

THE INTERCALATED STORIES OF MARK 11:11–26 AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE FOR DISCIPLESHIP

Elias E. Mogbeyiteren

Baptist Theological Seminary, Eku, Delta State, Nigeria

Received: 02 July 2026 | Accepted: 12 September 2026 | Published: 26 September 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22981883>

Abstract

This study examines Mark 11:11–26 as a paradigmatic instance of Markan intercalation, the literary “sandwich” technique in which the Evangelist interrupts one narrative (the cursing and withering of the fig tree) with a second, thematically resonant episode (the demonstration in the temple). Reading the two halves as mutually interpretive rather than as independent traditions loosely stitched together, the paper argues that the fruitless yet foliated fig tree functions as an enacted parable of a temple system that was outwardly impressive but spiritually barren, while the temple action supplies the hermeneutical key that discloses the tree-curse as a pronouncement of eschatological judgment. Employing narrative and literary criticism in conversation with historical-critical background and Old Testament intertextuality (notably Jeremiah 8:13, Hosea 9:10, 16, Isaiah 56:7, and Jeremiah 7:11), the study traces how the intercalation inaugurates the passion narrative of Mark 11–13 and relativizes the Jerusalem cultus in favour of a community defined by faith, prayer, and forgiveness. The paper contends, further, that this dense literary unit is not merely a piece of narrative artistry but a theological and pastoral charter for discipleship: it exposes the danger of “leafy but barren” religiosity, summons believers to mountain-moving faith, and reorients the practice of prayer around radical, reciprocal forgiveness. The concluding sections extend this exegesis into contemporary ecclesial application, arguing that congregations today face the same temptation toward outward religious performance decoupled from authentic spiritual fruit, and that Mark’s vision of the praying, forgiving community remains a corrective for the church’s self-understanding as the “house of prayer for all nations.”

Keywords: Intercalation, Markan sandwich technique, fig tree, temple cleansing, authentic discipleship, fruitfulness, faith and prayer, forgiveness, eschatological judgment

I. Introduction

Mark’s narration of Jesus’ final week in Jerusalem reaches an early climax in 11:11–26, where the Evangelist deliberately breaks the story of the fig tree in two and inserts the temple incident between its halves. This literary decision raises an interpretive question that has occupied Markan scholarship for over a century: why does Mark choose to tell these two stories as one, and what is a reader meant to conclude from their entanglement? The present study argues that, read as a single

intercalated unit, Mark 11:11–26 presents the cursed and withering fig tree as a prophetic sign that interprets Jesus’ temple action as judgment on a fruitless religious establishment, while simultaneously instructing the disciples, and by extension, every subsequent reader, on the shape of authentic discipleship: fruit-bearing faith, believing prayer, and unqualified forgiveness.

Methodologically, the study combines narrative-literary criticism with historical background and Old Testament intertextual analysis, moving from the mechanics of the Markan sandwich, through the broader Passion Week context of Mark 11–13 and a close exegesis of 11:12–26, to the passage’s theological and pastoral significance for discipleship.

II. Literary Context and the Markan Intercalation Technique

James R. Edwards defines the “sandwich technique,” or intercalation, as a distinctively Markan literary convention in which the Evangelist interrupts one narrative episode (A1) with a second, seemingly unrelated story (B), before returning to complete the original narrative (A2) (Edwards, 1989, pp. 193–194). Mateusz Kusio observes that while this structure governs the surface flow of the narrative, its deeper purpose is to endow the flanking episodes with theological depth through what he terms “plot simultaneity,” in which the outer story is understood to continue progressing even while it is not explicitly being narrated (Kusio, 2015, pp. 265, 267). Geoffrey David Miller notes that although Matthew and Luke preserve a small number of intercalations, they do so chiefly because of their literary dependence on Mark, who employs the device at least six to nine times to narrate two stories as one continuous act of communication (Miller, 2012, pp. 177–178). As Edwards observes, this artistic arrangement corroborates the ancient testimony attributed to Papias, which held that although Mark wrote accurately, he did not narrate events in strict chronological sequence, choosing instead to organize his material according to his own theological design (Edwards, 1989, p. 199).

