

# Dr. Mark Jennings, Mark, Lecture 6, Mark 3:1-19, Healing, Summary and the 12

© 2024 Mark Jennings and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. Mark Jennings in his teaching on the Gospel of Mark. This is session 6 on Mark 3:1-19, Healing, Summary, and the 12.

Hello, it's good to be back with you as we continue to work through the Gospel of Mark.

We're entering into Mark chapter three. In a lot of ways, Mark chapter three picks up where we left off in Mark chapter two. So we're in the public ministry of Jesus around the Galilean area.

If you recall, at the end of Mark chapter two, there was a controversy that centered around the Sabbath. It ended with Jesus declaring the intent of the Sabbath, that the divine intention of the Sabbath was meant to benefit humanity. It was a gift to humanity.

The religious leaders have turned it into something where humanity, man, was serving the Sabbath instead of the divine intent. Then Jesus substantiated his claim by indicating that he, as the son of man, was Lord of the Sabbath and that he was the one who determined what was right and appropriate. Quite a statement to make to the religious leaders whose profession, whose job and vocation was to interpret what was in keeping with the law and what was not.

So, it's with that idea that we step into Mark chapter three and we see that this Sabbath controversy hasn't gone away. So, I want to look here at the first six verses of Mark chapter three, verses one through six. Another time he went into the synagogue and a man with a shriveled hand was there.

Some of them were looking for a reason to accuse Jesus, so they watched him closely to see if he would heal him on the Sabbath. Jesus said to the man with the shriveled hand, stand up in front of everyone. Then Jesus asked them, which is lawful on the Sabbath to do good or to do evil, to save a life or to kill? But they remained silent.

He looked around at them in anger and deeply distressed at their stubborn hearts, said to the man, stretch out your hand. He stretched it out and his hand was completely restored. Then, the Pharisees went out and began to plot with the Herodians how they might kill Jesus.

When we look at Mark chapter three here as we start out, it's not immediately clear just who the people are that are looking for reason to accuse Jesus. We sort of jump

into just another scene just with this introduction of another time he went into the synagogue. But given the previous episode where it was the Pharisees who were accusing Jesus of Sabbath violation, Mark is implicitly telling us that this is the same group.

Luke, in fact, when he recounts it, he explicitly tells us that they are Pharisees and teachers. It's interesting because in the synagogue, Jesus is going to be entering into this discussion of what is lawful to do or not do. It's related to the healing of this man with the shriveled hand.

I think it's important to understand and set the context that in Second Temple Judaism, at least if we trust the Mishnah on this, the issue of doing a medical good to preserve a life was permitted on the Sabbath. There was a lot of debate on this, but the Mishnah concludes that whenever life is in doubt, that danger overrides the Sabbath. There are other things that override the Sabbath requirement of not working.

For example, midwives could work on the Sabbath, which is good to know that a woman who was giving birth didn't have to wait until sundown. Circumcision was even allowed on the Sabbath. I think the idea, at least according to the Mishnah, is that circumcision is a sacred act.

It was an act of covenant relationship, and so then it was actually an appropriate act to do on the Sabbath. I set the stage, because I want to make sure we're not thinking that within Second Temple Judaism, that their understanding of not doing a work on the Sabbath even meant the endangerment of a person. That wasn't the atmosphere that we were in.

Also, to set the stage on that, though, this man's life is not in danger. The man at the shriveled hand isn't in danger of dying on that day in the synagogue, and we'll come back to that. This isn't the first time we've had a healing on the Sabbath.

We know of two other examples of the healing on the Sabbath in the Gospel of Mark by Jesus. Depending on how you think of the exorcisms, there is that day in Capernaum that started out in Mark chapter 1. Remember, there was a man in the middle of the synagogue who stood up and was full of an unclean spirit, and Jesus cast that demon out. One could argue that that would have been an act seen as permissible on the Sabbath because he was violating the synagogue, and there would have been a protective quality to it.

