Gathered Around Jesus

An Alternative Spatial Practice in the Gospel of Mark

Eric C. Stewart

Gathered Around Jesus

Alternative Spatial Practices in the Gospel of Mark

Eric C. Stewart

James Clarke & Co

James Clarke & Co

and

The Lutterworth Press

Click on the links above to see our full catalogue for more excellent titles in Hardback, Paperback, PDF and Epub!

Gathered Around Jesus

ISBN: 978 0 227 90312 4

James Clarke & Co
P.O. Box 60
Cambridge
CB1 2NT
United Kingdom

www.jamesclarke.co.uk
publishing@jamesclarke.co.uk

ISBN: 978 0 227 17317 6

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A record is available from the British Library

First Published, 2009

Published by arrangement with Cascade Books,
a division of Wipf and Stock Publishers

To Aron and Jordan,
for the joy you have brought into my life

Contents

Acknowledgments

A project of this magnitude is never undertaken easily. From the onset of my undergraduate education, I have been especially blessed with gifted friends and mentors. The faculty of the Religion Department at Pacific Lutheran University set me on this course some sixteen years ago. Paul Ingram, Lyman Lundeen, and Nancy Howell were treasured teachers and allowed me room to stumble over myself in the path of following my bliss. Douglas E. Oakman was and is a cherished friend, mentor, and advisor. His knowledge of social theory and the New Testament continue to challenge and inspire me to this day. At the Claremont School of Theology, I was privileged to work with Burton L. Mack in his last year as active faculty. Though he inspires no small amount of controversy, his classes were stimulating, rigorous, and fun. His energy has stimulated me often over the years and is a major reason this book is completed. The members of the Context Group, as well, have been especially treasured colleagues and conversation partners. The fellowship of the group has reinvigorated me each time I am with them. I offer thanks especially to K. C. Hanson for his encouragement of this project and willingness to see it through to publication.

The members of my dissertation committee, of which this book is a substantially revised edition, deserve special thanks for their generosity of time and concern for the project. Brian E. Daley agreed to become part of the committee at a late hour in order to facilitate my graduation from Notre Dame. For his participation and keen insight, I am grateful. John P. Meier was a friend and mentor from his arrival at Notre Dame, and his careful reading of many of my papers and of these chapters over the years is much appreciated. David E. Aune also arrived at Notre Dame after me, but his breadth and depth of knowledge, his encouragement, his sense of humor, and his willingness to deal with endless inane questions from his

students make him an excellent teacher and role model. Finally, Jerome H. Neyrey has been a mentor to me in every conceivable way. Perhaps it is an irony that the book is finished the week that he has left the University of Notre Dame and settled into "retirement" in his home state of Louisiana. Jerry is everything a person could want in a mentor and *Doktorvater*. He is a most decent, kind, and thoughtful man, and a Southern gentleman in the best sense of the word. He presided not only over the dissertation, but my many moments of self-doubt and fatigue, as well as my entry into fatherhood. To him I will be eternally grateful.

Finally to my parents, Tom and Judi, who always knew that I could accomplish whatever I set my mind to and frequently told me so, I offer my deepest love. Their support over these many years of graduate education is much appreciated. To my wife Rikka and my children, Aron and Jordan, I offer thanks for all of those late nights and weekends they would have preferred to have me around rather than off in the library or office. It is my hope that I can someday make it up to them.

Abbreviations

Ancient

1QM	War Scroll (*Milḥamah*)
1QS	Rule of the Community (*Serek ha-Yaḥad*)
3 Bar.	*3 Baruch*
Aen.	Virgil, *Aeneid*
Agr.	Cicero, *De Lege agraria*
Anab.	Arrian, *Anabasis*
Ant.	Josephus, *Antiquities of the Judeans*
Ant. rom.	Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates romanae*
Apoc. Zeph.	*Apocalypse of Zephaniah*
Arch.	Vitruvius, *Architecture*
Astr.	Manilius, *Astronomicon*
Bell. gall.	Caesar, *Bellum gallicum*
B.J.	Josephus, *Judean War*
Cael.	Aristotle, *De caelo*
Caes.	Plutarch, *Caesar*
Cat.	Cicero, *In Catalinam*
Civ.	Augustine, *De civitate Dei*
Def. Orac.	Plutarch, *De defectu oraculorum*
Demon.	Lucian, *Demonax*
Descr.	Pausanias, *Graeciae description*
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
Ep.	Pliny the Younger, *Epistles*
Fast.	Ovid, *Fasti*
Gen. Socr.	Plutarch, *De genio Socratis*
Geogr.	Strabo, *Geographica*

