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 (**neaniskoj**) 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" (**kaqwj eipen umin**).[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 **neaniskoj**, 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, kai\meta\tau=a a0atelei=e0 u0i=n o(Kurioj, to_fwj= th=j dikaiosunhj kai\e0pistreyete ei0j th\n gh=n u0mwn= kai\u0meij oyesqe au0on_ e0 I0erousalhh dia\tou=o0omatoj au0ou=

of **of aw** 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 **Ioudaioj**. Elliott, "Jesus the Israelite," makes a convincing case that **Ioudaioj** 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 (**poihsai oudemian dunamin**) 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.

leadership of a priest," and (4) they had "conviction . . . that they 'could never fear captivity since the city was God's' (*Jewish Wars*, VI. 2.1)."[66] Davies, then, rejects the idea that Galilee had attained a status as holy land over and against Jerusalem either in early Judaism or in early Christianity. He asserts, instead, that "Jerusalem was the 'inevitable' Messianic centre" in Mark.[67]

In *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels*, Freyne argues that the traditional way that biblical scholars, including form and redaction critics, read Gospels is inadequate in several ways.[68] He prefers a literary approach that takes the Gospels as whole narratives and opposes paring away redactional material from original material in the Gospels.[69] Attempts to pare away later elements of the Gospel frequently involve removing the references to geographic and spatial locations for Jesus' activity.

Freyne's major concern in *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels* is that studies of the historical Jesus have not taken seriously his Galilean provenance. Freyne, while noting the significance of Galilee as "the main theatre for the action to follow" in the first few chapters of Mark, rejects Lohmeyer's distinction between Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark, particularly his assertion that Galilee is not "Jewish."[70] Several factors attest to the "Jewishness" of Mark's Galilee: (1) synagogues are community centers to which all people in their various locales gather, (2) the inhabitants of Capernaum show respect for the Sabbath (Mark 1:32) and (3) Jesus "also is careful to show respect for Pentateuchal law, by telling the cured leper to show himself to the priest before rejoining the community."[71] Jesus' freedom to travel between Gentile territory and Galilee and the fact that Gentile and Jewish territories are listed together in summarizing statements in the Gospel (i.e. Mark 3:7), however, show that Galilee "is not a Jewish world that is turned

66. Ibid., 235.

67. Ibid., 241.

68. Freyne, *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels*, 10–13.

69. Freyne bemoans the fact that this process leaves out the editorial seams of the Gospel as "worthless in terms of historical reconstruction, for anything but the final level of redaction" (ibid., 12). Indeed among these "editorial seams" one finds the most information relevant to the geographical and spatial settings of the Gospels.

70. Ibid., 33–35. Following Malbon, he believes that Lohmeyer relies too heavily on extra-textual materials for his overall presentation and, for this reason, Freyne finds it unconvincing.

71. Ibid., 35.

in on itself in any exclusive fashion."[72] Freyne also notes that we see no instances of "grinding poverty in Galilee,"[73] and that the overall portrait of Galilee presented by Mark is that of a rural territory.[74]

In a recent article, Freyne addresses the relationship of Galilee and Jerusalem in historical Jesus scholarship under the rubric "geography of restoration"—by which he means "the significance and role of territory within the various idealisations of Jewish restoration in the Hellenistic and Roman periods."[75] The Gospel of Mark, Freyne notes, contains several items that link Galilee and Jerusalem together in the scheme of restoration. First, he notes that a synchronic reading shows that "the Galilee-Jerusalem relations of the gospel . . . point to a deliberate reversal of expectations at the deeper level of meaning with regard to the significance of these places."[76] These two territories are mediated, however, "at the eschatological level . . . that is inspired by the Jerusalem temple and what is stands for."[77] Mark 14:58, Freyne concludes, shows that the Gospel envisions a "new centre of divine presence" of which "the Jerusalem temple offers the proper symbolic field of reference in order to understand its deeper significance."[78] Ultimately Freyne sees the possibility of two models of restoration at work in the Gospel of Mark. On the one hand, Jesus' journeys into Gentile territories suggest a friendly relation with outsiders that does not require the strict maintenance of ethnic boundaries. On the other hand, "the journey to Jerusalem takes on the character of a ritual pilgrimage to the centre of Israel in order to renew it also at the divinely appointed time

72. Ibid., 35.

73. Ibid., 38.

74. Ibid., 38–41.

75. Freyne, "Geography of Restoration," 291. Freyne distinguishes two types of restoration in the article. The first, found in texts like 1 Enoch, offer "a symbolic counterpole to Jerusalem" that "functioned as a critique of the existing Jerusalem." These texts do not, however present a true geographic alternative to Jerusalem, but "rather, a different Israel is envisaged, whose centre would still be in Jerusalem and its temple, but whose personnel would be of a different calibre to those presently functioning there" (296). The other type of restoration, found in texts like Ezekiel and the Genesis Apocryphon, understand restoration to involve the gradual expansion of the limits of the territories inhabited by the tribes of Israel.

