
Chapter 6

Etics

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Broadly speaking, our emic reading of the text in chapter 5 yielded three results: First, the narratological analysis of the ideological perspective and interest on the topographical level indicated that an opposition exists between Galilee and Jerusalem in the narrative. In terms of this result, we will therefore in the subsequent sections first concentrate on Jesus' activities on Galilean soil (section 6.4), and then on Jesus' activities in Jerusalem (section 6.5). Second, it was concluded in the previous chapter that the protagonist's (i.e. Jesus') interest is mainly Galilee, and that the interests of the antagonists seem to be Jerusalem. Thus, by studying the activities of the Markan Jesus regarding Galilee and Jerusalem, it will be possible to discern from an etic point of view the respective interests of the Markan Jesus and the antagonists. Third, it was indicated that the target of Jesus' ministry seems to be the crowds. In the subsequent etic reading we will therefore also try to indicate more precisely who these crowds were in the narrative world of Mark.

However, attention will first be given to the prologue of the narrative (section 6.2). In this section, it will be indicated that the narrator's spatial structuring of the prologue can be seen as a programmatic prolepsis of the itinerary of Jesus in the rest of the narrative. Also, Jesus' baptism, should be understood as a status transformation ritual, a ritual which changed Jesus' status to that of the new broker of God's kingdom. After this, Jesus' brokerage on Galilean soil and in Jerusalem will be analyzed. Jesus' brokerage on Galilean soil will be analyzed by using the different cross-cultural theories as discussed in chapter 4 (see section 4.2.1 to 4.2.10). In terms of Jesus' brokerage in Jerusalem, attention will be given to Jesus' temple action (section 6.5.1), as well as to Jesus' passion (i.e. his arrest, trial[s], crucifixion and resurrection). As will be indicated in section 6.2.1, the passion of Jesus will be analyzed as his second status transformation ritual in the Gospel. In this regard it will be indicated that in Jesus' second transformation ritual, the different interests of both the protagonist and antagonists become very clear. In terms of this second transformation ritual of Jesus, it will also be indicated that this ritual of Jesus can help to understand better the opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem in the Gospel. In section 6.6 our etic reading of the text will be summarized.

6.2 MARK 1:1-15: A PROGRAMMATIC PROLEPSIS OF THE ACTIVITIES OF JESUS IN GALILEE AND JERUSALEM

A narratological analysis takes as the point of departure what is called the *plot* of the narrative. In regard to this concept, Aristotle (1911:1450b) gives the following definition: ὅλον δὲ ἔστιν τὸ ἔχον ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσον καὶ τελευτὴν. According to him, any well constructed plot therefore consists of three main elements, namely a beginning/prologue, a middle and an end¹. The connection between these three elements is expressed by Van Aarde (1986a:5) as follows:

An elementary, well constructed plot usually consists of the linear sequence of a beginning which leads to the middle and the end. The *beginning* of the plot introduces the action and creates expectation. In the *middle* the introduced action is developed, and in the *end* of the plot the developed action is unraveled (denouement).

(Van Aarde 1986a:5; my emphasis)

The concept of plot thus pertains to the following: In the beginning of a narrative certain actions to follow are introduced and certain expectations are created by the narrator. These actions and expectations are then developed in the middle of the narrative and this development is unraveled at the end of the narrative. In defining the beginning, middle and end of Mark's gospel, we will use Vorster's division, namely as introduction Mark 1:1-15, as middle Mark 1:16-14:42, and as end Mark 14:43-16:8 (for other divisions see Keck 1966:359-360; Matera 1988:4-5)².

Our interest in the prologue of the narrative of Mark, is versed by Matera (1988:3) as follows: 'Few things are more essential to appreciating a story than understanding the manner in which the narrator begins. Readers who misunderstand the beginning almost inevitably misunderstand the conclusion. At the beginning of a narrative, the narrator establishes the setting, introduces the characters, and lays the foundation for the plot'.

Two aspects of the prologue of Mark's narrative are of importance for our analysis of Galilee and Jerusalem as political focal space in the Gospel: First, the way in which the narrator structures space in Mark 1:1-15, and second, Mark's description of the baptism of Jesus as a ritual of status transformation, when read from the cross-cultural theory of rituals described in section 4.2.4³.

6.2.1 The spatial structure of Mark 1:1-15

An analysis of the way in which the narrator structures space in the first fifteen verses of the narrative looks as follows: In Mark 1:9, we read that Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee down to the Jordan to be baptized by John. After his baptism, Jesus went to

the wilderness where he was tempted by Satan (Mk 1:12-13), after which he returned to Galilee where he started his ministry (Mk 1:15). Jesus' itinerary in the prologue of the narrative is thus sketched by the narrator as follows: Galilee-Judea-[temptation]-Galilee (cf also Belo 1981:101).

In section 5.2.4.2.1.3, it was indicated in referring to Mark 14:28 and 16:7, that the narrator clearly wants to inform the reader that the ministry of Jesus not only begins in Galilee and ends in Jerusalem with his death, but that after his death Jesus will again go back to Galilee. In terms of the rest of the narrative, Mark 1:16-16:8, Jesus' itinerary looks as follows: Galilee-Jerusalem (Judea)-[temptation and death]-Galilee. Thus, the same itinerary as in the prologue of the narrative. As such, the spatial structure of the prologue serves as a proleptic program of Jesus' itinerary to follow in the middle and in the end of the narrative.

This conclusion is important for two reasons: First, as indicated above, it gives the reader a proleptic program of the itinerary of Jesus to follow in the rest of the narrative. In the second place, it prepares the reader for another status transformation of Jesus which will occur in Jerusalem during his trial. As indicated above, in Mark 1:1-15 the itinerary of Jesus is described by the narrator as Galilee-Judea-Galilee. In the next section (section 6.2.2), it will be shown that Jesus, while being in Judea (at the Jordan), undergoes a ritual status transformation to the new status of broker of God's kingdom before he returns to Galilee.

In section 6.4 and 6.5, it will be indicated that Jesus' itinerary not only (in the prologue of the narrative) is replicated by the narrator in the rest of the narrative, but also his status transformation in the prologue, namely in Mark 1:9-14. Or, formulated more clearly: Jesus' itinerary, according to the prologue of the narrative, is that of Galilee-Judea-Galilee. In the rest of the narrative (i.e., in the middle and end), Jesus' itinerary is also portrayed by the narrator as Galilee-Judea (Jerusalem)-Galilee (see again section 5.2.4.2.1.3). In the 'Judea-section' (i.e. between Galilee and Galilee) of the prologue, Jesus undergoes a ritual of status transformation. This is also the case in regard to the rest of the narrative (Mk 1:16-16:8): In the 'Jerusalem-section', again between Galilee and Galilee, Jesus also undergoes a ritual status of transformation during his arrest, trial and crucifixion. What we thus have in the middle and end of the narrative is not only a replication of the spatial structure of the prologue, but also one of Jesus' status transformation between 'Galilee and Galilee'.

While the ritual status transformation of Jesus during his trial in Jerusalem will get our due attention in section 6.5.2, we now first turn to Jesus' status transformation in the prologue of the Gospel.

6.2.2 Jesus' baptism as a status transformation ritual

Baptism is a ritual, a rite of status transformation (Wedderburn 1987:363-371). Like all transformative rituals, it is centrally concerned with a radical restructuring of the participants' identity, and consequently, with a redefinition of their status (McVann 1991b:151). Also, according to Alexander (1991:1), 'ritual often acts as a form of protest against the existing social structure and contributes to social change'. Understood as such, Jesus' baptism in Mark 1:9-11, combined with Mark 1:12-13 (Jesus' temptation), can be seen as a ritual of status transformation.

In section 4.2.4, it was indicated that any ritual has two important aspects, the ritual *process*, combined with certain ritual *elements*. The ritual process is characterized by a three-step process of separation, liminality-communitas and aggregation. As indicated, the ritual elements which help to effect a passage to a new role and status, are the initiand(s) themselves, the ritual elder(s) and certain ritual symbols. When these salient features of the ritual process are applied to Mark 1:9-13, it looks as follows: In terms of the ritual elements listed previously, Jesus is the initiand, and John the Baptist functions as the ritual elder/limit breaker presiding over the ritual process (Mk 1:9). Finally, the ritual symbols in Mark 1:9-13 were the water of the Jordan, the heavens that were torn apart, the dove that descended on Jesus, as well as the voice which came from heaven. To these can also be added the wilderness and Satan.

In terms of the ritual process, Jesus is first separated from his own people because he joins the people/crowds from 'the whole Judean countryside and all the people of Jerusalem' (Mk 1:5) to be baptized by John. According to the narrator, these people are in a liminal state because they have separated themselves from the ordinary social world to come to John for repentance. What they seek is a status transformation from sin to purity (Mk 1:5). Among them is Jesus. Separated from his family in Nazareth where he most probably worked as a carpenter (Mk 6:3), Jesus is pictured by the narrator as also leaving for the Jordan to be baptized by John⁴. In terms of separation from place, Jesus thus moves from Nazareth to the Jordan and also later to the desert, or rather, a lonely place⁵ (Mk 1:12). During his transformation ritual, Jesus is also separated from time in that he is tempted by Satan for forty days in a lonely place. In terms of liminality-communitas, Jesus' liminality can be seen in the fact that Jesus comes from Nazareth as a carpenter, but during his sojourn and experience at the Jordan, he actually becomes a 'nobody'. He is, according to the narrator, not a carpenter anymore, and indeed nothing more than just that: He is somebody who is being baptized by John. In terms of communitas, he enjoys communitas with John and the others who have come down to the Jordan to be baptized. In terms of the third step of the ritual process, aggregation, Jesus is tempted by Satan in a lonely place. During his

temptation, Jesus, however, demonstrates his loyalty to the voice in heaven that called him his beloved son during his baptism. After this, Jesus then goes to Galilee and starts to proclaim the good news of God. His status has thus been changed, according to the narrator, from being a carpenter to one who proclaims the good news of God.

From the above, it is therefore clear that Jesus' baptism, when looked at from the cross-cultural theory of rituals, can be seen as a status transformation ritual. McVann (1991a:333-360), for example, applied this cross-cultural model of rituals to the baptism of Jesus as narrated by Luke, and came to the same conclusion⁶. What is not so clear, however, is the status that should be accredited to Jesus after his baptism. According to McVann (1991a:341-358), Jesus' status reversal should be seen as that of an initiate that takes on the role of a prophet, although 'Mark ... does not tell us what is meant by "prophet" or when Jesus assumed that role' (McVann 1991a:342). His argument is based on two assumptions: First, on the grounds of Jesus' relationship with John the Baptist⁷, and second, on the grounds of Mark 6:15 and Mark 8:28 where Jesus is said to be 'Elijah, or John the Baptist or one of the prophets'. According to McVann (1991a:342), the relationship between Jesus and John the Baptist especially lies in the fact that they both called sinners to repentance. Although this can be said of Mark 1:15, it is interesting to note that nowhere else in the rest of the Gospel is Jesus calling people directly to repent from their sins. In relation to his second argument, it may well be true that some saw in Jesus certain traits that could link him to the image of a prophet. In this regard, the question can be asked if Jesus is portrayed by the narrator as a prophet, or rather, if some of the characters in the narrative are portrayed by the narrator as perceiving Jesus to be some prophet (cf Mk 6:15, 8:28). However, before I further argue my case at this stage, let us turn first to still another interpretation of Jesus' status transformation during his baptism.

According to Waetjen (1989:68-69), Jesus' baptism has the effect of radically transforming his status, rendering him as a marginal outsider. From this, it is clear that Waetjen, although not applying the previous mentioned cross-cultural theory of rituals to understand Jesus' baptism as a status transformation, nevertheless sees it as such. According to him, Jesus' baptism especially effected his marginality in relation to society's overarching power structures in which he lived. By becoming wholly unobliged toward society, Jesus also became wholly marginalized and expendable. Through baptism, a status is thus created whose existence constitutes a protest against the old and implies a new order, new values and attitudes, and new modalities of community living. Although I do agree with Waetjen to a large extent that Jesus' vision of society indeed was something radically new which included a vision of new modalities of community living, I disagree in that Jesus should be seen as 'the New Human Being'

after his baptism, the 'new Human Being' who is totally unobliged to the society and discharged of all debts and obligations to society (Waetjen 1989:71). This conclusion of Waetjen, of course, is the result of making use of Burridge's understanding of salvation as understood in millennial movements.

The main reason for not agreeing with Waetjen, and McVann for that matter, is my conviction that we should look for an answer to the question of Jesus' status after his baptism in the text itself, or more specifically, in the prologue of the Gospel. Previously, I indicated that the spatial structure of Jesus' itinerary in the prologue corresponds with that of his itinerary in the rest of the Gospel. In terms of his baptism as status reversal, one could argue that, in terms of the prologue, Jesus came from Galilee and underwent a status transformation in Judea to equip him for 'work to be done' in Galilee. My contention is that the prologue indeed gives us a clear indication of what Jesus' 'work' in Galilee is going to be: To proclaim the kingdom of God.

I propose therefore, that Jesus' baptism in Mark's prologue should be understood as a status transformation to that of being the new broker of God's kingdom and God's presence. This conclusion is based on the following five arguments: First, in Mark 1:11, the voice from heaven, who can readily be identified as God himself, is telling Jesus that '[y]ou are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased'. By these words God is appointing Jesus as his broker, as the one in whom he is pleased. This corresponds to what Elliott (1988:5-8) calls favoritism. Because God favors Jesus, he is appointed as his broker. Or, in the words of Malina (1988b:10):

All the Synoptics agree that Jesus proclaimed the kingdom of Heaven, i.e., the *proximate enjoyment of the patronage of God*, and they all have a heavenly voice witness to Jesus as beloved son, i.e., one who *enjoys special divine patronage*.

(Malina 1988b:10)

In this regard, Patte (1987:23-28) also noted that the name given to a child by parents (in first-century Mediterranean society), was sometimes related to the identification and vocation in fulfilling a particular role or performing a task. To name a child, therefore, was to accept such a child legally and socially as one's own: (cf Duling 1991b:12). By calling Jesus his 'Son, the Beloved', the Patron therefore not only accepted Jesus legally and socially, but also gave him a particular role to fulfill.