Heir	Philo, *Who Is the Heir?*
Hist.	Herodotus, *Historiae*
Hist. Rech.	*History of the Rechabites*
Hypoth.	Philo, *Hypothetica*
Icar.	Lucian, *Icaromenippus*
Il.	Homer, *Iliad*
Jub.	*Jubilees*
Jul.	Suetonius, *Divus Julius*
Leg.	Plato, *Leges*
Legat.	Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*
Lev. Rab.	*Leviticus Rabbah*
LXX	Septuagint
Men.	*Menippus*
Metam.	Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*
Metam.	Ovid, *Metamorphoses*
Mete.	Aristotle, *Meteorologica*
Nat.	Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis hisoria*
Nat.	Seneca, *Naturales quaestiones*
Nat. d.	Cicero, *De natura deorum*
Nub.	Aristophanes, *Nubes*
Od.	Homer, *Odyssey*
Or.	Aelius Aristides, *Orationes*
Or.	Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes*
Or.	Isocrates, *Orationes*
Or.	Libanius, *Orationes*
Or.	Maximus of Tyre, *Orationes*
Or.	Menander Rhetor, *Orationes*
Pan.	Pliny the Younger, *Panegyricus*
Pol.	Aristotle, *Politica*
Pyth.	Pindar, *Pythian Ode*
Ran.	Aristophanes, *Ranae*
Rep.	Cicero, *Republica*
Resp.	Plato, *Respublica*
Rhet.	Dionysus of Halicarnassus, *Ars rhetorica*
Rom. Hist.	Dio, *Roman History*
Scaur.	Cicero, *Pro Scauro*
Sib. Or.	*Sibylline Oracles*
Spec. Leg.	Philo, *De specialibus legibus*

Tan.	*Tanḥuma*
Theog.	Hesiod, *Theogonia*
Tim.	Plato, *Timaeus*
Tusc.	Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes*
T. Mos.	*Testament of Moses*
T. Zeb.	*Testament of Zebulon*
Ver. Hist.	Lucian, *Vera historia*
Vit. Apoll.	Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*
Vit. Mos.	Philo, *De vita Mosis*

Modern

ANE	ancient Near East
ARA	*Annual Review of Anthropology*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
CW	*Classical World*
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JRS	*Journal of Roman Studies*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OTP	*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. Edited by James H. Charlesworth
SAC	Studies in Antiquity and Christianity
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

CHAPTER 1

Mark and Space in Recent Discussion

Overview of the Study

The study of first-century Jesus movements has long focused largely on temporal questions.[1] This is seen most clearly, perhaps, in the debate regarding the historical Jesus and the coming of the kingdom of God. *When* Jesus expected the kingdom has been a crucial question to biblical scholars for more than a century.[2] This focus on temporal matters has been matched by a substantial lack of focus on issues of spatiality in first-century Jesus movements. Critical social theory has also focused on history (that is, temporality) to the exclusion of geography (that is, spatiality).[3] It is not surprising, therefore, to find that biblical scholarship also lacks concern for critical spatial theory. There have been, to be sure, recent attempts to redress this problem both in social theory and in biblical studies.[4] The present study is an attempt to bring a critical social theory of spatiality to bear on one early text from the Jesus movement, the Gospel of Mark.

1. On avoiding the terminology of "Christian/Christianity" for the first-century Jesus movement, see Elliott, "Jesus was Neither a 'Jew' nor a 'Christian.'"