Specific examples illustrate Mark’s characteristic use of the device to bind together otherwise disparate narrative units. Kusio identifies the “double miracle story” of Mark 5:21–43 as the most transparent instance, in which the account of Jairus’s dying daughter is interrupted by the healing of the haemorrhaging woman (Kusio, 2015, p. 266). Edwards identifies further sandwiches, including the mission of the Twelve (Mark 6:7–30), which is interrupted by the martyrdom of John the Baptist, and the cursing and subsequent withering of the fig tree (Mark 11:12–21), which frames the clearing of the temple (Edwards, 1989, p. 198). Miller highlights the more complex intercalation of Mark 14:53–72, in which Peter’s presence in the courtyard and his eventual denial of Jesus form the outer frame for Jesus’ trial and confession before the Sanhedrin (Miller, 2012, pp. 177, 192). Taken together, these examples confirm that intercalation is not an isolated stylistic flourish but a recurring compositional strategy through which Mark trains his readers to interpret adjacent episodes as a single, mutually illuminating whole—an interpretive habit that the reader must bring to 11:11–26 if the unit’s full theological freight is to be recognized.

The theological purpose of intercalation transcends simple narrative suspense or the mere bridging of an interval of time. Whereas Ernst von Dobschütz argued that the device functioned primarily to allow a “time lapse” between the two halves of the outer story, Edwards contends that its principal function is mutual interpretation, in which the middle story operates as a “hermeneutical key” that unlocks the meaning of the flanking halves (Edwards, 1989, pp. 196, 200). Kusio adds that these

structures compel the reader to view the episodes as a single meaningful unit, citing the faith of the “outsider” woman in the Jairus sandwich as a lens through which the limitless faith demanded of the synagogue ruler becomes intelligible (Kusio, 2015, pp. 267, 274–275). Miller, for his part, emphasizes that Markan sandwiches frequently disclose Christ’s identity through dramatic irony, deploying secondary characters as foils that throw into relief both the courage of Jesus and the recurring failures and misunderstandings of his disciples, who must learn that authentic discipleship leads, ultimately, to the cross (Miller, 2012, pp. 176–177, 189). This threefold consensus, narrative interruption, theological simultaneity, and mutual interpretation, supplies the interpretive grammar for the exegesis that follows: the fig tree cannot be read rightly apart from the temple, nor the temple apart from the fig tree.

III. The Broader Context of Mark 11–13

Mark 11:12–26 belongs to the broader narrative arc of Mark 11–13, the section in which Jesus enters Jerusalem, confronts the temple authorities, and delivers the Olivet Discourse. Edwards observes that Mark 11–13 marks the beginning of the passion narrative proper, in which fully one-third of the Gospel is compressed into the final week of Jesus’ life, a compositional imbalance that itself signals the theological weight Mark attaches to the Jerusalem confrontation (Edwards, 2002, pp. 297–298). The material in this section is oriented, sustainedly, around the temple as the locus Dei, and Edwards argues that Mark’s purpose is to demonstrate that Jesus is not merely a reformer of the institution but its eschatological fulfilment and replacement (Edwards, 2002, p. 298; Kusio, 2015, p. 280). This thematic trajectory culminates in the Olivet Discourse of chapter 13, where the judgment already symbolized in the temple action is rendered explicit in Jesus’ prophecy that the temple buildings will be reduced to rubble (Edwards, 2002, pp. 349, 388). Read in this light, 11:11–26 functions as the narrative overture to that judgment: the fig tree and the temple are not isolated incidents but the opening movement of a sustained indictment that Mark will not resolve until the veil is torn and the temple’s fate is pronounced in full.

Kusio defines the “sandwich technique” formally as the insertion of one narrative episode between two parts of another, following an A1–B–A2 structure that equips the combined unit with theological meaning exceeding the sum of its parts (Kusio, 2015, p. 265). Edwards identifies the cursing of the fig tree as one of the clearest instances of this convention in the Gospel (Edwards, 1989, p. 198). In the first movement (A1, 11:12–14), Jesus curses a fig tree that is leafy but fruitless; in the middle section (B, 11:15–19), he enters the temple and forcibly halts its commercial and sacrificial operations; and in the resumption (A2, 11:20–26), the disciples discover the tree “withered from the roots,” an observation that occasions Jesus’ teaching on faith and prayer (Kusio, 2015, pp. 268, 279–280). Miller notes that this structure compels the reader to hold both stories in suspension simultaneously, deferring judgment on the first episode until the second has run its course, so that the two are necessarily interpreted as a single unit of meaning (Miller, 2012, pp. 177–178).

