.

The passion predictions have indicated that it is important for audience members to understand what the idea of resurrection entails, so that they can comprehend subsequent elements of the gospel.<sup>1645</sup> It is difficult, however, to determine whether

1642 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 375.

1643 For a similar point, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 243. Hooker claims, “if God is the God of the patriarchs (and of those who came after them), he does not cease to be their God at their death; experience of fellowship with God demands belief in some kind of continuing relationship with him.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 285. For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 351. According to Collins, “[i]t is not clear exactly what vv. 26–27 presuppose about the current state of the patriarchs, whether they are in a place of comfort awaiting the general resurrection or already in the presence of God. The main points are that the patriarchs experience resurrection (vv. 26–27) and that resurrection is spiritual; that is, it does not involve an earthly type of life.” Collins, *Mark*, 564.

1644 See also Mark 12:28.

1645 For the relationship between Jesus’ teaching in this episode and the passion predictions, see also Hartman, *Mark*, 502. According to van Iersel, the function of this passage in the Gospel of Mark “is not to convince the reader or the Sadducees of the resurrection of the dead, or of the fact that this can be derived from Exod. 3:6, but only to beat off the Sadducees’ attack.” van Iersel, *Mark*, 376.

the information which is provided in this episode is sufficient to gain appreciation for this concept.<sup>1646</sup>

### 12:28–34: Jesus Debates with One of the Scribes

Through the assertive point “one of the scribes came and heard them disputing” (Mark 12:28a), the extradiegetic narrator identifies a new character to audience members by stating his profession.<sup>1647</sup> The verb προσέρχομαι indicates that the scribe is approaching a reference object which is not pointed out by the extradiegetic narrator. Audience members may therefore construct this event in two alternative manners: 1. They may infer that Jesus is still the geographic center and reference object in the Markan world. In that case, the reference frame is external. 2. The perceptual information is determined by the location of the perceiver. In that case, the reference frame is relative. With regard to the previous episode, audience members located the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of Jesus. If audience members maintain their earlier construction of the position of the perceiver in the Markan world, the difference between the two alternatives is subtle. Audience members will probably attribute the visual perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator, because the introductory assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs which pertain to vision.

On the basis of the perceptual verb ἀκούω, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator perceptual access to the scribe. If sustained, this device may promote identification with the scribe. The subsequent assertive point, “seeing that he answered them well” (Mark 12:28b), may maintain the effect created by the perceptual verb ἀκούω. Based on the verb ὀράω audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the thoughts of the scribe. Audience members may interpret the scribe’s assessment of Jesus’ answer and achievement during his previous argument with the Sadducees in two different manners. Their interpretations will be determined by their answer to the following question: Does the scribe represent the character group labeled “the scribes,” who aim at destroying Jesus (Mark 11:18), or does he function as a minor character who demonstrates that every group has its dissidents?<sup>1648</sup> If the scribe is interpreted as a representative of the scribes, earlier encounters between Jesus and the scribes may be primed or activated. The scribe’s positive evaluation of Jesus’ answer contrasts with previous encounters that have taken place between Jesus and the scribes. Earlier conversations were largely initiated because the scribes evaluated Jesus’ actions or the actions of his disciples negatively (Mark 2:1–12; 2:15–17; 3:22–30; 7:1–13). Against this backdrop, audience members may consider the possibility that the scribe’s positive evaluation of Jesus’ answer motivated another verbal attack on Jesus, because the Sadducees were unsuccessful. This time, however, the approach will come from a different an-

1646 According to Collins, “[t]he latter response [Mark 12:26–27] either presupposes that Jesus knows that they are Sadducees and reject resurrection, or it is directed at the audience of Mark, who have been told about that rejection.” Collins, *Mark*, 562.

1647 On identification of characters, see Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 97.

1648 For a similar approach, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 377–378.



gle.<sup>1649</sup> If audience members regard the scribe as a dissident, they may assume that he is positive towards Jesus and his teaching.<sup>1650</sup> In either case, the scribe's positive evaluation of the previous event will influence the opinion of audience members; it may lead to or affirm a positive assessment of Jesus' achievement during the discussion with the Sadducees.<sup>1651</sup> This positive evaluation is substantiated by the fact that the scribe is a specialist with regard to the written cultural memory which Jesus quoted to corroborate his argument. In this manner, Jesus' authority as a teacher is verified, either by an opponent or by one of their dissidents who has similar training.

Through an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator introduces the following directive point uttered by the scribe: "Which commandment is first of all?" (Mark 12:28c). The manner in which audience members interpret this question will be determined by whether they regard the scribe as a representative of the character group labeled "the scribes" or as a dissident. If audience members choose the first alternative, they will probably interpret this question as a challenge. Alternatively, they may consider the possibility that the scribe uttered the question out of curiosity, because he regarded Jesus as a remarkable teacher. In the latter case, audience members will not call his motivation into question.

The actual perlocutionary effect of the question posed by the scribe is introduced by means of an assertive point uttered by the extradiegetic narrator (Mark 12:29a). Jesus' answer is constituted by an assertive point, which in turn is comprised by imperatives, i.e. directive points. In this context, however, the assertive point is of primary importance. By means of his speech act, Jesus informs the scribe, as well as side-participants and overhearers, about his opinion on the topic. "First is, 'Hear, Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind and with all your strength.' The second is this, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these" (Mark 12:29b–31). The actual perlocutionary effect of the man's question coincides with its intended perlocutionary effect, i.e. Jesus answers his question, but he mentions two commandments, not merely one.<sup>1652</sup> Through Jesus' speech act, all the characters present are probably reminded of these commandments. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they are probably reminded of these commandments as well. Audience members who are not conversant with this cultural memory are informed about it through Jesus' utterance. By uttering these commandments, Jesus confirms ancient cultural memory and points out its significance to his addressee and to side-participants.<sup>1653</sup>

1649 For related insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 710. van Iersel, *Mark*, 377–378.

1650 For a positive evaluation of the scribe, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 205. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 286. Heil, *The Gospel*, 245. Collins, *Mark*, 572.

1651 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 378.

1652 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 206. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 287. van Iersel, *Mark*, 379. Collins, *Mark*, 575. According to Collins, the second command is second in rank.

1653 For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 287.

If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, Mark 12:29–30 may prime or activate Deut 6:4–5.<sup>1654</sup> At this point, however, the Markan Jesus does not facilitate activation of cultural memory by referring to it explicitly. In the Markan world, Jesus' approach may reflect the fact that this component of the Shema constituted Jewish identity and was uttered every day.<sup>1655</sup> Mark 12:30 may also prime or activate traditions like Deut 10:12 and 30:6, but the wording is slightly different.<sup>1656</sup> The fact that different versions existed points out that commitment to God was expressed in several comparable manners. Jesus' version of dedication to God encompasses heart, soul, mind, and strength. Consequently, the entire human being must be devoted to God.<sup>1657</sup>

Mark 12:31 may prime or activate Lev 19:18b,<sup>1658</sup> but it is more likely that audience members who are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX will perceive the two commandments listed by Jesus as a summary of the fundamental ideas of the commandments.<sup>1659</sup> Jesus concludes his assertive points by stating: "There is no other commandment greater than these" (Mark 12:31b). The combination of different traditions and his concluding claim indicates to Jesus' addressees and side-participants that Jesus offers his own opinion on this matter. Jesus' teaching implies that these commandments are interrelated, but the exact interrelationship between them is not spelled out. The fact that Jesus elaborates more on the first commandment may indicate that dedication to God takes priority over one's fellow human beings. With regard to audience members, however, Jesus' emphasis at this point is probably balanced by Jesus' mighty deeds and teaching, which focus on his fellow human beings.

Through the assertive point which constitutes Mark 12:32a, the extradiegetic narrator introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' assertive point. First, the scribe utters an assertive point which affirms Jesus' answer to his previous question and demonstrates his own knowledge of these traditions.<sup>1660</sup> Then he summarizes Jesus' main points: "Quite right, Teacher; in accordance with the truth you have said that 'He is one and there is no other except him'; and 'to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the strength,' and 'to love the neighbor as oneself'" (Mark 12:32–33a). The utterance καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπες ὅτι εἷς ἐστὶν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ (Mark 12:32b) may prime or activate Mark 12:14 (ἀλήθεια) as well as 12:28 (καλῶς). If Mark 12:14 is activated, audience members may question the sincerity of the scribe, whereas activation of Mark 12:28

1654 "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord. You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength" (Deut 6:4–5 LXX).

1655 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 206. van Iersel, *Mark*, 378–379. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 354. Collins, *Mark*, 573.

1656 "And now, Israel, what does the Lord your God require of you, but to fear the Lord your God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul?" (Deut 10:12 LXX). "And the Lord will cleanse your heart and the heart of your descendants, to love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, in order that you may live" (Deut 30:6 LXX).

1657 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 206. Heil, *The Gospel*, 246. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 355. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 307.

1658 On Lev 19:18, see also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 206.

1659 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 206–207. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 288.

1660 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 207. van Iersel, *Mark*, 379–380.

may result in a positive evaluation of the scribe, because he has twice expressed his esteem for Jesus' teaching.<sup>1661</sup> The solution audience members choose will be influenced by whether they think the scribe represents the character group labeled "the scribes" or whether they regard this man as a dissident. The scribe's subsequent recapitulation of Jesus' main points may indicate, however, that he approves of Jesus' previous teaching.

The words which constitute the assertive points expressed by the scribe in Mark 12:32 may prime or activate related scriptural traditions (Deut 4:35; 4:39; 5:7; 6:4; Isa 44:8; 45:5–6; 45:14; 45:18; 45:21–22; 46:9). In Mark 12:33a, the scribe describes devotion to God by means of the words heart, understanding, and strength.<sup>1662</sup>

The scribe elaborates on his former assertive points by claiming that these insights are:<sup>1663</sup> "much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices" (Mark 12:33b). If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they may recognize that the man is drawing on a conventional theme (1 Kgdms 15:22; Hos 6:6; Mic 6:6–8; Prov 21:3; Isa 1:11–17). In the Markan context, however, the scribe makes an assertion which corresponds to and expands Jesus' indirect evaluation of the temple cult (Mark 11:15–19; 11:27–12:12).<sup>1664</sup> This aspect is probably the most important with regard to audience members, even if they are familiar with some of the previously mentioned traditions.<sup>1665</sup> If audience members interpret this event against the backdrop of previous events, and infer that the man has processed Jesus' earlier teaching as a side-participant, this episode, where the scribe is addressed by Jesus, may indicate to audience members that Jesus has been successful in convincing the scribe about the superiority of these two commandments over the temple cult. The two commandments also summarize Jesus' actions in the Markan world. By preparing the way of the Lord through his teaching, preaching, and mighty deeds, Jesus has served God as well as his fellow human beings. And he has done so apart from the temple cult.

In Mark 12:34a–b, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of the speech acts uttered by the scribe. "When Jesus saw that he answered wisely, he said to him, 'You are not far from the kingdom of God.'" On the basis of the first assertive point, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator access to the thoughts of Jesus. If sustained, this device may promote identification with Jesus. Through this speech act, audience members are informed about Jesus' evaluation of the scribe's response to his teaching. As side-

1661 According to Gundry, "Jesus has proved his didactic superiority." Gundry, *Mark*, 711.

1662 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 246–247.

1663 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 247. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 355. According to Lührmann, this utterance amplifies the second commandment mentioned by the scribe. Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 207.

1664 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 247. "His implicit denigration of temple worship, made more poignant by the fact that he is listening to Jesus' teaching while in the temple (11:27), coincides with and further develops Jesus' earlier condemnation of the temple for failing to achieve its purpose of becoming God's 'house of prayer for all peoples (11:17)."

1665 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 207. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 289.

participants to this episode, audience members may conclude that Jesus and the scribe have mutual respect for each other.

Jesus gets the final say during this discussion by means of the following assertive point: οὐ μακρὰν εἶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (Mark 12:34b). Through this speech act, Jesus does not merely show respect for the man: His utterance also indicates that the man embodies values and beliefs which correspond to those that characterize the kingdom of God.<sup>1666</sup> This speech act may prime or activate previous events where the concept ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ has been mentioned (Mark 1:15; 4:11; 4:26; 4:30; 9:1; 9:47; 10:14–15; 10:23–25). Earlier on, audience members have been informed that the kingdom of God is at hand, that it is a mystery, that it can be likened to the action of sowing or to a seed, that it can be perceived, and that it is conceived as a place. Jesus' speech act can be interpreted with regard to several of these aspects. Furthermore, effects associated with the kingdom seem to manifest themselves where Jesus and his followers are, through teaching and mighty deeds. On the basis of the scribe's acknowledgement of Jesus' teaching, Jesus can state that the scribe is close to the kingdom.<sup>1667</sup> The fact that the scribe acknowledged Jesus' assessment of the commandments and pointed out the priority of these commandments over the temple cult may draw attention to another aspect of the kingdom of God, viz. the ethics which Jesus presented while he was on the road.<sup>1668</sup> In previous episodes, Jesus' healings and exorcisms illustrated his commitment to God and to fellow human beings. These two commands, which interrelate love of God and love of neighbor, are a kind of summary of Jesus' preparation of the way of the Lord. Those who realize this fact have insight into "the mystery of the kingdom of God" (Mark 4:11). In this manner, the scribe may contrast with (a) the rich man, who did not want to sell his possessions to give to the poor and thus help his neighbor, (b) the disciples, who wanted to be the greatest and who spoke sternly to the children, (c) and James and John, who wanted privileged seating arrangements.

The extradiegetic narrator concludes the event by telling audience members: "And no one dared to question him anymore" (Mark 12:34c). Accordingly, silence constitutes the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' last statement. On the basis of the verb τολμάω audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the thoughts of Jesus' audience. Audience members may realize that this assertive point does not merely pertain to the last event. In effect, it rounds off the discussions which have taken place in Mark 11:27–12:34.<sup>1669</sup> If audience members have simulated these events on the basis of the two plots, they have probably concluded that Jesus has been successful in his attempts to ward off the opponents' at-

1666 According to Hooker, the response of the scribe has demonstrated that he has the right attitude. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 290. Donahue and Harrington claim that the scribe "has grasped Jesus' teaching about the supreme importance of God's kingdom and receiving it as a gift from God (see Mark 10:13–16). If he lives by the love commandment he will be able to 'enter' into the life of God's kingdom (see 9:43–48)." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 356. According to Lührmann, the scribe is not willing to recognize the proximity of the kingdom of God in Jesus' teaching. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 207.

1667 For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 290.

1668 See "8:27–11:10: Jesus Is on the Way Which Ends in Jerusalem" on page 310, including subdivisions.

1669 See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 205. Heil, *The Gospel*, 247. van Iersel, *Mark*, 381.

tacks. If audience members have shared the values and beliefs of the opponents, or of some of these groups, Jesus' arguments may have persuaded them to alter their value system and beliefs. In that case, the scribe may function as an object of emulation, because this episode shows the man's journey from appreciation of Jesus' teaching, to approval of Jesus' teaching, to gaining acceptance of his values and beliefs by Jesus.

During this episode, Jesus affirms and elaborates on cultural memory grounded in the LXX. Depending on whether or not audience members are familiar with these traditions, the simulation of this event may lead to maintenance, negotiation, or formation of group identity. As a significant teacher, Jesus points out the two basic values which constitute "the will of God" (Mark 3:35). Through Jesus' teaching, these values are recommended to audience members.

### 12:35–37a: Jesus Teaches in the Temple

The extradiegetic narrator introduces this episode by means of the following assertive point: "And Jesus continued, teaching in the temple he said" (Mark 12:35a). This speech act contains the character marker ὁ Ἰησοῦς, through which this episode is demarcated. At this point, audience members are not explicitly informed about the addressees of Jesus' teaching, as they were at the beginning of the previous episodes. They may therefore construct different inferences based on the context. When audience members heard Mark 12:12, they probably concluded that the chief priests, scribes, and elders, who approached Jesus in Mark 11:27, left him. When the events which took place in Mark 12:13–17; 12:18–27 and 12:28–34 were related, the extradiegetic narrator introduced new characters at the beginning of each episode, but he did not indicate that these characters left. As a result, audience members may deduce that the Pharisees, Herodians, Sadducees, and the scribe constitute the anonymous characters who listen to Jesus' teaching. Furthermore, they may infer that the crowd is still present (Mark 11:18; 11:32; 12:12).<sup>1670</sup>

Jesus' teaching is introduced by a directive point in form of a rhetorical question: πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι ὁ χριστὸς υἱὸς Δαυὶδ ἔστιν; (Mark 12:35b).<sup>1671</sup> The function of this speech act is probably to dispute assertive points which were uttered earlier by the scribes.<sup>1672</sup> Jesus' speech act may therefore prime or activate Mark 1:21–28, where characters drew attention to the authority with which Jesus was teaching, as opposed to the scribes.<sup>1673</sup> When the scribes taught, the noun χριστός did not refer to Jesus,<sup>1674</sup> and on the surface level Jesus' question refers to a hypothetical Mes-

1670 Mark 12:37b later confirms the presence of the crowd. On the difficulty of determining the identity of Jesus' audience, see also van Iersel, *Mark*, 382. Heil suggests that Jesus is addressing the crowd. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 248–249. According to Collins, this episode is an example of public teaching. See Collins, *Mark*, 579.

1671 According to Gundry, "Jesus' 'answering' does not mean that he answers the scribe, but that he responds to the lack of further questions by asking his own question about the scribes." Gundry, *Mark*, 717. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 290.

1672 See also Collins, *Mark*, 579.

1673 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 717.

1674 For the fact that this title refers to "der Messias' als im Judentum erwartete eschatologische Rettergestalt," see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 208.

siah.<sup>1675</sup> Audience members may recognize, however, that during the performance, this noun has until now been employed exclusively to characterize Jesus. Previously, the noun *χριστός* has been mentioned only three times in the Gospel of Mark (Mark 1:1; 8:29; 9:41), but the fact that it is stated in the title and at the turning point of the gospel has probably made audience members aware of the significance of this designation. The two first instances are the most important for the understanding of the present episode. Because both the extradiegetic narrator and Peter have employed this title to define Jesus' identity, audience members may interpret Jesus' directive point as a question concerning his own identity,<sup>1676</sup> and implicitly his authority. In that case, this episode contrasts with earlier events where Jesus attempted to prevent others from proclaiming his identity and actions (Mark 1:25; 1:44; 5:43; 8:30).<sup>1677</sup> Although the label "Messiah" has been utilized with regard to Jesus, audience members have not heard that he has been anointed. However, they may regard Jesus' baptism as a comparable event.<sup>1678</sup> At this point, Jesus teaches about the role of the Messiah for the first time.

Most characters in the Markan world do not know that Jesus is the Messiah. Moreover, audience members do not know whether the disciples, who were present during the event related in Mark 8:29, are nearby at this point or not. Accordingly, the implications of Jesus' speech act seem to be more obvious to audience members than to Jesus' addressees in the Markan world.

The phrase *υἱὸς Δαυίδ* may prime or activate Mark 10:47–48, where Bartimaeus addressed Jesus *υἱὲ Δαυίδ*, as well as Mark 11:10: "Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David! Hosanna in the highest heavens!" In view of these utterances, audience members may conclude that characters in the Markan world have regarded Jesus as Son of David. Jesus' question (Mark 12:35b) seems to dispute the idea that the Messiah is the Son of David. Both titles may prime or activate concepts associated with kings and kingdoms, and for many characters in the Markan world, these designations would clearly overlap.<sup>1679</sup> Consequently, Jesus' question may take his addressees by surprise. Audience members may recognize, however, that in the Gospel of Mark Jesus is associated with the kingdom of God, a kingdom whose values contradict those displayed by human rulers (Mark 10:42–45). As a result, audience members may assume that Jesus' perception of his own role as the Messiah goes beyond that of a political Messiah, or King of the Jews.

The actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' directive point is constituted by the following assertive point which Jesus himself utters: "David himself said in the Holy Spirit, 'The Lord said to my Lord, 'Sit at my right, until I put your enemies under your feet''" (Mark 12:36). By means of this speech act, Jesus informs his addressees and side-participants about David's declaration. Furthermore, Jesus introduces David's speech act by providing important information about the communication situation

1675 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 249.

1676 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 249.

1677 Exceptions: Mark 5:19 and 10:47–48. In the latter case, other characters who were present told Bartimaeus to be quiet.

1678 See "1:9–11: Jesus Is Baptized by John" on page 122.

1679 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 581.

in which David uttered his speech act. David spoke under the influence of the Holy Spirit: This means that David spoke with divine authority as a prophet.<sup>1680</sup> David's subsequent speech act is constituted by information about participants in an embedded communication situation in which a particular directive point was uttered. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, this speech act may prime or activate Ps 109:1 (LXX)/110:1.<sup>1681</sup> If this psalm is activated, they may also know that it was ascribed to David.<sup>1682</sup>

The assertive point uttered in Mark 12:37a indicates that Jesus focused on the communication situation which was sketched by David. "David himself calls him Lord; so how can he be his son?"<sup>1683</sup> By combining this assertive and directive point, Jesus employs David's authority and spiritual guidance to claim another status for the Messiah than the one suggested by the scribes. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they may perceive that this communication situation refers to the enthronement of a person prior to David, a person whom David himself called Lord. Against this backdrop, audience members may recognize that Jesus does not ground his perception of the role of the Messiah in the political traditions which were associated with David. He goes beyond David, by referring to his predecessor. On the basis of this argument, audience members may recognize that Jesus grounds his alternative perception of the Messiah in cultural memory which is substantiated by David's prophetic authority; however, Jesus' negotiation of this memory enables him to avoid its political implications. As a result, audience members may continue to regard Jesus, the Son of God, as a character who belongs to the line of suffering prophets and slaves/servants who represent God (Mark 12:1ff.). It follows that Jesus will not use force to lay claim to his vineyard and inheritance.

During the performance, audience members will probably recognize that Jesus claims the position at God's right hand for himself, since he is the Messiah in the Markan world (Mark 1:1; 8:29).<sup>1684</sup> Jesus' focus on sonship may prime or activate events where Jesus has been called Son of God and Son of Man. The designation Son of God may also refer to the Messiah.<sup>1685</sup> In the gospel, however, the title "Son of God" has one aspect which transcends the associations of the designation "Son

1680 According to Collins, this characteristic identifies David as a prophet. Collins, *Mark*, 579. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 293. Heil, *The Gospel*, 249. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 846.

1681 Marcus and Collins suggest that this quotation conflates elements from two psalms, 109:1 (LXX)/110:1 and 8:7 (LXX)/8:6. Marcus, *The Way*, 130. According to Collins, "[t]he rhetorical context of the quotation implies that the author can assume that the audiences are familiar with the interpretation of these psalms as prophecies or prefigurations of the messiah." Collins, *Mark*, 579.

1682 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 293.

1683 According to Marcus, the rest of the content of the quotation is also of importance. "If Mark's only purpose in quoting Ps. 110:1 had been to establish that David called the Messiah 'Lord,' he could have contented himself with citing the first words of the verse, 'The Lord said to my lord.' He has *not* so contented himself, however, but has gone on to cite the latter half of the verse, which speaks, in his interpretation, of the Messiah's exaltation to God's right hand and of God's victory on his behalf over enemies." Marcus, *The Way*, 134.

1684 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 249.

1685 According to Donahue and Harrington, Jesus "is more than David's son and more than the messiah of Jewish expectations. In fact, Jesus deserves to share the title *kyrios* with God." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 360.



of David.”<sup>1686</sup> In the gospel, Jesus, the Son of God, is the one who prepares the way of the Lord by proclaiming the kingdom of God, by performing mighty deeds, and by teaching the values of the kingdom. Furthermore, the kingdom of God as fluid, sacred space is present wherever Jesus and his companions are. In this manner, Jesus, the Markan Messiah, is the King of the kingdom of God. The future aspects of the kingdom of God (8:38–9:1) may indicate that Jesus, who also is the Son of Man, will ultimately be seated at God’s right hand.<sup>1687</sup> Against this backdrop, audience members may understand why Jesus’ assertive point suggests that the Messiah will surpass the expectations of the scribes.

The question with which Jesus closes his utterance is left unanswered.<sup>1688</sup> His addressees and side-participants will probably ponder on the answer, on the basis of the information provided by Jesus’ previous assertive point, which indirectly answered his question. Consequently, they may continue to “reflect on both the lordship and the sonship of Jesus.”<sup>1689</sup>

### 12:37b–40: Jesus Speaks to the Crowd

The end of the former episode and the beginning of Mark 12:37b–40 are bridged by an assertive point through which audience members are informed about the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ previous teaching: “And the great crowd was listening to him with delight” (Mark 12:37b). This speech act contains the character marker ὄχλος, by means of which this episode is demarcated. Audience members have probably inferred that the crowd was present when Jesus taught in the temple, because they have been informed by the extradiegetic narrator that the presence and response of the crowd motivated the actions of Jesus’ opponents in the Markan world (Mark 11:18; 11:32; 12:12). At this point, their presence is explicitly stated. Audience members may attribute perceptual access to the crowd to the extradiegetic narrator on the basis of the perceptual verb ἀκούω. In that case, audience members also have perceptual access to them. If sustained, this device may promote identification with this character group. On the basis of the adverb ἡδέως audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the crowd’s conscious feelings. This device may promote audience involvement with the crowd. Alternatively, audience members may think that this information refers to external manifestations of emotions.

By means of the subsequent assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator introduces Jesus’ subsequent teaching. On the basis of the introduction to this event, audience members will probably deduce that Jesus warns the crowd against the scribes.<sup>1690</sup> The propositional content of Jesus’ directive point also characterizes the scribes. In this manner, the propositional content of Jesus’ speech act points out the reason why the crowd should beware of the scribes (Mark 12:38b–39). “Beware of the scribes, who

1686 See also Marcus, *The Way*, 139–146.

1687 See also Mark 14:62.

1688 See also Collins, *Mark*, 581.

1689 Heil, *The Gospel*, 250.

1690 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 251. Gundry, *Mark*, 719. van Iersel, *Mark*, 384. Collins, *Mark*, 582. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 311.

like to walk around in long robes and to receive greetings in the marketplaces and the chief seats in the synagogues and the places of honor at dinners!” In sum, Jesus’ characterization of the scribes concerns honor and prestige.<sup>1691</sup> This was also the subject of Jesus’ conversations with his disciples on the road. Jesus’ perception and presentation of the scribes may prime or activate these events, where Jesus corrected the attitudes of his companions.<sup>1692</sup> The first characteristic which constitutes the assertive point voiced by Jesus in Mark 12:40a, “they who devour widows’ houses,” indicates that the scribes are not abiding by the second commandment uttered by Jesus to the scribe.<sup>1693</sup> Furthermore, the scribes are characterized as characters who “for appearance’s sake say long prayers” (Mark 12:40b). In this manner, they are accused of dishonesty and hypocrisy.<sup>1694</sup> Until this moment in the performance, audience members have heard only that Jesus prayed (Mark 1:35; 6:46). During both these events, Jesus withdrew from other characters in the Markan world in order to pray. In both cases, these speech acts were merely summarized, which means that neither the characters nor the audience members knew what Jesus said, how he prayed etc. If these events are activated, audience members may recognize that Jesus’ own practice is contrasted with that of the scribes. In Mark 11:24–25, Jesus told his companions about prayer. At that point, he connected this activity with faith and forgiveness. The result of prayer depends on faith, but Jesus does not regard prayer separately from a person’s relationship with his fellow human beings. Against this backdrop, the behavior of the scribes does not fit the ideals presented earlier by Jesus, nor the ideals illustrated by Jesus’ own actions. Jesus concludes his teaching by means of an assertive point, a prediction:<sup>1695</sup> “They will receive a more severe punishment” (Mark 12:40c). Jesus’ addressees and side-participants may regard this speech act as an indirect warning directed to them. In that case, they are warned about the consequences of acting according to the same values as the scribes.

### 12:41–44: Jesus Opposite the Treasury

This episode is introduced by means of the assertive point “he sat down opposite the treasury, and was watching how the crowd was putting money into the treasury” (Mark 12:41a–b). This speech act contains the spatial marker κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου, through which this episode is demarcated.<sup>1696</sup> This spatial marker also functions as a reference object, and this means that the reference frame is external. The positional constraints are thus weak, and audience members are free to construct a position for the perceiver as long as he is located in the immediate vicinity of the treasury. Because the first part of this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience mem-

1691 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 251. Collins, *Mark*, 583. According to Donahue and Harrington, Jesus charges them of self-promotion. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 362.

1692 See the episodes subsumed under “8:27–11:10: Jesus Is on the Way Which Ends in Jerusalem” on page 310. For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 251. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 312.

1693 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 252.

1694 See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 362–363. For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 384.

1695 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 720.

1696 See also Collins, *Mark*, 586.

bers may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. On the basis of the perceptual verb θεωρέω, audience members may attribute the perception of πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον (Mark 12:41b) to Jesus;<sup>1697</sup> this means that the extradiegetic narrator has perceptual access to him. Alternatively, they may continue to attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. In that case, the extradiegetic narrator observes Jesus, who watches the actions performed by the crowd. The earlier attribution of perceptions will determine the manner in which audience members perceive the subsequent assertive point: “Many rich people were putting in large sums” (Mark 12:41c). If they have attributed the observation of the crowd to Jesus, they may deduce that he makes this observation as well. Alternatively, they may attribute this observation to the extradiegetic narrator. If sustained, the first solution will promote involvement with Jesus.

Through the assertive point which constitutes Mark 12:42, audience members are informed that “a poor widow came and put in two lepta, which are worth a quadran.” Audience members will probably construct the event in such a way that they infer that the treasury still constitutes the reference object. Alternatively, they may construct the event according to a relative reference frame. In that case, the position of the observer constitutes the reference object. Because the perceiver is located in the immediate vicinity of the treasury, these alternatives will pertain merely to nuances.

The minor character who enters the scene is identified to audience members as a poor widow.<sup>1698</sup> As with most of the minor characters who have been introduced earlier, the woman’s name is not mentioned. She is presented only by means of her most important characteristic, which determines the sum of money she puts in the treasury, λεπτὰ δύο. This information is rendered by a Latin loanword (κοδράντης) in order to facilitate understanding throughout the entire empire.<sup>1699</sup> The information conveyed by Mark 12:41 enabled audience members to observe the crowd who put money in the contribution box. Depending on how they constructed the perceptual information at the beginning of this episode, they will continue to observe this event either through Jesus’ eyes or from an independent position. In Mark 12:41, the extradiegetic narrator focused on the rich people who contributed a lot. This poor woman contrasts with these rich characters, and her small contribution contrasts with their large sums.

The extradiegetic narrator introduces Jesus’ subsequent speech acts by uttering an assertive point through which audience members are told that Jesus called his disciples (Mark 12:43a). In this manner, audience members are informed about the particular communication situation in which these speech acts are uttered. During Jesus’ teaching in the temple, the disciples and the twelve have not been mentioned. Because they followed Jesus to Jerusalem, audience members have possibly inferred

<sup>1697</sup> See also Miller, *Women*, 115.

<sup>1698</sup> On the identification of characters, see Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 97.

<sup>1699</sup> For related insights, see Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 313. Cf. Gundry, *Mark*, 729. He claims that the audience is Roman. According to Collins, “mention of the two lepta makes it more likely that Mark was written in one of the eastern provinces.” Collins, *Mark*, 589. See also G. Theißen, *The Gospels*, 247–249.

that they have been present,<sup>1700</sup> but the extradiegetic narrator has focused on the conflicts with the scribes, elders, chief priests, the Pharisees, the Herodians, and the Sadducees. When audience members now hear the diegetic summary of Jesus' directive point (προσκαλεσάμενος), they may deduce that the disciples have been present all along in the outskirts of the crowd.

Jesus utters an assertive point by means of which he claims "truly I tell you, this poor widow put in more than all those who put into the treasury. For all of them put in out of their abundance; but she out of her poverty put in everything she had, her entire means of subsistence" (Mark 12:43b–44).<sup>1701</sup> The contexts in which the phrase Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν has been employed earlier may suggest to audience members that Jesus will utter "a prophetic saying or a saying about discipleship."<sup>1702</sup> Through this speech act, Jesus draws attention to the contrast between the contribution of this woman and the contribution of the rich people. Surprisingly, Jesus claims that the poor widow donated more than the others did.<sup>1703</sup> Jesus explains his claim by pointing out the contrast between abundance and poverty, which leads to an assessment of the contribution of these characters in proportion to their resources. On the basis of this criterion, the woman, who contributed the least, actually donated her whole subsistence, whereas the others merely gave out of their abundance. Jesus does not draw out the implications of this event. The disciples and audience members may therefore conclude as they please. Earlier, minor characters have exemplified faith in Jesus' power to heal and perform mighty deeds. At this point, however, the woman may rather illustrate the values that characterize the kingdom of God. By contributing her whole living, she illustrates faith in God and extreme dedication to him.<sup>1704</sup> In this way, she fulfills the first commandment mentioned by Jesus in his reply to the scribe (Mark 12:29–30).<sup>1705</sup> Because the noun χήρα may prime or activate the previous episode, her behavior may be regarded as a contrast to the behavior of the scribes.<sup>1706</sup> Against this backdrop, the scribes may illustrate a different approach to honor and status: In other words, they love their own selves. The widow, on the other hand, may exemplify the manner in which dedication to God determines one's priorities.<sup>1707</sup>

---

1700 According to Collins, the Markan audience would assume the implicit presence of the disciples. See Collins, *Mark*, 587.

1701 For the phrase Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, see my comments on Mark 3:28.

1702 Collins, *Mark*, 590.

1703 Audience members will have to infer how Jesus would be able to draw this conclusion.

1704 According to Heil, "[t]he poverty of the widow reminds the disciples and the sincere scribe of their need for detachment from material possessions in order to make the total commitment to God necessary to enter his kingdom." Heil, *The Gospel*, 254.

1705 See Collins, *Mark*, 590.

1706 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 212. Gundry, *Mark*, 728. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 365. van Iersel, *Mark*, 386. Miller, *Women*, 124. Collins, *Mark*, 590. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 313.

1707 Van Iersel suggests that "she may count on a place in the kingdom because she expresses the very core of Jesus' teaching in one single deed" van Iersel, *Mark*, 386. According to Donahue and Harrington, "attention to the Markan context leaves open whether the widow is presented as a model to be imitated for her

### 13:1–37: Outside the Temple

This episode is demarcated by means of the spatial markers ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (Mark 13:1) and κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ (Mark 13:3). Events which took place in the temple constituted the main parts of Mark 11:11–12:44; thus, the setting of this episode is connected with the setting of previous events. After Jesus entered into Jerusalem, he immediately went into the temple and “looked around at everything” (Mark 11:11). Jesus returned to Jerusalem the next day, entered the temple, and immediately took action against the way the temple was managed. By means of his teaching, Jesus contrasted the current state and practice in the temple with an ideal practice constituted by prayer (Mark 11:15–19). Jesus returned to Jerusalem and the temple on the third day and discussed the nature of his authority (Mark 11:27–12:12), the question of tax (Mark 12:13–17), the resurrection (Mark 12:18–27), and the commandments (Mark 12:28–34) with different character groups. He also offered his view on the identity of the Messiah (Mark 12:35–37a), warned against the scribes (Mark 12:37b–40), and employed a widow to illustrate the important aspect of differentiated donations (Mark 12:41–44). Many of the above-mentioned events highlighted negative characteristics of the temple and the cult practiced there.<sup>1708</sup>

In Mark 13:1, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members that Jesus leaves the temple. This is the third time audience members are told that Jesus exits this building complex.<sup>1709</sup> Because this action is repeated three times, it may catch the attention of audience members and they may expect that a significant act will take place at this moment. The fact that Jesus and his disciples leave the temple does not mean that the temple from now on is ignored. On the contrary, the events which constitute this major episode take place at two different locations which the extradiegetic narrator explicitly relates to the temple (Mark 13:1; 13:3).<sup>1710</sup> In this manner, both the temple and Jesus’ actions and teaching there will form the backdrop against which subsequent events and speech are interpreted.

#### 13:1–2: Jesus and the Disciples Went Out of the Temple

Through the assertive point constituting Mark 13:1a, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the setting of this event. “As he was going out of the temple, one of his disciples said to him ...” This information contains the spatial marker ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ and the character marker εἰς τῶν μαθητῶν, by means of which this episode is demarcated. Because this information does not contain a perceptual verb, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. The spatial marker indicates that the reference frame is external; hence, audience members will construct a position for the perceiver in the vicinity

---

sincerity and generosity or as someone to be pitied as a victim of religious exploitation.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 365.

1708 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 256.

1709 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 256. Mark 11:19 may be interpreted as a general statement about what they have done every evening. However, the extradiegetic narrator seems to focus on only three days.

1710 For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 367. Collins, *Mark*, 594.

of the temple gate. The disciple first attracts Jesus' attention by means of the vocative διδάσκαλε. Subsequently he employs the interjection ἴδε to draw Jesus' attention to the large stones and buildings,<sup>1711</sup> which audience members will infer constitute the temple. As side-participants, audience members are informed about the great size of the temple.

The extradiegetic narrator introduces the immediate perlocutionary effect of this speech act, i.e. a directive point uttered by Jesus: "Do you see these great buildings?" (Mark 13:2b). Jesus' question also draws attention to the great size of the temple. Jesus' question is peculiar. Because it repeats the main point of the previous utterance,<sup>1712</sup> audience members may interpret this directive point in the following two manners:<sup>1713</sup> 1. Jesus has not heard the utterance voiced by the disciple. 2. The speech act performed by the disciple is corroborated by Jesus' speech act. In this context, audience members may prefer the latter alternative. Both alternatives inform characters in the narrative world and audience members about the greatness of the temple; accordingly, this information is offered by two different sources.

Jesus continues his utterance by means of an assertive point, which is a prediction:<sup>1714</sup> "There will certainly not be left here a stone upon a stone which will not be thrown down" (Mark 13:2c).<sup>1715</sup> The fact that the assertive point succeeds the directive point indicates that Jesus' question is rhetorical and serves to contrast the present state of these buildings with Jesus' prediction about their future condition.<sup>1716</sup> In the narrative world, characters will probably interpret Jesus' utterance as a prediction because these speech acts carry no implication with regard to their truth or falsity.<sup>1717</sup> Audience members who know about the later destruction of the temple<sup>1718</sup> may interpret this speech act as a prophecy, which "generally implies that the speech act was true."<sup>1719</sup>

1711 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 387.

1712 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 217.

1713 Gundry solves this problem by regarding this speech act as a declaration. See Gundry, *Mark*, 735–736.

1714 Cf. Collins, *Mark*, 594. Collins proposes the label "prophetic saying" and claims that this saying is put in a scholastic context. Heil points out that Jesus' utterance may warn the disciples against "attachment to the physical beauty of the Jerusalem temple, which will ultimately be annihilated." Heil, *The Gospel*, 257.

