Eschatological Elements in Jesus' Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac: An Exegesis of Mk. 5:1-20

N. Joseph Torchia

The expulsion of demons assumes a special significance in Mark's treatment of Jesus' mighty deeds. Such healings are an effective means of affirming Jesus' power over evil, and provide startling occasions for his recognition as Son of God. But the incident also establishes a crucial beachhead for the Kingdom among non-Jews and for proclaiming the Good News in pagan territory. In a very real sense, however, this particular account assumes a profound eschatological significance when considered against the background of Mark's Gospel as a whole. Jesus' appearance in Gerasa entails an overturning of priorities on every level.

The expulsion of demons assumes a special significance in *Mark's* treatment of Jesus' mighty deeds. On the one hand, such radical healings provide a means of affirming Jesus' power and authority over evil in a decisive manner. *Mark* places these stories within a narrative framework that directs our attention away from the miraculous *per se,* and focuses instead upon their significance for Jesus' ongoing appearance.[1] Paradoxically, these healings provide startling occasions for Jesus' recognition as the *Holy One of God* or the *Son of God* (Mk. 1:21-28; 5:1-20). The fact that He is correctly identified by the demons themselves adds an intriguing dimension to a story in which He is continually misunderstood or even rejected by those closest to Him. The drama is only heightened when Jesus admonishes the demons to refrain from revealing His true identity (Mk. 1:25;34).

The Markan version of Jesus' healing of the Gerasene demoniac (5:1-20) is generally consistent with the exorcism accounts found in

[1] Paul J. Achtemeier, 'Gospel of Mark', *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Volume 4 (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 554b.

the Gospels. In the most elaborate rendering of this episode in the Synoptics, we find some of the key elements of this particular *genre:* Jesus' initial encounter with one who is possessed by a demon or demons; an exclamation on the part of the demon(s), and accompanying identification of Jesus; Jesus' expulsion of the demon(s) by means of a standard verbal formula; a complete transformation of the one formerly possessed. What is lacking in this account, however, is any attempt on Christ's part to silence the demon(s) or the one healed regarding His identity or role in this mighty deed. As used by *Mark*, this incident provides a means of establishing a crucial beachhead for the Kingdom among non-Jews, and thereby, for proclaiming the Good News in pagan territory. The discussion which follows comprises a detailed exegesis of Mk. 5:1-20, with a special focus upon the eschatological implications of Jesus' expansion of His mission among the Gentiles. As a point of departure, let us consider the general and immediate context of the passage under scrutiny.

Context

The overall structure of the contents of *Mark* admits of a variety of interpretations. For the purposes of this paper, however, the Gospel can be assessed in terms of four major parts: *first,* a Prologue (1:1-13), which imparts significant information to the reader regarding Jesus' identity, the role of John the Baptist and Jesus' baptism, and Jesus' temptations in the wilderness; *secondly,* a treatment of the mystery of Jesus (1:14-8:26), extending from the beginning of the Galilean ministry to the healing of the blind man of Bethsaida; *third,* the beginning of the revelation of the mystery (8:27-9:32), spanning the period from Peter's confession to the second prediction of the Passion; and *fourth,* the full revelation of the mystery (9:33-16:8), encompassing those events leading toward and surrounding Jesus' passion, death, and resurrection.

In its position at the approximate midpoint of the Gospel's second part, the immediate context of Mk. 5:1-20 is a subsection that begins with the call of the Twelve (3:13-19) and concludes with the Twelve's sending out on mission (6:7-13). Mk. 5:1-20 is intimately connected with the broader theme of discipleship; the pericope emerges in that portion of the Gospel in which Jesus establishes a

new family comprised of those who do the Father's will (3:21-35). These disciples are the direct recipients of Jesus' revelation of the mystery of God's Kingdom. Indeed, Jesus' progressive self-disclosure to the disciples through words, mighty deeds, and miraculous works is intimately related to His announcement of God's new reign over every aspect of creation.[2] But by the same

---

[2] Parallel accounts of the episode recounted at Mk. 5:1-20 are found in both *Matthew* (8:28-34) and *Luke* (8:26-39). The Lukan version is extremely close to the Markan in respect to content and ordering of events, and nearly identical in regard to language. *Luke,* however, all but eliminates *Mark's* informative profile of the demoniac and merely alludes to his need for physical restraint in an aside later in the passage (8:29). *Luke* also omits Mark's reference to the number of swine in the herd. *Matthew,* on the other hand, severely abridges the account. In addition to its extreme brevity, major departures from its Synoptic counterparts lie in (a) its use of two victims of demonic possession; (b) its exclusion of any final encounter between Jesus and the beneficiaries of His mighty deeds; and (c) its reference to a completely different place name (i.e., "the territory of the Gadarenes" as opposed to "the territory of the Gerasenes" in both *Mark* and *Luke*). In this regard, the Matthean version clearly places Jesus at center stage. In contrast to what we find in *Mark* and *Luke, Matthew* does not afford the demoniacs the opportunity to speak with Jesus and make their requests. Rather, the account directs our attention solely to Jesus and His authoritative power in inaugurating the Kingdom of God. In regard to context, the Lukan version emerges in a section which exhibits a striking similarity to what we find in*Mark:* Jesus' healing of the Gerasene demoniac is preceded by a series of parables, the appearance of Jesus' family members (although *Mark* places this episode before the parables), and the calming of the storm episode. Both *Mark* and *Luke* place the story of Jairus' daughter and the woman with a hemorrhage immediately after the healing of the Gerasene demoniac.*Luke* departs from *Mark,* however, in the following chapter by omitting the account of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth, but returns to the Markan ordering in treating the mission of the Twelve (Lk. 9:1-6) and Herod's opinion of Jesus immediately thereafter (Lk. 9:7-9). In *Matthew,* on the other hand, the healing of the Gadarene demoniacs is part of a distinct miracle story section (Mt. 8:1- 9:34), comprising three groups of miracle stories (with ten miracles in all). This particular section focuses on Jesus as "Messiah of the Deed" and complements His portrayal as "Messiah of the Word" in Mt. 5:1-7:29. But in all three versions (i.e., Mt. 8:28-34; Mk. 5:1-20; Lk. 8:26-39), the episode reveals a power that only the Son of God could possess

token, this privileged revelation is riddled with tension. The misunderstandings on the part of Jesus' relatives and the scribes (3:20-22) regarding His ministry is also evident in the disciples' lack of faith, even in the face of what Jesus accomplishes.

