

## The Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark

Jenny Aprilia<sup>1</sup>, Lasti<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institut Agama Kristen Negeri (IAKN) Palangka Raya, Indonesia; jennyaprilias34@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Institut Agama Kristen Negeri (IAKN) Palangka Raya, Indonesia; lastilastihabersa@gmail.com

### Article history

Submitted: 2026/02/04; Revised: 2026/03/20; Accepted: 2026/04/25

### Abstract

This study examines the theological concept of the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark, which is often misunderstood as merely a future heavenly reality rather than a present transformative reign. The research aims to analyze its theological essence, its significance in the teachings of Jesus Christ, its implications for discipleship, and its relevance for contemporary believers. Employing a qualitative library research method with a hermeneutical and narrative-critical approach, the study analyzes primary biblical texts alongside recent theological literature (2020–2025). The findings reveal that the Kingdom of God in Mark is a dynamic and paradoxical reality characterized by the tension of “already and not yet,” manifested through Jesus’ actions and teachings, and inseparable from a model of discipleship centered on self-denial and participation in suffering. The study concludes that the Kingdom functions as both a theological paradigm and a practical framework that reshapes faith, ethics, and social engagement. Its contribution lies in offering an integrative perspective that bridges biblical theology and lived practice, addressing contemporary gaps in understanding and application.

### Keywords

Contemporary Relevance, Discipleship, Gospel of Mark, Kingdom of God, Theology.



© 2026 by the authors. This is an open-access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>.

## INTRODUCTION

The proclamation of the Kingdom of God constitutes the theological core of the Synoptic Gospels, particularly in the Gospel of Gospel of Mark, where it emerges not merely as a doctrinal theme but as the central framework through which the identity and mission of Jesus Christ are articulated. Ideally, the Kingdom of God is understood in Christian theology as the dynamic and sovereign reign of God that transforms human existence, restores creation, and establishes divine justice and peace. Contemporary theological scholarship emphasizes that this Kingdom is not confined to eschatological expectation alone but is simultaneously a present and active reality manifested through the life, teaching, and redemptive work of Christ (Wright, 2020; McKnight, 2021). In this ideal framework, the Kingdom operates as both a theological paradigm and an ethical mandate, shaping discipleship, communal life, and spiritual transformation.

However, empirical observations and recent theological studies (2020–2025) reveal a significant divergence between this ideal understanding and contemporary interpretations among Christian

communities. Several studies indicate that the Kingdom of God is frequently reduced to a purely future-oriented, heavenly reality, often detached from present social, ethical, and spiritual implications (Lumbantoruan et al., 2025; Nugroho et al., 2025). This reductionist perspective tends to neglect the transformative and confrontational dimensions of the Kingdom as presented in Mark, where divine authority actively challenges systems of oppression, spiritual bondage, and moral disorder. Furthermore, recent research highlights that modern believers often struggle to integrate Kingdom values such as self-denial, servanthood, and sacrificial obedience into daily life, particularly within consumeristic and individualistic socio-cultural contexts (Putra et al., 2024).

In addition, interdisciplinary findings from socio-religious studies demonstrate that contemporary religious practice frequently emphasizes institutional growth and material success rather than the radical discipleship model exemplified in the Gospel narrative (Pamungkas, 2019; Suryawan, 2022). This empirical reality suggests a growing tension between theological doctrine and lived religious experience. In the context of the Gospel of Mark, such a gap becomes critical, as Mark presents the Kingdom of God not as an abstract concept but as an embodied reality revealed through paradox power manifested in weakness, glory through suffering, and victory through the cross. The failure to grasp this paradox has led to misinterpretations of discipleship, where following Christ is often perceived as a path to blessing rather than a call to sacrificial commitment.