Theologically, the fig tree and the temple episodes are constructed for mutual interpretation, with the temple incident functioning as the hermeneutical key. Edwards argues that the deceptive fig tree—full of foliage yet devoid of fruit—serves as an enacted parable of the temple itself, a religious institution bustling with commerce yet, in Jesus’ estimation, reduced to “a den of robbers” lacking spiritual vitality (Edwards, 2002, p. 308). Kusio explains that this “plot simultaneity”

transfers the metaphorical judgment pronounced on the fig tree onto the temple mount itself, signalling the impending dissolution of a cultic system that had become “disconnected” from the spiritual fruit that God desires (Kusio, 2015, p. 281). Edwards concludes that the withering of the tree signifies that the temple’s function is now dead “from the roots,” and that salvation is henceforth located in the person and authority of Jesus rather than in the old religious establishment (Edwards, 1989, p. 208). The remainder of this paper takes this consensus as its exegetical starting point while pressing further into the passage’s discipleship implications, a dimension that the literary-critical literature, though attentive to structure, has tended to treat only in passing.

IV. Exegesis of Mark 11:12–26

This section proceeds in three movements: the outer frame of the fig tree episodes (11:12–14 and 11:20–26), the inner story of Jesus’ temple action (11:15–19), and the interrelation of the two.

- a) **The Outer Frame: The Fig Tree Episodes (Mark 11:12–14, 20–26):** Robert H. Stein observes that the chronological marker “the next day” (τῇ ἐπαύριον) explicitly links the fig tree episode to Jesus’ initial “reconnaissance” of the temple the previous evening, binding the two days into a single unfolding assessment of Jerusalem’s religious life (Stein, 2008, p. 511). As Jesus departs from Bethany, Mark records that he “became hungry” (ἐπείνασεν) and approached a fig tree “having leaves” (ἔχουσιν φύλλα) in search of fruit (Stein, 2008, p. 511). William L. Lane explains that in the spring month of Nisan a fig tree already in leaf should typically bear paggim—small, edible green knops that precede the full leaves—yet this tree offered foliage alone (Lane, 1974, p. 400). The narrator’s notoriously difficult explanatory clause, “for it was not the season for figs” (ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων), does not exonerate the tree but rather underscores its false advertisement: full leaf ordinarily promised at least the immature paggim, so that the absence of any fruit whatsoever exposed the tree as all show and no substance (Lane, 1974, p. 400). R. T. France describes it memorably as a “braggart” tree, a plant that makes a promise of fruitfulness it cannot keep (France, 2002, p. 441), while William Hendriksen observes that its full foliage “promised much but provided nothing,” a horticultural detail Jesus turns into a vehicle for prophetic instruction (Hendriksen, 1975, p. 442).

The symbolic resonance of the fig tree is deeply rooted in Israel’s prophetic tradition, where it repeatedly functions as a metaphor for the nation’s covenantal relationship with Yahweh. William R. Telford argues that Mark’s readers, steeped in this prophetic idiom, would have readily associated a fruitless tree with impending eschatological judgment (Telford, 1998, p. 163). The relevant Old Testament background includes Jeremiah 8:13, where the Lord laments that “there are no grapes on the vine, nor figs on the fig tree; even the leaves are withered,” and Hosea 9:10, where Israel is likened to “the first fruit on the fig tree” (Hooker, 1991, p. 261). Morna D. Hooker argues that Jesus’ action identifies the nation as having failed to bear the “appropriate fruits” of righteousness at the very moment the Messiah arrived to inspect it (Hooker, 1991, p. 261). By cursing the tree, Jesus enacts what Edwards terms an “enacted parable,” dramatizing the impending end of the temple system through a deliberately chosen biological sign (Edwards, 2002, p. 339). The tree’s foliage, masking its barrenness, thus anticipates the temple’s own ritual busyness, which masks a comparable spiritual void (Lane, 1974, p. 400).