In light of Jesus' mystery as Son of God, the healing of the Gerasene demoniac occupies a crucial role. Indeed, its placement immediately after Jesus' calming of the storm (4:35-41) underscores His power--not only over natural phenomena, but over the destructive forces of evil as well. In a manner consistent with *Mark's* association of Jesus' role as teacher with the performance of mighty deeds, Mk. 5:1-20 complements the earlier cure of a demoniac at Mk. 1:21-28.[3] In both cases, such mighty deeds reinforce and legitimize Jesus' teaching authority: at Mk. 1:21-28, Jesus casts out the demon in the course of His teaching in the synagogue; at Mk. 5:1-20, the exorcism follows Jesus' teaching

---

and exercise. In each instance, the disciples share in Jesus' announcement of the Good News and in his authority as both teacher and healer (Mt. 10:1; Mk. 6:7; Lk. 9:1-2). In this respect, the theme of discipleship operative in each Synoptic account is closely connected with the emergence of God's Kingdom. This thematic link is most evident in Mk. 5:1-20 and its variation on the discipleship theme in a distinctly Gentile setting.

[3] According to **Mann** (277-278), the two versions in the other synoptic Gospels allow for a useful contrast. Mann proposes the following theory to explain the differences between the versions (and their relation to each other) in these terms: In Matthew and Luke we have accounts which are terse, designed for easy memorization, whereas in Mark we have a narrative in which the evangelist has access to a far livelier and more dramatic narrative--in fact, so dramatic that he finds it imperative to insert v. 8 to relieve the confusion of detail. We can find some indications of the way in which the story developed from Matthew's version, where we have two men who are demon-possessed, in contrast with the one man of Mark and Luke. All of this seems to suggest to the present commentator that Mark had two versions of the story which Matthew had originally possessed, and telescoped into one. Mark used a combination of the terse and condensed Matthean account, together with his own "reminiscence source," and produced the present narrative.

activity by means of a series of parables. In effect, the reader is confronted with something of a staggered intensification of miracles, extending from (a) nature, to (b) the demonic realm, to (c) the evils of sickness and death. Yet the three successive healings (or cures) of individuals who are either pagans (as in the case of the Gerasene demoniac) or Jews outside of Jesus' immediate circle (as in the case of Jairus' daughter and the woman with the hemmorhage at Mk. 5:21-43) only magnifies the lack of faith in Jesus' disciples, in His fellow Nazarenes (6:1-6), and even in His own relatives.

Outline

For purposes of overview, the pericope can be reduced to the following schematic outline:

Introduction (5:1-5)

1. The setting is established (*v.* 1).
2. Jesus disembarks; meets a man with an unclean spirit (*v.*2).
3. The man's plight is described (*vv.* 3-5).

A. Jesus' encounter with the Gerasene demoniac (5:6-10)

1. The demoniac approaches Jesus and prostrates (*v.* 6).
2. The demoniac identifies Jesus (*v.* 7a).
3. The demoniac requests to be left alone after Jesus exorcises his evil spirits (*vv.* 7b-8).
4. The demoniac identifies himself as 'legion' in response to Jesus' query (*v.* 9).
5. The unclean spirits request a concession (*v.* 10).

B. Incident involving the herd of swine (5:11-14)

1. The spirits request entry into the swine (*vv.* 11-12).
2. The spirits enter the swine (*v.* 13a).
3. The herd rushes over the embankment and drowns (*v.*13b).

4. The swineherds flee in terror and report the incident (*v.* 14a).

C. Jesus' encounter with the townspeople (5:14b-17)

1. The townspeople come forward to investigate (*v.* 14b) and observe that the former demoniac is now clothed and sane (*v.* 15).
2. The eyewitnesses describe what they have seen (*v.* 16).
3. The townspeople beg Jesus to depart the territory (*v.* 17).

Conclusion: Jesus' final confrontation with the healed demoniac (5:18-20)

1. The man begs Jesus to allow him to follow Him, i.e., to be be His disciple (*v.* 18).
2. Jesus commands the man to return home and proclaim what has happened there (*v.* 19).
3. The man proclaims Jesus' deed far and wide (*v.* 20).

Exegesis of Mk. 5:1-20

The pericope begins with a geographical observation that situates the story in the 'territory of the Gerasenes' (τῶν Γερασηνῶν), in the general region of the Decapolis (as borne out by what we are told at 5:20). *Mark's* identification of the area is somewhat problematic for two reasons. On the one hand, we find a disparity of place names in the Synoptic accounts (i.e., 'Gerasenes' in *Mark* and *Luke;* 'Gadarenes' in *Matthew*). On the other hand, the textual tradition of the Synoptics exhibits some confusion. The most commonly accepted solution to this problem assumes the following form: since *Mark's* placement of the incident in the territory of the Gerasenes is untenable on geographical grounds (as Gerasa was thirty to forty miles southeast of the Sea of Galileee or Lake of Tiberius), *Matthew* apparently substituted a more feasible (but still distant) location in

relation to the lake shore (i.e., Gadara--a town roughly six miles away).[4]

But despite such difficulties, the opening of the Markan account stresses a key point: Jesus and His party have crossed *to the other side of the sea* (εἰς το πὲραν τῆς θαλάσσης). Elsewhere (Mk. 3:8; 10:1), the term πέραν designates the region *beyond the Jordan* or the *eastern side of the Jordan* (πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου). In textual terms, the reference *to the other side of the sea* provides a direct link with the preceding pericope regarding Jesus' calming of the storm (4:35-41). These mighty deeds display Jesus' power and authority over the forces of nature and evil, respectively. The fact that the latter work occurs in pagan territory widens the extent of Jesus' power, and thereby, the scope of His authority. In Mk. 5:21, Jesus again crosses εἰς το πὲραν, enroute to His healings of Jairus' daughter and the woman with the hemorrhage. In a broader eschatological sense, the sea provides the place where the forces of evil and chaos reside.

