

# “Whatever You Ask” for the Missionary Purposes of the Eschatological Temple: Quotation and Typology in Mark 11–12

NICHOLAS G. PIOTROWSKI

---

Nicholas G. Piotrowski is Professor of Hermeneutics and New Testament at Crossroads Bible College and Indianapolis Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Indiana. He also serves as an Associate Pastor at Northside Baptist Church in Indianapolis. He earned his PhD from Wheaton College in Biblical Theology—New Testament focus. Dr. Piotrowski recently published *Matthew’s New David at the End of Exile* (NovTSup 170; Leiden: Brill, 2016) which explores the Christological and ecclesiological effects of the first evangelist’s Old Testament quotations.

The beginning of the Gospel of Mark anticipates—right away—that the narrative will climax at the Jerusalem temple. This “gospel” of Jesus Christ in Mark 1:1 is “as it is written” (καθὼς γέγραπται; 1:2) in Isaiah. The meaning of “gospel,” therefore, should be sought in the first place in Isaiah, specifically in the context of Isaiah 40:3 which is what Mark quotes in 1:3.<sup>1</sup> That is, Mark does not *simply* quote Isaiah 40:3, but indexes the entire Isaianic context, most narrowly 40:1–11, which then provides a definition of “gospel.”<sup>2</sup> The “gospel of Jesus Christ” (1:1) that now follows in the entirety of Mark (1:4–16:8) is the manifestation in history of Isaiah’s “gospel.”<sup>3</sup> How, then, does Isaiah define “gospel?” In Isaiah 40:9 a messenger with the “gospel” (תְּשֻׁבָה; ὁ εὐαγγελιζόμενος) calls people to see (הִנֵּה; ἰδοὺ) the arrival of the God of Israel.<sup>4</sup> In the larger context of Isaiah 40–55,<sup>5</sup> specifically Isaiah 52:7–10,

this also means the reign of God as he returns to Jerusalem/Zion in full view of all the nations.<sup>6</sup> *This* is what Jesus means when he says “the Kingdom of God is at hand” in 1:15—the reign of God over the nations from the locus of Jerusalem.<sup>7</sup> Inevitably, therefore, the narrative is headed to Jerusalem.

Interestingly enough, however, Mark 1:2–3 does not quote Isaiah *only*. Before the quote of Isaiah, Micah 3:1 and Exodus 23:20 are spliced in!<sup>8</sup>

Mark 1:1–3	Old Testament Source
<p>The beginning of the <u>good news</u> of Jesus Christ the Son of God.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> As written in Isaiah the prophet, “<u>See, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way,</u></p> <p><sup>3</sup> the <u>voice</u> of one <u>crying out in the wilderness</u>, ‘Prepare the way of the Lord; <u>make straight his paths.</u>’”</p>	<p>Get yourself up to a high mountain, O Zion, herald of <u>good news</u>; lift up your voice with strength, O Jerusalem, herald of <u>good news</u>; lift it up, fear not; say to the cities of Judah, “<u>Behold your God!</u>” (Isa 40:9)</p> <p><u>See, I am sending my messenger to prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple.</u> (Mal 3:1)</p> <p><sup>20</sup> I am going to send a <u>messenger ahead of you</u>, to guard you on <u>the way</u> and to bring you to <u>the place that I have prepared.</u> (Exod 23:20)</p> <p><sup>3</sup> A <u>voice cries out,</u></p> <p>“<u>In the wilderness prepare the way of the LORD, make straight</u> in the desert a <u>highway for our God.</u>” (Isa 40:3)</p>

Along the canon’s redemptive-historical arc, it is not hard to see what Exodus 23:20 is doing in Mark’s quote of “Isaiah.” In the first exodus the Lord brought his covenant people out of the land of idolatry and oppression along “the way” (דֶּרֶךְ; Exod 13:18, 21–22; 18:8; Deut 8:2), led by an angel/messenger to the place of worship (Exod 23:20–24; 32:34). Isaiah’s restoration from exile along “the way” is, in turn, the greater exodus because this time it will include the nations. Mark’s use of Malachi 3:1, however, is puzzling. Rikki Watts argues that the point of Malachi is that Isaiah’s second exodus has been “delayed because of the nation’s sin,” specifically *illegitimate temple worship*.<sup>9</sup> So in Malachi 3:1 “the way” is prepared for the Lord to “suddenly come to his temple,” and 3:2–4 says it will be for judgment and purification.<sup>10</sup> The

result will be a new priesthood that brings "offerings in righteousness to the Lord" (3:3). Thus, in Mark, Jesus is not headed to Jerusalem merely, but to *the temple* specifically. "The way" must lead there.

Once Jesus reaches Jerusalem in Mark 11 all of his actions and words in the rest of the gospel bear directly on the temple.<sup>11</sup> The goal of this article is to demonstrate how the discourse of Mark 11–12, and specific OT quotations therein, elucidates typological correspondences with Israel's historic temple. The current temple is judged and a new temple is erected: the temple of the community of Jesus-followers. They will fulfill the eschatological purposes for the temple by extending God's reign from Jerusalem to all the nations.<sup>12</sup> To see this I will give specific attention to the typological function of the temple in the OT vis-à-vis the narrative discourse and quotations in Mark 11–12.<sup>13</sup> In so doing, a Markan *crux interpretum* comes into clarity: 11:24's "whatever you ask in prayer" is meant specifically in reference to the ministrations of the temple now fulfilled in Jesus' followers. The church is, therefore, Jesus' eschatological temple—rebuilt three days after Jesus' destruction—that can now ask for "whatever" *to accomplish its mission to the nations*. In short, the events of Mark 11–12 comprise an extended temple antitype.<sup>14</sup>

## OLD TESTAMENT TEMPLE TYPOLOGY

Much could be said about the theology of the temple in the OT.<sup>15</sup> For our purposes, a big picture survey will be enough to understand typological correspondences in Mark 11–12.

In the OT the temple serves one primary function that also entails several directly related theological results. That primary function is to mediate the presence of God to the people of God. This is clear at the temple's inauguration when it is filled with the glory cloud of the Lord in 1 Kings 8:10–13. Solomon rhetorically expresses his wonderment at this when he asks in 8:27, "Will God indeed dwell on the earth?" since "Heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain [him]." This awe-some juxtaposition accentuates how the temple is *the means by which heaven and earth are connected, as God dwells in both*.<sup>16</sup> Yet this had *always* been the goal of redemptive-history, seen in the creation account (Genesis 1–2), pre-temple altars like Bethel (Gen 12:7–8; 26:24–25; 28:17–18; 26:25; 35:1), Sinai (Exod 19:9, 16–20; Deut 4:10–12; 5:22–26), and of course the tabernacle (Exod 25:8; 29:38–46; 40:34–48;

Lev 26:11–12).<sup>17</sup> It is not surprising, therefore, that this temple-inauguration in 1 Kings 8 also marks the fulfillment of so many other covenantal promises. Solomon emphasizes this promise-fulfillment dynamic (8:15–21, 24, 56) and echoes many other redemptive-historical themes: election (8:53), covenant (8:9, 21, 23), exodus (8:21, 43, 51), land (8:36, 40), seed (*passim*), blessing (8:14–15, 55–56), law (8:58), rest (8:56), Davidic throne (8:20, 24), Davidic temple-builder (8:15–21), and the promise that the Lord be “with his people” (8:57). It is clear that this moment—the coming of God’s glory to fill the temple—is the pinnacle of redemptive-history to which *all else* has been driving. Indeed, Graeme Goldsworthy is right to call 1 Kings 8–10 the high-water mark of the OT.<sup>18</sup> It simply cannot be overestimated how central the temple is to the OT’s theological system, nor the summative role 1 Kings 8–10 plays.

In addition to the fulfillment of covenantal promises and the coalescing of several redemptive-historical themes around the temple, there are also three directly related theological results from God’s dwelling there. (1) God pardons sin. In fact, it is *at* the very temple where God grants this forgiveness. It is his court and throne. This is clear from the presence of the ark (8:1–9, 21) as well as the recurring request of Solomon’s prayer (8:30, 34, 36, 39), especially its lengthy conclusion (8:40–53). This makes sense as God is holy and sinners are not, hence the entire point of Leviticus and the need for sacrifices there. (2) God hears prayer. This too is the recurring emphasis through 8:29–50. And, as with forgiveness, it is specifically *in* the temple where God hears prayers; they are “offered toward this place” (8:29–30, 35). Again, this makes sense; if that is where he dwells on earth, then that is where he hears.<sup>19</sup> Finally, because of all these things (3) the peoples of the earth will know Yahweh is the only God.<sup>20</sup> This was the goal of the exodus, to spread the knowledge of Yahweh’s exclusive glory (Exod 5:2; 7:5; 8:10; 14:18; 18:11 *et passim*; Josh 2:8–11) as he brought his people to worship in his presence (Exod 5:3; 6:7; 25:8 *et passim*). Now that he dwells with his people—“forever,” in Solomon’s estimation (8:13)—everything God has done for his glory reaches its climax in this new international demonstration. First Kings 8:60 even uses very similar language from the exodus, “that all the peoples of the earth may know the Lord is God” (cf. also 8:23, 43). In fact, the avenues of prayer and forgiveness are open to the “foreigner” as well (8:41–43) because “they will hear of [his] great name” (8:42).<sup>21</sup>

In sum, that God would dwell with his covenant people is the goal of redemptive-history. This necessitates in the first place that atonement for sin be made to provide the necessary forgiveness. With that, the reconciled relationship opens the door to the gracious hearing of prayer. All of it results in the nations' observation of the saving and hearing capacities of Israel's God, thereby inviting Gentiles to come and also gain access to the house in which he dwells. This all provides a typological scaffold for understanding what we will now see in Mark.<sup>22</sup>

### **"THE BEGINNING OF THE GOSPEL" AND THE "WAY OF THE LORD" (MARK 1-10)**

Israel's historic temple did not always fulfill these purposes. It was destroyed at the time of the exile for the idolatry, ironically, it facilitated (cf. Ezekiel 8), and after the historic return from exile, it inhibited the coming of Isaiah's great second exodus (Malachi 3).<sup>23</sup> But with the "beginning of the gospel" "as it is written in Isaiah" and *Exodus and Malachi* (Mark 1:1-3) the eschatological temple is ready for construction. This will happen when the Lord comes upon "the way."<sup>24</sup>

No sooner is "the way" to the temple mentioned in Mark, however, that focus on it falls immediately out of view. The reader does not see it again until 8:27. Not coincidentally, that is also the moment when Jesus asks his disciples who he is. When Peter answers that he is the Christ, Jesus immediately makes his first announcement of his sufferings and resurrection on the third day (8:31). The narrative then turns decisively toward that suffering and resurrection (9:30-32; 10:32-34) as Jesus continues on "the way" (9:33-34; 10:32, 46, 52). As Mark 1:1-3 foreshadows, "the way" leads straight to Jerusalem in 11:8. And again, as suggested by the use of Malachi 3 in Mark 1:2, "the way" leads specifically to the temple: "he entered Jerusalem, and went into the temple" (11:11).<sup>25</sup>

### **QUOTATION AND TYPOLOGY THROUGH MARK 11-12**

Now that Jesus has—as expected—arrived at the temple, the next two chapters in Mark persistently teach that Jesus' followers are the typological fulfillment of the OT temple: the locus of forgiveness, where God hears

prayers, and how the nations can know the Lord. This is seen through a contextual symbiosis of direct OT quotations and typology.