76. Ibid., 305.

77. Ibid., 307.

78. Ibid.

of Passover."[79] In this sense, the ultimate aim of restoration still lies at Jerusalem for Mark's Gospel.

Freyne also discusses the contrasts between house and synagogue and between the deserted place (Mark 1:35) and the synagogue as places of prayer.[80] He notes especially how these contrasts serve to reinforce the idea that Jesus' authority represents the new teaching of the kingdom of God while the scribes' teaching represents a now outdated order. The scribes, with their ties to Jerusalem, represent "the real source of opposition to Jesus, whose deeds of power gave his teaching an authoritative quality as being from God in a way that the scribes could never match."[81] These scribes have Jerusalem as their base of authority and operation, but are able to operate independently of the city in coming to Galilee to confront Jesus.[82]

Mark's Galilee, in contrast to Jerusalem, is presented as a land that lends itself to a disregard for boundaries. Easy access to Gentile territories makes Galilee a place with naturally porous boundaries.[83] In Galilee, Jesus is constantly moving, whereas in Jerusalem he is located almost exclusively in the temple during his visits to the city: he taught there daily (Mark 14:49). Jerusalem is a place with a localized holy center (the temple) while "Galilee is exploited to the full as the proper setting for portraying this new mode of divine presence which is no longer to be localised, and hence knows no boundaries."[84]

Summary

These studies that reject or modify the positions of Lohmeyer, Lightfoot, Marxsen and Kelber are not without their own difficulties. Merely because Jesus encountered difficulty in Galilee does not mean that Jerusalem is necessarily positively valued by Mark. Jesus does not go to Jerusalem on pilgrimage.[85] Davies' link between Galilean rebels and zealots is not readily

79. Ibid.

80. Freyne, *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels*, 43.

81. Ibid., 46. See his discussion of the scribes on 43–50.

82. For more on these points see chapter 5 below.

83. Freyne, *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels*, 54–59.

84. Ibid., 63.

85. Contrary to Freyne's and Davies's readings, nothing in Mark 1–13 suggests that Jesus goes to Jerusalem for any reason but to die. It is not until the Passion narrative that

applicable to Jesus, and certainly not to Mark's report of Jesus since Mark definitely does not view Jesus as a military revolutionary. Finally, whether or not the Galileans accepted the leadership of the priesthood, Mark's Jesus seems ultimately to reject it.

Davies responds to Lohmeyer, Lightfoot and Marxsen mostly on their own terms, denying that the interpretation of Galilee as a *terra Christiana* is legitimate for either the early or mid-first century CE. He does not, however, clearly explain why Mark presents Galilee and Jerusalem as he does.[86] Davies and Freyne, focused as they are on the localities of Jerusalem and Galilee, are still primarily concerned with questions of eschatology. The timing of the future kingdom animates the discussion in all four of these works. While each of these authors treats space in some way, none of them goes beyond the "theological" value of the categories of "Jerusalem" and "Galilee."[87]

Chapman's study is somewhat more problematic. There are three major difficulties associated with it. His argument for the author's location based on geographic detail could easily be flip-flopped. In other words, instead of arguing that Mark lived in Jerusalem and had contact with Galilean followers of Jesus, one could easily argue that Mark resided in Capernaum and knew residents of Jerusalem. There is no compelling reason to favor Jerusalem over Capernaum as the location for the writing of the Gospel in Chapman's argument. The second difficulty is related to the first. One could easily take his argument a bit further and suggest that Mark had sources from residents of both of these places and had never been to either one. The third major difficulty with the study is Chapman's hesitance to accept that Mark had sources. He rejects Marxsen's idea that geographic references come primarily from Mark's sources because it limits the control Mark has of the information presented in his Gospel.[88] In combination with his argument that Mark lived in first century Jerusalem, however, this

the reader discovers that it happens to be the time of the Passover.

86. In fairness to Davies, he is largely responding to Lohmeyer, whose work, though it is concerned with Mark's Gospel, is primarily devoted to the traditions concerning Galilee and Jerusalem in the eschatology of the early church.