2. See Malina, "Exegetical Eschatology," 49–59.

3. See the incisive comments in Soja, *Postmodern Geographies*.

4. The list of new works on theory in "human geography," "narrative geography" and "landscape theory" is too long to detail here. Several of these works are discussed in detail in chapter two of the present work. Recent works in biblical studies that have taken spatiality into account are also numerous. Among those more directly relevant to the present work are Malbon, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning in Mark*; Van Eck, *Galilee and Jerusalem*; Riches, *Conflicting Mythologies*; Malina, "Apocalyptic and Territoriality"; MacDonald, *Acts of Andrew*; Leyerle, "Landscape as Cartography"; and Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place*.

Mark's geographical difficulties have long captured the attention of scholars. Numerous attempts have been made to explain them, and there have been three major solutions posited. The first of these solutions is simply that Mark is ignorant of the geographical layout of Galilee and Judea since he had never been to these places himself. The second proposed solution is that Mark, rather than presenting a straightforward cartographic understanding of Galilee and Judea, crafts a specific image of both places in his selection of materials and in his composition of the Gospel. The final solution, one that has been largely rejected, is that Mark does not really demonstrate any difficulties at all in relation to geography since he presents geographic detail in a manner consistent to the peasantry of his time. The following study attempts to address elements of the second solution (that Mark exerts editorial and/or compositional control over the geographic presentation of Jesus' ministry), and in doing so, substantially modifies the third solution to suggest that Mark presents the world spatially in a manner widely consistent with geographic traditions found in Greek and Roman texts.

GALILEE AND JERUSALEM IN MARK'S GOSPEL

Hedrick suggests that geography may be the one organizing principle in the gospel genre. He describes Mark 1–13 in the following way: "the geographic and spatial locations . . . provide the only clear structural unity to *all* the individual episodes in Mark 1–13, as well as to the sub-groupings of material that Mark has organized."[5] Mark's spatial presentation, then, provides the reader with an important element to the overall understanding of his Gospel.

Historical Approaches

The earliest studies to focus significantly on space in Mark are Lohmeyer's *Galiläa und Jerusalem* and Lightfoot's *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*.[6] Their basic argument runs as follows. Mark's Gospel originally ended at 16:8 and contained no appearances of the resurrected Jesus.[7] For this rea-

5. Hedrick, "What is a Gospel?" 259–60.

6. Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem*; and Robert Henry Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels.* See also the summary article of Malbon, 'Galilee and Jerusalem."

7. Though there is not universal agreement on this question even today, the position

son, the words of the young man (νεανίσκος) at the tomb take on an additional significance. In Mark 16:7, he tells the women at the tomb that the resurrected Jesus will appear to his disciples only once they have returned to Galilee, "just as he told you" (καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν).[8] Rather than having Jesus appear in Jerusalem after his death, Mark "preserves" the tradition that Jesus would appear in Galilee. Lohmeyer and Lightfoot argue that the reason for such a tradition is that the Gospel preserves a portrait of Galilee as the place of Jesus' acceptance and Jerusalem as the place of his rejection and death. Not only does Jesus' death occur in Jerusalem, but his public ministry does not begin until he returns to Galilee from the Jordan River after his baptism. It is in Galilee (and its surrounding territories) that his public ministry largely takes place.[9]

Lightfoot highlights several instances of this pattern in Mark's Gospel. He notes that Jesus' true identity, revealed at the Transfiguration (Mark 9), occurs "not in the hallowed city of Jerusalem, but in the remote north of Galilee."[10] All of the exorcisms and miraculous healings, except for one, occur in the land of Galilee.[11] There is no "proclamation of the gospel, and also, we may add, no summons or invitation to repentance"

---

taken by Lohmeyer and Lightfoot is less controversial today than it was in the 1930s.

8. This phrase, spoken by the νεανίσκος, or young man, at the tomb recalls to the reader's mind Mark 14:28, where Jesus had told the disciples that he would go before them to Galilee after his resurrection.

9. Lightfoot, *Locality and Doctrine*, 124–25, "Galilee and Jerusalem therefore stand in opposition to each other, as the story of the gospels runs in St. Mark. The despised and more or less outlawed Galilee is shewn (sic) to have been chosen by God as the seat of the gospel and of the revelation of the Son of man, while the sacred city of Jerusalem, the home of jewish (sic) piety and patriotism, has become the centre of hostility and sin. Galilee is the sphere of revelation, Jerusalem the scene only of rejection. Galilee is the scene of the beginning and middle of the Lord's ministry; Jerusalem only of its end . . . . But the dark passage through which he is led has an end, and this is given in the words, 'After I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee,' the land where the divine fulfillment began and the land where it will receive its consummation."