1715 According to Collins, the first part of this utterance "depicts a reversal of the allusion to the building of the Second Temple in Haggai: And now call to mind, from this day backward, before the placing of a stone upon a stone in the temple of the Lord, what sort of people were you? ... (Hag 2:15–16a LXX)." Collins, *Mark*, 602. Heil suggests that this utterance reflects the fact that "the 'builders,' the Jewish leaders, have rejected the 'stone,' Jesus as God's beloved Son, which God has destined as the 'cornerstone' for his own true and authentic 'building' (12:1–12) or 'household' (11:17), the community of those who pray effectively with a comprehensive faith, forgiveness (11:22–25) and love (12:28–34, 41–44)." Heil, *The Gospel*, 257.

1716 In this context, Jesus' prediction may prime or activate Mark 11:13–21. For related insights, see Hartman, *Mark*, 530–531.

1717 Audience members may infer that all of Jesus' disciples exited the temple at this point and processed the speech acts uttered by Jesus as side-participants. For constructions of related inferences, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 387. Collins, *Mark*, 594.

1718 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 388.

1719 "To predict is to assert with the propositional content condition that the propositional content is future with respect to the time of the utterance and the additional preparatory condition that the speaker has

### 13:3–37: Jesus, Peter, James, John, and Andrew on the Mount of Olives

This episode is introduced by means of the following assertive point: “When he was sitting on the Mount of Olives opposite the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him privately” (Mark 13:3). This utterance contains a spatial marker (εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἔλαιῶν κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ) and character markers (Πέτρος, Ἰάκωβος, Ἰωάννης, Ἀνδρέας) by means of which this episode is demarcated. Through Mark 13:3, audience members are offered a description of the particular setting and event which took place in the Markan world. Because this utterance does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute the observation of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. The extradiegetic narrator employs two reference objects in order to describe Jesus’ position in the narrative world, viz. the Mount of Olives and the temple. Audience members are told that Jesus was sitting on the Mount of Olives,<sup>1720</sup> and an external descriptive reference frame indicates that the Mount of Olives is to be found opposite the temple.<sup>1721</sup> Because the reference frame employed is external, audience members will construct a position for the perceiver and thus for themselves on the Mount of Olives.

Jesus’ previous prediction about the fate of the temple will probably be activated by the spatial location opposite the temple. Previous episodes which took place in the temple, and Jesus’ prediction, may therefore comprise the background against which this episode can be interpreted. Accordingly, the temple and what it represents are still in focus.

Through the introductory assertive point, audience members are told that Peter, James, John, and Andrew asked Jesus a question in private. In this manner, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the communication situation of the subsequent speech acts.<sup>1722</sup> The element of privacy indicates that these

---

evidence in support of the proposition. ... ‘Predict’ is close to but not the same as ‘forecast’, ‘foretell’, and ‘prophesy’. Reports using these verbs vary in their implied truth claims, and the acts named by these verbs vary in the subject matter of the propositional content and in the role of evidence in the performance of the acts. Thus to characterize a speech act as a prediction or forecast carries no implication as to its truth or falsity; but to say that something was foretold or prophesied generally implies that the speech act was true. Furthermore foretelling and prophesying unlike predicting and forecasting are usually done in the absence of scientific evidence.” Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations*, 186. According to van Iersel, Jesus’ utterance “has the character of a sentence.” van Iersel, *Mark*, 388.

1720 According to David M. Freedholm, “the Mount of Olives was a place of significance for those expecting the end of time.” D. M. Freedholm, “‘When You,’” 134. Jesus’ posture indicates that Jesus will teach them. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 259. van Iersel, *Mark*, 389. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 368. Collins, *Mark*, 602. According to Marcus, the sitting posture is associated with teaching and with judgment. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 873.

1721 The places that make up this setting may prime or activate Mark 11:1 where audience members learned that ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς Βηθφαγή καὶ Βηθανίαν πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἔλαιῶν. These places are referred to later. In Mark 11:11–12, audience members learned that Jesus entered Jerusalem and the temple before he withdrew to Bethany. In Mark 11:19, audience members learned only that Jesus withdrew from the city every evening, whereas in Mark 13:3 the exact location is the Mount of Olives. In this manner, the locations mentioned in Mark 11:1 frame the subsequent narration.

1722 According to Collins, their question situates the following apocalyptic discourse in a scholastic context. Collins, *Mark*, 594.



characters are privileged. The four characters who are present on this occasion were the first characters who were called by Jesus (Mark 1:16–20). They were referred to in Mark 1:29, and their rank among the twelve was indicated by their prominent position in the list presented in Mark 3:16–19. Three of these characters, Peter, James, and John, were also present when Jesus raised a twelve-year-old girl (Mark 5:37f.) and when Jesus was transfigured (Mark 9:2f.). In all these instances,<sup>1723</sup> these three or four characters were privileged, because of their initial call, because of their prominence among the twelve chosen ones, or because they were privileged witnesses to extraordinary events. Audience members may regard this event as another indication of their standing within the group of Jesus' companions.

Because the extradiegetic narrator has told audience members about the setting and the communication situation, they are enabled to observe this event as invisible witnesses and to process speech acts as side-participants. As side-participants, they are the intended addressees of the extradiegetic narrator, but not of Jesus. Since audience members are informed by these speech acts, they are situated in a privileged position which is comparable to the advantageous situation of Peter, James, John, and Andrew.<sup>1724</sup> The major difference is that the presence of audience members is intended by the extradiegetic narrator, not by one of the characters.

The directive points uttered by Peter, James, John, and Andrew are constituted by one introductory request and two questions (εἰπὸν ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα; Mark 13:4).<sup>1725</sup> Because the reference of the demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα is not explicitly mentioned, these questions are ambiguous. Based on the previous context, audience members will most likely infer that the demonstrative pronoun refers to the previous episode and Jesus' prediction about the temple (Mark 13:1–2).<sup>1726</sup> The fact that these characters are located opposite the temple may contribute to this inference. If audience members make this deduction, they may infer that these four characters want to know when the temple will be destroyed. Furthermore, they want to learn about “the sign when all these things are about to be accomplished” (Mark 13:4b). In view of their previous inference, audience members may conclude that the four characters are mainly concerned about the future of the temple buildings.<sup>1727</sup> If audience members are familiar with cultural

1723 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 368. van Iersel, *Mark*, 389. Collins, *Mark*, 602.

1724 See also Hartman, *Mark*, 531. Lührmann suggests “daß die vier angeredeten Jünger für ‚alle‘ einschließlich der Leser des Markusevangeliums stehen, was in 37 dann ausdrücklich betont wird.” Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 219. Collins points out two levels of Mark 13:5b–37. “On one level, vv. 5b–37 is a speech of Jesus, as a character in the narrative, to four named disciples. On another level, as is now widely acknowledged among New Testament scholars, the evangelist indirectly provides his audience with an interpretation of the first Jewish war with Rome.” Collins, *Mark*, 603. For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 392.

1725 For the suggestion that the first question is answered in Mark 13:5–23, while the second question is answered in Mark 13:24–27, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 218. In the present study, Lührmann's structure is not endorsed.

1726 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 736–737. van Iersel, *Mark*, 393. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 368. Collins, *Mark*, 602. For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 218. According to Heil, the double question also refers to the end of the world. Heil, *The Gospel*, 258–259.

1727 According to Collins, this phrase “presupposes that the destruction of the temple is part of a sequence of eschatological events.” Collins, *Mark*, 602. Pilgaard points out that there may be a connection between

memory grounded in the LXX, Dan 12:6–8 may be primed or activated. If these traditions are activated, audience members may consider the possibility that the question posed by Peter, James, John, and Andrew also pertains to the end. Against this backdrop, the question may indicate that these characters ponder on the connection between the destruction of the temple and the end.<sup>1728</sup> If audience members make this inference, the question posed by these four characters may generate similar reflections among audience members.

The extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that Jesus responded to their speech act (Mark 13:5a). If audience members assumed that the questions posed by the four characters constituted their response to Jesus' prediction about the destiny of temple, the actual perlocutionary effect of their directive points does not seem to correspond to the intended perlocutionary effect.<sup>1729</sup> Jesus utters, not the expected assertive points, but a directive point which is not related to their previous questions.<sup>1730</sup> If audience members were familiar with traditions recorded in Dan 12:6–8, Jesus' reply will make more sense.

Jesus' addressees may process the speech act βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ (Mark 13:5b) as a warning,<sup>1731</sup> as an exhortation, or as a command.<sup>1732</sup> Prior to this speech act, the verb πλανᾶω has been employed only twice in the Gospel of Mark (Mark 12:24; 12:27). Both times, Jesus employed the verb when he argued against the position of the Sadducees, saying that they were led astray/were mistaken. Jesus thus warns, exhorts, or commands his addressees in order that no one may lead them astray.

In the gospel, "the way" has been a prominent feature of the topography of the Markan world; however, it has also constituted an important metaphor (Mark 1:2–3; 8:27–11:10).<sup>1733</sup> Through Mark 1:2–3, audience members were urged to prepare the way of the Lord so that he might come. Furthermore, the disciples learned how to interact as a group on the way to Jerusalem. Through simulation, audience members gained the same knowledge. These aspects are interrelated, because in the Markan world Jesus and his disciples prepare the way of the Lord as a group. Jesus' instructions on the road taught the disciples values, ideology etc., which would enable both them and subsequent members of the group to reach the group's main goal, i.e. the

the destruction of the temple and Jesus' return as the Son of Man. In that case, the destruction of the temple may serve as a sign of Jesus' appearance as the Son of Man. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 316, 318.

1728 Freedholm suggests that "the two parts of the question in verse 4 are not separate questions, one referring to the destruction of the temple and the other to eschatological events in general. They are, rather, parallel questions and represent an attempt by Mark to link the destruction of the temple with these eschatological events (*tauta panta*)." Freedholm, "When You," 135.

1729 For the fact that Jesus ignores their question, see Gundry, *Mark*, 738.

1730 According to Donahue and Harrington, "[t]he tenor of Jesus' eschatological discourse according to Mark 13 is to cool down end-time excitement and to urge cautious discernment in the face of dramatic cosmic events." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 368–369.

1731 See Collins, *Mark*, 602–603. Collins employs the term "admonition." According to Lührmann, "[d]ie Warnung vor Verführern ist ein Topos in solchen testamentartigen Abschnitten, die ja gerade für die noch ausstehende Zukunft die richtige Deutung sichern wollen (vgl. im Neuen Testament Apg 20,29 Mt 7,15 1Joh 4,1)." Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 219.

1732 For the first and the latter alternative, see Gundry, *Mark*, 733, 737.

1733 For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 394.

arrival of the Lord and the manifestation of the kingdom of God. These aspects may constitute the backdrop of Jesus' directive point. In that case, Jesus' addressees are warned so that they will not be led astray, but will rather continue to perform actions which will bring about the main goal of the group.

As side-participants, audience members are informed by this speech act. However, the fact that Jesus addresses Peter, James, John, and Andrew by means of a verb in the second person plural may indicate that audience members will process these speech acts as if Jesus were addressing them as well.<sup>1734</sup> The fact that they were urged or commanded to join God's project in Mark 1:2–3 may enhance this mechanism. Subsequent speech acts often contain verbs, pronouns etc. which are inflected in the second person plural. Audience members may process these speech acts as if they were addressed to them also.

An assertive point, a prediction, by means of which Jesus informs his addressees about his view of the future, succeeds the directive point: πολλοὶ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου λέγοντες ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν (Mark 13:6). This assertive point seems to constitute Jesus' motivation for uttering the former directive point.<sup>1735</sup> The phrase ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου may prime or activate earlier events where this phrase was employed (Mark 9:37; 9:39). If Mark 9:37 is activated, Jesus' teaching indicated that his addressees should receive children in his name; if Mark 9:39 is activated, Jesus' subsequent teaching indicated that people outside of his group of disciples should be allowed to exorcise evil spirits in his name. In this manner, Jesus' name served to include people in the group. The phrase ἐγώ εἰμι may prime the event where Jesus addressed the disciples after they had mistakenly concluded that he was a ghost (Mark 6:50).<sup>1736</sup> At that point, this phrase indicated Jesus' identity and the fact that the disciples knew him. In contrast to these events, Jesus now warns Peter, James, John, and Andrew about the future prospect that people might come in this name and thus claim his identity.<sup>1737</sup> According to Jesus, the consequence of this situation is that many people will be led astray.<sup>1738</sup> The adjective πολλοί is employed twice in this verse. The many deceivers correspond to the many who will be deceived.<sup>1739</sup>

Subsequently, Jesus utters an indefinite temporal clause, which constitutes an indirect prediction:<sup>1740</sup> "When you hear of wars and reports of wars" (Mark 13:7a). In this utterance, "wars and reports of wars" may function as the signs which Peter, James, John, and Andrew asked for in Mark 13:4. In this manner, the information

1734 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 394.

1735 Collins suggests that Mark 13:6 constitutes an explanation of the previous speech acts. See Collins, *Mark*, 602–603.

1736 On the fact that this phrase should not be regarded as a divine title, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 219. Gundry, *Mark*, 737.

1737 According to Gundry, Heil, and Collins, they claimed to be the Messiah. See Gundry, *Mark*, 737. Heil, *The Gospel*, 259. Collins, *Mark*, 604–605.

1738 Lührmann points out that Jesus is the one whom people should listen to (Mark 9:7). See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 219.

1739 See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 219. Gundry, *Mark*, 737. According to Hooker, Mark 13:6 does not refer to Christians. "[I]t is men and women in general who will be led astray by these false messianic claimants." See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 307.

1740 See Collins, *Mark*, 605.

provided by Jesus at this point matches the intended perlocutionary effect of Mark 13:4. Jesus' subsequent speech act can be interpreted as a directive point by means of which he urges his addressees not to be alarmed, or as an assertive point by means of which he reassures them that they should not be alarmed (Mark 13:7b).<sup>1741</sup> This speech act is followed by an assertive point δεῖ γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐπω τὸ τέλος (Mark 13:7c),<sup>1742</sup> which indicates that these events are part of a divine plan.<sup>1743</sup> If this speech act is interpreted against the backdrop of Mark 13:4a, the noun τέλος may refer to the end of the temple. However, Jesus' general response to their question may indicate that this noun may also refer to the ultimate end. Jesus' subsequent speech acts will determine the final interpretation of this noun. If audience members interpret this verse against the backdrop of Jewish cultural memory, they may realize that Jesus is relating the end of the temple to eschatological events.

Audience members with different backgrounds may recognize “wars and reports of wars” (Mark 13:7a) as apocalyptic commonplaces,<sup>1744</sup> which may function as scripta against which the characters in the Markan world as well as audience members in the real world may interpret their current situation and their future.<sup>1745</sup> All apocalyptic commonplaces will prime or activate general cultural memory. In this case, Jesus negotiates general cultural memory by pointing out that “wars and reports of wars” do not constitute the end, but rather precede it.<sup>1746</sup>

Through Mark 13:8, Jesus makes several assertive points, i.e. predictions, by means of which he explains his previous speech act: “For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there will be earthquakes in various regions; there will be famines. These things are the beginning of the birth-pains.” Elements constituting these speech acts may serve as additional signs for Jesus' addressees and side-participants, and these will be fulfilled before the end.<sup>1747</sup> The two first predictions elaborate on the apocalyptic commonplace constituted by wars and battles. These take place on different levels and between different agents, supernatural or hu-

1741 On the first point, see Collins, *Mark*, 605.

1742 According to Lührmann and Collins, the phrase δεῖ γενέσθαι is an allusion to Dan 2:28–29. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 219. Collins, *Mark*, 605. “[B]ut there is a God in heaven who reveals mysteries and has made known to King Nebuchadnezzar what must happen in the last days. O King, live forever. This is the dream and the vision of your head on your bed: O King, as you reclined on your bed you have seen all things that must happen in the last days, and he who reveals mysteries has made known to you the things that must happen.” (Dan 2:28–29 LXX). If this tradition is activated, audience members may conclude that Jesus' indirect prediction concerning wars and rumors of wars refers to the last days.

1743 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 259. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 369.

1744 See D. Hellholm, “Religion,” 415–426. These themes are attested in Iranian, Jewish, and Christian traditions.

1745 According to Collins, “[i]t is usually easy for audiences to associate these motifs with historical events in their own immediate situation. Nevertheless, their purpose here seems to be primarily to define the appearance of the deceivers as one of the events of the last days. Placing them and their activity in such a context heightens the importance of recognizing their true character and behaving accordingly.” Collins, *Mark*, 606. For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 220. Lührmann suggests that the readers of the gospel who are experiencing the Jewish war may relate Jesus' utterances to this specific situation. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 219.

1746 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 259. Collins, *Mark*, 605.

1747 For similar insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 606.

man.<sup>1748</sup> The latter predictions, which pertain to earthquakes and famines, refer to another apocalyptic commonplace, i.e. natural disasters.<sup>1749</sup> These events constitute signs which indicate the beginning of the end, not the end *per se*.

After Jesus' general predictions, through which he draws on apocalyptic commonplaces, Jesus makes a directive point by means of which he urges or warns/admonishes his addressees: Βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοῦς (Mark 13:9a). Audience members may process these speech acts as if they were addressed to them too, for the following reasons: The imperative is inflected in the second person plural. The verbs which precede and succeed this directive point are in the future indicative tense. As pointed out earlier, the future of the Markan world may include the present and future of audience members. The fact that some of Jesus' previous predictions have already happened in the Markan world and in the real world of audience members may contribute to the amalgamation of the future of the Markan world with the current situation and the future of audience members.

Jesus' directive point is succeeded by several assertive points, i.e. predictions each of which refers to a new setting: παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς (Mark 13:9b). The verb παραδίωμι may prime or activate Mark 1:14; 3:19; 9:31 and 10:33, which related the fate of John the Baptist and predicted the fate of Jesus. In this manner, Jesus predicts that his addressees may suffer a similar fate to the one suffered by John the Baptist. Moreover, they may suffer a similar fate to the one Jesus predicted with regard to himself.<sup>1750</sup> Because the word συνέδριον may refer to local councils, Jewish or Gentile, as well as the Sanhedrin,<sup>1751</sup> addressees who are rooted in different cultural traditions will be able to relate to this prediction.<sup>1752</sup> One of Jesus' predictions refers to an event set in the synagogue. Audience members with a Jewish background will probably relate more easily to this prediction. The third prediction combines governors and kings. Whereas the first group has not been mentioned in the Gospel of Mark, King Herod played an important role with regard to the death of John (Mark 6:14–29). If this episode is activated, audience members may once more recognize parallels between their own prospective fate and the fate of John the Baptist.<sup>1753</sup>

Jesus concludes his predictions by means of an assertive point, which indicates the reason why the disciples will suffer these fates. He claims that they will appear before these authorities “because of me, as a testimony to them” (Mark 13:9b). Audi-

1748 See Hellholm, “Religion,” 415–426.

1749 See Hellholm, “Religion,” 426–429. See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 219. Collins, *Mark*, 606. These themes are attested in Iranian, Jewish, Jewish-Christian, and Greco-Roman cultural memory.

1750 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 220. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 309–310. Collins, *Mark*, 607. Lührmann points out that Mark 13:9–13 refer to general experiences of following Jesus. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 220.

1751 For similar insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 739. Cf. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 370.

1752 Lührmann argues that the word συνέδριον refers to Jewish local courts, which he contrasts with Roman authorities, which are represented by governors and kings. Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 220. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 309. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 370.

1753 The second time audience members hear the gospel, they may realize that their prospective fate mirrors the fate of Jesus. For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 220.

ence members may conclude that the assertive point Jesus utters in Mark 13:10, “and first it is necessary that the good news is proclaimed to all the nations,” elaborates on the previous assertive points. In that case, their appearances in the court and synagogue and before governors and kings constitute opportunities to proclaim “the good news of God” “to all the nations.”<sup>1754</sup>

The noun ἔθνος may prime or activate previous events in which this noun was employed, in particular Mark 11:17. If Mark 11:17 is activated, this verse may also prime or activate Isa 56:7, including its context. In Isaiah, the temple was regarded as a house of prayer for all people. In Mark 13:10, however, God’s plan of salvation for the nations is represented by the proclamation of the gospel, not by the temple.<sup>1755</sup> Jesus’ speech act (Mark 13:10) is an assertion, but in some contexts, it can be processed as a directive point.<sup>1756</sup> The verb κηρῦσσω may prime or activate several episodes where John the Baptist, Jesus, the twelve, or minor characters proclaimed (Mark 1:4; 1:7; 1:14; 1:38–39; 1:45; 3:14; 5:20; 6:12; 7:36). The noun εὐαγγέλιον may prime Mark 1:1; 1:14–15; 8:35 and 10:29. The verb “proclaim” and the noun “gospel” are combined in Mark 1:14, where Jesus was preaching the gospel of God. By proclaiming the gospel to all nations, Jesus’ addressees may follow his lead. The adverb πρῶτον indicates the order of these events with regard to the end,<sup>1757</sup> i.e. the gospel must be preached before the end.<sup>1758</sup>

Through Mark 13:11, Jesus elaborates on Mark 13:9–10.<sup>1759</sup> Mark 13:11a is constituted by an indefinite temporal clause: “When they arrest you and hand you over.” This temporal clause is succeeded by two directive points, by means of which Jesus commands,<sup>1760</sup> instructs, or urges his addressees: “Do not be anxious beforehand about what you will say; but say whatever is given to you at that time” (Mark 13:11b). The attitude and actions which Jesus proposes are explained by means of the subsequent assertive point: “For you are not the ones who speak, but the Holy Spirit” (Mark 13:11c). In the Gospel of Mark, the Holy Spirit has been mentioned in Mark 1:8; 1:10; 1:12; 3:22–30 and 12:36. Accordingly, it has been associated mainly with Jesus and David. In Mark 1:8, however, John predicted that Jesus “will baptize you with the Holy Spirit.” Audience members probably processed this speech act as addressees.<sup>1761</sup> If they are baptized, they may consider the possibility that they received the Holy Spirit during baptism, as they witnessed earlier with regard to Jesus (Mark 1:10).<sup>1762</sup> Against this backdrop, they might think that they, like Jesus (Mark 3:22–30),

1754 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 261. Collins, *Mark*, 607. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 321.

1755 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 220.

1756 According to Heil, this speech act may exhort “the disciples to fulfill their responsibility of offering the gospel to all peoples.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 261.

1757 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 739.

1758 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 261. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 321.

1759 According to Marcus, Mark 13:11 “seems to imply that proclamation of the gospel is a result of persecution rather than its cause.” Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 883.

1760 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 739.

1761 See “1:4–8: The Ministry of John the Baptist” on page 119.

1762 According to Gundry, “[t]he command, ‘But whatever is given you in that hour, speak this, for you are not the ones speaking, but the Holy spirit [is speaking]’ (cf. 12:36), implies a continuing fulfillment of

are possessed by the Holy Spirit, who will speak through them. This phenomenon may explain the divine passive in Mark 13:11b.

Earlier Jesus described conflicts between nations and kingdoms, natural disasters (Mark 13:8) and prosecution, where his addressees would appear in councils and synagogues, and before governors and kings (Mark 13:9). In Mark 13:12 Jesus deals with conflicts within families. Like wars and natural disasters, the disintegration of society and family constitute an apocalyptic commonplace.<sup>1763</sup> The verb *παράδιδωμι* may once more prime or activate the fate of John the Baptist and Jesus which was related or predicted in Mark 1:14; 3:19; 9:31 and 10:33; as well as the fate of his addressees which was predicted by Jesus in Mark 13:9 and 13:11. In these two previous verses the subjects who will hand Jesus' addressees over are anonymous, but in this case Jesus predicts that "brother will hand over brother to death, and a father a child, and children will rise against parents and put them to death" (Mark 13:12). Accordingly, family members at all levels will hand over one another.

In Mark 13:13, Jesus predicts that his addressees "will be hated by all because of my name. But the one who endures to the end will be saved." Because the verb *εἶναι* is in the second person plural, audience members may think that Jesus addresses them too. Again, Jesus' name plays an important role with regard to the manner in which people will relate to Jesus' addressees. Mark 9:37–39 and 9:41 indicated that Jesus' name played an important role with regard to the activities performed by the group of Jesus' followers. Jesus' name may thus serve an important function with regard to their identity as a group. In this case, however, their association with Jesus' name will lead to suffering.<sup>1764</sup>

Jesus' second prediction may comfort and encourage Jesus' addressees. Jesus' prediction constitutes a commissive point, a promise, but also a directive point, an exhortation, i.e. they will be saved by God (divine passive) if they endure to the end.<sup>1765</sup> The "end" may refer to death (martyrdom) or to the end of the world.<sup>1766</sup> The verb *σώζω* may prime or activate earlier events where Jesus was expected to heal (Mark 5:23; 5:28) and where Jesus healed (Mark 5:34; 6:56; 10:52), as well as utterances about saving one's life (Mark 8:35). In the first two examples, the verb is employed with reference to the healing of physical afflictions, whereas the third example may refer to eternal life. Mark 13:13 seems to belong to the latter category.<sup>1767</sup> At this point, rescue is not based on faith (as in Mark 5:34 and 10:52), but on the ability to endure. In this manner, salvation may function as a reward.

John the Baptizer's prediction that Jesus would baptize his followers 'in [the] Holy Spirit.' Gundry, *Mark*, 739.

1763 See Hellholm, "Religion," 430–432. Collins, *Mark*, 607. This motif is found in Iranian, Babylonian, Jewish, Greco-Roman, and Christian traditions. Van Iersel thinks that this conflict may also refer to the fictional family established by Jesus. van Iersel, *Mark*, 397.

1764 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 371.

1765 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 262. Donahue and Harrington point out that "[p]atience (*hypomonē*) is an important virtue in Jewish and early Christian apocalypses. One must remain faithful until God's plan is fully unfolded ('to the end [*telos*]: see 13:7) and the righteous are vindicated and the wicked punished." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 371. See also Hartman, *Mark*, 538–539.

1766 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 262.

1767 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 371.



In Mark 13:14a, Jesus utters an assertive point, a prediction. This speech act is constituted by an indefinite temporal clause, which contains a particular sign: “But when you see the desolating sacrilege standing where it ought not be.” Through this utterance, Jesus addresses the topic of the second question voiced by Peter, James, John, and Andrew in Mark 13:4.<sup>1768</sup> The phrase Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε (Mark 13:14) seems to indicate a new phase,<sup>1769</sup> in contrast to the previous stage which was introduced by means of the phrase ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων (Mark 13:7). The perceptual verb ἀκούω (Mark 13:7) indicates a certain distance to the events, whereas the perceptual verb ὁράω (Mark 13:14) points out that these events are in the immediate vicinity of the addressees.

The key to understanding this passage is probably the sign. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, the phrase τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως may prime or activate traditions recorded in Dan 9:27; 11:31 and 12:11.<sup>1770</sup> If these traditions are activated, audience members may consider the possibility that this sign is related to the temple.<sup>1771</sup> In this case, audience members may deduce that Jesus employs cultural memory grounded in the LXX to interpret events that will occur in the future. The sign which is mentioned by Jesus is, however, obscure to modern researchers.<sup>1772</sup>

At this point the extradiegetic narrator makes a directive point to the reader, urging him who was reading aloud to take note of this sign (ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, Mark 13:14).<sup>1773</sup> In this manner the membrane separating the narrative world from the real world of the performance or reading collapses. Grammatically speaking, the extradiegetic narrator communicates with the reader (third person singular), not with audience members. This is a clear indication of the oral performance situation, where one performer reads to an audience. It is not possible to reconstruct the actual perlocutionary effect of this speech act, i.e. whether the reader was expected to elaborate on or explain this point, or to come up with another relevant response.

Through Mark 13:7, Jesus urged or reassured the addressees that they should not be alarmed. At this point, Jesus utters several directive points, all of which urge or command people to choose the appropriate response to this sign. He does this by sketching different situations and by urging those situated in these circumstances either to perform a specific action or to avoid one (Mark 13:14b–16). In Mark 13:14b, Jesus urges those in Judea to flee to the mountains; in Mark 13:15, the one on the housetop is urged not to “go down or enter to take something out of his house”; and

1768 See also Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 323.

1769 See also Collins, *Mark*, 607.

1770 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 221.

1771 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 741. According to Gundry, this sign does not indicate the destruction of the temple, but rather “the coming of the Son of man plus the unequalled tribulation immediately preceding it.” Gundry, *Mark*, 742.

1772 For different interpretations and contexts, see Collins, *Mark*, 608–610.

1773 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 598, 608. Cf. Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 15–16, 176–177. Cf. Gundry, *Mark*, 742–743. Collins claims that this clause is “an aside from the evangelist to the individual who read the Gospel aloud to a group of assembled followers of Jesus (directly) and to his audience (indirectly), a hypothesis supported by the concluding statement in v. 37, which makes clear that the speech is directed to a broader audience than the four disciples named in v. 3.” Collins, *Mark*, 608.

in Mark 13:16, the one in the field is urged not to “return to take his cloak.”<sup>1774</sup> If the sign is related to the temple, this information may indicate to audience members that Jesus’ predictions are related to the Jewish war.<sup>1775</sup> In that case, they will realize that Jesus earlier drew on cultural memory grounded in Daniel in order to interpret this event.

In Mark 13:17, Jesus makes an expressive point by conveying extreme displeasure with regard to the situation of pregnant women and women who are nursing infants, and in Mark 13:18, he makes a directive point, urging his addressees: “Pray then that it may not happen in winter.” The situation of pregnant and nursing women and the situation in winter are also apocalyptic commonplaces.<sup>1776</sup> These two utterances are probably related to the situations described in Mark 13:14b–16 and the actions which these characters are urged to choose or not to choose. Pregnancy and nursing will slow down the flight, and bad weather may lead to the same result.<sup>1777</sup> The fact that Jesus employs the form *προσεύχασθε* may indicate that the addressees will be affected as well, or that they should act in sympathy with those affected by these situations.

By means of the conjunction *γάρ*, Jesus connects the prediction he utters in Mark 13:19 to the previous verses. In this manner, this utterance explains his previous directive points. Jesus estimates the extent of the suffering with regard to previous and subsequent suffering. First, he states that the severity of the suffering which will take place during those days “has not taken place from the beginning of the creation which God created until now” (Mark 13:19b) and he continues by means of the phrase *οὐ μὴ γένηται* (Mark 13:19c), which constitutes a strong negative assurance. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, this utterance may prime or activate Dan 12:1.<sup>1778</sup> In that case, audience members will realize that Jesus employs scripts grounded in cultural memory in order to interpret this future event. According to Jesus, the suffering experienced at that time is unparalleled both in the past and in the future. Through this speech act, Jesus seems to negotiate cultural memory, because Dan 12:1 employs a similar utterance to describe the final time of anguish before those who are written in the book will be rescued. According to Jesus, however, these events do not immediately precede the end.<sup>1779</sup>

The noun *θλίψις* may prime or activate Mark 4:17 where Jesus stated: “Then, when tribulation or persecution arises on account of the word, immediately they fall away.” If this part of the Parable of the Sower is activated, audience members may realize

1774 According to Gundry, Mark 13:15–20 seem to be limited to Judea. Gundry, *Mark*, 743.

1775 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 222–223.

1776 See Hellholm, “Religion,” 424. On the role of pregnant women, nursing women, and unweaned children in the Old Testament and Jewish oracles of eschatological judgment, see Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 896.

1777 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 743. Hartman, *Mark*, 542. Lührmann drew attention to the fact that it would be difficult to find food on the fields if they had to flee during the winter. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 223. On the difficulty of fleeing during the winter, see also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 315. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 324.

1778 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 223. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 315–316. Hartman, *Mark*, 518, 539.

1779 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 223.

that those who have received the word without being able to process it properly due to their hardened hearts may fall away during this period.

Mark 13:19 is followed by a condition which indicates the limited time frame of this suffering and its results: “And if the Lord did not shorten the days, no flesh would be saved” (Mark 13:20a).<sup>1780</sup> In this context, it seems that God cuts short the days of tribulation, not the days until salvation.<sup>1781</sup> Moreover, Jesus states the reason why the time frame was short: “But for the sake of the elect, whom he had chosen, he shortened the days” (Mark 13:20b). This is the first time the substantivized adjective ἐκλεκτός has been employed in the Markan narrative. Accordingly, the identity of these characters is not easy to discern. According to Donahue and Harrington, the term “the elect” would refer to members of the Christian community in this context.<sup>1782</sup>

In Mark 13:21, Jesus utters a temporal clause by means of which he connects the predicted events with the time of tribulation.<sup>1783</sup> “And if anyone says to you at that time, ‘Look! Here is the Messiah!’ or ‘Look, there!’” (Mark 13:21a). If Jesus’ addressees are addressed by others in this manner, Jesus urges or commands them that they should not respond in a way which reflects the intended perlocutionary effect of these speech acts, i.e. “do not believe” (Mark 13:21b).<sup>1784</sup> The reason why Jesus urges or commands his addressees to respond in a manner that is contrary to such a speaker’s intention is provided by the explanation he offers in Mark 13:22.<sup>1785</sup> An assertive point constitutes this explanation, by means of which Jesus predicts that “false messiahs and false prophets will appear and produce signs and wonders to mislead, if possible, the elect” (Mark 13:22). At this point, Jesus returns to the subject of the question posed by Peter, James, John, and Andrew concerning the signs (Mark 13:4). In his response to their question, he immediately warned them/urged them: “Beware that no one leads you astray” (Mark 13:5b). Now, Jesus predicts that false messiahs and prophets may produce signs and wonders with the intent to lead the elect astray. Through this utterance, Jesus may warn his addressees against a narrow focus on signs, by pointing out that signs are ambiguous: They may actually mislead them.

1780 Lührmann points out that the motif of cutting short the days is a typical apocalyptic motif. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 223. See also Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 325.

1781 See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 223. According to Hooker, “[i]t seems more likely that what is meant here is not any alteration in the divine plan, but simply that God has from the beginning set a limit to the sufferings of the elect by decreeing that they should last for a certain fixed period of time.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 316.

1782 See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 373. Heil points out that “Jesus consoles his listeners, who are to consider themselves to be among God’s ‘elect,’ by assuring them that for the sake of their salvation God has mercifully reduced the most severe period of suffering the world has ever experienced (13:20).” Heil, *The Gospel*, 264. If audience members are familiar with apocalyptic literature, they may think that Jesus refers to the eschatological community. See Collins, *Mark*, 611–612.

1783 See Collins, *Mark*, 613. Cf. Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 223.

1784 Gundry regards this speech act as a warning. Gundry, *Mark*, 743–744.

1785 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 744.

Audience members may interpret the noun ψευδόχριστος on the basis of their knowledge of its positive counterpart, i.e. χριστός.<sup>1786</sup> Until now, χριστός has been employed in Mark 1:1; 8:29; 9:41; 12:35 and 13:21. From the beginning of the gospel, audience members have been aware that this title describes the identity of Jesus. In this manner, Mark 13:21–22 parallels 13:6, where people would claim Jesus' identity for themselves. The prefix ψευδό- indicates that their identity as salvific agents is false, in contrast to Jesus whom audience members will recognize as the protagonist of God's project.

The noun ψευδοπροφήτης may prime or activate elements which constitute prophetic traditions (Zech 13:2; Jer 6:13; 33:7–8; 33:11; 33:16; 34:9; 35:1; 36:1; 36:8). In these contexts, this term implies a contrast with true prophets. In Mark 1:2–3, God's project was introduced on the basis of the authority of the prophet Isaiah. Later, Jesus seemingly claimed to be a prophet (Mark 6:4), and some regarded Jesus (Mark 6:15; 8:28) or John as prophets (Mark 11:32). Audience members may therefore conclude that false prophets are those who oppose the plan of God by making false predictions, e.g. about the end of the world. In this context, Jesus predicts that these characters will produce signs and wonders. The purpose of producing these signs is "to mislead, if possible, the elect" (Mark 13:22b). Once more, the term "elect" is employed. If audience members infer that this term refers to the Christian community, they may feel included, when Jesus employs this term.

In Mark 13:23, Jesus continues by urging, commanding, or warning his addressees ὑμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε. Until this point in chapter 13, Jesus has urged, commanded or warned his addressees three times with similar phrases (Mark 13:5; 13:9; 13:23). In Mark 13:5, Jesus introduced a theme which has been repeated several times until now, namely the possibility of being led astray. Mark 13:9 introduced the possibility of being handed over, and Mark 13:23 is a general exhortation/command/warning. Subsequently Jesus utters the assertive point προεἶρηκα ὑμῖν πάντα (Mark 13:23b). Through this speech act, Jesus probably refers to Mark 13:5–22 (πάντα).<sup>1787</sup> In the Markan world, the pronoun ὑμῖν refers to Peter, James, John, and Andrew, but audience members may also process this speech act as if it were addressed to them. This speech act underlines the fact that Jesus' speech restrains end-time excitement.<sup>1788</sup> Moreover, this speech act indicates that Jesus' predictions will enable his addressees to endure, because he has prepared them by informing them about the future and the appropriate way to act during these circumstances.<sup>1789</sup>

In Mark 13:24, Jesus makes another prediction about days which he dates with reference to the tribulation he mentioned in Mark 13:19. These days succeed the suf-

1786 They may also consider the possibility that false messiahs and prophets refer to Jewish figures during the Jewish war with Rome. See also Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 325.

1787 See also Hartman, *Mark*, 543. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 325. If Mark 13:23b refers to 13:5–22 then προεἶρηκα ὑμῖν πάντα is a meta-text, see Hellwig, "Titulus," 16. "Die Relation Metatext zu Objekttext liegt vor, wenn ersterer über letzteren handelt;" see further D. Hellholm, "Substitutionelle Gliederungsmerkmale," 15–19. According to Lührmann, Mark 13:5b–23 refers to the present time and the immediate past. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 224. For similar insights, see Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 325.

1788 For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 374, 382.

1789 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 265.

fering which he mentioned earlier.<sup>1790</sup> In those days, “the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will be falling from heaven, and the powers which are in the heavens will be shaken” (Mark 13:24–25). This prediction refers to natural disasters which constitute yet another apocalyptic commonplace.<sup>1791</sup> The combination of temporal indications and events taking place in nature may indicate to audience members that the questions posed by the four in Mark 13:4 are still in focus. In this manner, Jesus indicates a new time frame within which nature will provide the signs. If audience members are familiar with Jewish and general apocalyptic traditions and literature, they may regard them “as signs of the eschatological divine intervention.”<sup>1792</sup>

Jesus subsequently makes another prediction which contains both a temporal indication and a sign: “And then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory” (Mark 13:26). If this verse is interpreted against the backdrop constituted by Mark 13:25, “[t]he appearance of the Son of Man in v. 26 is thus characterized as an eschatological divine intervention.”<sup>1793</sup> This event may prime or activate Dan 7:13,<sup>1794</sup> which may indicate to audience members that Jesus once more employs cultural memory grounded in the LXX to interpret future events.<sup>1795</sup> Audience members previously learned that the Son of Man had the authority to forgive sins (Mark 2:10); he was lord of the Sabbath (Mark 2:28); he was going to experience suffering, death and resurrection (Mark 8:31; 9:9; 9:12; 9:31; 10:33–34; 10:45); and he was presented as a character who would come “in the glory of his Father with the holy angels” (Mark 8:38). Accordingly, power, suffering, and death are all associated with this character; however, at this point Mark 8:38 seems to constitute the main reference. In that case, they may relate the glory of the Son of Man to the Father.