87. It is unclear why Davies rejects understanding Galilee in a theological way but is comfortable understanding Jerusalem in that way.

88. See Chapman, "Locating the Gospel," 25. Chapman's reading of Marxsen on this point seems somewhat disingenuous. Marxsen argues that, in many instances, Mark added a reference to "Galilee," but not necessarily references to locations within Galilee. See Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 94.

smacks of a historical argument veiled in geographic disguise. Chapman wants to locate Mark geographically and temporally closer to Jesus as "a member of the early Christian church in Jerusalem!"[89] This conclusion stretches the data too far. Furthermore, it does not address at all the major distinctions highlighted by Marxsen (and Lightfoot and Lohmeyer before him).[90]

Beyond Galilee and Jerusalem: Other Spaces in Mark's Gospel

The studies summarized above treat Markan space only as it relates to the territorial units of Galilee and Jerusalem (Judea). They make little attempt to treat other types of spaces in the Gospel.[91] Several more recent studies have undertaken to understand Mark's space more broadly. While these studies do include discussions of Galilee and Jerusalem in the Gospel, they treat the other spaces of Mark's narrative as well—households, synagogues, mountains, the sea of Galilee, the temple and other spaces are analyzed in an attempt to gain an appreciation of Mark's overall representation of space. These studies are primarily concerned with the story world of Mark and its space rather than the geography of the eschaton.

Narrative based Readings

Malbon discusses Mark's presentation of space by means of a structural exegesis of the Gospel.[92] She divides Markan space into three suborders: geopolitical, topographical, and architectural. The geopolitical suborder, which consists of "those relations designating events reported or projected in the Gospel of Mark in spatial relation to a specific, named village, city, country, region, area, mountain, sea, or river,"[93] is divided into three major relational oppositions—Jewish homeland vs. foreign lands, Galilee vs.

89. Chapman, "Locating the Gospel," 35.

90. Despite its problems, Chapman's study does make important points about "scale" and "egocentrism" in ancient production of maps and spatial imagery. See the discussion in chapter three below.

91. An exception to this statement is Freyne, *Galilee, Jesus, and the Gospels*.

92. Malbon, *Narrative Space and Mythic Meaning*. Her analysis is based on the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss. See also Malbon, "Galilee and Jerusalem."

93. Malbon, *Narrative Space*, 17.

Jerusalem and the Jerusalem environs vs. Jerusalem proper.[94] Each of these pairs represents a "familiar" space and a "strange" space.[95] In the first pair, the Jewish homeland represents the familiar space while the foreign lands represent the strange space. The Gospel portrays mediation between these places when people come to Jesus from both the Jewish homeland and the foreign lands, and in Jesus' frequent travels between them.[96] Galilee itself, as Jesus' homeland, and specifically the Sea of Galilee, become the spaces of mediation. In the second opposing pair Mark inverts the normal expectation of the readers by making Galilee the "familiar" pole and Jerusalem, the symbolic center of Judaism, the "strange" pole.[97] These two spaces are mediated by the journeys of Jesus (and his disciples) between them, both at the beginning of the Gospel for the baptism and at the end for the Passover. These journeys are spatially represented by the road to Jerusalem.[98] The final geopolitical pair, which consists of Jerusalem proper and its environs, also reverses expectations.[99] Ordinarily one would expect the city itself to represent the "familiar" pole in this group, but it is the environs of Jerusalem that represent the "familiar" pole in this pair, while the city itself represents the "strange" pole.[100] This reversal is true because "Jerusalem is the power base of the religious establishment that opposes Jesus."[101] For this last oppositional pair, there is no clear mediation. There is movement toward mediation within each of these three pairs, but "no final mediator is presented with the geopolitical schema."[102]

The topographical suborder in Mark begins with the unmediated and irreconcilable pair "promise" and "threat." This pair is eventually replaced by the three mediating pairs, "heaven vs. earth," "land vs. sea," and "isolated

94. Ibid., 38–49.

95. Ibid., 38–40. See especially Figure 4 on p. 40. The "familiar" and "strange" opposition represents the irreconcilable opposition which is replaced by the other three pairs in an attempt to mediate between them.

96. Ibid., 43–44.

97. Ibid., 44–46. In this discussion she follows Lightfoot, noting that Mark characterizes "Galilee not only as the familiar home from which Jesus and the disciples have come but as the final home to which they will return" (45).