10. Ibid., 122. Lightfoot treats the geographic areas surrounding Galilee as part of one larger "greater Galilee."

11. The exception is the healing of blind Bartimaeus which occurs while Jesus and his disciples are leaving Jericho (Mark 10:46–52). There is one other "act of power" located in Jerusalem. The withering of the fig tree, though, "owes its position in the narrative to its symbolic importance" according to Lohmeyer (ibid., 123). Lohmeyer and Lightfoot both accept the Gentile territories that surround Galilee as part of a *terra Christiana* that is encompassed with the environs of Galilee. Miraculous events, therefore, that happen in Gentile territory outside of Galilee are considered within this greater Galilee.

in Jerusalem.[12] Perhaps more telling are the "traces of a longer or a more frequent residence of the Lord at Jerusalem than is apparent from the book itself."[13] These traces includes the fact that Jesus "has friends at Bethany," "the willingness of a resident [of Jerusalem] to set apart a room in his house for the last supper," and the idea that Jesus "was daily . . . in the temple teaching," a fact that makes little sense in Mark's Gospel since Jesus has only been in the city for a few days.[14] According to Lightfoot, these traces of a longer residence in Jerusalem are de-emphasized by Mark in an attempt to highlight the positive nature of Galilee while eliminating any positive portrayal of Jerusalem in his received sources.

Lohmeyer and Lightfoot argue that the reason that Mark portrayed Galilee in a positive light over against Jerusalem is that Galilee represented an alternative center of early Christianity that emphasized the eschatological return of the Son of Man and rejected the Jerusalem cult.[15] Lohmeyer believes that this type of Christianity existed very early after the resurrection based on Mark's presentation of the eschatological return of the Son of man there.[16] He attributes the attachment of this type of significance to Galilee to Jesus himself: "he makes Galilee the home of his Gospel and of his community."[17] Lohmeyer compares *T. Zeb.* 9:8 with Mark 16:7. *Testament of Zebulon* 9:8 reads "the Lord, the light of righteousness, will visit in your land and you will see him in Jerusalem on account of his name."[18] Both Mark and the *Testament of Zebulon* contain the future tense

12. Ibid., 123.

13. Ibid., 125.

14. Ibid., 125–26.

15. See the discussion of Lohmeyer's position with regard to the eschatological manifestation of the Son of Man in ibid., 73–77. Lightfoot asserts that Mark is not privy to some traditions of resurrection appearances in Galilee, but rather that the appearance of Jesus (as the Son of Man) in Galilee will be the consummation of the ages (ibid., 65). "It may be, to judge from the plan and statements of his book, especially if, as is possible, it ends and was meant to end at 16:8, that St. Mark should be regarded as a witness to an expectation of one appearance or manifestation of the crucified and risen Lord in Galilee; and that this appearance or manifestation was to be the consummation itself."

16. In addition to the works of Lohmeyer and Lightfoot, see Grant, *The Earliest Gospel*, 125–47.

17. Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, 30. Translation is my own.

18. Translation is my own based on the text quoted in Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, 12. The Greek text, as quoted by Lohmeyer, reads, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνατελεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ Κύριος, τὸ φῶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐπιστρέψετε εἰς τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεις ὄψεσθε αὐτὸν ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ.

of ὁράω and the coming advent of God in the one case and the Son of Man in the other. Lohmeyer concludes that the type of tradition found in the *Testament of Zebulon* is exactly what Mark has in mind "only it is not the Parousia of God, but rather of Jesus, and it happens not in Jerusalem, but rather in Galilee. This is, therefore, the holy land of his eschatological coming."[19] Galilee, then, represents an alternative eschatological center for Jesus' return.[20] Lohmeyer especially understands the contrast between Galilee and Jerusalem to have begun during the ministry of the historical Jesus.