Typology is inherently contextually anchored (it is not indeterminate like allegory!) and a form of intertextuality. Types and antitypes are both embedded in contexts and then communicate across the canon. Attention to Mark's literary context, therefore, and specific OT quotations in that context, helps guide in observing typological correspondences that may otherwise be overlooked. That is how we shall proceed here: first an analysis of the Markan flow of thought (the narrative discourse), then an inspection of explicit OT quotations, and finally a consideration of types and antitypes in dialogue with said context and quotations.

### ***Discourse***

The Markan narrative has a very tight flow through chapters 11–12, and a singular unifying focus: the temple.<sup>26</sup> With all the narrative buildup to his coming to the temple, what Jesus now does there is critical.<sup>27</sup> Mark tells us that he “looked around.” With Malachi 3:1–4 back in view, this “looking around” is an assizegment. The prophet predicts that the sudden coming of the Lord to his temple would result in judgment and purification. Jesus' going directly there can mean nothing less. That “it was already late” does not mean the time of day, as though Jesus is simply tired and ready to go home from the night. Rather, it is “late” in time, “late” in history (cf. 1:15's “the time is fulfilled”).<sup>28</sup> The ministrations of that temple are at an end. The old era is over, and that means the eschatological fulfillment of Malachi 3's temple vision.<sup>29</sup>

“The following day” in 11:12 marks the beginning of judgment on the old temple. The cursing of the fig tree (11:14) should be read in this light; it is an emblematic verdict against the temple.<sup>30</sup> It does not bear fruit.<sup>31</sup> In Jesus' pronouncement, “May no one ever eat fruit from you again,” the “you” means the fig tree, of course. But it also means the temple.<sup>32</sup> The immediate referent is the tree, but the immediate context cannot be forgotten.<sup>33</sup> Jesus did not find what the tree should have had, just as he did in the temple when he “looked around” (11:11).<sup>34</sup> Intertextual attention to Jeremiah 8:13 supports this reading: “When I would gather them, declares the Lord, there are no grapes on the vine, nor figs on the fig tree; even the leaves are withered.” This verse is an indictment against all of Israel's leadership (cf. Jer 8:10). But the

forecast of the temple's destruction in the immediate context of Jeremiah 7—which *Jesus himself quotes in Mark 11:17* (see below)—makes Jesus' action read like a prophetic enactment of the whole of Jeremiah 7–8, aimed specifically at the temple leadership.<sup>35</sup> Yahweh's finding no figs (Jeremiah 8) is the reason for the imminent destruction of the temple (Jeremiah 7). Jesus' finding no figs (Mark 11:12–14, 20–21) means the imminent destruction of the temple (11:15–19, 23; 13:2).

This is made increasingly clear as the setting moves, very naturally, *back to the temple* (11:15).<sup>36</sup> Jesus' driving out of the merchants and overturning of the tables is no "cleansing," however.<sup>37</sup> It is a prophetic speech-act where God's messenger shockingly acts out his message.<sup>38</sup> Jesus is saying: As these people are driven out and these tables are overturned, in the same way all will be driven out and this entire house knocked down.<sup>39</sup> For it has become "a den of robbers" (σπήλαιον ληστῶν). But how? The money-changers *qua* money-changers are not the issue.<sup>40</sup> Rather, the entire temple leadership is under indictment for their habitual practices.<sup>41</sup> One day's selling and buying matters very little.<sup>42</sup> But the priestly aristocracy had long used the temple's monetary resources to provide loans, and then take people's land when they would default.<sup>43</sup> It is easy to see how that can degenerate into a form of theft (cf. 12:38–44).<sup>44</sup> And that is the reason for Jesus' temple action—such routine corruption profanes the worship of the Holy One of Israel. "Jesus was proclaiming that they did not represent the true temple of God."<sup>45</sup> Perhaps, however, Jesus is not calling them "robbers" as much as "insurrectionists," also a use of ληστής.<sup>46</sup> Thus, the temple leadership's *lack of reception of Jesus at the "triumphal entry"* is a mark of "treasonous rebellion" against the covenant Lord when he suddenly comes to his house (11:11; cf. Mal 3:1).<sup>47</sup> Either way, the larger focus is on the temple itself and its leadership, not the day-trading. This is supported by the fact that the *chief priests* are mentioned first in verse 18 as those who want to destroy Jesus. "The irony, of course, is that the cleansing/expulsion is directed not against the Romans [as would have been expected vis-à-vis 1 Macc 4:36; 13:51; 2 Macc 10:7] but against the present Temple authorities and their functionaries and operatives, who Jesus apparently regards as the true insurrectionists."<sup>48</sup>

Relatedly, the nature of the specific action is a symbolic announcement that the kind of worship expected at the temple—paying the right coin and *offering the right sacrifice*—can no longer be done.<sup>49</sup> The prophetic denouncement

brings with it the end of the sacrificial system.<sup>50</sup> As N. T. Wright succinctly puts it, “Without sacrifice, the Temple has lost its *raison d’être*.”<sup>51</sup>

Returning to the fig tree in 11:20, the disciples observe its condition.<sup>52</sup> In response, Jesus further demonstrates that it is indeed representative of the temple when he draws their attention to “this mountain” in 11:23.<sup>53</sup> What could “*this* mountain” mean to anyone between Bethany and Jerusalem? It is not a generic statement about *any* mountain.<sup>54</sup> But “*this* mountain” must mean Mount Zion, the Temple Mount.<sup>55</sup> Jesus then proceeds to predict its destruction again: it will be “cast into the sea.”<sup>56</sup> Then Jesus’ disciples are immediately instructed to pray and forgive as their Father in heaven forgives them (11:24–25). I will return to comment on these particular matters in the Typology section below, including the necessary faith in verse 22 and the term *πάντα ὅσα* in verse 24—they are best understood after the whole context is first observed. Suffice it for now to observe how relentlessly Jesus has denounced the temple and its leadership since the “the way” led him there à la Malachi 3:1–4.<sup>57</sup> As William R. Telford aptly puts it,

‘the moving of mountains’ expected in the last days was now taking place. Indeed, about to be removed was the *the* mountain *par excellence*, the Temple Mount. The Temple, known to the Jewish people as ‘the mountain of the house’ or ‘this mountain’ was not to be elevated, as expected, but cast down! ... It is a fitting supplement, therefore, to the equally surprising, if not shocking, story of Jesus’ cursing of the fig-tree, to whose meaning it thereby gives the clue.<sup>58</sup>

The narrative of the fig tree encases Jesus’ temple-action and leads seamlessly into his mountain and prayer logia.<sup>59</sup> All need to be read together.

In 11:27–28 Jesus is still in the temple when the chief priests, among others, ask him where he gets such authority to do (and presumably say) these things.<sup>60</sup> At first he refuses to tell them (11:29–33). But he *does* tell them; the parable that immediately follows (12:1–11) transparently describes the relationship between them (12:12) and Jesus (12:7), the latter of which receives his authority from God himself (for all this is “the Lord’s doing”; 12:11).<sup>61</sup> And again, not surprisingly, the parable is also told against the temple. The “vineyard” (12:1) is Israel, as seen in Isaiah 5:1–7, whereby the “tower” and the “wine press” are specifically understood in the late Second Temple literature as symbols of the temple and altar respectively.<sup>62</sup>

The "tenants," therefore, are those who care for the vineyard by specifically tending to the business of the wine press and tower (the temple).<sup>63</sup> Thus, the tenants are Israel's priests put in charge of the temple.<sup>64</sup> Once again, as in 11:13, the tenants/priests have no fruit (12:2). The result, therefore, is the judgment of the tenants/priests and the building of a new *temple* (12:10) for a better tending of the vineyard. I will return to the "giv[ing of] the vineyard to others" in verse 9 below.

The next three pericypae involve Israel's now-condemned leaders stepping forward, one by one, to challenge Jesus' authority. The question of 11:28 ("Who gave you this authority?") is, thus, still on the table as they challenge him with issues pressing to each of them.<sup>65</sup> The Pharisees ask him about the law (12:13–17). The Sadducees ask him about the resurrection (12:18–27). And a scribe tests his knowledge of the scriptures (12:28–34). After Jesus bests them each in succession, *he* turns to question *them* with an interpretive riddle from Psalm 110 (12:35–37). In so doing, he also answers 11:28's question of his own authority. The answer is: his authority comes from God himself because "the Holy Spirit declared" it in Psalm 110. The quote also reminds the reader that Jesus is the Son of David (as in 11:10 where this all starts), and so has kingly authority directly from God. But there is a sudden and shocking twist: Psalm 110 is also priestly!<sup>66</sup> Jesus, in addition to his kingly authority, *also has priestly authority* directly from God. Thus, even when it seems like the temple is out of view (not discussed in any of the questions *other people* ask in 12:13–34) Jesus brings it back in force with an OT quotation.