The pronouncement of the curse and its subsequent fulfilment function as a potent enacted prophecy of judgment against the temple leadership. Jesus addresses the tree directly: “May no one ever eat fruit from you again” (Μηκέτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκ σοῦ μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι). Stein observes that this is not a mere expression of frustration but a formal, judicial pronouncement—an absolute and irrevocable sentence (Stein, 2008, pp. 511, 516). The disciples’ discovery the following morning that the tree had “withered from the roots up” (ἐξηραμμένην ἐκ ῥιζῶν) underscores the totality of the judgment (Stein, 2008, p. 516). Dong-Hyuk Kim argues that this withering specifically targets the temple leadership, whose failure to bear fruit has hastened their eschatological rejection (Kim, 2021, p. 48), while France notes a likely echo of Hosea 9:16, which describes Ephraim as “stricken” with “a root dried up”—a linguistic link reinforcing that the judgment envisioned is neither temporary nor reversible (France, 2002, p. 447). Peter’s later recognition of the tree “which you cursed” (ἣν κατηράσω) confirms that Jesus has exercised divine authority to permanently disqualify the old cultic centre (France, 2002, p. 447).

In response to the disciples’ amazement, Jesus offers an extended teaching on the community’s new locus of prayer and the necessity of forgiveness. His command, “Have faith in God” (Ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ), calls the disciples to a posture of absolute trust (Stein, 2008, p. 518). M. Eugene Boring argues that the hyperbolic image of casting “this mountain” (τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ) into the sea specifically evokes the Temple Mount, envisioning its symbolic removal to make way for a new worshipping community (Boring, 2006, p. 324), and further explains that the loss of the Jerusalem “house of prayer” is compensated by the emergence of the Christian community as the true eschatological temple (Boring, 2006, p. 325). Jesus concludes the unit by binding answered prayer to the practice of forgiving (ἀφίετε) others (Boring, 2006, p. 325), and Lane observes that this linkage ensures that the new community is defined by sincere, forgiving prayer rather than by the “robbers’ den” that had come to characterize the old system (Lane, 1974, p. 410). The authority once localized in the Jerusalem temple is thus relocated to the praying, forgiving community of disciples, whose efficacy before God depends entirely on their relationship with the Father in heaven (Lane, 1974, p. 410).

- b) **The Inner Story: Jesus’ Action in the Temple (Mark 11:15–19):** Jesus’ arrival at the temple precincts (τὸ ἱερόν) marks a decisive transition from a veiled messianic procession to an unmistakably public, authoritative demonstration (Boring, 2006, p. 314). Lane observes that the Court of the Gentiles, a massive thirty-five-acre enclosure, had by this period been transformed into what he calls an “oriental bazaar and a cattle mart,” facilitating both the sale of sacrificial animals and the exchange of foreign currency for the Tyrian shekel required by temple law (Lane, 1974, p. 405). Mark records that Jesus “began to drive out” (ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν) those buying and selling, while “overturning” (κατέστρεψεν) the tables of the money-changers (κολλυβιστῶν) and the seats of those selling pigeons (Stein, 2008, p. 514). France highlights the distinctively Markan detail that Jesus refused to allow anyone to “carry a vessel” (διενέγκη σκεῦος) through the temple court, a prohibition most plausibly directed against the use of sacred space as a convenient thoroughfare (France, 2002, p. 444). For Stein, these were not spontaneous outbursts of rage but calculated “prophetic acts”

standing squarely within the tradition of Old Testament prophetic symbolism—Jesus had come to inspect the “fruit” of the temple system and found it wanting (Stein, 2008, pp. 511, 516).