98. Ibid., 45–46.

99. The "environs of Jeruslaem," according to Malbon, consist of "Bethphage, Bethany, the Mount of Olives, Gethsemane, and Golgotha" (ibid., 46).

100. Ibid., 46–49.

101. Ibid., 46.

102. Ibid., 47.

areas" vs. "inhabited areas." These three pairs are, in the end, mediated by the "way."[103] The first two opposing pairs in this suborder, heaven vs. earth and land vs. sea, reinforce normal expectations inasmuch as heaven and land represent promise while earth and sea represent threat. The final pair contained within the topographical suborder, however, "isolated areas" vs. "inhabited areas," again inverts the reader's normal expectation because in Mark's Gospel isolated areas represent the "promise" while inhabited areas represent "threat."[104] This pair is mediated through the fact that Jesus always returns to inhabited areas after a retreat to isolated areas. The topographical suborder as a whole is mediated by the concept of the way. "The mediation of promise and threat is a dynamic process, not a static state; it is known in the experience of being on the way."[105] Malbon highlights the fact that at the end of the Gospel, Jesus is on the way to Galilee.

The final spatial suborder in Mark, architectural space, treats the unmediated mythic pair "sacred" and "profane," represented by the oppositions "house vs. synagogue and temple, room vs. courtyard, and tomb vs. temple."[106] The latter element in each of these pairs represents the "sacred," whereas the former elements, house, room and tomb, are profane spaces in Mark. Malbon notes that in the Gospel of Mark, "contrary to what one might expect of 'religious literature,' the positively valued pole of this Markan schema, the pole manifested by the architectural spaces most closely associated with Jesus, is the profane pole."[107] In the pair house vs. synagogue and temple, Malbon suggests that, with the temple destroyed and the synagogue abandoned by Jesus' movement, Mark presents the household as the locus of Jesus' teaching activity (from chapter 6 onward) because that is the locus of the emerging Markan community.[108] While there are no clear spaces of mediation between these oppositional pairs in the Gospel, the overall effect of Mark's presentation of these pairs is that they are "witnesses to the breakdown of the opposition of the sacred and the profane and the breakthrough into a new reality."[109]

103. Ibid., 95–105.
104. Ibid., 103.
105. Ibid., 104.
106. Ibid., 131–40.
107. Ibid., 140.
108. Ibid., 135–36.
109. Ibid., 140.

Malbon concludes her study by arguing that the overarching scheme of Mark's spatial presentation is the topographical suborder because "the topographical schema, in isolation, presents two mediators, whereas neither the geopolitical schema nor the architectural schema presents a final mediator."[110] The fact that the topographical schema entails cosmic space that is larger in scale than either geopolitical or architectural space may account for this presentation. The way, especially the way to Galilee, which is the "center of order" for this Gospel, is the final place of mediation between the fundamental opposition of order and chaos.[111] The spatial presentation of the Gospel of Mark presents the beginning of the overcoming of chaos by order. This "conflict between the chaos and order of life is overcome not in arriving, but in being on the way."[112]

The treatment of Markan space in Rhoads', Michie's and Dewey's *Mark as Story* is similar to Malbon's in that it deals with cosmic, topographical and political-cultural elements of Mark's space.[113] Markan cosmic space "includes social boundaries meant to keep some people holy before God by separating the Israelites from the impure Gentiles and by separating the leaders of Israel from Judeans considered to be defiled."[114] The Markan cosmos views the earth as a flat disk, of which Jerusalem is the center, in the center of the cosmos in which God, angels, demons, Satan, people and animals all live together. Creation, for Mark, however, is not as God intended it to be. Instead of humans having dominion over creation they oppress each other, "are possessed by demons, wracked by illnesses, and threatened by storms at sea."[115] The Gospel, however, presents a cosmos that is about to be changed. "The arrival of God's rule changes cosmic

110. Ibid., 155. Besides the "way," which Malbon sees as the final mediator of the topographical schema, the mountain functions as mediator between heaven and earth.

111. Ibid., 158.

112. Ibid., 168. The study of Van Eck, *Galilee and Jerusalem*, is very similar to Malbon's in many ways. Van Eck attempts to read the Gospel through the prism of social-scientific and narratological methods, but he largely condenses these two methodologies into one. His conclusions basically endorse the views of Lightfoot, Lohmeyer, Marxsen and Malbon. The major conclusion of his study can be summarized in his own words: "Galilee, and not Jerusalem, is portrayed by the narrator as the place where access to the Patron is available. And in Galilee, there is no temple, only the house" (295). In his focus on the house as the locus of the kingdom movement, he diverges somewhat from Malbon's focus on the "way" as the space of final mediation in Mark.