After a warning to his followers to beware of the scribes (12:38–40), Jesus "sits" opposite the treasury (v. 41). As part of the temple, the treasury was the mechanism by which the centralized religious leadership robbed widows (12:40) and made the house of the Lord a "den of thieves" (11:17).<sup>67</sup> This "sitting" (form of καθίζω in Mark) is appropriately reminiscent of Malachi 3:3 when the Lord "sits" (form of καθίζω in the LXX) in judgment of the sons of Levi. It is what the reader has expected not only since Jesus arrived in Jerusalem in 11:1–11, but since the first quote of Malachi in Mark 1:2.

Thus ends this lengthy discourse through Mark 11–12. Jesus is ready to judge the "den of thieves." Not surprisingly, therefore, in 13:1 Jesus leaves the temple and in 13:3 "sits" (form of κάθημαι) on the Mount of Olives opposite the temple (i.e., likewise in judgment of it). If any readers wonder whether

Jesus could really have had such an unflinching gaze upon the temple and unreserved indictment of it, Mark 13:2 makes explicit what might have been overlooked in the symbols: “There will certainly not be left here a single stone that will not absolutely be destroyed.”

This review of the discourse through Mark 11–12 has necessarily been brief. I have not commented on everything, but I have elucidated the driving thrust: the current temple is defunct and stands in the way of eschatological fulfillment (which amounts to delaying the second exodus). Therefore Jesus relentlessly critiques and predicts the destruction of the edifice. But first-century Jewish religion is impossible to imagine without a temple.<sup>68</sup> What are Jesus and his followers to do? How could the Jewish religion possibly continue without a temple?<sup>69</sup> Watts answers, “presumably a new Temple to which all nations will come, will emerge to take the place of the old.”<sup>70</sup> Quotations and typologies laced through this section reveal that Jesus and his followers comprise the new temple that will succeed where the previous failed.<sup>71</sup>

### **Quotations**

To begin, Psalm 118 is used twice in Mark 11–12. Psalm 118:25–26 is quoted at the triumphal entry (Mark 11:9) which mixes in the Davidic promise of 2 Sam 7:29 (Mark 11:10).<sup>72</sup> Then Psalm 118:22–23 is quoted to conclude the parable of the tenants (Mark 12:10–11). In its entirety, the psalm is a song of praise to the Lord for delivering the author from terrible trials (vv. 5–13), even death (vv. 17–18), that then turns to focus on the temple (vv. 19–27) from which the Lord will save all his people (v. 25).<sup>73</sup> It is as though the psalmist sees his own deliverance from death as a type of the (future?) temple: he is persecuted (vv. 10–13) but the Lord delivers him (vv. 14–16); likewise the stone that the builders reject (v. 22a) is the very one that the Lord uses as the temple capstone (vv. 22b–24).<sup>74</sup> Stephen Dempster has convincingly demonstrated how throughout the OT salvation from death is commonly associated with resultant temple-building.<sup>75</sup> The use of Psalm 118:25–26 in Mark 11:9 draws that theology into Mark, with an additional Davidic accent in 11:10. The intertextual deposit of all of Psalm 118’s theology into Mark 11–12 gives the reader this understanding that the coming of David’s great son means two things. (1) Jesus will be persecuted, even unto death as the reader already knows (3:6; 8:31; 9:9, 31; 10:33–34, 45), but

the Lord will also raise him as the reader also already knows (8:31; 9:31: 10:34; consider also 9:14–27). The additional insight provided by the psalm, then, is to cast Jesus' sufferings in the language of Psalm 118:10–13 whereby his deliverance is even greater than the psalmist's. For while the psalmist is saved *from* death in Psalm 118:17–18, Jesus will be saved *after* death! (2) The result of Jesus' resurrection will be the building of the eschatological temple through which others are saved as well. Were this not clear enough in Mark 11:10–11, the psalm is invoked again in 12:10–11. There, again, the killing of Jesus (12:7) is associated with the rejection of the eschatological temple.<sup>76</sup> But the Lord will have none of it. After the rejection comes the resurrection. After the destruction of the temple comes its rebuilding. Thus, these two major Markan themes are here coordinated on the same theological axis: Jesus' death will lead to his resurrection and the temple's destruction will lead to its rebuilding.<sup>77</sup>

Next, in the midst of Jesus' temple action he quotes both Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11 (Mark 11:17).<sup>78</sup> Isaiah 56:7 comes from a beautiful description of how the Lord will fold Gentiles into his covenant people through the eschatological temple (Isa 56:6–8).<sup>79</sup> Jesus' quote of it "intimat[es] that the future is now present: the promised pilgrimage of the Gentiles and the eschatological re-gathering of exiled Israel ha[s] begun."<sup>80</sup> But the same context, Isaiah 56:9–11, also chastises Israel's leadership of the prophet's day. Thus, Jesus' announcement of the new temple also type-casts Israel's leaders of Jesus' day in the same terms, amounting to a serious warning against them.<sup>81</sup> Jeremiah 7:11 also comes from a context that rebukes God's people for presuming upon the status of the temple and promises judgment for the injustice and bogus worship going on there (Jer 7:1–15).<sup>82</sup> The point in Markan perspective is that the current temple is not "a house of prayer for all peoples" as it ought vis-à-vis Isaiah 56:7, so it must endure the wrath of God again as it did in Jeremiah's day.<sup>83</sup> "[T]he mountain of the Lord's house will not be elevated as expected (Is. 2:2 = Mic. 4:1), but cast down."<sup>84</sup> Yet, as I will continue to argue below, the casting down will not be the last word. There is a new temple ready to rise from the rubble—a new house of prayer that *will be* for all the nations.

Finally, Jesus' use of Psalm 110 in Mark 12:36 ends the dispute over authority. Jesus has finally answered their question of Mark 11:28. Jesus has authority because he is the Davidic temple-builder, commissioned by

the Lord himself who has his Son at his right hand (place of authority). But Psalm 110 is *also* priestly!<sup>85</sup> The eschatological priest-king rules over his enemies (in Mark, those trying to kill him) on the day of his coronation. That is *some answer* to 11:28's "who gave you this authority."<sup>86</sup> Jesus' answer basically amounts to, "The covenant God, Yahweh, gave me this authority when he declared that David's great son would not only rule the nations, but would do so as the priest *par excellence* in the midst of a new temple in theological coordination with his own eschatological sufferings and resurrection."<sup>87</sup> Moreover, those who not 'repent and believe this gospel' (1:15) make themselves God's and David's enemies." No wonder in Mark everyone is "amazed" when Jesus speaks!<sup>88</sup>

**Typology**

With the discourse of Mark 11–12, and the OT quotations therein, so thoroughly temple-focused many typological correspondences between the OT temple and the Markan narrative jump off the page:

OT Temple Types	Markan Temple Antitypes
Presence of God (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:10–13)	Arrival of Jesus at the temple (Mark 11:11)
Davidic Temple-Builder (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:20)	Jesus the Davidic Son (Mark 11:10; 12:36)
Blessing (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:14–15, 55–56)	Jesus the Blessed (Mark 11:9–10)
Prayer Heard (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:29–30, 35)	Disciples Pray (Mark 11:24–25)
Forgiveness Granted (e.g. 1 Kgs 8 passim)	Disciples Forgive (Mark 11:25)
Nexus of Heaven & Earth (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:27)	Response from Heaven (Mark 11:25)
Nations to Come (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:41–43, 60)	Nations to Come and Pray (Mark 11:17)

Every time we see David, blessing, prayer, forgiveness, heaven, and the nations does not necessarily mean a temple-theology is the primary concern of the text (or necessarily in view at all). But this context is so thoroughly temple-focused as are the explicit quotations. Such saturation creates a symbolic-theological ecosystem inside of which several details can be read typologically. Jesus is the Lord permanently come to his temple.<sup>89</sup> He is also David's great son responsible for building the temple (2 Sam 7:12–13).<sup>90</sup> That temple is specifically built of his people who pray, forgive, and are forgiven in/from heaven (11:14–25). And that temple will finally fulfill its mission as a light to the nations.

To see this we return to 11:23–25, whose typologies the context and

quotations have prepared us to appreciate. If 11:23 ("this mountain ... into the sea") is another prediction of the temple's demise (see above), then what will Jesus' Jewish movement do without a temple?<sup>91</sup> Well, the reader need only wait one verse to get the answer: Jesus' followers become the new temple. In 11:24 they are the new locus of *prayer*.<sup>92</sup> In 11:25 they are the new locus of *forgiveness*. In the OT, where does God hear prayer and grant forgiveness? In the temple (see above). Well, here in Mark 11:24–25 Jesus says *his followers* are to *pray* and *forgive*. Those are temple activities now practiced among Jesus' followers (presumably wherever they go).<sup>93</sup> Through such activities they are even said to be linked to *heaven* where the Father is (cf. 1 Kgs 8:27). *In such a temple-laden context like Mark 11–12—with explicit quotations of OT temple texts—the language of prayer, forgiveness, and access to heaven should be read as nothing less than a temple typology.* The disciples are the new temple. Their prayers and forgiveness are the eschatological temple's antitypes to 1 Kings 8. And as Solomon's temple linked God's people to heaven, so now Jesus' followers are thus linked to heaven. Or, we could say the disciples perform priestly activities—prayer and forgiveness—*within* the new temple.<sup>94</sup> The result then will be the cry of Isaiah 56:7 in Mark 11:17, that "My house shall be called a house of *prayer* for *all the peoples*."<sup>95</sup> This temple will succeed in that mission.<sup>96</sup> This temple fulfills the eschatological vision of Isa 56:6–8. The point at which the nations gain access to God is now the community of disciples.

This provides immense help in getting at the *crux interpretum* in 11:24, "whatever you ask in prayer, believe that you have received it, and it will be yours." Could Jesus really mean *whatever without qualification*? Of course not. All utterances are qualified by the context in which they are made.<sup>97</sup> So the question is what qualifies Jesus' "whatever." The answer is the nar-ratological discourse in which the statement is housed.<sup>98</sup> Since the focus is on the temple throughout, Jesus means this: "Whatever you ask for the missionary purposes of the temple in offering forgiveness and calling in the nations to worship the one true God, it will be granted!"<sup>99</sup> In other words, Jesus is encouraging *missionary prayer* and *missionary faith*.<sup>100</sup> He is saying, "If you believe in the purposes of the community of Jesus-followers as the new eschatological temple whose mission is to expand Jesus' temple-authority around the globe (i.e. Isaiah's "gospel"), and you pray prayers to that end, the Father in heaven will hear and give you missionary success."<sup>101</sup> And is this not what the

church has experienced for nearly 2,000 years? Perhaps not on a one-to-one, this-prayer-for-that basis. But in the larger vista the missionary prayers of God's people to bring in more and more peoples to experience the true presence of the true God through forgiveness in Christ *have been answered*.<sup>102</sup> As I write this, I myself am a Gentile in Indianapolis in 2017 (covenantally, geographically and temporally very far removed from Solomon's temple) writing about the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob!