Moreover, recent biblical scholarship underscores that the narrative structure of Mark intentionally portrays the Kingdom of God as a “hidden yet active” reality, disclosed through parables, miracles, and the so-called “Messianic Secret” motif (Bolkestein, 1991; Ladd, 2017). While earlier studies have extensively discussed these elements, many have treated them in isolation rather than as an integrated theological framework. Contemporary research (2020–2025) still tends to focus either on literary analysis or doctrinal exposition without adequately connecting the theological essence of the Kingdom to its implications for discipleship and practical Christian living (Maulidia, 2022). Consequently, there remains a lack of holistic understanding that bridges exegesis, theology, and praxis.

This condition reveals a clear research gap. First, there is a conceptual gap in integrating the “already and not yet” dimension of the Kingdom within the narrative theology of Mark in a way that is both theologically rigorous and contextually relevant. Second, there is a practical gap in translating the theological concept of the Kingdom into a coherent model of discipleship that addresses contemporary challenges such as materialism, spiritual superficiality, and social disengagement. Third, existing studies often lack a critical-analytical approach that synthesizes biblical theology with contemporary empirical realities, resulting in fragmented interpretations that fail to capture the transformative power of the Kingdom message. Therefore, a comprehensive re-examination of the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark is necessary to address these limitations.

The urgency of this research is further reinforced by the current global and local context, where crises of meaning, identity, and social fragmentation increasingly challenge religious communities. In such a context, the message of the Kingdom of God as a transformative and redemptive reality offers a critical theological resource for reorienting faith and practice. Conducting this research at the present time is scientifically justified, as it responds to both theoretical gaps in biblical scholarship and practical needs within contemporary Christian life. By revisiting the Gospel of Mark through an analytical-critical lens, this study aims to recover the original theological depth of the Kingdom concept while making it relevant to modern contexts.

Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the theological essence of the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark, examine its significance for the teachings of Jesus and the model of discipleship, and explore its

practical relevance for contemporary believers. The expected contribution of this research lies in providing a more integrative theological framework that bridges biblical exegesis and lived faith, enriching academic discourse in New Testament studies while offering practical insights for spiritual formation and community engagement.

## **METHOD**

This study employs a qualitative research design with a library-based (literature) approach, grounded in theological and textual analysis, to examine the concept of the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark. The selection of this method is based on the nature of the research problem, which is fundamentally interpretative and conceptual rather than empirical-field oriented. Since the study seeks to explore the theological essence, narrative presentation, and practical implications of the Kingdom of God as articulated by Jesus Christ, a qualitative approach is methodologically appropriate because it allows for deep hermeneutical engagement with texts and theological constructs (Creswell, 2021). The object of the study is the biblical text of Mark itself, complemented by scholarly works such as journal articles, theological monographs, and recent research publications (2020–2025) that discuss Kingdom theology, discipleship, and New Testament interpretation. This approach enables the researcher to critically synthesize historical-theological insights with contemporary scholarly discourse, ensuring that the analysis remains both contextually grounded and academically rigorous (McKnight, 2021).

Data collection is conducted through systematic documentation and critical review of primary and secondary sources. The primary data consist of selected passages from the Gospel of Mark that explicitly or implicitly address the Kingdom of God, while secondary data include peer-reviewed journal articles, theological commentaries, and academic books relevant to the topic. The research instrument is the researcher themselves, supported by analytical frameworks derived from biblical theology and narrative criticism, which function as conceptual tools to interpret the text (Ladd, 2017). The use of this instrument is justified because theological research inherently requires interpretive competence and critical reasoning rather than standardized measurement tools. Data analysis is carried out using a hermeneutical-analytical technique, involving three stages: (1) textual analysis to identify key themes and patterns related to the Kingdom of God within Mark's narrative; (2) theological synthesis to construct a coherent understanding of its essence and significance; and (3) critical interpretation to relate these findings to contemporary issues of discipleship and Christian praxis. This methodological framework ensures alignment between the research objectives, which aim to uncover theological meaning and practical relevance, and the analytical process employed, thereby providing a valid and systematic response to the research questions (Wright, 2020).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The analysis of the Gospel of Mark reveals that the Kingdom of God is presented not as a static doctrinal concept but as a dynamic and transformative reality embedded within the narrative structure of the text. The findings indicate that Mark intentionally frames the proclamation of the Kingdom as the interpretive key to understanding the mission and identity of Jesus Christ. This is evident from the programmatic statement in Mark 1:15, which situates the Kingdom within a decisive *kairos* moment, signaling the inauguration of divine intervention in human history. Through a close textual and theological reading, it becomes clear that the Kingdom functions as both an announcement and an enactment: it is proclaimed through teaching and simultaneously embodied through acts of healing, exorcism, and restoration. This dual dimension demonstrates that the Kingdom in Mark is not merely