Second, by announcing this arrived patronage⁸ (cf Mk 1:15), and by starting to gather up its clientele (see e.g. Mk 1:16-2:17), Jesus set himself up as broker (Malina 1988b:2). Therefore, by reacting in the way he did, it is clear that at his baptism the narrator wants to tell us Jesus became the broker of God, the patron. Third, it is inte-

resting that Jesus in all four instances in which he refers to God in Mark (cf Mk 8:38; 11:25; 13:32; 14:36), uses the term 'father'. What Jesus therefore did was to apply kinship terminology to the God of Israel. According to Malina (1988b:9), this sort of 'kin-ification' is typically patron-client behavior. 'God, the 'father,' is nothing less than God the patron' (Malina 1988b:9). Fourth, according to Alexander (1991:2-3), rituals create social conflict by relaxing or suspending some of the requirements of everyday social structure, making alternative social arrangements possible. As Waetjen (1989:68-69) indicated, Jesus' baptism can be understood as Jesus becoming wholly unobliged to the *status quo ante*, and now will reorder society in terms of new patterns and values. In section 6.4 it will be argued that, according to the narrator of Mark, this is precisely what Jesus started to do after his baptism, namely to create a new household among the crowds (including the expendables in society) along new lines of understanding God as the Patron, and as a consequence, new lines of understanding society as well.

Finally, I want to argue that Jesus became broker of God's kingdom because, according to the narrator of the Gospel, God's kingdom was a brokerless kingdom⁹. For a detailed explanation of this argument we now turn to the next section.

6.3 A BROKERLESS KINGDOM

In the everyday life of the Jews at the beginning of the first-century CE, the relationship between God and man was expressed by the *Shema*, a prayer composed of three segments (Dt 6:4-9; 11:13-21; Num 15:37-41) which the faithful were to bind to the hand and the forehead and the doorposts (Foerster 1955:154; 1968:106-107), or as Kee (1984:247) puts it: '[O]n the heart, on the frontlets between the eyes, and on the doorposts'¹⁰. This prayer (named after the first word in Dt 6:4) had to be recited twice daily by every observing Jew and had essentially two elements: The confession that the God of Israel was an only God and, as a consequence, the setting apart of the believing Jews from those people who were not acceptable to God. The prayer thus served as a mnemotechnic device by means of which all were reminded of the vital importance of keeping God's commandments, failing of which all kinds of life-threatening sanctions were invoked (Van Staden 1991:1). It was, to cite Neyrey (1988a:82), 'a sacred profession of belief which distinguished Jews from all other peoples in the ancient world'. The concepts imbued by the *Shema*, therefore were to remain a persuasive directional force in the everyday lives of the Jewish people.

This means that the core value of Judaism was God's holiness, expressed by the utterance found many times in Leviticus 11-25, namely 'You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy'. The implications that this core value had for the observant

Jew were spelled out in section 4.2.7. The creation was seen as God's ultimate act of ordering and classifying the world. All things in creation (especially society and the physical body) had to replicate and express the divine order of classification, discrimination and order of the creation (cf Douglas 1966:53). This understanding of 'holiness' also came to be embodied especially in the central symbol of Israel's culture, the temple (Neusner 1979:103-127). This again led to maps of places, persons, time and things being developed which helped the observant Jew to know *what* and *who* belong *when* and *where*. This function of the temple is described as follows by Elliott (1991b:318-319):

For Judaism, the temple as Israel's central holy place represented the chief visible symbol of its identity as God's holy people. The holiness of its space, its personnel (priests [*hiereis*] = 'holy functionaries'; chief priests [*archiereis*]; Levites), its sacrifices, and the laws [and maps] of holiness it enforced symbolized a holy people's union with the Holy One of Israel. This link between holy place and the holy people and their demarcation from all that was unholy was derived from the Torah; and it was elaborated, maintained, and legitimated in an ideology and system of holiness which defined Jewish identity and regulated all aspects of Jewish life.

(Elliott 1991b:218-219)

A specific symbolic hierarchy thus regulated Jewish life: Creation-temple-society-human body (see again Douglas 1966:51-53, 91-115).

At the pinnacle of the temple were the high priest¹¹ and the chief priests¹². Allied with the Sadducean faction¹³, and controlled by the Roman governor¹⁴, this priestly aristocracy represented the power of the temple over all aspects of Jewish political, economic, social and cultural life. With the scribe-lawyers and elders (consisting of some of the family heads of the aristocratic Jewish families or the landed lay aristocracy), they also constituted the Sanhedrin¹⁵.

The scribes were the official interpreters of the Mosaic law (Torah)¹⁶. According to the narrator of Mark, they constituted a further arm of the temple apparatus. From Mark 14:53 and Mark 15:1 it is clear that they held a key position in the Sanhedrin and represented the link between temple authority and Torah observance. In Mark, this is very clearly depicted by the narrator describing some of the scribes who opposed Jesus on Galilean soil as coming from Jerusalem, from the temple (cf Mk 3:22; 7:1). Also, in relation to the scribes, the synagogue was the extension of the temple on Galilean soil.

A further key aspect of the temple was the Pharisees¹⁷. The Pharisees, who enforced the temple purity regulations even more rigorously, extended the norms of the temple and priestly holiness to 'the bed and the board of every observant Jewish home' (Elliott 1991b:221). Except for the maps of persons, places, things and times the Pharisees had their own special map, namely the map of meals. They claimed to speak for the replication of holiness in non-temple situations, and for ordinary (non-priestly) people who did not live close to the sacred place of the temple. Tactically, they claimed influence over other territory. They focused on the ordinary, but necessary daily activity of eating. And so, in speaking about meals, they claimed authority over a highly visible, external activity around which they built many hedges from the tradition of the elders.

In terms of the maps discussed in section 4.2.7, boundaries and lines in a place like Galilee, which was far from the temple, became very important (Wright 1992:209). In a sense, one can say the Pharisees replicated the elaborate temple rules by applying them to ordinary table fellowship. The people who were not allowed to enter the temple also could not eat with the observant Jew. This meant, for instance, a blind person was not only forbidden to enter the temple, but also could not sit down and have a meal with his family. People who were not 'whole' (e.g. unclean), therefore, were ostracized from their families. Also, certain animals which were not allowed to be offered in the temple were classified unclean, that is, improper and unsuitable for the table. Priests in the temple had to conform to certain purification rites before they were allowed to preside over the sacrificing of the offers, so observant Jews had to wash their hands before they could eat. Symbols were therefore created, namely symbols of purity and impurity, or clean and unclean (see again section 4.2.7).

Outside the house, the purity lines called for a careful avoidance of contact with all that was judged impure or unholy, like sinners, lepers, the blind and lame, corpses and tax collectors. People who crossed boundaries were labelled sinners and were not permitted to live inside the walls of the cities. The Pharisees also built a 'fence around the law' to make sure no purity line nor boundary was crossed. Their attitude therefore was to exclude, not to include. Everyone had to be watched to see if he/she should be labelled as a deviant to keep society intact and to make sure no boundaries were transgressed.

This then, was the 'religious top-structure' of first-century Judaism, a top-structure which led to a brokerless kingdom. The high priest was part, or at least a retainer of the Roman government (Fiensy 1991:160), as were the chief priests and scribes. The scribes walked around in long robes and wanted to be greeted with respect in the marketplaces. They wanted to have the best seats in the synagogues and the places of

honor at banquets, but also devoured widows' houses and for the sake of appearance said long prayers in public (cf Mk 12:38-40). The temple became an economic and a political institution (cf Belo 1981:186-191; Waetjen 1989:183), and the guardianship of the temple by the chief priests and scribes was self-serving. Maps meant more tithes, and more tithes meant more money. The vineyard leased to them was used for their own benefit, and not to God's advantage (Mk 12:1-12; cf Van Eck & Van Aarde 1989: 794). Furthermore, outside the temple, the Pharisees burdened people with the law, and thus did not aid their entrance into the kingdom, but rather blocked it. The Patron was there, his presence was available. There were also many clients, but there were no brokers. The brokers had their own patrons and these patrons were of more importance than the heavenly Patron.

With this as background, we can now return to our main argument, which is that Jesus *inter alia* became the broker of the kingdom because the kingdom was brokerless. According to Seeman ([1992]:11), patronage is a model of social exchange which is defined in contrast to formal social relationships. Formal relationships are normative interactions based on compulsion and negative sanctions. Partition in such relationships is based on ascription rather than choice. According to Seeman ([1992]:11), the temple in Jerusalem was the focus of formal political and economic relationships based upon ascribed ethnic inclusion within the polity of Yahweh's people, Israel. Temple sacrifice was the ritual production of this system, being normative and constituting an enactment of balanced reciprocity. Purity norms constituted the ideological basis of the temple.

By contrast to such formal relations, patronage is an informal form of interaction — it is an '*addendum to or replacement of formal relations*' (Seeman [1992]:11; my emphasis). It involves a personal exchange of valued symbolic or material resources based upon unequal access to power. Patronal relationships are normally regarded by holders of formal authority as deviant. However, patronage is generally sought out by clients because the formal interactions are perceived to be inadequate for realizing subsistence needs or other objects.

In section 4.2.2, it was indicated that such patron-client relationships were commonly employed to remedy the inadequacies of all institutions, that is, to cushion the vagaries of life for social inferiors. Therefore, what patron-client relationships essentially entail is endowing and outfitting economic, political or religious institutional arrangements with the overarching quality of kinship. Such relationships 'kin-ify' and suffuse the persons involved with the aura of kinship, albeit fictive or pseudo-kinship. And since the hallmark of kinship as a social institution is the quality of commitment, solidarity or loyalty realized in terms of generalized reciprocity, patron-client relation-

ships take on these kinship dimensions. Patron-client relationships therefore, in the first place do not intend to exploit people. However, from what was said above, it is clear that the 'official brokers' of the kingdom started to exploit the clients, and as a consequence, lost their status as God's brokers. Because of this, Jesus became the broker of the kingdom of God. The formal relationship between the common people and the temple as the only access to God no longer worked.

It is against this background that the results of the emic reading in chapter 5 should be understood. One of the important results yielded by the emic reading of the text in the previous chapter was that, in terms of the ideological perspective of the narrator on the topographical level of the text, Galilee is opposed to Jerusalem, and more specifically, house to temple¹⁸ (see again section 5.2.4). In the subsequent section of this chapter, it will be argued that this opposition(s) should be understood in terms of the fact that the 'official brokers' of the God, and therefore also of the temple, brokered the Patron's availability and presence in such a way that the Patron was no longer readily available. Jesus, however, especially on Galilean soil made the presence of the Patron available to everyone that wanted to share in the kingdom, but especially to the expendables who most needed it. And by doing this, the narrator depicts Galilee as a positive symbol, and Jerusalem as a negative symbol. Or to put it boldly: 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.

In terms of the analysis of Jesus' baptism as a status transformation ritual, the following conclusion can be drawn: Jesus' baptism in Mark 1:9-13 should be seen as a status transformation ritual, a ritual in which Jesus becomes the broker of God's kingdom (Mk 1:15). In the subsequent sections of this chapter, it will be argued that the notion kingdom of God is used by the narrator of Mark as a metaphor, that is, a symbol of the actual sphere of access to God's saving presence. It will also be argued that the sphere of God's presence should be seen as the household, the new household of God, with its egalitarian and inclusive tendency; a new family and household 'that illustrates features of life under the reign of God' (Elliott 1991b:227).

It will be indicated below that Jesus brokered the kingdom, and therefore also the new household, to his clients especially through his healings, the way he ate (i.e., what, with whom, when, how and where Jesus ate), and through his interpretation of the purity rules of his day. Furthermore, this was done in Galilee, and not in Jerusalem. Galilee therefore became the symbol of God's presence, rather than Jerusalem. Understood as such, Galilee is portrayed by the narrator as a positive symbol, and not Jerusalem. In terms of the map of places (see again section 4.2.7), Jerusalem was 'holier' than the rest of Israel, and the temple was even holier. However, according to the narrator of Mark, this was no longer the case.

6.4 JESUS' BROKERAGE ON GALILEAN SOIL

6.4.1 Introductory remarks

Section 4.2 will consist of an analysis of Jesus' brokerage on Galilean soil. For the sake of our argument in regard to the opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem, and house and temple, some passages which fall in 'the-way'-section of the narrative (Mk 8:27-10:52) will also be discussed here. The analyses of specific passages in the following sections do not pretend to be exhaustive, in that the analyses are done to substantiate the main argument, namely that the focal space house(hold) is used by the narrator as a symbol for the kingdom of God. In terms of the theories discussed in section 4.2, our analysis of Jesus' brokerage on Galilean soil will be done as follows: First we shall look at Jesus' interpretation of the purity rules of his day (section 6.4.2), and then an analysis will be made of the way Jesus 'ate' (i.e., what, with whom, when, how and where Jesus ate; section 6.4.3). This will be followed by an analysis of Jesus' healings and exorcisms (section 6.4.4) and Jesus as ritual elder (section 6.4.5), which then will be followed by an analysis of the different micronarratives in which labelling occurs, especially those in which Jesus is involved as the one who is being labelled (section 6.4.6). Finally, an analysis will be done of Jesus' respective interpretation of honor and shame and first-century personality in relation to his understanding of the new household of God (sections 6.4.7 and 6.4.8). The conclusions regarding Jesus' brokerage on Galilean soil will be summarized in section 6.4.9.

6.4.2 Purity and pollution

According to Jewish law and tradition, it would have been expected of Jesus, as a Jew, to be a defensive person who avoided all contact with uncleanness. He would have been expected to respect the lines and the boundaries of Jewish observance, which are indicated in the maps of places, things, persons and times (see again section 4.2.7). Holiness, defined as separateness from all things unclean, defective or marginal is indicated in behavior which keeps one separate from uncleanness and which maintains the classification system. Borg (1987:86) calls this a *politics of holiness*, where holiness is understood in a highly specific way, namely as *separation*. Yet in Mark, we find a description of Jesus who, especially on Galilean soil, seems to tramp on all the lines and boundaries of the culture of his day.

However, according to Neyrey (1986a:105), 'it would be erroneous to assert that Mark portrays Jesus as abrogating the general purity system or that Mark was himself unconcerned with purity issues'. Or, in the words of Crossan (1991a:263): 'I propose ... that he (Jesus — EvE) did not care enough about such ritual laws either to attack or to acknowledge them. He ignored them, but that, of course, was to subvert them at a

most fundamental level'. These remarks of Neyrey and Crossan raise, according to my opinion, the fundamental question in regard to Jesus' relation with the purity rules of his day: What exactly was Jesus' attitude, according to the narrator of the Gospel, towards the 'map-system' of the culture of which he was a part? In the subsequent discussion we will try to answer this question.