All this also clarifies Mark 12:9. When the owner (God) gives the vineyard (Israel) to other tenants (priests), those "others" are *the disciples*.<sup>103</sup> They become the new tenants caring for the "wine press and tower" for the sake of the vineyard. They become the new priesthood serving on behalf of all people, among the Jews and among the Gentiles, who desire temple-access to God. And 11:24's "whatever you ask" *guarantees* success to this end as Isa 56:6–8 had always foretold.

To summarize, Mark 11–12 is thoroughly temple-focused. Specifically, Jesus brings a prophetic critique and, like Jeremiah 7–8, predicts the temple's destruction because of priestly abuses. Conversely, other OT quotations in this context—Isaiah 56; Psalm 110; 118—anticipate the building of an eschatological temple that will draw in all peoples. In that context, and with those OT quotations, a poignant temple typology is applied to Jesus' followers. *They* are the newly built temple where prayers are heard, forgiveness is experienced, and heaven is accessed. In short, they are the locus whereby the covenant God of Israel is extending this gospel-reign to the nations. The kingdom of God draws near (1:15) through this temple. All this is accomplished by Jesus—the new temple's cornerstone—who creates this community through his death and resurrection, thus fulfilling his role as the Davidic temple-builder.

### **DESTRUCTION AND RESURRECTION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL TEMPLE (MARK 13-16)**

The remainder of the gospel continues to coordinate these concepts.<sup>104</sup>

The destruction of the temple is the focus of the next chapter (cf. 13:1–2).<sup>105</sup> And it will lead to calling all nations (13:10) to participate in the kingdom of God through the gospel (compare 1:15 to 13:10). The last supper is also referential to the temple insofar as Jesus declares, through

another prophetic speech-act, the fulfillment of Isaiah 52–53's suffering servant (anticipated throughout Mark since 1:1–3, and reemphasized in force in 10:45 right before entering Jerusalem) to explicate his coming death. Thus, the cessation of temple sacrifices symbolically gestured in Jesus' temple action has come full circle: Jesus' death will provide the necessary eschatological atonement.<sup>106</sup> But equally, no sooner do they leave the upper room that Jesus declares his new-temple people will be scattered (14:27), *but also regathered* (14:28) in Galilee *only after Jesus' resurrection*.<sup>107</sup> That is, his death will mark the end of the old temple-system, and his resurrection will inaugurate the construction of the new!<sup>108</sup>

In turn, Jesus' death and the rending of the veil—the symbolic representation of the temple's expiry—occur together (15:37–38).<sup>109</sup> At *that* moment (15:39) a Gentile confesses the gospel in the language of Mark 1:1—Jesus is the “Son of God!”<sup>110</sup> And so, Solomon's prayer of 1 Kings 8:41–43 is in the process of being typologically fulfilled:

Likewise, when a foreigner, who is not of your people Israel, comes from a far country for your name's sake (for they shall hear of your great name and your mighty hand, and of your outstretched arm), when he comes and prays toward this house, hear in heaven your dwelling place and do according to all for which the foreigner calls to you, in order that all the peoples of the earth may know your name and fear you, as do your people Israel, and that they may know that this house that I have built is called by your name.

In short, with this Centurion Isaiah's eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles has begun.<sup>111</sup>

Finally, in 16:6 Mark records the most powerful statement ever uttered, equaled only by the power of its subtlety: “He is risen” (*a mere word* in the Greek, ἡγέρθη). The regathering of the disciples instructed in the very next verse (16:7) is therefore the groundbreaking of the eschatological temple, the community of Jesus-followers who will pray and forgive and gain access to heaven (11:24–25). This is all “as he told you” (16:7).

## CONCLUSION

Mark 11–12 significantly advances a temple emphasis that had been

developing since the quotation of Malachi in the opening paragraph. Located right before Jesus' clearest prediction of the temple's destruction (Mark 13) these two chapters are loaded with prophetic speech-acts and explicit statements in denouncement of Israel's largest theological icon. In that context, the more enigmatic statements (like 11:23's "say to this mountain ..." and 11:34's "whatever you ask ...") take on significant temple meanings, and the combination of *prayer*, *forgiveness* and *heavenly access*—the main themes of the historic temple's dedicatory prayer by Solomon in 1 Kings 8—appear as temple antitypes now applied to Jesus' followers. The upshot is that *they* will be the new locus through which the true and living God will engage the world and welcome in the nations. The community of disciples will finally become the covenant God's "house of prayer for all the peoples" (Isa 56:7 quoted in Mark 11:17). In sum, the second exodus has come in force. And as with the first exodus, "the way" has led to the new place of worship.<sup>112</sup> Thus, the goal of redemptive-history, that God would dwell with his people, is accomplished through the atoning and temple-building work of the (priestly) Son of David. The literary discourse of Mark 11–12 and the explicit quotations therein, have created a symbolic-theological ecosystem inside of which these typological correspondences come into clarity.<sup>113</sup>

It is not enough to simply spot typologies, however. We also have to say what they mean. What do we learn from them? We should remember that Mark's narration is but "the beginning of the gospel." So we are told in 1:1. Thus, we should say that 16:7 is the *beginning* of the construction of the eschatological temple. This gospel will then *continue* in all believing communities world without end. Gospel believing congregations should take up Jesus' promise in Mark 11:24–25 and *pray missions oriented prayers* and *expect the Lord to answer them*. We should be bold in our outreach, evangelism and missions, but even *more bold in our praying* for outreach, evangelism and missions.<sup>114</sup> The point of the first exodus event was to demonstrate the Creator's exclusive glory to the otherwise idolatrous world. The second exodus through Jesus Christ accomplishes the same with more and longer-lasting effects. For the gospel of the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ continues to shine into a darkness that cannot overcome it. In Israel's history the drawing of the blind nations to that saving light was the role of the temple. Likewise—and indeed on a higher plane of fulfillment—the church is the new temple: the new beacon lifted up for all to see, the house

to which the nations will come to pray, receive forgiveness and gain access to the Holy One of Israel's heavenly throne of grace. Is this not a divine injunction to the church to turn exegetical inquiry into ministerial bravery, theological waters into missionary wine? Indeed. It is a summons to pray boldly and then go with confidence to the nations with all amazement, trembling, astonishment and fear.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> The Roman meaning of "gospel" as well as "Son of God" are also in view as an opportunity for Mark to subvert them. Mark is saying, "The Caesar alleges to be the 'Son of God' and his actions are purported to be 'gospel.' But I will now tell you the *real* 'gospel' of the *real* 'Son of God.' To get there, let's start with Isaiah." For more on this background, see Scot McKnight and Joseph B. Modica, eds., *Jesus is Lord, Caesar is Not: Evaluating Empire in New Testament Studies* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2013).
  - <sup>2</sup> I will not take the effort here to defend this sort of contextual reading of the OT. For starters see C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet & Co., 1952), ch. 2–3; William R. Telford, *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition* (JSNTSup 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 128–32; G. K. Beale, "Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?," *Themelios* 14 (1989): 89–96; Richard Schneek, *Isaiah in the Gospel of Mark, I–VIII* (BIBALDS 1; Vallejo, Calif.: BIBAL Press, 1994). My larger work on the first gospel, *Matthew's New David at the End of Exile: A Socio-Rhetorical Study of Scriptural Quotations* (NovTSup 170; Leiden: Brill, 2016), also articulates, defends, and demonstrates the benefits of this sort of reading.
  - <sup>3</sup> To use Max Botner's terminology in his excellent "Prophetic Script and Dramatic Enactment in Mark's Prologue" (*Bulletin for Biblical Research* 26 [2016]: 369–80), Isaiah provides the "prophetic script" to the theodrama, and the Gospel of Mark is the "dramatic enactment" on the stage of history.
  - <sup>4</sup> On Isa 40:1–11 as a coherent unit (and the way it functions as a summary-prologue to all of Isaiah 40–55), see Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66* (trans. David M. G. Stalker; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 32–33 *inter alia*; Kiyoshi Kinoshita Sacon, "Isaiah 40:1–11: A Rhetorical-Critical Study," in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (PTMS 1; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1974), 99–116; David Noel Freedman, "The Structure of Isaiah 40:1–11," in *Perspectives on Language and Text: Essays and Poems in Honor of Francis I. Andersen's Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 167–93; Terry W. Eddinger, "An Analysis of Isaiah 40:1–11 (17)," *BBR* 9 (1999): 119–35; Øystein Lund (*Way Metaphors and Way Topics in Isaiah 40–55* [FAT 2/28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007], 70–73, 95–100).
  - <sup>5</sup> On the necessity of reading Isaiah 40–55 as a coherent whole, see esp. Roy F. Melugin, *The Formation of Isaiah 40–55* (BZAW 141; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1976), 77–82; R. E. Clements, "The Unity of the Book of Isaiah," *Int* 36 (1982): 120–23; John Goldingay, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (2 vols.; ICC; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 1:4–8.
  - <sup>6</sup> These two announcements of the "gospel"—Isaiah 40:1–11 and 52:7–12—form an inclusio in Isaiah 40–55 (see e.g. Andrew T. Abernathy, *The Book of Isaiah and God's Kingdom: A Thematic-Theological Approach* [NSBT 40; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2016], 53–65). They start and end the larger section of Israel's "comforting" and "pardoning" (40:1–2; 52:9) for the sins that led to the exile. The various means by which the covenant Lord will lead his people out of exile (noting especially the efficacious call of his word in 40:6–8; 45:23) in the presence of the on-looking nations is described throughout the section. But one detail is excluded: *how will forgiveness of sins be accomplished?* Re-gathering is one thing. Atonement is another. Finally, it is only after the closing of the inclusio that Isaiah reveals it at last: through the vicarious work of the Suffering Servant of 52:13–53:12. This is followed by great praise (ch. 54) and the invitation to come (ch. 55; esp. 10–11). Hence the continual echoes of Isaiah's Suffering Servant in Mark: the accomplishment of that atonement is the ultimate mark of the restoration (cf. esp. Mark 10:45). And, again, of course atonement takes place at the temple. That is why Jesus must go there.