In Mark 13:27 Jesus makes yet another prediction by means of which he elaborates on Mark 8:38 and Mark 13:26. The prediction contains a temporal indication as well as a future action where the angels will be sent out on a mission to “gather his elect from the four winds, from the end of the earth to the end of heaven” (Mark 13:27). On the basis of Mark 13:20, audience members may regard this event as a salvific intervention which will encompass the entire creation.<sup>1796</sup>

Jesus interrupts the line of predictions by means of a parable about the fig tree. First, he makes a directive point urging his audience: Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολὴν (Mark 13:28a). Then he utters the following assertive point: “When its branch has already become tender and puts forth leaves, you know that summer is

1790 See also Hartman, *Mark*, 548.

1791 See Hellholm, “Religion,” 426–429.

1792 Collins, *Mark*, 614.

1793 Collins, *Mark*, 614.

1794 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 224. Collins, *Mark*, 615. Hartman, *Mark*, 548–549. Collins, Hartman, and Pilgaard point out that judgment is not in focus. See Collins, *Mark*, 614. Hartman, *Mark*, 550. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 327.

1795 Peter Bolt does not think that this future aspect refers to a distant parousia. “Mark’s Gospel tells us that the Son of man comes when Jesus rose again from the dead. That is when he received the Kingdom from the Ancient of Days, and began to share it with his people.” P. G. Bolt, “Mark 13,” 26.

1796 For the latter point, see also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 375.

near” (Mark 13:28b). This assertive point constitutes source input 1, whereas Mark 13:29 offers the target input and a hint of yet another source input of the conceptual integration network:<sup>1797</sup> “So also you, when you see these things taking place, you know that he is near, at the doors.” “Its branch has already become tender and puts forth leaves” maps onto “these things,” which in the Markan context probably refers to Mark 13:5–25. The “summer” maps onto “he is near, at the doors” and “the inferred subject of the verb,” which in the Markan context may refer to “the Son of Man” (Mark 13:26). In this case, the frame of source input 1 is projected to organize the blend. Because source input 1 pertains to the change of seasons, which is regular and signaled by signs, this parable seems to focus on the predictability of these signs.<sup>1798</sup> In the blend, the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory is the approaching summer and the person at the doors. His imminent arrival is signaled by the things taking place (the signs mentioned previously by Jesus in Mark 13)/the tender branch of the fig tree. Through this parable, Jesus seems to respond to the question uttered in Mark 13:4b, but the emphasis is wider than the temple.<sup>1799</sup>

Jesus continues by uttering an assertive point, a prediction about the present generation. Its reliability is enhanced by the phrase Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν.<sup>1800</sup> “Truly I tell you, this generation will certainly not pass away until all these things happen” (Mark 13:30). This speech act may prime or activate Mark 9:1. Both Mark 9:1 and 13:30 indicate that Jesus’ return as the Son of Man can be expected soon.<sup>1801</sup> Accordingly, Jesus seems to expect that all these events will take place within the generation of his addressees. By means of his subsequent assertive point, Jesus stresses the eternal validity of his predictions:<sup>1802</sup> “The heaven and the earth will pass away, but my words will certainly not pass away” (Mark 13:31).

After having listed all these relative times and signs, Jesus finally states: “But about that day or the hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, and not even the Son, except the Father” (Mark 13:32). This assertive point is followed by two directive points and an assertive point which provide the reason why Jesus utters the two directive points (Mark 13:33). By means of the directive points, Jesus urges his addressees to be on their guard and to keep alert, and he asserts: “For you do not know when the time is” (Mark 13:33b). In this manner, he points out that neither the addressees nor the angels nor the Son have knowledge about the time when Jesus will return as the Son of Man.<sup>1803</sup> The only one who knows the precise time is God, because everything occurs according to his plan.<sup>1804</sup>

1797 Figure 38 in the appendix.

1798 See van Iersel, *Mark*, 408.

1799 See Hartman, *Mark*, 551. According to Telford, Mark “has used a fig-tree logion in the service of an eschatological lesson regarding the destruction of the Temple and the imminence of the Parousia.” Telford, *The Barren*, 218.

1800 For this phrase, see “3:20–35: Jesus in a House” on page 189.

1801 See also Collins, *Mark*, 616.

1802 See also Collins, *Mark*, 617.

1803 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 225. Hartman, *Mark*, 553–554.

1804 See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 376. Hartman, *Mark*, 553.

In Mark 13:34, Jesus employs another parable to elaborate on the situation described by means of the previous speech acts. Mark 13:34 constitutes the source input of the conceptual integration network (Figure 39 in the appendix). “It is like a man away on a journey, who left his home and put his slaves in charge, each with his work, and commanded the doorkeeper to keep watch.” In Mark 13:35–36, Jesus’ parable suggests both the source and the target inputs. The frame of the source input is constituted by a master who leaves his household. The man/master of the household in the source input maps onto the Son of Man (Mark 13:26) in the target input, whereas both his slaves and the doorkeeper in the source input map onto a single element, you, in the target input.

In the blend, the Son of Man is the master of the household who is away on a journey. You are the slaves who are put in charge of the work and the doorkeeper who is commanded to keep watch. You/the slaves/the doorkeeper do(es) not know when the Son of Man/the master comes, in the evening, at midnight, at cockcrow, or in the morning. He must not find you/the slaves/the doorkeeper asleep if he comes suddenly. You/the slaves/the doorkeeper must perform the assigned tasks. In the target input, this parable illuminates the sudden appearance of Jesus as the Son of Man (Mark 13:26). Jesus’ addressees must therefore keep awake. As Hooker points out, the man’s arrival is not unexpected, but “his servants are given no warning about the precise time that he will come and must therefore be constantly vigilant.”<sup>1805</sup>

The entire episode ends by means of a directive point which reflects the command uttered to the doorkeeper. Through a remark which refers to the communication situation, Jesus expands the circle of addressees. Audience members may conclude that Jesus now addresses all the disciples,<sup>1806</sup> not merely the four who posed the two questions in private. This may also indicate that the other disciples overheard the communication which took place in private. Because the verb *γρηγορέω* is in the second person plural, audience members may process this command as if it were addressed to them too.<sup>1807</sup> By processing Jesus’ teaching as side-participants and addressees, audience members are informed about events that will occur in the future in the real world. In this manner, they know what to expect and they are provided with scripts that point out how they should act with regard to different events.<sup>1808</sup> Because Jesus negotiates not only Jewish but also general cultural memory, audience members with different cultural backgrounds learn how the expectations of their leader and thus of their group diverge from those of other contemporary groups.

1805 Hooker, *A Commentary*, 324.

1806 See also Collins, *Mark*, 619.

1807 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 225. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 324. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 377. Collins, *Mark*, 619. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 329.

1808 “The material is foregrounded for the sake of the reader to reflect upon in order to ‘understand’ what ‘followed’ (in the narrative of Mark!), and to instruct the reader about his own conduct.” W. S. Vorster, “Literary Reflections,” 278. According to Vorster, “[i]t is the paraenetic mode of expression which dominates the text, not in the sense of ‘ethical’ admonitions, but of the stringing together of imperatives of conduct.” Vorster, “Literary Reflections,” 285.



### 14:1–11: Two Days before Passover and the Feast of the Unleavened Bread

In Mark 14:1a, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members about an exact date: “It was two days before the Passover and the festival of Unleavened Bread.” This speech act contains the temporal marker Ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, by means of which this episode is demarcated. The two Jewish festivals that are mentioned by the extradiegetic narrator both commemorate the exodus by focusing respectively on the Paschal lamb and the unleavened bread (Exod 12:1–13:10).<sup>1809</sup> Because the extradiegetic narrator refers to these feasts, Israel’s deliverance from Egypt, the main salvific event of Jewish history, may be primed or activated.<sup>1810</sup> If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, exodus traditions may constitute scripts against which they may interpret this and subsequent episodes.<sup>1811</sup> On the basis of this backdrop, many audience members may regard these events as a new exodus, i.e. as a new, fundamental, salvific event.<sup>1812</sup> The priming and activation of exodus traditions is probably facilitated by the fact that previous episodes most likely primed or activated related cultural memory, provided that audience members were conversant with it.<sup>1813</sup>

### 14:1–2: The Chief Priests and the Scribes

After Jesus’ long monologue, the extradiegetic narrator resumes the narration. Through the assertive point which constitutes Mark 14:1b, he informs, or alternatively reminds,<sup>1814</sup> audience members about the joint project and goal of the chief priests and the scribes. “The chief priests and the scribes were looking for a way to arrest him by deceit and kill him.”

This speech act contains the character markers of ἀρχιερεῖς and οἱ γραμματεῖς, through which this episode is demarcated. The setting of this event is not mentioned.<sup>1815</sup> Instead, the extradiegetic narrator focuses on the thoughts and aspirations

1809 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 384. Heil, *The Gospel*, 6–7, 273, at 7. “Through this commemoration Jews believed that the original Exodus events were actually made present again for them, so that they relived and participated in these saving deeds of God in a sacramental way, with the hope of participating in the final establishment of God’s salvation.”

1810 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 415.

1811 Christians who have heard the gospel previously may regard Jesus’ death as a similar redemptive act.

1812 See “II.6.2.3. The Gospel of Mark as Cultural Memory” on page 85.

1813 See for instance “1:2–13: In the Wilderness” on page 113, including the subsections.

1814 If audience members have earlier inferred that the characters who wanted to arrest Jesus in Mark 12:12 were the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders (Mark 11:27), they will be reminded instead of this joint project.

1815 According to van Iersel “[t]he setting of the two outer parts is not specified, but the reader assumes that the event takes place somewhere in the precincts of the Temple in Jerusalem.” van Iersel, *Mark*, 413–414. Audience members may make inferences with regard to the setting, but inferences of this type (Class 11) “are not needed for establishing coherent explanatory meaning representations.” Graesser et al., “Constructing Inferences,” 376. On the basis of constructionist theory, therefore, one might predict that these inferences are less likely to be generated on-line. See Graesser et al., “Constructing Inferences,” 382.

of these characters. On the basis of Mark 14:1b, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the thoughts of the chief priests and scribes. If sustained, this device may promote audience involvement with these characters.

The character constellation and verbs which are employed in Mark 14:1b may prime or activate previous episodes that may constitute the backdrop against which audience members will interpret Mark 14:1–2.<sup>1816</sup> The phrase ἐξήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς (Mark 14:1b) may remind audience members of Mark 11:18, where the extradiegetic narrator told audience members that the chief priests and the scribes “were looking for a way to put him to death.” The words which the extradiegetic narrator employs to describe the goal of these characters are dissimilar (ἀπόλλυμι – Mark 11:18, ἀποκτείνω – Mark 14:1), but the fact that lexical entries are content addressable suggests that Mark 11:18 may still be primed or activated. The combination of ζητέω and κρατέω in Mark 14:1 and 12:12 may indicate that Mark 12:12 will also be primed or activated. In Mark 12:12, the extradiegetic narrator revealed that the goal of the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders was to arrest Jesus (see also 11:27).<sup>1817</sup> On the basis of these events, audience members may infer that Jesus’ attempt to alter the spatial practice and function of the temple (Mark 11:15–19) and his subsequent interaction with the Jewish leaders led to a new attempt to destroy him, this time by deceit.<sup>1818</sup>

Last, but not least, the verb ἀποκτείνω may prime or activate the three passion predictions (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34) and the Parable of the Wicked Vine-Dressers (Mark 12:5; 12:7–8). With regard to the passion predictions, the fact that the extradiegetic narrator focuses on the chief priests and the scribes in Mark 14:1b may indicate that Mark 10:33–34 (and possibly 8:31) will receive a higher degree of activation.

Because the extradiegetic narrator draws attention to the intention of these characters, i.e. to arrest and kill Jesus, audience members are probably reminded of these similar episodes. As a result, the second plot is again in focus, and audience members can continue to simulate that plot from the perspective of these character groups. If audience members are reminded of the joint project and goal of these characters, they will observe them en-face. The second plot was initiated by the Pharisees and Herodians (Mark 3:6), who subsequently attempted to trap Jesus (Mark 12:13). However, two passion predictions (Mark 8:31; 10:33), Mark 11:27–12:13, and Mark 14:1 indicate that the chief priests and the scribes have gradually become Jesus’ main antagonists, in collaboration with the elders (Mark 8:31; 11:27–12:13). Mark 14:1 may point out to audience members that Jesus’ predictions about his death are about to be realized in the Markan world.<sup>1819</sup>

1816 On the fact that Mark 3:6; 11:18 and 12:12 set the scene for the following narrative, see also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 325.

1817 In addition, the verb κρατέω may prime or activate the arrest of John the Baptist (Mark 6:17), and the verb ἀποκτείνω may prime or activate the event where audience members learned that Herodias wanted to kill him (Mark 6:19). In this manner, parallels between the death of Jesus and John the Baptist may constitute the backdrop of this event too.

1818 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 274.

1819 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 801. According to Heil, Jesus’ passion predictions point out to the reader that the chief priests and the scribes will eventually succeed in arresting Jesus. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 274. In order

If Mark 12:12 is activated, audience members may infer that the plan of the chief priests and the scribes to arrest Jesus by deceit is motivated by their fear of the crowd.<sup>1820</sup> The following assertive point uttered by the extradiegetic narrator, “for they said, ‘Not during the festival, in order that a riot will not occur among the people’” (Mark 14:2), is an explanation which seems to confirm this inference. If audience members remember the reactions of the crowd to Jesus’ teaching in the temple (“because the whole crowd was amazed at his teaching” Mark 11:18 and “the great crowd was listening to him with delight” Mark 12:37), they may find it reasonable that the chief priests and the scribes fear a riot.

The speech act cited by the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members that they will not arrest and kill Jesus during the festival. Because audience members have been informed earlier that the festival is two days away, they may wonder whether these characters plan to act swiftly or rather decide to postpone the actions which will enable them to achieve their goal.<sup>1821</sup> A problem is thus indicated to audience members.<sup>1822</sup>

Overall, the most important function of this episode is to draw attention to the goal and motivation of the chief priests and the scribes, so that audience members will be able to simulate the joint project which constitutes the second plot.

#### 14:3–9: Jesus in Bethany in the House of Simon the Leper

By means of the following assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the setting of this episode: “While he was in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper and was dining” (Mark 14:3a).<sup>1823</sup> This speech act contains the spatial marker ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, through which this episode is demarcated. This initial assertive point does not contain precise temporal markers. Audience members may infer, however, that Mark 14:1–2 and 14:3–9 take place simultaneously.<sup>1824</sup> Jesus’ location in the house of Simon the leper may prime or activate Mark 1:40–45. If they identify the leper mentioned in Mark 1:40–45 with Simon, audience members may infer that minor characters who were healed by Jesus stayed in contact with him after having experienced the effects of the kingdom of God.

Because the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about the location of Jesus at the table in the house at Bethany, emphasis is put on their role as invisible witnesses of this event. The table constitutes the reference object in the Markan world; hence, the reference frame is external. Audience members may construct a

---

to draw this conclusion, one must assume that Jesus is a true prophet.

1820 For similar points, see also Mark 11:32.

1821 For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 326. Heil, *The Gospel*, 274. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 333.

1822 See also Hartman, *Mark*, 570.

1823 According to Heil, the fact “[t]hat Jesus is now in the house of one ‘Simon the leper’ means he is again associating, in opposition to the chief priests and scribes, with social outcasts and those who ‘need a physician’ (see 2:17).” Heil, *The Gospel*, 276. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 328. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 386. According to Pilgaard, Jesus may possibly have healed Simon at an earlier date. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 334.

1824 See summary below. See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 276.

position for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of the table and Jesus. Since this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute to the extradiegetic narrator the perception of this event.

Through the subsequent assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator introduces a woman to audience members and describes her actions. “A woman came with an alabaster vase of very expensive ointment of pure spikenard. She broke the vase and poured it on his head” (Mark 14:3b).<sup>1825</sup> The verb ἔρχομαι functions as a deictic marker, which indicates that the woman approaches Jesus and the perceiver in the Markan world. Depending on the manner in which audience members have constructed the setting, they may infer that the woman came to the house,<sup>1826</sup> that she entered the room where Jesus was reclining, or that she merely drew attention to herself by stepping forward in order to anoint Jesus.

Whereas the owner of the house was mentioned by name as well as by a physical characteristic, the woman’s name is not mentioned. Instead of focusing on her identity, the extradiegetic narrator makes another assertive point by describing the object she has brought with her as well as her action.<sup>1827</sup> In this manner, the function the woman fulfills in the Markan world is emphasized. Since the spikenard was costly, audience members may infer that the woman was rich.<sup>1828</sup> By focusing on the vase and the action of the woman, the extradiegetic narrator promotes the visualization of the event, which in turn enables audience members to observe the woman’s actions as invisible witnesses.

From the woman’s point of view, her action may first and foremost demonstrate hospitality or devotion to Jesus.<sup>1829</sup> If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, however, her action of pouring the spikenard over Jesus’ head may prime or activate traditions which refer to the fact that kings,<sup>1830</sup> prophets,<sup>1831</sup> and priests<sup>1832</sup> were anointed. Some of these traditions do not mention the instrument by means of which the anointing took place. If the device is men-

1825 The fact that the woman broke the jar may symbolize that the woman’s gift was total. See, however, note 1859 on page 453.

1826 See also Collins, *Mark*, 641. She suggests that the woman probably “came to Jesus from outside the house of Simon and was an uninvited guest.”

1827 It is significant that the woman anoints Jesus’ head in Mark 14:3–9 and Matt 26:6–13, whereas she anoints Jesus’ feet in Luke 7:36–50 and John 12:1–8. For the fact that the heads of priests and kings were anointed, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 386–387. For comments on the different versions of the narrative, see Miller, *Women*, 128–129.

1828 See also Collins, *Mark*, 641.

1829 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 276–278. According to Hooker, “[i]t was customary to pour oil on the hair of guests at dinner parties given by the well-to-do, and the incident can be understood, at one level, as an act of devotion to Jesus by the woman.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 327. On the basis of the perspective of the reader, Lührmann suggests another interpretation. “Was die Frau tut, muß dem Leser zunächst rätselhaft bleiben; er kann nur den Eindruck einer außergewöhnlichen Verschwendung haben.” Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 232.

1830 1 Kgdms 9:16; 10:1; 15:1; 15:17; 16:1; 16:12–13; 2 Kgdms 2:4; 2:7; 5:3; 5:17; 12:7; 3 Kgdms 1:34; 1:38–39; 5:15; 19:15–16; 4 Kgdms 9:1–6; 9:12; 11:12; 23:30; 1 Chr 11:3; 14:8; 29:22; 2 Chr 23:11; 36:1; Ps 88:21 (LXX)/89:20.

1831 3 Kgdms 19:16; Isa 61:1.

1832 Exod 28:41; 29:7; 29:29; 30:30; 40:13; Lev 8:12; Num 35:25; 1 Chr 29:22.

tioned, these characters are not anointed with *μύρον νάρδου*, similar to Jesus, but rather with *ἔλαιον*.<sup>1833</sup> Because lexical entries are content addressable, this distinction may, however, only be of minor importance to audience members.

In 1 Kgdms 10:1 and 4 Kgdms 9:3–6 a “flask”<sup>1834</sup> containing olive oil is poured over the head of the king. The woman’s action may therefore be sufficient *per se* to prime or activate these traditions. If these traditions are primed or activated, the fact that Bartimaeus addressed Jesus as Son of David (Mark 10:47–48) and several elements which constitute the description of Jesus who approached Jerusalem (he sat on a colt, the road was covered with cloaks, he was hailed by the crowd) may suggest to audience members that Jesus is anointed as king at this moment. Alternatively, audience members may deduce that the woman’s action indicates that Jesus is a true prophet, whose predictions will be fulfilled. In the Markan world, Jesus seems to embody both roles. Both roles can be evoked by this episode, but as the above-mentioned events suggest, this event is primarily related to Jesus’ role as the Messiah. This event may thus prime or activate Mark 12:35–37a where Jesus taught about the role of the Messiah in the temple, speech acts which audience members probably interpreted in relation to Jesus’ own identity and authority.

Until this point in the gospel, the title *χριστός* has been employed twice as a definition of Jesus’ identity (Mark 1:1; 8:29), but it is only through Mark 14:3 that audience members are informed about an event that fully justifies this designation. In Mark 8:30, the actual perlocutionary effect of Peter’s claim *σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός* (Mark 8:29) was related. Jesus responded by means of a directive point, “and he rebuked them in order that they should tell no one about him” (Mark 8:30). Jesus’ speech act may reflect the fact that Jesus, for various reasons, wanted to keep his identity secret. By means of his subsequent teaching, however, Jesus also indicated that the designation *ὁ χριστός* should be related to rejection, suffering, death, and resurrection, and audience members could regard this as a sign that Jesus corrected at least some of the implications of Peter’s claim. At this point, audience members may recognize another reason why Jesus neither denied, nor confirmed Peter’s claim, i.e. Jesus was not yet anointed. Accordingly, Peter’s assertive point was not entirely correct.<sup>1835</sup> During Jesus’ baptism, the Spirit of the Lord came upon him as it did with regard to other leaders, such as prophets and ideal kings. In 1 Kgdms 16:13, the Spirit of the Lord came upon David when he was anointed. In the case of Jesus, these two events are separated. The Spirit came upon him at the beginning of his mission, whereas the anointing takes place when his death is imminent.

In the Gospel of Mark Jesus is anointed by an unidentified woman with a “very expensive ointment of pure spikenard” (Mark 14:3c), not olive oil, at a meal which takes place in the house of Simon the leper. In the traditions mentioned earlier, those

1833 For this reason, Collins argues against the possibility that the woman anointed Jesus as the royal Messiah. See Collins, *Mark*, 642.

1834 On *φακός* as a lentil-like container, see J. Lust et al., *Greek-English*, 930A.

1835 When Jesus affirms in Mark 14:61–62 that he is the Messiah, he has been anointed. He can therefore affirm/claim this identity.

who anointed the kings were prophets,<sup>1836</sup> priests,<sup>1837</sup> both a prophet and a priest,<sup>1838</sup> the Lord,<sup>1839</sup> all the people,<sup>1840</sup> all the elders of Israel,<sup>1841</sup> the men of Judah/the house of Judah,<sup>1842</sup> the people of the land,<sup>1843</sup> or the whole assembly.<sup>1844</sup> Accordingly, the woman performs a role which was usually performed by important male characters,<sup>1845</sup> first and foremost by prophets and priests. Susan Miller suggests that the woman is a prophetic figure in the Gospel of Mark.<sup>1846</sup> “Her action is a prophetic sign, since Jesus’ identity as Messiah and king is not revealed until the time of his death on the cross (15.39).”<sup>1847</sup> I would rather claim that the action the woman performs is similar to that of the men listed above. In other words, it is not merely a prophetic sign. Because she anoints Jesus, he becomes *ὁ χριστός*.<sup>1848</sup> Because prophets anointed kings, the woman may still be regarded as a prophet. The fact that Jesus is anointed by a woman is only one element that distinguishes Jesus’ kingship from that of previous kings. Jesus is both king and prophet; he is a leader who serves his fellow human beings and God by preparing the way of the Lord through proclamation and mighty deeds. The kingdom of God is present as a fluid, sacred space where Jesus and his companions are, and as the king of this kingdom, Jesus can determine the values that should guide the behavior of those who are associated with his kingdom. Because Jesus has previously subverted traditional values, such as honor and status, and practiced table fellowship with outcasts, it seems appropriate that an anonymous woman should anoint Jesus as King of the kingdom of God in the house of a leper.

In Mark 14:4a, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about the manner in which some anonymous characters who were present in Simon’s house re-

---

1836 1 Kgdms 9:9–10:1; 15:1; 16:1–13; 3 Kgdms 19:15–16; 4 Kgdms 9:1–6.

1837 3 Kgdms 1:38–39; 2 Chr 23:11. In 3 Kgdms 1:38–39, a prophet was also present.

1838 3 Kgdms 1:34; 1:45.

1839 1 Kgdms 15:17.

1840 1 Kgdms 11:15.

1841 2 Kgdms 5:3; 1 Chr 11:3.

1842 2 Kgdms 2:4; 2:7.

1843 4 Kgdms 23:30; 2 Chr 36:1.

1844 1 Chr 29:20–22.

1845 See also Miller, *Women*, 133.

1846 See Miller, *Women*, 128, 133–135, 141, 144.

1847 See Miller, *Women*, 133. Referring to Matera, she also states: “Jesus is first described as a king during the Passion Narrative, when he is called king six times (15.2, 9, 12, 18, 26, 32).” For the woman’s action as a prophetic gesture, see also Heil, *The Gospel*, 278.

1848 According to Hooker, Jesus is revealed as Messiah through his death. Therefore, she suggests that the anointing for burial may also be a symbol of Jesus’ messianic anointing. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 328. Donahue and Harrington also make a similar point to the one made in the main text, but with less emphasis on the messianic implications. “The narrative of the anointing has a dual focus. One focus is christological: on the anticipation of Jesus’ death. Though Mark clearly states that the anointing is for burial, the anointing of *his head* also evokes royal, and hence messianic, overtones since the heads of kings and priests were anointed.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 390. On other aspects of this anointing, see also “15:2–15: Jesus, Pilate, the Chief Priests, and the Crowd in Front of Pilate’s Residence” on page 490.

spond to the anointing:<sup>1849</sup> “But some were indignant and said to one another ...” This assertive point may indicate that the following utterances were not intended for all the characters present, or that only some of those present agreed with this utterance.<sup>1850</sup> These anonymous characters expressed displeasure to one another, and audience members thus learn about the specific communication situation in which the question “Why did this waste of ointment take place?” (Mark 14:4b) was uttered. Through this directive point, these characters object to and question the woman’s action.<sup>1851</sup> This utterance is followed by an assertive point which functions as an explanation, “for this ointment could have been sold for more than three hundred denarii and given to the poor” (Mark 14:5a). The explanation indicates why the question was posed, and as side-participants, audience members are informed about the value of the spikenard as well as about an alternative proposal for how the money could have been spent. Finally, the extradiegetic narrator makes a diegetic summary of a correction uttered by these characters to the woman.

When Jesus called the rich man, he told him: “Go, sell what you own, and give the money to the poor” (Mark 10:21). Characters who were present at both events as well as audience members could therefore assume that Jesus would agree with the position of the anonymous characters in Mark 14:5.<sup>1852</sup> On the basis of what they learned when they heard about the rich man, audience members may empathize with the emotion demonstrated by the anonymous characters. If however audience members think that the woman has anointed Jesus as king, their emotions will still be anger, but their anger will be directed at the characters who are criticizing the woman, not at the woman. Hence, the emotions felt by audience members will not necessarily mirror the emotions displayed by the characters in the Markan world.<sup>1853</sup> Because audience members have access to more information, they will be able to interpret the event from a perspective which does not coincide with the perspective of these characters.

Speech acts uttered by Jesus in Mark 14:6 indicate that he overheard both the question and the explanation uttered by the anonymous characters. However, his response reflects other values than those audience members would expect on the basis of Jesus’ earlier encounter with the rich man. First Jesus makes a directive point telling/commanding them to “leave her alone” (Mark 14:6b). This utterance is followed by another directive point, through which he asks them “why do you cause trouble for her?” (Mark 14:6c). Finally, Jesus makes an expressive point by praising the woman’s action: “She has carried out a good deed to me” (Mark 14:6d).<sup>1854</sup> Through the latter speech act, Jesus corrects the negative evaluation of the woman’s action which was

1849 Marcus infers that these characters are disciples. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 935, 940.

1850 For the last point, see also Miller, *Women*, 135.

1851 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 277.

1852 For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 417. Collins, *Mark*, 642. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 335.

1853 For this mechanism, see “II.6.1.2.2.1. Emotions Caused by Means of Empathy and Its Subgroup Identification” on page 78.

1854 According to Heil, the woman performs an act of charitable love. This practice was also demanded by Jewish piety and surpassed almsgiving. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 277. See also Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 335.



uttered by the anonymous characters.<sup>1855</sup> On another level, he corrects the evaluation of audience members who did not understand the significance of the woman's action because they were unfamiliar with cultural memory pertaining to the anointing of kings and prophets. Audience members who understood the significance of the anointing may feel that their emotional response, i.e. anger towards the anonymous characters who questioned the woman's action, is justified by Jesus' speech acts.

Jesus continues in Mark 14:7 by means of an assertive point, a statement which explains his previous utterances: "For you always have the poor with you, and whenever you want, you can show kindness to them; but you do not always have me." Audience members may also regard this utterance as a prediction.<sup>1856</sup> Jesus' assertive point may also prime or activate Mark 2:20.

In Mark 14:8a, Jesus utters an assertive point by means of which he affirms that the woman's action was appropriate: "She has done what she could." Her action may prime or activate Mark 12:44, where the widow "put in everything she had, her entire means of subsistence."<sup>1857</sup> If this event is activated, audience members may conclude that two women, one wealthy and one poor, performed their generous acts out of devotion. Jesus continues by informing his addressees about his interpretation of the woman's action towards him: "She anointed my body beforehand for its burial" (Mark 14:8b). As side-participants, audience members are also informed. By means of this assertive point, Jesus explicitly links the woman's action to his death.<sup>1858</sup> If audience members have concluded that Jesus was anointed king, the designation "Messiah" is likewise linked to his death. Although the woman anointed only his head, Jesus states that she anointed his body, which was customary at burials.<sup>1859</sup> In this manner, the anointing of Jesus is comprised of two aspects. Jesus is anointed in a similar manner to the kings, but his kingship is different and involves death.<sup>1860</sup> Because the anointing first primes or activates traditions associated with the anointing of kings, Jesus' interpretation is framed by these traditions and interpreted against this backdrop, which in turn may prime or activate Jesus' earlier teaching on the relationship between the Son of David and the Messiah (Mark 12:35–37a).

By means of the phrase ἀμὴν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν,<sup>1861</sup> Jesus confirms what has been said earlier,<sup>1862</sup> but he also draws particular attention to the following utterance by assuring his addressees of its veracity. In Mark 13:10, Jesus stated, "and first it is necessary

1855 See also Collins, *Mark*, 642.

1856 Gundry regards this utterance as another passion prediction, see Gundry, *Mark*, 803. See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 387.

1857 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 278. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 330. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 388. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 941.

1858 According to Donahue and Harrington, "Jesus' words here point directly to the anointing of a corpse." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 388.

1859 "[I]t was customary to anoint bodies before burial," Miller, *Women*, 133. See also 134. "Also flasks used to anoint corpses were often broken and left in the coffin," Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 386. See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 329.

1860 The action of the woman also prefigures the action of the women in Mark 16:1–8. Audience members who have heard the story before may also add this facet to their interpretation.

1861 On this phrase, see comments on Mark 3:28.

1862 For the manner in which this phrase is employed, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 388.

that the good news is proclaimed to all the nations.” In Mark 14:9, Jesus points out: “Wherever the good news is proclaimed in the whole world, what she has done will be spoken of in memory of her.” In this manner, the woman’s action is firmly grounded within the worldwide proclamation of the gospel,<sup>1863</sup> which constitutes the cultural memory of the group. Collins points out that Mark 14:9 functions particularly well in a context of reoralization, i.e. in a communication situation where the Gospel of Mark was read aloud.<sup>1864</sup>

At this point, Jesus emphasizes the significance of the woman’s action, which may support my claim that her action constructs Jesus as the Messiah in the Markan world.<sup>1865</sup> The memory of the anonymous woman is explicitly tied to the proclamation of the gospel, to Jesus’ identity as the Messiah, and to his death.

In this episode, two ways of responding to the act of the anonymous woman are simulated in turn. First, audience members empathize with the anonymous characters who criticize the woman; next, they simulate Jesus’ correction of their reaction as well as his interpretation of the anointing. Depending on the cultural memory that is activated by this episode and on how audience members employ these traditions to interpret the event, Jesus may either correct or confirm their own attitude towards the woman. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory which pertains to the anointing of kings and prophets, they may react with anger towards the characters who reproved the woman, and not merely mirror their anger at the woman. Audience members who are unfamiliar with this cultural memory may construe this event on the basis of Jesus’ interpretation of her action in Mark 14:7–8. Because he connects her action with his death, they may primarily feel sadness. In this manner, the process that elicits emotions and transmission of knowledge is complex.

### 14:10–11: Judas Iscariot and the Chief Priests

The extradiegetic narrator introduces this episode by telling audience members that “Judas Iscariot, who was one of the twelve, went off to the chief priests in order to hand him over to them” (Mark 14:10). This assertive point contains the spatial marker ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς and the character marker Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώθ, through which this episode is demarcated. The character marker Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώθ may prime or activate Mark 3:19, where Judas was listed as one of the twelve characters whom Jesus appointed on the mountain.<sup>1866</sup> Even then, Judas was presented as the one who handed Jesus over (παραδίδωμι). Once more, Judas’ intention to hand Jesus over is in focus, but simultaneously, audience members are reminded that he actually is one of

1863 According to Donahue and Harrington, “Mark anticipates the universal spread of the gospel throughout the world.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 388.

1864 See Collins, *Mark*, 644.

1865 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 330. “In pouring out her gift over his head, she has in one action anointed him Messiah, proclaimed his death and resurrection and made an act of total commitment to him as Lord: the story is itself a proclamation of the good news which is to be preached throughout the whole world.” According to Pilgaard, her action anoints Jesus’ body for burial, but it may also anoint him as Messiah. See Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 336.

1866 Hooker suggests that Judas “was chosen deliberately, because he was necessary to the divine plan (cf. John 13.27).” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 331.

the twelve.<sup>1867</sup> Since Judas' intention is disclosed, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of Judas' thoughts. If sustained, this device may promote audience involvement with Judas. Because audience members are informed about the plan and goal of Judas, i.e. to hand Jesus over to the chief priests, they will be able to simulate the following events from Judas' perspective. Accordingly, they will observe Judas' subsequent actions for their own sake (attitude en-face) and appraise the likelihood of his imminent success or failure. They are not informed, however, about the motive for Judas' decision.<sup>1868</sup>

The verb *παράδιδωμι* will most likely prime or activate Mark 9:31 and 10:33.<sup>1869</sup> In that case, audience members will conclude that Judas is one of the characters who will contribute to the fulfillment of Jesus' passion predictions by handing Jesus over to the chief priests.<sup>1870</sup> Jesus did not reveal the identity of the betrayer when he uttered these predictions. In Mark 9:31, Jesus did not even mention the characters to whom he would be handed over, but in Mark 10:33 he pointed out that he would be handed over to the chief priests and the scribes. Audience members may regard the fact that one of these character groups (i.e. the chief priests) is mentioned in this episode as another indication that the fulfillment of Jesus' passion predictions is in progress. The information that one of Jesus' closest companions approaches the chief priests in order to hand Jesus over to them also indicates that the conspiracy against the protagonist of the first plot intersects established character groups. In this manner, one of the disciples, whose interrelationship with Jesus constitute a subdivision of the first plot, contributes to the realization of the second plot.

The goal of Jesus' antagonists, i.e. to destroy Jesus, was revealed to audience members at an early stage (Mark 3:6). Subsequently, audience members have heard information that will allow them to simulate the joint project which these characters initiated in order to reach their goal, a project which has become more and more complex. In this episode, the sophistication of the second plot is illustrated by the fact that one of Jesus' own companions initiates contact with some of the main protagonists of the second plot. Audience members may assume that Judas' intention will facilitate the realization of the joint project of the chief priests and scribes (Mark 14:1–2), because he may enable them to arrest Jesus by stealth.

1867 "Er verläßt damit die in 3,14 genannte Funktion der Zwölf, μετ' αὐτοῦ zu sein und von Jesus gesandt zu werden." Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 233. For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 279–280.

1868 See also Collins, *Mark*, 644. For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 233. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 331. van Iersel, *Mark*, 419.

1869 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 331. In addition, this verb may prime or activate Mark 1:14, where the fate of John the Baptist was disclosed. In that case, audience members may reflect on parallels between John's and Jesus' death. If Mark 13:9 and 13:11–12 are primed or activated, audience members may reflect on parallels between Jesus' fate and the fate of his adherents. If Mark 1:14; 13:9 and 13:11–12 are activated by the verb *παράδιδωμι* the connection between the fate of John the Baptist, Jesus, his disciples, and possibly of audience members may constitute the backdrop against which this event is interpreted. The fact that Jesus was handed over can be regarded as an effect of his efforts to prepare the way of the Lord, an activity which was prefigured by John the Baptist and emulated by Jesus' companions and subsequent adherents. By simulating the first and the second plot in this manner, audience members gain experiences which may prepare them for events that may take place subsequently in the real world.

1870 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 280. Gundry, *Mark*, 805.

Through the assertive points which constitute Mark 14:11a, the extradiegetic narrator summarizes the interaction which takes place between Judas and the chief priests. “When they heard, they were glad and they promised to give him money.” On the basis of the participle of the perceptual verb ἀκούω, audience members may infer that Judas uttered a speech act which was not cited by the extradiegetic narrator; moreover, they may attribute the perception of this utterance to the chief priests. Audience members are subsequently informed about the actual perlocutionary effect of Judas’ speech act, i.e. “they were glad” (Mark 14:11).<sup>1871</sup> On the basis of this information, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator knowledge of the conscious feelings of the scribes. Alternatively, they may regard this information as external manifestations of emotions, which they may observe as invisible witnesses in the Markan world. If audience members have attributed to the extradiegetic narrator perceptual access to these characters, they will most likely choose the former alternative, which may enhance involvement with the chief priests. By means of the subsequent summary of a speech act uttered by the chief priests, the extradiegetic narrator points out another perlocutionary effect of Judas’ speech act, i.e. a commissive point through which the chief priests promise to give Judas money.<sup>1872</sup>

The extradiegetic narrator concludes the episode by uttering an assertive point which elaborates on Judas’ intention to hand Jesus over. “And he was looking for how to hand him over conveniently” (Mark 14:11b).<sup>1873</sup> On the basis of this information, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator knowledge of Judas’ thoughts, and this may enhance involvement with him. Because the extradiegetic narrator relates this episode in a manner which may promote involvement with these characters, audience members are enabled to simulate the second plot on the basis of the intention and agreements of these characters. The fact that Judas is paid to hand Jesus over may indicate that these characters make a joint plan based on a division of labor,<sup>1874</sup> a plan which in turn will contribute to realization of the joint project that constitutes the second plot. This simulation will be based on Judas’ plan and goal, and this means that audience members will observe him en-face. In this manner, the problem of the chief priests and scribes (Mark 14:1–2) is apparently solved.<sup>1875</sup>

1871 Heil infers that “they are ‘pleased’ because they have now presumably found a way to arrest and kill Jesus ‘by deceit’ so as not to cause a disturbance of the people during the Passover feast (14:2).” Heil, *The Gospel*, 280.