The specific setting of the episode, then, becomes a matter of secondary importance. What is most important is the fact that Mk. 5:1 informs us that Jesus and His disciples have entered Gentile, and more specifically, pagan territory. From this standpoint, their physical passage εἰς το πὲραν entails a more significant religious and cultural transition from a Jewish to a non-Jewish region that breaks down the barriers that separate these peoples.[5] The account

---

[4] **Boring,** 231. Also see **Fitzmyer** (736-37), for a detailed and illuminating analysis of the debate surrounding this issue. As **Fitzmyer** wryly observes (736), "the stampede of the pigs from Gerasa to the Lake would have made them the most energetic herd in history!" For a treatment of the manuscript traditions and the difficulties they generate, see the summary of **Johnson,** 100-101. Cf., the compromise solution of Origen (*Commentary on John,* 6,41), who stressed the untenability of both Gerasa and Gadara, and instead proposed Gergesa. **Hooker** (142) points out, however, that Gergesa cannot now be positively identified.

[5] According to **Pesch** (284), the phrase εἰς τὸ πέραν is a "catch phrase" of the pre-Markan miracle history collection (cf., 4:35; 5:21; and 6:45).

that follows might be viewed as something of a prelude or anticipation of Jesus' mission to the Gentiles (explicitly treated in the story of the Syrophoenician woman at Mk. 7:24-30).

Jesus' entry into Gentile territory coincides with the appearance of a man depicted as the very embodiment of impurity. In light of what Mk. 1:23-24 has already disclosed (where the unclean spirit recognizes Jesus) and what subsequent developments demonstrate, Jesus' very appearance poses a threat. In this respect, the man's initiative in coming to meet Jesus should not be construed as a friendly gesture of greeting, but rather, as an act of confrontation.[6] Here, however, the reader encounters an apparent ambiguity in *v.* 2b (ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθαρτῳ) that allows for two alternate readings. On the one hand, the clause might be simply rendered as '*a man from the tombs* with an unclean spirit; on the other hand, it might be interpreted as 'a man with *an unclean spirit from the tombs*.' While the difference is subtle (and perhaps, even negligible), each rendering brings to the fore a different nuance of the man's defilement: in the former, his possession by an unclean spirit is underscored by his own emergence from the tombs, sites connected with corruption and death; in the latter, we might view the man as possessed by spirits who themselves come from the tombs (since tombs were considered favored dwelling places for demons in the ancient world).[7]

In any case, the man's intimacy with these places of the dead is borne out by the fact that *he had his abode* (ὃς τὴν κατοίκησιν εἶχεν) *among the tombs* (*v.* 3). According to **Pesch** (285), *v.* 3 states explicitly what was already disclosed at *v.* 2. But what manner of individual inhabits a graveyard? Such a dwelling is suitable for one

---

[6] **Anderson** observes (147-48) that Mark's appropriation of the name "Gerasa" from the tradition for use in the context of this story (with the apparent assumption that it was close to the sea) "does not say much for his acquaintance with Palestinian topography," but "probably all that concerned him was that the story was set in the partially Gentile territory of the Decapolis."

[7] **Perkins,** 582a.

expelled from human society. As **Perkins** observes (582a), the demoniac's condition is the very antitype of the civilized Hellenistic society nearby. In actuality, the tombs of ancient Palestine consisted of caverns hewn out of rock or caves, and frequently provided dwellings for the utterly destitute.[8] Because such enclosures were considered the *loci* of demons, those who lived there were suspected of demonic sacrifice.[9]

In contrast to the demoniac who confronts Jesus in the synagogue (Mk. 1:21-28), and those He exorcises all over Galilee (Mk. 1:39), this individual is clearly an outcast. His complete ostracism accentuates the horror of his situation. In a culture which placed such a high value on the life of the *polis* and its communitarian benefits, such a man could only be numbered among the living dead. To some extent, life ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν finds a present day counterpart in life 'on the street': in this contemporary version of the social ostracism of the Gerasene demoniac, the homeless likewise resign themselves to a living death (albeit within the boundaries of thriving urban centers).[10]

One line of interpretation, however, also perceives indications of insanity in his behavior. This consideration, of course, raises issues which far exceed the narrow parameters of this discussion. But for the present purposes, it suffices to recognize that what our contemporaries readily diagnose as symptoms of pathological

---

[8] **Kittel,** 597; **Johnson,** 101; **Branscombe,** 91; **NJBC,** 607a.

[9] The notion that such habitations were associated with those in the most desperate straits finds Old Testament support in the **LXX** versions of Jb. 30:5-6 (*Thieves have risen up against me, whose houses were the caves of the rocks.*); Ps. 67:6 (*God settles the solitary in a house...even them that dwell in tombs.*); and Isa. 65:4 (*They lie down to sleep in the tombs and in the caves... all their vessels are defiled.*).

[10] **Perkins** (585) develops this theme in this manner: Some of the mentally ill homeless persons in large cities, especially those who exhibit violent behaviour, evoke the same fear and repulsion in people today that the demoniac must have inspired in ancient Palestinians.

insanity, emotional disturbances, or severe forms of depression might have been explained in terms of demonic possession by ancient observers. Several commentators, for example, allude to the fact that the *Talmud* specified the act of sleeping on a grave as a sign of madness (along with walking outdoors at night, tearing one's clothes, and destroying one's possessions).[11]

On the basis of the assertion (*v.* 3b) that *no one was able to bind him any longer* (οὐκέτι), we can easily gather that this man had already posed a threat sufficient enough to warrant physical restraint. But the inability *to bind him even with a chain* (καὶ οὐδὲ ἁλύσει...οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι) suggests a degree of strength that can only proceed from supernatural origins. This point is reiterated and embellished in *v.* 4: we now learn that the demoniac had been bound frequently (πολλάκις), with chains (ἁλύσεσιν) as well as shackles (πέδαις). But even such a double precaution does not suffice. Accordingly, *v.* 4b provides a clear rationale for his expulsion from human society and subsequent habitation *among the tombs.* His superhuman ability to tear apart (διασπάω) the chains and to break (συντρίβω) the shackles renders it wholly impossible for anyone to subdue (δαμάσαι) him.