When one reads through the Galilean-section of the Gospel, it is interesting that except for Mark 1:16-20, 35-39, 3:31-35, 4:1-45; 6:1-6, 14-29, 45-52 and Mark 8:11-21, the rest of this section of the narrative can be related, in some way or another, to the fact that Jesus transgressed the purity rules of his day¹⁹. In terms of the maps of persons, places, things and time, the following can serve as an illustration to give an indication of how often Jesus transgressed the purity rules:

Maps of persons:

- * Jesus came in contact with many unclean people: Mark 1:21-28, 29-34; 2:1-12, 13-14; 3:1-6, 7-12; 6:35-44, 53-56; 7:31-39; 10:46. Some of these people he even voluntarily touched: Mark 1:41; 5:41; 8:22-26.
- * He was touched by unclean people: Mark 3:7-12; 5:25-34; 6:53-56.
- * Jesus even touched corpses: Mark 5:35-43.
- * Jesus was also regularly in contact with the possessed: Mark 1:21-28, 29-32; 3:7-12, 19-28; 5:1-20; 9:14-29.

Maps of places:

- * Jesus travelled extensively in 'non-Jewish' (Gentile) country, thus crossing boundaries which were not to be crossed and exposed himself to pollution on every side. In these regions, he had direct contact with Gentiles: Mark 5:1-20; 7:24-30, 31-37; 8:1-10.

Maps of things:

- * Jesus broke one of the strictest purity laws in Israel when he discarded all dietary restrictions: Mark 2:15-17; 7:1-23.
- * He shared meals with unclean sinners and Gentiles: Mark 2:15-17; 8:1-10.
- * Jesus had no regard for the surface of the body: Mark 1:40-45.
- * He also had no regard for body orifices: Mark 7:31-37; 8:22-26.

Maps of time:

- * Jesus healed on the Sabbath: Mark 1:21-28, 29-32; 3:1-6.
- * He also plucked grain on the Sabbath: Mark 2:23-28.
- * Jesus violated the times of fasting: Mark 2:18-22.

These examples clearly state that Jesus transgressed about every purity map established. This however, does not show how Jesus interpreted the purity laws of his day. To understand how he interpreted these laws, we therefore have to look more closely to some of the examples cited above.

According to the narrator, Jesus transgressed the purity system the first time in Mark 1:21-28. The interesting aspect of Mark 1:21-28 is that the narrator situates Jesus in the right *place* (the synagogue), at the right *time* (on the sabbath) and with the right *people* (observant Jews; Neyrey 1986a:106). Because Jesus was in the synagogue, it can also be supposed that scribes were present: First, the synagogue was the main place where the scribes taught, and second, those present referred to Jesus' teaching as having more authority than that of the scribes (cf Mk 1:22). According to the narrator, while Jesus was teaching, a demon confronted him by saying that he was 'the Holy One of God' (cf Mk 1:24). After rebuking the demon, the man was cleansed.

From this short episode, the following conclusions can be drawn: By acknowledging Jesus as being 'the Holy One of God', the demon is acknowledging that Jesus is God's official broker who has the authority to destroy him/them. Second, because the synagogue can be seen as the extension of the temple on Galilean soil, this episode can also be understood as happening, in a certain sense, in the temple itself (see section 6.3). Most probably this man was a deviant in one way or another, and therefore was previously labeled by the scribes (or Pharisees) as one who possessed a demon (see section 4.2.5). By driving out the demon, Jesus indicated he and his followers are not bound by the purity system of the temple as practiced by the scribes (and Pharisees). This healing of Jesus thus challenged the temple purity system in its essence.

It is also interesting how the narrator, in terms of the development of the plot of the narrative, is depicting Jesus as having more and more authority to be the broker of the kingdom in regard to the purity rules of his day. As described above, Jesus transgressed the purity rules the first time in Galilee in the presence of the scribes. In their presence, he showed that he had authority over their interpretation of purity. In Mark 1:40-45, we again read that Jesus stepped over boundaries when he healed an unclean person, this time a leper. After Jesus cleansed him, he sent him to the local priest. By this, Jesus did not mean that the priest should discern if the man was cleansed or not, but that the man could be a testimony to Jesus' authority in reinterpreting the purity system, that is, that Jesus also had the authority to declare someone clean (cf Mk 1:44). In Mark 8:22-26, the last episode in the Galilean-section of the Gospel, the narrator depicts Jesus as having so much authority over the purity laws that he tells the man who was cleansed to go straight to his house, not even first to his village. If I understand this correctly, the narrator is informing the reader that at the end of the Galilean-section

of the narrative, Jesus had so much authority over the purity system that not even the village in which the man lived had to attest to his cleanness. In terms of the dyadic character of first-century Mediterranean relationships, this is indeed remarkable. The narrator thus wants to inform the reader that Jesus as broker of the kingdom had so much authority that when he pronounced someone clean, he/she was clean: No priest (i.e. the temple) or even the pivotal values of honor and shame came into play when Jesus made someone clean. As the authoritative broker of God's kingdom Jesus also had the authority to decide who was clean or not.

From the above it is thus clear that, according to the narrator, Jesus as broker had the authority to step over the lines and boundaries of purity. But how did he interpret the purity laws of his day? To answer this question we have to turn to Mark 7:23. According to Mark 7:2 the Pharisees, on the grounds of the traditions of the elders (i.e. the 'fence' around the law), took objection when Jesus and his disciples were eating with defiled hands, that is, not washing them before starting to eat. Jesus answered them by saying there is nothing that can defile a person that goes into him from the outside, but what does defile a person is what comes from the inside to the outside of the body. With this answer Jesus referred to the fact that the Pharisees were only concerned with the externals and surfaces (washing of hands, pots, cups and vessels), but at the same time, they honored God only with their lips and not with their hearts (cf Mk 7:6). What did Jesus mean by this?

The Pharisees, by guarding the external fences of the law, made sure nothing from the outside could come and make the inside unclean. The danger was those outside the fence, not those who were on the inside. But Jesus turned this around. According to him, the danger did not come from the outside, but rather from the inside. It is the insiders who make the outsiders 'impure'/'unclean' by not making the kingdom available, and by labelling them as being outside the kingdom. And by so doing, they were breaking up the household of God. Their politics of holiness, to use Borg's words, was breaking up the household.

This conclusion is based on the following interpretation of the example of the *qorban* Jesus used when he answered the Pharisees in regard to their accusation that he and the disciples were unclean because they did not adhere to the tradition of the elders (cf Mk 7:1-23). The word *qorban* appears very often in Leviticus and Numbers (e.g. Lev 1:2; Num 7:13) and can be translated as an 'offering' or a gift offered to God (see Pilch 1988a:34). In Mark 7:11, the word is used to describe a 'vow' by which a person pledges personal wealth to God upon death while retaining the use of it during life (Fitzmyer 1971:96). According to Pilch (1988a:34-35), the effect of the *qorban* behavior pattern deprived parents of support deserved from a son (cf Neyrey [1991]e;

Van Aarde 1991a:691-692), and second, the word *qorban* definitely belonged to the temple semantic network and drew its primary meaning therefrom (see Pilch 1988a: 34). It therefore, was not simply the case that the son actually possessed money or wealth which he would not give the parents, but rather that he held back his personal assistance and efforts in any form.

The *qorban* therefore, according to the Markan Jesus, was breaking up households. It made sons only look after themselves, and not also after their fathers (and mothers) and their households. And that was precisely what the Pharisees were doing with their Father and his household. With their fences around the law, they were only looking after themselves, and by doing this, the interests of their Father were shoved into the background. They only honored him with their lips, but not with their hearts also (cf Mk 7:6). With their fences around the law, they kept people (sons) outside the household who should actually be inside, and by doing this they were breaking up the Father's household. Because of the *qorban*, the son (and his resources) was no longer available to the father. And with their fences around the law, the household of the Father was no longer available to his sons. The danger of pollution was therefore not somewhere 'out there', but in the community itself (Pilch 1988b:65). According to Jesus, it was therefore the community (Pharisees) which was breaking up the household, that is, who made the kingdom unavailable. Horsley (1992:14) understands the controversy between Jesus and the Pharisees in Mark 7:1-23 in the same vein: 'The conflict in Mark 7 ... is not over observance of the Torah, but over the effects on the people of the scribe's and Pharisees' official role in the temple-state'.

What Jesus was implying in his answer to the Pharisees is that in his father's household this can not be allowed. In this household everyone was welcome. And because everyone was welcome, new lines had to be drawn. Lines that included also the lepers, the blind, the possessed, as well as those from Tyre, Sidon and Idumea (cf Mk 3:7-8). These new lines and boundaries, however, made the old ones obsolete, so obsolete that they can not be even be adapted and still be useful. We find this point of view of Jesus in Mark 2:21-22: No one sews a piece of unshrunk cloth on an old cloak, and no one puts new wine in old wineskins, because the worst tear will be made, and the new wine will burst the old skins.

To summarize: Jesus' interpretation of the purity laws of his day was that they were breaking up the household of his father. It also made the kingdom unavailable to those who needed it the most, the so-called 'unclean' or expendables of society. As broker of the kingdom of God Jesus came to make it available. This can especially seen by the fact that on Galilean soil almost every time Jesus transgressed the purity laws of his day, it occurred in the surroundings of the household. And if the move-

ment of Jesus, that is, those who travelled with him, is understood as the new household of God, these occurrences were even more numerous. Also, if Meeks' understanding of the synagogue is taken into consideration, Jesus' transgression of the purity rules in the synagogue can be added to the household settings in which Jesus transgressed the purity rules. According to Meeks (1983), the archeological evidence indicate that the earliest synagogue should be dated more or less in third century CE. In this regard Horsley (1992:7-8) has noted the following:

[In first-century Palestine] villages or towns were economically self-sufficient and politically semi-autonomous communities. Social-economic-religious relations were guided by traditional customs and practices. Village self-government took the standard traditional form of local assembly (*kneset*, *synagoge*) which attended to all kinds of local affairs from maintenance of water supply to constituting courts to handle inter-family conflicts to collections for the poor to collective prayers Once we recognize that the *synagogai* in Mark are not religious buildings but local village assemblies, it is evident that Mark portrays Jesus' ministry as based on villages

(Horsley 1992:7-8)

This would mean that in first-century Palestine synagogues were houses, houses that were big enough, for example, to be used as a place where scripture reading and teaching could take place (cf also Kee 1990b:1-24; Van Aarde 1990b:251-264; 1991d:51-64). Understood as such, when Jesus transgressed the purity rules in the synagogue, he did it also in the context of the household. Even the meals Jesus presided over in Mark 6:35-44 and Mark 8:1-10 can be added to this list, since the eating of a meal can be understood as symbolizing the household.

Hence, for Jesus as broker the resources of his father had to be available to everyone. And therefore, the purity maps had to be ignored and had to go. Or, in the words of Crossan (1991a:263): To ignore these purity maps was to subvert them at the most fundamental level. And to subvert is a calculated attack on that which is subverted. Important also to remember is that all of this happened in Galilee, far away from the temple and its system, but also very dangerous to the temple and its maps of purity. That this was noted by Jesus, antagonists on Galilean soil is clear from the narrative. They observed how often Jesus transgressed all the purity maps of his culture regarding persons, places, things and times. They also saw how often he communed with unclean spirits and unclean persons. And therefore, they concluded Jesus could not be 'the Holy One of God' (Mk 1:24). Since he showed such flagrant disregard for

purity rules, he could not be clean himself. On the contrary, he must be of Satan's camp. And therefore he was labelled as being from Beelzebul (cf Mark 3:22). This accusation leveled at Jesus will be discussed in detail in section 6.4.6. But let us first look at the way how Jesus, according to the narrator, ate (i.e., what, with whom, when, how and where).

6.4.3 Ceremonies

In section 4.2.4, it was argued that arrangements and norms concerning food and meals regularly relates to and replicates patterns and rules of social systems in general and familial institutions in particular (Douglas 1966:41-57; cf also Leach 1969:55-61; Feeley-Harnik 1981:6-18; Powers & Powers 1984:40-45; Douglas 1984:1-39; Harris 1985:61-68). Or to put it briefly: Food codes embody and replicate social codes. This cross-cultural understanding of the relationship between food codes and social codes is put by Elliott (1991d:103) as follows:

In any society or sub-group thereof, there is generally a correlation of the rules and boundaries concerning *what* one eats, with *whom* one eats, *when* one eats, *how* one eats, *where* one eats, to what community, group, or kinship network one belongs, and what constitutes the group's traditions, values, norms, and worldview.

(Elliott 1991d:103; my emphasis)

In this regard, Douglas proposed considering food as a code of social relations:

If food is treated as a code, the message it encodes will be found in the pattern of social relations being expressed. The message is about different degrees of hierarchy, inclusion and exclusion, boundaries and transactions across the boundaries. Like sex, the taking of food has a social component, as well as a biological one. Food categories therefore encode social events ... the ordered system which is a meal represents all the ordered systems associated with it.

(Douglas 1972:61)

As such, food and meals, beyond supplying nourishment, have a variety of social capacities. They can serve as social boundary markers distinguishing types and groups of participants and consumers like men/women, adults/children, kin/non-kin, upper/lower classes and insiders/outsideers (see Elliott 1991d:103). They can also serve as temporal and spatial markers distinguishing ordinary from extraordinary or profane from holy time and space. Beside marking status lines and social boundaries, food and meals are also the media of social and economic exchange in that they replicate broader social

codes aimed at securing order and social cohesion. Specific types of food (e.g. wine, bread or fish) and specific meals (e.g. private or public feasts) also serve as ideational and ideological symbols of core beliefs and values. Thus, 'who may eat what with whom is a direct expression of social, political, and religious relations' (Feeley-Harnik 1981:2), exactly because 'in no society ... [were] people permitted to eat everything, everywhere, with everyone, and in all situations' (Cohen 1968:508). Foods and meals thus encode social relationships, cultural values and norms and metaphysical world-views.