1872 Van Iersel infers that the money “is probably meant to make him keep his word and stimulate him to complete the betrayal.” van Iersel, *Mark*, 419.

1873 According to Lührmann, the emphasis lies on choosing the right time to hand Jesus over. This connects this episode with Mark 14:2. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 233.

1874 On joint plans, see “II.6.1.2.2.1. Emotions Caused by Means of Empathy and Its Subgroup Identification” on page 78.

1875 See also Hartman, *Mark*, 570.

## Summary

The events taking place in Mark 14:1–2 and 14:10–11 frame Mark 14:3–9.<sup>1876</sup> Because there are some indications of continuity between Mark 14:1–2 and 14:10–11, audience members may deduce that all three events take place simultaneously.<sup>1877</sup> This structure creates a contrast between the characteristics which are displayed by characters in these three episodes. The chief priests, the scribes, and Judas, who want to kill Jesus or hand him over, are contrasted with the anonymous woman who anoints Jesus. The intention of Jesus' antagonists contrasts with her devotion, and her expensive gift to Jesus is contrasted with the money which the chief priests promise to give to Judas Iscariot.<sup>1878</sup> Because the anointing of Jesus, which is associated with the first plot, is framed by two elements constituting the second plot, the connection between Jesus' kingship and his death is clearly emphasized. When the woman performs what she may consider an act of hospitality or devotion, audience members may conclude that the woman prepares the way of the Lord by anointing Jesus as king and by simultaneously preparing his body for his funeral. Through intercalation, audience members are enabled to simulate two plots, which are explicitly interwoven on a structural level at this moment. Because they are allowed to simulate both plots, they may experience the contrast between Jesus' antagonists and Judas on the one hand, and the anonymous woman on the other. By preparing the way of the Lord, the woman performs an action which audience members would actually expect that Judas, one of the twelve, would perform.<sup>1879</sup>

### 14:12–72: On the First Day of Unleavened Bread, When the Passover Lamb Was Being Sacrificed

The extradiegetic narrator introduces this episode by means of the assertive point, “on the first day of the Unleavened Bread, when they sacrifice the Passover lamb” (Mark 14:12a). This speech act contains the temporal markers *τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον*,<sup>1880</sup> by means of which this episode is demarcated. These temporal markers point out to audience members that the time for the festivals has come.<sup>1881</sup> The plot to kill Jesus looms large; however, these temporal markers may prime or activate Mark 14:1–2. If that episode is activated, audience members will probably remember that the chief priests and the scribes did not want to arrest Jesus during the festival.

1876 The fact that these episodes are intertwined is also noticed by Edwards, “Markan Sandwiches,” 208–209. Shepherd, “The Narrative,” 531. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 389. van Iersel, *Mark*, 413–414. Collins, *Mark*, 640–641.

1877 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 414. See, however, Shepherd, “The Narrative,” 527.

1878 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 280–281. Shepherd, “The Narrative,” 531. van Iersel, *Mark*, 419.

1879 According to Shepherd, “Judas clearly represents failed discipleship, the woman represents faithful discipleship.” Shepherd, “The Narrative,” 531.

1880 Hooker suggests that this dating represents a non-Jewish viewpoint. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 334. For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 235–236.

1881 See also Collins, *Mark*, 647.

Against this backdrop, audience members may deduce that Jesus is safe for the time being.<sup>1882</sup>

These temporal markers indicate to audience members that all the episodes which are subsumed under them take place on the first day of Unleavened Bread, but characters and locations will change.

### 14:12–16: Jesus and His Disciples Plan and Organize the Passover

Through an assertive point which contains the character marker οἱ μαθηταί (Mark 14:12), the extradiegetic narrator introduces a directive point, a question uttered by the disciples. “Where do you want us to go and prepare in order that you may eat the Passover?” (Mark 14:12b).<sup>1883</sup> By means of this question, the disciples point out a problem to Jesus, i.e. they do not yet know where they will eat the Passover.<sup>1884</sup> Audience members are subsequently informed about the actual perlocutionary effect of this question, viz. an action and several conjoined speech acts. First, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that Jesus sent two of his disciples (Mark 14:13a), and then Jesus’ instructions are cited.<sup>1885</sup> Audience members may, however, infer that the order of these events in the Markan world was the other way around.

Jesus’ first speech act is constituted by a directive point through which he tells the two disciples to “go into the city” (Mark 14:13b).<sup>1886</sup> This speech act is succeeded by the assertive point: “A man carrying a water jar will meet you” (Mark 14:13c). Accordingly, Jesus predicts whom they will meet in the city and describes the man to them so that they will be able to recognize him. Jesus subsequently instructs his disciples to “follow him” (Mark 14:13d). In Mark 14:14, Jesus continues his directive point by instructing the disciples to utter a specific speech act to the owner of the house which the man enters. This particular speech act can in turn be classified as a directive point, a question, which the two disciples are to pose on behalf of their teacher: “The Teacher says, ‘Where is my guest room where I may eat the Passover with my disciples?’” (Mark 14:14b).<sup>1887</sup>

1882 Heil points out “that the chief priests and scribes did not succeed in arresting Jesus and having him put to death before the Passover feast has begun.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 282.

1883 Van Iersel infers that Jesus is still in Bethany in the house of Simon. van Iersel, *Mark*, 420.

1884 According to Heil, Judas has left table fellowship with Jesus. It is therefore the remaining disciples to whom the label οἱ μαθηταί refers at this point. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 282.

1885 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 283. Collins, *Mark*, 647. This event may prime or activate Mark 11:1–7.

1886 Audience members may infer that this city is Jerusalem. See also Collins, *Mark*, 647. According to Hooker, “[t]he Passover had to be eaten in Jerusalem, and it was therefore normal – and necessary – to make a request to use a room for the evening.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 335. For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 420. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 338. Hartman suggests that the addressees of the Gospel did not necessarily know that this meal should be eaten within Jerusalem and that the inhabitants of the city had to provide room for fellow Jews who had travelled to Jerusalem for the feast. Hartman, *Mark*, 562–563, 577.

1887 Heil points out that this is the first time Jesus employs the title οἱ διάσκαλος when he refers to himself. Heil, *The Gospel*, 283. See also Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 337–338.

Jesus also predicts the action which constitutes the actual perlocutionary effect of this speech act: “He will show you a large room upstairs, furnished and ready” (Mark 14:15a). In this manner the two disciples, Jesus’ addressees, and the side-participants are informed about the main qualities of the room. Jesus concludes his instructions and predictions by means of a directive point, which constitutes the final perlocutionary effect of the question posed by the disciples in Mark 14:12b: “Prepare for us there” (Mark 14:15b). As side-participants, audience members are informed by this directive point.

The extradiegetic narrator relates the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ speech acts in Mark 14:16. By means of a summary, the extradiegetic narrator makes several conjoined assertive points which inform audience members that “the disciples went out and came into the city, and they found everything just as he had told them, and they prepared the Passover” (Mark 14:16). Because these speech acts do not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute the perception of these events, which take place at different locations, to the extradiegetic narrator.<sup>1888</sup> The narration enables audience members to simulate the event from the perspective of the two disciples. First, they hear about the problem referred to by the question posed by the disciples, then they learn how the problem might be solved, and finally they observe how the two disciples solve the problem by carrying out the instructions they received from Jesus. Audience members will therefore evaluate the actions of the two disciples positively.

Because the propositional content of Jesus’ previous predictions is realized, Jesus is once more established as a true prophet whose predictions are fulfilled. This fact may assure audience members that both Jesus’ predictions in chapter 13 and the passion predictions were uttered by a genuine prophet.<sup>1889</sup> Accordingly, they may expect that these events too will take place in the future.

#### 14:17–25: Jesus and the Twelve Come in the Evening

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about the time at which this episode occurs and draws attention to the characters who are involved. “And when it was evening, he came with the twelve” (Mark 14:17). This speech act contains the temporal marker ὀψίας γενομένης and the character marker τῶν δώδεκα, through which this episode is demarcated.<sup>1890</sup> Because this speech act does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will most likely attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. Moreover, the lack of reference objects indicates that the reference frame is relative. The verb ἔρχομαι functions as a deictic marker which indicates that the perceiver is present at the location and ob-

1888 The difficulty in constraining the position of the extradiegetic narrator is a typical indication of omniscient narrations. Bortolussi and Dixon, *Psychonarratology*, 190. This technique enables audience members to observe the departure of the two disciples, their arrival in the town, and the fact that they prepared the Passover meal there.

1889 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 284.

1890 According to Collins, “[t]he story in vv. 12–16 could be read as implying that Jesus shared the meal with a larger group, but the account in vv. 17–21 assumes that he ate only with the Twelve.” Collins, *Mark*, 648. This information suggests that Judas has not left table fellowship with Jesus. Cf. Heil, *The Gospel*, 282.



serves when these characters arrive.<sup>1891</sup> As invisible witnesses of this event, audience members observe everything that happens in the narrative world from the location they construct for the perceiver.

The exact setting for the arrival of Jesus and the twelve is not explicitly stated, but audience members may infer that they entered the house and the room which Jesus described earlier in his prediction (Mark 14:14–15), i.e. the place where the two disciples prepared the Passover meal (Mark 14:16). This inference corresponds to the description of the communication situation which is provided by the extradiegetic narrator in Mark 14:18a. By means of an assertive point, audience members are told what happened “when they were reclining and eating.” This information offers audience members only a sketch of the event, and some of them may infer other details on the basis of their own previous experiences at dinners, which will enable them to form a more elaborate picture of the meal that is taking place. Because this event may prime different kinds of experiences and these primed events are unconscious, audience members will unknowingly construct the setting in different manners, depending on whether their context is Jewish or Hellenistic.

At dinner, Jesus makes the following assertive point: “Truly I tell you, one of you will hand me over, one who is eating with me” (Mark 14:18b).<sup>1892</sup> Through this speech act, Jesus predicts that one of his addressees will hand him over.<sup>1893</sup> Jesus’ companions are thus informed by Jesus. This information is underscored by means of the introduction ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν. These words constitute an implicit claim to authority, which may remind audience members of speech acts that were uttered by prophets; the main difference is that Jesus does not refer to the Lord, but to his own authority.<sup>1894</sup> Jesus’ predictions do not primarily inform audience members. Because Mark 14:10–11 probably activated Mark 3:19, they already know that Judas will hand Jesus over, they have in fact been aware of this information from the very formation of the twelve. Consequently, they are only reminded of Judas’ intention to hand Jesus over. Because audience members know the identity of the betrayer as well as the identity of the characters with whom Judas has made the joint plan, they are in an advantageous position in comparison to most of Jesus’ addressees.

In this episode, Jesus presents the problem of betrayal. Earlier, audience members were enabled to simulate the same problem from the perspective of Judas, the betrayer (Mark 14:10–11). While listening to this episode, audience members are allowed to simulate the event by empathizing with Jesus, the one who is being handed over, and his close associates. The fact that audience members apparently have the same knowledge as Jesus may enhance their ability to empathize with him.<sup>1895</sup> Other aspects presented below may encourage the simulation of the event from the perspective of the twelve.

1891 For similar insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 421.

1892 Collins suggests that Jesus takes on the voice of the psalmist in Ps 40 (LXX). She mentions in particular v. 10. Collins, *Mark*, 649–651. For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 285–286. van Iersel, *Mark*, 422.

1893 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 285.

1894 See comments on Mark 3:28.

1895 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 422. According to van Iersel, “the reader really takes it for granted that Jesus knows about Judas.”

Through the assertive point which constitutes Mark 14:19a, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the actual perlocutionary effects of Jesus' prediction. "They began to be distressed and to say to him, one by one ..." On the basis of the verb λυπεῖσθαι, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the conscious feelings of these characters. Alternatively, they may consider it as an external manifestation of emotions. The first option may promote identification with these characters, whereas the second may favour empathy. Because there are no other textual indications that substantiate the first option, it is more likely that audience members will observe the response of these characters as invisible witnesses to the event. The second actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' speech act is constituted by several directive points, through which each of Jesus' addressees asks him the same question (μήτι ἐγώ;). The manner in which the question is posed indicates that Jesus' companions expect an emphatic negative reply.<sup>1896</sup> By simulating this episode, audience members can vicariously experience an event which suggests that everyone can become a traitor.<sup>1897</sup>

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of their question (Mark 14:20a). Instead of making a negative assertion, which was anticipated by his addressees, Jesus confirms his previous assertive point: "It is one of the twelve, one who is dipping with me into the bowl" (Mark 14:20b). By stating that it is one of the twelve, Jesus may indicate that other people were present too during the meal. Moreover, he underscores the fact that the one who will hand him over is actually one of the twelve chosen ones. The name of the betrayer is still not disclosed. As side-participants, audience members are merely reminded of Judas' identity as one of the twelve. Jesus' statement, "one who is dipping with me into the bowl," emphasises that the betrayer is close to Jesus.<sup>1898</sup> Audience members are not informed about the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' speech act.

In Mark 14:21a, Jesus continues his speech act by uttering an assertive point which elaborates on this previous utterance: "For the Son of Man goes away as it is written about him." Jesus' addressees and the side-participants learn that Jesus interprets the role of the suffering Son of Man against the backdrop of written cultural memory,<sup>1899</sup> which may imply that he regards it as part of the divine plan. However, Jesus does not quote from written cultural memory in order to substantiate his point.<sup>1900</sup> If audience members are unfamiliar with Jewish cultural memory, Jesus' speech act may primarily prime or activate Jesus' passion predictions.

1896 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 336. According to Heil, they are unsure of their commitment. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 286. For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 394.

1897 For similar insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 422.

1898 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 286. Gundry, *Mark*, 828. Collins, *Mark*, 651. Van Iersel "takes Jesus' repeated announcement as a last, almost desperate, appeal to Judas to retrace his steps and break his promise to the Temple authorities." van Iersel, *Mark*, 422.

1899 Donahue and Harrington claim that "no text in the Jewish Scriptures explicitly mentions a suffering Son of Man." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 394.

1900 For related insights, see also Collins, *Mark*, 651.

Jesus continues his speech act by uttering a declarative point, a curse (Mark 14:21b).<sup>1901</sup> “But woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is handed over!” Through this speech act, Jesus holds the betrayer, whose identity is not disclosed, responsible for his actions.<sup>1902</sup> Jesus’ speech act is reinforced by an assertive point through which Jesus settles the issue by stating: “It would have been better for him if that man had not been born” (Mark 14:21c). It is highly likely that this strong emotional expression combined with the strong assertive point will influence the emotions of audience members. Because Jesus’ conclusion seems to be based on the same information that audience members received earlier, their emotions may mirror those felt by Jesus. Individual audience members may feel differently, on the basis of specific personal experiences which constitute the suggestion aspect of the narrative.

This part of the episode enables audience members to empathize both with Jesus and with the twelve, but for the following reasons, audience members may focus more on Jesus. 1. Jesus presents the problem which is the centre of attention of these verses. 2. Audience members possess the same knowledge that he has. 3. Jesus’ empathetic reaction surpasses the previous response of the twelve.

By means of several conjoined assertive points, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about several acts that are performed by Jesus during the meal. “While they were eating, he took bread, blessed it, broke it, and gave it to them” (Mark 14:22a).<sup>1903</sup> Because these speech acts do not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably continue to attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator, who in turn enables audience members to visualize this event through his narration. As invisible witnesses, audience members observe that Jesus took the loaf of bread and gave it to his companions. However, they are not enabled to hear the declarative point through which Jesus blesses the loaf of bread; it is replaced by a diegetic summary. Jesus subsequently utters a directive point, a command or instruction, which is succeeded by an assertive point. “Take, this is my body” (Mark 14:22b).<sup>1904</sup> Alternatively, audience members may regard the latter speech act as a declarative point, through which Jesus transforms the bread in question into his body.<sup>1905</sup> By means of these gestures and utterances, a conceptual integration

1901 See also Hartman, *Mark*, 580. According to Donahue and Harrington, “Jesus’ use of ‘woe’ is resonant of the frequent prophetic judgment oracles and continues the motif of Jesus as the suffering prophet (see Hos 7:12–14; Amos 5:17–19; 6:3–5; especially Mic 2:1–2; Isa 5:7–23; 28:1–2).” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 394.

1902 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 287. According to Heil, the betrayer is to be pitied.

1903 Bultmann rejects the idea that this meal is a Passover meal, see Bultmann, *The History*, 265, note 4. Cf. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 332–334, 336–337. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 339. Heil, *The Gospel*, 288. According to Heil, Jesus transforms the meaning of the Passover meal by placing “a new symbolic interpretation upon the bread and wine.” Mark 14:22a may prime or activate Mark 6:41 and 8:6. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 340. Heil, *The Gospel*, 289. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 395. Collins, *Mark*, 655.

1904 Hooker points out that some of the elements of the Passover meal were interpreted. She states that “the words **this is my body...this is my blood** are reminiscent of those used at the passover meal to describe unleavened bread: ‘this (is) the bread of affliction.’” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 340.

1905 Heil suggests that Jesus designates the bread “as the symbolic and sacramental equivalent of his ‘body,’ that is, his very person: ‘this is my body.’” Heil, *The Gospel*, 288–289. According to Collins, “[t]he brief saying related to the bread in v. 22 is certainly metaphorical and symbolic, rather than propositional or

network is created. In its blend, a loaf of bread is Jesus' body.<sup>1906</sup> The actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' speech acts is not related to audience members. It is thus not explicitly stated that Jesus' companions eat the bread/body, but audience members may infer it.<sup>1907</sup>

Subsequently, the extradiegetic narrator makes several conjoined assertive points by means of which audience members are told that "he took a cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them, and they all drank from it" (Mark 14:23).<sup>1908</sup> Once more, audience members are allowed to observe the event, but the declarative point through which Jesus blesses the cup is condensed into a diegetic summary. At this point, audience members are not told that Jesus uttered a directive point. They may infer it, however, on the basis of the directive point uttered in Mark 14:22b and the fact that they all drink from the cup.

Through the assertive point which constitutes Mark 14:24a, the extradiegetic narrator introduces another speech act uttered by Jesus. "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out in behalf of many" (Mark 14:24b).<sup>1909</sup> Audience members may regard this speech act as an assertive or as a declarative point. By means of this speech act, Jesus elaborates on the previously constructed conceptual integration network<sup>1910</sup> by mapping the content of the cup onto his blood.<sup>1911</sup> The frame of input space a, i.e. eating and drinking at a meal, is projected to organize the blend. In the blend, the bread is the body of Jesus and the wine is the blood of Jesus. The disciples eat the bread/the body of Jesus and drink the wine/the blood of Jesus. Ingesting the bread/the body of Jesus and the wine/the blood of Jesus effects unity/assimilation with him.<sup>1912</sup> This nourishment stimulates growth and maintains Christian life.

Jesus did not elaborate on the phrase τὸ σῶμά μου in Mark 14:22, but the phrase τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης contains an attribute which determines the character of Jesus' blood. In this manner, another input is recruited to the conceptual integration network. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, this attribute may prime or activate Exod 24:8 and its context.<sup>1913</sup> This tradition associated blood with the covenant between the Lord and the people, which was based on the regulations that Moses passed on from the Lord. If Exod 24:8 is acti-

---

metaphysical. No notions of transubstantiation or real presence have arisen at this early date." Collins, *Mark*, 655.

1906 For a similar blend, see Lundhaug, *Images*, 32–33.

1907 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 425.

1908 Heil relates this verse to Mark 10:35–40. In this manner, they all drink from the cup. Heil, *The Gospel*, 290.

1909 Collins draws attention to the fact that this speech act is uttered after the twelve have drunk from the cup. She suggests that this passage interprets Jesus' death before the event. It should not be regarded as a liturgical text. Collins, *Mark*, 656.

1910 Figure 40 in the appendix.

1911 Donahue and Harrington point out that "by metonymy the cup represents what it contains (here, wine)." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 395.

1912 For related insights, see Lundhaug, *Images*, 33. According to Heil, "[t]he Twelve's special privilege 'to be with' Jesus (3:14) thus reaches its high point in this unique Passover meal as they eat the bread/body of Jesus, which unites them in table fellowship 'with him' on his way to death." Heil, *The Gospel*, 289.

1913 This attribute may also prime or activate Zech 9:11.

vated, audience members may infer that Jesus makes a covenant with those present. The fact that this covenant is made at a meal, which from the outset commemorated the exodus, may not be coincidental. As I have pointed out earlier, the exodus was the main salvific event in the history of Israel, where God made a covenant with the people, a covenant which was regulated by his commandments.

Jesus does not state explicitly that the covenant he refers to is new,<sup>1914</sup> but audience members may infer this. By employing two regular ingredients of the Passover meal, Jesus elaborates on the previously presented conceptual integration network in a manner which illuminates the covenant that he makes with them. In this network,<sup>1915</sup> Jesus' blood/my blood of the covenant maps onto the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you. Furthermore, the fact that it was poured out for many maps onto two elements of the cultural memory input, i.e., the blood of the sacrificial animal that was sprinkled on the altar and the blood sprinkled on the people (Exod 24:5–8).<sup>1916</sup> In the blend, the blood of Jesus ingested by the disciples is my blood of the covenant and the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you. The blood of Jesus/my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many, is the blood of the covenant which was sprinkled on the altar as a sacrifice and the blood sprinkled on the people to confirm/seal the covenant. Jesus makes a covenant with his disciples (a new covenant), just as the Lord made a covenant with his people (the old covenant). In the Markan context, no commandments that may constitute regulations for this covenant are delivered.

The verb ἐκχέω may prime or activate previous traditions that are recorded in Leviticus. Some of these instances concern sin offerings (Lev 4:3–7; 4:13–18; 4:23–25; 4:27–30; 4:32–34). If these traditions are activated, audience members may regard this sacrifice as an atonement for sin.<sup>1917</sup> The fact that the blood is poured out for many may indicate the large number of people with whom the covenant is made. Furthermore, this speech act may prime or activate Mark 10:45.<sup>1918</sup> At this point, the wine/blood is not poured out or sprinkled on those present; it was ingested<sup>1919</sup> prior to this speech act.<sup>1920</sup>

1914 See Metzger, *A Textual*, 95. Heil and Pilgaard interpret this covenant against the backdrop of Jer 31:31–34 (38:31–34 LXX). See Heil, *The Gospel*, 291. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 343.

1915 Figure 40 in the appendix.

1916 For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 426. Heil also relates Mark 14:24 to Exod 24. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 291. Collins suggests that the phrase “which is poured out for many” has sacrificial connotations, and relates it to the idea of a renewed covenant. See Collins, *Mark*, 656.

1917 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 291. Collins suggests that the phrase ὑπὲρ πολλῶν may be understood in two different manners. “One is in terms of a metaphorical sacrifice effecting atonement for sin. The other is in terms of the vicarious suffering of a righteous person.” She argues in favor of the first alternative. Collins, *Mark*, 656. Heil thinks that this phrase refers to the universal aspects of the covenant. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 291–292. According to Hooker, “Mark may well have the passover lamb in mind and so be thinking of the death of Jesus as the redemptive act which brings the new community of God’s people into existence.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 343.

1918 See also Collins, *Mark*, 657.

1919 Hooker and Hartman draw attention to the problems of ingesting blood, or wine which represents blood, in a Jewish context. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 342. Hartman, *Mark*, 581.

1920 According to Hooker, Jesus’ utterance “seems to be an interpretation of the act of sharing the wine, rather than of the wine itself.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 342.

When audience members hear what takes place at this event, rituals taking place in their own house churches may be primed or activated.<sup>1921</sup> As a result, they may employ experiences which they have had in the real world in order to interpret the significance of the event taking place in the Markan world, but the experiences audience members have in the Markan world may also explain their present experiences as a community. During this event, Jesus validates an important ritual, through which audience members likewise ingest Jesus' body and blood and thus have communion with him in the real world. In this manner, the narrative world and the real world may merge.<sup>1922</sup>

In Mark 14:25, Jesus utters an emphatic, assertive point. When Jesus predicts<sup>1923</sup> "I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God," he indicates that he soon will enter/establish the kingdom of God.<sup>1924</sup> However, Jesus does reveal how and when this will occur.<sup>1925</sup> Audience members are informed by this speech act, and they may realize that the chief priests and scribes may seek to arrest Jesus during the festival after all. Through this speech act, Jesus also points out to his addressees and side-participants that similar dinners will take place in the kingdom of God.<sup>1926</sup>

#### 14:26–31: They Went Out to the Mount of Olives

Through an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about actions that take place in the Markan world. "When they had sung a hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives" (Mark 14:26).<sup>1927</sup> This speech act contains the spatial marker εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν and the character marker ἐξῆλθον, by means of which this episode is demarcated. On the basis of the spatial marker and the verb ἐξέρχομαι, audience members may construct a position for the perceiver which assumes that he is still located inside the house.<sup>1928</sup> From that position, he observes the departure of these characters. The latter part of this assertive point indicates the destination of these characters. Audience members may therefore infer that Jesus' subsequent speech act, which is introduced by the extradiegetic narrator in Mark 14:27a, is uttered at the

1921 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 426–427.

1922 According to Hooker, "Mark's own community would presumably have gathered together regularly to celebrate the Lord's Supper and would therefore have been very much aware that in doing so they were sharing in and appropriating what took place in the upper room." Hooker, *A Commentary*, 339. For related insights, see Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 965–966.

1923 See also Collins, *Mark*, 657.

1924 See also Mark 9:1.

1925 Hooker proposes that the context of the saying "suggests that Mark perhaps sees the death of Jesus as being in some way instrumental in bringing about the arrival of God's Kingdom." Hooker, *A Commentary*, 343.

1926 According to Collins, drinking wine may be a symbol of eschatological fulfillment. See Collins, *Mark*, 657.

1927 This information may substantiate the thesis that the previous meal was a Passover meal. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 344. van Iersel, *Mark*, 428. Collins, *Mark*, 668.

1928 If audience members have inferred that the house is in Jerusalem, they will deduce that Jesus and his companions leave this house to go to the Mount of Olives.

Mount of Olives. At this moment, the extradiegetic narrator does not provide audience members with much information which they may employ to construct a new position for the perceiver.<sup>1929</sup> Accordingly, the emphasis is put on their role as side-participants to speech acts that are uttered.

First Jesus utters an assertive point (Mark 14:27b), through which he predicts: “You will all fall away.” The verb σκανδαλιζομαι may prime or activate several of Jesus’ previous utterances. In Mark 4:17, tribulation and persecution that arise because of the word may cause people to fall away. Since Jesus’ previous predictions have been fulfilled, audience members will find it likely that Jesus’ companions will take offense, and this means that they will fall away. If Mark 4:17 is primed or activated, audience members may interpret subsequent events against this backdrop.

Jesus explains his prediction by referring explicitly to written, cultural memory. “I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered” (Mark 14:27c). If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they may know that this tradition is recorded in Zechariah. Zech 13:7b refers, however, to several shepherds. Furthermore, a number of people are commanded to strike the shepherds, apparently on behalf of God.<sup>1930</sup> By relating this tradition, Jesus introduces a source input from written traditions which may illuminate his own fate as well as the fate of the disciples. Audience members may map “I” onto “God,” “the shepherd” onto “Jesus,” and “the sheep” onto “the disciples.”<sup>1931</sup> If they project the frame from the source input to organize the blend, audience members may compose a blend where God/I will strike Jesus/the shepherd so that the disciples/the sheep will be scattered.<sup>1932</sup> In this manner, Jesus’ death is willed by God.<sup>1933</sup> On the basis of this conceptual integration network, Jesus seems to be negotiating established cultural memory in order to illuminate the prediction of his fate as well as that of his disciples. Jesus continues his utterance by predicting: “But after I am raised up, I will go ahead of you to Galilee” (Mark 14:28). Through this speech act, Jesus appears to envision the restoration of his own role as well as the role of his addressees, which will lead the group back to its formation in Galilee.<sup>1934</sup>

Through the assertive point constituting Mark 14:29a, the extradiegetic narrator introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ first prediction (Mark 14:27a), i.e. a commissive point uttered by Peter. εἰ καὶ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ’ οὐκ

1929 According to Collins, this event takes place “[a]t some unspecified place on the Mount of Olives.” Collins, *Mark*, 669. Van Iersel suggests that it takes place on the way to the Mount of Olives. van Iersel, *Mark*, 428.

1930 According to Collins, “Mark may have modified the LXX text known to him to fit the situation of Jesus better, or he may have known an early Greek version that was more similar to the Hebrew text than the earliest recoverable reading of the LXX that has come down to us.” Collins, *Mark*, 669.

1931 Figure 41 in the appendix. For similar insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 294.

1932 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 429–430. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 402. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 346. Cf. Gundry, *Mark*, 845. He claims that the one who strikes is unidentified.

1933 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 294. Collins, *Mark*, 670.

1934 According to Heil, “Galilee” thus represents the place of both the beginning and the renewed continuation of the dynamic ‘way’ of Jesus.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 295. As said by Donahue and Harrington, “[t]he promise of a post-resurrectional meeting in Galilee is the promise of a new mission (see 16:7).” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 402. This prediction can also be regarded as a sign of re-establishment. See also Hartman, *Mark*, 587. On the fulfillment of this prediction, see Petersen, *Literary Criticism*, 73–79.



ἐγώ (Mark 14:29b).<sup>1935</sup> The intended perlocutionary effect of this speech act is probably to reassure Jesus about his dedication to him. By means of Mark 14:30a, the extradiegetic narrator introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of Peter's speech act. Jesus affirms the content of his subsequent speech act by drawing attention to his authority ἀμὴν λέγω σοι (Mark 14:30b).<sup>1936</sup> Jesus then utters an assertive point, another prediction,<sup>1937</sup> by means of which he informs Peter about actions which he will perform subsequently: "Today, in this night, before the cock crows twice, you will deny me three times" (Mark 14:30c). Accordingly, the actual perlocutionary effect of Peter's assertive point does not correspond to its intended perlocutionary effect. The verb ἀπαρνέομαι may prime or activate Mark 8:34. If this verse is activated, audience members may deduce that Peter will deny not himself, but Jesus.<sup>1938</sup>

When the extradiegetic narrator introduces the utterance which constitutes the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' previous speech act, he focuses on the manner in which Peter utters it, viz. vehemently. During the performance situation, this information may suggest how the subsequent speech act, "even if it is necessary for me to die with you, I will certainly not deny you" (Mark 14:31b), should be performed. Once more, Peter utters a commissive point. Audience members may regard the speech acts uttered by Peter as promises.<sup>1939</sup> Through these speech acts, Peter points out his goal, and by means of the latter commissive point he obligates himself to die, if necessary, in order to achieve this goal. Audience members are informed by these speech acts. Moreover, they are informed by the assertive point through which the extradiegetic narrator summarizes speech acts that are uttered by other characters who are present (ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον, Mark 14:31).

As side-participants to Jesus' predictions, audience members are informed about subsequent events.<sup>1940</sup> Audience members may simulate these events on the basis of the information that they have heard during this episode. If Jesus' predictions are fulfilled, these subsequent events will signify that he is a true prophet. Jesus' success is intertwined, however, with the failure of his companions to fulfill their obligation to him. During the rest of the performance, audience members who have committed themselves to the joint project which constitutes the first plot will experience the stress caused by these conflicting interests.<sup>1941</sup> They probably want to regard Jesus as a true prophet, but at the same time, they may hope that his companions will be able to fulfill their obligation to him.

1935 Collins suggests that the implication of Peter's utterance is that he "still lacks understanding concerning who Jesus is and how great the test will be to which the Twelve will be subjected." Collins, *Mark*, 671.

1936 See also comments on Mark 3:28.

1937 See also Collins, *Mark*, 671.

1938 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 296. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 403.

1939 According to Donahue and Harrington, Peter's utterance "expresses an emphatic negative in a somewhat solemn, oath-like form." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 404.

1940 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 670–672, esp. 672.

1941 Tannehill claims, "[w]hen the reader reads these predictions, he knows how the disciples' story will come out, for Jesus' predictions carry authority. But that does not lessen his emotional involvement. The emotions of tragedy are aroused as the reader witnesses the fatal promises being made and recognizes the approach of disaster." Tannehill, "The Disciples," 402–403.

## 14:32–52: Jesus and the Disciples at Gethsemane

This episode is demarcated by means of the spatial marker εἰς χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανί (Mark 14:32), which points out the setting of episodes that are subsumed under this heading.

## 14:32–42: Jesus, Peter, James, and John

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that “they came to a place named Gethsemane” (Mark 14:32a). The verb ἔρχομαι may indicate that these characters come to this place, or that they go there.<sup>1942</sup> If the first interpretation is chosen, audience members will construct the event in a manner where they observe these characters arrive at Gethsemane, whereas the latter construction indicates that the perceiver watches them walk away to Gethsemane. If audience members regard Gethsemane as a reference object, they may prefer the first alternative. In that case, audience members are located in the immediate vicinity of, or at, this place. This construction is in harmony with subsequent information which is related to audience members during this episode. The extradiegetic narrator does not focus on visual aspects of the Markan world at this point; he merely employs an assertive point to introduce Jesus’ subsequent speech act. This assertive point contains the character maker τοῖς μαθηταῖς, which contributes to the demarcation of this episode. Jesus utters a directive point by means of which he tells or commands his addressees, the disciples, “Sit here while I pray” (Mark 14:32c). As side-participants, audience members are informed by Jesus’ directive point, but the extradiegetic narrator does not tell them about the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus’ speech act. They may infer, however, that the disciples perform the requested action.

Subsequently, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about actions that take place in the Markan world, i.e. Jesus “took Peter and James and John with him” (Mark 14:33a). This assertive point contains the character markers τὸν Πέτρον; [τὸν] Ἰάκωβον; [τὸν] Ἰωάννην, which contribute to the demarcation of this episode. Because this assertive point does not contain reference objects, the location audience members have constructed for the perceiver earlier on will determine the manner in which they perceive this event. In other words, the reference frame is relative. On the basis of the verb παραλαμβάνω, audience members may deduce that Jesus, Peter, James, and John move away from the perceiver. Because this speech act does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator.

This character constellation may prime or activate previous events, such as Mark 1:16–20; 1:29; 3:16–17; 5:37; 9:2 and 13:3.<sup>1943</sup> All these events indicate that these three characters are privileged, an aspect which seems to be important at this moment too.<sup>1944</sup> These characters move away from the perceiver physically, but the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about Jesus’ emotions, ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι

1942 BDAG, 393–394, 1.2.

1943 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 347.

1944 See also Hartman, *Mark*, 587. In Mark 1:16–20; 1:29 and 13:3, Andrew was present as well.

καὶ ἀδημονεῖν (Mark 14:33).<sup>1945</sup> On the basis of these verbs, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of Jesus' conscious feelings. Alternatively, they may construct this information as external manifestations of emotions. The first option may promote identification with Jesus, whereas the latter construction may facilitate simulation based on empathy. Both alternatives may elicit parallel or complementary emotions from audience members.<sup>1946</sup>

By means of the assertive point constituting Mark 14:34a, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that Jesus made another utterance. On the basis of this information, audience members may construct a new location for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of Jesus. First, Jesus utters an assertive point, through which he discloses his emotions to Peter, James, and John. "My soul is deeply grieved to the point of death" (Mark 14:34b). As side-participants to this speech act, audience members are probably reminded of the previous assertive point uttered by the extradiegetic narrator (Mark 14:33). In this manner, Jesus' speech act confirms the knowledge which the extradiegetic narrator communicated to audience members. Jesus' subsequent speech act is constituted by a directive point, through which he instructs, tells, or commands his addressees to "remain here, and stay awake" (Mark 14:34c).<sup>1947</sup> As side-participants, audience members are merely informed by this speech act. The verb γρηγορέω may prime or activate Mark 13:34–37.<sup>1948</sup> If this event is activated, audience members may interpret Jesus' directive point against an eschatological backdrop.<sup>1949</sup>

Through the subsequent assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator describes two actions which are performed by Jesus. "And he went a little further, fell on the ground" (Mark 14:35a). Jesus' current actions underscore his emotions.<sup>1950</sup> Once more, Jesus shifts location, but audience members are not informed about a specific reference object. They may therefore conclude that Jesus moves away from the position of the perceiver. If audience members construct the event in this manner, they will remain together with Peter, James, and John when Jesus moves away. However, the fact that audience members are allowed to observe and hear actions and speech acts which Jesus performs at the new location indicates that the reference object of Jesus' movements in the Markan world is not the perceiver, but rather Peter, James, and John. Accordingly, Peter, James, and John are left behind, whereas the perceiver and thus audience members may accompany Jesus as invisible witnesses of the following events, which occur in private.

1945 Hartman points out that the description of these emotions reflects Psalms which pertain to the suffering righteous one. Hartman, *Mark*, 588.

1946 See "II.6.1.1. Functions and Structural Components of Emotions as They Occur in Real Life and in Literature" on page 73. According to Gundry, "Mark uses his authorial omniscience of Jesus' inner feelings to excite sympathy for him." Gundry, *Mark*, 854.

1947 Collins infers that Jesus "needs these leading disciples, these close friends, to stay nearby and awake in order to provide him company and support." Collins, *Mark*, 677.

1948 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 298–299.

1949 For related insights, Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 407.

1950 According to Hartman, the verb πίπτω is employed in the LXX and other Greek texts to indicate humility with regard to a God or a powerful person. See Hartman, *Mark*, 568, 588.