Of course, later that day, in Peter's mother-in-law's house, she has a fever, and Jesus heals her on the Sabbath. But that was a private event, and there was no indication necessarily that it was known publicly and widely that it had occurred. So, though we as a reader of Mark know that Jesus has already healed on the Sabbath, that he feels

fully comfortable in healing on the Sabbath, it's not as clear that the Pharisees knew he had done that, at least in the Gospel of Mark.

What is clear is that the Pharisees expect him to do the miracle. I think there's an irony here that they're in this situation, they're in this synagogue, they know there's a man with a shriveled hand there, and some of them were looking for a reason to accuse Jesus. So, they've come here to the synagogue on the Sabbath with the intent of finding cause against Jesus.

We've been seeing this happen throughout Mark. Why does he eat with sinners, for example? Why does he eat with the tax collectors? Why does he permit the disciples not to fast? We've been seeing these accusations. And so now they're here at the synagogue not to receive teaching.

They're primarily here to see if they could entrap Jesus. And even specifically, they watched him closely to see if he would heal him on the Sabbath. So that sets a perspective for us of why the Pharisees were there.

They have no care or intent, they're not hoping this man might be healed. They're actually hoping Jesus would heal the man, not for the benefit of the man, but so that they might accuse Jesus of doing a work on the Sabbath. You begin to see their skewed perspective that they're having on this.

And so, then Jesus asks a question. He enters into the debate. And he says to the man with the shriveled hand, Stand up in front of everyone.

The Greek there is the idea of stand up in the middle of everyone. So, understand what is happening here. Jesus purposefully chose to make a very public event of what he was about to do.

He's not waiting until the service is over, inviting the man with the shriveled hand back to the house, and then healing him there. This goes to what we've been talking about throughout. Jesus makes very specific intentions on when he does what and for what reason.

We saw that with the man who was paralyzed and he was lowered down in the mat. Jesus, before he did the healing, specifically said, Your sins are forgiven. He chose to unite the healing of the paralytic man with the declaration of his power to forgive sins.

Here, he chooses to do this healing on the Sabbath in the synagogue in a very public way. So he has the man stand up. And then, he links what he's about to do with his question regarding the purpose of the Sabbath.

In a very good Second Temple Jewish debating fashion, he sets up two sides with a question. He asks, Which is lawful on the Sabbath? So that language, which is lawful on the Sabbath, is putting it in the context of the debate on what is allowed on the Sabbath by law and what is not. By law meaning sort of the law of Moses and the understanding of the Scripture and the old tradition.

So, he sets that up. Which is lawful on the Sabbath? To do good or to do evil? Now, I find the question very interesting because it's never lawful to do evil. It is never lawful to do evil on any day, let alone on the Sabbath.

And so, the nature of that question almost requires full assent. Everyone there would say they would almost look at it in the sense of, well, it's not lawful to do evil on the Sabbath. And so there is a general form of that, even of arguing that question of gaining assent, of lining up good, doing good, and the Sabbath.

Of lining those two together. And how doing evil on the Sabbath is an absurd idea is anathema. In the same way that fasting during a wedding feast is an absurd idea, doing evil on the Sabbath is an absurd idea.

And then again, he progresses to the next question. The implication is, which is lawful on the Sabbath? To save a life or to kill? So, I now have two other sorts of questions. Lining up good with saving a life, lining up evil with killing.

Now, the question of whether it is lawful to save a life on the Sabbath. That was an active question, and as I said earlier, the Mishnah and Rabbinic Judaism seem to have settled on the fact that, yes, it is lawful to save a life on the Sabbath. But it's never lawful to murder. And it's certainly never lawful to murder on the Sabbath.

And so, it's fascinating. So, he's taking this good and evil, saving a life, and killing, in very stark terms, this dichotomy. And I think what is lining up here in this progression is that evil and killing are working together, good and saving a life are working together, in very strong dichotomies, that there isn't a middle ground.