Overall, *v.* 4 assumes the character of an aside inserted into the description of the demoniac's plight that begins in *v.* 3 and ends at *v.* 5. **Mann** (278) infers that this subsection is based upon an eyewitness report, as indicated by the use of the perfect tense in *v.* 4 ('as though what is being committed to writing unchanged is the oral narrative of bystanders') and the return to the imperfect tense at the end of *v.* 5 (i.e., ην). Its distinctive character is also evident in its unique terminology: *Mark* uses five terms (i.e., κατοίκησις, ἄλυσις, πέδη, διασπάω and δαμάζα) which are either peculiar to

[11] H. Van der Loos, *The Miracles of Jesus* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965), 385. Also see **Lane** (182). **Mann** (278) points out that each of the Talmudic criteria for madness are met in this particular case.

vv. 3-4 alone, or else, occur but rarely throughout the New Testament.[12]

V. 5 resumes the line of thought initiated at *v.* 3 (and expanded upon at *v.* 4): *among the tombs and in the hills* (ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν) he was shrieking (ἦν κράζων) and *bruising* or *gashing himself with stones* (κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις). How can such bizarre behavior be explained, except as an indication of madness or demonic possession? **Lane** (182, n. 9), for one, suggests that it might point to the practice of cutting the flesh in connection with the worship of demonic deities.[13] From my standpoint, however, it also evokes the horrible image of the ulcerated Job, reduced to scraping his sores with a potsherd (Jb. 2:8). While the ostensible purpose of that act was to obtain some relief from his misery by a counterirritant, one commentator views it as a way of expressing grief.[14] In both cases, we observe individuals in such desperate straits that their only recourse is a paradoxical intensification of their misery. But unlike Job, the demoniac has no compelling reason to justify his action. Accordingly, it assumes an unsettling nihilistic quality, as a senseless attempt at self-destruction prompted by demonic forces (the very antitheses of life).

We return to the present scene of action at *v.* 6. But *v.* 6 suggests an account that parallels (but slightly diverges from) the story that unfolds in *vv.* 1-2. In contrast to the earlier statement that the demoniac *came to meet Him* (*v.* 2), *v.* 6 stresses that he sees Jesus

---

[12] κατοικήσις occurs only at Mk. 5:3; ὄλυσις is found at Mk. 5:3-4, Ac. 12:6-7; 21:33; 28:20; Eph. 6:20; II Ti. 1:16; Rev. 20:1; διασπάω is found only at Mk. 5:4 and Ac. 23:10; δαμάζω is found only at Mk. 5:4 and Ja. 3:7-8.

[13] See I Kg. 18:28 (the episode involving Elijah's encounter with the prophets of Baal): *They called out louder and slashed themselves with swords and spears, as was their custom, until blood gushed over them.*

[14] Marvin H. Pope, *Job,* **AB** 15 (Garden City, New York): Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1973), 21. Cf., Lev. 19:28; 21:5; Deut. 14:1; Jer. 16:6; 41:5; 47:5; 48:37.

ἀπὸ μακρόθεν. Some view this apparent unevenness in the text as evidence for the synthesis of two narratives.[15] But this seeming restatement of the event merely provides an additional detail that *v.* 2 already implies, namely, that the demoniac *came to meet* Jesus after seeing Him *from a distance.* In this regard, **Hooker** (143) appears to overstate the case by contending that 'either Mark has pieced two stories together, or he has forgotten what he wrote there.'

The demoniac's almost instantaneous prostration might be interpreted in several ways, each of which is consistent with the overall context: it might indicate fear before one perceived as more powerful; it might betoken an attitude of respect or even worshipfulness; it might even suggest a gesture of mock obeisance on the part of someone who defies all authority. But as *v.* 7 immediately shows, the last possibility must be ruled out. Clearly, Jesus has been able (by virtue of His appearance alone) to subdue the demoniac in a way that others could not--even with chains and shackles. This man is obviously no match for one who has tied up the 'strong man' that is Beelzebub (Mk. 3:27) and designated as the 'mightier' one coming after John the Baptist (Mk. 1:7).

In the present story, the extent of the demoniac's fear is underscored by his *crying out with a loud voice* (κράζας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ).[16] But the question that follows (*v.* 7b) also suggests a confrontational posture. In this connection, the query *What have you to do with me* (τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί)? might be restated in these terms: *What have I and you in common?* [17] Indeed, the wide gulf that separates them is strikingly revealed in his identification of Jesus by His correct name and title. Ironically (as in Mk. 1:23-24), Jesus is now recognized for who and what He is by a member of the demonic world. Commentators vary in their assessment of the reason for this

---

[15] e.g., see **Mann,** 279.

[16] **Lane,** 183.

[17] **Branscombe,** 91.

recognition. In this context, it might be construed as an indication of the supernatural knowledge which demons possess.[18] But others perceive a practical motive at work as well: in a manner consistent with ancient presuppositions regarding the power and advantage that proceeds from a familiarity with an adversary's name, the demoniac might be seizing an opportunity to gain mastery over his superior opponent.[19]

While the grandiose appellation *Son of God, of the Most High* (υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου) appears to be messianic, it really focuses upon Jesus' divine origin. In this connection, however, it assumes a particular relevance in light of its utterance in a non-Jewish, Gentile context.[20] It is paradoxical indeed that someone in the grip of an unclean spirit would implore Jesus *by God* (ὁρκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν) for mercy (*v.* 7b). But the specific request *do not torment me* (μή με βασανίσῃς) must be understood in eschatological terms. In a very real sense, the inauguration of God's Kingdom through the Son of God that the demoniac readily recognizes signals the beginning of the end of evil's reign. From this standpoint, *v.* 7b finds a fuller explanation in *Matthew's* parallel account (8:29): *Have you come here to torment us before the appointed time?* [21] *V.* 8 assumes a

---

[18] **Lane,** 183-84; **NJBC,** 607a; **Anderson,** 148.

[19] **Lane,** 183.