The historical background of the temple’s commercial operation reveals that these activities were, strictly speaking, both legal and ostensibly necessary for the maintenance of cultic service. Lane explains that the half-shekel temple tax mandated by Exodus 30 had to be paid in Tyrian coinage on account of its purity and its freedom from graven images, a requirement that necessitated the presence of the κολλυβιστῶν (Lane, 1974, p. 404). Ben Witherington III notes, however, that while sacrificial animals were traditionally sold on the Mount of Olives, the high priest Caiaphas may have recently authorized their sale within the temple precincts themselves in order to increase priestly revenue (Witherington, 2001, p. 314). This commercial intrusion effectively monopolized the only space in which non-Jews could pray and seek the God of Israel without distraction—the Court of the Gentiles (Lane, 1974, p. 406). Hooker underscores that this prioritization of ritual commerce over the spiritual access of the nations demonstrated that the religious leadership had failed in its vocation as “stewards” of the vineyard (Hooker, 1991, p. 263), so that Jesus’ interruption of the trade was not a bid to reform the system but a symbolic cessation of the sacrificial order as a whole (Edwards, 2002, p. 339).

Several scholars read this event not as a “cleansing” aimed at restoring proper worship but as a proleptic sign of the temple’s coming destruction. E. P. Sanders argues that by halting the commercial traffic necessary for sacrifice, Jesus performed a symbolic attack on the temple’s very function, anticipating its imminent demise (Sanders, 1985, p. 70). Telford connects this directly to the outer frame of the fig tree, noting that just as the tree was cursed never again to bear fruit, so the temple was being permanently disqualified from its former role (Telford, 1998, p. 238). Jesus justifies his action by quoting Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11 in a sharp antithetical parallel between the divine ideal and its human perversion (France, 2002, p. 445): by citing Isaiah, he insists that his “house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations” (ὁ οἶκος μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), an eschatological promise of inclusion that the temple’s exclusionary commerce openly violated (Edwards, 2002, p. 343). Edwards observes that this citation implies that the temple system was being dismantled to make way for a new community defined by faith rather than by animal sacrifice (Edwards, 2002, p. 344).

The second half of Jesus’ citation— “but you have made it a den of robbers” (ὁμοίαν δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν σπήλαιον ληστῶν), drawn from Jeremiah 7:11—carries an even sharper tone of judgment. Sharyn Dowd explains that the term “robbers” (ληστῶν) denotes not primarily financial “cheats” but violent “bandits” who use a den as a place of refuge and false security after committing crimes (Dowd, 2019, p. 46). Craig A. Evans argues that just as the Israelites of Jeremiah’s day presumed the temple’s presence guaranteed their safety despite their unrighteousness, so the leadership of Jesus’ day used cultic ritual as a “hiding place” that masked their spiritual barrenness (Evans, 2001, p. 175). Boring adds that this charge effectively accused the chief priests and scribes of transforming a “house of prayer” into a fortress for exclusionary and self-protective religion (Boring, 2006, p. 322). The

authorities' reaction—that they “heard and were seeking how they might destroy him”—confirms that Jesus' words were understood not as a call to reform but as a formal indictment (Lane, 1974, p. 407). As Lane concludes, this inner story of judgment ensures that when the temple curtain is later “torn” (ἐσχίσθη), it is recognized as the ultimate fulfilment of the sentence Jesus pronounced in this earlier, symbolic demonstration (Lane, 1974, p. 407).

- c) **Interrelation of the Two Stories:** Read intercalatively, the fig tree and the temple action interpret each other in both directions. The tree, seen “having leaves” yet found to bear “nothing except leaves,” functions as a transparent metaphor for the temple's deceptive religiosity: just as the tree's foliage promised fruit that never materialized, so the temple's imposing architecture and bustling commerce, what France terms a “braggart” display, concealed a profound spiritual vacancy (France, 2002, p. 441; Lane, 1974, p. 407). Conversely, the temple action supplies the concrete referent for the tree's abstract curse: the lack of fruit on the tree translates directly into the lack of righteousness, justice, and prayerful access to God that Jesus discovers when he enters the temple courts to inspect it (Edwards, 2002, p. 339). Hooker frames this structural arrangement as the Messiah's arrival to gather the nation's “first-ripe figs,” only to discover an outward show of religion that produced no fruit of lasting worth, a discovery that leads inexorably to the tree's, and, by extension, the temple's condemnation (Hooker, 1991, p. 261).