In sections 4.2.4 and 6.3 it was indicated that this was especially true in regard to the Pharisees' understanding of God's holiness. For them, food and meals formed a mediating link between the temple and its altar, priesthood and sacrifices and the private home and the table. Their metaphysical worldview, that is, their understanding of the symbolic universe, led to their own specific map, namely the map of meals. Only likes were permitted to eat with likes, and therefore Jews did not eat with Gentiles. Only specific foods were allowed to be eaten, and this concern for clean/unclean foods extended to the dishes used in their preparation and consumption. The place where one ate was also important, because it ensured that the proper diet was prepared in a proper way and could be served on proper utensils. Because God was holy, the temple had to be holy too. Therefore, priests had to be holy, as well as the sacrifices. Meals replicated the sacrificial system, and therefore the bed and board of every observant Jew also had to be holy. And to make sure all this would be the case, a map of meals was needed. It was a map that, in terms of their understanding of the symbolic universe, not only replicated and embodied social codes, but also maintained or modified social relations.

In turning to our analysis of ceremonies in Mark, four episodes which relate to ceremonies as meals are of importance here: Mark 2:15-17 (where Jesus ate with Levi and other tax collectors), Mark 2:18-20 (where Jesus and his disciples ate while others were fasting) and Mark 6:35-44 and 8:1-10 (respectively the first and second multiplication of the bread and fish). In terms of Mark 2:15-17, it is clear that Jesus was not adhering to the maps of persons when it came to meals. As was indicated in section 4.2.7, tax collectors were seen as people who were continuously stepping over boundaries and therefore were labelled as being in a constant state of sin. It is for this reason that the Pharisees criticized Jesus for eating with 'sinners and tax-collectors' (cf. Mk 2:16). Jesus' answer to them can be seen as a programmatic declaration in terms of who he will be eating with in the rest of the Gospel: 'He came for the sinners, not for those who think that they are righteous. His practice will be that of 'open commensality' (Crossan 1991a:262).

Although in Mark 2:18-20 no meal is mentioned, this episode clearly relates to eating. This can be deduced from the fact that the Pharisees were criticizing Jesus that he and his disciples were not fasting, in other words, they were eating while the Pharisees and John's disciples were fasting. Jesus thus has no respect for the map of times as applied to meals. Jesus' answer to them in Mark 2:19-20, in terms of him being the broker of the kingdom of God, was as follows: Because I came to broker the kingdom, the kingdom is here (cf Mk 1:15). This kingdom is a feast, similar to a marriage. And because the kingdom is a feast, and especially because the bridegroom (broker) is present, the feast must go on. In the kingdom of God there will therefore be no times of fasting or times of feasting. One can eat whenever one wants, and also with whomever one wants (see again Mk 2:15-17).

This then is also evident in Mark 6:35-44 and Mark 8:1-10. Let us first look at those aspects which are similar to these two episodes. In both instances, Jesus and the crowd are pictured as being in a deserted place (cf Mk 6:35; 8:4). In terms of the map of places, the perception of an ordered universe was replicated not only in terms of the spatial arrangement of persons and things, but also in regard to the place where one eats. A 'deserted place' therefore was unsuitable for eating, especially because there was no proper water for the prescribed purification rites for the washing of hands before eating. It also excluded the possibility of eating only prescribed food which was properly tithed and prepared. The map of meals further prescribed seating arrangements had to be done in terms of the status and ranking of those present. Jesus, however, ordered the disciples to make the people sit in groups on the ground/grass, and therefore erased all possibility of social and status ranking. Jesus thus not only ate in terms of open commensality, but also in terms of egalitarianism. There were no places of honor at his banquets (cf Mk 12:39). In the kingdom of God there is only one status, namely that of belonging to the household of God.

In terms of the maps of things, it was indicated in section 4.2.4 that certain people, in relation to their status, received certain foods and sometimes also in certain quantities. Jesus, however, gave to everybody present the same food to eat. Because everyone present ate and was filled, and by the fact that there were leftovers, it is clear that those present also received the same quantity of food, namely as much as they would like. In terms of the map of persons, it is clear from both Mark 6 and 8 that people who were unclean were present among the group. This can easily be deduced from the narrator's description of the crowd in the Gospel (cf Mk 6:53-56) which consisted mainly of the expendables. Furthermore, as it can be deduced from the spatial designations used by the narrator in Mark 7:24 and 31, it is also clear that in Mark 8:1-10, during the second multiplication of the bread, there were also Gentiles present.

Another interesting aspect of the feedings in Mark 6 and 8 is the fact the Jesus, before he made the disciples serve the bread and fish to the crowd, prayed (cf Mk 6:41; 8:6). This, according to my opinion, relates to Mark 7:19 and 10:27. In Mark 7:19 Jesus declared all food clean, and in Mark 10:27 he stated that for God all things are possible. It one therefore asks, God will not only provide, but will render it fit to be eaten.

To summarize then: According to the narrator, the most startling element of the way in which Jesus ate, was *the principle of open commensality*. His meals were inclusive. His table was the place where 'nobodies' met, and became 'somebodies', participants of the available kingdom of God. Classes, sexes, ranks and grades were all mixed up together. In fact, everyone was welcome. Any food could be eaten anywhere. Everyone was equal. No distinctions nor discriminations were made. *It was a situation of egalitarian commensality*. It was the creation of the new household of God. Understood as such, one can even say that Jesus' meals have become, in a certain sense, rituals. While his meals confirmed the values and structures of the kingdom, it also served as a status transformation to many who took part. From being sinners, the marginalized or 'nobodies', of society, they became members of God's new household, part of the kingdom of God. Or, stated differently: They became the kingdom. Understood as such, the narrator of Mark uses the meals Jesus presided over to define the inner structure of the new household.

If we take into consideration the fact that meals were seen as the social counterpart of a specific reflection on the symbolic universe, it is clear that the way Jesus ate contained almost inevitably the seeds of an alternative understanding of the symbolic universe. The Pharisees' understanding of the holiness of God led to an exclusivistic view of society, while Jesus' understanding of his Patron led to an inclusivistic understanding of God's kingdom. In God's kingdom the salient features therefore were hospitality, solidarity and mutual support. But dignity, respect and economic comfort (as can clearly be seen from Mk 6:37; 8:3), were also features which were all a part of the normal household.

Jesus' meals in Mark can therefore be seen as a symbol of the kingdom, a symbol which can be described in terms of inclusive hospitality, status reversal, humility and service. The sharing of food and table-fellowship in this kingdom were like the reciprocal relationships of kin and fictive-kin and thus symbolized social identity and solidarity with the kingdom. This sharing, however, clearly did not identify with the temple and its exclusivistic purity regulations. Meals symbolized something of the availability of the kingdom, as well as the availability of its Patron. The temple, on the other hand, symbolized the unavailability of the kingdom and the Patron. Understood

as such, the narrator is clearly depicting meals in Mark as a positive symbol, and the temple as a negative one. The one symbolizes availability and inclusivity, the other unavailability and exclusivity. Or, in the words of Farb & Armelagos (1980:113):

[E]ating is the primary way of initiating and maintaining human relationships. Once the anthropologist finds out where, when, and with whom the food is eaten, just about everything else can be inferred about the relations among the society's members [T]o know what, where, how, when, and with whom people eat is to know the character of the society.

(Farb & Armelagos 1980:113)

Meals thus serve in Mark as potent illustrations of the beliefs and behavior of the new community, the new household of God called into being by its broker, Jesus. In this household a new holiness applies, a holiness which makes room for anyone who wants to participate.

6.4.4 Sickness and healing

Sometimes I aint so sho who's got ere right to say when a man is crazy and when he aint. Sometimes I think it aint none of us pure crazy and aint none of us pure sane until the balance of us talks him that-away. It's like it aint so much what a fellow does, but it's the way the majority of folks is looking at him when he does it.

(William Faulkner, *As I lay dying*, cited by Hollenbach 1982b:567)

Men may seek salvation from evil conceived in many forms — from anxiety, illness; inferiority feelings; grief; fear of death; concern for social order. What they seek may be healing; the elimination of evil agents; a sense of access to power; the enhancement of status; increase of prosperity; the promise of life hereafter, or reincarnation, or resurrection from the grave, or attention from posterity; the transformation of the social order (including the restoration of a real or imagined formation of the social order).

(Wilson 1973:492)

The above citations of Faulkner and Wilson clearly illustrate what was said previously about sickness and healing in the first-century Mediterranean world (see section 4.2.6): Health is but one example of good fortune, and sickness is but one example of a wide range of misfortunes. Sickness is a state of being which, according to Wilson (1973:492), can range from anxiety, illness, inferiority feelings, grief and fear of death

up to the concern for social order. Understood as such, sickness becomes a human experience when it becomes meaningful. And sickness becomes meaningful when worrisome or biological signs are given socially recognizable meanings, that is, when a person with such behavior or signs are labelled as unclean and therefore unfit to be part of the holy community. This again, according to Wilson (1973:492), may lead the labelled person to seek healing, the elimination of evil agents, a sense of access to power, the enhancement of status, increase of prosperity, attention from posterity or even the transformation of the social order. From this it is therefore clear that in the first-century Mediterranean world, illness refers to a social and personal perception of certain disvalued states, all of which can be seen as but one example of a wide range of misfortunes.

Turning to Mark, a taxonomy of the different episodes in Mark which pertain to ill persons who were healed by Jesus looks as follows:

- Mark 1:21-28: A man possessed by an unclean spirit.
- Mark 1:29-31: Simon's mother-in-law in bed with a fever.
- Mark 1:32-34: Many had illnesses and were possessed by demons (summary).
- Mark 1:39: Many demons were cast out (summary).
- Mark 1:40-45: A man who had leprosy.
- Mark 2:1-12: A man who was paralyzed.
- Mark 3:1-5: A man who had a withered hand.
- Mark 3:10-12: Many had illnesses and were possessed by demons (summary).
- Mark 5:1-20: A man possessed by an unclean spirit.
- Mark 5:22-24, 35-43: A young girl who was dying.
- Mark 5:25-34: A woman who suffered from hemorrhages.
- Mark 6:5: Many had illnesses (summary).
- Mark 6:53-56: Many had illnesses (summary).
- Mark 7:24-30: A girl possessed by an unclean spirit.
- Mark 7:31-37: A deaf man with an impediment in his speech.
- Mark 8:22-26: A man who was blind.
- Mark 9:17-29: A young boy with a spirit.
- Mark 10:46-52: The blind Bartimaeus.

A three-fold division seems to emerge from these passages: People who have different illnesses (Mk 1:29-31, 40-45; 2:1-12; 3:1-5; 5:22-24 and 35-43, 25-34; 7:31-37; 8:22-26; 10:46-52), who are possessed by unclean spirits/demons (Mk 1:21-28; 5:1-20; 7:24-30; 9:17-29) and summary-type statements in which both illness and the possessing of spirits are referred (Mk 1:32-34, 39; 3:10-12; 6:5, 53-56).

In terms of the latter, Pilch (1988b:65) and Kingsbury (1989:65-88) are of the opinion that the summary-type statements in Mark are used by the narrator to illustrate the power and authority with which Jesus taught. This is especially clear from the narrative in terms of the results that Jesus' healings and exorcisms have on the crowd: They are amazed (Mk 1:27), the whole village gathered at the door to see his healings and exorcisms (Mk 1:32-34), there were so many that they crushed Jesus (Mk 3:9), and they laid the sick before him so they could be healed (Mk 6:53-56).

While this can also be said of the specific cases in which Jesus either healed or exorcised, Jesus' healings and exorcisms in Mark also culminate into something more: In Jesus' healings and exorcisms, Jesus extended the boundaries of society and included into the holy community many who were otherwise excluded. Jesus' main goal with his healings and exorcisms was to reinstate people to be part of the community, that is, to make them whole, clean and acceptable. By doing this, Jesus again, as was the case with his interpretation of the purity rules of his day and his interpretation the map of meals, was defining the household of God. And by defining it in this way, Jesus as broker made the kingdom of God also available to those who were labelled unclean or were possessed by a spirit because they in one way or another were perceived by society as stepping over a boundary line. Also, in Jesus' healings and exorcisms, it becomes clear who his clients were, or, as defined in chapter 5, who his target was: The crowds, consisting of *inter alia* the expendables in society.

As a result of the three-fold division which emerged from our previous discussion of the taxonomy of the different healings and exorcisms of Jesus, we will, in the two subsequent sections, treat Jesus' exorcisms and healings separately. First we will look at Jesus' exorcisms and healings on Galilean soil (respectively sections 6.4.4.1 and 6.4.4.2). Then Jesus' exorcisms and healings in 'the way-section' of the narrative, in Mark 8:27-10:52, will be referred to in section 6.4.9.1.

6.4.4.1 Jesus' exorcisms

As was indicated in section 6.4.4, except for the summary-type statements, we find in Mark four instances when Jesus cast out unclean spirits/demons: In Mark 1:21-28, Jesus cast out an unclean spirit from a man, in Mark 5:1-20, he healed the Gerasene demoniac, in Mark 7:24-30, he exorcised an unclean spirit from a young girl, and in Mark 9:17-29, Jesus healed a boy with an unclean spirit²⁰. The first three instances will be analyzed in this section and the latter in section 6.4.9.1. Before we, however, turn to an analysis of these three passages, let us first look at what the prevailing beliefs about demons/spirits and demon-possession were in the time of Jesus, as this can help us to understand the passages named above in a more comprehensive manner.

Current social-scientific theories regarding to demon and demon-possession, more or less agree that three causes for demon-possession can be indicated. According to Kiev (1964:135-137, 204-205, 262-263), Lewis (1971:35) and Bourguignon (1976:53-54), demon-possession can be caused by social tensions such as class antagonisms rooted in economic exploitation²¹, conflicts between traditions where revered traditions are eroded²² and 'colonial' domination²³. According to Fanon (1963:250), 'colonialism' was a systematic negation of the other person and a furious determination to deny the other person all attributes of humanity, in that it forces the people who are dominated to ask themselves constantly the question, 'In reality, who am I?' In the colonial situation of domination and oppression, it is therefore not strange that mental illness/spirit possession flourished in extraordinary numbers of the population. This correlation between oppression and possession was also noted by Myers (1988:141-152, 1992:1-13) and Waetjen (1989:113-119).