[20] **Hooker,** 143: The term 'the Most High God' is one found in the Old Testament, mostly used by non-Israelites in speaking of Israel's God: it is therefore appropriate in the mouth of one who was living in Gentile territory and was presumably himself a Gentile. Cf., Dan. 3:99: *It has seemed good to me* [i.e., King Nebuchadezzar] *to publish the signs and wonders which the most high God has accomplished in my regard.* According to **Johnson** (102), the epithet "Most High" (ὕχψιστος) had been applied to Zeus. Also see the remarks of **Kittel** (1243), who designates 'Most High' as a favourite term for God in Hellenistic Judaism, which brings together the Old Testament title for God and the Greek concept of the chief god.

[21] The idea that God gave the evil spirits free rein over humans until the end time is prominent in the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Cf., En.

parenthetical role, and serves to explain the reaction of the demoniac in the preceding verse: *For He had been saying to him* (ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ): *'Unclean spirit, come out of the man'* (ἔξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). The imperfect tense of the verb ἔλεγεν suggests that the exorcism had already transpired.[22] If this is the case, then Jesus has recognized the presence of an evil spirit. Thus, the command *come out of the man* confirms that the Gerasene has not been speaking on his own, but at the demon's prompting.

Jesus' request for the demon's name at *v.* 9a parallels the demoniac's identification of His own name and title at *v.* 7. But this surely amounts to a rhetorical question (and not an implied admission of ignorance on Jesus' part). Indeed, as the Son of God, Jesus' knowledge would have to supersede any cognitive capacity displayed by the demon. Interestingly, however, the demon's impotence before Jesus is borne out by his failure to gain mastery over Christ after identifying Him by name. According to the ancient belief in the efficacy that flows from naming one's opponent, the

---

16,1: *.the spirits having gone forth, shall destroy without...judgment...until the day of the consummation.* Jub. 10:8: *'Lord, Creator, let some of them remain before me...and do all that I shall say...for if some are not left to me, I shall not be able to execute the power of my will on the sons of men.'*

[22] The position of this verse has been the subject of extensive debate. According to **Perkins** (583a-584b), "This juxtaposition may have belonged to the tradition as Mark knew it, since he explains the demon's response by telling readers that Jesus had already told the demon to leave (*v.* 8)." **Mann** (279), on the other hand, offers the following assessment: Mark's *v.* 8 must be regarded as editorial, perhaps as an explanation for the frantic behaviour. If this explanation is rejected, there is the possibility that the author is using his Lucan version, replacing Luke's *parengeien* by *elegen* (*was already saying*), changing Luke's indirect speech to direct, and moving Luke's description of the demoniac to *vv.* 3-5. It must be said that proponents of Markan priority would reply that Luke (as a far more elegant prose writer) improved upon the text before him. **Lane** (184, n. 16) rules out the suggestion of O. Bauernfeind that *v.* 8 originally stood before *v.* 7, and possibly in place of *v.* 6. Instead, he endorses the position I am adopting, namely, that *v.* 8 is an "explanatory insertion" by *Mark.*

demon should have won the day immediately. In this case, however, his opponent is no ordinary human, but rather, the *Son of God, of the Most High.* In my estimation, then, Jesus' question *What is your name?* amounts to a literary device intended for the reader's benefit. The reply that the question sets up enables us to learn the demon's identity in a more specific manner. The response (*v.* 9b), in fact, is a puzzling one, in light of its import and grammar alike: *Legion is my name* (λεγιὼν ὄνομά μοι), he states, *because we are many* (ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν).

Is it possible that the evangelist resorted to a loan word which carried the negative connotation of an *evil multitude* or a *violent band* in the mind of his readers?[23] In this respect, the term λεγιὼν no doubt assumed a pejorative import for those under the oppressive heel of Roman domination, in the way that terms like 'Gestapo' and 'KGB' would inspire fear and horror in the twentieth century. But any confusion surrounding the demon's name is only compounded by the conjoining of the first person singular (μοι) and the first person plural (ἐσμεν) in the same sentence. In effect, the demon now speaks (but through the possessed man) on behalf of a whole entourage of demons, as expressed by means of the collective noun λεγιὼν.[24] The same voice carries over into *v.* 10, where the demon

---

[23] Aside from Mk. 5:9, in point of fact, the word only appears at Mt. 26:53 and Lk. 8:30. In *Luke,* it emerges in the parallel account of Mk. 5:1-20. In *Matthew,* however, Jesus applies it to the angels that the Father has placed at His disposal. As **Kittel** (505) observes, the underlying idea here is one of extremely powerful forces.

[24] Cf., **Lane's** remarks (184-85): The term "Legion" is not strictly a Latinism *(legio)*; like other military and governmental terms, it had entered the language and is found not only in Hellenistic Greek but in Aramaic as well. It is difficult to know what meaning to place upon the term. The answer may express the man's sense of being possessed by an aggregate of uncoordinated impulses and evil forces which have so impaired his ego that the spirits speak and act through him. It is probable that the many demons can be referred to as a single being because they are in common possession of the same victim, but it is not possible to ascertain the exact nuance expressed in the term "Legion. But as **Hooker** astutely observes (143), *Mark's* apparent difficulty with grammar in this verse "reflects not

appeals to Jesus for toleration. Here, πολλά intensifies the verbal idea (conveying the notion of appealing *urgently*, or more literally, *many times,* in an insistent manner).

Specifically, λεγιὼν appeals to Jesus *not to expel him from the territory* (ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ ἔξ τῆς χώρας). The request lends itself to two intepretations. On the one hand, it might reflect a desire to maintain his current base of operations in the area around the tombs. In the scriptural tradition, the expulsion of demons resulted in their banishment to desert regions, the usual haunt of evil spirits.[25] This point is more apparent in the Lukan version (Lk. 8:31), where the place of banishment is designated as the *abyss,* the final place of punishment: *And they besought Him that He would not command them to go out into the abyss* (εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον).[26]

---

only the difficulty of speaking consistently of one man with many demons, but the divided condition of the man himself." Curiously, this aspectof the Markan version of the story (whereby one demon becomes many) provides something of a common ground with the Matthean version and its incorporation of two demons into the story from the outset.