The direction of interpretation also runs from the temple back to the tree. Boring observes that Jesus' “looking around” the temple the previous evening (11:11) was not idle curiosity but a deliberate act of prophetic reconnaissance that already marked the building for judgment (Boring, 2006, p. 322). By citing Jeremiah 7:11 the following day, Jesus explicitly names the leadership a “den of robbers,” a charge that reframes the cursing of the tree from an apparently impulsive act against nature into a calculated judicial sentence against the religious establishment (Boring, 2006, p. 322). Witherington notes that the curse pronounced on the tree “forever” finds its historical correlate in the permanent cessation of the sacrificial order that Jesus enacts by “driving out those who were selling and buying” (Witherington, 2001, pp. 312, 315). The temple action, in short, supplies the moral and theological justification for the tree's supernatural death, just as the tree supplies the interpretive lens through which the temple action must be read, not as reform, but as an enacted verdict.

V. Theological Significance

The literary device of intercalation, the Markan “sandwich” (A1–B–A2), demands that the cursing of the fig tree and the demonstration in the temple be read as a single, unified theological statement in which each episode functions as a hermeneutical key for the other. The fig tree, which Jesus saw “having leaves” but on which he found “nothing except leaves,” becomes a transparent metaphor for the deceptive religiosity of the temple establishment (Lane, 1974, p. 407). Just as the tree's foliage promised fruit that was wholly absent, so the temple's imposing scale and bustling ritual commerce masked a profound spiritual void (France, 2002, p. 441). The inner story of the temple action thus supplies the material content that defines the outer frame of the fig tree: the absence of fruit on the tree corresponds directly to the absence of righteousness and prayerful devotion within

the religious system Jesus arrived to inspect (Edwards, 2002, p. 339). As Hooker observes, this structural arrangement signifies that when the Messiah arrived to gather the “first-ripe figs,” he found only an outward performance of religion that produced no fruit of worth, a discovery that led inevitably to the tree’s condemnation (Hooker, 1991, p. 261).

Conversely, Jesus’ authoritative action within the temple precincts illuminates the specific target of his botanical curse, transforming what might otherwise appear an impulsive act against nature into a calculated judicial sentence against the religious establishment. Boring emphasizes that Jesus’ “looking around” the previous evening was not curiosity but sober reconnaissance that had already marked the temple for destruction (Boring, 2006, p. 322). By citing Jeremiah 7:11, Jesus explicitly labels the leadership a “den of robbers,” a charge that indicts those who had turned the “house of prayer” into a hideout for their own spiritual barrenness. The temple action is therefore not a bid for reform but a proleptic sign of total disqualification. Witherington observes that the curse pronounced on the tree “forever” finds its historical correlate in the permanent cessation of the sacrificial order that Jesus enacts by driving out those who were selling and buying (Witherington, 2001, pp. 312, 315). The temple action, in short, provides the concrete moral justification for the tree’s supernatural death, and the tree, in turn, universalizes the temple’s judgment into a timeless parable applicable to every subsequent generation of God’s people.

This mutual interpretation also carries important Christological freight. By performing an act of prophetic judgment reserved, in the Old Testament pattern, for Yahweh himself against unfaithful Israel, Jesus implicitly claims an authority over the temple that exceeds that of any reforming prophet. The intercalation thus functions simultaneously as ecclesiology and Christology: it discloses who Jesus is—the one with authority to judge and to replace the temple—precisely by disclosing what the temple has become. Mark’s readers, most of whom faced their own experience of exclusion, suffering, or displacement from institutional religious life, would have heard in this pairing both a vindication of Jesus’ authority and a reassurance that access to God no longer depended on proximity to a physical building but on membership in the praying, forgiving, fruit-bearing community that Jesus was even then forming around himself.