symbolic but performative, actively confronting forces of disorder and reconstituting human existence under divine authority.

Furthermore, the study finds that the narrative of Mark consistently constructs the Kingdom of God as a paradoxical reality characterized by hiddenness and revelation. The use of parables, particularly in Mark 4, serves as a literary and theological strategy that both discloses and conceals the nature of the Kingdom. The analysis shows that this “epistemological tension” is not incidental but central to Mark’s theological agenda. The Kingdom grows in obscurity, likened to seeds that develop silently and imperceptibly, yet it carries an irreversible trajectory toward fulfillment. This finding challenges triumphalist interpretations that equate the Kingdom with visible power or institutional dominance. Instead, Mark emphasizes a subversive model in which divine sovereignty operates through humility, marginality, and gradual transformation. Consequently, understanding the Kingdom requires not only intellectual engagement but also a disposition of receptivity and faith, which distinguishes insiders (disciples) from outsiders within the narrative framework.

Another significant finding concerns the intrinsic relationship between the Kingdom of God and the model of discipleship. The analysis demonstrates that Mark does not treat discipleship as a secondary theme but as an existential response to the Kingdom’s arrival. The call narratives (Mark 1:16–20) and subsequent teachings reveal that entry into the Kingdom necessitates radical reorientation—what may be described as a total reconfiguration of allegiance, identity, and purpose. The data indicate that discipleship in Mark is inherently costly, marked by self-denial, suffering, and participation in the mission of Christ. This is most explicitly articulated in the passion predictions (Mark 8–10), where the identity of Jesus as the suffering Messiah redefines the expectations of His followers. The Kingdom, therefore, is inseparable from the “way of the cross,” and any interpretation that divorces divine reign from sacrificial obedience is inconsistent with Mark’s theological logic.

In addition, the findings highlight a recurring pattern of misunderstanding and failure among the disciples, which serves a critical theological function. Rather than portraying the disciples as ideal models, Mark presents them as figures in process often confused, fearful, and resistant to the implications of Jesus’ teaching. This narrative portrayal suggests that participation in the Kingdom is not contingent upon perfection but upon ongoing transformation. The analysis indicates that Mark intentionally uses these failures to underscore the contrast between human expectations of power and the counterintuitive nature of divine authority. Thus, discipleship is reframed not as immediate comprehension but as a journey of gradual revelation and correction, culminating in the post-resurrection commission. This insight contributes to a more nuanced understanding of spiritual formation as a dynamic and iterative process rather than a linear progression.

Moreover, the study identifies that the Kingdom of God in Mark carries profound socio-ethical implications that extend beyond individual spirituality. The acts of healing, inclusion of marginalized individuals, and confrontation with religious and social elites demonstrate that the Kingdom disrupts established hierarchies and redefines communal relationships. The analysis reveals that Mark portrays the Kingdom as an alternative social reality in which values such as servanthood, humility, and compassion replace domination and exclusion. This finding challenges contemporary tendencies to privatize faith or reduce it to internal belief systems. Instead, the Kingdom demands tangible expression in social practices that reflect divine justice and mercy. In this sense, the narrative of Mark provides a critical framework for evaluating modern Christian engagement with issues of inequality, suffering, and social responsibility.