113. Rhoads et al., *Mark as Story*, 63–72.

114. Ibid., 64.

115. Ibid.

space, because the power of God from above is now available on earth for healing and exorcism. The power of God's rule breaks out of local, national, and natural boundaries to make all space into God's space."[116] The story of the Gospel of Mark, then, begins, according to Rhoads, Michie and Dewey, with the idea that creation is about to be set right for its intended purpose.

The social, or political cultural world, of Mark's Gospel is composed of a small group of elites (comprised of "high priests, the elders, and other aristocratic landowners" as well as the Roman rulers) and retainers (Pharisees and scribes in Mark) and the rest of the population ("common folk who live at the subsistence level").[117] The land of Israel is separate from the rest of the world, which "is comprised of the Gentile nation—the Roman Empire and the nations under its domination."[118] In the narrative world of Mark, it is the role of the disciples to bring the gospel to these other nations in the same manner that Jesus brought it to Israel.

Rhoads, Michie and Dewey read Mark largely as a travel story. These authors see the "journey of Jesus" as that element that "structures the narrative as a whole."[119] The journey motif consists of two major parts: travels in Galilee and the surrounding regions, and the pilgrimage to Jerusalem. The trip to Jerusalem is further divided into three parts: "first the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, then Jesus' actions and teachings in Jerusalem, and finally the story of the crucifixion and empty grave."[120] During Jesus' journeying, many of the places to which he comes recall Israel's past. The Jordan River is the sight at which the Israelites initially entered the land after the Exodus. The desert reminds the reader of the "place where God had prepared the Israelites to enter the land of Israel."[121] The Israelites again crossed the desert in returning to Judea after the Babylonian exile. Like the Israelites in the desert, Jesus was also tested in the desert. The sea

116. Ibid., 65.

117. Ibid., 65.

118. Ibid., 66.

119. Ibid.

120. Ibid. Following the earlier studies on Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark, Rhoads et al., note that Galilee is the first place to which Jesus brings his message of good news, and it is there that it is first received. They note that the Galilean ministry, however, is not without complications. Their position on this issue is similar to Malbon's.

121. Ibid., 69.

and the mountains of the Gospel also recall the parting of the Reed Sea and the time the Israelites spent on Mount Sinai.[122]

The final spaces that Rhoads, Michie and Dewey discuss are public and private spaces. The public spaces are those in which Jesus encounters crowds and his opponents. They are marked by Jesus' miracles, teaching and conflicts with his opponents. The private spaces are marked by encounters with the disciples. Jesus teaches and corrects his disciples in these private settings. These places "contribute to the secrecy motif of the story, because those characters who are present, the insiders (as well as the readers), have access to what goes on there, while the other characters, the outsiders, do not."[123]

Rhoads, Michie and Dewey understand the space of the Gospel of Mark in two distinct ways. The first way is from the perspective of the earth, in which the distinction between Israel and Gentile nations is of extreme significance. The second perspective, however, is from the heavens in which God dwells. Seen from this perspective the spatial divisions of the political and geographical kind prevent the earth from realizing the purpose of God's cosmos. For Mark, according to this reading, creation has gone awry and is about to be set right through the way of the Lord on which Jesus embarks.

Sacred Space in Mark

Riches' work is concerned with the roles of kinship and sacred space in the Gospels of Mark and Matthew.[124] Drawing upon the work of the anthropologist Clifford Geertz, Riches is especially interested in the cosmology of the texts of Matthew and Mark.[125] His project thus attempts "to take two of these common concepts, descent and attachment to the Land, and to use them to lead us into a discussion of the world-view and ethos of the first two Gospels."[126] Riches makes several insightful and important contributions to the idea of cosmic and terrestrial space in Mark. The first of these points is that Mark offers a worldview in which the ethnic divisions between Israel and the nations fall away since the true followers of Jesus

122. Ibid., 69–70.
123. Ibid., 71.
124. Riches, *Conflicting Mythologies*.
125. Ibid., 10–13.
126. Ibid., 14.

are gathered from the ends of the earth (Mark 13:27). Rather than draw an ethnic mental map of the world, Mark's space "is divided into those who think the things of God and those who think the things of men."[127] "Ethnic divisions are subordinated to the new—voluntarist—criteria for membership of the group, even if the new group takes its rationale from the history of a nation defined by just such markers."[128]

Mark's presentation of space, however, is more complicated than this notion of the eradication of ethnic markers. Through Jesus' numerous exorcisms, Riches notes that in Mark Galilee "represents in some sense a world purged of evil and suffering."[129] The place of the final resolution of this conflict between the demonic forces and God's anointed agent, however, is not specified in the Gospel. "Mark 13 displays a clear tendency to move away from direct and explicit reference to specific locations and to prefer a setting which is unspecified and cosmic."[130] Such a reading distances Riches from Lohmeyer and Lightfoot.