Redactional Approaches

In contrast to Lohmeyer and Lightfoot, Marxsen focuses on Mark's redactional elements. Though he denies the role of author in the modern sense to Mark, Marxsen suggests that by examining the framework material of the Gospel one can "get a clearer grasp of what is typically Markan on the basis of later formulation."[21] Marxsen sees two basic ways to explain the geographic framework of Mark's Gospel. "One is that he constructs it for historical purposes" while the "other explanation is that with his outline Mark has in mind a purpose other than the historical and uses the geographical data to express it."[22] Marxsen rejects the first possibility, claiming that "due to his ignorance of the territory or to the incompleteness of his materials" Mark would not have been able to accomplish such a task.[23] He opts for the second possibility, that is, that Mark shaped his geographical material with a specific purpose in mind.

Marxsen, however, modifies the position of Lohmeyer. He is not content to conclude that a "Son of man eschatology" predominated in Galilee, providing the reason for Mark's presentation of Galilee and Jerusalem in his Gospel. He wishes to "distinguish, perhaps even more sharply than Lohmeyer, the traditional material from the work of the evangelist him-

19. Ibid., 12. Translation is my own.

20. Ibid., 10–15.

21. Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 29. Marxsen relies heavily on form criticism and the work of Bultmann and Schmidt, particularly in his attempt to separate tradition from redaction.

22. Ibid., 54–55.

23. Ibid.

self."[24] Marxsen distinguishes three stages of development of the early Christian traditions. The first stage occurs during the period of the ministry of Jesus. Marxsen believes that the historical Jesus "worked in Galilean (and neighboring) regions."[25] At this stage of the tradition, certain places became attached to certain stories, but this occurred in something of a haphazard fashion. There was no overall logic to the locations (except insofar as they might have recorded genuine historical reminiscences).[26] The second stage occurs within the primitive community at which point the church "in all probability attached itself to Jerusalem"; but Marxsen sees a shift toward a Galilean location because it "is natural to suppose the Second Coming was awaited where the first coming occurred."[27] It is at this second stage that Marxsen sees Galilee becoming a new center for the early church. The third stage occurs with the penning of Mark. Mark "stands in the midst" of this new "orientation to Galilee."[28] Rather than a "historical-geographical" interest, Mark demonstrates an "eschatological-geographical" interest.[29] Marxsen moves past the historical questions of Lohmeyer into the redactional framework of Mark's Gospel. The spatial elements of the Gospel reflect the concerns of the late first century CE rather than the concerns of the earlier part of that century.

Werner Kelber argues that the Gospel of Mark was written after 70 CE in order to respond to the crisis generated by the destruction of the temple.[30] The Gospel's aim is to bring Jesus into the author's present. Since Jesus' initial preaching occurs in Galilee (Mark 1:14), this is where the kingdom of God "accomplished its realization."[31] Kelber prefers to focus on this realization of the kingdom of God in Galilee during Jesus' (narrated) lifetime as the "gist of the gospel program" rather than on its future realization with the coming of the Son of man.[32] In doing so, he

24. Ibid., 56. Marxsen notes in footnote 7 on the same page that Lightfoot's distinction between tradition and redaction is also lacking.

25. Ibid., 92.

26. Marxsen himself is unconcerned whether the data of these received traditions preserves accurate historical information or not.

27. Ibid., 93.

28. Ibid.

29. Ibid.

30. Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark*.

31. Ibid., 11.

32. Ibid.

departs from Marxsen's focus on the risen Christ as the centerpiece of Mark's Gospel.[33]

Kelber adopts the views of Lohmeyer, Lightfoot, and Marxsen regarding the opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem in the Gospel. He argues that the Gospel divides the sayings of Jesus into two major clusters, one in Galilee (4:1–34) and the other in Jerusalem (13:5–37).[34] Kelber, however, differs from Lohmeyer, Lightfoot, and Marxsen on the reason for an anti-Jerusalem bias in the Gospel. He understands Mark to reject the Davidic kingdom and focus instead on God's kingdom. Kelber reads the disagreement over the status of the Messiah as David's son as a refutation of the Davidic kingdom (Mark 12:35–37). Since Jesus argues that the Christ must be the lord of David rather than his son, Kelber says that "Jesus rejects the Davidic sonship in favor of the sonship of God."[35]