- 7 “The great event that the prophets had been announcing down through the centuries is about to happen” (Herman C. Waetjen, *A Reordering of Power: A Sociopolitical Reading of Mark’s Gospel* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989], 65).
- 8 The reader will easily notice how this piece operates within the conceptual framework laid down in Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah’s New Exodus in Mark* (BSL; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002; repr. from WUNT 2/88; Tübingen; Mohr Seibeck, 1997). See also Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992).
- 9 Watts, *New Exodus*, 67–76.
- 10 The “day of his coming” in 3:2 is the same as “the great and awesome day of the Lord” in 4:5. It is preceded by Elijah—John the Baptist in Mark (1:6; 9:11–13). Morris M. Faierstein (“Why Do the Scribes Say that Elijah Must Come First,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 [1981]: 75–86) also demonstrates from the Jewish background that the eschatological arrival of Elijah did not anticipate merely the coming of a messiah in Second Temple expectations. In view of the Isaianic background, Watts demonstrates how this must be the arrival of Yahweh himself (*New Exodus*, 79–84). See also Waetjen, *Reordering of Power*, 63–74; Richard B. Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014), 17–33; Botner, “Prophetic Script,” 169–80.
- 11 See e.g. John Paul Heil, “The Narrative Strategy and Pragmatics of the Temple Theme in Mark,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59 (1997): 76–100.
- 12 On this theme throughout the gospels, esp. in relation to a new creation already-not-yet eschatology, see G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church’s Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (NSBT; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 169–200.
- 13 For more on the *textual* warrant for discerning types, see esp. David Schrock, “What Designates a Valid Type?: A Christotelic, Covenantal Proposal,” *Southeastern Theological Review* 5 (2014): 3–12. In fact, it is my hope that this article could be read as an example of Schrock’s own proposal that typology must be textual, covenantal and Christotelic (*ibid.*, 3–26). It is that first mark—the *textual* nature of typology—that most tangibly distinguishes it from allegory. Allegory is imposed *from outside* the Bible, whereas typology follows the sequencing and storyline *within* the Bible. This article would add the concept of *contextual warrant* as well. That is, the entirety of Mark 11–12 will lead us to find legitimate typology as the discourse is pulled together in a coherent way by that typology. Typology is not midrash either. It is not simply connecting passages across the Bible through linking words or themes. Rather, typology correlates Christological themes across the Bible through clear organic and multifaceted dimensions within the texts in question. *The texts are asking to be linked*, in other words. The links are not imagined in the reader’s mind. This article is seeking to demonstrate how that sort of *asking* is going on within Mark 11–12.
- 14 Pace Robert H. Stein (*Mark* [BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008], 520 n. 15), the burden of this article is to show how this reading has more than a “little textual support.”
- 15 Indeed much *has* been said. For starters, see Beale, *Temple*, 29–167; T. D. Alexander and Simon Gathercole, eds., *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 11–79.
- 16 On this theme throughout the OT and other Jewish literature see Beale, *Temple*, 31–50.
- 17 See Beale, *Temple*, 94–107; T. D. Alexander, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem: An Introduction to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2008), 13–73. Not surprisingly this is the climactic theme at the end of redemptive-history in Revelation 21–22; see esp. William J. Dumbrell, *The End of the Beginning: Revelation 21–22 and the Old Testament* (The Moore Theological College Lectures 1983; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985; repr. Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2001).
- 18 Graeme Goldsworthy, *Christ-Centered Biblical Theology: Hermeneutical Foundations and Principles* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2012), 114–28. In chapter 10 the Queen of Sheba comes to learn wisdom from the Davidic temple-builder as though she were a metonymy for the nations’ deliverance out of the darkness of idolatry (cf. Gen 12:3). One *might* think the Bible could end at 1 Kings 10. But 1 Kings 11, and the subsequent narrative of 1–2 Kings, clearly demonstrates the stubborn pervasiveness of idolatry even in the hearts of Davidic kings, and therefore longs for a future day and an eternal king. See e.g. William J. Dumbrell, *The Faith of Israel: A Theological Survey of the Old Testament* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 94.
- 19 Of course God can hear all prayers wherever they are offered. Even 1 Kings 8:39, 43, 49 says he “hear[s] in heaven.” But that is just the point: his heavenly abode now touches to the earth (8:27).
- 20 For this role of the temple throughout the OT see Beale, *Temple*, 117–21.
- 21 We could add to this that the temple is also the place from where God speaks to his people (Exod 25:22; 29:42–43; Num 1:1; 7:89; 11:16–17, 25).
- 22 With the destruction of this temple in 2 Kings 25:9, the prophets eschatologize these same themes in the

- coming eternal temple (Isa 2:1–4; 56:3–8; 60:1–14; 66:18–21; Ezek 40–48; Mic 4:1–8; Hag 2:1–9; cf. also Psalm 68). On the hope of the eschatological temple, see R. J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Temple* (OxTM; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 9–57; esp. on its universal expansion, see Beale, *Temple*, 110–13, 129–54.
- <sup>23</sup> Again, see Watts, *New Exodus*, 67–76.
- <sup>24</sup> Discontent with the temple and its establishment is not unique to Jesus and his biographers. For a review of Second Temple Jewish opinions of Herod's temple and its ministrations, as well as a hope for a new eschatological temple, see McKelvey, *New Temple*, 9–24; Andrew M. Mbuvi, *Temple, Exile and Identity in 1 Peter* (LNTS 345; London T&T Clark, 2007), 16–21, 44–69; Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (London: SPCK, 2010), 4–13, 17–37.
- <sup>25</sup> The astute reader will observe, however, that neither Malachi nor the focus on the temple are entirely absent before Mark 11. Jesus' baptism carries a temple motif as the sky/heavens are "ripped" open to send forth the Spirit (1:10; εἶδεν σχίζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς). If this is not immediately evident at 1:10, the same verb is used at 15:38 when the temple veil—another barrier between heaven and earth—is "ripped" (τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη). Jesus exhibits a temple-holiness as he cleanses the leper in 1:40–44 (see Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 1," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 4 [2006]: 155–75; idem, "Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 2," *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 5 [2007]: 57–79). At the healing of the paralytic, Jesus also *forgives his sins* (2:5). Jesus' teaching of the "lamp . . . on the stand" (4:21) is reminiscent of the menorah, and the coming of others to the "light" (4:22) echoes Isaiah 2:2–5 where Gentiles come to the eschatological temple. At the transfiguration Jesus' clothes (9:3) recalls Malachi 3:2 and thus also the temple-purifying effects of "the day of the Lord's coming." Finally, the language of Isaiah's sacrificial servant (Isa 52:13–53:12) is all over Mark's thematic verse, 10:45. These are subtle reminders through the narrative that keep the expectancy high for Malachi's temple themes to reemerge in force once Jesus reaches Jerusalem. Indeed, Perrin argues that Jesus' view of the temple and his own self-awareness as the eschatological temple builder "make sense of Jesus' other activities undertaken earlier in his career" (*Jesus the Temple*, 14 *et passim*).
- <sup>26</sup> Telford is right that this focus continues into ch. 13 (*Barren Temple*, 39–40, 216–17). "Its total context is that of the Temple" (*ibid.*, 39).
- <sup>27</sup> On a potential Zechariah background to this section of Mark, as well as common Greco-Roman practices of rulers entering cities and immediately going to the local temple, see Paul Brooks Duff, "The March of the Divine Warrior and the Advent of the Greco-Roman King: Mark's Account of Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 55–71.
- <sup>28</sup> On the nexus between the coming of the Lord to his temple, the imagery of fig trees, and the dawning of the eagerly anticipated *new age*, see Telford, *Barren Temple*, 189, 261 *et passim*.
- <sup>29</sup> Of course there is also a teleological line running from Gen 49:10–11 through 2 Sam 7:12–13; 1 Kgs 1:38, 44; Zech 9:9–10 and into the triumphal entry.
- <sup>30</sup> On the conceptual and theological linking of the temple and the fig tree see esp. Telford, *Barren Temple*, 49–59 *et passim*; Waetjen, *Reordering of Power*, 180–82; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1981): 239–40; Sharyn Echols Dowd, *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22–25 in the Context of Markan Theology* (SBLDS 105; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 39 nn. 10–11, 53–55; Watts, *New Exodus*, 310–18; R. T. France, *The Gospel of Mark* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 435–41, 443; Joel Marcus, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (2 vols.; AB 27; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000–2009), 788–790.
- <sup>31</sup> Mark's addition, "for it was not the season for figs," supports this. The reader should not think that the *tree itself* is somehow at fault. The issue is not that it is just a barren tree. It can be forgiven for not having fruit *out of season*. But it stands for the temple, and therefore its cursing is an expression of Jesus' judgment on the temple.
- <sup>32</sup> The fig tree is used across the Old Testament with a variety of symbolic connotations (see Telford, *Barren Temple*, 132–142). For those specifically in view for Mark, Telford points to Isa 28:3–4; Jer 8:13; Hos 9:10, 16; Joel 1:7, 12; Mic 7:1 (*Barren Temple*, 142–56). For the image in postbiblical Judaism see Telford, *Barren Temple*, 179–204.
- <sup>33</sup> Says McKelvey, "When, however, the narrative is read in the light of the setting which the evangelist provides for it, something much more radical than a reform of the cult is seen to emerge. By embedding the cleansing in the story of the cursing and withering of the fruitless fig-tree Mark shows that he understands the actions of Jesus to mean nothing less than the abrogation of the temple and cult." (*New Temple*, 65). See also Scott G. Brown, "Mark 11:1–12:12: A Triple Intercalation?," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 64 (2002):