In discussing the "way of the Lord" in Mark, Riches suggests that Jesus' glory, revealed on the cross to the Roman centurion, is contrasted to the rending of the temple veil, which signifies the departure of the *Shekinah* from the temple.[131] The Isaian motif of the way in Mark points to "a salvation historical view which sees God as enabling his people to overcome sin by teaching and leading them."[132] Through the metaphor of the way, Mark creates a new kind of sacred space, one "which locates God's presence not in particular cultic sites" but "chooses instead to see the presence of God as disembedded, not limited but irrupting wherever the Gospel is preached and heard."[133] Mark's Gospel redraws the map of the world inasmuch as it draws the "boundaries of Gentile territory and the Land, of Galilee and Jerusalem," but these boundaries are "variously subverted" in the Gospel.[134] This subversion comes as a result of Mark's

127. Ibid., 111.

128. Ibid., 112. Here Riches argues that Mark 3:31–35 signals the rejection of biological family ties in favor of fictive kinship.

129. Ibid., 133.

130. Ibid., 134. Riches does not endorse the viewpoint of Lohmeyer, Lightfoot, and Marxsen that the eschaton will begin in Galilee with Jesus' return.

131. Ibid., 137–39.

132. Ibid., 140.

133. Ibid., 142.

134. Ibid., 147.

attempt to mediate between a cosmology interested in the restoration of Israel and another interested in an end time revolution in which the old order and its distinctions pass away.[135]

Summary

These studies of Markan space highlight previously neglected elements of Mark's spatial understanding. They treat space more holistically in some ways than did the other studies examined above. Each of these studies treats cosmic space and argues that when seen from a cosmic perspective, geopolitical distinctions lose some of their significance. The idea of the way of the Lord also figures prominently in these discussions. Markan space is seen as unfinished, "on the way" by Malbon; Rhoads, Michie, and Dewey; and Riches. The significance of the way is highlighted by Malbon and Rhoads, Michie and Dewey to suggest that Mark's text is essentially a travel narrative, while Riches prefers a more metaphorical and ethical understanding of the way. Each of these studies also suggests a rejection of and redefinition of sacred space. Jerusalem's temple is no longer the center for Mark's Gospel.[136]

Despite some advances, there are problematic elements in these studies as well. Malbon, for example, begins her study by suggesting that she will interpret Mark from within the text itself. In certain instances, however (most notably in the discussion of house vs. synagogue and temple), Malbon is forced to go outside of the text for explanations for her analysis. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, the idea that "myth operates to mediate irreconcilable opposites by successively replacing them by opposites that do permit mediation" is not borne out in the geopolitical or architectural suborders since the original oppositional pairs (strange vs. familiar and profane vs. sacred) are not ultimately mediated.[137] The whole structural interpretation of the text is jeopardized by the fact that only one of the three suborders permits the type of mediation that structural analysis of mythic texts provides. It is also particularly noteworthy that the architectural suborder, in which the temple is located, does not assume the central position in Malbon's understanding of the Gospel. It is a difficulty

135. Ibid., 145–79.

136. It should be noted that the fact that Riches argues that the return in chapter 13 is not specifically located leaves open the possibility for Jerusalem's eschatological centrality.

137. Malbon, *Narrative Space*, 2–3.

with Malbon's study as well as that of Riches that there is an element of negativity in the portrayal of Jerusalem in the Gospel that is difficult to ignore. Especially with Riches' understanding that Mark creates a new sacred space "which locates God's presence not in particular cultic sites," it is difficult to assume this can be anything but a challenge to and/or rejection of the Jerusalem temple. Since Riches' work concentrates on the idea of restoration, it is difficult to understand why Mark would ultimately decide on a presentation of sacred space that rejected the temple to which he hoped the entire Israelite people would be restored.