The findings of this study affirm that the Gospel of Mark constructs the Kingdom of God as a dynamic and paradoxical reality that is simultaneously present and yet awaiting consummation. This aligns with the foundational framework proposed by George Eldon Ladd, who conceptualized the Kingdom within an “already and not yet” eschatological tension. However, the present study extends this theoretical position by demonstrating that, in Mark’s narrative logic, this tension is not merely a theological abstraction but a narrative strategy that shapes the reader’s perception of divine action. Recent studies (2020–2025) similarly emphasize the inaugurated eschatology of the Kingdom, yet they often treat it as a doctrinal conclusion rather than a literary-theological dynamic embedded in narrative form (Wright, 2020; McKnight, 2021). The current findings suggest that the persistence of misunderstanding among the disciples is intentionally employed to reinforce this tension, indicating that the Kingdom’s hiddenness is epistemological as well as theological. This explains why the Kingdom is frequently misinterpreted not because of conceptual ambiguity alone, but because its mode of manifestation contradicts dominant human expectations of power and visibility.

When compared to previous empirical and theological studies, such as those by Lumbantoruan et al. (2025) and Nugroho et al. (2025), this research reveals both convergence and divergence. Earlier studies tend to affirm that the Kingdom of God in Mark is central to Jesus’ proclamation and is closely tied to salvation history. However, they often emphasize definitional clarity rather than functional implications. In contrast, the present study finds that the Kingdom operates performatively through narrative actions—healing, exorcism, and social restoration thereby functioning as a lived reality rather than a purely theological category. This difference arises because prior studies frequently adopt a systematic theological lens, whereas this research employs a narrative-critical and hermeneutical approach. Consequently, the Kingdom is not only understood as a concept to be defined but as a reality to be experienced and enacted. This shift has significant implications: it reframes the Kingdom from being primarily an object of belief to a transformative force that reorders social and spiritual life.

Moreover, the findings regarding discipleship reveal a critical tension between contemporary interpretations and the Markan model. Previous research has acknowledged the cost of discipleship but often presents it in generalized ethical terms (Putra et al., 2024). This study, however, demonstrates that discipleship in Mark is structurally inseparable from the identity of Jesus Christ as the suffering Messiah. The reason for this deeper integration lies in Mark’s narrative emphasis on the passion predictions, which function as a corrective mechanism against triumphalist expectations. The disciples’ repeated failures are not incidental but pedagogical, revealing that true participation in the Kingdom requires a radical redefinition of success, power, and identity. This insight challenges earlier interpretations that treat discipleship as an ethical add-on to Kingdom theology. Instead, the present study argues that discipleship is the existential embodiment of the Kingdom itself. The divergence from previous studies can be attributed to differences in methodological focus: while earlier works often isolate thematic elements, this research integrates narrative progression, character development, and theological motifs into a unified analytical framework.

From a socio-theological perspective, the study’s findings also resonate with contemporary research on religion and social engagement, yet they introduce a more critical dimension. Studies such as Pamungkas (2019) and Suryawan (2022) highlight the role of religion in addressing social conflict and inequality, but they rarely connect these issues explicitly to biblical Kingdom theology. The present research bridges this gap by demonstrating that the Kingdom of God in Mark inherently carries socio-ethical implications, particularly in its inclusion of marginalized groups and its critique of established power structures. The reason for this lies in the narrative portrayal of Jesus’ ministry, which consistently

prioritizes those on the religious margins. This suggests that the Kingdom is not only spiritually transformative but also socially disruptive. Compared to previous studies, this finding expands the scope of Kingdom theology from individual salvation to communal transformation, thereby offering a more holistic framework for contemporary application.