He's setting up this miracle that he's about to do within that dichotomy. And notice they remain silent. So, asking this question, which is lawful on the Sabbath, to do good, to do evil, to save a life, or to kill?

And they, those trying to test him, remain silent. No response indicates at that point that these religious leaders know that they can't really voice anything. Because to voice an opposition at that point would mean standing on the side of the dichotomy that Jesus has set up.

Jesus is a master debater here. He has set up two categories, and implicitly, he set himself up in the category of affirming life, of affirming good. And so to voice

anything against Jesus would almost by default put themselves in the category of evil and murder.

And so, they can give no response. They stay silent instead of answering. And the fact that they do not answer indicates how far removed they are from affirming Jesus and what Jesus is doing.

They refuse even to voice support, yes, Jesus, you're right. It's only lawful to do good and it's only lawful to save a life. But the fact that they refuse to say anything indicates that their true purpose is not even trying to understand or enter into a discussion of what is permitted on the Sabbath or not.

That their true purpose is simply to align against Jesus. And that elicits a response from Jesus in verse 5. He looked around at them in anger, deeply distressed at their stubborn hearts. This is, in Mark, this is a very rare emotion.

Jesus in Mark, we get a lot of emotion. The human qualities of Jesus in Mark get stressed. But this is the only time where anger is clearly presented in Mark by Jesus, by Jesus being angry.

There is a disputed textual variant earlier on in the Gospel of Mark where it's motivated by anger or compassion. But here, it's very, very clear. And notice what he's angry at.

He's angry at their stubbornness. A more preferred translation of that might be the hardness of their hearts instead of their stubbornness. Hardness of heart is a very idiomatic way of conveying resistance; resistance to God is often accompanied by spiritual blindness.

Groups that had a hardness of heart in the Old Testament were groups who had stubbornly resisted what God was doing, and the result of their stubborn resistance was a deepening of their inability to see or understand. So, you had this dichotomy working. We see this with Exodus 4, Exodus 7, Exodus 8. I mean, Pharaoh, this is speaking of Pharaoh there.

2 Chronicles 36, Jeremiah 3, Jeremiah 7 and 13. Paul uses very similar phrasing himself in Romans 11 and 2 Corinthians 3. And so, what Jesus, in seeing them say nothing, he becomes very angry. Here are these religious leaders who refuse to affirm what he has just said.

That's indicative of the hardness of their heart. Now, the hardness of the heart, this is going to play a role as we move out through the Gospel of Mark. We're going to see this come up elsewhere.

And by being angry at the hardness of their heart, Jesus, one, is again having insight into the condition of their heart. This goes back to what we've talked about earlier about how Jesus is able to do what is only associated with God, which is to understand the heart of a man. But also, this language is putting the Pharisees and the religious leaders on the side of Pharaoh, on the side of the cause and the enemies regarding the exile in Jeremiah, of the Israelites, the Jewish people who have been hardened.

And we've seen this happen several times. We saw this in Chapter 2 when Jesus was discussing the state of the question over the consecrated bread and David and have you not read. We'll see this play out through the rest of Mark, where Jesus continually puts the religious leaders and associates them with the Israelites who were disobedient or the followers of pagan ways, those who murmured and grumbled in the wilderness throughout.

But he's constantly associating the present leadership with the bad guys, if you will, from the Old Testament. And so here he's angered. And I think that anger motivation also is preparing us for the language of judgment that Jesus is going to be giving to these groups as well, that there is a divine judgment being issued as a result of the hardness of their hearts.

And so, in looking around in anger at the hardness of their hearts, he said to the man who's standing right there, like this little discussion has been happening. I always picture this man just kind of sitting there going, what do I do? What just happened? I've been asked to come up here, and now there's a big religious debate over the Sabbath. And Jesus said to the man, stretch out your hand.