Subsequently the extradiegetic narrator employs an indirect content paraphrase to summarize a prayer uttered by Jesus, i.e. he “prayed that, if it was possible, the hour would pass him by” (Mark 14:35b). This assertive point is succeeded by a prayer which the extradiegetic narrator seemingly cites in full.<sup>1951</sup> This prayer is introduced by a vocative (αββα), which is translated into Greek (ὁ πατήρ).<sup>1952</sup> Accordingly, the extradiegetic narrator does not assume that all audience members are familiar with Aramaic. By means of this vocative, Jesus attracts the attention of his addressee. This speech act is followed by the assertive point πάντα δυνατά σοι (Mark 14:36b). By voicing this utterance, Jesus expresses his faith or trust in God’s power,<sup>1953</sup> possibly his power to save.<sup>1954</sup> Jesus’ belief or trust in God forms the basis of Jesus’ subsequent directive points. Through the first of these speech acts, Jesus pleads, “remove this cup from me” (Mark 14:36c), through the second, he insists “but not what I want, but what you want” (Mark 14:36d).<sup>1955</sup> In this manner, Jesus subjects himself and his fate to the will of God,<sup>1956</sup> illustrating his total devotion to God and to the joint project that constitutes the first plot. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they may deduce that Jesus refers to the cup of wrath.<sup>1957</sup> If this information is activated, audience members may infer that Jesus prays that he will not be subjected to God’s wrath.<sup>1958</sup> The noun πατήρ may prime or activate Mark 8:38; 11:25 and 13:32, but since lexical entries are content addressable, Jesus’ prayer may also prime or activate Mark 1:11 and 9:7. During the latter two events, God’s voice from heaven declared or proclaimed that Jesus was his son. Against this backdrop, audience members may recognize that Jesus is communicating with his father, God, through prayer.<sup>1959</sup>

In Mark 14:37a, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about an action Jesus performs in the Markan world. Because this assertive point does not contain a perceptual verb, audience members will probably attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. “He came and found them sleeping.” The fact that Peter, James, and John are sleeping indicates that they were unable to perform the task which Jesus assigned to them when he uttered his previous directive point

1951 For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 433. Collins, *Mark*, 678.

1952 According to Hartman, God is not addressed as father in the OT, but this designation was not uncommon in non-Jewish contexts. See Hartman, *Mark*, 568. According to Lührmann, the words αββα ὁ πατήρ were also used to address God in Greek-speaking communities. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 244.

1953 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 349. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 408.

1954 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 299. In this manner, Jesus resembles minor characters who have trusted him and his power to perform mighty deeds.

1955 According to Collins, this speech act introduces an aspect of resignation, but she also points out that it may indicate perfect obedience in an ancient Jewish context. See Collins, *Mark*, 679.

1956 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 244. Heil, *The Gospel*, 300. Hartman, *Mark*, 590.

1957 Ps 75:8/74:9 (LXX), Isa 51:17 and Jer 25:15/32:15 (LXX). See also Collins, *Mark*, 680. According to Heil, this cup “refers to the suffering and death that Jesus must ‘drink.’” Heil, *The Gospel*, 300.

1958 This information may in turn prime or activate Mark 10:38 and the previous blend which was created on the basis of Mark 14:27. See comments on “14:26–31: They Went Out to the Mount of Olives” on page 465.

1959 For similar insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 299.

(Mark 14:34c). Accordingly, the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' speech act did not correspond to the intended one. Jesus responds to their action by uttering two directive points, which draw attention to their failure. These directive points are both addressed to Peter, who apparently represents all three characters at this point.<sup>1960</sup> Σίμων, καθεύδεις; οὐκ ἴσχυσας μίαν ὥραν γρηγορήσαι; (Mark 14:37b).<sup>1961</sup> Through these speech acts, Jesus rebukes Peter, and indirectly James and John, because he/they were unable to carry out his previous instructions.

Jesus' speech acts are succeeded by another set of directive points which are addressed to several addressees. Because these verbs are in the second person plural, audience members may assume that these directive points are directed to Peter, James, and John. Now Jesus extends his instructions by telling or commanding his addressees to pray as well as to keep awake, γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ ἔλθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν (Mark 14:38a). Once more, the verb γρηγορέω may prime or activate Mark 13:34–37. If these speech acts are activated, audience members may interpret this event against an eschatological backdrop.<sup>1962</sup> In that case, they may process these speech acts as if they themselves too were instructed to keep awake and pray.<sup>1963</sup> This mechanism is facilitated by the fact that these imperatives are inflected in the second person plural.<sup>1964</sup>

During this episode, a contrast is created between Peter, James, and John, who fail to stay awake, and audience members who witness Jesus' intimate conversation with his father. Jesus' instruction to pray is introduced after audience members have heard Jesus' prayer, which highlighted faith and trust in God and subjection to the will of God. If Mark 11:25 was activated at that moment, the context may have been primed (Mark 11:22–24). In that case, audience members may now understand that prayer and faith will enable Peter, James, and John to do the impossible, in this case to stay awake.

The noun πειρασμός may prime or activate previous events that have dealt with this topic. With regard to all these instances, the verb πειράζω was employed (Mark 1:13; 8:11; 10:2; 12:15) and Jesus was the one who was tempted. This time, however, Jesus' addressees are urged to pray so that they will not undergo similar tests.<sup>1965</sup> Jesus concludes his utterance by means of an assertive point through which he states: τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής (Mark 14:38). By means of this statement, Jesus contrasts the immaterial part of the human personality with the body. The immaterial part of the human personality is perceived as eager, but the body is incapable of performing the actions which the spirit requires of it. Heil suggests that

1960 See also Collins, *Mark*, 680.

1961 When the extradiegetic narrator introduces Jesus' speech act, he employs the name Peter. In this manner, Jesus' choice to call Peter "Simon" in this context stands out. According to Collins, the fact that Jesus calls Peter "by his old name may be an ironic expression of the observation that he is not living up to his new name, 'Rock.'" Collins, *Mark*, 680.

1962 For related insights, see Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 984.

1963 For related insights, see Hartman, *Mark*, 590. On the relationship between this episode and the addressees of the gospel, see also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 245.

1964 See also Collins, *Mark*, 681.

1965 Van Iersel interprets this speech act as a warning. See van Iersel, *Mark*, 436.

the spirit denotes the part of the human being which is attuned to God, whereas the flesh is attuned to oneself.<sup>1966</sup>

Through Mark 14:39, the extradiegetic narrator utters an assertive point which informs audience members about an action Jesus performed; moreover, he provides a diegetic summary of a directive point uttered by Jesus. “Again he went away and prayed, saying the same words.” Because this speech act does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. The fact that the adverb *πάλιν* is employed may notify audience members that a similar event has taken place before. Since the action and speech acts are only summarized, the quality of the transportation to the Markan world is determined by the ability of audience members to construct inferences on the basis of what they have heard previously.

By means of another assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator summarizes actions that occur in the Markan world: “Again he came and found them sleeping” (Mark 14:40a). Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perception of these actions to the extradiegetic narrator. Once more, the adverb *πάλιν* notifies audience members that a similar event has happened before. Another assertive point, which explains to audience members why Peter, James and John are unable to stay awake, follows this information. *ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὄφθαλμοὶ καταβαρυνόμενοι* (Mark 14:40b). Audience members may attribute the perception of these characters to the extradiegetic narrator. Such attribution may facilitate the observation of this event as invisible witnesses. Alternatively, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator knowledge of the sensory perceptions of these characters. The latter option may promote involvement with Peter, James, and John, if it is sustained by subsequent information. The succeeding assertive point may support the latter alternative, because audience members may attribute knowledge of their thoughts to the extradiegetic narrator. *οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τί ἀποκριθῶσιν αὐτῷ* (Mark 14:40c).<sup>1967</sup>

In Mark 14:41a, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members about the communication situation in which Jesus’ subsequent speech acts are uttered. “He came a third time and said to them.”<sup>1968</sup> Prior to this speech act, the extradiegetic narrator did not summarize the causal antecedent of this event, viz. that Jesus must have gone away again in order to return for a third time. Audience members may only infer that Jesus has performed this action. In this manner, the extradiegetic narrator stresses Jesus’ speech acts, which are cited. First, Jesus utters a directive point by means of which he tells them, “Are you still sleeping and resting? It is enough.” (Mark 14:41b).<sup>1969</sup> Jesus’ directive point is succeeded by

1966 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 302. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 349. According to Lührmann, “Geist ist der von Gott geschenke (vgl. 1,10f 13,11), Fleisch die Existenz ohne diesen Geist.” Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 244.

1967 Gundry infers that they were embarrassed. Gundry, *Mark*, 856.

1968 According to Collins, the pattern of three “increases the pathos of the portrait of Jesus struggling alone without the support of his friends. It also emphasizes the weakness and failure of the disciples.” Collins, *Mark*, 681.

1969 Collins regards this utterance as an ironic or sarcastic remark. “Sleep now and rest; it is enough.” Translation by Collins, *Mark*, 673. Donahue and Harrington perceive this utterance as a question. See Donahue

two assertive points, through which he declares: “The hour has come; look, the Son of Man is to be handed over into the hands of the sinners” (Mark 14:41c). This verse may prime or activate several earlier events. In Mark 14:35–36, audience members learned that Jesus prayed about events that would take place in the future. At that point, audience members were not explicitly informed about the events in question, but they probably inferred that Jesus referred to the betrayal. At this point, this previous inference is confirmed by Jesus. The combination of the verb παραδίδωμι and the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου may first and foremost prime or activate Mark 9:31 and 10:33. However, Judas’ betrayal of Jesus was mentioned as early as Mark 3:19, and that information was activated again in 14:10–11; 14:18 and 14:21. Against this backdrop, audience members may conclude that Jesus earlier prayed that Judas would not hand him over. Whereas the Son of Man was “handed over into the hands of human beings” in Mark 9:31, he was “handed over to the chief priests and the scribes” in Mark 10:33, and then in turn to the Gentiles.<sup>1970</sup> In Mark 14:41, Jesus labels the characters to whom he is handed over “sinners.” In this manner, a new element is introduced.<sup>1971</sup>

Jesus concludes this episode by uttering two directive points and one assertive point. “Get up, let us go. Look, he who hands me over is near” (Mark 14:42). Audience members may perceive a tension between these speech acts and Mark 14:41b, and this may indicate that Jesus’ directive point in Mark 14:41b was ironic.<sup>1972</sup> In that case, audience members may think that Jesus was exasperated by the fact that the actual perlocutionary effect of his previous directive points (Mark 14:34; 14:38) did not correspond to the intended perlocutionary effects. By means of the current directive points (Mark 14:42), Jesus urges his addressees to perform two actions, and the subsequent assertive point explains to them why they have to perform these actions. Through the assertive point, Jesus also points out that his predictions are being fulfilled at this moment.<sup>1973</sup>

During this episode, audience members have been able to simulate the events on the basis of the perspectives of Jesus and the character group constituted by Peter, James, and John. Jesus was distressed and dealt with his problem by praying to God, his father. His prayer indicated his trust and faith in God and showed that he subjected his will to the will of God and to their joint project. Because Peter, James, and John were asleep every time Jesus returned to them, audience members probably deduced that they were unable to carry out the tasks which Jesus assigned to them. In this manner, Jesus seems to constitute the ideal character to emulate,<sup>1974</sup> in contrast to his three companions. On the other hand, the failure of Peter, James, and John is described in a manner which may facilitate involvement with them. Accordingly,

---

and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 410. Gundry regards this speech act as an exasperated command. Gundry, *Mark*, 857.

1970 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 682.

1971 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 410. For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 244–245.

1972 See Collins, *Mark*, 682.

1973 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 303.

1974 According to Pilgaard, Jesus embodies the ideal to keep awake (Mark 13:37). Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 348.



this event may elicit admiration of Jesus and pity or compassion with Peter, James, and John.

### 14:43–52: Judas and the Crowd Arrive

At this moment, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members about actions that take place in the Markan world. “Immediately, while he was still speaking, Judas, one of the twelve, arrived; and with him was a crowd with swords and clubs, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders” (Mark 14:43). This speech act contains the temporal marker ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος and the character markers Ἰούδας and ὄχλος, through which this episode is demarcated. Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. This assertive point does not contain reference objects. Audience members may therefore construct the perception of this event on the basis of the location of the perceiver, and this means that the reference frame is relative. On the basis of the verb παραγίνομαι, audience members may deduce that the perceiver is already present at the location and observes that Judas arrives.<sup>1975</sup> The immediacy of these actions is underlined,<sup>1976</sup> εὐθὺς ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος. This confirms the accuracy of Jesus’ earlier assertive points (Mark 14:41c; 14:42b).<sup>1977</sup>

Once more, the extradiegetic narrator characterizes Judas as “one of the twelve” (Mark 14:43b).<sup>1978</sup> His presence may, however, prime or activate Mark 3:19; 14:10–11 and 14:17–21. Judas’ identity is thus constituted by two characteristics: (1) he is one of Jesus’ close companions, (2) and he is a traitor. The fact that Judas arrives together with “a crowd with swords and clubs, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders” (Mark 14:43c) may prime or activate Mark 14:1–2 and 14:10–11. Furthermore, this character constellation may prime two of Jesus’ passion predictions (Mark 8:31; 10:33) and Jesus’ conflicts with these characters in the temple (Mark 11:18; 11:27–12:12). Not all of these character groups were present during all the above-mentioned events, and other characters have committed themselves to the joint project, which aims at destroying Jesus – such as the Pharisees, the Herodians (Mark 3:6; 12:13–17), and the Sadducees (12:18–27). Because the extradiegetic narrator focuses on the connection between Judas, the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders, audience members may realize that Jesus’ predictions of betrayal and rejection are about to be realized. When audience members hear that the crowd brings swords and clubs, they are reminded of the violent character of the plot against Jesus.<sup>1979</sup> The presence of these objects may also enhance visual aspects of the narrative.

1975 Van Iersel infers that Judas sneaked away when they arrived at Gethsemane. See van Iersel, *Mark*, 428, 437.

1976 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 858.

1977 On the link between these verses, see also Collins, *Mark*, 684.

1978 According to Hooker, this presentation emphasizes Judas’ treachery. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 351. For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 305. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 414.

1979 According to Heil, the fact “[t]hat Judas brings with him a ‘crowd’ armed ‘with swords and clubs’ adds to the suspense by creating an expectation of a violent betrayal and possible resistance by Jesus and/or his disciples.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 306.

In Mark 14:44a, the extradiegetic narrator utters an assertive point through which he tells audience members that “he who handed him over had given them a signal.” This assertive point introduces a speech act which audience members may infer had been uttered by Judas to the crowd previously.<sup>1980</sup> “The one whom I shall kiss is he; arrest him and lead him away under guard” (Mark 14:44b).<sup>1981</sup> By means of this speech act, Judas informs his addressees of the sign which will confirm Jesus’ identity, i.e. a kiss.<sup>1982</sup> This assertive point virtually constitutes the protasis of a conditional relative sentence. This protasis is succeeded by two directive points by means of which Judas commands or instructs his addressees “arrest him and lead him away under guard” (Mark 14:44b). Successful completion of these directive points will thus depend on the realization of the condition.

The assertive point constituting Mark 14:45 (“When he came, he immediately went up to him and said, ‘Rabbi,’ and kissed him.”), informs audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of the assertive point which Judas uttered in Mark 14:44. By addressing Jesus as ῥαββί and subsequently kissing him, Judas confirms Jesus’ identity. Through another assertive point, audience members are told that “they laid hands on him and arrested him” (Mark 14:46).<sup>1983</sup> The actual perlocutionary effect of Judas’ first directive point thus occurs as soon as the condition which constitutes Judas’ earlier assertive point (Mark 14:44) is satisfied. This event also fulfills the predictions Jesus uttered in Mark 14:17–21 and 9:31.<sup>1984</sup> Consequently, Judas’ betrayal may affirm that Jesus is a true prophet.

The extradiegetic narrator continues the narration of this event by describing the manner in which one anonymous character responds to these actions. “One of those present drew the sword, struck the slave of the high priest, and cut off his ear” (Mark 14:47). Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. This detailed description promotes transportation to the Markan world. Accordingly, the role audience members play as invisible witnesses of events that take place in the Markan world is enhanced. Audience members will probably infer that this action is performed by one of Jesus’ companions.<sup>1985</sup> Because audience members have been informed only about the weapons of the crowd who accompanied Judas, this violent response may take them by surprise. This action may indicate to audience members that Jesus’ companions have not yet understood the joint project that constitutes the first plot, which includes the death and suffering of Jesus.<sup>1986</sup>

1980 See also Collins, *Mark*, 684.

1981 Through these instructions, the emphasis is put on Judas’ active role as a betrayer. See Hartman, *Mark*, 608.

1982 On different backdrops which may explain this kiss, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 414–415. Collins, *Mark*, 684–685. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 997. Hartman, *Mark*, 594.

1983 According to Heil, these characters are the sinners to whom Jesus referred in Mark 14:41. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 306. See also Hartman, *Mark*, 609.

1984 On the latter prediction, see Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 998.

1985 See also Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 993. Cf. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 415.

1986 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 685–686.

Through the assertive point which constitutes Mark 14:48a, the extradiegetic narrator introduces Jesus' response to the arrest. First, he employs a directive point to question these characters about their intent and the manner in which they arrest him.<sup>1987</sup> In this context, this speech act may also function as a reproach:<sup>1988</sup> "As if against a robber you have come out with swords and clubs to arrest me" (Mark 14:48b). Jesus continues in Mark 14:49 by means of several assertive points. Through the first of these speech acts, he reminds his addressees as well as side-participants that he was with them every day in the temple teaching (Mark 14:49a). He subsequently points out that they did not arrest him (Mark 14:49b)<sup>1989</sup> and claims that in this manner the scriptures could be fulfilled (Mark 14:49c).<sup>1990</sup> Through the latter speech act, Jesus points out that his arrest can be illuminated by means of scriptures grounded in written cultural memory, but he does not specify the traditions to which he is referring. As side-participants to this speech act, audience members are also informed about the fact that Jesus thinks his arrest can be illuminated by written traditions. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they may construct inferences which may constitute the backdrop against which Jesus' arrest can be interpreted.<sup>1991</sup> Alternatively, they may process this speech act as a general utterance.<sup>1992</sup> By interpreting the arrest as the fulfillment of the scriptures, Jesus indicates that the current event is part of the joint project which constitutes the first plot. Accordingly, it is God's will (Mark 8:31 δεῖ; 14:36). In this manner, the first and the second plot are once more interrelated.

Subsequently, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that "they all abandoned him and fled" (Mark 14:50). Because Mark 14:50 does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perceptions of these events to the extradiegetic narrator. Audience members may regard these actions as the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' previous speech act. If Mark 14:49c activates the blend audience members constructed on the basis of Mark 14:27, Mark 14:50 illustrates the fulfillment of scripture (Zech 13:7b) as well as the fulfillment of Jesus' earlier prediction (Mark 14:27).<sup>1993</sup> Against this backdrop, audience members may once more conclude that Jesus proved to be a true prophet.

---

1987 According to Hooker, Jesus "protests against the manner of his arrest." Hooker, *A Commentary*, 351–352.

1988 See also Collins, *Mark*, 686.

1989 This information may prime or activate previous events which indicated that they did not arrest Jesus because of the crowd (Mark 11:18; 12:12). See "14:1–2: The Chief Priests and the Scribes" on page 446. See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 307–308. Collins, *Mark*, 686.

1990 Collins suggests that "[a]lthough the point is disputed, this seems to be the clearest statement in Mark of the idea that the events of the passion of Jesus take place in fulfillment of the scriptures read as prophecies." Collins, *Mark*, 686.

1991 On the basis of the context, Donahue, Harrington, and Collins propose that Jesus alludes to Zech 13:7. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 416. Collins, *Mark*, 687. Pilgaard focuses on texts that speak of the suffering just one (Ps 37:14; 71:11). Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 353.

1992 Hooker suggests that the general terminology implies that the scriptures are all fulfilled. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 352.

1993 For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 352. Heil, *The Gospel*, 308–309. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 416. Collins, *Mark*, 687. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 999.

Through the assertive points which constitute Mark 14:51–52, the extradiegetic narrator elaborates on the previous summary of the flight. “A certain young man was following him, wearing a linen cloth over his naked body, and they seized him. But he left the linen cloth behind and fled naked.” The description of the young anonymous man is highly visual, and this may facilitate transportation to the Markan world. The presentation of the young man and his actions may indicate that this man was one of Jesus’ followers. In the Gospel of Mark, the verb συνακολουθέω has been employed only in Mark 5:37 (with regard to Peter, James, and John), but his presence at this location at this moment indicates that he too is following Jesus. The fact that lexical entries are content addressable may substantiate this point. Against this backdrop, audience members may conclude that his shameful, naked escape illustrates the flight of Jesus’ companions that was sketched in Mark 14:50.<sup>1994</sup> On the basis of Mark 14:50–52, audience members may conclude that all of Jesus’ followers have left him. However, the perceiver – and with him the audience members, who have followed Jesus as invisible witnesses in the Markan world – still remain with Jesus.

By playing the role of side-participants and invisible witnesses during this event, audience members are able to simulate two approaches to Judas’ betrayal and Jesus’ subsequent arrest. Jesus reproached those who arrested him, but he did not fight back or attempt to escape. One of his followers responded with violence and they all fled. As a result, they broke their commitment to their joint project with Jesus. During this episode, Jesus’ previous predictions concerning the betrayal and the scattering of his companions were fulfilled: Moreover, Jesus’ passion predictions were partially fulfilled. This aspect of the gospel may indicate to audience members that Jesus is a true prophet.

The simulation of this event on the basis of the joint project and aim which constitute the first plot may elicit divergent emotions. Because events that take place in the Markan world once more indicate that Jesus is a true prophet, audience members may admire him. However, Jesus’ previous predictions and the fact that they are currently being fulfilled may simultaneously elicit fear for his life. The actions of Jesus’ companions may elicit pity or anger because these characters are now unable to fulfill their obligation to Jesus.

Audience members may also simulate this event on the basis of the second plot. In that case, they may conclude that the protagonists of this plot are successful. Whether they think that these characters will reach their ultimate goal, will depend on whether or not they believe that Jesus is a true prophet. If audience members are convinced that Jesus is a true prophet, they will believe that he will be raised and thus vindicated by God in the end; if audience members are not convinced that Jesus really is a true prophet, they may instead believe that Jesus’ antagonists will ultimately

---

1994 Collins also suggests “that the incident involving the young man running away naked is an instance of the general flight of the disciples and that it is part of the theme of their misunderstanding and refusal to accept the passion of Jesus and their duty to follow him in suffering that cannot honorably be avoided.” Collins, *Mark*, 694. For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 417. According to Hooker, the man is not a disciple. She envisages that the disciples have all fled and that the man follows Jesus when he is led away. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 352. For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 441. Heil proposes that the young man “stands for the reader as a possible candidate to fulfill the role of an ideal disciple.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 309.

succeed in destroying him. During this event, the extradiegetic narrator promotes the simulation of the first plot by focusing on its protagonist and his companions.

### 14:53–72: Jesus and Peter at the High Priest's Residence

This episode is demarcated by means of the spatial marker πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα (Mark 14:53). Events subsumed under this heading take place on the way to or at the high priest's residence.

#### 14:53: Jesus Is Led to the High Priest

At this moment, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to tell audience members that “they led Jesus away to the high priest; and all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes assembled.”<sup>1995</sup> Since this assertive point does not contain reference objects, deictic markers will refer to the location of the perceiver in the Markan world. On the basis of the verb ἀπάγω audience members may locate the perceiver in Gethsemane. Accordingly, the perceiver observes that Jesus is led away. This action constitutes the actual perlocutionary effect of Judas' second directive point (Mark 14:44).<sup>1996</sup> On the basis of the verb συνέρχομαι audience members may subsequently infer that the observer is located at the destination of these characters, i.e. the residence of the high priest, where the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders assemble. This character constellation may prime or activate earlier events where all or some of these characters, including their representatives, have been present or mentioned (Mark 8:31; 10:33; 11:18; 11:27; (12:12); 14:1; 14:10; 14:43; 14:47).<sup>1997</sup> The first two of these verses associate these characters with the fate of the Son of Man, and the latter verses reveal that these character groups conspired against Jesus to have him killed.<sup>1998</sup> In this manner, events which constitute the second plot are primed or activated, and may form the backdrop against which audience members will interpret the subsequent events.

#### 14:54: Peter Is in the Courtyard of the High Priest

After audience members have observed the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes assemble at the high priest's residence, the extradiegetic narrator tells them that “Peter followed him from a distance right into the courtyard of the high priest; and he was sitting with the servants and warming himself at the fire.”<sup>1999</sup> This speech act contains the spatial marker ἕως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλήν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, through which this episode is demarcated. On the basis of this assertive point, audience members will have to

1995 This assertive point contains the character markers οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, and οἱ γραμματεῖς, through which this episode is demarcated. Up to now, the high priest has been mentioned only in passing (Mark 14:47).

1996 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 311. Gundry, *Mark*, 883. Collins, *Mark*, 685, 698, 700.

1997 Gundry mentions Mark 8:31 and 10:33. See Gundry, *Mark*, 883.

1998 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 700.

1999 According to Heil, “at a distance” may allude to Ps 38:12 (37:12 LXX). Heil, *The Gospel*, 311.

adjust their previous construction of the Markan world somewhat. Either they may deduce that the extradiegetic narrator was exaggerating when he claimed that “they all abandoned him and fled” (Mark 14:50), or they may infer that Peter has returned to stay with Jesus. The fact that Peter follows Jesus, albeit from a distance, may prime or activate Mark 14:29, where Peter attempted to assure Jesus that he would not fall away as Jesus had predicted (Mark 14:27). When audience members interpret Mark 14:54, they may emphasize the fact that Peter followed Jesus from a distance, or else they may stress the fact that Peter still followed. If they focus on the distance between Jesus and Peter, their evaluation of Peter’s action will be slightly negative. They may regard Peter as a coward who found it hard to keep his commitment to Jesus, even though he had said earlier that he was willing to die with him (Mark 14:31).<sup>2000</sup> Alternatively, audience members may emphasize the fact that Peter still followed Jesus, despite the fact that the others had fled.<sup>2001</sup> If Peter is compared with the characters who fled, rather than with the high standards he set for himself in Mark 14:29–31, audience members may perceive Peter as a courageous man who attempts to keep his commitment to Jesus even though he risks getting seized like the young man whose desperate flight audience members observed earlier (Mark 14:51–52).

Peter’s arrival at the high priest’s residence is described by means of several assertive points. Because the extradiegetic narrator does not employ perceptual verbs, audience members may again attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. At this moment, the courtyard constitutes the reference object of several referents, viz. Peter, the servants, and the fire. The position of the fire is not specified; thus, audience members are free to construct its location. However, the fire in turn constitutes a reference object with regard to the location of those characters who sit around it. As a result, audience members will construct the courtyard in a manner where they are free to position the fire, but they will have to locate Peter and the guards close to it. Obviously, audience members may elaborate on the setting by means of other inferences, but these inferences are not necessarily generated on-line.<sup>2002</sup>

### 14:55–65: Jesus, the Chief Priests, and the Council

In Mark 14:55, the extradiegetic narrator relates what happens at the location where the chief priests, the whole council, and Jesus are gathered.<sup>2003</sup> The extradiegetic narrator does not seem interested in describing the setting and the location of these characters. Rather, he focuses on their actions and speech acts. By means of two assertive points the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that “the chief priests and the

2000 According to Collins, “his following ‘from a distance’ (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν) already portrays his fear and desire to preserve his life (cf. 8:35).” Collins, *Mark*, 701.

2001 Van Iersel points out that Peter is braver than the others. See van Iersel, *Mark*, 444.

2002 Elaborative inferences, such as class 11, are normally generated off-line. See “II.3.4. The Realization Aspect” on page 42.

2003 This episode is demarcated by means of the character markers ἀρχιερεῖς and τὸ συνέδριον. The noun συνέδριον may prime or activate Mark 13:9, where Jesus predicted that his addressees would be handed over to councils. In this manner, audience members may conclude that Jesus’ fate may anticipate the fate of these addressees.

whole council were looking for testimony against Jesus in order to put him to death; and they were not finding any” (Mark 14:55).<sup>2004</sup> On the basis of this information, audience members may construct this event as a trial, during which Jesus’ opponents are looking for testimonies that will enable them to sentence him to death. This event may prime or activate the prediction Jesus uttered in Mark 10:33, i.e. “the Son of Man will be handed over to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death.” If audience members have begun to regard Jesus as a true prophet, they will already know the outcome of the event, but they will not know how his opponents will achieve their goal.

Other events that constitute the plot against Jesus may also be primed or activated by this information. In Mark 14:55 the verb ζητέω is employed in the first assertive point. In Mark 11:18; 12:12; 14:1 and 14:11 this verb was utilized in connection with the plot to kill Jesus. If these events are activated, audience members are offered a backdrop against which they may interpret this event. This information may facilitate simulation of the second plot. Because the chief priests and the council are incapable of finding testimonies which will enable them to put Jesus to death, audience members may conclude that Jesus’ antagonists are unsuccessful at the moment, but Jesus’ prediction (Mark 10:33) has indicated that Jesus believes these characters will succeed in the end. The fact that they are unable to find testimonies against Jesus will probably suggest to audience members that he is innocent.<sup>2005</sup>

The last utterance constituting Mark 14:55 is elucidated by means of another assertive point: πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἴσαί αἱ μαρτυρίαι οὐκ ἦσαν (Mark 14:56).<sup>2006</sup> By means of this explanation, audience members are informed that many witnessed against Jesus; however, the identity of these characters is not revealed. Audience members may infer the identity of these characters. If they do so, they may consider the possibility that these anonymous witnesses were those character groups that challenged Jesus when he was in the temple. Alternatively, they may assume that these witnesses earlier constituted the crowd who were side-participants on these occasions. Because audience members have been explicitly informed about the presence of the high priest, the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes (Mark 14:53), they may think that these characters are the only ones who are present during the trial. If this inference is generated, it seems strange that Jesus’ opponents are incapable of coordinating their testimonies so that they will be able to convict him. In that case, audience members may conclude that they are inept. If on the other hand audience members infer that there are other characters present, the problem constituted by divergent testimonies will be easier to explain. Because members of the crowd and the Sadducees have not been explicitly connected with the plot to kill

2004 Collins claims that “[t]he bald statement of v. 55 is an apologetic accusation that the members of the council departed from their proper judicial role in actively seeking testimony against Jesus and in perverting justice by deciding in advance what the outcome of the trial should be.” Collins, *Mark*, 701.

2005 See also Gundry, *Mark*, 884. Heil, *The Gospel*, 312. Heil relates this information to the script of the suffering just one.

2006 If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they may know that “there must be agreement by two or more witnesses for the death sentence (Num 35:30; Deut 17:6; 19:15).” Heil, *The Gospel*, 312. For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 421.



Jesus, even though the Sadducees challenged Jesus in the temple, they may not necessarily testify with the aim of getting Jesus convicted.

Through Mark 14:57–58, audience members hear one example of those testimonies that were uttered against Jesus. First, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members that “some stood up and bore false witness against him” (Mark 14:57). Then the testimony is cited: “We heard him saying, ‘I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another that is not made with hands’” (Mark 14:58). By introducing the testimony in this manner, the extradiegetic narrator evaluates it and thus attempts to influence the belief of audience members before they are able to form their own opinion. The cited testimony consists of two assertive points. First, these anonymous characters claim that they heard what Jesus said, and then they report what he said. As side-participants, audience members are informed by both speech acts. Because audience members have played the role of side-participants to Jesus’ previous speech acts, they know that Jesus had never voiced these utterances.<sup>2007</sup> They will therefore probably agree with the extradiegetic narrator who employed the verb *ψευδομαρτυρέω* to characterize the testimonies of these anonymous characters (Mark 14:57).

The verb *καταλύω* may prime or activate the event which was related in Mark 13:1–2. When Jesus exited the temple for the last time, he responded to a speech act that was uttered by one of his disciples. If that event is activated, audience members may deduce that these witnesses overheard Jesus’ prediction with regard to the temple.<sup>2008</sup> Audience members know, however, that Jesus did not state that he would destroy the temple or that he would build another temple. They may therefore conclude that these witnesses are making false assertions.<sup>2009</sup> The phrase *διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν* may furthermore prime or activate Mark 8:31; 9:31 and 10:34.<sup>2010</sup> Jesus’ predictions of his death and resurrection were uttered to the disciples or to the twelve. If these events are primed or activated, audience members may infer that these witnesses overheard Jesus teach his disciples or the twelve, or else they may associate members of the twelve or the disciples with these witnesses. Both alternatives seem relatively implausible. However, with regard to audience members this testimony may make some sense. If Jesus’ passion predictions are activated, audience members may interpret them against the backdrop of Mark 12:1–12. In that case, they are reminded that Jesus is the cornerstone of the new community which replaces the temple and its cult.<sup>2011</sup>

Through an assertive point the extradiegetic narrator concludes, “not even thus was their testimony consistent” (Mark 14:59). On the basis of this information, audience members may conclude that the efforts of Jesus’ antagonists to kill him are currently unsuccessful.

2007 See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 249.

2008 See also van Iersel, *Mark*, 445.

2009 See also Collins, *Mark*, 701–702. According to Collins, these witnesses make an accusation of blasphemy.

2010 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 313. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 421.

2011 See “11:27–12:12: Jesus Debates with the Chief Priests, Scribes, and Elders” on page 400. For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 313. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 356.

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that “the high priest stood up in the middle” (Mark 14:60a). Because this speech act does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. At this point, characters who are present, or the room as such, seem to constitute the reference objects.<sup>2012</sup> Accordingly, the external reference frame, εἰς μέσον, is determined by these objects. Because the reference frame is external, the positional constraints are weak. Audience members are therefore free to construct a position for the perceiver as long as he is located in the immediate vicinity of these events.

Currently, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that the high priest asked Jesus a question. Then he cites one directive point that is uttered by the high priest. “Have you no answer to what these are testifying against you?” (Mark 14:60b). Through the subsequent assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of this directive point, i.e. “he was silent and did not answer anything” (Mark 14:61a).<sup>2013</sup> Accordingly, the actual perlocutionary effect of this question does not correspond to the intended one. By means of another assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator introduces an additional speech act uttered by the high priest. This time the directive point concerns Jesus’ identity. “Are you the Messiah, the son of the Blessed?” (Mark 14:61b). Audience members may thus perceive that Jesus is challenged to confirm the identity of which they have been aware since the gospel was introduced (Mark 1:1).<sup>2014</sup>

At this moment, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that Jesus answers the question; hence, the actual and the intended perlocutionary effect of the directive point correspond. Several assertive points which are voiced by Jesus succeed the assertive point uttered by the extradiegetic narrator. By means of the phrase ἐγώ εἰμι (Mark 14:62a), Jesus affirms that he is “the Messiah, the son of the Blessed?” (Mark 14:61b). The phrase ἐγώ εἰμι may prime or activate Mark 6:50, where Jesus employed this phrase to identify himself to the disciples after they had mistaken him for a ghost.<sup>2015</sup> This event may also prime or activate Mark 14:3–9. If that episode is activated, audience members will know that Jesus is making a true assertion about his identity, because the anonymous woman had anointed him as Messiah in the house of Simon the leper (Mark 14:3–9). When Peter claimed that Jesus was the Messiah in Mark 8:29, Jesus was not yet anointed. Moreover, Jesus neither affirmed nor denied this identity.<sup>2016</sup> Rather, he rebuked his addressees “in order that they should tell no one about him” (Mark 8:30). In contrast, Jesus now affirms to outsiders<sup>2017</sup> that he is

2012 Collins chooses the latter alternative, see Collins, *Mark*, 703.

2013 Collins interprets this event against the backdrop of Ps 37:14–15 (LXX). See Collins, *Mark*, 704. See also Heil, who suggests that Jesus’ response illustrates that he is the suffering servant of God and the suffering just one. Heil, *The Gospel*, 314. For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 249.

2014 For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 423.

2015 The phrase may also prime or activate Mark 13:6, where Jesus informed his addressees that “many will come in my name and say, ‘I am he!’”

2016 According to Collins, Jesus had previously indirectly affirmed Peter’s utterance (Mark 8:30–31). Collins, *Mark*, 704.

2017 See also Collins, *Mark*, 704.

God's elected and anointed agent. The question posed by the chief priest is also open to the interpretation that Jesus is Son of God,<sup>2018</sup> which constitutes one of the main characteristics of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark (Mark 1:11; 3:11; 5:7; 9:7 and 12:6).<sup>2019</sup>

In Mark 14:62b, Jesus continues his utterance by making a prediction concerning the Son of Man: “You will see the Son of Man sitting on the right of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven.”<sup>2020</sup> In this manner, Jesus once more relates the title Messiah to his identity as the Son of Man. In Mark 8:27–33, Jesus focused on rejection and suffering, elements which probably are evoked by this context as well, but by means of the current prediction, Jesus explicitly points out his relationship with God.<sup>2021</sup> In this manner, he informs his addressees that his power is associated with the power of God. This speech act may prime or activate Mark 8:38–9:1; 12:36 and 13:26. Against this backdrop, audience members may deduce that Jesus suggests that he is the King of the kingdom of God, which will soon manifest its power. Accordingly, Jesus only mentions his return and his future vindicated state to these outsiders.<sup>2022</sup> The fact that they will be able to see him indicates that his status will be publicly manifested.<sup>2023</sup>

The extradiegetic narrator relates the actual perlocutionary effect of Jesus' assertions to audience members by means of an assertive point which enables them to observe that “the high priest tore his clothes” (Mark 14:63a).<sup>2024</sup> This action is followed by a question uttered by the high priest. The question is rhetorical; thus, it functions as an assertive point which informs the addressees of the high priest as well as side-participants that he thinks witnesses are superfluous (Mark 14:63b). This utterance is underscored by means of an assertive point through which he states: “You heard the blasphemy!” (Mark 14:64a). This speech act communicates the high priest's evaluation of Jesus' answer to his addressees and to side-participants.<sup>2025</sup> This speech act forms the basis of his subsequent directive point: “What do you think?” (Mark 14:64b).

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator summarizes the actual perlocutionary effect of this speech act: “They all condemned him as deserving death”

2018 For related insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 886.

2019 See also “12:35–37a: Jesus Teaches in the Temple” on page 422.

2020 Collins suggests that “Jesus' reply to the high priest is part of the narrative reinterpretation of the ‘messiah’ in Mark.” Collins, *Mark*, 705.

2021 According to Collins, “[b]eing seated at the right hand of God implies being equal to God, at least in terms of authority and power.” Collins, *Mark*, 706.

2022 For related insights, see Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 357. According to Hooker, “[t]he essential point in Mark 14 is not a future parousia, but the contrast between the present situation and the future vindication.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 362.

2023 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 706. See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 423. They suggest that the members of the Sanhedrin will see him.

2024 Audience members may regard this action not as a sign of grief, but rather as an indication that God's honor was threatened. See Collins, *Mark*, 705. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 357. On this action as a sign of indignation and anger, see Hartman, *Mark*, 597–598. Cf. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 423. They regard this action as a symbol of grief.

2025 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 316. Collins, *Mark*, 705.

(Mark 14:64c). Thus, they affirmed the high priest's judgment.<sup>2026</sup> This information may prime or activate Mark 10:33, where Jesus predicted that the chief priests and the scribes would condemn him to death. By sentencing Jesus, these characters ironically confirm to audience members that Jesus is a true prophet. The summary which the extradiegetic narrator provides of these speech acts is followed by a description of several actions which frame a speech act (Mark 14:65): "Some began to spit on him, to cover his face, and to strike him, saying to him, 'Prophesy!' The servants treated him to blows." The details of these assertive points may enhance transportation to the Markan world. Hence, the role as invisible witness is enhanced.