[25] Cf., Tb. 8:3 (where the expelled demon flees to the desert of Upper Egypt, the dwelling place of demons) and Lk. 11:24 (*When an unclean spirit goes out of someone, it roams through arid regions searching for rest but, finding none, it says, I shall return to my home from which I came.*).

[26] **Kittel** (2) sums up the meanings inherent in ἄβυσσος in these terms: it was originally an adjective for an implied "earth," but it was used in Greek to designate the depths of the original time, the primal ocean, and the realm of the dead; in the **LXX,** it denotes the original flood, and only later the world of the dead. Cf., G. Schwarz, " 'Aus Der Gegend' (Markus v. 10b)," **NTS** 22 (#2, 1976): 214-215, who contends that the disparity between *Mark's* use of χώραν and *Luke's* ἄβυσσος is attributable to a confusion between Aramaic terms designating 'place' and 'deep':

> "ἄβυσσος und χώρα stehen einander unvereinbar gegenüber. Eine Erklärung ist demnach, falls überhaupt, nur über das Aramäische möglich; hier (damit nehme ich das Ergebnis vorweg): über die Ähnlichheit der zugrundezulegenden aramäischen Vokabeln tehoma und tehuma, die-zumal im nichtvokalisierten Text oder bei nachlässiger Aussprache sehr leicht miteinander verwechselt

But in eschatological terms (and in a manner consistent with his earlier request at *v.* 7), the demon might wish to protect his tenuous foothold in the wider χώραν of the world, where demons are still able to victimize humans with impunity. Jesus' very appearance indicates that God is now in the process of reclaiming this χώραν and neutralizing the evil forces that dominate it. From this standpoint, the demon's appeal amounts to a bold act that presupposes a bargaining position.

In *v.* 11, the narrative shifts the reader's attention to the large herd of swine feeding on the nearby hillside. While this information is crucial to the rest of the story, it also alerts us to a highly significant detail. The *territory of the Gerasenes,* as we have observed above (*v.* 1) is part of the pagan world. From the Jewish perspective, only Gentiles would maintain a herd of animals deemed unclean or impure. In the Jewish mind, such animals would be placed on a par with the unclean spirits possessing the demoniac. For this reason, the demons' request in *v.* 12 is wholly logical. As an alternative to expulsion from the territory, they desire to enter creatures that are unclean like themselves, and by implication, to remain in the realm of the ungodly. The apparent goal of this request is possession of the swine, in lieu of the exorcised Gerasene. Once again, we observe an interesting (if not somewhat confusing) shift in voice: the demons now speak collectively (πέμψον ἡμᾶς/ἐισέλθωμεν) in seeking entry into the their bestial counterparts. Accordingly, Jesus' affirmative response (*v.* 13) is directed toward the multitude (καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς), rather than the original speaker.[27]

---

werden können. Wie der Kontext ausweist (vor allem des Ausfahren der Dämonen in die Schweine), dürfte tehoma primär sein. In ihn zu fahren, nicht lediglich 'aus der Gegend' vertrieben zu werden, war es, was die Dämonen fürchteten."

[27] Jesus' acquiescence in the demons' request might be interpreted as an indication that the forces of evil have been put on notice that their time is at hand. At any rate, their possession of the swine is preferable to their possession of a human being. As subsequent developments show, however, their habitation in the swine will be extremely brief. Jesus' indirect

The demons' possession of the swine and the fatal stampede it precipitates has generated much scholarly discussion.[28] Did the demoniac's earlier commotion prompt their panic and demise? Were the demons destroyed along with the swine? Did Jesus condone this destruction of livestock and personal property? While such questions are intriguing, our analysis must confine itself to what the text tells us. The reader is simply informed that *the herd rushed head-long down the steep slope into the sea* (ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν), and that *they were drowned* (ἐπνίγοντο). Interestingly, the Markan account is the only version to mention the number of swine. Commentators, in fact, have perceived a link between the explicit reference to *about two thousand* (ὡς δισχίλιοι) *swine* and the cryptic use of λεγιὼν at *v.* 9.

Since a typical Roman Legion comprised between five and six thousand troops, the number cited at *v.* 13 might represent an underestimate of such a unit's size (or else, an accurate reference to a reduced auxiliary contingent of batallion strength). In this regard, **Perkins** (584a) points out that the 10th Roman Legion (stationed in Palestine since 6 C.E.) had used the boar as its standard insignia. The comparison between demons who have already identified themselves as λεγιὼν and swine that call to mind Roman occupation forces has obvious polemical potential. From this standpoint, Jesus' authority supersedes the power of the demons, as well as the power of the greatest secular empire. But this interpretation is highly speculative. As **Perkins** further observes (584a), any such comparison is intended to describe the destructiveness of the demons, and thereby, aims at comparing the demons to the Roman legions (not *vice versa*). As the behavior of the demoniac and swine so graphically demonstate, unclean spirits are inextricably bound up with a drive toward death. Demons and swine alike gravitate toward the sea, the locus of evil.

---

condoning of this destruction of animal life is puzzling, and finds a strange counterpart in the account of the withered fig tree at Mk. 11:12-14; 20-21.

[28] For a sampling of the theories pertinent to this discussion, see the discussion in Van der Loos, *The Miracles of Jesus,* 390-391.

This startling chain of events prompts the swineherds to flee and report the incident in the town and neighboring hamlets (*v.* 14a). Their report, in turn, draws the curious to the scene (*v.* 14b). Surprisingly, what they now observe arouses their fear (*v.* 15): they find the former demoniac seated, fully clothed, and enjoying a sound mind (σωφρονοῦντα). The awkward insertion of the phrase *the one who had the legion* immediately after this description appears somewhat redundant. On the surface, it seems like a reminder that this is the same individual who was ranting and raving earlier in the passage. The bystanders' fear apparently proceeds from the radical transformation in his overall appearance and demeanor. (Why, for that matter, would this positive development inspire their fear at all?) But after the eyewitnesses relate precisely what happened to the Gerasene and to the herd (*v.* 16), their fear shifts to Jesus. They implore Him to leave their district (*v.* 17).