So again, this is a very public, you know, this is Jesus is going to make sure everyone can clearly see what is about to happen. The healing is very public and full view. And he stretched out his hand and his hand was completely restored.

Imagine that scene. Here was in full view a withered hand, a shriveled hand, a hand that was unable to work, a hand that was unable to grasp, and now a hand fully restored, which is in keeping with what we've been seeing throughout Mark. When Jesus does something, it's wholly restored.

When he healed Peter's mother-in-law, she immediately got up to serve. When demons are present, he tells them to be quiet, and they shut up, and he tells them to leave, and they fully leave. There's no gradual restoration here.

It's a full restoration. So, he has done the very thing these Pharisees have been wondering if he would do. There's almost an agent-provocateur effect there.

He knows what they're here to trap him for, and he deliberately does it. And he has made this restoration of the hand. He has declared that that is a good act.

That is not an evil act. That is an act that is in keeping with the Sabbath. And this makes sense from what he's been saying about the Sabbath, that the Sabbath was meant to bring goodness to people.

And so, in restoring this man's hand, that is bringing goodness to that man, that there is a restoration. There's that, you know, even this idea of during the Sabbath, which Hebrews picks up on in sort of the eschatological Sabbath rest of just fully enjoying being in the presence of Jesus. This is what this man is now enjoying; it was out of step to have a withered hand in the presence of Jesus because he restores it in the presence of Jesus.

And so, he does this very, very public act. And the Pharisees are put in this position where they cannot speak against it. Who could speak against such a huge display of restoration occurring on the Sabbath that Jesus has said yes to, that this is in keeping with good and with keeping a life?

And so, then, what happens next is fascinating in verse 6. Then, the Pharisees went out, left the synagogue, went out, and began to plot with the Herodians how they might kill Jesus. First, the Herodians only appear twice in the New Testament. This group is called the Herodians, and then in Mark 12, where again, they plotting to kill Jesus. Now, the Herodians, who are these people? These would have been advocate supporters of the Herodian dynasty, the dynasty of King Herod the Great.

And then upon Herod the Great's death, his kingdom was split up. Herod Antipas and Herod Philip factor in, two sons that ruled after him, factor into this area. Now, the Herodians were very pro-Roman.

Herod was appointed king by the Romans. He had had the support of the Roman Senate. He had had the support of Mark Antony.

In fact, the Herodian alliance with the Romans actually began when Julius Caesar found himself in trouble in Egypt, trying to establish his rule, and the Herodians came and helped him. And that was a very good decision for the Herodians and for the line of Herod because they backed the right guy by coming and helping him, and so then that allowed some favor to exist. So, remember when we think of Herod, first Herod was not fully Jewish.

He wouldn't have been a full Jewish stock, sort of in the Maccabean idea. And he was appointed rule by the Romans. As a side note, that is why it was such a huge statement in Matthew when the Magi from the east come to Herod and they say, where is the one born king of the Jews? And the real issue here is not just the king of

the Jews but the born king of the Jews because Herod can never make the claim that he was born king.

He was appointed king in full sort of alliance with Rome. And what's fascinating, then, is that the Herodians would have backed the dynasty that was united to Rome. The Pharisees stood very much against the aristocracy that aligned with Rome.

The Pharisees looked for a time of restoration when Israel would stand as its own independent state and be out from underneath the thumbs. They sought the vindication of Israel, of the Jewish people. They were very much against Rome.

I mean, there's a reason when we shift to Jerusalem, the Pharisees start to take a bit of a back seat in terms of some of the decisions that are made against Jesus. They're not completely absent, but they take a bit of a back seat because the Pharisees weren't in the seats of power in Jerusalem. They weren't aligned with Rome as the Herodians were the Sadducees and some of the other ruling classes.

The Pharisees were mostly out in the countryside and in different areas, which is why we often see them in confrontation with Jesus; that's where they were as well. And so, we get this statement first of all of how the Pharisees, if they were to choose between aligning with Jesus who is healing people on the Sabbath or aligning with their arch enemies who are in favor of a pro-Roman rule, they would rather align with the Herodians because both the Herodians and the Pharisees saw a threat in Jesus. And the last little bit is fascinating.