- 79–81; J. Bradley Chance, “The Cursing of the Temple and the Tearing of the Veil in the Gospel of Mark,” *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007): 269–73.
- <sup>34</sup> Says Marcus, “Especially in view of the Temple setting of our narrative, the most immediate culprits seem to be the Temple and its functionaries (cf. the parallel between ‘seeing . . . the fig tree’ in 11:13 and ‘looked around at everything’ in the Temple in 11:11)” (*Mark*, 790).
- <sup>35</sup> Watts, *New Exodus*, 317–18 (following R. A. Cantrell, “The Cursed Fig Tree,” *The Bible Today* 29 [1991]: 105–108). “Jesus, in other words, appears to be deliberately evoking the whole context in Jeremiah. The cursing of the fig tree is part of his sorrowful Jeremianic demonstration that Israel, and the Temple, are under judgment” (N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* [vol. 2 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996], 421–22). See also Jeremiah 24 where *bad figs in front of the temple* are used to describe Israel’s leadership and the reason for their judgment (at the time of Nebuchadnezzar’s conquest). Hosea 9:10 also uses figs in a description of false worship (cf. also 9:16), where the figs are specifically in season. Telford concludes that “no one ‘fig’ verse seems to have provided a starting-point for Mark’s story . . . but interrelated OT passages” (*Barren Temple*, 156) formed the conceptual grid. Consistently (cf. esp. Isa 28:3–4; Jer 8:13; Ezekiel 17; 47; Hos 9:10, 16; Joel 1:7, 12; Mic 7:1; Zechariah 14; Psalms *passim*) it is a symbol of eschatological blessing or judgment where “[v]ery often the reason given for God’s wrathful visitation is cultic aberration on the part of Israel, her condemnation for a *corrupt Temple cultus and sacrificial system* (ibid., 162; emphasis original). Telford goes on, “Who could doubt, then, the extraordinary impact that Jesus’ cursing of the fig-tree would have produced upon the Markan reader, schooled to recognize symbolism wherever it occurred? Who could doubt that a *solemn judgement* upon the nation was there being proclaimed; and in this context a *judgement directed against a corrupt Temple cultus*” (ibid., 163; emphasis original)?
- <sup>36</sup> Watts argues for a chiasmic structure through 11:1–12:12, with quotations of Psalm 118 on the outside (11:1–11; 11:26–12:12), the issue of the fig tree inside (11:12–14; 11:20–25), and this temple incident with Isaiah and Jeremiah forming the middle (11:15–19) (*New Exodus*, 304). This makes Jesus’ temple action the centerpiece, bearing the most hermeneutical weight and casting a Psalm 118 interpretive influence over the rest. Equally, Brown identifies Mark 11:15–19 as the highlighted centerpiece of a “triple intercalation” that in turn elucidates the symbolic interrelatedness of the rest of 11:1–12:12 (“Mark 11:1–12:12,” 78–89).
- <sup>37</sup> On the interpretive options see Watts, *New Exodus*, 325–30 et bibliog. ad loc.; Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 88–92.
- <sup>38</sup> A. E. Harvey contends well that Jesus could not have imagined that his interruption would have effected any real change in the temple or its associated institutions, but that his actions are a startling prophetic gesture (*Jesus and the Constraints of History* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982], 129–32). Mimicking the OT prophets (1 Kgs 11:29–39; 22:11; Isa 20:1–6; Hosea 1:2 *inter alia*), rather, Jesus “does not physically change things by his actions; but his actions may represent the change which God wills to bring about and which the prophet is charged to proclaim” (ibid., 131). On the symbolic nature of Jesus’ other actions see also Ben F. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (PrTMS 48; London: SCM, 1977; repr., Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick, 2002), 153–73, 197–202.
- <sup>39</sup> It “is not an act of reformation” but a “closing down . . . signifying the end of the cult and its hierocracy” (Waetjen, *Reordering of Power*, 182). See esp. Telford, *Barren Temple*, *passim*; E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 61–76; Christopher D. Marshall, *Faith as a Theme in Mark’s Narrative* (SNTSMS 64; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 160–63; Duff, “Divine Warrior,” 67–69; Wright, *Victory of God*, 415–24; Watts, *New Exodus*, 310–32; France, *Mark*, 437–38; Chance, “Cursing,” 271–73; Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 80–113. The removal of several merchants and tipping of a few tables would not “cleanse” anything. It is a dramatic portent of coming judgment. If there is any doubt of this, the reader need only get to chapter 13. What point could “cleansing” serve if not one stone will be left on top of another (13:2)? Evans (“Jesus’ Action,” 237–70) does still contend that Jesus’ temple action should still be understood as a “cleansing.” It is unclear to me, however, given Evans’s understanding of the critique of the temple in the Markan context (ibid., 238–43) why indeed it is not a portent of destruction after all. I agree, nonetheless, with Evans that Sanders could not be more wrong in the claim that Mark misunderstood the “historical Jesus” on this point. My argument here (as well as that of Telford, Dowd and others) is that it is *the Markan context* that elucidates this point the most.
- <sup>40</sup> Perrin makes a compelling point, however, that the fact that they dealt with money certainly does implicate the overall economic system of the temple (*Jesus the Temple*, 92–93).
- <sup>41</sup> In the Rabbinic literature, see *t. Men.* 13:21–22; *b. Git.* 52b; *b. Pes.* 57a; in Josephus see *Ant.* 20.205–206. As Harvey comments, “[I]t was surely not the tradesmen themselves, but the authorities who sanctioned their trade, who were responsible for anything that was amiss” (*Constraints of History*, 131). See also France, *Mark*,

- 437, 446–47.
- <sup>42</sup> "The presence of the money-changers and the booths for the sale of animals and birds for sacrifice in this part of the temple was a necessary convenience for worshippers" (McKelvey, *New Temple*, 64). See also Sanders, *Jesus*, 64–65. There was debate, nonetheless, that such transactions should have taken place on the Mount of Olives, not in the temple Court of the Gentiles (see France, *Mark*, 443–44). Jesus' comments, however, do not focus on the location of the trading. But that the house of the Lord is full of thieving (11:17).
- <sup>43</sup> See Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 95–99 et bibliog. ad loc. Neill Q. Hamilton comments on how common it was in the ancient world for temples to accrue massive wealth and in turn function as banks ("Temple Cleansing and Temple Bank," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83 (1964): 365–66). The Jerusalem temple itself regulated commerce and granted interest-accruing loans (see esp. 2 Maccabees 3) at "the control of the high-priestly well-to-do aristocracy" (*ibid.*, 366–70; quote from p. 369). For more on the opulence of the temple, as well as the greed and corruption of the first century priesthood, (and the consequent defamation of the temple) see Evans, "Jesus' Action," 257–63, 267–69.
- <sup>44</sup> Evans ("Jesus' Action," 267–68) *inter alia* prefer the term "brigand" because ληστής connotes one who "takes by force, not a swindler."
- <sup>45</sup> Donna Runnalls, "The King as Temple Builder" in *Spirit within Structure: Essays in Honor of George Johnston On the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed., E. J. Furcha; Allison Park, Pa.: Pickwick, 1983), 31.
- <sup>46</sup> See France, *Mark*, 446. Mark 15:27 also uses ληστής.
- <sup>47</sup> Watts, *New Exodus*, 329. Both readings have contextual support. The first has 12:38–44 right before the final declaration of the temple's destruction in chapter 13: They are crooks who swindle the poor, and that calls for their judgment. The second has the anticlimactic conclusion to the "triumphal entry" right before it: Jesus expected a coronation that did not happen. Perhaps we do not have to decide, but the high priests' robbing of Yahweh's people is simply another manifestation of their insurrection, just as their lack of reception when he "suddenly comes to his temple." Perrin, however, warns us not to make too much of this noun (nor to read details of the Jewish War into it), but to look to the whole context of Jeremiah 7 for understanding its meaning in Mark 11 (*Jesus the Temple*, 93–95), which we will explore a bit in the Quotations section of this article.
- <sup>48</sup> Watts, *New Exodus*, 331.
- <sup>49</sup> Brant Pitre, "Jesus, the New Temple, and the New Priesthood," *Letter & Spirit* 4 (2008): 63–69.
- <sup>50</sup> "From the viewpoint of the author of Mark, the temple had been rejected as a failure long before the Romans destroyed it" (Dowd, *Prayer*, 53).
- <sup>51</sup> Wright, *Victory of God*, 423.
- <sup>52</sup> Marshall contends that Peter's exclamation in v. 21 demonstrates his "profound sense of the portentousness of what he sees" (*Faith*, 164). Waetjen suggests that the comment on the death of its roots signifies the hopelessness of a renewal or revitalization of the temple (*Reordering of Power*, 184), again suggesting that Jesus' temple action was "not an act of reformation" but "[t]he cursing of the fig tree symbolizes the condemnation of the temple institution" (*ibid.*, 182).
- <sup>53</sup> Telford states, "Mark has attached this logion to the story of the fig-tree as a secondary interpretive saying, whose function it was to alert Mark's readers to the parallel that existed between the withering of the fig-tree . . . and the removal of the Temple Mount" (*Barren Temple*, 95).
- <sup>54</sup> R. M. Grant provides a handful of examples of how the "mountain" has become generically applicable in Christian preaching, but concludes that here the saying was "originally directed towards an immediate and particular situation" ("The Coming of the Kingdom" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 67 [1948]: 301–302). Telford provides many examples of how uprooting mountains has been used in a variety of contexts, and some possible historical developments leading up to the writing of Mark (*Barren Temple*, 95–118). The point here, though, is to give the Markan context the priority for interpreting in *this* instance. See also Stein, *Mark*, 519–20. It is strange to me that France is consistent on using the context to interpret the images in Mark 11 vis-à-vis the temple, but then understands "this mountain" generically (*Mark*, 449).
- <sup>55</sup> So Watts (*New Exodus*, 333–37) *inter alia*. Some have taken it to mean the Mount of Olives, however, with a thoroughgoing Zechariah 14 background for all of Mark 11 (see e.g. Grant, "Kingdom," 298–302). But it is more likely the Temple Mount because that is the mountain that travelers have in their purview as they journey from Bethany to Jerusalem (Marcus, *Mark*, 785; cf. 11:12 and 11:27) and because—as argued throughout this piece—the temple is continually the focus of the larger context (see also Marshall, *Faith*, 168–69). Moreover, in the Old Testament terms like "the mountain of the Lord," "the Lord's Holy Hill," etc. most commonly refer to Mount Zion/the Temple Mount (Psa 2:6; 43:3; 78:54; Isa 2:3; 30:29; Mic 4:2; Zech 8:3). And, of course, the use of Isaiah 56 and Jeremiah 7 in the near context all but settles the