VI. Significance for Discipleship

The intercalation of the fig tree and the temple cleansing in Mark 11:11–26 is not merely a dramatic narrative device; it delivers a sustained challenge and invitation to authentic discipleship. By binding the judgment on fruitless religion to Jesus’ teaching on faith, prayer, and forgiveness, Mark summons every follower to move beyond outward religious appearance into a transformative relationship with Christ that yields lasting spiritual fruit.

a) Authentic Fruitfulness: The cursing of the fig tree and the subsequent clearing of the temple together constitute a powerful “prophetic sign-action,” demonstrating that outward religious display without genuine spiritual fruit leads inevitably to divine judgment (Wilkins, 2004, pp. 50–68). This “leafy but barren” condition mirrors a form of religion that prioritizes external ritual observance, much like the rigid legalism Jesus confronted throughout his ministry, over the “new life of discipleship,” which requires internal transformation and a decisive break from self-serving religious performance. In Mark’s theological world, authentic fruitfulness is not an optional accessory to faith but a demand for repentance and mission, in which the “soil” of the disciple’s

heart remains receptive to God's word and yields a harvest of justice and mercy. Discipleship to Jesus is distinctive precisely because it is not an academic or ceremonial program but a life initiated within a permanent, personal relationship to the Master—a relationship that must manifest itself in “doing God's will” rather than in maintaining a façade of pious observance. The barren fig tree therefore stands as a perpetual warning to the “community of salvation” against a commercialized religiosity that fails to produce the fruit befitting the inaugurated Kingdom. Applied concretely, this means that structures, programs, and even orthodox doctrine can themselves become a new “foliage” behind which barrenness hides unless they are continually tested against the fruit they actually produce in the lives of believers and in the life of the wider community.

b) Faith That Moves Mountains: Jesus' teaching on “faith that moves mountains” in Mark 11:22–23 most plausibly refers to the Temple Mount itself, signalling that the disciples' participation in God's redemptive purposes is now grounded in confident faith in God rather than in the physical structures of the old cultic system (Cockerill, 2016, p. 41). This mountain-moving faith is best understood as a hidden, transformative spiritual power that enables the community to remove obstacles and advance the Kingdom mission even amid the mounting opposition of secular and religious authorities. Such faith requires disciples to “think the things of God” rather than merely human interests, a paradigm shift demanding constant recalibration of their commitment to Jesus' unique person and mission. Although the original disciples in Mark's narrative frequently exhibit an “unsteady” faith and a corresponding “hardness of heart” in moments of crisis, the call embedded in this teaching is toward a confident, unwavering trust in God's saving power—one capable of overcoming both demonic opposition and spiritual stagnation. Ultimately, this faith constitutes the “fundamental core” of what it means to be joined to Jesus, enabling disciples to share in the Master's authority through total dependence upon his Spirit rather than upon institutional guarantees.

c) Prayer and Forgiveness as the New Temple: The transition from the physical temple to the disciples' community as the “new temple” is secured through the twin practices of believing prayer and radical forgiveness (Colijn, 1998, p. 12). Within this “spiritual family,” prayer must be characterized by an expectant belief that acknowledges God's initiative while requiring a sincere human response of trust. Crucially, Jesus binds the effectiveness of communal prayer to the practice of forgiveness, implying that an unforgiving heart obstructs the disciple's relationship with the Father and stifles the movement of God within the community. Forgiveness is thus central to both worship and discipleship, mirroring Jesus' own mission of bringing healing to sinners and offering a model for a genuinely reconciling community. By forgiving as they have been forgiven, disciples demonstrate that they have entered the “sphere of salvation,” where the ransom accomplished in Christ's life informs every interaction and dismantles the social and religious barriers the old temple system had reinforced.

d) Contemporary Applications: In contemporary application, the danger of becoming “leafy but barren” remains a real and pressing threat to churches that prioritize worldly prosperity and success-oriented theology over the radical, self-giving demands of the cross (Meyer, 2002, p. 232). Fruitful discipleship today requires a deliberate rejection of status-seeking and exclusivism, in favour of building a “reciprocating community” that serves a waiting world through authentic acts of repentance and mercy (Henderson, 2006, p. 45). Modern believers are challenged to cultivate faith-

filled prayer capable of addressing the “mountains” of social injustice and spiritual apathy, while intentionally fostering forgiving communities that replicate the life of Christ. Practically, this entails forming believers in biblical standards of discipleship that resist commercialized religion, and adopting a “paradigm of power” that locates strength in humble service rather than institutional prestige. Ultimately, the call to follow Jesus into the “Galilee” of ordinary life demands that believers move beyond inherited preconceptions toward a wholeness of life that honours the Master’s authority and advances his mission in a world still waiting for a community that bears real fruit.