Second, demon possession can also be seen as a socially acceptable form of oblique protest against, or escape from, oppression (Fanon 1963:290; Kiev 1964:218-219; Lewis 1971:72; Ward & Beaubrun 1980:206). Understood as such, some types of demon possession become escapes from, 'cures' for, as well as symptoms of social conflict. To adapt to stress in the midst of conflict, possession was seen as a socially recognized and accepted practice. Possession thus functioned *inter alia* as a outlet for people who saw no other way to cope with the horrendous social and political conditions in which they found themselves. However, as Van Aarde (1992b:442) has indicated, deformed children was also seen as being demon-possessed. Demon-possession, therefore, was not only the result of affected exploitation, but also served as a legitimization of exploitation.

Third, accusations of madness, demon possession and witchcraft can be used by socially dominant classes as a means of social control (Rosen 1968:5-17; Bourguignon 1976:53). Accusations of demon possession thus represents a distancing strategy which seeks to discredit, sever, deny links and ultimately assert separate identity. When someone challenges their understanding of society (e.g. the purity maps), persons of religious dominant positions will therefore classify such a person as being possessed by a demon. By doing this, they would not only gain social control over such a person, but would also protect their own understanding of what the structure of society should be like²⁴.

When we turn to the first exorcism of Jesus in Mark 1:21-28, it is clear that the latter cause for demon possession (accusations of e.g. demon possession as a means of social control), is active here. Most probably, the man who had the unclean spirit previously transgressed the purity lines and boundaries as understood by the scribes.

To maintain their understanding of what the structure of society should be like, the man was labelled as possessed by an unclean spirit. By doing this, the scribes not only rendered him unclean and unacceptable, but also protected and maintained their understanding of society as the legal and correct one. Their teaching, therefore, was the correct understanding and application of the purity maps derived from the temple and the Torah.

In Mark 1:21-22, the narrator tells us that Jesus, before he was confronted by the unclean spirit, was busy teaching in the synagogue. *What* he taught, the narrator does not tell us, but Jesus' teaching was of such content that the crowd present was astounded, describing it as having more authority more than the scribes, some of whom were most likely present. In a certain sense, one can also say the unclean spirit also understood what Jesus was teaching, and realized this new teaching caused it to no longer have a place in society. Therefore it came forward, and was cast out by Jesus.

At this time, I want to postulate this first exorcism of Jesus is presented to us by the narrator in such a manner that the actual exorcism shifts to the background, and the effect/meaning of the exorcism is put in the foreground. Or, in other words: The narrator does not really want to tell the reader Jesus exorcised an unclean spirit, but rather Jesus' teaching, which probably focused on his understanding of the kingdom of God (cf Mk 1:15), was a challenge to the scribe's understanding of society. It should be remembered that the scribes were seen as an extension of the temple. Also, the man was most probably labelled as possessed by a demon because he transgressed the purity laws which originated from the temple. Understood as such, this passage has more to do with a renunciation of the temple than the actual healing of a man with an unclean spirit. That the man himself, in a certain sense, is not that important can also be deduced in that the narrator never identifies the man with a specific name. It is also interesting that the man himself never actually speaks or acts in this passage. Only the unclean spirit(s) comes forward.

It should also be kept in mind that this was the first public deed of Jesus in relating to his proclamation of the kingdom of God. Here, at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, the narrator is informing the reader that since Jesus has effective power against demons, he also has the power to maintain order in society as it should be in terms of the kingdom of which he is the broker. Having kept the demons in their place, Jesus also maintains good order in the kingdom. Furthermore, he also controlled reality as he and his followers understood it, which meant that he also indirectly controlled the temple and the scribes as an extension thereof. Mark 1:21-29, therefore relates more to a healing of an illness (as a result of the temple-system and its application), than to an actual exorcism of Jesus.

Turning to Mark 5:1-20, it seems only logical regarding the relationship between oppression and possession noted previously, to understand this episode of the Gerasene demoniac in terms of demon possession flowing from the Roman oppression in first-century Palestine. This then is also the vantage point from which Hollenbach (1982b: 581), Waetjen (1989:133-119) and Crossan (1991a:313-317) analyze this episode. The results of their respective interpretations of this episode are more or less the same: Mark 5:1-20 is 'a narrative of the destruction of demonic powers of living death and dehumanization' (Waetjen 1989:113). The demon's name, Legion, refers most likely to the Roman colonialism of Palestine relating to its economic exploitation, political suppression and social disruption. By casting the demon(s) from the man into the pigs, and by driving them into the sea, Jesus not only indicated he had power over 'colonialism', but probably at the same time destroyed the food supply of the Roman legions stationed in the territory. Roman imperialism, therefore, meant God's people were possessed by demons on the social level. Roman imperialism indicated a power greater than oneself, admittedly 'inside' oneself, something evil, therefore, beyond any collusion or cooperation. By driving out the demon(s), Jesus (symbolically) released the Jewish people from this oppression.

When one understand this exorcism as explained by Waetjen, Crossan and Hollenbach, it can also be said that Jesus' aim was to directly confront the political power of the Romans. However, in agreeing with Seeman ([1992]:10), I am of the opinion this explanation would be difficult to substantiate in terms of the peripheral role played by the Romans in Mark's gospel in general. As was indicated in section 5.2.4.2.1.2, there is, except for Pilate's role in the crucifixion of Jesus, very little political interference from the side of the Romans in Jesus' activity in the Gospel²⁵. I do, however, disagree with Seeman ([1992]:10) in regard to his opinion that Mark 5:1-20 is a 'relative isolated ... pericope within the [framework of the] overall narrative'. When Mark 1:21-28 and Mark 5:1-20 (as respectively Jesus' first and second exorcism in Mark) are compared with each other, the following interesting similarities come to the fore: First, while Mark 1:21-28 is Jesus' first public deed on Galilean soil, Mark 5:1-20 is Jesus' first deed in Gentile territory. Second, Jesus' first deed in Galilee is an exorcism, as is the case with Mark 5:1-20, Jesus' first public deed in Gentile territory. Third, in Mark 1:21-28 the demon(s) address Jesus directly, as is the case in Mark 5:1-20²⁶. In terms of the development of the narrative, there is thus a clear relationship between these two pericopes in the Gospel. But what is this relationship?

When Mark 1:21-28 was discussed, it was indicated the narrator uses the exorcism of Jesus to indicate that since Jesus has effective power against demons, he also has the power to maintain order in society as it is understood in terms of the kingdom of which

he is the broker. By keeping the demons in their place, Jesus also maintained order in the kingdom. By implication therefore, Jesus was setting the boundaries of the new household of God. Mark 1:21-28 thus serves as an articulation and implementation of Jesus' strategy and objective(s) in terms of the new household of which he is the broker.

When we look more closely at Mark 5:1-20, it is clear the household is also one of the main themes of this micronarrative. The first description the narrator gives of the man is that he lived among the tombs, that is, not in his house with his family (Mk 5:3). Second, the reason for him living among the tombs is given: Because he was hurting himself, his family tried to restrain him with shackles and chains, but he wrenched the chains apart and broke the shackles into pieces (Mk 5:4-5). The demoniac, therefore, was not suffering alone, but his kin was effected too. The fact he was possessed was breaking up the household. That this was indeed the case can be deduced from Mark 5:18-20. When the demoniac was whole again, he wanted to get into the boat with Jesus. Jesus did not allow him to do so, but sent him back to his house where he belonged. Jesus' message to the man was clear: You and your family are whole again.

As such, the narrator is using this pericope to tell the reader the following: Mark 1:21-28 was Jesus' first public deed on Galilean soil, and Mark 5:1-20 was Jesus' first public appearance in Gentile territory. Both are exorcisms. The exorcism in Mark 1:21-28 is used by the narrator to show Jesus has effective power against demons on Galilean soil, and therefore also has the power to maintain order in Galilean society. However, he also has the power to control society in Jerusalem. It was the extension of the temple (its maps and officials) which was the reason for the man being labelled as demon possessed. By doing this, the scribes tried to control society. But now Jesus controls society, because he has power over the scribes' labelling of the man being demon-possessed. Jesus therefore also has power to set the boundaries of the new household. Not only did the demon(s) attest to this, but so did those who were present.

But Jesus also has the power to invite Gentiles to become part of his new household. In Mark 5:1-20, the narrator depicts Jesus as not only restoring the household to which the demoniac belonged, but also uses this restored household as a symbol for Jesus' restoration of the new household of God of which he is the broker. In Jesus' new household Gentiles are also welcome. And as those present in Mark 1:21-28 were amazed by Jesus' new interpretation of the household of God, so also was everyone in the Decapolis (cf Mk 5:20). Mark 1:21-28 can therefore be seen as the inauguration of new household in the kingdom of God on Galilean soil, and Mark 5:1-20 as the inauguration of the new household of God in Gentile territory.

When we turn to Mark 7:24-30, especially in terms of what was said in regard to Mark 1:21-28 and Mark 5:1-20, the first important aspect of this episode is the following: In Mark 1:21-28, Jesus, when in the synagogue, defined the new boundaries of the household of God. In Mark 5:1-20 Jesus, is 'between synagogue/temple and household,' in that he sends the healed demoniac to his house. In Mark 7:24-30 Jesus, is in the 'new household' (cf Mk 7:24). This is clear in that Jesus, while in the region of Tyre, enters a house. That this house was most probably a Gentile household can be deduced from the fact that Jesus is depicted here by the narrator as travelling in Gentile territory. Jesus thus has come the full circle. First, he implicitly referred to the new household (Mk 1:21-28), then he sent someone to his household (Mk 5:1-20), and now he is in the household himself. This new household of God was now so popular that Jesus could not escape notice (Mk 7:24).

While Jesus was in the house, a Syrophenician woman came to him asking him to heal her daughter who was possessed by a unclean spirit. Although the reason for this possession is difficult to infer from this episode, there is however, another interesting aspect of this pericope which is of importance for our discussion here: In Mark 1:21-28, Jesus had to overcome the scribes' understanding of the household of God, and in Mark 5:1-20, he sent someone to his household after being healed. Now Jesus only has to declare the daughter healed, and the household is immediately restored. The household was broken up because it could not function as a whole. Now it can, simply because Jesus said so.

If we compare this development of Jesus' authority over the new household with what has said in section 6.4.4.1 in regard to the way in which the narrator depicts Jesus having increasing authority over the purity rules of his day, the following similarity emerges: In section 6.4.2, it was indicated that in Mark 1:21-28, Jesus transgressed the purity rules the first time in Galilee in the presence of the scribes. In their presence, he showed he has authority over their interpretation of purity. In Mark 1:40-45, we read that Jesus again stepped over purity boundaries when he healed a leper. After Jesus cleansed him, he sent him to the local priest so the man could be a testimony to Jesus' authority in reinterpreting the purity system. In Mark 8:22-26, the last episode in the Galilean-section of the narrative, the narrator depicts Jesus having so much authority over the purity laws that he told the man he cleansed to go straight to his house. If Jesus therefore declared someone clean, he was, because Jesus is the one with the authority to set the boundaries of the new household.

This same development can also be derived from Jesus' exorcisms in the Galilean-section of the Gospel. First, in Mark 1:21-28, Jesus showed he had more authority than the temple, and because of this, inaugurated the new household of God. In Mark

5:1-20, he had the authority to restore a Gentile household, that is, as a symbol for the restoring of the new household of God. And in Mark 7:24-30, Jesus is depicted by the narrator as having so much authority over the new household of God, that Jesus can speak, and as a consequence, another household is restored.

To summarize: The narrator of Mark uses Jesus' exorcisms in the Galilean-section of the Gospel to show Jesus has the authority as the broker of God's kingdom to restore the new household of God. This can be deduced from the fact that, as for the context of possession itself, household or kinship relationships seem to provide the dominant setting and the immediate cause for the exorcism narratives in Mark (cf also Seeman [1992]:10). First Jesus had to wrest the household of God from the scribes (Mk 1:21-28), then he restored a Gentile household as a symbol for the restoring of the new household of God, and finally, while being in a Gentile household, he restored another Gentile household by simply declaring it restored. The narrator of Mark therefore uses Jesus' exorcisms in Mark to indicate Jesus has the authority to be the broker of the kingdom, to control society, as well as to set the boundaries of the new household. Also, Jesus' exorcisms are used to inaugurate the new household in both Galilean and Gentile territory.

This new household, however, stood in contrast to the household of the temple. There, possessed people were not welcome, nor were Gentiles. Understood as such, Jesus' exorcisms, like his interpretation of the purity laws and the way he ate (i.e., what, with whom, when, how and where), can be seen as direct critique of the temple. The temple, as the pinnacle of God's 'official' household, was exclusive in character. The new household, however, was inclusive in character. And as broker of this new household Jesus made this possible. Not only in the way he interpreted the purity maps or in the way he ate, but also in the way he restored the household by declaring possessed people clean when healing them.

6.4.4.2 Jesus' other healings

As was indicated in section 6.4.4, we have in Mark nine instances where Jesus healed different kinds of illnesses: In Mark 1:29-31, Jesus healed the mother-in-law of Simon, in Mark 1:40-45, Jesus healed a leper, in Mark 2:1-12, he healed a paralytic, in Mark 3:1-5, Jesus healed a man with a withered hand, in Mark 5:22-24 and 35-43, he healed a girl who was dying, in Mark 5:25-34, a women who suffered from hemorrhages was healed, in Mark 7:31-37, a deaf man was healed, and in respectively Mark 8:22-26 and 10:46-52, a blind man was healed. As was the case in our study of Jesus' exorcisms, the first six healings of Jesus will be analyzed in this section, and the last two in section 6.4.9.1, when Jesus' activity on his way to Jerusalem will be discussed.

In the previous section, it was indicated that from the manner in which the narrator pictures the exorcisms of Jesus, three conclusions can be drawn: First, Jesus is depicted having more authority than the scribes because the person(s) who was labelled by them as being possessed, were declared by Jesus as clean. Jesus thus also has authority over the temple. Second, because Jesus has authority over the temple, he also has the authority, as the broker of the new household of God, to rebuild this new household and to decide himself who would be welcome to become part of it. And third, the authority of Jesus to rebuild the new household of God is depicted as gradually growing up to a point where only a word from him is enough to restore this household. In our following analysis of the other healings of Jesus in Mark, it will be indicated that especially the first two conclusions drawn above are also valid.