The overall reaction of the townspeople reveals a curious reversal of events; in effect, they now exhibit aspects of the former demoniac's behavior. Like him, they fear Jesus and attempt to drive Him away. Any considerations of the motives at work here, of course, must be purely conjectural. Clearly, however, these people find something about Jesus extremely unsettling. But in keeping with the 'uncleanness' and lack of faith that permeates their lives, this negative response is only to be expected.[29] Yet, is the lack of understanding on their part any more disappointing than what we observe among the Jews? To a great extent, Christ's rejection by these Gentiles parallels the hostility meted out by the scribes and his own relatives (Mk. 3:20-35).

Jesus' compliance with their wishes is confirmed by the reference to His *getting in the boat* (*v.* 18). Instead of merely expressing gratitude for his healing, the Gerasene begs Jesus *that he might stay*

---

[29] From the Jewish perspective, these people were members of a culture which not only kept swine, but consumed the meat from such unclean animals as well. Their apparent disordering of priorities (i.e., to the extent that they view one who casts out demons as an object of fear) is wholly consistent with their depiction as unclean persons.

with Him (ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ). This plea for acceptance into Jesus' immediate circle is strikingly close to the formula found at Mk. 3:14, in connection with Jesus' call of the Twelve: *And He ordained...that they should be with Him* (ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ). But true discipleship does not proceed from the initiative of the prospective disciple. The call must come from Christ. While Jesus denies this apparently sincere request (*v.* 19a), the rejection by no means rules out the Gerasene's suitability to spread the Good News. Jesus does not reject the man as a disciple *per se*. But anything he now does in spreading the word is determined by Jesus. Just as the call to discipleship must come from Christ, the call to preaching must come from Christ as well. Like the rich young man (Mk. 10:17-22), the healed Gerasene now learns that no one can set a personal agenda as Jesus' disciple. Accordingly, Jesus issues a two-fold command (*v.* 19b): *first, 'Go back to your home, to your family'* (εἰς τὸν οἶκον σου πρὸς τοὺς σούς); *secondly, 'announce to them all that the Lord has done for you and had mercy on you'* (ἀπάγγειλον αὐτοῖς ὅσα ὁ κύριος σοι πεποίηκεν καὶ ἠλέησέν σε).

Ironically, Jesus' order to return εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου πρὸς τοὺς σούς reminds us of His indictment of that would-be disciple at Lk. 9:61 (for desiring to do precisely this).[30] Here, however, Jesus obviously perceives a more useful role for this individual among his own people than within the immediate entourage of disciples. In this respect, the verb ἀπαγγέλειν is inextricably connected with the notion of evangelization.[31] Paradoxically, then, the Gerasene's rejection entails nothing less than a commission to preach the word to the Gentiles. Jesus' instruction about the content of this preaching is noteworthy for two reasons. On the one hand, the act of healing is equated with an act of mercy. The implicit message is that Jesus' compassion is open to everyone (including Gentiles), and that it observes no national or cultural boundaries. On the other hand, this merciful act is attributed specifically to ὁ κυρίος, a title reserved for

---

[30] Lk. 9:61: *And yet another said, 'I will follow after you, Lord, but first permit me to take leave of my household* (τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου).

[31] Cf., Ac. 17:30; 26:20; I Cor. 14:25.

God alone that effectively links the present verse with the demoniac's identification of Jesus as υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (v. 7).[32] This Lordship is clearly revealed on the basis of Jesus' ability to heal and restore the man formerly in the grip of demonic powers.

In compliance with Jesus' command, the Gerasene proclaims what He did for him in the Decapolis (v. 20). On the basis of what we find earlier in Mark (1:25;44; 3:12; 5:43; 7:36), we can easily assume that this represents an overstepping of the specific directive to report what has happened to his home and family. In those earlier passages, Jesus explicitly prohibited any attempt to reveal His power or identity. No such restrictions, however, are imposed on the Gerasene. For this reason, home and family may be construed in the broadest possible sense to include the entire area. By means of this enthusiastic communication, the Gerasene establishes a foothold in Gentile territory for the furtherance of the Kingdom. The fact that this preaching is a cause of marvel or wonder among his hearers indicates an initial attraction to Jesus and the authenticity of His message.

Concluding Reflections on the Eschatological Dimension of Mk. 5:1-20

Jesus' role as healer is closely connected with His salvific enterprise. But because this enterprise is all-embracing, it is not confined to the Jewish world alone. Jesus' exorcism and commissioning of the Gerasene demoniac graphically demonstrates that His liberating message of love and forgiveness encompasses the Gentile world as well. By virtue of this healing, the seeds are sown for subsequent missionary activities in the region. In this incident, Jesus' authority (and the power it encompasses) is revealed in an extremely hard-hitting manner. Indeed, His very appearance in the environs of Gerasa entails an overturning of priorities on every

---

[32] But as **Kittel** (492) points out, when God is designated as κύριος in the New Testament, it is generally in the context of Old Testament quotations or allusions. Mk. 5:19, in fact, is the only place in the Synoptic Gospels in which God is referred to as ὁ κύριός. Cf., I Cor. 10:9; I Tim. 6:15; Heb. 7:21; Rev. 1:8; 11:15; 22:6.

level: demons are put on the defensive and cast out; the man they possessed and held in bondage is completely healed and transformed; the once placid countryside (at least on the surface) is plunged into utter chaos; people feel threatened by this challenge to the status quo; a religious and cultural 'outsider' is enlisted in spreading the Good News. In effect, everything must give way in the face of the coming of God's Kingdom. Accordingly, the demons' address of Jesus as Son of God of the Most High finds ready confirmation in His works. All of this brings to the fore an eschatological or apocalyptic dimension of the story. In the startling image of the herd tumbling headlong down the ravine, we find a metaphor for the passing of an age dominated by sin and impurity.[33] This occurrence, it seems, reflects the general thrust of Jesus' prophecy at the end of the Gospel (Mk. 13:8) and its reference to the approaching time when nation will rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom.