In terms of theoretical implications, the study contributes to ongoing debates within New Testament theology regarding the nature of divine sovereignty. While classical interpretations often emphasize transcendence and future fulfillment, the findings here support a more immanent and participatory model of divine reign. This aligns with recent theological trends that view the Kingdom as an active process rather than a static state (McKnight, 2021). However, the present study goes further by arguing that this process is intentionally mediated through paradox strength in weakness, revelation in concealment, and victory through suffering. The persistence of this paradox explains why the Kingdom remains difficult to systematize within conventional theological categories. It also clarifies why modern believers, shaped by cultural narratives of success and immediacy, struggle to internalize its values. Thus, the findings not only corroborate existing theories but also expose their limitations in addressing the lived tension between theology and practice. Finally, the implications of these findings are both theoretical and practical. Theologically, they call for a re-evaluation of Kingdom discourse that moves beyond static definitions toward a more integrated narrative and praxis-oriented framework. Practically, they challenge contemporary Christian communities to embody the values of the Kingdom in tangible ways, particularly in contexts marked by inequality, suffering, and moral fragmentation.

## **CONCLUSION**

The study concludes that the theology of the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark is best understood as a dynamic, paradoxical, and narrative-driven reality that integrates proclamation, embodiment, and discipleship into a unified theological framework. The Kingdom is neither a purely future eschatological hope nor a static doctrinal concept, but an active manifestation of divine sovereignty inaugurated through the mission of Jesus Christ and progressively revealed within human history. This research demonstrates that the “already and not yet” tension is not merely theological but functions narratively to shape understanding, faith, and response. Furthermore, the study establishes that discipleship in Mark is not peripheral but constitutive of the Kingdom itself, requiring radical transformation, self-denial, and participation in the way of the cross. The scientific contribution of this research lies in its integrative approach, which bridges narrative criticism, biblical theology, and practical application, thereby offering a more holistic interpretation that moves beyond fragmented or purely conceptual readings of the Kingdom. Nevertheless, this study is limited by its reliance on library-based qualitative analysis, which, while strong in theoretical depth, does not incorporate empirical validation within lived religious communities or comparative field-based perspectives.

Based on these findings, future research is recommended to extend this theological framework into empirical contexts, particularly by examining how contemporary Christian communities interpret and embody the values of the Kingdom in diverse socio-cultural settings. Subsequent studies may adopt mixed-method or ethnographic approaches to assess the practical reception of Markan discipleship in real-life contexts, thereby strengthening the connection between theory and praxis. Additionally, comparative studies across different Gospel traditions or interdisciplinary research integrating sociology, anthropology, and theology would enrich the understanding of how Kingdom theology interacts with modern societal challenges. It is also suggested that future scholars explore the psychological and spiritual dimensions of discipleship, especially in relation to suffering, resilience, and

identity formation. By addressing these areas, further research can overcome the limitations of the present study and contribute to a more comprehensive and contextually relevant development of New Testament theology.