These actions may prime or activate the most elaborate of Jesus' predictions concerning the fate of the Son of Man, where Jesus told his addressees that ἐμπαΐξουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμπτύουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτόν (Mark 10:34).<sup>2027</sup> Jesus actually predicted that the Gentiles would perform these actions, but the characters who are present on this occasion perform similar deeds. Until this moment, the verb ἐμπτύω has been employed two times in the Gospel of Mark, in Mark 10:34 and in Mark 14:65. The fact that these characters spit on Jesus may thus prime or activate this passion prediction. Although Jesus is not flogged at this point, audience members may interpret the fact that they beat him with their fists and slapped him in the face as similar actions.<sup>2028</sup> The extradiegetic narrator also cites a directive point, through which these characters told Jesus to prophesy. Audience members may interpret these actions as well as the directive point as mocking.<sup>2029</sup> Against this backdrop, audience members may deduce that the chief priests, members of the council, and servants fulfill Jesus' previous prediction.<sup>2030</sup> This aspect adds an ironic twist to the episode, since these characters mock Jesus because they do not regard him as a true prophet.<sup>2031</sup>

### 14:66–72: Peter

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about what happens at Peter's location (Mark 14:66). "While Peter was below in the courtyard, one of the slave girls of the high priest came."<sup>2032</sup> This information enables

2026 See Collins, *Mark*, 706. Collins argues that what members of the council regarded as blasphemy was considered by audience members to be the truth. Collins, *Mark*, 707.

2027 Collins suggests that this event may evoke Isa 50:6. See Collins, *Mark*, 707. If audience members are familiar with the LXX, they may interpret Jesus' suffering in the light of this script. See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 316.

2028 Lexical entries are content addressable.

2029 See also Collins, *Mark*, 707.

2030 For related insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 888. According to Collins, they do not fulfill the prediction. The fulfillment of this prediction occurs in Mark 15:16–20. See Collins, *Mark*, 707.

2031 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 316–317. Gundry, *Mark*, 888. Shepherd notes that "the ending of the inner story, with the cry of the mockers against Jesus, 'Prophesy!' (14.65) finds its completion in Peter fulfilling to the letter Jesus' prophecy about denial (Mark 14.30)." Shepherd, "The Narrative," 527–528. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 363. See also S. Smith, *A Lion*, 226.

2032 This episode is demarcated by means of the spatial marker κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ and the character marker τοῦ Πέτρου.

audience members to construct a better image of the residence of the high priest. When they hear that Peter was located κάτω ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, audience members may infer that the trial against Jesus took place on a higher level of the residence.<sup>2033</sup> Audience members are not informed about the precise location of Peter; accordingly, they may infer that he is still situated by the fire where he sat when they left him in order to witness the trial against Jesus.

Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute to the extradiegetic narrator the perception of the servant girl who came by. Audience members may regard Peter as a geographic center in the Markan world at this moment. In that case, Peter constitutes the reference object and the deictic marker constituted by the verb ἔρχομαι will indicate that the girl approaches him.

In Mark 14:67, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the girl's actions: "When she saw Peter warming himself, she looked at him" (Mark 14:67a). Thanks to the participles of the verbs ὁράω and ἐμβλέπω, audience members may attribute to the servant-girl the perception of Peter who was warming himself, and this means that the extradiegetic narrator has perceptual access to the girl. Alternatively, audience members may continue to attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. In that case, the extradiegetic narrator observes that the servant-girl stares at Peter. The first construction may facilitate identification with the servant-girl, whereas the second construction may facilitate empathy. The verb θερμαίνομαι may confirm that Peter is still sitting by the fire.

The servant-girl subsequently utters an assertive point (Mark 14:67b): "You also were with the Nazarene, Jesus." Through an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of this speech act. First, the extradiegetic narrator makes a diegetic summary of Peter's speech act: "He denied it" (Mark 14:68a). Then Peter's denial of Jesus is cited: "I neither know nor understand what you are saying" (Mark 14:68b). By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator indicates another perlocutionary effect of the girl's speech act, i.e. Peter "went outside into the forecourt" (Mark 14:68c). Peter's withdrawal from the courtyard may indicate to audience members that Peter is a coward who is afraid that his identity will be revealed.<sup>2034</sup> Audience members who interpreted the distance between Peter and Jesus in Mark 14:54 as a sign that Peter was a coward may consider this character indication as a confirmation of their view. Audience members who had a more positive evaluation of Peter's action may correct their view of him on the basis of this information. Peter's withdrawal from the courtyard to the forecourt also enables audience members to get a more detailed picture of the residence of the high priest.

Peter's denial of Jesus will activate Mark 14:30, where Jesus predicted that Peter would deny him three times "before the cock crows twice." In this manner, audience members become aware that Jesus' previous prediction is going to be fulfilled.<sup>2035</sup>

2033 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 425.

2034 Collins also suggests that this action was motivated by fear. See Collins, *Mark*, 708.

2035 For related insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 889. Collins, *Mark*, 708.

Some manuscripts lack the phrase *καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν* (Mark 14:68d).<sup>2036</sup> If this phrase is lacking, the extradiegetic narrator seems less eager to emphasize the literal fulfillment of Jesus' prediction, which was cited in Mark 14:30. If the phrase is included, this information may enhance the activation of Mark 14:30. The verbs which are employed in Mark 14:30 and 14:68 are slightly different; but the fact that lexical entries are content addressable suggests that the activation of Jesus' prediction will still occur.<sup>b</sup>

In Mark 14:69a, audience members are once more told that the servant-girl saw Peter. On the basis of the participle of the verb *ὁράω*, audience members may attribute the perception of Peter to this girl. Alternatively, they may attribute this perception to the extradiegetic narrator, who observes the movements of her eye. In Mark 14:67, the girl addressed Peter; here, however, through the assertive point uttered in Mark 14:69b the extradiegetic narrator indicates that she addressed the bystanders again.

At this moment, the servant-girl points out to her addressees that "this man is one of them" (Mark 14:69c). The addressees of the servant girl do not reply to this speech act, but Peter, who is merely a side-participant with regard to this speech act, responds. The extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of the girl's assertive point by uttering a diegetic summary of Peter's assertive point, *ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνεῖτο* (Mark 14:70a).

The extradiegetic narrator employs another assertive point to inform audience members about the communication situation of the speech act which constitutes the actual perlocutionary effect of Peter's second denial. Audience members learn that after a short while the bystanders address Peter again (Mark 14:70b). By way of an assertive point, these bystanders claim: "You really are one of them; for you are also a Galilean" (Mark 14:70c). On the basis of this explanation, audience members may infer that the bystanders were able to hear or see that Peter came from Galilee. The manner in which the adverb *πάλιν* is employed in this episode underlines Peter's repeated denials of Jesus, which are characterized by escalation.<sup>2037</sup> During this episode, two interrelated processes take place. 1. The accusations become progressively more serious. 2. Peter's denial of his relationship with Jesus gets increasingly intense.<sup>2038</sup> First, the servant girl asks him about his connection with Jesus (Mark 14:67). Then, she notifies other people of Peter's association with Jesus. At last, these bystanders pose their own question, which reveals that they have been convinced of Peter's identity. Peter's latter denial reflects that he will have to convince these bystanders that he is not associated with Jesus.<sup>2039</sup>

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of the speech acts which were uttered

2036 For motivations which could explain why these words were added to a manuscript or omitted from it, see Metzger, *A Textual*, 97.

2037 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 364. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 425. Collins, *Mark*, 708.

2038 See also Hartman, *Mark*, 618–619.

2039 This event may prime or activate Mark 8:38. In that case, the seriousness of Peter's denial will be stressed.

by the bystanders. “But he began to curse and swear” (Mark 14:71a).<sup>2040</sup> This speech act is constituted by a diegetic summary of one declarative and one assertive point, through which Peter rebuts their claims. Then he cites Peter’s last utterance. “I do not know this man you are talking about” (Mark 14:71b). At once, the extradiegetic narrator utters an assertive point by means of which he informs audience members that “immediately the cock crowed for the second time” (Mark 14:72a). At this moment, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members about Peter’s reaction: *καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (Mark 14:72b). Based on the verb *ἀναμνήσκω* audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of Peter’s thoughts. With regard to Peter, the cockcrow thus activates Jesus’ previous utterance. If Jesus’ previous prediction (Mark 14:30) for some reason was not activated by Mark 14:68, audience members are now offered the proper backdrop against which this event should be interpreted. The extradiegetic narrator even cites Jesus’ prediction, albeit not verbatim (Mark 14:72c).

The extradiegetic narrator concludes this episode by telling audience members about Peter’s reaction. The participle of the verb *ἐπιβάλλω* describes Peter’s action to audience members,<sup>2041</sup> i.e. “he began to weep” (Mark 14:72d).<sup>2042</sup> Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator the perception of the external manifestations of Peter’s emotions. Peter’s response suggests that he is grieving because he failed to carry through his commitment to Jesus. By affirming his previous commitment (Mark 1:16–18) to Jesus in Mark 14:29 and 14:31, Peter stated a goal for himself; he even promised to die with Jesus rather than deny him.

During the performance of this episode, audience members have simulated this event from Peter’s perspective on the basis of his previous commitment to Jesus. They have heard speech acts that challenged him, and they have observed and heard his response. Now they will conclude that Peter was unable to keep his promise and commitment to Jesus. Peter’s unsuccessful attempt to keep his promise may cause audience members to feel parallel or complementary emotions based on empathy,<sup>2043</sup> but they will also form a negative evaluation of Peter’s action.<sup>2044</sup> Personal experiences that constitute the suggestion aspect of this episode may encourage some audience members to identify with Peter.

2040 “The implication is that Peter put himself under a curse, if what he said was not true. In addition, he took an oath that what he said was true; in other words, he called upon God as a witness to his truthfulness.” Collins, *Mark*, 708. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 365. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 359.

2041 The meaning of the verb in this context is not clear. On different alternatives, see BDAG, 367–368, 2b, at 368. “Prob. Mk intends the reader to understand a wild gesture connected with lamentation.”

2042 Heil suggests that Peter’s reaction is an indication of remorse. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 320.

2043 See “II.6.1.1. Functions and Structural Components of Emotions as They Occur in Real Life and in Literature” on page 73.

2044 For related insights, see Tannehill, “The Disciples,” 403.



## Summary

The manner in which episodes concerning the trial against Jesus and Peter's denial of Jesus are related suggests that they are interwoven and function as contrasts.<sup>2045</sup> First, audience members were allowed to simulate Jesus' trial in front of the high priest and the whole council. Then they witnessed what happened when the servants in the courtyard questioned Peter. Jesus confirmed his identity as the Messiah and was sentenced to death, whereas Peter, who had promised that he would not deny Jesus even if he had to die with him, denied that he knew Jesus.<sup>2046</sup> In this manner, Jesus showed his commitment to the joint project which constitutes the first plot, whereas Peter broke his commitment by attempting to save his life.<sup>2047</sup>

In Mark 13:9, Jesus predicted to his addressees, who included Peter, that they would be handed over to councils etc. However, the nature of that prediction indicated that audience members could also process those speech acts as if they were addressed to them. Through these episodes, audience members were allowed to simulate two contrasting "trials," where Jesus constituted the ideal to emulate.<sup>2048</sup> Peter's story, on the other hand, allowed audience members to experience vicariously the consequences of denying knowledge of Jesus.

### 15:1–47: Early in the Morning

This episode is demarcated by means of the temporal marker *πρωί* (Mark 15:1),<sup>2049</sup> which may indicate to audience members of non-Jewish descent that a new day has begun. The episodes which are subsumed under this major episode take place on the same day.

#### 15:1: Jesus Is Led Away and Handed Over to Pilate

The extradiegetic narrator employs several assertive points to inform audience members about what happened "early in the morning" (Mark 15:1a). Audience members learn that "the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council" (Mark 15:1b). This speech act contains the character markers of *ἀρχιερείς*, *τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, *γραμματέων*, and *τὸ συνέδριον*, through which this episode is demarcated. This event seems to constitute the starting point of three successive actions, viz. these characters "bound Jesus, led him away, and handed him over to

2045 For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 364. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 426. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 355.

2046 For related insights, see Tannehill, "The Disciples," 403. Heil, *The Gospel*, 318. Edwards points out that this is the first time in the Gospel of Mark that Jesus is openly denied. In contrast, Jesus confirms his identity for the first time in Mark 14:62. Edwards, "Markan Sandwiches," 212.

2047 This event may prime or activate Mark 8:35.

2048 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 315.

2049 According to Donahue and Harrington, this temporal marker may mean "early," or else it may refer to the fourth watch of the night. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 430. During subsequent events it seems that the Roman and Jewish calculations of days are intertwined, perhaps because of tension between the sources and the manner in which they are combined. Collins suggests that Mark "calculates the day from morning to morning." Collins, *Mark*, 794.

Pilate” (Mark 15:1c).<sup>2050</sup> Because these assertive points do not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the observation of these proceedings to the extradiegetic narrator. The information related in Mark 15:1c indicates that the perceiver gets a glimpse of what happens to Jesus at different occasions and locations. It is therefore impossible to construct a coherent position for the perceiver,<sup>2051</sup> and the position of audience members shifts correspondingly. In the end, audience members learn that Jesus is handed over to Pilate. The extradiegetic narrator does not inform audience members about the location of this event; however, they may regard Pilate as a geographic center and reference object in the Markan world.

The manner in which the extradiegetic narrator presents Pilate to audience members, i.e. by name only, suggests that he thinks audience members have heard about Pilate before.<sup>2052</sup> If audience members know that he is a Roman governor,<sup>2053</sup> Pilate’s name and the verb *παράδιδωμι* may prime or activate the prediction Jesus uttered in Mark 10:33 (“the Son of Man will be handed over to the chief priests and the scribes, and they will condemn him to death and hand him over to the Gentiles”). If this prediction is activated, audience members will realize that Mark 15:1 partly fulfills the third passion prediction.<sup>2054</sup> As a result, audience members may conclude that this event confirms Jesus’ identity as a true prophet. The verb *παράδιδωμι* may in addition prime or activate other events which constitute the second plot (Mark 3:19; 9:31; 10:33; 14:10–11; 14:18; 14:21; 14:41–42; 14:44). Furthermore, parallel events, such as the arrest of John the Baptist (Mark 1:14) and Jesus’ predictions in Mark 13:9 and 13:11–12, may be primed or activated.<sup>2055</sup> Audience members could primarily simulate this episode against the backdrop of the second plot, but Pilate’s examination of Jesus may exemplify the type of trials that await those who prepare the way of the Lord. In this manner, the backdrop of this event illustrates that throughout the ages, those who have committed themselves to the joint project of God have faced and will face similar trials. In this manner, the first and the second plots are intertwined.

During the relation of this event, audience members will perform simulations which are based on the first as well as the second plot. Through their simulations, they will assess the likelihood that Jesus’ opponents will succeed. At this moment, Jesus’ antagonists have condemned Jesus to death and handed him over to Pilate. If audience members draw on Jesus’ three predictions concerning the fate of the Son of Man (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33–34) when they interpret the actions they observe, they will probably conclude that Jesus’ opponents will soon achieve their goal, viz. to destroy (Mark 3:6; 11:18) or kill (Mark 14:1) Jesus. These predictions provide audience members with a more or less detailed overview of the stages of development that

2050 According to Collins, the information that Jesus was bound recalls Mark 14:44. See Collins, *Mark*, 712.

2051 Difficulty in constraining the extradiegetic narrator’s position in a consistent manner constitutes a vital characteristic of omniscient narration. Bortolussi and Dixon, *Psychonarratology*, 190.

2052 For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 458.

2053 Some audience members may know that only the Roman governor could impose the death sentence. On the death sentence, see Collins, *Mark*, 699, 712.

2054 For related insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 923–924. Heil, *The Gospel*, 321. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 431. Collins, *Mark*, 712. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 362.

2055 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 323.

pertain to the fate of the Son of Man. Mark 10:33–34 is more detailed than the other predictions. It mentions the journey to Jerusalem, and declares that the Son of Man will be handed over to the chief priests and scribes, that they will condemn him to death, and that they will hand him over to the Gentiles (Mark 10:33).<sup>2056</sup> Audience members may conclude that these elements of the prediction have already been fulfilled, and that this suggests that Jesus is a true prophet. They may therefore expect that the remaining elements of the prediction, i.e. that the Gentiles will mock him, spit upon him, flog him, and kill him, will occur subsequently (Mark 10:34).

In Mark 8:31 Jesus employed the impersonal verb δέῃ which indicated to audience members that the Son of Man must suffer this fate because it is the will of God. All three passion predictions, which have informed the disciples, the twelve, and audience members of the fate of the Son of Man, have ended with the prediction that he will rise after three days. If audience members interpret the prediction of Jesus' resurrection against the backdrop of Mark 12:10–11, it will be obvious to them that God in effect is the agent of Jesus' vindication. Against this backdrop, audience members may conclude that the successful completion of the joint project and goal of Jesus' opponents is interrelated with the success of the joint plan of God, John the Baptist, Jesus, and his companions. Audience members, who for various reasons have regarded themselves as the extended members of the group of characters who constituted Jesus' addressees in Mark 13:3–37, may also realize that this event may mirror their own fate. In this manner, the second plot reaches a climax when Jesus dies, but this plot also prefigures the fate of some of Jesus' subsequent followers. The climax of the first plot lies in the future, i.e. when the Son of Man "comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (Mark 8:38).

Audience members who share the values of Jesus' opponents may fail to notice that the success of the first plot is achieved through the completion of the second plot. They will primarily simulate the second plot at this moment and consider the likelihood of the imminent success or failure of Jesus' opponents.

### 15:2–15: Jesus, Pilate, the Chief Priests, and the Crowd in Front of Pilate's Residence

The extradiegetic narrator begins this episode by voicing an assertive point which contains a diegetic summary of Pilate's subsequent directive point (Mark 15:2a).<sup>2057</sup> "Pilate asked him, 'Are you the King of the Jews?'"<sup>2058</sup> The extradiegetic narrator does not elaborate on the communication situation in which Pilate's question is uttered.<sup>2059</sup>

2056 See note 1410 on page 373.

2057 This episode contains the character marker ὁ Πιλάτος. On the basis of Mark 15:1–2 and 15:16, audience members may infer an implied spatial marker. In that case, they may assume that this event takes place outside of Pilate's residence (see also v. 8). This inference will be generated when audience members hear Mark 15:16. Accordingly, this structure is not at all times compatible with the principle of the linear presentation of information.

2058 Gundry points out that this question parallels the one uttered by the high priest in Mark 14:61. See Gundry, *Mark*, 924. See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 367. Heil, *The Gospel*, 321.

2059 Donahue and Harrington suggest that the Jewish leaders handed Jesus over to Pilate so that he might sanction their decision. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 437.

Accordingly, audience members do not know Pilate's motivation for bringing up this issue. The fact that Pilate poses this question indicates that he does not know the answer, that he thinks Jesus knows it, and that he does not think Jesus will provide this information if he is not asked. Furthermore, Pilate wants to know the answer to his question.<sup>2060</sup> As in the trial at the chief priest's residence, so here too, Jesus' identity is the subject of Pilate's interrogation.<sup>2061</sup>

In order to understand why Pilate posed this question, audience members may infer that those who handed Jesus over to Pilate (Mark 15:1) told him that Jesus had affirmed during the previous night that he was the Messiah.<sup>2062</sup> If audience members recognize that the designation "the Messiah" has political implications, the title "King of the Jews" would constitute the appropriate Roman equivalent.<sup>2063</sup> Jesus' utterance could thus be considered as a desire for power. Against this backdrop, audience members may regard Pilate's question as a way to determine whether Jesus sought influence and authority. On the basis of the previous episodes, audience members may thus realize that this event is a trial.

Through an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of Pilate's question, i.e. an assertive point uttered by Jesus. By stating *οὐ λέγεις* (Mark 15:2b), Jesus neither affirms nor denies the propositional content of Pilate's speech act.<sup>2064</sup> Consequently, the actual perlocutionary effect does not correspond to the intended perlocutionary effect of Pilate's speech act, a question which actually demanded a simple yes-no answer.

In Mark 14:3–9, Jesus was anointed. If audience members were familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they would most likely conclude that Jesus was anointed as king. As I have argued earlier, Jesus is always associated with the kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark. He proclaims that the kingdom of God is at hand (Mark 1:14–15). He knows "the mystery of the kingdom of God" and he is able to impart this knowledge to his companions (Mark 4:11). Furthermore, he presents his knowledge about the kingdom in parables (Mark 4:1–34). Jesus' healings and exorcisms illustrate the presence of the kingdom of God. He makes predictions about the future, when the kingdom will appear in power (Mark 9:1). He conceives the kingdom of God as a place which one may enter (Mark 9:47; 10:14–15; 10:23–25), and he is able to perceive people's association with the kingdom of God (Mark 12:34). Finally, Jesus' relates his own future to the kingdom of God (Mark 14:25). On the basis of this text-internal information, most audience members, including those who are unfamiliar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, may conclude that the Markan Jesus is the King of the kingdom of God, not the King of the Jews.

By anointing Jesus as King of the kingdom of God, the anonymous woman confirmed his right to restrict entrance to this kingdom and to establish the rules that

2060 On the appropriateness conditions for questions, see Pratt, *Toward*, 82.

2061 According to van Iersel, "Pilate tries to verify the charges against Jesus that the Temple authorities have presented to him as the findings of their own investigation." van Iersel, *Mark*, 459.

2062 See also Collins, *Mark*, 713. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 1033.

2063 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 321. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 437. Hartman, *Mark*, 621. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 362.

2064 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 367–368. Heil, *The Gospel*, 322. Collins, *Mark*, 713.

determine the proper behavior of those who belong to this kingdom. The fact that an anonymous woman anointed Jesus to be King of the kingdom of God in the house of Simon the leper in Bethany illustrates the inversion of the values which the kingdom of God represents. Jesus was not anointed by a male prophet or a priest in Jerusalem or in the temple as one might expect, but in the home of an unclean or a formerly unclean man by an insignificant woman. The fact that Jesus does not affirm the identity proposed by Pilate may reflect this fact, i.e. that he is anointed to be king, but not King of the Jews.<sup>2065</sup> Accordingly, the propositional content of Pilate's question is only to some extent correct.<sup>2066</sup>

Like the trial that took place in the residence of the high priest, Pilate's examination of Jesus may also prime or activate Jesus' prediction in Mark 13:9. At that point, Jesus predicted that his addressees would stand before governors. Audience members who processed that prediction as if they were addressed by Jesus may now simulate this event from different perspectives and thus vicariously experience this type of trial as well.

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that "the chief priests accused him of many things" (Mark 15:3).<sup>2067</sup> The assertive points uttered by the chief priests are not cited; they are merely referred to by means of a diegetic summary.<sup>2068</sup> On the basis of the actions of these characters, audience members may infer that the chief priests testify against Jesus, but due to the diegetic summary, they are not informed about the nature of their accusations.

The extradiegetic narrator subsequently introduces the actual perlocutionary effect of their accusations, i.e. two speech acts uttered by Pilate: "Pilate asked him again, saying, 'Have you no answer? Look how many charges they bring against you'" (Mark 15:4). Pilate's response may indicate that both Jesus and Pilate were the intended addressees of the accusations uttered by the chief priests. Jesus was accused, but these accusations were uttered in order to provide Pilate with information which would enable him to pass sentence upon Jesus. The adverb *πάλιν* draws explicit attention to Pilate's previous speech act. The propositional content of Pilate's directive point (*οὐκ ἀποκρίνη οὐδέεν*; Mark 15:4a) indicates that Jesus did not respond in a manner which corresponded to the intended perlocutionary effect of the accusations that were uttered by the chief priests. Through his subsequent assertive point, Pilate underscores his previous question by calling explicit attention to the accusations that were uttered by the chief priests. On the basis of Pilate's utterances, audience members may conclude that Jesus responded with silence instead of defending himself.<sup>2069</sup>

2065 Heil claims that the reader thinks Jesus is "the king of the Jews' in the sense that he is the messianic Son of God through suffering, dying and rising as the Son of Man (14:61–62)." Heil, *The Gospel*, 322.

2066 According to Lührmann, Pilate is not able to pose the correct question. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 255.

2067 According to Lührmann, "Jesus ist wieder als der leidende Gerechte in derselben Situation wie in 14,56–59." Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 255.

2068 According to Donahue and Harrington, all the charges against Jesus were related to his identity as King of the Jews. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 432.

2069 This response may prime or activate Psalms of individual lament. For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 714.

Audience members have not been informed about the nature of these accusations, but Pilate's questions (Mark 15:2; 15:4) may activate the trial that took place earlier in the residence of the high priest, in particular the questions that were uttered by the high priest (Mark 14:60–61).<sup>2070</sup> Accordingly, audience members may think that their accusations pertain to Jesus' identity.<sup>2071</sup> At that point, Jesus affirmed that he was the Messiah (Mark 14:62), an utterance which formed the basis of Jesus' sentence (Mark 14:63–64). Audience members may therefore infer that the accusations uttered by the chief priests concerned Jesus' claim to be the Messiah. If this inference is generated, it may corroborate previous inferences made with regard to Mark 15:2.

Against this backdrop, the two speech acts uttered by Pilate seem to pressure Jesus to affirm or deny that he is the King of the Jews. Once more, the actual perlocutionary effect of Pilate's speech act does not correspond to the intended one. By means of another assertive point, audience members are informed that "Jesus made no further reply" (Mark 15:5). If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, the fact that Jesus does not answer may prime or activate Isa 53:7.<sup>2072</sup> Against this backdrop, they may recognize that Jesus' behavior fulfills the scripture, and they may continue to interpret his behavior against the backdrop of these traditions.

The extradiegetic narrator underlines that the actual perlocutionary effect of Pilate's speech acts does not correspond to the intended perlocutionary effect, i.e. "Pilate wondered" (Mark 15:5b).<sup>2073</sup> Audience members may construct this information in two manners. They may attribute unrestricted knowledge of Pilate's thoughts to the extradiegetic narrator, or they may attribute the perception of the external manifestations of Pilate's reactions to the extradiegetic narrator. The first construction may facilitate identification with Pilate, whereas the second may facilitate empathy with him.

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about an established custom: "At each festival he released one prisoner for them whom they requested" (Mark 15:6). This speech act may create suspense, because audience members may wonder whether Jesus will be able to escape from the trap, as he had done previously when he was challenged verbally in the temple. The subsequent information may sustain this suspense.<sup>2074</sup> "Now a man called Barabbas was imprisoned with the rebels who had committed murder during the insurrection" (Mark 15:7).<sup>2075</sup> When audience members hear these assertive points, they may deduce that

2070 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 368. Heil, *The Gospel*, 322. Gundry, *Mark*, 924–925. According to Collins, the "second exchange between Pilate and Jesus is similar to the first exchange between Jesus and the high priest in the trial before the Judean council." Collins, *Mark*, 713–714.

2071 For related insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 925.

2072 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 323. van Iersel, *Mark*, 460. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 432, 439. Collins, *Mark*, 714.

2073 According to Donahue and Harrington, this "motif suggests that Pilate was trying to be a fair judge and was concerned with justice." Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 432.

2074 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 324–325.

2075 Van Iersel draws attention to the fact that he is described as a political prisoner. See van Iersel, *Mark*, 460.

either Barabbas or Jesus will be released.<sup>2076</sup> Because of the gravity of the offence that Barabbas' companions had committed,<sup>2077</sup> audience members may expect that Pilate will prefer to release Jesus rather than Barabbas. On another level, however, audience members may realize that this suspense is in contrast to the expectations which were created by the initial fulfillment of Jesus' third passion prediction. Jesus has been handed over to the chief priests and the scribes, they have condemned him to death, and they have handed him over to Pilate. Audience members may therefore expect that the actions which constitute the second part of Jesus' prediction (Mark 10:34) will take place.

In Mark 15:8, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members that the crowd went up "and began to ask him to do for them just as he was accustomed to do." Because this speech act does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. The verb ἀναβαίω indicates that movement takes place in the Markan world. The fact that these characters come to ask Pilate indicates that he constitutes a geographic center in the Markan world. Audience members may therefore regard his position as the reference object, which means that the descriptive reference frame is external. The positional constraints posed by this reference frame indicate that the perceiver will continue to witness events that take place at the location where Pilate, Jesus, and those who handed him over are gathered. The assertive point contains an indirect content paraphrase of a directive point, a request, uttered by the crowd to Pilate.

The extradiegetic narrator subsequently informs audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of the crowd's request. Pilate utters a directive point, a question: "Do you want me to release for you the King of the Jews?" (Mark 15:9). This question seems to substantiate the expectations that were generated by Mark 15:6–8, i.e. that Pilate would rather release Jesus than Barabbas.<sup>2078</sup> As a result, audience members may think that Jesus' fate is not yet settled. Through another assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator explains why Pilate asked this question: "For he knew that the chief priests had handed him over on account of jealousy" (Mark 15:10).<sup>2079</sup> On the basis of this information, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator unrestricted knowledge of the thoughts of Pilate. If sustained, this device may facilitate identification with Pilate. This explanation points out to audience members that Pilate had uncovered the motivation for the plot against Jesus, i.e. jealousy.

---

2076 For related insights, see Gundry, *Mark*, 925.

2077 "The text does not clearly state that Barabbas had personally committed murder, but he was the sort who would, or at least he associated with men who had." Collins, *Mark*, 719. According to Gundry, "[h]is being bound 'with the insurrectionists who had committed murder in the insurrection' makes him an insurrectionist and murderer." Gundry, *Mark*, 926. See also Hartman, *Mark*, 623.

2078 On the fact that this question would elicit an affirmative answer, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 433.

2079 According to Collins, "[t]his explanation implies that Pilate expected the people to ask for Jesus. The envy of the chief priests, the implied reader is expected to infer, is due to Jesus' popularity with the crowd." Collins, *Mark*, 720.



Through the assertive point which constitutes Mark 15:11, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of Pilate's previous question (Mark 15:9), i.e. "the chief priests stirred up the crowd in order that he would release Barabbas for them instead" (Mark 15:11). This speech act enables audience members to observe events that take place in the Markan world; moreover, the extradiegetic narrator reveals the aim of the chief priests. This information enables audience members to simulate this episode on the basis of the plan and goal of the chief priests. The extradiegetic narrator does not explicitly tell audience members that members of the crowd asked Pilate to release Barabbas, but audience members will probably infer that they did so. Through the relation of these events, a new aspect of the second plot comes to the fore. Previously, the crowd was fascinated by Jesus' teaching and gathered around him to listen to him (Mark 2:4; 2:13; 3:9.20.32; 4:1; 5:21.24; 6:34; 7:14; 8:1.34; 9:15.25; 10:1; 10:46; 11:18; 12:37). Their fascination for him and his teaching even protected Jesus indirectly from being arrested (Mark 11:18; 12:12). This time, the chief priests manipulate the crowd in order to achieve their goal. Hence, the crowd is being implicated in the second plot, the joint project that aims at destroying Jesus.<sup>2080</sup>

If audience members inferred that the crowd asked Pilate to release Barabbas instead of Jesus, Pilate's subsequent utterance constitutes the actual perlocutionary effect of their request. By means of a directive point Pilate asks them (Mark 15:12b): "Then what do you want me to do with the one you call the King of the Jews?"<sup>2081</sup> The propositional content of this phrase seems to confirm that those who handed Jesus over had told Pilate that Jesus was the King of the Jews.<sup>2082</sup> The extradiegetic narrator does not inform audience members about the identity of Pilate's addressees. They may infer either that Pilate poses the question to the crowd, or that he asks the crowd as well as the chief priests. The actual perlocutionary effect of Pilate's question is introduced by means of an assertive point, i.e. some anonymous characters shouted. Accordingly, the extradiegetic narrator focuses on the manner in which the utterance is expressed. This information may influence the manner in which this speech act is uttered in the performance situation as well. Audience members may interpret the adverb *πάλιν* in two manners. Either they will deduce that these anonymous characters shouted their answer to Pilate, or they will conclude that these characters responded to Pilate again. The latter alternative may substantiate the previous inference that the crowd asked Pilate to release Barabbas (Mark 15:11). Audience members who have interpreted the event in this manner may conclude that the crowd utters the following directive point to Pilate: *σταύρωσον αὐτόν* (Mark 15:13). By telling Pilate what he should do with Jesus, the crowd becomes further implicated in Jesus' death; until now, this goal was pursued primarily by the high priest, the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes (Mark 14:53; 14:55–65).<sup>2083</sup>

2080 Collins points out that "[i]n the ancient world crowds were proverbially unstable." Collins, *Mark*, 719.

2081 According to Collins, Pilate "abdicates his authority as governor acting as judge" by letting the crowd decide Jesus' verdict. Collins, *Mark*, 720.

2082 Pilgaard suggests that this question implies that the Jews, not Pilate, designate Jesus as King of the Jews. See Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 365.

2083 See also comments on earlier passages for other characters who previously contributed to this project.

Mark 15:14 contains the actual perlocutionary effect of the directive point uttered by the crowd. Using an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members that Pilate talked to them. Pilate responds by means of a directive point, a question: “What evil has he done?” (Mark 15:14a). This question implies that Pilate considers Jesus to be innocent.<sup>2084</sup> If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, Pilate’s question may prime or activate Isa 53:9. Hence, some audience members will consider this characteristic as another fulfillment of the scriptures, and interpret this event on the basis of related scripts.

Pilate’s response reflects the fact that those who told Pilate to crucify Jesus, whether the crowd or those who handed him over, have no authority or power over him. Moreover, Pilate questions the legitimacy of their demand. The actual perlocutionary effect of this directive point is introduced by means of an assertive point, οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἔκραζαν (Mark 15:14b). This speech act contains a diegetic summary of the subsequent utterance. Once more, the extradiegetic narrator focuses on the manner in which the utterance is expressed, which in turn may influence the presentation of this utterance in the performance situation. By means of this utterance, Pilate’s addressees repeat their former directive point: σταύρωσον αὐτόν (Mark 15:14c). Although the characters who utter these directive points do not have authority or power over Pilate, their persistence indicates that they will not accept a flat refusal to crucify Jesus.<sup>2085</sup>

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members of the intent of Pilate in this situation. “So Pilate, wanting to satisfy the crowd, released Barabbas for them” (Mark 15:15a). On the basis of this information, audience members will probably attribute unrestricted knowledge of the thoughts of Pilate to the extradiegetic narrator, a device which, if sustained, may facilitate identification with Pilate. The description of Pilate’s motivation for carrying out the subsequent actions reveals that he primarily wanted to satisfy the crowd. In this manner, the Roman governor, who possesses political power and authority in the Markan world, does not act according to his previous evaluation of the situation, where he concluded that the chief priests handed Jesus over because of jealousy (Mark 15:10).<sup>2086</sup> He is more concerned to satisfy the crowd. Pilate’s intention constitutes the basis for three subsequent acts: ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββᾶν, καὶ παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν φραγελλώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῆ (Mark 15:15b). These actions seem to seal Jesus’ fate. In sum, a murderer is released instead of the innocent man, who is flogged and handed over to be crucified by a reluctant official.<sup>2087</sup>

The verb παραδίωμι may first and foremost prime or activate other events which constitute the conspiracy against Jesus (Mark 3:19; 9:31; 10:33; 14:10–11; 14:18; 14:21;

2084 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 369. Collins, *Mark*, 721. Hartman, *Mark*, 623–624. Heil points out that this question “emphasizes the complete innocence of Jesus as the ‘suffering just one’ of God.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 325.

2085 According to Donahue and Harrington, “[t]he second shout (again *krazein*) of the crowd is even stronger and suggests that Pilate is losing control of the situation.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 434.

2086 Donahue and Harrington regard Pilate as a weak character, reminiscent of Herod. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 433–434.

2087 According to Shiner, “[t]he commonplace of condemnation by a reluctant official was clearly part of Mark’s storytelling repertoire.” Shiner, “The Ambiguous,” 13.

14:41–42; 14:44; 15:1; 15:10). Now the verb initiates the final phase of the second plot. Until Mark 15:13, audience members were not given any indication about the manner in which Jesus would die. In Mark 15:15, the extradiegetic narrator confirms that the crowd and Jesus' opponents have influenced Pilate to crucify Jesus. The verb *φραγελλῶ* as well as the fact that this action is instigated by Pilate may prime or activate Jesus' prediction in Mark 10:33–34. In that prediction the verb *μαστιγῶ* was employed, but the fact that lexical entries are content addressable may cause audience members to interpret the current event against the backdrop of this prediction. Audience members may thus realize that further elements of Jesus' predictions are being fulfilled.<sup>2088</sup> If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, this event may prime or activate Isa 50:6. In that case, this verse may also constitute the framework for the interpretation of the subsequent episode.

During this episode, the extradiegetic narrator has enabled audience members to simulate a trial in front of a Roman governor. The manner in which the episode is related facilitates simulation based on the plan and goal of Jesus' antagonists. Furthermore, knowledge of Pilate's thoughts promotes involvement with him. When this episode ends, audience members will conclude that Jesus' opponents and the crowd succeeded in persuading Pilate to kill Jesus. They may therefore conclude that Jesus' antagonists may soon reach their goal.

By witnessing Jesus' trial, audience members may also vicariously experience how they should behave when they are interrogated by Roman governors. In this manner, they may emulate Jesus' behavior in the future on the basis of scripts that were conveyed through this episode.

### 15:16–20a: Jesus Is in the Courtyard Together with the Whole Roman Cohort

In Mark 15:16a, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members that the soldiers led Jesus away into the courtyard.<sup>2089</sup> On the basis of this information, audience members may infer that the previous episode took place in front of Pilate's residence.<sup>2090</sup> The verb *ἀπάγω* indicates that Jesus is led away from his previous position as well as from the perceiver. Because the perceiver is able later on to observe and hear what happens in the courtyard, the invisible witnesses and side-participants may follow Jesus and witness these events. In this manner, Jesus seems to function as a geographic center, which determines the positional constraint posed on the perceiver. Jesus thus constitutes a more important reference object than geographical or architectural landmarks, and being in the immediate vicinity of Jesus forms the main positional constraints posed on the perceiver. Because this information does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator, who enables audience members to play the role of invisible witnesses and side-participants.

2088 See also Collins, *Mark*, 721.

2089 See Gundry, *Mark*, 940. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 435. Collins, *Mark*, 725. Cf. BDAG, 150, 2b, 859.

2090 For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 370. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 366.

The extradiegetic narrator seems to assume that at least some audience members will benefit from an explanation of the noun ἀλλή, even though this noun has been mentioned twice before without clarification (Mark 14:54; 14:66). Then he employs an assertive point, which contains a diegetic summary of a speech act which was voiced by these characters, i.e. “they called together the whole cohort” (Mark 15:16b). The noun indicates the number of persons who gathered, and this in turn suggests the size of the courtyard to audience members. Mark 15:16 contains the spatial marker ἔσω τῆς ἀλλῆς and the character markers στρατιῶται and ὄλην τὴν σπεῖραν, through which this episode is demarcated.