- case (Wright, *Victory of God*, 422).
- <sup>56</sup> See esp. Telford, *Barren Temple*, 49–59, 95–127. Marshall points out that the manner in which “the sea” functions in the rest of Mark (4:35–41; 5:13; 9:42) powerfully attests to this statement being one of judgment and destruction (*Faith*, 169).
- <sup>57</sup> Isaiah 40:3 and Malachi 3:1–5 and the temple cleansing “belonged to [the] selfsame context” (Meyer, *Aims*, 197).
- <sup>58</sup> Telford, *Barren Temple*, 119.
- <sup>59</sup> Says Marcus, the two fig tree pericopae (11:12–14 and 11:20–25) form an “interpretive envelope ... The center of the composition is Jesus’ action in the Temple, which the surrounding fig tree story interprets, not only by casting the sanctuary in the role of the fruitless tree, barren and cursed, but also by presenting an alternative: faith and prayer that bypass the sacrificial system of the ‘den of brigands’ and appeal directly to the heavenly Father for mercy” (*Mark 8–16*, 788–89). See also nn. 33–36 above.
- <sup>60</sup> That Jesus had ridden into the city on a donkey instead of his usual custom of walking may have also been a claim of authority (Harvey, *Constraints of History*, 122–28, 131–34). An echo of Genesis 49:11 is also very palpable in Mark 11:2 and therefore, again, the right of Judah’s house to rule. First Kings 1:38, 44 is also likely in the background of 11:7, giving the scene still deeper Davidic dimensions (Marcus, *Mark*, 779). Nehemiah’s entry to Jerusalem on a beast of burden (Neh 2:11–18) as a prelude to his rebuilding the city may also stand in the background (*ibid.*, 790).
- <sup>61</sup> So too Rikk E. Watts, “The Lord’s House and David’s Lord: The Psalms and Mark’s Perspective on Jesus and the Temple,” *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007): 316–17; Marcus, *Mark*, 815.
- <sup>62</sup> Cf. *Tg. Isa.* 5:1–2; *1 En.* 89:56, 66–67; 4Q500; *Barn.* 16:1–5; *t. Suk.* 3:15 (Craig A. Evans, “On the Vineyard Parables of Isaiah 5 and Mark 12,” *BZ 28* [1984]: 82–86; *idem*, “Jesus’ Action,” 240).
- <sup>63</sup> Teachers and religious leaders are referred to as “builders” in CD IV, 19–20; VIII, 12, 18; XIX, 31; 1 Cor 3:10; *b. Ab.* 114a; *b. Ber.* 64a; *Cant. R.* 1.5 (Watts, “Lord’s House,” 316).
- <sup>64</sup> Matthias Konradt is very strong on this point that the Parable of the Wicked Tenants is not aimed at the entire nation of Israel, but its leaders (*Israel, Church, and Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew* [trans. Kathleen Ess; BMSEC; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014], 172–93, 263–64). See also Evans, “Jesus’ Action,” 240–41; Dowd, *Prayer*, 39. Joel Marcus does make a case that the tenants are the entire nation of Israel (“Intertextual Polemic of the Markan Vineyard Parable,” in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* [Graham N. Stanton and Guy G. Stoumsa, eds.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998], 211–27). This just does not fit, however, with the positive responses within Israel that many have in Mark (esp. 11:9–10; 15:11 clearly says the chief priests stir up the crowd there), and Marcus’s reading is too dependent on an uncertain historical context of the author. Better is Watts’s approach that takes into fuller consideration the OT background that is clearly in view, Isaiah 5:1–7, where the near context of Isa 3:11–15 specifically singles out Israel’s leaders for destroying the Lord’s vineyard, and sympathizes with the populace under their control (*New Exodus*, 330, 340–49).
- <sup>65</sup> Together they comprise the Sanhedrin, partly explaining their concern for authority (James R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark* [PNTC Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002], 362).
- <sup>66</sup> See e.g. Watts, “Lord’s House,” 318–20; Tremper Longman III, *Psalms* (TOTC 15–16; Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2014), 381–84.
- <sup>67</sup> So too Heil, “Narrative Strategy,” 86.
- <sup>68</sup> On the importance of the temple in Second Temple Jewish conceptions not only of the nation and its religion but also on a cosmic level, see E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 bce–66 ce* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1992), 47–145; Wright, *Victory of God*, 406–12; Johann Maier, “Temple,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:921–26; Oskar Skarsaune, *In the Shadow of the Temple: Jewish Influences on Early Christianity* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2002), 87–102; Pitre, “Jesus,” 47–83.
- <sup>69</sup> “Since the fate of the temple is symbolized by the fig tree, the question of its replacement in the life of Israel becomes critical. . . . What will serve as God’s residence on Earth in the future? What will take the place of his architectonic center?” (Waetjen, *Reordering of Power*, 184). Says Dowd, “the destruction of the Jerusalem temple raised the question of the continued possibility and efficacy of prayer” (*Prayer*, 52).
- <sup>70</sup> Watts, *New Exodus*, 349. As Beale puts it, Jesus “is beginning to clear the way for the eschatological temple” (*Temple*, 179). See also Meyer who concludes that Jesus’ temple-action is both one and the same time a fulfillment of OT expectations (Zech 14:21)—even of judgment (Jer 7:4–11; Mal 3:1–5)—as well as a sign of future restoration and Gentile inclusion à la Isa 2:2–4; 11:12; 40:3; 56:6–8 (*Aims*, 181–85, 197–202). Says Perrin, “Anyone with the slightest insight who had witnessed the cleansing of the temple would have

- recognized the enacted parable as a sign of the temple's destruction and its eschatological rebuilding: a sign against the present temple and a sign for the future temple" (*Jesus the Temple*, 111). See also Karl Olav Sandnes, "The Death of Jesus for Human Sins: The Historical Basis for a Theological Concept," *Themelios* 20 (1994): 20–23; James M. Hamilton Jr., *God's Glory in Salvation through Judgment: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010), 389. These ideas will be revisited in the Typology section of this article.
- <sup>71</sup> In tight theological correspondence, Jesus and his followers are also new priests. Moreover, Jesus is also the sacrifice (10:45 and 14:2 are fulfillments of Isa 52:13–15; 53:11–12).
- <sup>72</sup> So too Marcus, *Mark*, 775, 791–93.
- <sup>73</sup> As Derek Kidner puts it, "The battle was single-handed; the victory is shared" (*Psalms 73–150: A Commentary on Books III–V of the Psalms* [TOTC; London: InterVarsity, 1975], 414).
- <sup>74</sup> Nancy deClaisse-Walford also observes in Psalm 118 the conceptual relationship between the individual psalm-singer's experience and the community's temple worship (Nancy deClaisse-Walford, Rolf A. Jacobson and Beth LaNeel Tanner, *The Book of Psalms* [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014], 868). "The threat of destruction in the Marcan parable may also be implied in the citation of Ps 118:22–23 where a new foundation is laid, possibly that of a new temple" (Evans, "Jesus' Action," 240).
- <sup>75</sup> Stephen G. Dempster, "From Slight Peg to Cornerstone to Capstone: The Resurrection of Christ on 'the Third Day' According to the Scriptures," *Westminster Theological Journal* 76 (2014): 371–409. He also shows how that salvation is commonly preceded by *three days* of trial/suffering/near death. This could just well explain what Paul means in 1 Cor 15:4 that Christ "was raised on the *third day* in accordance with the scriptures," as well as why Jesus is insistent that his resurrection must be *μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας* (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34). See also Meyer, *Aims*, 182–83.
- <sup>76</sup> On these twin uses of Psalm 118 in Mark, and especially the temple theology it brings into focus around Jesus' resurrection, see esp. Watts, "Lord's House," 313–17. Jesus is "the chief stone of a new temple consisting of a reconstituted vineyard Israel gathered around himself" (*ibid.*, 317).
- <sup>77</sup> Says Marcus, "Christians would immediately recognize this exaltation as a cipher for Jesus' resurrection ... this scenario was interpreted in early Christianity as a reference to Christ's foundation, through his death and resurrection, of a sanctuary of 'living stones,' that is the Christian community" (*Mark*, 814; cf. Ps 118:22 in Acts 4:10–11 and 1 Pet 1:3; 2:7 as well).
- <sup>78</sup> Perrin calls these "two cited verses ... a kind of précis of Jesus' actual message" (*Jesus the Temple*, 84).
- <sup>79</sup> Even the *Psalms of Solomon* have a place for Gentiles in the new temple in 17:31–32. The nations in 17:21–25 are specifically the "unlawful" ones (v. 24; so *παράνομα* is rendered in *OTP*) that currently oppress Jerusalem (Rome in the eyes of the author/s).
- <sup>80</sup> Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 85. First Maccabees 7:37 also quotes Isa 56:7 but leaves out "for all nations/peoples." It is key in Mark that it is retained. Marcus demonstrates at length how many Second Temple Jewish texts saw the Messiah's job as one of excluding Gentiles from the temple (*Mark*, 792–93) and concludes, "Thus while the Marcan Jesus in some ways fulfills the traditional expectations from the Messiah, combining his triumphal entry into Jerusalem with a dramatic action laying claim to and purging the Temple, in other ways he defies the messianic image prevalent in Mark's world. While other eschatologically minded Jews ... dream of a Messiah who will purge the Temple by ridding it of foreign influences, Mark's Messiah cleanses it by expelling the (Jewish) traders who defile the Court of the Gentiles and thereby thwart the Temple's divinely intended purpose of becoming a 'house of prayer for all peoples.'" As Edwards puts it, "Jesus' action, however, is exactly the reverse. He does not clear the temple of Gentiles, but for them" (*Mark*, 343).
- <sup>81</sup> Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 85–86, 93–94.
- <sup>82</sup> "[T]he thematic interests of Jeremiah 7 as a whole, brought together with those of Isaiah 56 as a whole, mesh brilliantly with Jesus' conviction that Israel's leaders had gone bad" (Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 94).
- <sup>83</sup> The use of Jeremiah 7 is further evidence that Jesus means no "cleansing" but destruction of the temple. Even Evans points out that "the text contains a threat of destruction" ("Jesus' Action," 251).
- <sup>84</sup> R. J. McKelvey, "Temple," in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology: Exploring the Unity & Diversity of Scripture* (T. Desmond Alexander et al., eds.; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 808.
- <sup>85</sup> Cf. n. 66.
- <sup>86</sup> Watts also sees this use of Psalm 110 as Jesus' ongoing answer to the question of his authority ("Lord's House," 318–19).
- <sup>87</sup> After surveying the importance of the Davidic temple builder and/or restorer in the OT and Second Temple literature, Runnalls concludes that "the gospel of Mark gives the clearest indication that the incident of the cleansing of the Temple was a symbolic action by Jesus by which he was making the claim to be the Davidic messiah who was the temple builder/restorer [after the exile] and at the same time was asserting that God