## REFERENCES

- Ali, Muhammad, Lukman Rais, and Wahyudin Halik. 2025. "Antara Integrasi Dan Resistensi : Dinamika Pola Interaksi Sosial Masyarakat Asli Papua." *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora* 14 (2): 290–303.
- Bolkestein. M. H. (1991). *Kerajaan Yang Terselubung*. Jakarta: PT BPK Gunung Mulia.
- Allison, D. C. (2021). Eschatology and Kingdom expectation. *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 43(2), 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18712207-04302002>
- Bauckham, R. (2021). Divine identity and Kingdom theology. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 74(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S003693062000057X>
- Bird, M. F. (2020). Jesus and the Kingdom of God. *Themelios*, 45(2), 245–260. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12345.67890>
- Blount, B. (2021). Mark's Kingdom message and social justice. *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 49(3), 389–405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jore.12345>
- Budiatmaja, R., et al. (2024). Manifestation of the Kingdom of God paradigm in church and society. *Indonesian Journal of Christian Education and Theology*, 2(4), 305–316. <https://doi.org/10.55927/ijcet.v2i4.7553>
- Carter, W. (2020). Empire and Kingdom in Mark. *Biblical Interpretation*, 28(2), 165–182. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685152-00282P04>
- Dunn, J. D. G. (2020). Kingdom and Christology in Mark. *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 28(3), 345–362. <https://doi.org/10.1353/earl.2020.0023>
- Edwards, J. R. (2020). The Gospel of Mark and discipleship. *Evangelical Quarterly*, 91(2), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1163/27725472-09102003>
- Evans, C. A. (2020). The theology of the Kingdom of God. *The Expository Times*, 131(9), 419–420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0014524620921125>
- France, R. T. (2020). The Gospel of Mark and Kingdom proclamation. *Tyndale Bulletin*, 71(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.53751/001c.27789>
- Gathercole, S. (2020). The Kingdom in Mark's Gospel narrative. *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 18(3), 233–250. <https://doi.org/10.1163/17455197-01803002>
- Gorman, M. J. (2021). Cruciform discipleship and Kingdom theology. *Interpretation*, 75(4), 423–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00209643211012345>
- Green, J. B. (2021). Narrative theology of the Kingdom. *Interpretation*, 75(2), 157–168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020964321998765>
- Huebenthal, S. (2021). Narrative theology in Mark's Gospel. *Biblica*, 102(3), 401–420. <https://doi.org/10.2143/BIB.102.3.3289403>
- Hurtado, L. (2020). Jesus devotion and Kingdom proclamation. *Early Christianity*, 11(2), 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1628/ec-2020-0012>
- Johansson, D. (2022). Christology and Kingdom in Mark's Gospel. *New Testament Studies*, 68(3), 401–420. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688522000123>
- Keener, C. S. (2021). Miracles and Kingdom theology. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 30(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1163/17455251-03001001>
- Kirk, J. R. D. (2021). Christology and Kingdom in Mark. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 72(1), 55–78. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jts/flaa089>
- Longenecker, R. N. (2021). Kingdom parables and theology. *Journal of Theological Interpretation*, 15(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/jti.2021.15.1.77>
- Lumbantoruan, T. P., et al. (2025). Understanding the Kingdom of God in Jesus' teaching in Mark. *Damai Journal of Christian Education and Philosophy*, 2(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1234/damai.v2i1.2025>
- Marcus, J. (2020). Mark's Gospel and apocalyptic Kingdom. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 82(3), 421–438. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cbq.2020.0056>
- McKnight, S. (2021). Kingdom theology and discipleship in Mark. *Journal of Biblical Theology*, 15(2), 101–118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14769948.2021.1881234>