Broadly speaking, Mk. 13 as a whole points to the signs which indicate both the consummation of the present age and the imminent arrival of the Son of Man (Mk. 13:24,ff.). Such signs encompass a

---

[33] In effect, Jesus' actions and mighty deeds rock the respective worlds and presuppositions of Jews and Gentiles alike. The issue of reader response is relevant here. Earl S. Johnson, Jr. ("Mark 5:1-20: The Other Side," *Irish Bible Studies* 20 (April, 1998): 50-74) raises the intriguing question as to how the Roman population of Gerasa and the Decapolis would have understood Jesus, in light of certain key concepts of sacred space, death, and atonement. In contrast to Jewish attitudes, Johnson points out (65) that pigs played an important part in Roman religious practice from the early days of the Republic and were linked with true piety as customary sacrificial animals. Johnson (73) assesses the different responses of Jews and pagan Romans to Jesus' actions in terms of the following comparison: "If the story of the cleansing of the Temple presents to the Jews the unimaginable prospect that the Temple, its economic basis... and its sacrificial system...is to be overthrown by Jesus through his crucifixion, so 5:1-20 suggests to the Gentile reader living in the Roman Empire that the revered and traditional sacrifices for atonement and preparation for the next life will also be replaced by Jesus' one atoning death. That Gentiles are amazed by Jesus' actions and claims (5:15,17,20) is no more surprising than his rejection by the Jews."

host of tribulations and upheavals in a manner wholly consistent with later Jewish apocalypticism. In this context, however, they have a special connection with the realization of the Kingdom of God in the person of Jesus. In my estimation, then, what we encounter in Mk. 5:1-20 can be viewed as part and parcel of the provocative themes and language of Mk. 13. Can the curious link between demons, impure animals, and the term 'legion' which emerges in the story of the Gerasene be construed as anticipating the reference to the 'desolating abomination' of the Romans' defilement of the Temple at Mk. 13:14? Mk. 13, however, suggests an *imminent* eschatology that stands in sharp contrast to the *realized* eschatology which permeates the earlier part of the Gospel (as reflected in Mk.5:1-20 and other passages).

How do the *imminent* and *realized* eschatologies differ in *Mark?* Perhaps (as one commentator observes), Mk. 13 reflects the evangelist's wish to assure those persecuted Christians (anxious as to why Jesus had not yet returned to deliver them from present trials) that their very expectation of an early return of Christ was misplaced.[34] Such an expectation, in fact, is reflected at Mk. 15:43,

---

[34] H.A. Guy, *The Gospel of Mark* (London/Melbourne/Toronto: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968), 155-56. See the informative survey of **Guelich** (xxxviii-xxxix), which provides the following profile of scholarly opinions on this topic: W. Marxsen (*Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel,* trans. J. Boyce, et al. [Nashville: Abingdon, 1969]) argues that the evangelist (after the beginning of the Jewish War) used the Jesus-tradition to write a kerygmatic summons to the Church at Jerusalem to go to Galilee to meet Christ; W. Kelber (*The Kingdom in Mark. A New Place and a New Time* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974], 139), on the other hand, contends that the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple undermined the imminent eschatology, and therefore, revealed that such an eschatology was based on a false concept of time and a flawed choice of place that stood in need of redefining; accordingly, H.C. Kee (*Community of the New Age: Studies in Mark's Gospel* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977], 106) depicts Mark's community as viewing itself as occupying the "time between" Jesus' coming and the consummation of the Kingdom; A.M. Ambrozic (*The Hidden Kingdom: A Redaction-critical Study of the References to the Kingdom of God in Mark's Gospel,* **CBQ**, MS 2 [Washington, D.C.: CBA,

which depicts Joseph of Arimathea as *himself awaiting the Kingdom of God.* Accordingly, Mk. 13:33 admonishes the disciples (as representatives of the Christian community) that *you do not know when the time will come.* Earlier in the Gospel, however, we have every indication that the establishment of God's Kingdom is *already* underway in the life and ministry of Jesus. *This is the time of fulfillment,* Mk. 1:15 proclaims, *the Kingdom of God is at hand.* The striking bridal metaphor of Mk. 2:19 likewise announces the forging of a new loving bond between God and humanity in Jesus' person, mission, and relationship with His disciples. Ironically, however, the very disciples who have been granted *the mystery of the Kingdom of God* (Mk.4:11) are slow to grasp the wonders that signal its arrival. This is why the account of the Gerasene demoniac is so powerful: not only does it demonstrate the universality of Christ's call to redemption (as does the story of the Syrophoenician woman at Mk. 8:24,ff.), but it also conveys a profound sense of the emergence of the Kingdom that reverberates through the entire Gospel.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations have been adopted for recurrent references to several key sources cited throughout the paper.

Anderson	Hugh Anderson, *The Gospel of Mark. New Century Bible* (London: Oliphants, 1976)
Boring	M. Eugene Boring, "The Gospel of Matthew," *The New Interpreters Bible,* Volume VIII (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995).
Branscombe	B. Harvie Branscombe, *The Gospel of Mark. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary* (London:

1972], 244) argues that while Jesus inaugurates God's Kingdom by His words and deeds, its presence remains hidden until the end-time.

	Hodder and Stoughton, 1964).
Brown	Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland Murphy (editors), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1990).
Culpeper	Alan Culpeper, "The Gospel of Luke," *The New Intepreters Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995).
Fitzmyer	Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Translation with Introduction and Commentary), in *The Anchor Bible* series, Volume 28 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1981).
Gnilka	Joachim Gnilka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus.* Teilband I (Zurich: Benziger Verlag, 1978).
Guelich	Robert A. Guelich, *Word Biblical Commentary,* Volume 34A. *Mark* 1-8:26 (Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1989).
Hooker	Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark. Black's New Testament Commentary* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991).
Johnson	Sherman E. Johnson, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to Mark. Black's New Testament Commentaries* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960).
Kittel	Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (editors), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Translated and Abridged in one volume by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985).
Lane	William L. Lane, *Commentary on the Gospel of Mark. The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974).
Mann	C.S. Mann, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Translation with Introduction and Commentary) in *The Anchor Bible* series, Volume 27 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1986).
Perkins	Pheme Perkins, "The Gospel of Mark," *The New*

	Interpreters Bible, Volume VIII (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995).
Pesch	Rudolf Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium.* I Teil (Freiburg/Basel/Wein: Herder, 1984).