Jesus' first healing in Mark, other than his exorcisms, is that of the healing of Simon's mother-in-law in Mark 1:29-31. In this micronarrative, the narrator informs the reader that Jesus, after he healed the man with the unclean spirit in the synagogue, went to the house of Peter. When they arrived at the house, they found Simon's mother-in-law in bed with a fever. Jesus then, by taking her by the hand and lifting her up, healed her. She then immediately began to serve the household and everyone present. Although this episode may be cryptic in appearance, a few very important conclusions can be drawn from it. First, in the previous episode Jesus showed the scribes he has more authority than they do, and therefore can be seen as the legal broker of the kingdom of God. He will be the one who will be restoring the new household of God. The narrator then, by depicting Jesus as entering a household directly after the events in the synagogue, shows the reader how the household of God will be restored: Simon's mother-in-law is healed in a house. And just as important, Simon's mother-in-law, after she was healed, immediately started to serve the household again. Jesus therefore not only healed someone to be able to serve the household again, but also made the household itself whole. The fever which was breaking up the normal functioning of the household, was removed, and therefore the house could function as normal again. The narrator thus wants to inform the reader that from now on, the place where the kingdom is to be found will not only be in the synagogue and temple, but also in the house. However, while the synagogue and temple declared certain people unclean and unwelcome, the new household declared them healed, and therefore 'clean' and welcome. Understood as such, the new household is a broadening of the synagogue and temple.

Turning to Mark 1:40-45, it is clear that also in this micronarrative the main emphasis of the narrator is to set Jesus' authority on par with that of the temple. According to Crossan (1991b:1196), Mark 1:40-45 can be seen as a micronarrative

which is a good example of 'an intense effort in theological damage control': The person who came to Jesus in Mark 1:40 most probably had a skin problem, since his skin had started to rot. Mark tells us that he was a *λεπρός*, a Greek word which can also be translated with either scaliness, mildew, rot or flakiness (see Crossan 1991b:1197). It was therefore most probably not the modern disease which is known as leprosy. However, it is clear that this man had a skin condition which made it impossible to discern orifice from surface, and because of this, he was seen, in terms of the purity system, as being either ignorant or disobedient to legal purity regulations, and as a consequence, was labelled as a leper. In terms of the religious purity regulations, his life was therefore damaged. He was declared unclean and therefore unfit to be part of God's holy people.

Of importance here is that whatever the actual *disease* was the man had, his *illness* laid in his separation from his family and village, 'a fate close to death in the ancient Mediterranean world of face-to-face culture where one took one's identity from the eyes of others' (Crossan 1991b:1197). He was not accepted, was rendered unclean and, as a consequence, God's kingdom was not available to him.

Understood in terms of the above, his words to Jesus in Mark 1:40 ('If you choose you can make me clean'), as well as Jesus' answer to him in Mark 1:41 ('I do choose. Be made clean!'), are highly significant: The narrator sets Jesus' power and authority on a par with that of the temple authorities themselves. It is not just a simple request for and granting of a healing. Jesus can, if he wants to, both heal and declare clean. He has the authority to do so, and therefore has more authority than the temple. Jesus is thus depicted here as a healing and purifying alternative for the temple.

What Jesus thus did was to heal the man's illness, not necessarily his disease. He healed the illness by refusing to accept the official quarantine (the theological damage control) of the temple and its personnel, by refusing to stay separate from the sick person, by even touching him and thereby 'confronting others with a challenge and a choice' (Crossan 1991b:1197). A choice which, if it was made positively, would also make them part of the new household of God. But Jesus even went further: After the man was healed, Jesus sent him to the priest. This was not done to fulfill the purity relations. That was done already, because by touching the leper, Jesus already fulfilled the purity regulations. Rather, the leper was sent to the priest as a challenge, that is, to be a testimony against them (cf Mk 1:44): A testimony that he had, at least, the same authority as the temple, and as a consequence, was the new official broker of God's kingdom. The result of this healing of Jesus is depicted by Crossan (1991b:1197) as follows:

By doing so, of course, he (Jesus — EvE) was making extremely subversive claims about who defined the community, who patrolled its boundaries, who controlled its entries and exists, who, in other words, was in charge.

(Crossan 1991b:1197)

The healing of the leper in Mark 1:40-45 is thus narrated in such a way that it depicts Jesus as the one who has authority over the temple. By refusing to accept the temple's official quarantine, Jesus also refused to accept the temple and its official brokers. As God's new official broker, it is he who will define the boundaries of the new community, the new household of God. He will also control its entries, but not alone: Others are also invited to share his vision of God's new household, not only to become a member, but to also have the same attitude of mercy/pity toward those who were, in the eyes of the official brokers of the temple, unclean and not fit to enter the household of God.

In Jesus' next healing in Mark, namely Mark 2:1-12, the narrator again is depicting the house and not the temple as the place where God's kingdom is available to his clients. This is done by the narrator as follows: First, Jesus is pictured as being in a house. Masses of people are portrayed as coming to the house to listen to Jesus' teaching, that is, not only to the synagogue/temple where teaching normally took place. According to the narrator, it was therefore no longer only at the synagogue where God's people were gathering, but also at the house. The house thus became a symbol for the new household of God. We then read a paralyzed man was brought to Jesus to be healed. The reasons for his paralysis could either be that he was physically malnourished or maybe hysterically disabled (cf Crossan 1991a:324). However, if that was the disease he had, his illness most probably stemmed from his belief that the scribes said his condition was the result of sin. The paralytic thus experienced his paralysis as the divine punishment of God for his sin (cf Mk 2:5). The people who were bringing him to Jesus most probably also were part of the expendable class, as was the paralytic himself. In section 6.3, it was indicated the Pharisaic replication of the temple community in everyday life had the religious implication that social ostracism was legitimized with divine alienation (see again Van Aarde 1991d:59). When people had to be ostracized, the pressure normally came from the extended family, since they normally conformed with the accepted purity regulations (cf Mk 6:1-6). Ostracized people therefore ended up with the other expendables of society. In terms of what has been said thus far in regard to Jesus' exorcisms and healings, it is clear that Jesus' target, or, his clients, were mostly people who were part of the expendable class. From this, therefore, it is clear the paralytic, being an expendable, was brought to Jesus by other expendables.

However, what is interesting in this micronarrative is that, after the man was let through the roof on a mat and came before Jesus, Jesus did not declare him clean (as was the case in Mk 1:40-45), but told him that his sins were forgiven. This was a direct assault on the temple. This assault on the temple is versed by Crossan (1991a:324) as follows:

There is, first and above all, a terrible irony in ... [the] ... conjunction of sickness and sin, especially in first-century Palestine. Excessive taxation could leave poor people physically malnourished or hysterically disabled. But since the religiopolitical ascendancy could not blame excessive taxation (because they were part of it — EvE), it blamed sick people themselves by claiming that their sins had led to their illnesses. And the cure for sinful sickness was, ultimately, in the Temple. And that meant more fees, in a perfect circle of victimization. When, therefore ... Jesus cured people of their sicknesses, [he] implicitly declared their sins forgiven and nonexistent [He] challenged not the medical monopoly of the doctors but the religious monopoly of the priests. *All this was religiopolitically subversive.*

(Crossan 1991a:324; my emphasis)

In terms of Jesus' words in Mark 2:9, his challenge towards the temple was clear: If sickness is a divine punishment for sin, the one who heals sickness has forgiven sin and manifested divine power. If the scribes were the official brokers of God's kingdom, or acted as brokers who wanted to make God's kingdom available, they also should forgive this man his sins. But they are not the official brokers of God's kingdom; they only broker God's presence in terms of their own personal interests. By not forgiving this man his so-called sins, they maintained their political and economical interests in the temple. They were therefore self-serving, and were not serving God. Jesus thus trapped them in their own theology (cf also Crossan 1991a:324).

What is also of importance in this micronarrative is the fact that Jesus, after forgiving the man his sins, sent him off to his home. His household has been restored as was the case in Mark 1:29-31 when Simon's mother-in-law was healed. And when the house of the paralytic, as well as the house in which he is healed, are seen as the symbols for the kingdom of God, God's new household is also restored.

The fact that the scribes and Pharisees were not making God's kingdom available to God's people is again clear from Mark 3:1-5. According to the narrator, by now it was clear that the official brokers of the temple/kingdom realized Jesus' interpretation of the availability and presence of God's kingdom radically challenged their interpreta-

tion thereof. So they watched Jesus to see if he would heal someone on the sabbath (Mk 3:2). As broker of God's kingdom, Jesus, however, was not going to let human 'fences around the law' interfere with the availability of God's kingdom. Therefore, to challenge them, Jesus for the first and only time in Mark, initiated a healing himself. In the new household of God, Jesus told them, one must do good to others as much as possible. God's kingdom is more important than a map of times. Then, while grieving in his heart that the official brokers of the kingdom were only self-serving, were setting their minds not on divine things but on human things (cf Mk 8:33), Jesus healed the man with the withered hand. In the kingdom of which he is the broker, not even the most sacred time, the sabbath (see again *m. Moed* in section 4.2.7), will stand in the way of making God's kingdom available to those who need it.

Jesus' healings in Mark 5:22-24 and 35-43, as well as in Mark 5:25-34, also stress the fact the house can be seen as a symbol for the new household of God, or, the kingdom of God of which Jesus is the official broker. In Mark 5:21-24 and 35-43, we read Jairus, one of the leaders of the synagogue, came to Jesus to ask him to heal his daughter who was dying. First, it is clear that because of the girl's illness, the household was broken up. Second, by depicting the father as being one of the leaders of the synagogue, the narrator is again telling the reader that the household now also was the place where God's kingdom is available. This is also clear from the fact that the father asked Jesus to come to his house, and not necessarily to the synagogue (Mk 5:23). Furthermore, it is also clear from Mark 5:41-42 the narrator is using the restoring of different households as a symbol for Jesus' restoring of the new household of God. After Jesus took her by the hand, and thus again complied with the fulfillment of the purity regulations of the temple (see again Mk 1:41 above), he ordered her family to give her something to eat. The household was therefore restored, and everything was functioning normally again.

In Mark 5:25-34 the household is also one of the central aspects of Jesus' healing of the woman who suffered from hemorrhages. Because of her illness, she was most probably not able to care for her family. Thus, when Jesus healed her, she was not only healed, but her household was also restored because the woman was now again able to look after and care for her family.

We turn finally to the micronarrative in Mark 7:31-37. As was the case with Jesus' exorcisms, the narrator also uses this healing of Jesus to indicate the Gentiles were also to be part of the new household of God, as it is clear his healing took place in Gentile territory (cf Mk 7:31). After the deaf man was healed, he would be permitted to return to his family and could live again in normal conditions.

6.4.4.3 Summary: Sickness and healing in the Galilean-section of the Gospel

In section 4.2.8, it was argued that kinship can be seen as the dominant social institution in first-century Mediterranean society. Kinship in this society especially pertained to the extended family/household. The salient features of this household were hospitality, solidarity, egalitarianism, mutual support, inclusivity, dignity and respect (see again section 6.4.3). In sections 6.2.2 and 6.3, it was also argued that as the new broker of God's kingdom, Jesus' main aim was to restore the household of God. This he did by restoring the household as a symbol for the kingdom of God; his new household.

When we take this perspective as the starting point for analyzing Jesus' brokerage on Galilean soil, it is therefore not strange that our analysis of Jesus' exorcisms and healings indicated almost every instance of healing had to do with transforming people back to their proper functions in the context of kinship or household relationships. It is also no surprise then the family, including fictive kin, is shown as being involved and effected in almost all of the instances of sickness discussed above.

In our analysis of Jesus' exorcisms in section 6.4.4.1, it was concluded that the narrator of Mark uses Jesus' exorcisms to show that Jesus has the authority as the broker of God's kingdom to restore the new household of God. This conclusion was made on the grounds that, as for the context of possession itself, household or kinship relations seemed to provide the dominant setting, as well as the immediate cause, for the exorcism narratives in Mark. Or, to put in differently: The narrator of Mark uses Jesus' exorcisms mainly to picture Jesus as having the authority to restore households. In symbolic terms, this means that Jesus, while restoring individual households, is restoring the kingdom of God, the new household, of which he is the new official broker.

The same conclusion was reached in our analysis of Jesus' other healings in Mark. In all the instances discussed above in section 6.4.4.2, Jesus healed ill people in such a manner that they were again able to function as part of a normal household. This became clear from the following: When Jesus healed persons in their own households, the specific household in which the healing took place started to function normally again (e.g. Mk 1:31; 5:42-43). Also, when Jesus healed people outside their households, they are sent back to again go and serve their own household (e.g. Mk 2:1-12; 5:34).

Understood as such, the household in Mark 1:16-8:26 is depicted as a symbol for the new household of God. In this new household, God is not only available to all, but everyone is welcome, including Gentiles, lepers, blind, lame, sinners, the demon possessed and the like, or in short, also the expendables in society. This new household,

however, stood in sharp contrast with the household of the temple. There, the possessed and other people with different kind of illnesses were not welcome, nor were the Gentiles. Our emic reading of the text in chapter 5 yielded, *inter alia*, two results. First, it was indicated that the target of the protagonist's mission can be seen as the crowds, and second, on the topographical level of the text the narrator is depicting the house as standing in opposition with the temple. From the above etic analysis of Jesus' exorcisms and healings these two results (of the emic reading of the text) can now be understood in a more comprehensive manner: The target of Jesus ministry is mainly the expendables in society. By Jesus' healings and exorcisms, they are taken up into the new household of God. The opposition between house and temple yielded by the emic reading of the text should therefore be understood against this background. Because expendables were taken up in the new household, expendables who would not have been allowed in the temple, conflict exists between the house and temple in the narrative. Our emic reading is therefore confirmed by our etic reading of the text, but the etic reading also enables us to understand the named emic opposition: The household is the place where God's saving presence is also available to the expendables, and the temple is the place where it is not. The reason for this is that the temple is depicted by the narrator as the symbol for the brokerless kingdom of God, and the household as the symbol of the brokered kingdom, the new household or fictive kinship was created by Jesus on the basis of the features of the extended household (kinship).

Jesus' exorcisms and healings therefore can be seen as direct critique on the temple itself. By healing, forgiving sins and exorcising the possessed, sometimes even in the synagogue itself, Jesus set his power on par/above that of the temple. And by doing so he in effect declared that the temple, which should make God available also to the expendables, was doing exactly the opposite. Jesus declared the temple as being a negative symbol in society. Or, as put by Kee (1986:3): Exorcisms and healings is techniques 'through word or act, by which a desired end is achieved ... [an] end [that] lies in the solution to the seeker's problem [and] in damage to the enemy who has caused the problem'. Jesus' exorcisms and healings thus had two ends: First, to restore the household of God, and second, to point to the inadequacies of the temple and its infrastructure (i.e. the scribes and Pharisees). Or, to put it in the words of Montefiore (1964/5:71): [H]e (Jesus — EvE) never attacked the cult as such, only its abuses'.