VII. Conclusion

Through the Markan technique of intercalation in 11:11–26, the cursing and withering of the fig tree functions as a prophetic sign that interprets Jesus’ temple action as divine judgment on fruitless religiosity, while simultaneously summoning disciples to authentic fruitfulness grounded in faith-filled prayer and radical forgiveness. The passage confronts every generation of readers with the danger of a superficial, leafy-but-barren discipleship that offers outward appearance without spiritual substance, while equipping believers with a positive paradigm in its place: a mountain-moving faith that removes every obstacle, and a forgiving, praying community that supersedes the old temple system. Jesus’ followers today are thereby commissioned to become the new “house of prayer for all nations,” bearing lasting fruit that glorifies God and advances his Kingdom in a needy and waiting world. Future study might productively extend this analysis into the reception of Mark 11 in early Christian communities under social and political pressure, and into comparative work on temple and fruit imagery across the Synoptic tradition, in order to test how widely this intercalated theology of fruitful discipleship informed the earliest churches’ self-understanding.

Copyright © 2026, Authors retain copyright. Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> (CC BY 4.0 deed)

References

- Adomako-Mensah, P. (2019). Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark. *E-Journal of Religious and Theological Studies*, 5(1), 54–67.
- Bock, D. (2015). *Mark*. Cambridge University Press.
- Boring, M. E. (2006). *Mark: A commentary*. Westminster John Knox Press.
- Cockerill, G. L. (2016). The invitation-structure and discipleship in the Gospel of Mark. *The Journal of Inductive Biblical Studies*, 3(1), 28–43.

- Colijn, B. B. (1998). Salvation as discipleship in the Gospel of Mark. *Ashland Theological Journal*, 30, 11–22.
- Dowd, S. (2019). Prayer, power, and the problem of suffering (SBLDS 105). Scholars Press.
- Edwards, J. R. (1989). Markan sandwiches: The significance of interpolations in Markan narratives. *Novum Testamentum*, 31(3), 193–216.
- (2002). The Gospel according to Mark. William B. Eerdmans.
- Evans, C. A. (2001). Mark 8:27–16:20 (Word Biblical Commentary 34B). Thomas Nelson.
- France, R. T. (2002). The Gospel of Mark: A commentary on the Greek text. William B. Eerdmans.
- Garland, D. E. (1996). Mark. Zondervan.
- Henderson, S. W. (2006). Christology and discipleship in the Gospel of Mark. Cambridge University Press.
- Hendriksen, W. (1975). Mark. Baker Books.
- Hooker, M. D. (1991). The Gospel according to Saint Mark. A & C Black.
- Kim, D.-H. (2021). Understanding Jesus' cursing of the fig tree (Mark 11:12–21). *Korea Presbyterian Journal of Theology*, 53(4), 37–53.
- Kusio, M. (2015). Theological implications of Markan interpretative intercalations. *Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny*, 68(3), 265–288.
- Lane, W. L. (1974). The Gospel according to Mark: The English text with introduction, exposition and notes. William B. Eerdmans.
- Meyer, M. (2002). Taking up the cross and following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark. *Calvin Theological Journal*, 37(2), 230–238.
- Miller, G. D. (2012). An intercalation revisited: Christology, discipleship, and dramatic irony in Mark 6.6b–30. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 35(2), 176–195.
- Sanders, E. P. (1985). Jesus and Judaism. Fortress Press.
- Stein, R. H. (2008). Mark (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament). Baker Academic.
- Telford, W. R. (1998). The barren temple and the withered tree (JSNTSup 1). JSOT Press.
- Wilkins, M. J. (2004). Unique discipleship to a unique master: Discipleship in the Gospel according to Mark. *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*, 8(3), 50–68.
- Witherington III, B. (2001). The Gospel of Mark: A socio-rhetorical commentary. William B. Eerdmans.