Through another assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator describes several actions that are performed by some unidentified characters. Presumably, audience members will infer that these characters are soldiers.<sup>2091</sup> These characters “dressed him in purple; plaited a crown of thorns and put it on him” (Mark 15:17). If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, elements of this description may prime or activate some of these traditions, which in turn may constitute the backdrop against which this description is interpreted. In 1 Maccabees putting on a crown and wearing purple color seems to be a mark of pride (1 Maccabees 8:14). The color purple is worn by those who are considered as friends of the king, i.e. deputies and local leaders<sup>2092</sup> (1 Maccabees 10:20; 10:62; 10:64; 11:58) and it is a distinguishing mark (1 Maccabees 14:43–44). In Daniel, it is a mark of the distinguished position of a ruler (Dan 5:7; 5:16; 5:29).

The crown is obviously associated with a ruler, i.e. as a symbol of his power.<sup>2093</sup> In this manner, the soldiers dress Jesus as a ruler, but the crown is not of gold. It is made of thorns, and this may indicate to audience members that their action represents the mockery which Jesus predicted that he would undergo (Mark 10:34).<sup>2094</sup> By clothing him in purple and by putting the crown on Jesus’ head, Roman soldiers crown him as a mock-king.<sup>2095</sup> To audience members, the thorns may suggest the pain Jesus went through when he was flogged and the suffering he will go through when he is crucified. The characters who perform these actions are mocking Jesus, but audience members may realize that these actions actually define Jesus’ kingship. Being King of the kingdom of God entails suffering and death, and the ideals which characterize this kingdom are not power and riches.

2091 According to Gundry, Mark’s audience will regard them as Gentiles. See Gundry, *Mark*, 939.

2092 “In the East, kings allowed their deputies and local leaders under their patronage and control to wear purple clothing.” Collins, *Mark*, 726. According to Hooker, this color was worn by emperors. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 370. Donahue and Harrington suggest that the color signifies royalty. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 435.

2093 Collins regards the crown as “another emblem of rulers subordinate to the great kings of the East.” Collins, *Mark*, 726.

2094 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 435.

2095 According to Heil, “the ‘whole’ cohort of soldiers performs a cruel parody of an official royal investiture of Jesus.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 327. Donahue and Harrington suggest that “[t]he mockery episode makes an important theological contribution by reminding readers of the difference between appearance (Jesus as a weak Jewish messianic pretender) and reality viewed from the perspective of faith (‘King of kings and Lord of lords’).” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 436.

In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus is crowned by Roman soldiers, not by a priest as in 4 Kgdms 11:12. Moreover, the crowning follows the anointing, not the other way around. In this manner, both the anointing and the crowning of Jesus diverge from previous Jewish practice. Turning traditional values and practice upside down thus seems to constitute a hallmark of the kingdom of God.

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that these characters “began to salute him” (Mark 15:18a). The diegetic summary of the subsequent expressive point thus points out the proper interpretation of their speech act to audience members. “Hail, King of the Jews!” (Mark 15:18b). Dressed as a mock-king, Jesus is greeted as the King of the Jews, a title which was earlier employed by Pilate (Mark 15:2; 15:9; 15:12),<sup>2096</sup> and probably by Jesus’ opponents (Mark 15:12). This salute confirms that these characters merely *depicted* Jesus as a king. Audience members on the other hand know that Jesus is a king.<sup>2097</sup>

The extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to describe the subsequent actions performed by these characters. “They struck his head with a reed and spat upon him and knelt down in homage to him” (Mark 15:19). The two first actions contrast with the last one and qualify these actions too as means to mock Jesus. The verb ἐμπύω may prime or activate Jesus’ prediction which was uttered in Mark 10:33–34<sup>2098</sup> as well as the event which took place at the high priest’s residence (Mark 14:65). The verb προσκυνέω may prime or activate Mark 5:6,<sup>2099</sup> where the demoniac bowed down before Jesus. Whereas the action performed by the demoniac was sincere, the action performed by the Roman soldiers is clearly not.

In Mark 15:20a the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members that “when they had mocked him, they stripped him of the purple clothing and put his clothes on him.” In this manner, the distinguishing mark of power is removed, whereas the symbol of suffering, the crown of thorns, seems to remain on Jesus’ head.<sup>2100</sup>

In this episode, perceptual aspects of the Markan world have constituted the center of attention of the extradiegetic narrator. Because the event was described in such detail, audience members became invisible witnesses of the events that took place in the courtyard. In this manner, audience members follow Jesus when his closest companions have left him.

2096 See also Collins, *Mark*, 726.

2097 For related insights, see S. Smith, *A Lion*, 228. van Iersel, *Mark*, 467–468. Collins, *Mark*, 726. According to Lührmann, the kingship motif points out that “der Gesalbte, der Sohn Gottes, der Menschensohn, (14,61f), den das Synedrium zum Tode verurteilt hat, als Verspotteter, Leidender und Gekreuzigter auch ‚König der Juden‘ ist.” Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 257.

2098 In this manner, further elements of Jesus’ predictions are being fulfilled. See also Gundry, *Mark*, 940–941. Heil, *The Gospel*, 328. Collins, *Mark*, 723, 728.

2099 See also Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 367. According to Donahue and Harrington, “[b]ending the knee in worship (*proskynēsis*) was part of the ritual observed in royal courts in the Greco-Roman world.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 436.

2100 See also Collins, *Mark*, 728.

## 15:20b–21: Jesus Is Led Out to Be Crucified

By means of another assertive point, audience members are informed that “they led him out to crucify him” (Mark 15:20b).<sup>2101</sup> This speech act contains the spatial marker ἐξάγουσιν, through which this episode is demarcated. The verb ἐξάγω implies that the reference object is constituted by the courtyard. For this reason, the descriptive reference frame is external, and audience members will construct a location for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of the event. Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members will probably attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator.

The phrase ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν αὐτόν (Mark 15:20b) indicates the purpose of these characters. Accordingly, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator knowledge of the thoughts of these characters. The fact that audience members are informed about the goal of these characters may facilitate the simulation of the subsequent event from their perspective. This device may also facilitate identification with them, if it is sustained by similar mechanisms.

By means of another assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator provides a summary of a directive point which was uttered to Simon of Cyrene. Through this speech act, they compelled him “to carry his [Jesus’] cross” (Mark 15:21b).<sup>2102</sup> Simon is identified to audience members as “a passer-by,” “who was coming from the country” (Mark 15:21a) and as the father of Alexander and Rufus.<sup>2103</sup> The last point may indicate that the extradiegetic narrator assumes that at least some audience members are more familiar with the latter male characters than with Simon of Cyrene himself.<sup>2104</sup> Alternatively, this information is important in order to differentiate between this Simon and Simon/Peter (Mark 1:16; 1:29–30; 1:36; 3:16; 14:37), Simon the Cananaean (Mark 3:18), Jesus’ brother Simon (Mark 6:3), and Simon the leper (Mark 14:3). The fact that Simon of Cyrene is introduced as a passer-by points out to audience members that he was chosen to carry Jesus’ cross by coincidence.<sup>2105</sup>

2101 According to Gundry, the historical present tense emphasizes the fulfillment of Jesus’ prediction in Mark 10:33–34, i.e. that the Gentiles would kill him. See Gundry, *Mark*, 943.

2102 This information indicates that Simon was pressed or forced into service. See BDAG, 7. See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 259. On the fact that the verb ἀγγαρεύω is employed when official authorities demand certain services, see Hartman, *Mark*, 628–629, 640. Donahue and Harrington suggest that Simon was forced by “the soldiers to whom Pilate had handed Jesus over.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 441.

2103 Heil suggests that Simon’s action of carrying Jesus’ cross turns him into “a substitute model of discipleship.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 329. See also 330. For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 468.

2104 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 259. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 372. Gundry, *Mark*, 944. Collins, *Mark*, 736.

2105 According to Gundry, “[o]mission of a reason for the requisition of Simon focuses attention on the dignifying of Jesus rather than on whatever weakness or suffering of his might have lain behind the requisition.” Gundry, *Mark*, 944.

## 15:22–41: Jesus at Golgotha

This episode is demarcated by means of the spatial marker ἐπὶ τὸν Γολγοθᾶν τόπον (Mark 15:22). Minor episodes which constitute this episode are demarcated through temporal markers.

## 15:22–24: Jesus Arrives at Golgotha

In Mark 15:22a, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members that “they brought him to the place Golgotha.”<sup>2106</sup> Because the extradiegetic narrator does not employ perceptual verbs at this point, audience members will probably attribute this perception to him. Golgotha constitutes the reference object, and the descriptive reference frame is external, as indicated by the verb φέρω and the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ τὸν Γολγοθᾶν τόπον (Mark 15:22a). The positional constraints are weak, and this means that audience members may construct the event in such a way that the perceiver is located somewhere in the immediate vicinity of the place called Golgotha. The extradiegetic narrator translates the Aramaic word for this place into the Greek equivalent Κρανίου Τόπος (Mark 15:22b). In this manner, he presupposes that at least some audience members are unfamiliar with Aramaic.<sup>2107</sup>

By means of another assertive point, audience members are informed of two actions. First, they observe that some anonymous characters<sup>2108</sup> “tried to give him wine to which myrrh had been added” (Mark 15:23a).<sup>2109</sup> Then they observe that Jesus “did not take it” (Mark 15:23b). If Mark 14:25 is activated by this information,<sup>2110</sup> audience members may regard Jesus’ refusal as an indication that Jesus wished to fulfill his previous prediction. Alternatively, they may think that Jesus was “willingly accepting the path of suffering.”<sup>2111</sup> As invisible witnesses, audience members are enabled to observe the events that take place before the crucifixion.

2106 This episode is demarcated by means of an implied temporal marker, i.e. before the third hour.

2107 On Golgotha and different suggestions with regard to its location, see Collins, *Mark*, 738–740.

2108 Based on the context, audience members may infer that these characters are soldiers. See Gundry, *Mark*, 944. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 442. Hooker suggests that this wine “would have been offered to Jesus by Jewish sympathizers (perhaps women from Jerusalem) rather than by his Roman executioners.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 372.

2109 On the fact that ἐδίδουν is a conative imperfect, see Collins, *Mark*, 740. See also Hartman, *Mark*, 629. According to Hartman, this type of wine was regarded as fit for occasions of celebration. Gundry points out that this wine was a delicacy, which added to Jesus’ dignity. See Gundry, *Mark*, 944. According to Donahue and Harrington, the wine “was intended to have a narcotic effect.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 442. Marcus suggests that “[t]his sort of drink was given to condemned prisoners as an act of mercy, to render them insensible to the pain of execution.” Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 1042. Collins presents various interpretations, see Collins, *Mark*, 741–742.

2110 According to Collins, Jesus’ refusal could remind audience members of Mark 14:25. See Collins, *Mark*, 743. See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 330.

2111 Hooker, *A Commentary*, 373. According to Lührmann, the narrator “will offenbar unterstreichen, daß Jesus bis zuletzt bei vollem Bewußtsein ist.” Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 260. If audience members are familiar with the “noble death” tradition, Jesus’ gesture would also “carry the connotation of disdaining pain and any effort to minimize it.” Collins, *Mark*, 743.



The extradiegetic narrator employs another assertive point to tell audience members that these anonymous characters “crucified him and divided his clothes, casting lots for them to decide who would take what” (Mark 15:24).<sup>2112</sup> Accordingly, audience members also witness the crucifixion and the events following it.<sup>2113</sup> At this moment, the previous goal of the chief priests and the crowd, which constituted the backdrop against which audience members simulated Mark 15:2–15,<sup>2114</sup> is attained. Jesus is crucified, and soon the final goal of Jesus’ opponents will be realized, i.e. his destruction or death. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, the event which is described in Mark 15:24b may prime or activate Ps 21:19 (LXX)/22:18.<sup>2115</sup> If this psalm is activated, audience members may believe that Jesus’ death fulfills the scriptures, and they may continue to interpret his death against the scripts provided by this psalm.<sup>2116</sup>

### 15:25–32: From the Third to the Sixth Hour

At this moment, the extradiegetic narrator calls attention to the point in time when Jesus was crucified, “it was the third hour and they crucified him” (Mark 15:25). This assertive point contains the temporal marker ὥρα τρίτη, through which this episode is demarcated. By means of another assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that “the inscription of the charge against him was inscribed” (Mark 15:26a). This charge is subsequently cited by the extradiegetic narrator: ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Mark 15:26b). This information confirms the inferences that were generated when audience members heard Mark 15:2–4. In other words, the accusations uttered by the chief priests could be summarized by the designation “King of the Jews.”<sup>2117</sup>

The title which constitutes this charge may prime or activate the event where Pilate asked Jesus to affirm or deny this identity (Mark 15:2), the event where Pilate called Jesus the King of the Jews (Mark 15:9), and the event where Jesus was dressed and hailed as a mock-king (Mark 15:17–20). Audience members may remember that

2112 Gundry points out that the historical present tense of the phrase σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν stresses the fulfillment of Mark 10:33–34. See Gundry, *Mark*, 944.

2113 For the cultural reality of crucifixion in the Roman world, see J. G. Cook, “Envisioning Crucifixion,” 262–285.

2114 See “15:2–15: Jesus, Pilate, the Chief Priests, and the Crowd in Front of Pilate’s Residence” on page 490.

2115 For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 373. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 442. Collins, *Mark*, 745. Hartman, *Mark*, 630. Hartman points out that several parts of Mark 15 echo this Psalm. Cf. Gundry, *Mark*, 944–945.

2116 Donahue and Harrington suggest that this Psalm is “a model or even a script for the story of Jesus’ Passion and death.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 445. According to Gundry, “[w]e should resist the temptation to think that Mark means to show the fulfillment of OT prophecy by borrowing phraseology from Ps 22:19(18) when he describes the division of Jesus’ garments. He can assume his audience’s knowledge of Jesus’ predictions from his having recorded them earlier in order that the audience may note the fulfillment when it takes place. But he cannot assume his audience’s knowledge of the OT, for they repeatedly need his explanation of all things Jewish.” Gundry, *Mark*, 944–945. Gundry suggests that this event points out Jesus’ dignity by drawing attention to the desirability of his clothing. Collins suggests that Ps 21 portrays Jesus as a king. See Collins, *Mark*, 746.

2117 See “15:2–15: Jesus, Pilate, the Chief Priests, and the Crowd in Front of Pilate’s Residence” on page 490.

Jesus himself did not affirm that he was the King of the Jews,<sup>2118</sup> as he did when he was asked whether he was the Messiah (Mark 14:61–62). They may therefore perceive a discrepancy between Jesus' perception of himself as the Messiah and the charge against him. Earlier, Jesus redefined the concept of Messiah by negotiating cultural memory in a manner which enabled him to go beyond the political traditions which were associated with King David (Mark 12:35–37a).<sup>2119</sup> As King of the Jews Jesus' reign would be limited, but as King of the kingdom of God his reign is universal.

In the Gospel of Mark, Jesus is presented as the King of the kingdom of God. His mighty deeds and proclamation indicate the presence of the kingdom of God as a sacred, fluid, space. Moreover, the episode of the anointing of Jesus indicated that the values of his kingdom were not power and honor. As King of the kingdom of God, Jesus has power to determine the spatial practice of his fluid, sacred space. Because this space overlaps with the territory that is controlled by Jewish leaders, conflicts arise, leading to his imminent death. Against this backdrop, it is possible to regard Jesus as a political figure in the sense that he determines the values and ideology of his kingdom, but his values and his ideology are of the kind which subverts conventional ones.

Jesus never explicitly acknowledged the title "King of the Jews."<sup>2120</sup> Moreover, the simulation of Mark 15:2–15 on the basis of Pilate's perspective indicated that he considered Jesus to be innocent of the charges. Audience members may therefore conclude that Jesus is not a traditional, political king. Rather, he embodies the redefined role of the Messiah.

In Mark 15:27, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that "with him they crucified two robbers, one on his right and one on his left."<sup>2121</sup> These details may enhance transportation to the Markan world and promote the experience of being an invisible witness of this event. The reference object at this point is Jesus; hence, the descriptive reference frame is external. The adjective δεξιός may prime or activate Mark 10:37 and 10:40, and the adjective εὐώνυμος may prime or activate Mark 10:40.<sup>2122</sup> During that episode, James and John asked Jesus to sit at his right and at his left, but Jesus indicated that he was not at liberty to grant them their request. If audience members interpret the roles played by the two bandits against this backdrop, they may conclude that the honor expected by James and John is replaced by suffering and humiliation. In Mark 10:39, James and John made an utterance which could be interpreted as an assertive or a commissive point, and by means of this speech act they seemed to convince Jesus about their ability to emulate him. At this

2118 Collins points out that "[f]or the evangelist and his audiences, however, the inscription is ironic, because it unwittingly expresses the truth that Jesus is a king." Collins, *Mark*, 748.

2119 See "12:35–37a: Jesus Teaches in the Temple" on page 422.

2120 According to Hooker, "it is through crucifixion that Jesus is proclaimed as Messiah, and as the King of the Jews." Hooker, *A Commentary*, 373.

2121 According to Hooker, Jesus "is 'enthroned' on the cross, with an inscription telling the world who he is, and with two thieves occupying the places of honor at his right and his left (10.37)." Hooker, *A Commentary*, 372. For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 331. Heil suggests that the two robbers "serve as substitute disciples for James and John." Collins thinks that Mark 15:27 may evoke Isa 53:12. See Collins, *Mark*, 748. For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 443.

2122 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 748.

moment, audience members know that they have fled,<sup>2123</sup> but in the Gospel of Mark Jesus is presented as a reliable character. Accordingly, on the basis of Jesus' speech act in Mark 10:39b, audience members may assume that James and John may experience similar suffering later.<sup>2124</sup>

The extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to tell audience members about the behavior of people who passed by Jesus (Mark 15:29a). Once more, their role as side-participants and invisible witnesses of the event is facilitated by the information which is provided by the extradiegetic narrator. First, he presents a diegetic summary of speech acts uttered by these characters (ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτόν), then he describes actions which underline these speech acts (κινούντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν).<sup>2125</sup> The performer may incorporate these gestures into the performance of the gospel.<sup>2126</sup> One of the utterances of these characters is cited: "Aha! You who destroy the temple and build it in three days, save yourself by coming down from the cross!" (Mark 15:29b–30).

The first part of this utterance is constituted by an assertive point which serves as the basis for the subsequent directive points. The verbs καταλύω and οἰκοδομέω may prime or activate the testimony which was uttered against Jesus at the trial that took place at the residence of the high priest (Mark 14:58).<sup>2127</sup> Mark 15:29, as well as Mark 14:58, may prime or activate Mark 13:2. Once more, audience members may conclude that some characters, possibly the same characters who testified against Jesus in Mark 14:58, overheard Jesus' response to the disciple in Mark 13:2.<sup>2128</sup> Because Jesus did not state that he would rebuild the temple in three days, audience members may conclude that these characters are making a false assertion. The phrase ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις may prime or activate Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33–34 and 14:58. Jesus' three predictions were addressed to the disciples or to the twelve, but the testimony uttered in 14:58 as well as the assertive point uttered in Mark 15:29 may suggest that other characters possibly overheard these predictions and combined them with Jesus' prediction about the temple (Mark 13:2). As a result, these characters believe that the three days refer to the reconstruction of the temple, not to Jesus' resurrection. If audience members have been persuaded by the narrative rhetoric, they may regard Jesus as the cornerstone of the new community.<sup>2129</sup>

The interjection οὐά indicates that the following assertive point (ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, Mark 15:29) should be interpreted as an

2123 Collins points out that their positions are filled by people who are unworthy. See Collins, *Mark*, 748, 751.

2124 On the fact that "[t]he earliest and best witnesses of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text lack" Mark 15:28, see Metzger, *A Textual*, 99.

2125 Collins points out that Mark 15:29–32 may evoke Ps 21:8–9 (LXX) and Ps 108:25 (LXX). See Collins, *Mark*, 749.

2126 On implied gestures in Mark, see Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 135–137.

2127 On the connection between these events, see also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 262. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 373–374. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 443. Collins, *Mark*, 750–751.

2128 See "14:55–65: Jesus, the Chief Priests, and the Council" on page 479. With regard to Mark 15:31a, Collins points out that "[t]he chief priests and scribes would be more likely to know about the false testimony against Jesus than random passersby." Collins, *Mark*, 751.

2129 See "14:55–65: Jesus, the Chief Priests, and the Council" on page 479.

expression of scorn.<sup>2130</sup> “Those who passed by” (Mark 15:29a) apparently describe Jesus’ powers, but the interjection indicates that they are not sincere. The subsequent directive points, through which these characters command Jesus to save himself “by coming down from the cross” (Mark 15:30b), further underscore the insincerity of these characters. The first directive point constitutes the reason for the second point. The common preparatory condition of directive points is “that the hearer is capable of doing what he is directed to do.”<sup>2131</sup> However, the previous scorn and insincerity displayed by the characters who utter these directive points indicate that they do not think Jesus is able to perform these actions, nor do they want him to save himself. In this manner, this speech act also violates the general sincerity condition of directive illocutionary forces.<sup>2132</sup>

As side-participants, audience members process these speech acts on the basis of other events which they have witnessed as invisible witnesses in the Markan world. They have observed that Jesus saved many people through healings and exorcisms, and once they even witnessed him raise a little girl from the dead (Mark 5:21–24; 5:35–43). On the basis of these observations, audience members who have accepted Jesus’ identity will probably conclude that the scorn is misguided, and they may assume that Jesus is actually capable of saving himself. However, Jesus chooses “to submit himself to the mysterious plan of God,”<sup>2133</sup> which entails saving many (Mark 10:45; 14:24).<sup>2134</sup>

In Mark 15:31, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members that “in the same way the chief priests were also mocking him among themselves along with the scribes” (Mark 15:31a). Subsequently, he cites an example of this mockery. The verb ἐπαίζω constitutes a diegetic summary which the extradiegetic narrator employs in order to guide the manner in which audience members interpret the subsequent assertive points: “He saved others; he cannot save himself” (Mark 15:31b). Audience members may infer that the first assertive point refers to those characters whom Jesus healed or exorcised.<sup>2135</sup> I suggested above that audience members would regard Jesus’ mighty deeds as an indication that he would be able to save himself. At this point, the chief priests and scribes draw the opposite conclusion, presumably because Jesus is still hanging on the cross. Their conclusion may remind audience members of a common theme in the Gospel of Mark, viz. that Jesus’ power and mighty deeds are open to divergent interpretations. Audience members who have not been persuaded by the extradiegetic narrator to accept Jesus’ identity may empathize with the opinion held by these characters.

2130 On this interjection as “an expression of scornful wonder,” see BDAG, 734.

2131 See Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations*, 56.

2132 “All directive illocutionary forces have the general sincerity condition that the speaker wants or desires the hearer to do what he attempts to get him to do.” Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations*, 56.

2133 Collins, *Mark*, 750. Hooker points out that Jesus would deny that he is Messiah, if he were to save himself. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 374. Heil points out that “only God can and will save him by raising him after he has died (8:31, 34–38; 9:31; 10:34).” Heil, *The Gospel*, 332.

2134 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 332.

2135 The event where the girl was raised from the dead took place in private (Mark 5:37–43). On the fact that this assertion refers to Jesus’ mighty deeds, see also Collins, *Mark*, 751.

Their evaluation of Jesus' ability to save himself is succeeded by a directive point, which is addressed indirectly to Jesus.<sup>2136</sup> "Let the Messiah, the King of Israel, come down from the cross now" (Mark 15:32a).<sup>2137</sup> At this point, the perspective shifts. Earlier, the Gentiles labeled Jesus "King of the Jews" (Mark 15:26); now, Jesus is called "King of Israel," which suggests an inner-Jewish perspective.<sup>2138</sup> The assertive point, "in order that we may see and believe" (Mark 15:32b),<sup>2139</sup> succeeds their directive point.<sup>2140</sup> Through this speech act, the chief priests provide Jesus with a reason why he should "come down from the cross" (Mark 15:32a). As I pointed out in the comments to Mark 15:31, the fact that characters observe Jesus heal and exorcise unclean spirits from other people will not necessarily convince them that Jesus is able to save himself. Audience members may therefore question the propositional content of this phrase.

Mark 15:32 seems to put the aim of the extradiegetic narrator in a nutshell. The Gospel of Mark was probably created in order to transport audience members to the Markan world so that they could play the role as invisible witnesses of God's ultimate project, the new exodus. By staging them as invisible witnesses of Jesus' mighty deeds and by letting them process the speech acts uttered in the Markan world as side-participants and addressees, the extradiegetic narrator enables audience members to have vicarious experiences that may elicit faith or reinforce it. Against this backdrop, this episode thematizes the enigma constituted by the fact that some characters see and believe, whereas others are not persuaded by what they observe and hear.<sup>2141</sup> The main difference between these alternatives seems to be the framework within which the events are interpreted. Throughout the Gospel of Mark, the extradiegetic narrator employs assertions in order to create an adequate framework for this enterprise.

By means of an assertive point, audience members are informed that "those who were crucified with him also reviled him" (Mark 15:32c). As a result, audience members may conclude that Jesus undergoes a total humiliation at the hands of people passing by, of his opponents, and even of people who suffered the same fate.

As invisible witnesses to this event, audience members may simulate this event on the basis of the perspective of those who taunt Jesus, or else they may simulate the event from Jesus' perspective. In the first case, they may reflect on the problems

---

2136 Pilgaard points out that they will not demean themselves by addressing Jesus directly. See Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 371.

2137 "Here the irony is strikingly double in nature, operating at two different levels. First, the mockers are saying things they do not mean; they mockingly call Jesus the Christ, the King of Israel. Their words are ironic. But the second, deeper level of irony is that in the world of the story, their mocking words are in fact true. Jesus *is* the Christ, the King of Israel." Fowler, "Who Is 'the Reader,'" 52–53.

2138 See Gundry, *Mark*, 946–947. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 444. Collins, *Mark*, 750. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 371.

2139 This speech act may prime or activate Mark 8:11f. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 374.

2140 According to Collins, the premise of Mark 15:32, namely that seeing is believing, is not directly addressed anywhere else in the gospel. Collins, *Mark*, 750.

2141 See for instance "4:10–20: Jesus Teaches 'Those Around Him Along with the Twelve'" on page 208. With regard to Mark 15:32, Collins states, "even if these outsiders did see Jesus come down from the cross, they probably would still not believe." Collins, *Mark*, 750. On the basis of Mark 10:46–52, Heil points out that faith may precede seeing. Heil, *The Gospel*, 332.

of seeing and believing. In the latter case, they may empathize with Jesus' suffering. The performer, who may utter the speech acts voiced by those who taunt Jesus in a condescending manner, can stress the latter aspect.<sup>2142</sup> This device will probably elicit sympathy with Jesus.

### 15:33: From the Sixth to the Ninth Hour

Through the assertive point constituting Mark 15:33, the extradiegetic narrator summarizes what happened between the sixth and the ninth hour. "At the sixth hour, darkness came upon the whole land until the ninth hour." This speech act contains the temporal marker ὥρας ἕκτης . . . ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης,<sup>2143</sup> by means of which this episode is demarcated. The extradiegetic narrator focuses on an event which seems to function as a portent.

If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, the noun σκότος may prime or activate Amos 5:18; 5:20; Joel 2:1–2 and 3:4 (LXX)/2:31. These traditions deal with the day of the Lord. Moreover, the fact that lexical entries are content addressable may prime or activate Mark 13:24 (σκοτίζομαι).<sup>2144</sup> In this manner, audience members may interpret Jesus' death against the backdrop of a characteristic which signals the day of the Lord and the return of the Son of Man.

Audience members may also know that death is often associated with darkness. This miraculous portent was mentioned with regard to the death of Romulus, Cleomenes, Julius Caesar, Carneades, and Pelopidas.<sup>2145</sup> If audience members regard the darkness as a sign,<sup>2146</sup> it will underline the significance of Jesus himself and of his death.<sup>2147</sup> Audience members may thus draw on different traditions, Jewish or Greco-Roman, in order to understand this event.

### 15:34–41: Jesus Dies at the Ninth Hour

The extradiegetic narrator introduces this episode by means of the following assertive point: "At the ninth hour, Jesus cried out with a loud voice" (Mark 15:34a). This speech act contains the temporal marker τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ, which demarcates this epi-

2142 According to Shiner, it is the "mockery that involves the audience so deeply in the crucifixion." Shiner, *Proclaiming*, 182.

2143 Collins suggests that the time of Jesus' death is significant. Jesus died during "the second daily sacrifice of a lamb in the temple," and this would mean that his death was "a metaphorical sacrifice." Collins, *Mark*, 752–753.

2144 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 262. Heil suggests that the darkness characterizes Jesus' death "as a preliminary event of God's end-time with significance for the whole world." Heil, *The Gospel*, 334.

2145 See Shiner, "The Ambiguous," 8, 10. See also Collins, *Mark*, 752.

2146 According to Gundry, "[t]he supernatural character of the darkness . . . magnifies Mark's apologetic point: now that Jesus' prediction of mockery has reached complete fulfilment, God hides his Son from the blasphemers' leering." Gundry, *Mark*, 947. Hooker regards the darkness as a symbol of "the judgement that comes upon the land of Israel with the rejection of Israel's king." Hooker, *A Commentary*, 376. Donahue and Harrington suggest that the cosmos mourns the death of Jesus, the Son of God. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 447.

2147 See also Collins, *Mark*, 752.

sode. Through this assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator underscores the manner in which Jesus uttered the subsequent speech act.<sup>2148</sup> Then Jesus' speech act is cited and translated by the extradiegetic narrator: ελωι ελωι λεμα σαβαχθανι; ὁ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον· ὁ θεός μου ὁ θεός μου, εἰς τί ἐγκατέλιπές με; (Mark 15:34b). The fact that Jesus' directive point is translated indicates that at least some audience members are unfamiliar with Aramaic.<sup>2149</sup> By including these words in Aramaic, the extradiegetic narrator enables audience members to hear Jesus' utterance voiced in the language which Jesus spoke. This device may reinforce the experience of being transported to the Markan world.

If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, Jesus' utterance may prime or activate Ps 21:1 (LXX). In that case, audience members may recognize that Jesus is expressing his feeling of being abandoned by God through scripts that were offered to him by the tradition. Audience members may interpret these utterances as a prayer,<sup>2150</sup> but Jesus is clearly challenging God to help and support him.<sup>2151</sup> He prays to God in order to be saved.<sup>2152</sup>

Subsequently the extradiegetic narrator utters another assertive point, καὶ τινες τῶν παρεστηκότων ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον (Mark 15:35a). On the basis of the perceptual verb ἀκούω, audience members may attribute to the bystanders the perception of Jesus' earlier speech act. Because the extradiegetic narrator has already cited this speech act to audience members, the effect of this attribution is diminished. As a result, this assertive point primarily informs audience members that these characters overheard Jesus' former speech act. Audience members may conclude that the subsequent speech act uttered by these characters is motivated by Jesus' cry. By means of an assertive point, these characters express their interpretation of Jesus' previous speech act: ἴδε Ἡλίαν φωνεῖ (Mark 15:35b).<sup>2153</sup> Elijah has been mentioned several times during the narration. Accordingly, Mark 15:35b may prime or activate Mark 6:15; 8:28; 9:4–5 and 9:11–13. The latter event suggests that John the Baptist primarily embodies Elijah in the Gospel of Mark. Audience members who have heard both the Aramaic utterance and the translation provided by the extradiegetic narrator may not question the sincerity of these characters, but they have clearly heard that the

2148 The performer of the Gospel of Mark may consider this information as an indication that this utterance should be expressed in a louder voice than other speech acts.

2149 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 755.

2150 According to Searle, the difference between entreating and praying is constituted by the fact that God or another sacred person or entity is addressed when one prays. See Searle and Vanderveken, *Foundations*, 204–205.

2151 For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 754–755.

2152 See also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 263. "Das Wort des (scheinbar) völlig Verlassenen – nun sogar von Gott selber – deutet das, was hier geschieht, daß nämlich allein von Gott Rettung kommt, der den Gerechten ins Recht setzt (Ps 22,9)."

2153 These bystanders are probably Jews, because they are familiar with traditions about Elijah. See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 376. Collins, *Mark*, 755. Hartman, *Mark*, 645. According to Hartman, these Jews should have been able to distinguish between these two words. Thus, they "have malevolently chosen to misunderstand."



word ελωι does not refer to Elijah. They will therefore deduce that these characters have misunderstood Jesus' utterance.<sup>2154</sup>

In Mark 15:36, the extradiegetic narrator employs an assertive point to inform audience members of actions that take place in the Markan world. Because the extradiegetic narrator does not employ perceptual verbs at this point, audience members will probably attribute the perception of these actions to the extradiegetic narrator: δραμῶν δέ τις [καί] γεμίσας σπόγγον ὄξους περιθεις καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτὸν λέγων (Mark 15:36a).

Provided that audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, the noun ὄξος may prime or activate Num 6:3 and Ps 68:22 (LXX)/69:21. If Num 6:3 is activated, audience members may interpret this event as a temptation to break a vow to God, which for instance was expressed by not drinking sour wine. If Ps 68:22 is activated, the fact that Jesus is offered sour wine can be interpreted as an act performed by enemies.<sup>2155</sup> On the basis of the way in which sour wine was used by ordinary people in antiquity and of the narrative context, Collins suggests “that the implied reason for giving Jesus the sour wine was to cool any fever he may have had, to quench his thirst, and thus to extend his life a bit longer so that the bystanders could see whether Elijah would come.”<sup>2156</sup>

This action is succeeded by the following speech act: “Let us see whether Elijah comes to take him down” (Mark 15:36b). Audience members may process this speech act as a directive point, through which the speaker proposes or suggests that the bystanders should observe this event to find out whether Elijah will respond to Jesus' cry.<sup>2157</sup> In Mark 6:15 and 8:28, other characters in the Markan world seemed to think that Jesus was Elijah; but these characters apparently realize that he is not Elijah. The speech act in Mark 15:36b is thus interpreted against the backdrop of Mark 15:35, where Jesus was believed to call for Elijah. If audience members are familiar with cultural memory grounded in the LXX, they will know that Elijah was associated with mighty deeds (4 Kgdms 2:8) and that he ascended to heaven (4 Kgdms 2:1–12).<sup>2158</sup> If audience members interpret the utterance of this anonymous character against this backdrop, his speech act may indicate that he thinks Elijah will be able to save Jesus. Audience members who have realized that John the Baptist primarily embodies Elijah in the Gospel of Mark will know that he cannot save Jesus. He is already dead.<sup>2159</sup>

By means of the assertive point related in Mark 15:37, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that “Jesus uttered a loud cry and expired.” Because the extradiegetic narrator does not employ perceptual verbs at this point, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to him. This phrase contains a diegetic summary of Jesus' speech act, which focuses on the manner in which it was uttered. The content of Jesus' cry is not related.

2154 Heil suggests that this mistake is caused by the resemblance in sound between the Aramaic address ελωι and the name of the prophet. Heil, *The Gospel*, 335.

2155 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 263.

2156 Collins, *Mark*, 757. For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 335.

2157 On the fact that the speaker probably is one of the Jewish bystanders, see Collins, *Mark*, 756.

2158 On these traditions, see also Collins, *Mark*, 755.

2159 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 335.

The extradiegetic narrator then utters another assertive point by means of which audience members are informed that “the curtain of the temple was split in two, from top to bottom” (Mark 15:38). Because this speech act does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may again attribute to the extradiegetic narrator the perception of what takes place in the Markan world. At this point, the perceiver observes what happens at another location, viz. the temple. Since the reference frame is external,<sup>2160</sup> the positional constraints are weak. Audience members may therefore construct a position for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of the curtain which separates the holy place from the Holy of Holies (Exod 26:33).<sup>2161</sup> The extradiegetic narrator subsequently describes the manner in which the curtain was torn in two, but audience members are not allowed to see what was behind this curtain, i.e. the Holy of Holies, which “was like heaven devoted to God.”<sup>2162</sup>

The event that takes place in the temple seems to constitute the immediate effect of Jesus’ death, which is highlighted by the fact that the extradiegetic narrator subsequently continues to relate what happens at Golgotha when Jesus dies. In this manner, Jesus’ death is intimately tied to the spatial practice in the temple. The fact that the extradiegetic narrator indicates that the perceiver has access to the holy of holies may prime or activate Mark 11:17.<sup>2163</sup> In that case, Gentile audience members may realize the meaning of the phrase “my house shall be called a house of prayer for all the nations?” (Mark 11:17), because they now have access to the holy of holies in the temple, and thus direct access to God.<sup>2164</sup>

Because the assertive point which constitutes Mark 15:39a (“when the centurion who was standing opposite him saw that he expired in this way”) contains a participle of the perceptual verb ὀράω, audience members will probably attribute the perception of Jesus’ last breath to the centurion. Jesus seems to constitute the reference object at this point; hence, the reference frame is external. Audience members will therefore construct a position for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of Jesus and the centurion. The details of the centurion’s observation are not related, presumably because audience members have observed this event previously through the eyes of the extradiegetic narrator. Audience members may assume that the centurion has observed the same events, except for the rending of the temple veil.<sup>2165</sup>

2160 In this case, the axes of the reference frame are intrinsic to the object described. See Bortolussi and Dixon, *Psychonarratology*, 187.

2161 On the fact that the inner curtain is meant, see also Collins, *Mark*, 760.

2162 Josephus, *Ant.* 3.123 (Thackeray, LCL).

2163 For related insights, see Hartman, *Mark*, 646.

2164 The temple is part of the setting which constitutes the Markan world. For an overview of various interpretations of the rending of the veil, see Collins, *Mark*, 762–764. Lührmann suggests that “[d]ie Öffnung des Tempels ... bedeutet seine Profanierung und weist damit voraus auf seine Zerstörung (vgl. 13,14).” Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 264. According to Gundry, “Mark transliterates the Aramaic of the shout because the mystique of an oriental foreign language carries the connotation of power .... Here, the power will turn out so superhuman that the breath-Spirit which Jesus exhales in shouting the Aramaic makes a wind strong enough to rend the veil of the temple.” Gundry, *Mark*, 948. Hooker states, “[i]f barriers are broken down through the death of Jesus, even Gentiles can now enter.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 378.