This also means that Jesus, because he has power over demons and other related illnesses, also has power over society and thus power to rebuild/restore the kingdom of God, *including the temple*. It is he who defines the new community, who patrols its boundaries, who controls its entries and exists, who, in other words, is in charge (see Crossan 1991b:1197). And for that matter, everyone else wanted to take up the chal-

lenge by believing that God's saving presence was to be found in the household, and not in the temple. Because of this, the temple would also have to be restored. Jesus' restoring of the temple, however, will be attended to in section 6.5.1.

6.4.4.4 Meals and healing as the pivotal values of God's new household

From the conclusions drawn in sections 6.4.4.1 and 6.4.4.2, as well as in section 6.4.3 (when ceremonies were discussed), it is clear the new household of God (as narrated by the narrator of Mark) can be typified in terms of the symbols of open commensality and healing. This conclusion is based on our analysis of Jesus' healing and eating practices in Mark.

There is however in Mark, further proof that the kingdom of God can be typified by these two symbols, namely Jesus' sending out of his disciples in Mark 6:7-13. In regard to this micronarrative, Crossan (1991a:334) poses the following questions:

I wonder, but this is a pure guess, if what we are initially or primarily dealing with is *healed healers*? Is this what Jesus did with those whom he himself healed and who wanted to join his movement? He sent them out to do likewise?²⁷.

(Crossan 1991a:334; emphasis by him)

If we look at Mark 6:7-13 in terms of what was said thus far about the way Jesus healed and ate (i.e., with whom, what, where and how), it is possible to answer positively the questions posed by Crossan. Let us look at this micronarrative in more detail.

In regard to the orders which were given to the disciples by Jesus, three aspects are of importance: What they must *wear* and *take along*, what they must go and *do*, and finally, what they must do when they are *not received*. In Mark 6:8-9, we read Jesus ordered them to take along nothing but a staff; no bread, no bag, no money in their belts. They were to wear sandals and not to put on tunics. What they must do is to go into houses, cast out demons (Mk 6:7) and heal the sick (Mk 6:13). If people did not want to accept them, they should leave that specific house.

When this is interpreted in terms of what has been said up until now in regard to Jesus' restoring of the new household of God, it looks as follows: The disciples are healed healers because they accepted the challenge of the arrived kingdom to think differently about the society in which they lived. They were no longer bound by the purity system of their day. They were now a part of the new household of God where everyone was welcomed and accepted, even those who were previously labelled as being sick or demon-possessed because they transgressed the purity rules of the temple.

The disciples were also healed from discrimination in terms of sex and race, and also healed from the maps of meals of their day. And now, they were challenged to go to others and do the same. Because the kingdom was restored in terms of the new household, they also were to go to houses. That is where the new kingdom began, and where it would be found in the future. They took no bag nor bread along because their kingdom was one of open commensality. They were to eat what was set before them and were to heal the sick and cast out demons/unclean spirits, because the purity rules that labelled them as sick or deviant did not apply anymore²⁸. They had to bring to the peasant, and to his home a kingdom which was available. The peasants did not have to go only to the synagogue/temple anymore to experience the saving presence of God: It was now also offered to them in their own houses also. By accepting these healed healers, they would also be healed and become part of the new household of God. Or, as put by Crossan (1991b:1197): 'Finally, in the Jesus movement, the healers make house calls. Healing is shared freely in the only way that is truly free for a peasant: it comes to you'. All that is asked of them is to accept these healed healers and, as a consequence, would also become part of the kingdom. But if these healed healers are not accepted, the healers who are offering this new kingdom will shake the dust of that specific house off their feet as a testimony against them, because, 'whoever is not against us is for us' (Mk 9:40).

Let us turn finally to Mark 6:12. Thus far we tried to indicate that the household should be seen as a symbol for the new kingdom of God of which Jesus is the broker. By restoring households (e.g. in his healings), Jesus was therefore restoring the new household of God/kingdom of God. When we compare Mark 6:12 with Mark 1:15, further light is shed on this relationship between house and kingdom. In Mark 1:15, we saw Jesus indicated repentance is one of the salient elements of the kingdom (see again section 6.2). In Mark 6:7-13, we saw the kingdom is brought to the house. And in this house, according to Mark 6:12, the people are called to repentance²⁹. House and kingdom thus go hand in hand. The house, in which open commensality and healing are practiced, is also the kingdom. Or, to put it boldly: *The house is the kingdom*.

We conclude our analysis of ceremonies and healing in Mark with the following remarks by Crossan (1991a:341, 344-345, 350):

The missionaries (disciples — EvE) do not carry a bag because they do not beg for alms or food or clothing or anything else. They share a miracle and a Kingdom, and they receive in return a table and a house. *Here, I think, is the heart of the original Jesus movement, a shared egalitarianism of spiritual and material resources*.... [This] combination

of magic (healing — EvE) and meal ... with its egalitarian commonality ... laid ... a foundation on which the future could be build [These were] the radical alternatives proposed by Jesus.

(Crossan 1991a:341, 344-345, 350; my emphasis)

In terms of what has been said above, healings and open commensality (with its new interpretation of the purity rules) were, in my opinion, also at the heart of the Markan Jesus. They are the symbols of the new household. By depicting the house as the symbol of the kingdom, the narrator therefore also depicts the temple as a negative symbol, and, as a consequence, Galilee as a positive symbol and Jerusalem as a negative one.

6.4.5 Rituals

In section 4.2.4, it was indicated that rituals can be seen as rites of status reversal/transformation. Jesus' exorcisms and healings should, therefore, be analyzed as follows: People's status was changed from unclean to clean, from being unacceptable and outside the kingdom to being accepted and part of the kingdom. Because most of Jesus' healings and exorcisms were described in the previous sections of this chapter in one way or another, a full description of them will not again be given. However, in this section, attention is given to one of Jesus' healing thus far not fully described, namely Mark 8:22-26. In section 6.4.4.1, it was indicated that this passage would be dealt with in section 6.4.9.1. There, however, it will be addressed in terms of a different aim and context. Here it is used to serve as an example of Jesus' healings as status transformations³⁰.

In section 4.2.4, it was indicated rituals consist of a ritual process and ritual elements. The ritual process refers to the aspects of separation, liminality-communitas and aggregation, and the ritual elements to that of the initiands, ritual elders and ritual symbols. In terms of the first aspect of the ritual process, namely separation, the narrator tells us that Jesus took the man by the hand and led him out of the village (Mk 8:23). In terms of liminality-communitas, the man's sight is at first not fully restored, and only after a second attempt by Jesus, his sight is fully restored. Aggregation then took place when he was sent to his home for everyone in his household to see his eyesight was restored. In terms of the ritual elements, the blind man was clearly the initiand and Jesus was the ritual elder who presided over the ritual process. The ritual symbol used by Jesus was his own saliva.

With both the ritual process and elements identified, let us look in more detail to some of the aspects of the ritual process and the ritual elements in this micronarrative. The ritual symbol which Jesus used was his own saliva, in other words, orifices from the body which was rendered unclean. Therefore, to show the reader therefore that

Jesus is a different ritual elder than the scribes and Pharisees (and the priests in the temple), the narrator is making Jesus use something considered by them to be unclean to make a person considered unclean clean. In terms of the maps of purity of first-century Palestine, this must have been startling to those present (see Mk 8:24). From this it is clear the narrator wants to depict Jesus as a different ritual elder from the usual ones. He did things differently. But then Jesus also had a different interpretation of the presence and availability of God's kingdom of which he was the broker. It should also be remembered the blind man was not made clean in terms of the purity rules of the temple. He was invited to become part of God's new household (see especially Mk 8:26) where the purity rules no longer applied (see section 6.4.2). Therefore, Jesus can use something rendered unclean to restore someone again to wholeness. Understood as such, it can therefore also be said that the narrator uses Jesus' ritual to indicate the new rules which apply to God's available kingdom.

A further aspect of this micronarrative of importance here is verse 22, where it is clear Jesus was appointed as ritual elder by the people who brought the man to him. According to McVann (1991a:337), ritual elders are persons who are officially charged with conducting the ritual. In first-century Palestine, these elders were the scribes, the Pharisees and the priests. Especially because they were the ones who either directly (by labelling) or indirectly (in terms of their interpretation of the law) made a person unclean, it was they who would have had the authority to reverse the situation. Furthermore, ritual elders were limit-breakers or boundary jumpers. Unlike other people, they were licensed to deal with initiands who were in the dangerous state of being unclean. Ritual elders also saw to it that the preconceived ideas about society, status, relationships, or in short, about life itself, were wiped out. They instilled new ideas, assumptions and understandings that the initiand(s) will need to function effectively once they assume their new roles and statuses.

When this understanding of ritual elders is applied to Mark 8:22-26, the following interesting aspects came to the fore: Jesus' appointment as ritual elder was not made by the 'official elders' of his day, but by the crowd present. By sending the man directly to his house, Jesus also made sure the man's preconceived ideas about society, status and relationships were wiped out. The man did not really need to go to a priest to be cleared, because in Jesus' kingdom, society worked in a different way. The temple and purity rules did not organize society anymore. What organized society was the fact that the Patron and the broker had mercy (cf Mk 5:19; 6:34). Because of this, the man should not serve the old kingdom anymore, but the new kingdom which was available to all. Therefore he had to go to his house, because the house was where the kingdom was to be found. Understood in this way, it is again clear that in this passage

also the narrator uses the house as a symbol for the new household, the kingdom of God. By sending the man to his house, Jesus thus instilled new ideas, assumptions and understandings that the healed man needed to function effectively in his new role and status. He was now a part of the kingdom, and in this kingdom, the house was the most important aspect. This is where he should go and serve.

If the above analysis of Mark 8:22-26 is taken as typical of the rituals in Mark in which Jesus presided as ritual elder, the following conclusions can be drawn: In Jesus' own ritual in Mark 1:9-13, he was not only appointed by the Patron of the kingdom to become its broker, but also as the ritual elder who had to assist others to undergo the same status reversal, namely to become part of the new household of God. At first, the narrator confirmed Jesus' position as ritual elder by picturing him having more authority than the official ritual elders of his day (e.g. Mk 2:6-11). Jesus' position as ritual elder was also confirmed by the crowd's reaction in regard to his teaching, exorcisms and healings (e.g. Mk 1:22, 28; 2:12). Later in the narrative, however, Jesus' authority of being a ritual elder is not only attested by the crowd's reaction, but also by bringing to him the sick to be healed, that is, to have their status reversed from unclean to clean. In almost all the cases, where Jesus presided over rituals, people not only were made whole again, but also were either sent back to or were enabled to serve their respective households again (e.g. Mk 1:31 5:19). Also, the different rituals in Mark clearly identify Jesus' main target, namely the expendables.

In terms of rituals in Mark, therefore, the official elders are replaced by Jesus, and by implication, the current understanding of God's holiness as exclusive is replaced by an inclusive kingdom where the Patron and the broker have mercy (Mk 5:19; 6:34)³¹.

6.4.6 Labelling and deviance

In the Mediterranean world of the first century a virtuous person was one who was able to recognize and maintain the prescribed social boundaries. This meant, for example, that one did not mix with people in certain despised positions, especially not in terms of the purification prescriptions regarding what was clean and unclean. This also made it possible for people to make a living within limited means and obligations Jesus acted as *patron* to his *clients* of the community who could not defend their honor, such as the sick who were also regarded as being unclean by the Pharisees. Jesus' compassion towards these people was thus experienced as an anomaly by the Pharisees. All communities, including the first-century Mediterranean community had methods of remo-

ving anomalies. One of these was to declare the person causing the anomaly a public danger. Thus, instead of being seen as the patron (or broker — EvE) of the community of the sick, Jesus was declared as the leader of devils Jesus was denounced as a wizard.

(Van Aarde 1992b:437)

As was indicated in section 4.2.5, labelling is a social creation: It occurs when someone's behavior is judged to jeopardize the social order of society (see again citation above). When someone stepped over boundaries and lines, he was not only perceived as being dangerous in terms of having the possibility to pollute others, but also as one radically out of place. When this happened, people with social standing whose interests were being jeopardized by such deviance, would label such a person as a deviant.

In the Gospel of Mark, we find many examples of people who have previously been labelled by the official guardians of society (e g the scribes and Pharisees) as being deviants: In Mark 1:21-28, we find a man who was previously labelled as having an unclean spirit; in Mark 1:40-45, a man who had a skin problem was labelled as a leper, and a man who was a paralytic was labelled as a sinner (Mk 2:1-12), to name but a few. Although these persons are not labelled directly in the text, it is easy to discern they were labelled previously, especially because the narrator depicts them by virtue of their deviant statuses. We do find in Mark, however, an example where actual (direct) labelling took place, namely Mark 3:20-30. In this passage, Jesus was labelled by the scribes from Jerusalem as being from Beelzebul (Mk 3:22), or, as having an unclean spirit (Mk 3:30).

According to Neyrey (1986a:110-111), this passage in Mark is used by the narrator with two aims in mind: First, to summarize Jesus' exorcisms thus far in the Gospel, and second, to prove Jesus was indeed pure, 'the Holy One of God' (Neyrey 1986a:110; cf Mark 1:24). Jesus' exorcisms proved he was the enemy of Satan, not his servant or ally. This can be deduced from the fact that the demon(s) in Mark 1:24 testified Jesus came to destroy them. In terms of Mark 3:27 it is also clear that Jesus depicts Satan as the strong man, but as John the Baptizer said previously, Jesus is even more powerful, he is the 'Stronger One' (Neyrey 1986a:110; cf Mk 1:7). Because of this, Jesus not only bound the strong man in the desert (Mk 1:13), but also plundered his house through successive exorcisms. Understood as such, Jesus' purity rating is defended: He is God's ally and Satan's mortal enemy, he belongs to God's kingdom and liberates those imprisoned in Satan's realm, and he has total power over Satan (Neyrey 1986a:110).