- was authenticating the claim. Without some temple action of this nature his claim to Davidic succession would not have been complete" ("King as Temple Builder," 15–37, quote from 31).
- <sup>88</sup> The amazement and astonishment throughout Mark is also an echo of Isa 52:13–14.
- <sup>89</sup> Richard Bauckham provides two extensive lists of NT passages that apply LXX texts to Christ where the original meaning of κύριος is Israel's covenant God (*Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 186–88, 219–21). On Mark specifically, see Daniel Johansson, "Kyrios in the Gospel of Mark," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 33 (2010): 101–24. See also n. 10 above.
- <sup>90</sup> See esp. Runnalls, "King as Temple Builder."
- <sup>91</sup> As France says, "[Verses] 22–25 are not an alien intrusion in this context, for the imminent loss of the 'house of prayer' in Jerusalem (v. 17) poses the urgent question of where the tradition of prayer is then to continue" (*Mark*, 448). See also Dowd, *Prayer*, 45–55; Marshall, *Faith*, 163–72; n. 69 above.
- <sup>92</sup> "[A]lthough the existing temple has been disqualified, they are the beginning of God's new 'house of prayer for all nations'" (Marshall, *Faith*, 165). See also Dowd, *Prayer*, 44–45 nn. 40–42; Perrin, *Jesus the Temple*, 4–6, 101–104, 110–11 *inter alia*. On the pervasive notion in the ancient world that temples make prayer efficacious see Dowd, *Prayer*, 45–54.
- <sup>93</sup> See Heil who also observes the temple-significance of the combination of prayer and forgiveness ("Narrative Strategy," 79–80, 82 *et passim*).
- <sup>94</sup> First Peter 2:4–10 also coordinates the concepts of the community as the temple and a new priesthood. See Pitre's very thought-provoking "Jesus, the New Temple, and the New Priesthood" for an Historical Jesus study that concludes that Jesus consistently understood himself and his disciples as the eschatological temple and eschatological priesthood. The temple and priesthood "are almost synonymous: the Temple is the locus of the priesthood because it is the sole place of sacrifice, and it is the sole place of sacrifice because it is the locus of the priesthood" (*ibid.*, 71). See also *idem*, *Jesus and the Last Supper* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015); Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Priest* (forthcoming).
- <sup>95</sup> Pitre also points out that Isa 56:6–8 and 66:20–21 foretell that Gentiles will come comprise the new eschatological priesthood as well ("Jesus," 72–73).
- <sup>96</sup> Watts says well, "[T]he Lord of the Temple having arrived, now orients the Temple toward its final goal" (*New Exodus*, 324).
- <sup>97</sup> For example, what do I mean when I say to my son, "You can have whatever you want"? Do I mean that whatever his little heart can possibly imagine without qualification will be all his? That is ridiculous, and irresponsible to think or teach. Rather, "whatever you want" is qualified by where we are and what the recent conversation has been. If I say it at a restaurant, then I mean whatever is on the menu. If I say it at Toys R Us (a dangerous place to utter such words) then I mean whatever is in the store, but only if I say it the moment we walk in. If I say it in a certain isle after deliberating there for a while, then I mean whatever is in that isle. If I say it at a car dealership (now we are getting ridiculous) it obviously means whatever is on the lot and the kind we already discussed and the price range we already discussed and so forth. We know by intuition that all utterances are controlled by many such variables discerned from their context. It is foolish and dangerous to suddenly drop such considerations when reading Jesus' words. So it is hard to conclude that Jesus meant to talk about the temple and talk about the temple and talk about the temple, then suddenly change subjects and offer his followers whatsoever their carnal hearts desire, then snap back to talking about the temple again. That is just not how discourse works.
- <sup>98</sup> Other attempts to qualify "πάντα ὅσα" (see Marcus, *Mark*, 795–96) fail to attend to this macrocontext. I do, however, see great value in Dowd's reading, where she compares Mark 11:22–25 with 14:32–42 for a fuller view of the Markan understanding of prayer that fits very well the gospel's juxtaposition of power and suffering (*Prayer*). Those are the only two passages, after all, in the gospel that address prayer; they should be read together. She agrees that the Markan community would see itself as the new temple-locus of prayer, but does not read Jesus' "whatever" in this light. Rather, to her "whatever" is qualified by "not what I will, but what you will" in 14:36. But I can easily see both readings working together. For it is God's will that his temple be a house of prayer for all nations as Jesus clearly states in 11:17.
- <sup>99</sup> The qualifier is not "having faith" in the thing asked for in some generic sense of "faith." Rather, again in context, the faith called for in verse 24 is specifically faith in the removal of the old temple, and by implication the raising of the new temple. So even the kind of faith Jesus is calling for is specified by the context.
- <sup>100</sup> Again, faith in v. 22 should not be understood as a lever that gets God to act in heaven or even merely the means of entry into the community, but the continuous *modus operandi* of the community (Marshall, *Faith*, 164–72) that now serves as the new ongoing temple.

- <sup>101</sup> This reading is supported powerfully by further intertextual attention to 1 Kings 8, where LXX 8:43 shares the term *πάντα ὄσα*, and 8:28–54 has *προσεύχομαι* nine times.
- <sup>102</sup> It should also be observed that the verbs, participles and pronouns in 11:24–25 are all second person plural. France says this emphasizes the communal aspect of prayer “which the community of disciples undertakes together, not a private transaction between the individual believer and God” (*Mark*, 448). If France is right, that this is the intention of the text, then it also cuts against the idea of praying for “whatsoever” we want to suite individual personal desires. Rather, the desires of the church are in view—the collective voice of the entire congregation in solidarity of missional focus.
- <sup>103</sup> Konradt, *Israel*, 172–93, 263–64. Heil also makes the case that this must mean the disciples because they are the first ones instructed to carry out the temple activities of prayer and forgiveness in 11:24–25 (“Narrative Strategy,” 82–83). See also n. 64 above.
- <sup>104</sup> Though dated, Donald Juel’s *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (SBLDS 31; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977) is still very helpful. See also Heil, “Narrative Strategy,” 76–100.
- <sup>105</sup> The disciples’ words, “*διδάσκαλε, ἴδε*” in 13:1 recalls “*ῥαββί, ἴδε*” in 11:21, again linking the fig tree to the temple (Marcus, *Mark*, 794). Telford also argues that the fig tree of 13:28–32 is, as in chapter 11, another symbol of the temple’s demise (*Barren Temple*, 216–18). This is another point at which I do not understand Evans’s critique of the view that Jesus’ temple action was a portent of destruction. Observing that while Second Temple literature commonly longs for a new temple (*1 En.* 90:28–30; *Jub.* 1:17; 11QT XXIX, 8–10; *Sib. Or.* 5:425) he writes, “The problem here is that there is no clear evidence that would suggest that the Messiah (or God acting through the Messiah) would *destroy* the temple” (“Jesus’ Action,” 249). But there is that very evidence in *Mark*, chapter 13. He even concedes, “Criticism of temple business activities, coupled with a warning (or threat) of destruction, coheres well with the prophetic Scriptures, with Jesus’ own prediction of the temple’s destruction (Mark 13:1–2), and with the charge brought against him at his trial (Mark 14:58)” (“Jesus’ Action,” 269).
- <sup>106</sup> Pitre, “Jesus,” 67–69, 79–81. One table replaces another.
- <sup>107</sup> Mark 14:28 anticipates the regathering of the disciples in Galilee (16:7), thereby commencing the reconstruction of the temple.
- <sup>108</sup> So too *inter alia* Heil, “Narrative Strategy,” 96–99.
- <sup>109</sup> See esp. Chance, “Cursing,” 284–90; Pitre, “Jesus,” 62–63, 69.
- <sup>110</sup> McKelvey calls Jesus’ death, the rending of the veil and the Centurion’s confession “a single event” (*New Temple*, 72–73). Says Beale, “The centurion’s confession was the beginning of the prophetic fulfillment that the eschatological temple would be the place to which God ‘will bring’ foreigners (Is. 56:7) and ‘the nations would stream’ (Is. 2:2–3; Mic. 4:1–3)” (*Temple*, 191–92).
- <sup>111</sup> See also Heil, “Narrative Strategy,” 98–99; Chance, “Cursing,” 86–90.
- <sup>112</sup> The original exodus was intended “so that they may worship me” (Exod 4:23; 8:1, 20; 9:1, 13). And so in *Mark*, “the way” will lead to the creation of a worshipping community, a new temple locus.
- <sup>113</sup> Speaking specifically about 11:22–25, Marshall says well, “Mark’s mountain-moving saying achieve its narrative significance partly from the range of associations and comparisons the imagery and language themselves evoke, and partly from the ironical aptness of these associations to the point under discussion, namely the replacement of the old temple mount with a new eschatological community” (*Faith*, 166).
- <sup>114</sup> McKelvey also concludes that such temple imagery gives the church ethical imperatives to be holy and unified, to worship and serve, to offer praise and thanksgiving, and to perform good deeds and charity (*New Temple*, 183–86). “The aspect of the church’s priestly service on behalf of the world that is most to the fore in the New Testament is its mission ... Those converted are the sacred first fruits.” (*ibid.*, 185).

Special thanks to Noah Debaun for reading a penultimate draft of this and helping me bring some clarity to key parts.