2165 Shiner states that “[t]he relationship between the rending of the temple veil and the pronouncement of the centurion is less clear. Although the temple veil would not actually be visible from Golgotha, it is

The centurion's perception seems to constitute the basis for his subsequent assertive point: ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν (Mark 15:39b).<sup>2166</sup> The centurion may regard what he observes when Jesus dies as portents that are appropriate for the death of a *son of God*.<sup>2167</sup> The fact that the centurion is a Gentile may suggest to audience members that his utterance is based on a Hellenistic framework,<sup>2168</sup> but on another level, it reinforces the claim of the extradiegetic narrator, i.e. that Jesus is *the Son of God*. Because lexical entries are content addressable, this assertive point may prime or activate Mark 1:11; 3:11; 5:7; 9:7 and 14:61, where Jesus was called Son of God, or where an equivalent designation was employed.<sup>2169</sup> Accordingly, Jesus' identity as Son of God is emphasized when significant events take place in the Markan world, first and foremost during the baptism, the transfiguration, the trial, and the crucifixion. During the baptism, only Jesus and audience members heard God's declarative point. In Mark 9:7, Peter, James, and John also heard God's voice. During the crucifixion, a Roman centurion utters the speech act which defines Jesus in the Gospel of Mark.<sup>2170</sup>

Through another assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that "there were also women watching from a distance" (Mark 15:40a). Audience members may construct this event in such a way that they attribute to the extradiegetic narrator the perception of the women. The adverb μακρόθεν indicates the reference frame, but the reference object is not stated explicitly. Audience members may deduce that the reference object is still Jesus and the cross; hence, the reference frame is external. Based on the subsequent perceptual verb θεωρέω, audience members may attribute to the women the observation of Jesus' death. As a result, audience members may conclude that the extradiegetic narrator has perceptual access to these characters. The fact that the extradiegetic narrator has earlier described Jesus' death may explain why audience members are not informed of what these women actually observe. Alternatively, audience members may continue to attribute to the extradiegetic narrator the perception of these events. If the latter option is chosen, the extradiegetic narrator observes the women, who witness the event from a distance.

---

unlikely that Mark's listeners knew the geography of Jerusalem well enough to know that. The listener's natural assumption would be that the veil is visible since the whole scene otherwise takes place on Golgotha." Shiner, "The Ambiguous," 10. This assumption seems to be unwarranted. The extradiegetic narrator has previously related by means of intercalation what happened at the same time at different locations. On the difficulty of constraining the position of the extradiegetic narrator when he is omniscient, see Bortolussi and Dixon, *Psychonarratology*, 190. According to Gundry, the centurion observes the rending of the veil. See Gundry, *Mark*, 950. For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 449.

2166 Lührmann regards this utterance as a confession. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 264. See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 449. Heil, *The Gospel*, 336–338. Heil regards the centurion as a substitute disciple.

2167 See Shiner, "The Ambiguous," 4, 8, 9, at 9. Shiner mentions four events that may function as portents: "the loud cry with which he died, the darkness from noon to three o'clock which preceded his death, the splitting of the temple veil, and the rapidity of Jesus' death." For the fact that the utterance of the centurion constitutes a response to omen(s), see Collins, *Mark*, 765.

2168 See Shiner, "The Ambiguous," 4.

2169 For a similar point, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 337–338. Shiner, "The Ambiguous," 19–20.

2170 See Ph. Vielhauer, "Erwägungen," esp. 205–210.

The extradiegetic narrator employs another assertive point to identify some of these characters to audience members,<sup>2171</sup> ἐν αἷς καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσήτος μήτηρ καὶ Σαλώμη (Mark 15:40b). The first Mary is identified by means of her home town, Magdala. The second Mary is identified as the mother of James the younger and Joses.<sup>2172</sup> The third woman is introduced only by means of her first name, Salome. In Mark 6:3, audience members learned that Jesus' mother was called Mary and that he had a brother named James. This backdrop may explain why the extradiegetic narrator introduces the two Marys by referring to the first woman's hometown and to the second woman's familial relations (Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ). He seems to emphasize that neither of these Marys is the mother of Jesus.<sup>2173</sup>

Audience members are subsequently told that these women "followed him and served him when he was in Galilee" (Mark 15:41a). This assertive point constitutes an analepsis which informs audience members of actions which these women performed while Jesus was still in Galilee. These women are characterized by means of indirect presentation,<sup>2174</sup> i.e. by means of actions which they perform (ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ καὶ διεκόνουν αὐτῷ). The imperfect form of the verb indicates that the extradiegetic narrator regards these activities as habits.<sup>2175</sup> The verb ἀκολουθέω may prime or activate events where different characters followed Jesus, events where characters were urged to follow him, and events where different aspects of this activity were treated (Mark 1:18; 2:14; 2:15; [3:7]; 5:24; 6:1; 8:34; 9:38; 10:21; 10:28; 10:32; 10:52; 11:9; 14:54). The events which are primed or activated by the verb ἀκολουθέω indicate that this action is not performed exclusively by the disciples or the twelve.<sup>2176</sup> However, this verb denotes an important characteristic of the relationship which members of these character groups have with Jesus. As a result, some scholars have interpreted these women as disciples.<sup>2177</sup> The verb διακονέω may prime or activate Mark 1:13, where angels waited on Jesus, and Mark 1:31, where Simon's mother-in-law served Jesus, Simon, Andrew, James, and John. Moreover, this verb may prime or activate Mark 10:45, where Jesus presented the Son of Man as a person who came to serve. When the Son of Man is presented in this manner, he epitomizes the model servant, an ideal which Jesus presented to his addressees in Mark 10:43–45. Because both verbs (ἀκολουθέω and διακονέω) are employed to characterize these women, audience members may conclude that they are female disciples. Against this backdrop, audience members may conclude that some of Jesus' disciples were present and observed his death, albeit from a distance.

2171 On the identification of characters, see Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 97.

2172 Hooker suggests that James the younger and Joses "were well known to Mark's readers (cf. v.21)." Hooker, *A Commentary*, 379.

2173 On the fact that the second Mary should not be identified with the mother of Jesus, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 264. Collins, *Mark*, 774. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 1060.

2174 On indirect presentation, see Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 61–67.

2175 For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 449–450.

2176 See also Malbon, "Fallible Followers." Malbon, "Disciples," 107–110.

2177 See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 449. Heil suggests that they are ideal disciples. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 338.

The extradiegetic narrator employs the last assertive point which constitutes Mark 15:41 to inform audience members that “there were many other women who had come up with him to Jerusalem.” On the basis of this information, audience members may infer that women were present among the anonymous characters to whom Mark 10:32 referred.<sup>2178</sup>

As invisible witnesses of Jesus’ death, audience members are enabled to observe its significance with regard to their own relationship with God. As a direct result of his death, they are allowed to have access to him – Jews as well as Gentiles.

### 15:42–47: When the Evening of the Preparation Day Had Come

Mark 15:42–47 is demarcated by means of the temporal marker ἡδὴ ὀψίας γενομένης, ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευὴ ὃ ἐστὶν προσάββατον (Mark 15:42). This episode in turn is made up of minor episodes which are demarcated by means of spatial markers and character markers.

#### 15:42–45: Joseph of Arimathea Went to Pilate

The extradiegetic narrator introduces this episode by uttering an assertive point which points out to audience members when this event took place (Mark 15:42). Audience members learn that it is already evening on the day of preparation.<sup>2179</sup> The extradiegetic narrator elucidates the word παρασκευὴ by means of the word προσάββατον. Because the extradiegetic narrator explains this word, all the audience members,<sup>2180</sup> Jews as well as Gentiles, may understand the motivation for the subsequent actions.<sup>2181</sup> Through another assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator introduces a character by the name of Joseph to audience members.<sup>2182</sup> Joseph is presented as a man from Arimathea, as a prominent member of the council,<sup>2183</sup> and as a man “who was also himself waiting for the kingdom of God” (Mark 15:43a). The second of these characteristics may indicate to audience members that Joseph was an influential man,<sup>2184</sup> whereas the

2178 See also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 450. “Again for the first time (!) Mark acknowledges the existence of a larger band of women travelers on the journey to Jerusalem than simply Jesus and the Twelve.” On the fact that they were traveling with Jesus on the journey that began in Mark 8:27, see also van Iersel, *Mark*, 489.

2179 Lührmann points out the temporal connection between Mark 15:1 and 15:42. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 266.

2180 According to Donahue and Harrington, Mark thought that his readers needed this explanation. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 453.

2181 “Die Begründung ... für das folgende wird nicht mit der Vorschrift Dtn 21,22f gegeben, daß ein Toter nicht über Nacht am Kreuz hängen bleiben darf, sondern mit dem bevorstehenden Sabbat” Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 266.

2182 The character marker Ἰωσήφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας contributes to the demarcation of this episode.

2183 On the opinion that Joseph is not a member of the Sanhedrin, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 267. Cf. Heil, *The Gospel*, 340. Gundry, *Mark*, 980–981. van Iersel, *Mark*, 490. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 453. According to them, Joseph had condemned Jesus to death, because the whole council took part in the trial against Jesus.

2184 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 267. Hooker, *A Commentary*, 381.

last feature may suggest that he was one of Jesus' adherents. In the Gospel of Mark, the kingdom of God is always associated with Jesus, i.e. with his teaching, preaching, mighty deeds, and future coming. If these events are activated, audience members will probably interpret Joseph's subsequent actions against this backdrop.<sup>2185</sup> By stating that Joseph was "waiting for the kingdom of God" (Mark 15:43a), the extradiegetic narrator characterizes him in a manner which indicates that he knows about the kingdom of God, a characteristic which is connected in the Markan world first and foremost with "those around him along with the twelve" (Mark 4:10–11). Against this backdrop, audience members may regard him as a sympathizer of Jesus.<sup>2186</sup>

After the elaborate introduction of Joseph, the extradiegetic narrator employs another assertive point to tell audience members that Joseph "summoned up courage, went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus" (Mark 15:43b).<sup>2187</sup> This speech act informs audience members of Joseph's goal, and they may simulate this episode by constantly evaluating the likelihood of his success or failure. The fact that it was the day before the Sabbath (Mark 15:42) seems to motivate Joseph's actions (Mark 15:43). If audience members are familiar with Jewish funeral rites, Mark 15:42–43 may point out to them that Joseph wishes to bury Jesus according to Jewish customs, i.e. before sunset.<sup>2188</sup> The fact that this event takes place on the day of preparation also indicates that Jesus should be buried while one was still permitted to work.<sup>2189</sup>

This event may prime or activate Mark 6:29, where the disciples of John the Baptist took his body and laid it in a tomb.<sup>2190</sup> If Mark 6:29 is activated, audience members may interpret the subsequent events against this backdrop. If they regard Joseph as one of Jesus' adherents,<sup>2191</sup> audience members may conclude that at least one of Jesus' companions came to obtain his body. Consequently, there is no major contrast between the burial of John the Baptist and that of Jesus; rather, their deaths and

2185 According to Hartman, Joseph's religious attitude, which Hartman relates to the term "reign of God," may motivate his actions. See Hartman, *Mark*, 648.

2186 See also Heil, *The Gospel*, 340.

2187 This assertive point contains the spatial marker πρὸς τὸν Πιλάτον and the character marker τὸν Πιλάτον, both of which contribute to the demarcation of this episode.

2188 For Jewish funeral rites, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 381. Collins, *Mark*, 775–776.

2189 Cf. Hartman, *Mark*, 647. Hartman does not think that audience members will reflect on what actions a Jew was allowed to perform on the Sabbath. Lührmann claims that Mark has confused the Jewish and the Roman system of day-reckoning: "Nach jüdischer Tagesrechnung wäre jedoch der in 42 angegebene Zeitpunkt bereits Teil des Sabbats ... Mk hat demnach die griechische bzw. römische Tagesrechnung mit der jüdischen vermischt; erneut zeigt sich, daß Mk nur pauschale Kenntnisse über jüdische Verhältnisse besitzt." Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 267. On the fact that the Sabbath had already begun, see also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 380. Hooker suggests that the point was to bury Jesus before dusk. For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 453.

2190 For related insights, see van Iersel, *Mark*, 490–491.

2191 Cf. Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 267. "Der Relativsatz charakterisiert ihn weiter als einen, der wie Jesus und seine Jünger das Reich Gottes erwartete, ohne zu ihnen zu gehören." According to Hooker, Joseph was not necessarily sympathetic to Jesus' cause. Against the backdrop of Jewish traditions, Hooker states: "Far from being a secret follower of Jesus acting out of devotion to him, therefore, Joseph may have regarded Jesus' body as a curse to the land which needed to be disposed of as soon as possible." Hooker, *A Commentary*, 381. Gundry, Donahue, and Harrington do not regard Joseph as a disciple. See Gundry, *Mark*, 980. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 453. Heil suggests that he is a substitute disciple. Heil, *The Gospel*, 340–341.

entombments are parallel events. Alternatively, audience members could regard Joseph's action merely "as an act of piety in obedience to the law."<sup>2192</sup>

The verb *τολμάω*, which the extradiegetic narrator employs to characterize Joseph's attitude and action, can be perceived as a contrast to Peter's attitude and actions in Mark 14:54 and 14:66–72. Furthermore, audience members may recognize a contrast between Joseph and the women who were characterized in Mark 15:40–41. Although Peter was following Jesus, the fact that he was following him from a distance probably suggested to some audience members that Peter was a coward.<sup>2193</sup> This impression was substantiated by the fact that Peter subsequently denied Jesus. Similarly, the women who observed what happened when Jesus died were located at a distance. The distance between these women and Jesus may suggest to audience members that they too were cowards. In contrast, Joseph's action is described as a bold endeavor.

Audience members may know that corpses were often left on the cross, and thus were exposed to animals. At special times, however, relatives were allowed to bury those who had been crucified.<sup>2194</sup> Against this backdrop, it would make sense to characterize Joseph's act as an act of courage.<sup>2195</sup> In Mark 15:43b, the extradiegetic narrator merely makes a diegetic summary of Joseph's directive point, which audience members may regard as a request.

Through Mark 15:44, the extradiegetic narrator tells audience members about the actual perlocutionary effect of Joseph's speech act. On the basis of the verb *θαυμάζω*, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator knowledge of Pilate's thoughts. This verb may prime or activate Mark 5:20, where this verb described the reactions of people who heard the proclamation of the former demoniac. This verb may also prime or activate Jesus' reaction to the unbelief of people in his hometown (Mark 6:6) and Pilate's reaction when Jesus did not respond to the charges against him (Mark 15:5). Here, the verb probably indicates that Pilate was taken by surprise. He did not expect that Jesus would be dead so soon.<sup>2196</sup>

2192 Collins, *Mark*, 776.

2193 Heil points out that Joseph's courage "stands in sharp contrast with the cowardice of the Galilean disciples who have betrayed, deserted and denied their master." Heil, *The Gospel*, 340.

2194 See Collins, *Mark*, 775. Hartman, *Mark*, 633–634, 648.

2195 Hartman points out that Pilate could make an exception to the conventional practice. It could be risky to make such a request, especially if one was not related to the convict. In that case, one could be regarded as a sympathizer. See Hartman, *Mark*, 648. It would probably be easier for Pilate to grant this request, because he regarded Jesus as innocent. Heil suggests that Joseph "risks loss of his 'distinguished' status by giving proper burial to the criminal whom his own council has condemned to an ignominious death." Heil, *The Gospel*, 340.

2196 People could suffer for two days on the cross before they died. Accordingly, the process should take longer than six hours. See Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 454. Hartman, *Mark*, 645, 648. For related insights, see Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 377. Collins suggests that "[a] plausible explanation for Mark's introduction of the motif that Pilate marveled at how soon Jesus had died is that the relatively quick death is portrayed as a divine response to Jesus' complaint in v. 34 that God had abandoned him." Collins, *Mark*, 778. For related insights, see Tolbert, *Sowing*, 287.



By means of an assertive point, audience members are informed that Pilate “summoned the centurion and asked him whether he had died long ago” (Mark 15:44b).<sup>2197</sup> This speech act contains one diegetic summary and one indirect content paraphrase of directive points. The actual perlocutionary effects of the second directive point are related in Mark 15:45. The extradiegetic narrator tells audience members that Pilate “learned from the centurion” (Mark 15:45a).<sup>2198</sup> On the basis of this assertive point, audience members may infer that the centurion verifies Jesus’ death. Subsequently, the extradiegetic narrator utters an assertive point, which points out the perlocutionary effect of this inferred speech act. By means of an indirect content paraphrase of a directive point, audience members hear that Pilate “granted the corpse to Joseph” (Mark 15:45b). Accordingly, audience members will conclude that Joseph was successful.

### 15:46–47: Joseph Lays Jesus in a Tomb

In Mark 15:46, the extradiegetic narrator utters an assertive point which describes to audience members several actions performed by Joseph. Because this assertive point does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator the perception of these actions. On the basis of the narration, audience members will in turn observe these events from the position they construct for the extradiegetic narrator. Audience members learn that Joseph bought a linen cloth, took him down from the cross, wrapped him in the linen cloth, laid him in a tomb, and “rolled a stone against the opening of the tomb” (Mark 15:46e).<sup>2199</sup> In this manner, the extradiegetic narrator and audience members play the role of invisible witnesses of actions which take place at several different locations. The first three actions are summarized briefly, whereas the fourth and fifth are described in a more elaborate manner through the depiction of the tomb and the stone. This description enables audience members to construct a more vivid picture of Jesus’ burial and of the tomb in which he was laid.

The extradiegetic narrator subsequently employs an assertive point to tell audience members that “Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Jesus saw where he was laid” (Mark 15:47).<sup>2200</sup> This character constellation may prime or activate Mark 15:40–41, where the extradiegetic narrator introduced three female characters to audience members.<sup>2201</sup> If this event is primed or activated, audience members will probably conclude that these two female characters are identical with the two char-

2197 On the fact that this is the centurion who observed Jesus’ crucifixion, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 454.

2198 Heil states that the centurion “gives the definitive witness that Jesus has really died.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 341.

2199 This assertive point contains the spatial marker ἐν μνημείῳ, which contributes to the demarcation of this episode. On the fact that ointment or anointing is not mentioned, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 381. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 455. Collins, *Mark*, 776, 779. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 377. Collins points out that those who were wealthy used this type of tomb. See Collins, *Mark*, 776.

2200 This assertive point contains the character markers Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή and Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσήτος, which contribute to the demarcation of this episode.

2201 Heil points out that these women were witnesses to Jesus’ ministry in Galilee, to his crucifixion, and to his burial. Accordingly, “these women disciples are uniquely qualified and prepared to witness the

acters called Mary in Mark 15:40. The extradiegetic narrator once more employs the place of origin and familial relations to identify these women to audience members. Audience members may also notice that Salome is not mentioned. The fact that these women were introduced to audience members at an earlier stage may explain why only one of the sons of the second Mary is mentioned at this point.

On the basis of the perceptual verb θεωρέω, audience members may attribute to the two women the perception of this event. Accordingly, the extradiegetic narrator has perceptual access to them. If sustained, this attribution may facilitate identification with these women. Alternatively, audience members may continue to attribute to the extradiegetic narrator the perception of this event. In that case, they observe that these women witness this event. The latter option is more likely, because this perceptual verb is not combined with other indications of perceptual attribution or similar devices.

The extradiegetic narrator does not tell audience members what these women see. However, audience members may infer this information on the basis of what they themselves have observed as invisible witnesses of Jesus' burial. If audience members make these inferences, this process may facilitate empathy or identification with these women.

As invisible witnesses and side-participants to this event, audience members hear and observe that Jesus is in fact dead.

### 16:1–8: When the Sabbath Was Over

This episode is demarcated by means of the temporal marker διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου (Mark 16:1).<sup>2202</sup> Minor episodes that constitute this episode are demarcated by means of temporal markers, spatial markers, and character markers.

#### 16:1: Mary Magdalene, Mary the Mother of James, and Salome Buy Spices

By means of an assertive point, the extradiegetic narrator informs audience members about what happened “when the sabbath was over” (Mark 16:1a). Audience members are told that “Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Salome bought fragrant oils” (Mark 16:1b). This assertive point contains the following character markers Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, Μαρία ἡ [τοῦ] Ἰακώβου, and Σαλώμη, through which this episode is demarcated. This character constellation may prime or activate Mark 15:40 as well as Mark 15:47, where all three or two of these female characters were portrayed as witnesses to Jesus' death and burial. This time, the second Mary is introduced by means of her family relations with the first of the two male characters referred to in

---

predicted resurrection of Jesus from the dead (15:47).<sup>2</sup> Heil, *The Gospel*, 341–342, at 342. On their role as witnesses, see also Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 455. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 378.

2202 This temporal marker connects this episode with the previous one. See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 269. Gundry, *Mark*, 988. Upton, *Hearing*, 137. Collins, *Mark*, 794. Hartman, *Mark*, 655, 659. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 381.

Mark 15:40; however, the epithet “the younger” is not mentioned.<sup>2203</sup> In contrast to these previous events, these women are not characterized as passive witnesses; rather, they themselves carry out an action. Because the extradiegetic narrator does not employ perceptual verbs when these events are related, audience members may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator the perception of these characters and the actions they perform. By means of the last assertive point which constitutes Mark 16:1, the extradiegetic narrator points out the plan and goal of these characters, i.e. they want to “go and anoint him” (Mark 16:1c).<sup>2204</sup> This information facilitates the simulation of the plan and goal of these women, and audience members may assess the likelihood of their success or failure as the narration continues.

The verb ἀλείφω may prime or activate Mark 14:3–9, where the anonymous woman anointed Jesus.<sup>2205</sup> Jesus employed the verb μυρίζω (Mark 14:8) when he referred to her action, but lexical entries are content addressable. Mark 14:3–9 may therefore be primed or activated. The fact that Jesus informed his addressee that “she anointed my body beforehand for its burial” (Mark 14:8b) may enhance the priming or activation of Mark 14:3–9. If Mark 14:3–9 is activated, audience members may wonder why these characters go to the tomb to anoint Jesus. If these characters were with Jesus when he was anointed, they ought to know that this action is superfluous.<sup>2206</sup> To explain the intent of these women, audience members may make one of the two following inferences: (1) These women were not present when Jesus was anointed in Bethany.<sup>2207</sup> (2) These women were present, but they did not understand the implications of the woman’s action or Jesus’ interpretation of it. This event is, however, even more complicated. In Mark 15:41, audience members were informed that these women went up with Jesus to Jerusalem. On the basis of this information, audience members may infer that they were present when Jesus predicted that he would rise after three days.<sup>2208</sup> Accordingly, their intention to anoint Jesus’ dead body on the third day may indicate to audience members that these women had misunderstood Jesus’ predictions. Alternatively, they did not believe that he was a true prophet.<sup>2209</sup> Audience members may evaluate the subsequent actions of these women according to their goal, i.e. to anoint Jesus. If however audience members believe that Jesus is a true prophet, whose predictions will manifest themselves as prophecies, they may

2203 On these women, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 383. Gundry, *Mark*, 989. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 457. Collins, *Mark*, 794. Hartman, *Mark*, 659–660.

2204 One would normally prepare a corpse for burial by anointing it. See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 383. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 457.

2205 For the fact that Jesus was already anointed for burial, see also Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 269.

2206 Heil suggests that their intention to anoint Jesus carries on their service to him as disciples. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 346. “Their wish to ‘anoint’ the body of Jesus arouses dramatic tension for the reader, as it clashes with the fact that Jesus’ body has already been anointed for burial by the woman at Bethany (14:3–9).”

2207 According to Heil, the women are apparently unaware that Jesus has been anointed. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 346.

2208 The predictions in Mark 8:31 and 9:31 were addressed to the disciples.

2209 Heil proposes that these women do not expect that Jesus’ passion predictions will be fulfilled. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 346.

believe that the plan and goal of these three women are doomed to failure.<sup>2210</sup> Then again, resurrection from the dead is indeed an extraordinary happening.

### 16:2–7: Very Early on the First Day of the Week They Came to the Tomb

This episode is demarcated by means of the temporal markers *λίαν πρωί τῆ μιᾶ τῶν σαββάτων* and *ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου* and the spatial marker *ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον* (Mark 16:2).

#### 16:2–4: Outside the Tomb

The extradiegetic narrator employs another assertive point to inform audience members of the particular time at which this episode takes place, viz. “very early in the morning on the first day of the week, when the sun had risen” (Mark 16:2). By means of a second assertive point, audience members are told that “they went to the tomb” (Mark 16:2).<sup>2211</sup> Because the extradiegetic narrator does not employ perceptual verbs at this moment, audience members will probably attribute to him the perception of this action. Since the narration enables audience members to construct the event from the location of the perceiver, they too become invisible witnesses of this event. The phrase *ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον* indicates that the reference frame is external; audience members may thus construct a position for the perceiver in the immediate vicinity of the tomb.

In Mark 16:3, the extradiegetic narrator utters an assertive point which informs audience members that these women said something to each other. The extradiegetic narrator subsequently cites this speech act, and audience members will process it on the basis of their role as side-participants. The question uttered by these women (“Who will roll away the stone for us from the opening of the tomb?” Mark 16:3b) is a deliberation, and as such an assertive point.<sup>2212</sup> The propositional content may prime or activate Mark 15:46–47, where Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Jesus observed Jesus’ burial.<sup>2213</sup> On the basis of the information revealed by this question, audience members may find it less likely that these women will be able to enter the tomb, unless there are other characters present at the tomb when they arrive. Accordingly, an obstacle to the plan and goal of these women is pointed out, and this creates suspense.<sup>2214</sup>

2210 Van Iersel draws attention to the dramatic irony in this episode. “[T]hey intend to anoint a dead body which has already been anointed, and which, if Jesus’ words have come true, is no longer dead.” van Iersel, *Mark*, 494. For related insights, see Collins, *Mark*, 794.

2211 In this case, the spatial marker which demarcates this episode is implied.

2212 See “II.5.3.1. Types of Speech Acts” on page 64, suggestives.

2213 According to Hooker, “Mark’s purpose is to underline the fact that the tomb had been firmly closed, and that the women had no expectation of finding it open, so he enables us to share their surprise at finding that the stone had been rolled away.” Hooker, *A Commentary*, 384.

2214 According to Heil, their question creates suspense, which “builds as they ‘look up’ and see that the large stone already ‘had been rolled back.’” Heil, *The Gospel*, 346. See also Collins, *Mark*, 795.

By means of another assertive point, audience members are told that these women look up (Mark 16:4). The perceptual verbs ἀναβλέπω and θεωρέω as well as information which reveals to audience members what these characters saw (ἀποκεκύλισται ὁ λίθος ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα) may indicate that audience members will attribute this perception of the setting to these women. Accordingly, the extradiegetic narrator and thus audience members have perceptual access to them. Alternatively, audience members may construct the event in a manner where the extradiegetic narrator perceives facial expressions which indicate that the women perceive the tomb and the stone. The first option may facilitate identification with these characters, whereas the second option may promote empathy. At this point, audience members may find it slightly more possible that these characters will succeed, because the obstacle is removed.<sup>2215</sup> Heil suggests that the mysterious solution to their problem gives them a reason to enter the tomb.<sup>2216</sup>

### 16:5–7: They See a Young Man in the Tomb

By means of an assertive point, audience members are told that these women entered the tomb. The perceptual verb ὁράω may indicate that audience members should attribute the perception of the “young man, wearing a white robe, sitting on the right” (Mark 16:5) to these women. Mark 16:5 contains the spatial marker εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον and the character marker νεανίσκον, through which this episode is demarcated. What these women see is described to audience members, a device which may facilitate attribution of these perceptions to the three women. In this manner, audience members may conclude that the extradiegetic narrator has perceptual access to the three women and is able to communicate this information to audience members. This construction of Mark 16:5 may sustain the first construction of Mark 16:4, i.e. that audience members should attribute the perception of these events to the women.

The event which these women observe may prime or activate two previous incidents. The noun νεανίσκος as well as the participle of the verb περιβάλλομαι may prime or activate Mark 14:51, and the adjective λευκός may prime or activate the transfiguration (Mark 9:3), where Jesus’ “clothing became shining and very white, as no bleacher on earth could whiten them.” If this event is interpreted against one of these backdrops, audience members may infer that the young man who previously escaped was sitting in the tomb, or they may think that the man is Jesus,<sup>2217</sup> who is in

2215 For the fact that the women’s dilemma had been solved, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 458.

2216 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 346.

2217 Gundry suggests that Mark intends “to make the young man represent Jesus, who is on the verge of heavenly exaltation.” Gundry, *Mark*, 991. According to Collins, “[t]he young man here is portrayed as symbolically *similar* to the risen Jesus.” Collins, *Mark*, 795.

a transfigured state after he was raised by God.<sup>2218</sup> Alternatively, they may think the young man is a supernatural being,<sup>2219</sup> an angel.<sup>2220</sup>

The reactions of these women to their observation is related by means of the word ἐκθαμβέω. According to Hooker, the women were terrified, not merely amazed.<sup>2221</sup> Audience members may construct this information as external manifestations of emotions, or they may attribute to the extradiegetic narrator knowledge of the conscious feelings of these characters. The latter alternative is compatible with the previous perceptual verbs and the descriptions of what these characters saw. Because these features seem to be consistent, audience members may construct this information as conscious feelings. This choice may facilitate identification with the women.

In Mark 16:6, audience members are informed that the young man spoke to these women. The extradiegetic narrator subsequently cites these speech acts. First, the young man utters a directive point by means of which he responds to their emotions. He tells the women that they should not be frightened (Mark 16:6b). Then he makes an assertive point, stating that they are “looking for Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified” (Mark 16:6c). Audience members will probably assume that these three women know whom they have come to anoint; accordingly, this information seems initially to be superfluous. However, the adjective Ναζαρηνός has previously been employed by different characters to identify Jesus, and these events may be primed or activated at this moment (Mark 1:24; 10:47; 14:67). This time, the fact that Jesus was crucified is stressed. Because both these women and the audience members observed the crucifixion, this information too seems redundant, but the young man’s identification of the person whom these women expected to find in the tomb forms an important basis of the subsequent assertive point. The young man informs these three women as well as audience members that “he has been raised; he is not here” (Mark 16:6d). By reminding both the women and the audience members of Jesus’ identity and the fact that he was crucified, the information that he was raised by God (implied by the passive)<sup>2222</sup> may confirm that he was innocent.

By means of the subsequent directive point, the women are told to see the place where they laid him (Mark 16:6e). In this manner, the young man presents evidence that Jesus has been raised.<sup>2223</sup> Audience members who previously constructed the event in a manner where they attributed perception to these three women may identify with them. If they do so, they may be inclined to process these speech acts as addressees, not as side-participants. Audience members are not informed of the actual perlocutionary effect of this directive point, and thus do not know whether these

2218 According to van Iersel, “the readers suspect that hiding behind the young man and speaking with his voice is the author/narrator himself.” van Iersel, *Mark*, 502.

2219 See Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 269. Hartman, *Mark*, 653, 660.

2220 See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 384. Heil, *The Gospel*, 346–347. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 383. Collins, *Mark*, 795. Marcus, *Mark 8–16*, 1085. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 458. They also refer to Mark 14:51.

2221 See Hooker, *A Commentary*, 385. Donahue and Harrington suggest that the “term connotes intense emotion.” Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 458.

2222 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 385. Gundry, *Mark*, 992. Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 458. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 383.

2223 See Heil, *The Gospel*, 347.

women perform the requested action. Moreover, they are not informed about what they see. As a result, audience members will have to infer that these women observed that Jesus was no longer there.<sup>2224</sup> Because the extradiegetic narrator does not provide audience members with information which will enable them to visualize the place where Jesus was laid, they have to rely on the previous information provided by the young man.

Because Jesus is not there, audience members will assume that these women will be unable to anoint him. Audience members may therefore conclude that these women were unable to achieve their goal. If audience members accept the truth claims of the assertive points uttered by the young man, the information that Jesus was raised points out to them that Jesus' passion predictions were fulfilled.<sup>2225</sup> Hence, Jesus was indeed a true prophet. This information may confirm their previous suspicion that the women had misunderstood the state of affairs.

At this point, audience members may realize the significance of Mark 14:3–9, and especially 14:8. Because Jesus was a true prophet, he knew that he would not be anointed when he was buried. Moreover, he could not be anointed after his death, because he knew that he would be raised by God.

The young man continues his utterances to the women by making another directive point. They are commanded<sup>2226</sup> or requested to “go and tell his disciples and Peter that he is going ahead of you to Galilee” (Mark 16:7a). The propositional content of this utterance constitutes the assertive point which these women are told to address to the disciples and Peter.<sup>2227</sup> Through this speech act, audience members are informed that these women are going to tell the disciples and Peter that Jesus is going ahead of them, but this utterance may also activate Jesus' prediction in Mark 14:28.<sup>2228</sup> If audience members are reminded of Jesus' previous utterance, they may realize that this speech act will remind the disciples and Peter of Jesus' previous prediction.<sup>2229</sup> The young man elaborates on Jesus' prophecy by adding the prediction ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε (Mark 16:7b). Moreover, he refers to Jesus' previous prediction in order to validate his own assertive point (καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν, Mark 16:7c). In this manner, the young man suggests that Jesus will continue to lead his disciples on the way.<sup>2230</sup>

In the Gospel of Mark, seeing has been contrasted with blindness. These terms have in turn symbolized understanding or lack of understanding.<sup>2231</sup> Accordingly,

---

2224 For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 458.

2225 For related insights, see Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 269. See Heil, *The Gospel*, 347.

2226 See also Upton, *Hearing*, 148.

2227 The fact that Peter is mentioned explicitly is probably motivated by his previous denial of Jesus. For related insights, see Hooker, *A Commentary*, 385. van Iersel, *Mark*, 499. Pilgaard, *Kommentar*, 384.

2228 See also Hooker, *A Commentary*, 385.

2229 According to Hartman, the women are to confirm Jesus' previous words. See Hartman, *Mark*, 661. Heil suggests that the young man's utterance “confirms the fulfillment of Jesus' previous promise of leading the disciples back to communion with him in Galilee after his resurrection.” Heil, *The Gospel*, 347.

2230 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 347.

2231 See for instance “4:10–20: Jesus Teaches “Those Around Him Along with the Twelve”” on page 208.



the young man's speech act indicates that the disciples will not only see Jesus: They will also understand what they have failed to comprehend before.<sup>2232</sup>

### 16:8: They Flee from the Tomb

The actual perlocutionary effect of these speech acts is related to audience members by means of several assertive points. First audience members are informed that “they went out and fled from the tomb” (Mark 16:8a).<sup>2233</sup> This assertive point contains the spatial marker ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, by means of which this episode is demarcated. Because this speech act does not contain perceptual verbs, audience members may attribute the perception of this event to the extradiegetic narrator. The reference object is the tomb, and the perceiver observes that these women exit it and flee from it. Because the perceiver observed what happened in the tomb, audience members may construct the event in a manner where he is inside the tomb. From this position, the perceiver is able to observe them exit and flee from the tomb.

The actions carried out by these women are explained by their reactions. First, the extradiegetic narrator relates that these characters exhibited an external manifestation of fear or awe.<sup>2234</sup> Then audience members learn that these characters were amazed (Mark 16:8b). The latter information can be constructed as an external manifestation or as a conscious feeling. The first option may facilitate empathy, whereas the second may promote identification. In the end, audience members are informed of a second perlocutionary effect, which clearly does not correspond to the intended effect of the speech acts uttered by the young man. Rather than informing or reminding the disciples and Peter about Jesus' prophecy, “they said nothing to anyone” (Mark 16:8c). Their reaction is explained and portrayed by means of the verb φοβέομαι (Mark 16:8d). This verb can be interpreted as fear or as reverence. In this manner, the relation of the women's emotions constitutes the last words uttered by the extradiegetic narrator. Audience members may construct these textual indications of emotions as external manifestations of emotions or as conscious feelings,

Audience members may interpret the emotional reactions of these women in the following two manners: Either as fear or as reverence for a divine being.<sup>2235</sup> The information provided by the man has suggested to audience members that he was a divine being, albeit not Jesus. Depending on their interpretation of the emotions displayed by these women, audience members may evaluate these reactions positively or negatively.<sup>2236</sup> The fact that these women do not carry out the task they were given by the young man may cause audience members to evaluate them negatively. However, a negative ending does not seem to correspond to Mark 1:1, where the story about Jesus

2232 For related insights, see Heil, *The Gospel*, 348.

2233 According to Petersen, “[t]he flight of the women belongs to the scattering of the sheep.” Petersen, *Literary Criticism*, 78.

2234 For related insights, see Donahue and Harrington, *The Gospel*, 459.

2235 According to Collins, the fear of the women is caused by what they experience in the tomb. See Collins, *Mark*, 799.

2236 Collins suggests that the women are struck with awe. See Collins, *Mark*, 800.

Christ was introduced to audience members as good news. Audience members may therefore reexamine the entire gospel to understand the significance of the ending.

When audience members observe the women flee from the tomb, and learn that “they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid” (Mark 16:8), they may realize that they are the only ones who will be able to continue the joint project of God and Jesus, which they were urged to join in Mark 1:2–3. If audience members did not commit themselves to this project, and remained unconvinced by the narrative rhetoric, the ending of the narrative will scarcely persuade them to change their opinion. The main protagonists of God’s project, John and Jesus, are both dead, their companions have fled or renounced Jesus, and the women have fled in fear, without carrying out the task they were given. Audience members who have remained skeptical will probably conclude that it is not attractive to commit themselves to an unsuccessful project which seems to be quite contrary to the good news they were promised in the introduction to the gospel.

If audience members have committed themselves to God’s and Jesus’ project, they will probably focus on Jesus’ predictions in Mark 8:31; 9:31 and 10:33–34. If they do so, the young man in the tomb will confirm that these predictions were in fact true prophecies, because God has raised Jesus.<sup>2237</sup> This interpretation may encourage them to carry on the project to which they have committed themselves.<sup>2238</sup> Because the boundary between the Markan world and the real world is blurred, the future of the Markan world merges with the future of audience members in the real world. Accordingly, audience members will prepare the way of the Lord in the real world. At this point, they will probably realize that it will be the way of the Lord who “comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels” (Mark 8:38), when the kingdom of God comes with power.

This abrupt ending may also encourage audience members to employ knowledge from the real world to construct a satisfying ending.<sup>2239</sup> If they do so, they will probably conclude that these women informed the disciples and Peter of these events.<sup>2240</sup> Otherwise, the Gospel of Mark would not have been performed.<sup>2241</sup>

---

2237 The verb ἠγγέροθη in Mark 16:6 is interpreted as a divine passive.

2238 “The ending would call the audience to *continue* the story, expecting both successes and failures. The lack of closure helps to involve the hearer in the continuation of the story. As the process of associative identification blurs the boundaries of identification, so it also blurs the boundaries of actor–spectator, and, with an open ending such as Mk 16.8, it blurs the boundaries between story and everyday reality.” Dewey, “The Gospel,” 156.

2239 On the Longer Ending of Mark, see also Hartvigsen, “Matthew.” On the Markan Endings, see Hartvigsen, “Canon.”

2240 On the fact that the women’s silence is temporary, see also Heil, *The Gospel*, 349.

2241 “It would appear that the narrator assumes that the hearer/reader assumes that the women did tell the disciples about the resurrection, because later someone surely told the narrator who now tells the hearer/reader!” Malbon, “Fallible Followers,” 45.