What do they plot to do? That they might kill Jesus. So, think about this. Jesus has just said, which is lawful on the Sabbath? To save a life or to kill? On the Sabbath, what are the Herodians and the Pharisees doing? They're plotting to kill.

That indicates how far removed from understanding the intent of the Sabbath and God's plan and, how Jesus is playing a role, how hardened they've become. That they will do what everyone would recognize as unlawful, which is to plot to kill, and they would do it on all days, the Sabbath. So, we're beginning to get a sense of the growing confrontation.

Now, it's not just a minor contention. The lines have gotten starkly drawn. There are the Pharisees who aligned with the Herodians, seeking to kill Jesus.

And so, as we move forward, we need to remember that as the Pharisees come up in different places. Marks 7 through 12 is an interesting sort of summary statement. So, we've kind of left these Sabbath controversies that were paired up together.

And then in 7 through 12, we really get a little bit of a reminder from Mark, if you will, at what is occurring. So, in Mark 7 through 12, Mark reminds us that Jesus



withdrew with his disciples to the lake, and a large crowd from Galilee followed. When they heard all he was doing, many people came from Judea, Jerusalem, Idumea, and the regions across the Jordan and around Tyre and Sidon.

Because of the crowd, he told his disciples to have a small boat ready for him to keep people from crowding him. For he had healed many so that those with diseases were pushing forward to touch him. Whenever the evil spirit saw him, they fell down before him and cried out, You are the Son of God.

But he gave them strict orders not to tell who he was. This statement is very similar to Mark 1, 14 through 15 in that it has this summary quality to it. Mark begins with Galilee, but then geographically expands his summary to include out to the east and to the northwest, in case you're wondering how this is working.

Judea is a province to the south. Idumea is a Latin name for Edom. And so, it is interesting he's using the Latin name there, which might indicate the audience that he is writing to is more familiar with the Latin names.

Edom is another name for Esau. This is the region that was settled by the Edomites. Beyond the Jordan would be the eastern side of the Jordan River.

This would be the area of Decapolis in the north and Perea in the south. They're on the Mediterranean coast, north of Israel. These are Gentile regions.

I think it's interesting as Mark is presenting how his fame is spreading, the fame of Jesus is spreading beyond Galilee. It's spreading to different areas, including Gentile areas. This reference about the crowds trying to touch him, that's likely reflects a belief you could touch Jesus and be healed.

We'll see a specific instance of that happening there. We see that idea. It's not just a unique idea around Jerusalem.

We'll see this idea play out other places in the New Testament. So, for example, there will be in Acts people trying to get the handkerchiefs of Paul. If Paul touched him, they thought they could heal him, and then miracles would occur.

Or if the shadow, like Peter, could just pass over someone. So you get this sort of fervor, sometimes superstitious fervor, playing around in this. And we get this, again, summary statement.

Jesus is healing. The crowds are imposing on him. He's getting in the boat.

Because of it, all types of pictures are being created that come up again and again in the Gospel of Mark. And even the exorcisms. Notice that, again, we get this: whenever the evil spirit saw him, they fell down before him.

That shouldn't be understood as worship, more as recognition of authority. So, all the exorcisms have the same pattern. The demons see Jesus.

They fall down in submission in front of him, recognizing their authority. They're all crying out, you are the Son of God. We've seen different variations of that occur in the Gospel of Mark.

That always brings up the question of demonic awareness of Jesus. And I think, in general, because it is, to what extent did they understand Jesus as God's Son? The Son of God language is also even problematic there because it's used for all kinds of different figures in the Old Testament. But I think we can at least, at most, say that the demons recognize that Jesus had an authority over them.