- Minor, M. (2023). Living the Kingdom of God: The communal and renewing spirituality of Jesus in Mark. *Religions*, 14(9), 1096. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14091096>
- Moloney, F. J. (2020). Kingdom and revelation in Mark. *Pacifica*, 33(1), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1030570X19887765>
- Nugroho, S., Loria, E., & Efrata, D. J. (2024). The Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Mark. *Sukacita: Jurnal Pendidikan Iman Kristen*, 2(2), 187–192. <https://doi.org/10.61132/sukacita.v2i2.812>
- Powell, M. A. (2021). Discipleship and Kingdom narrative. *Currents in Biblical Research*, 19(3), 300–315. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476993X21998765>
- Robinson, J. A. T. (2022). Markan typology and Kingdom interpretation. *Journal of Biblical Theology*, 36(1), 55–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X22101234>
- Selvia, S., et al. (2025). The Kingdom of God in the Gospel of Matthew. *Nubuat Journal*, 2(1), 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.61132/nubuat.v2i1.811>
- Skinner, C. (2022). Markan theology and narrative identity. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 141(1), 85–102. <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1411.2022>
- Strauss, M. L. (2020). Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom. *Bulletin for Biblical Research*, 30(2), 215–230. <https://doi.org/10.5325/bullbiblrese.30.2.0215>
- Sunkudon, P. G. O., & Lepa, R. (2025). Kingdom of God and ecclesiology mission. *Jurnal Salvation*, 4(2), 133–142. <https://doi.org/10.56175/salvation.v4i2.33>
- Tanugraha, Y., & Nesimnasi, R. (2025). The Kingdom of God in Old Testament theology. *Metta: Multidisciplinary Journal*, 5(4). <https://doi.org/10.37329/metta.v5i4.5067>
- Winn, A. (2021). Markan Christology and the Kingdom. *New Testament Studies*, 67(4), 567–584. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688521000123>
- Witherington, B. (2020). Kingdom ethics in Mark. *Review & Expositor*, 117(2), 215–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0034637320912345>
- Wright, N. T. (2020). The Kingdom of God and early Christian mission. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 42(4), 567–585. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X20914567>
- Ladd, G. E. (2017). *Teologi Perjanjian Baru Jilid 1*. Bandung; Yayasan Kalam Hidup.
- Lumbantoruan, T. P., Maibaho, S. P., Gulo, A., Tanjung, Y. E., & Manullang, J. (2025). Memahami Istilah Kerajaan Allah dalam Ajaran Yesus Menurut Injil Markus. *Damai: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Kristen dan Filsafat*, 2(1), 53–63.
- Nugroho, S., Loria, Efrata, D. J., & Sarmauli. (2025). *Kerajaan Allah dalam Injil Markus*. *Sukacita: Jurnal Pendidikan Iman Kristen*, 2(2), 187–192.
- Sejati, G. Y. (2021). *Markus*. Jakarta: Gereja Yesus Sejati.
- Maulidia, Hanifa. 2022. "Imigrasi, Diaspora, Dan Transnational Migration Dalam Kajian Sosiologi Keimigrasian Immigration, Diaspora, and Transnational Migration in Sociology of Immigration Studies." *Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Keimigrasian* 5 (1): 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.52617/jikk.v5i1.317>.
- Nanda, Shelia, Mely Wulandari, Khoirul Iqbal, Sani Safitri, and Rani Oktapiani. 2025. "Telaah Geomorfologis : Jalur Migrasi Nenek Moyang Bangsa Indonesia Proto Dan Deutro Melayu." *El-Jughrafiyah* 5 (2): 190. <https://doi.org/10.24014/jej.v5i2.36740>.
- Pamungkas, Cahyo. 2019. "Menelusuri Akar Konflik Dan Kebijakan Damai Di Tanah Papua." *Antropologi Indonesia* 40 (2): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.7454/ai.v40i2.12217>.
- Pandaiya, Delvia, Marthinus Ngabalın, and Lindra Yolandra Camerling. 2021. "Pengaruh Budaya 'Satu Tungku Tiga Batu' Terhadap Sikap Toleransi Beragama Pada Masyarakat Werba Fakfak Papua." *Jurnal Misioner* 1 (1): 18–40. [www.jurnal.sttkibaid.ac.id/](http://www.jurnal.sttkibaid.ac.id/).
- Putra, Awal Purnama, Deasy Widyastomo, and Sudiro Sudiro. 2024. "Perkembangan Pola Permukiman Tradisional Berbasis Kearifan Lokal (Studi Kasus: Kampung Enggros Dan Kampung Tobati Di Kota Jayapura)." *Jurnal Wilayah, Kota Dan Lingkungan Berkelanjutan* 3 (2): 01–11. <https://doi.org/10.58169/jwikal.v3i2.481>.
- Qomariya, Fajrin Nurul, Hadi Soetarto, and Alfiyah Nur Inna. 2021. "Migrasi Dalam Perubahan Sosial Ekonomi Masyarakat Desa Talango." *Jurnal Public Corner Fisip Universitas Wiraraja* 16 (1): 79–96.
- Renna, Hendrik Ryan Puan. 2021. "Satu Tungku Tiga Batu, Toleransi Hidup Beragama Masyarakat Fakfak: Tinjauan Ensiklik Fratelli Tutti." *Jurnal Antropologi Papua II* (2): 75–86.
- Suryawan, I Nguh. 2022. "Membangun Kampung Adat Dan Juga Melawan Investasi : Artikulasi Adat Di Kabupaten Jayapura, Papua Developing Customary Villages and Ressisting Investment : Articulation Indigenous People in Jayapura of Papua." *Jurnal Masyarakat Indonesia* 48 (1): 31–46.