As a result of his anti-Jerusalem, anti-David bias, Mark presents a "break with the center of Jerusalem and an orientation toward a new goal."[36] Mark presents the temple, therefore, as "the nerve center of the city . . . the seat of Davidic promises which Jesus is about to disclaim, as well as the core of hostility and opposition."[37] Kelber notes that in combination with the plot to murder Jesus (Mark 11:18), the late hour (11:19), and the withered fig tree (11:20–21), Mark has in mind the destruction of the temple rather than a cleansing.[38] "Far from being 'cleansed' in order to serve in a new and purified fashion, the temple is condemned and ruined beyond all hope of recovery."[39] All is not lost, however, since Mark's Jesus inaugurates a rival place of eschatological authority. To that end, Kelber argues that Jesus' activity on the Mount of Olives is intended "to divest the temple mount of its eschatological authority."[40] Through the exorcisms introduced in Mark 1:21–28, 5:1–20 and 7:24–30, "Galilee was cleansed

33. Ibid. Kelber argued that, absent further proof, one should not assume Pauline influence on the Gospel of Mark. Without this influence, Kelber believed, the idea of the risen Christ could no longer be taken to be the focal point of the work.

34. Ibid., 25.

35. Ibid., 95.

36. Ibid., 97.

37. Ibid., 100.

38. Ibid., 101–2. It is significant to note that Kelber is arguing for Mark's status as a post-70 gospel in distinction from the majority of scholars before him (1). The destruction of the temple for Mark, then, is a *fait accompli*.

39. Ibid., 102.

40. Ibid., 104.

and created because it is to become the New Jerusalem for those caught in the crisis of the old Jerusalem."[41]

Kelber further sees the Gospel divided into two "designations"—one Jewish and one Gentile.[42] According to Kelber, "the idea of the lake as the boundary line of Galilee is broken down" in Mark 4:35—8:21.[43] This section of the Gospel serves to bridge the gap between Jews and Gentiles in Mark's story world. Kelber notes that just as Jesus' public activity in Galilee began with an exorcism (Mark 1:21–28), so does his activity in the region of the Decapolis (5:1–20).[44] Kelber treats Mark 6:1–6 as a rejection of family ties and 7:1–23 as a rejection of the authority of Jerusalem.[45] He sees the rejection of the "southern capital" as an "emancipation" that "engenders new freedom of movement."[46] This new freedom of movement provides the opportunity for the kingdom to expand northward into the region of Tyre and Sidon. Here again, when Jesus enters a new region, an exorcism is the first act performed (Mark 7:24–30).[47] The conclusion drawn from Mark's first eight chapters is that Jews and Gentiles alike are invited into the kingdom. The Lake of Galilee, rather than serving as a barrier, "is transposed into a symbol of unity, bridging the gulf between Jewish and Gentile Christians."[48]

Kelber differs from Lohmeyer, Lightfoot, and Marxsen by arguing that Mark was written after the destruction of the temple in Rome for Jerusalem-based Christians who had survived the destruction and violent takeover of the city by Roman troops. In order to provide them new hope, Mark showed that "more than forty years ago Galilee had been designated

41. Ibid., 107.

42. Scholars are becoming increasingly sensitive to the use of "Jew" or "Jewish" to translate Ἰουδαῖος. Elliott, "Jesus the Israelite," makes a convincing case that Ἰουδαῖος is best understood as an outsider term for resident of Judea, while those who descended from the twelve tribes of Israel referred to themselves as Israelites. This distinction holds up in most cases. While sensitive to these sociolinguistic issues, I have retained the more common modern usage of "Jew" or "Jewish" to refer to the people and texts of the post-exilic period of Israel/Judah. In so doing, I have tried to represent faithfully the problems and concerns of the modern authors' whose work I am treating throughout this book. See also Hanson and Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus*, 11.