One that is in keeping with what would be a divine authority because they're always worried about judgment. They're always worried about destruction in the hands of Jesus. So, to whatever full extent of the understanding of who Jesus is, there was certainly that recognition.

And Jesus would command them to be silent. We get that summary statement, which commands them to be silent. I think there's a sense that one that commanding them to be silent shows mastery.

Jesus has mastery over them and even what they can speak. And I think it prevents the heralds of who Jesus is from that activity belonging to demonic forces, that there's something wrong with that coming from the demons that Jesus is silencing. We get this summary statement continuing.

And then, after a summary statement, notice we have a selection of the 12 that follows in 13 through 19. This selecting of the 12 is interesting because after that summary statement in Chapter 1, we get the choosing of the 4. And so, you do see this pattern that is developing in the Gospel of Mark here where there's a similarity between summary statements and choosing, selection, sort of this next stage of progression. And from here on out, we're going to get greater attention on the 12 here.

We're now seeing a distinction being made between those who belong to Jesus and those who stand against him. Like there's this wintering effect. And there's also a distinction being made between those who are following and those who are the 12.

And so, you have this progression of disciples, of followers, of 12 disciples, and then of the 4, the special 4 that were chosen early, and then even of the 3 out of that 4. And so there is this hierarchy if you will. Now, the stress here on 12, I think, is twofold. Why 12? I think the choosing of 12 is significant.

One is just the representative factor that 12 has for Israel, the 12 tribes of Israel. And here's a selecting of 12. And I think it reflects this idea of an eschatologically restored Israel, of this covenant community now being defined, Israel being defined in a way through these 12.

Also, with this selection of these 12, you get the expansion of Jesus' ministry. We're going to see the 12 do things similar to what Jesus was doing. And so there seems to be even some growth there.

After this moment, the term disciples in Mark is almost used exclusively as a reference to the 12 part of the 12. So now the distinction of what is a disciple is starting to get defined. You know, this role of 12 as representative leaders is implied in Mark; it's made explicit in Matthew 19 and Luke 22.

But even more, think about what this means for Jesus. Jesus does not include himself as one of the 12. He has chosen the 12.

This, I think, is a strong argument for Jesus' messianic self-awareness. One of the things that is always debated is to what extent did Jesus see himself as a messianic figure, or was just the early church looking back upon Jesus and ascribing to him a messianic idea? This is the idea you'll hear referred to as the messianic self-consciousness of Jesus.

Well, here I think as we look at it, choosing 12 very much has this picture of Jesus standing in the position of God and sort of designating who his people are and choosing the 12 tribes and identifying the 12 tribes, of identifying the covenant people. And so I think this act of choosing 12 is strong evidence that Jesus had an awareness of who he was and what he was doing. It's interesting when you look at what the job of these 12 is in these verses.

Their first job is simply to accompany him. He chooses 12 to accompany him, to be with him. And when we see this appointing of the 12, notice in verse 14 of chapter 3, he appointed 12, designating them apostles, apostles being sort of this idea of emissary, sent ones, representatives, that they might be with him, that's their first thing, and that he might send them out to preach and to have authority to drive out demons.

So, notice their first job is to accompany him, but accompanying him has a reason. There's a purpose, he wants them to be around him, and it's the purpose so they will

be equipped to do the very things Jesus has been doing, namely preaching, proclaiming the kingdom of God, that the kingdom of God has drawn near, and notice to have the same authority, to have his authority over demons. Now, typically, we've been seeing three elements always together in this authority relationship, the triad of authority, if you will, which is teaching, casting out demons, and healing.

And when we look at what Mark chapter 3 says here, that they might go out to preach, this would be the teaching authority, and to have authority to drive out demons, there's no reference to healing here, and so the question of is, should we make a big deal of that? I don't think so. I don't think so because when we get to Mark 6, we're going to see that the disciples were also healing. In the same way, when you think about the end of chapter 1, on that day in Capernaum, when Jesus talks about how he must go out and teach, for that is why he has come, the very next verse about talks also him doing miracles and casting out demons.