Critical Spatiality and Early Christianity

In a series of articles, Moxnes has evaluated the recent work of biblical scholars on Galilee and the role reconstructions of ancient Galilee have played in scholarly portrayals of the historical Jesus.[138] Moxnes notes that it is within nineteenth-century German scholarship, expanded later by Nazi ideologues, that a picture of Galilee as a place of open-mindedness, of mixed ethnicity and race and a lack of concern for purity first developed.[139] In response to this understanding of Galilee, Klausner argued for a thoroughly Torah-observant, temple-loyal Galilee.[140] Later, Geza Vermes, following this line of scholarship, introduced a picture of Galilean religion centered around the idea of Jesus (and others) as charismatic healers "in contrast to halakhic Judaism that became the corner stone of rabbinic Judaism."[141] Sanders's work, on the contrary, shows a more unified picture of Judea and Galilee under the rubric of Jewish religion. Galilee as a place bears no special significance in his reconstruction of Jesus.[142]

In the third quest of the historical Jesus, Galilee again has come to the fore. Moxnes credits this development to two things. The first is "a general trend in historical and religious studies toward social and local contexts," while the second is the greater number of archaeological excavations conducted in Galilee.[143] Moxnes asserts that two assumptions,

138. Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place*; "The Construction of Galilee—Parts 1 and 2"; "Kingdom Takes Place"; and "Placing Jesus of Nazareth."

139. Moxnes, "Construction of Galilee—Part 1," 30–32.

140. Ibid., 33–34.

141. Ibid., 35.

142. Ibid., 36.

143. Moxnes, "Construction of Galilee—Part 2," 64.

common to the nineteenth-century depictions of Galilee, have continued to hold sway over various depictions of ancient Galilee. The first is that "one should strive to produce as accurate a representation of the world as possible, and indeed that such a mimetic representation was possible . . . without unnecessary theorizing."[144] The second assumption is that places shape people rather than the reverse. In other words, place is an actor that defines what people can be and what they are.[145]

Newer ideas from the study of space, however, are beginning to make their way into the study of Galilee.[146] The discussion of the race and ethnicity of the ancient Galileans has largely been replaced by an interest in the "cultural mix" of the Galileans.[147] In some recent works (such as those by Mack and Crossan), Galilee is seen as culturally "open" allowing for easy contact between Jews and non-Jews.[148] Meyers, however, argues for a less substantial influence of Hellenization on Galilee. Instead Galilee is a place of "negotiated Jewishness."[149] Indeed, "even with the influence of Hellenism there seems to be a basic unity to Judaism in Palestine."[150] In addition to this interest in cultural elements in Galilee, there is also a burgeoning interest in the social and political elements of Galilee.[151] This approach stresses things like power over space and peoples in ancient Galilee.[152] Whether ancient urban centers operated cooperatively or exploitatively in relation to villages is also a key question.[153]

Moxnes concludes his study by outlining four areas that need broader discussion. The first is the areas around Galilee. While many of the studies of ancient Galilee have focused on the relationship between that territory and Jerusalem, they "have overlooked the much closer areas to the North, East, and South, that are all within easy walking distance from any area in

144. Ibid., 67.

145. Ibid. See the discussion in chapter 3 below.

146. Ibid., 67–68. Moxnes uses the developments found in Sean Freyne's work as an example of how emphases are shifting in the study of Galilee.

147. Ibid., 68.

148. Ibid., 68–69.

149. Ibid., 69–70. The phrase is that of Moxnes. On Meyers's reading there is little difference between Galilee and Jerusalem.

150. Ibid., 70.

151. Ibid., 70–72.

152. Ibid., 70–71. Moxnes cites Horsley's work as a major example here.

153. Ibid., 71–72.

Galilee."[154] A second element that deserves more attention is the role of the interpreter of ancient Galilee. As Moxnes stresses, "the essentialism implied in earlier presuppositions of a mimetic representation of landscape is no longer a viable option."[155] Space encodes power relationships, patterns of behavior and cultural definitions that are not always immediately evident. The role of the interpreter in viewing space needs to be made explicit. A third element that needs attention is how spaces are created through resistance to dominating powers.[156] The final element that Moxnes wishes to stress is the role of Jesus in shaping Galilee.[157] By this he means that Jesus' way of speaking about and imagining space "as a landscape with an alternative spatial management of power" suggests, on the part of Jesus and his movement, "a give and take between their experience of landscape and their own attempts to recreate landscape in a different fashion."[158]