43. Ibid., 46. Kelber largely accepts Lightfoot's notion of a "greater Galilee."

44. Ibid., 51.

45. Ibid., 53–59.

46. Ibid., 59.

47. Ibid., 59.

48. Ibid., 62–63.

by Jesus to be the center of life."[49] It is not, however, a political kingdom that involves violent overthrow of Rome. It is rather a "new place," instituted by Jesus during his lifetime, for the Jesus movement of Mark's time that had been forced from Jerusalem.

Summary

The works of Lohmeyer and Lightfoot continue to exercise a tremendous influence among modern scholars. Their thesis, however, is not without problems. Though it is true that more miracles occur in the Galilean ministry of Jesus than the ministry in Jerusalem, there are clear occurrences of problems performing miracles in Galilee. Mark 6:1–6 is the clearest example of this problem. "And he could do no deed of power there, except that he laid his hands on a few sick people and cured them" (Mark 6:5). In this instance, albeit in a limited sense inasmuch as Jesus did cure some sick people, Jesus is unable to perform a deed of power (ποιῆσαι οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν) because it is his hometown. There is nothing in the narratives in Jerusalem that suggest that Jesus is unable to perform miracles there. Jesus does not encounter sick and possessed people in Jerusalem.[50]

A further difficulty with the proposal of Lohmeyer and Lightfoot, and exacerbated by the studies by Marxsen and Kelber, is that there is no evidence for Galilee as a rival center to Jerusalem in early Christianity. Though it is clear that some Jesus group members (notably Paul) did have difficulty with the leadership of the Jerusalem community over certain issues, there are no existing traditions that indicate that there was tension between Galilee and Jerusalem during the period proposed by Marxsen and Kelber for Mark's composition. This point, as will be shown below, is the centerpiece of the criticism that has been leveled at the conclusions of Lohmeyer, Lightfoot, and Marxsen.

Reactions to Lohmeyer and Lightfoot

Several scholars question the polarity of Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark, denying that Mark could have envisioned an eschatology in which Jerusalem was not central. There are two main responses to the positions

49. Ibid., 139.

50. The exception, of course, is blind Bartimaeus. This is the only person Jesus encounters in Judea in need of healing, and he is healed (Mark 10:46–52).

of Lohmeyer and Lightfoot. The first response rejects the idea that Mark contains geographical errors and argues that it is only according to modern standards of cartography that such errors are obvious. The second position reaffirms the centrality of Jerusalem in the Gospel of Mark. Those who argue for Jerusalem's centrality note that the "new centrality" of Galilee in the Gospel should be questioned since Jesus does encounter resistance within Galilee in the Gospel. These studies, like those against which they react, are largely interested in "centrality" in an eschatological setting.

"Problems" in Mark's Geography Due to Peasant Perception

Chapman argues that scholars who contend that Mark records geographical "mistakes" because of his ignorance of the sites in which the events recorded took place fail to appreciate the cartographic skills of pre-literate peasants.[51] His basic argument runs as follows. 1) To ask for cartographic exactness in the modern sense of critical mapping is to ask too much of Mark. If one judges by these standards, the Markan geographical "mistakes" stand out readily.[52] 2) Counter to the idea that Mark is unfamiliar with the sites of ancient Palestine is "the sheer number of place names, including several . . . which were not available to the author from the Hebrew Bible, the Greek Septuagint, or the foremost geographic writing of his time, Strabo's *Geography*."[53] Chapman notes two other factors that suggest that Mark had some firsthand knowledge concerning ancient Palestine: "Mark's accurate placement of references" and his "accurate sequences of geographical references."[54] 3) Because of this direct knowledge of Palestine, Chapman contests, any study that focuses on the geographical errors in Mark's Gospel misses the larger point that a narrow focus on the mistakes does not explain how Mark produces some (Chapman would contend many) correct details about the geography of ancient Palestine.[55]

Chapman aims to resolve the issue by recourse to perception theory, using the work of Piaget regarding the perception of space by children. Briefly, Chapman argues that perception and mental representation of space in the Euclidean, projective sense, common to modern cartography,

51. Chapman, "Locating the Gospel of Mark."
52. See the list of geographical errors listed in ibid., 24.
53. Ibid.
54. Ibid.
55. Ibid.

is the final stage in the representation of space. Peasant societies, according to the studies cited by Chapman, represent space in a colloidal manner that is characterized by "egocentrism," "lack of scale," "limits defined by personal experience," "topological characteristics," "plasticity," and "three-dimensionality."[56] This representation of space is most concerned with proximity. Chapman draws two conclusions about ancient Palestinian peasants from these studies of space.