And so, I think by even giving the two, the third seems to be somewhat assumed. At least when we get to Mark 6, it's made explicit. Other interesting notes, I think, are on the list. I won't spend as much time on this, but these are the 12 he appointed. Simon, to whom he gave the name Peter.

Simon is listed first. He's always listed first in the listings. That indicates what is recognized as Simon really being the leader of the 12.

He often was their representative. So, we see when Simon says something, he was also known as Peter. The naming there is even like Cephas and Petras, both of them meaning rock.

When Peter speaks, he has the idea that he's not alone in what he is saying, but he speaks for the whole, and he has this leadership aspect to it. But what's interesting is Mark breaks up the brothers. There are the 12 he appointed.

Simon, to whom he gave the name Peter. James, son of Zebedee and his brother John. Then, notice in 18, he calls them sons of thunder.

Andrew. Now what's interesting is we know Andrew is Peter's brother. What would have been common would be to do Simon and his brother Andrew and James and his brother John.

It was not to break up the brothers. Yet Mark breaks them up. They were called together.

Simon and Andrew are called at the same time. James and John are called at the same time. So why does Mark put Andrew fourth instead of second in the brother pairs? I think the answer to that is what we've already been talking about.

What we'll see is that while there was this group of four, there was a special group of three. That there was a special group of three who witnessed things that Andrew did not. That Simon, Peter, James, and John are going to be allowed to see things.

They're going to see the transfiguration, for example. They're often going to be pulled apart, even when we get to Gethsemane and prayer, they're pulled, and then a group is even pulled apart from the larger group. We're going to see this.

I think Mark in his listing here is indicating there's something of unique value and presence for Peter, James and John. In case you're wondering about these three, these four, we've talked about Peter a little bit. This reference to James and John as the sons of thunder probably is a way of referring not to their father but to their character.

When you use the language, the son of something, whatever that something is, is a way of indicating something about you or something about that person. To call them sons of thunder most likely means that maybe they had a bit of a temper, that they had an aggressive, violent streak, perhaps a loud streak, something associated with that. I find it fascinating to think of James and John in Acts.

James is the first apostle killed. He's the first apostle martyred. John will be the one who ends up living out the longest, writing, I believe, the Gospel of John, the Johannine Epistles, and Revelation.

I just find it fascinating the dichotomy of those two, between the one that's first martyred and the one that lasts. Andrew, we don't get much about Andrew. We know from the other Gospels he was a follower of John the Baptist.

It was Andrew who brought Simon to see Jesus, which I think is fantastic. The last, of course, on this list is Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him. The betrayer is listed as one of the twelve.

This speaks, I believe, to the historicity of the Gospels because if one were creating a special twelve that the hero chosen, you'd be unlikely to create a story where the hero, Jesus, chooses poorly. But Jesus here is in full control of the twelve, and among those twelve is the one who will be known as the betrayer, which we will get to. There's always been a lot of debate about what Iscariot means.

Most likely, it's a way of indicating where he's from, Kiriath. Other people say it means some sort of assassin group or zealot group. Probably it means the region that he's from, Kiriath, which is a place from Judea, which means that puts him as the only disciple from Judea.

So, there's a geographical separation at that point. So here we have the beginning of this description of the inside group and outside group in chapter 3. We have the clear enemies that have been aligned with the Pharisees and the Herodians. Jesus has separated a group of twelve for himself, which I believe constitutes this move towards Israel.

This is setting the stage for what is going to become a discussion about who is Jesus' family, who is not, and who Jesus considers belongs to him, in the midst of a discussion of the Pharisees' blasphemy of the Holy Spirit and the power of exorcism. We'll get to that next time. Thank you.

This is Dr. Mark Jennings in his teaching on the Gospel of Mark. This is session 6 on Mark 3:1-19, Healing, Summary, and the 12.