Moxnes brought the information from his studies of Galilee together in his book *Putting Jesus in His Place.* Since Moxnes's book is largely concerned with the historical Jesus, much of his information is drawn from Q, but there are several insightful comments about Mark as well. One of these insights, in particular, is significant for understanding space in Mark. Whereas in Q, Moxnes contends, Jesus invites his followers into "queer space" that involves homelessness (see Q 9:58),[159] in Mark the household serves as the metaphoric space for the new community. It is not, however, the household as normally configured in Galilean antiquity. Mark retains the radical nature of Jesus' call to leave everything (Mark 1:16–20), "but it is modified by the stories he tells."[160] Instead of locating Jesus in the no-man's land of "queer space" as the sayings in Q seem to do, "Mark provides a social and spatial location for the new, fictive kinship group. Jesus has a house (2:15; 3:20, 31–35), and that becomes a center for him and the group of disciples, and metaphorically, for the Markan commu-

154. Ibid., 74.

155. Ibid., 74.

156. Ibid., 75.

157. Ibid.

158. Ibid.

159. Queer space was a space characterized by "transgression, asceticism, and liminality" and "does not represent a new identity or a fixed position in place," Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place*, 105.

160. Ibid., 57.

nity."[161] This house, however, is not like the ones the disciples left; "there is no father figure in the new household . . . and life in this household includes persecution, probably in the form of social exclusion from their old household and village."[162] Mark's alternative to the household that the disciples are called to leave, then, is a new household. This shows a truism in critique of space: "a criticism of existing structures is often, paradoxically, presented in similar structures."[163] Mark 10:30 suggests that those who have left their households to follow Jesus will become part of this new family and new household "in this time." Mark, in his critique of existing familial relationships within existing household structures, envisions a new type of familial life in a new type of household.[164]

Moxnes treats the exorcisms of Jesus in relation to the space of the kingdom of God as well.[165] Moxnes, following the work of Jonathan Z. Smith, treats demonic as a "locative category."[166] People who are demon-possessed are out of place. Exorcism, then, restores them to their rightful place in society. More than that, however, "exorcisms appeared to be a way to speak of control and domination of space. In exorcism it became visible that control over the world was contested."[167] Exorcisms are visible confirmations of the power of God's kingdom over the land. "In this way the kingdom was not just an 'imagined place,' but an experienced place."[168] Moxnes' understanding of how space encodes power relationships and how these power relationships can be challenged through alternative spatial configurations is a major advance in the study of space in the Gospel of Mark.

Conclusion

The study of Mark's spatial presentation began in earnest in the 1930s with the work of Lohmeyer and Lightfoot. Much of the early work on Mark's

161. Ibid., 69.

162. Ibid., 70. Moxnes cites Mark 3:31–35 and 10:29–30 as evidence of the idea of the new household of Jesus in Mark.

163. Ibid., 62.

164. More will be said on this point in chapter 5 below.

165. Moxnes, *Putting Jesus*, 125–41.

166. Ibid., 128.

167. Ibid., 139.

168. Ibid., 141.

space focused on the presentation of Galilee and Jerusalem. More recent studies have broadened the focus to include topographical features of the landscape as well as architectural spaces. With the exception of Moxnes, however, none of these authors address the critical study of space at all. They focus, rather, on theological and historical issues pertaining to space. These issues, while certainly not irrelevant to the understanding of space in an ancient text, do not tell the complete story. Ancient people did not understand geography in the same manner as modern people.[169] None of these studies have addressed the question of ancient perceptions of space. Theirs was a world spatially perceived in a much different manner from that in which geographers and cartographers today perceive space. None of the studies surveyed use comparative information from ancient authors. There is no consultation of Strabo, Pausanias, or any other ancient geographer or historiographer.

This study is an inquiry into ancient perceptions of space and place and how they underlie much of Mark's gospel. Rather than apply theological, psychological or structural readings to space in Mark, the present study will attempt to understand the social nature of space in antiquity, addressing questions related to power and its dissemination in space as well as to how Mark understands, accepts and subverts claims made by others to the space in which Jesus lived. Chapter two focuses on a discussion of modern theories concerning the use and organization of space. Chapter 3 details ancient understandings of place and how these are related to social definitions in antiquity. This chapter is followed by a chapter addressing various spaces in antiquity, analyzed using information highlighted in chapters two and three. Finally, all of this information will be used to understand more fully Mark's perspective on and understanding of the spaces of ancient Galilee and Judea.

169. Chapman, "Locating the Gospel," attempted to address this issue, but even he does not use information from ancient Greek, Roman, and Jewish authors about space and geography.