> First, I do not believe anything like a true map was ever consciously represented in its totality in the mind of a Palestinian peasant. Such a representation would require greater familiarity with Euclidean and projective space. Second, since colloidal geography must retain its three-dimensional realism, a resident of Jerusalem would have thought of "map," if at all, rather as a constellation of actual places, than as a constellation of symbols.[57]

Such an understanding, Chapman concludes, explains Mark's geographical "errors." The more remote the place was from the author, the more likely the "scale" of places might become distorted. Chapman argues that the author of Mark, given the amount of geographic detail in the Passion narrative, resided in Jerusalem.[58] The "correct" geographic references in Galilee are likely due to "Mark's repeated contact with residents from that area."[59] For Chapman, then, Mark presents space fairly straightforwardly, only lacking the spatial perception of a modern cartographer.

Eschatological Centrality of Jerusalem

Davies represents a second critique of Lohmeyer, Lightfoot and Marxsen.[60] He rejects the view that Galilee is the "favored" geographical setting in the Gospel of Mark, offering three arguments against this position. The first, and perhaps most telling, criticism is the fact that there is "no convincing evidence for the existence of a distinct Galilean Christianity" that "could have imposed itself on the tradition" in such a way as to create a

56. Ibid., 30–31.

57. Ibid., 31.

58. Ibid., 34.

59. Ibid., 35.

60. Davies, *Gospel and the Land*. In footnotes on 221 and 409, Davies lists a number of scholars who disagree with Lohmeyer, Lightfoot and Marxsen.

gospel that favored Galilee over Jerusalem.[61] The second critique is that the scheme "acceptance at Galilee/rejection at Jerusalem" does not work out neatly with the text of Mark's Gospel.[62] Davies' final critique is that there is no evidence for an eschatological tradition locating the coming of the Messiah in Galilee. He contends that because "there is no connection made between the Messiah and Galilee . . . any marked eschatological or theological significance ascribed to Galilee by a primitive Christian community would be extremely difficult to understand."[63]

In summarizing his opposition to Lohmeyer and Lightfoot, Davies concludes:

> Not for him [Matthew] nor for Mark was Galilee *terra Christiana*; it was not Messianic holy land in either Gospel. Failure as well as success marked the Galilean ministry from the start. That failure knew no geographic boundaries. There is no Galilean idyll for Jesus in Mark or Matthew. For them both, Galilee found much to object to in Jesus, as he found much to condemn in it. Lohmeyer and Lightfoot too easily overlooked the fact that even when the Galileans 'understood' Jesus they misunderstood him: for this reason, at the very height of his popularity there, Jesus found that he had to escape from Galilee.[64]

After rejecting the position of Lohmeyer and Lightfoot, Davies attempts to discuss Mark's presentation of Galilee "as objectively as possible, that is, without any attempt to ascribe a theological dimension to it."[65] He notes four factors that he argues should be interpreted to mean that Galilean Jews never set up a rival center to Jerusalem: (1) pilgrims constantly moved from Galilee to Jerusalem, (2) Galilean revolutionaries focused on Jerusalem rather than Galilee (indeed Galileans were "among the most audacious Zealots in Jerusalem"), (3) they were ready "to accept the

61. Ibid., 222.

62. Indeed, Davies points to the inclusion of an entire chapter in Lightfoot's earlier book, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, titled "The Rejection in the Patris," and notes that there is simply no mention of the significance of this text in his later book. Davies argues that the rejection at Nazareth comes immediately after three works of power, culminating with Jesus raising Jairus' daughter from the dead (Mark 5:35–43). He compares this scene, followed by Jesus' rejection at Nazareth, to the Gospel of John's account of Jesus' raising of Lazarus and the plot to kill him that ensues.

63. Davies, *Gospel and the Land*, 222.

64. Ibid., 241.

65. Ibid., 239.