Although it may be the case, as Neyrey suggests, that Jesus' purity rating was at stake in this micronarrative, there are, however, other aspects of this micronarrative which are of importance for our argument thus far, namely that the narrator uses Jesus'

exorcisms to picture the household as a symbol for the kingdom of which Jesus was the broker. In regard to Neyrey's argument, it is clear he understands this passage in terms of a 'battle' between Jesus and Satan. Satan is the strong one, but Jesus is the stronger one, and therefore, Jesus can bind him and plunder his house. I am of the opinion, however, the actual 'battle' in this passage is that of Jesus and the scribes, and the reference to Satan is only used by Jesus to stress the point he wanted to make, namely, he has bound the scribes (as Satan's allies), and therefore was also able to plunder their house (the temple). Let us look at this argument in more detail.

In Mark 3:7-8, we read that among the people who came down to Galilee to see Jesus were people from Jerusalem. In terms of the narrative world of the text, we can, therefore, infer that the scribes in Jerusalem heard about Jesus' practice of exorcisms, and realized Jesus was challenging their authority (see again section 6.4.4.1). They then came down to Galilee to confront Jesus by labelling him as being from Beelzebul (Mk 3:22), or, as having an unclean spirit (Mk 3:30). As was indicated in section 6.4.4.1, accusations of madness or witchcraft (i.e. the exorcising of demons) was used in the first-century Mediterranean world by socially dominant classes (like the scribes) as a means of social control (cf Hollenbach 1982b:577). By labelling a person who exorcised demons as being possessed himself, was a way to effect his neutralization. It was a social weapon by which someone could be injured and stripped of his authority. The scribes, therefore, by labelling Jesus as having an unclean spirit, not only perceived him as an equal (see Malina 1981:129; 1988b:30), but also tried to neutralize him by advocating he was a dangerous member (an anomaly) of society. Or, in other words, they came down to Galilee to reclaim their formal and recognized authority (Seeman [1992]:5). Also, as Seeman ([1992]:11-12) indicated, patronal relationships were generally regarded by holders of formal authority as deviant.

That the scribes' authority was at stake here became clear in our discussion of the implication of Jesus' exorcisms in section 6.4.4.1. People were mainly labelled because the scribes' interpretation of the law made it possible. If someone other than the scribes did the labelling it did not really matter: It was the scribes' interpretation of the law that made it possible for others to do the labelling, that is, all labelling was based on their authority and interpretation of the Torah. When Jesus thus declared possessed people clean, he directly challenged the authority of the scribes. Hence, to eliminate Jesus, they had to label him being from Beelzebul so it would be evident that 'by the ruler of the demons he casts out demons' (Mk 3:22).

When we look at Jesus' answer to them, the most important aspect is the conjunction Jesus creates between kingdom, house and Satan. According to Jesus, a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand. This was a direct attack on the scribes. They were the official guardians/brokers of the kingdom (see again Mk 12:1-10). They were the one's who should have made God's presence available to others. But because they

ruled and brokered the kingdom for their own benefit, they divided the kingdom. Those who should be a part of the kingdom, that is, those who they labelled as so-called sinners or deviants, were shoved aside and not allowed to enter the kingdom, temple or household. God's kingdom was thus divided and brokerless. Moreover, Jesus, who was helping people to become part of the kingdom, was now being labelled by them as a deviant. The scribes, therefore, were lording over the Patron's clients (cf Mk 10:42), they were dividing the household of the Patron, and therefore the kingdom would not stand.

The same holds true for the house and Satan. If Satan rose up against himself he would be divided. And if Jesus would do in his new house the same as the scribes were doing in the kingdom, his new household also would not stand. However, according to the Markan Jesus, his house (i.e. the new household) will be able to stand if the strong man (or men) of the house (temple) are bound. This is exactly what Jesus did with the strong men of the house/temple, that is, by declaring people clean who were previously declared as possessed/unclean. Jesus now had the power in society, because he was the new official broker of the kingdom. And, therefore, he already began to plunder the strong men's house: By declaring people clean and by casting out demons put there by the scribes, Jesus was plundering their house, that is, making these 'unacceptable people' part of the new household of God.

This answer of Jesus to the scribes can further be highlighted when it is read against the background of Mark 1:21-28 and Mark 3:1-6, Jesus' only two healings in the synagogue. In section 6.4.2, it was argued, in following Meeks (1983), Kee (1990b:1-24), Van Aarde (1990b:251-264; 1991d:51-64) and Horsley (1992:7-8), synagogues in first-century Palestine most probably were houses, houses that were big enough, for example, to be used as a place where scripture reading and teaching could take place. In terms of Mark 1:21-28 and Mark 3:1-6, this would mean the scribes physically were dividing households because people were ostracized from the synagogue. Or, stated differently: By healing people in synagogues (which were houses), Jesus was restoring those specific households. When Jesus thus told the scribes a house which is divided against itself cannot stand, he was referring to the synagogue (and the temple). But by binding the strong men of the house (the synagogue), Jesus now could plunder their household: Their clients, through Jesus' healings, became his clients. These clients now belonged to his household, and therefore his household will stand because it is not dividing the household of the Patron, but rather is the household of the Patron.

If this understanding of this passage is correct, a further important conclusion can be drawn: In the previous sections of this chapter, it was indicated the narrator of Mark uses the setting house as a symbol for the new household of God. This became evident especially from the way in which Jesus interpreted the purity laws of his day,

the way he ate (i.e., with whom, what, how, when and where), but also in the way he healed. In section 6.4.4.4 it was also indicated, by comparing Mark 6:12 to Mark 1:15, the narrator again made, albeit indirect, a conjunction between house and kingdom. In Mark 3:20-30, we have, however, a direct conjunction between house and kingdom. The current kingdom was divided because its brokers ruled for themselves. It is further divided by labelling people as deviants because they did not fit in the brokers' understanding of the kingdom. Because Jesus also did not fit in this kingdom, he was also labelled as a deviant. But according to Jesus, this dividing of the kingdom is something of the past: He has bound the strong men from the kingdom and was now plundering their house by building the new household, the kingdom of God. In this passage the narrator therefore makes it clear that house(hold) and kingdom go together. The kingdom began in the house (see Mk 1:21-28), and the kingdom will be found in the house.

Myers (1988:164-168) also understands Mark 3:20-30 as a 'war' between Jesus and the scribes and not between Jesus and Satan. He expresses himself as follows:

The carefully chosen images of the domain of 'Satan' (3:23,26) bear remarkable correspondence to the ideological foundations of scribal Judaism: the centralized politics of the ... kingdom ... and its symbolic center, the temple ('house,' 3:25). That these foundations are in crisis and 'cannot stand' will be articulated later in the story, when Jesus battles these scribal opponents on their home turf in Jerusalem ... When he finally encounters the temple itself, he will 'exorcise' (*ekballein*) those who have 'divided' the purpose of the 'house of prayer' (11:15-7). Then ... Jesus will prophesy that the temple-state will not be able to stand (13:2) and the true 'Lord of the house' will come and reclaim his domain (13:35).

(Myers 1989:166; italics by him)

And, in terms of the relationship between house and kingdom:

I have mentioned that kinship was the axis of the social world in antiquity. The extended family structure determined personality and identity, controlled vocational prospects, and most importantly facilitated socialization. For Mark, then, kinship is the backbone of the very social order Jesus is struggling to overturn Mark then introduces a new kinship model, based on obedience ... to God alone. *The fundamental unit of 'resocialization' into the kingdom will be into the new family, the community of discipleship.*

(Myers 1988:168; my emphasis)

If this relationship between house and the kingdom was only an implicit one in terms of Jesus' exorcisms and healings, in the way he ate (i.e., with whom, what, how, when and where), and in the way he interpreted the purity rules of his day, it became less implicit in our analysis of Mark 6:7-13: The kingdom is a kingdom of repentance, and so should be the house(s) that accept the disciples. This relationship however, became explicit in our analysis of Mark 3:20-30: If the kingdom is divided it will not stand. The same holds for the house. But because Jesus is the broker of the house, it will stand, and the official kingdom will be divided even more.

6.4.7 Honor and shame

In the first-century Mediterranean world, the honorable person was one who put in a great effort to stay within the boundaries of the law. He was the person who always adhered strictly to the different maps of purity, that is, he kept the 'fences around the law'. Because such a person would always see himself through the eyes of others, he would do nothing that would transgress what was seen as a socially proper attitude and acceptable behavior perceived by the official guardians of society. When he perceived his actions as reproducing the ideals of society (as understood by the temple and its 'officials'), he would expect others would acknowledge his behavior as honorable and he would receive a grant of honor.

When this understanding of honor is compared to the words and deeds of Jesus in Mark as described by the narrator, Jesus was not a honorable man, especially in the eyes of the guardians of society in his day: Jesus, for example, showed courtesy to shameless people like the demon-possessed (e.g. Mk 1:21-29; 5:1-20), unclean people (e.g. Mk 1:40-45; 2:1-12; 5:25-34), did not keep the purity regulations of his day (e.g. Mk 2:18-20; 7:1-23), did not adhere to the maps of times (e.g. Mk 2:23-28; 3:1-6) and even ate with tax-collectors and sinners (Mk 2:15-17; 6:35-44; 8:1-10). In the eyes of the scribes and the Pharisees (and the temple authorities), Jesus was therefore a shameless person, one with a dishonorable reputation beyond all social doubt, one outside the boundaries of acceptable moral life, hence one who should be denied the normal social courtesies. He was a fool, because to show courtesy to shameless persons makes one a fool since it was foolish to show respect for boundaries when a person acknowledged no boundaries.

But this was Jesus' honor from the point of view of the official religious leaders in Jesus' day. According to the narrator, Jesus was indeed an honorable man. People were astounded by his teaching (Mk 1:22, 27; 2:12); when they came to Jesus they kneeled before him (e.g. Mk 1:40; 10:17), or worshipped him (Mk 5:6), the whole of Capernaum came to see him (Mk 1:32), as well as the crowd(s) (Mk 2:13; 3:7, 19; 4:1; 6:33; 53-56), and his fame spread throughout the surrounding region of Galilee (e

g Mk 1:29). Therefore, from the point of view of the religious leaders on Galilean soil, Jesus had no honor and was shameless, but from the point of view of the crowds (and the narrator), Jesus was an honorable man. Let us look at this contradiction in more detail by concentrating on the way in which the narrator depicts Jesus' disputes with the scribes and Pharisees.

In section 4.2.1, it was indicated that honor was a limited good in first-century Mediterranean society. To get a grant of honor from someone meant someone else had to be dishonored. In terms of acquired honor (see again section 4.2.1), someone could also only acquire honor if he excelled over others in the social interactions that are called challenge and response. Understood as such, Jesus acquired honor by excelling over his adversaries in the different challenge-response situations in Mark as described by the narrator.

In Mark there are many challenge-response situations in which Jesus is described as being confronted by the scribes and/or the Pharisees. When Jesus, for instance, cast out demons from a person, or declared someone clean, he therefore challenged the honor of those people who did the labelling of demon-possession or uncleanness. Jesus thus not only claimed to enter the social space of the scribes and the Pharisees, but also claimed to dislodge them from their social space and status. Because they were honorable people, they had to challenge Jesus. But by challenging him, they not only lost their honor, but also gave Jesus the opportunity to redefine honor in terms of the new household of God. To prove this point just made, let us look more closely at some of the challenge-riposte situations in which Jesus was involved as described by the narrator of Mark.

According to the cross-cultural theory of challenge-riposte, challenges always took place in public. 'For prestige to be gained or retained it is necessary to have witnesses in order to affirm the outcome' (Malina 1981:51-70). It also only took place between equals (cf Malina 1981:30). It consisted of three phases: The challenge itself in terms of some action/word or both, the perception of this challenge by both of those who are challenged and the public at large (or present), and the reaction of the receiving individual with the evaluation of that reaction on the part of the public. In Mark 2:1-12, all these aspects are present. When Jesus healed the paralytic, it was in public (Mk 2:2). The challenge came from Jesus: A paralytic man, who was labelled previously by the scribes as being a sinner, was declared by Jesus forgiven, that is, he had no more sin. This was a direct challenge to the scribes present (cf Mk 2:6), because they were most probably those who previously labelled the man. Jesus thus was claiming to enter their social space, in order to dislodge them from their honor because they were honorable men who had to react to Jesus' challenge. But after Jesus answered them, the crowd present honored Jesus rather than the scribes; they were dishonored.

The same can be said of Mark 7:1-23. By not washing his hands before he and his disciples ate, Jesus challenged the Pharisees' understanding of the 'tradition of the elders' (see Mk 7:5). He thus not only challenged their interpretation of the law, but also their social standing as the recognized official interpreters and guardians of the law. After the Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem reacted to Jesus' challenge, his answer to them again resulted in a grant of honor and reputation from the crowd. Although this grant of honor by the crowd is not as clearly expressed as in Mark 2:12, it can be inferred from Mark 7:14, the crowd, after the challenge-riposte, is taught by Jesus and not by the Pharisees and scribes. He was the honorable man, and therefore they listened to him.

The same conclusion can be drawn from the challenge-ripostes in Mark 2:18-22 (the dispute over fasting), Mark 2:23-28 (Jesus' interpretation of the sabbath), Mark 3:1-6 (Jesus' healing of the man with the withered hand) and Mark 3:20-30 (where Jesus is labelled by the scribes from Jerusalem as having a unclean spirit)³². In all these controversies, the challenge itself came from Jesus (see Mk 2:18, 23; 3:3), and the Pharisees reacted in trying to defend their honor and status (see Mk 2:18, 24; 3:2). Although no reaction of the crowds is given in these three passages, it is clear from Mark 3:7-8, as well as Mark 6:53-56, Jesus was granted honor, status and reputation, and the Pharisees lost face. It is also clear in all the passages described above, Jesus came out as the honorable one and his adversaries did not. But what does this mean in terms of Jesus being the broker of the new household, the kingdom of God?

The honorable person was not the one who had the proper attitudes and behavior in terms of society as defined by the purity rules of the temple, but the person who repented (see Mark 1:15; 6:12), that is, the person who did not allow himself to be controlled and organized by the purity maps of the temple as interpreted by the official guardians of society. In terms of the new household that would be shameful and would make one a fool. People who adhered to the boundaries of the law were outside the new kingdom; they collaborated in dividing the new household of God.

This is especially clear from Mark 7:1-23. According to the Pharisees, a person *inter alia* acquired honor when he served the temple (by adhering to the *qorban*, i.e. an offering to God). A person thus acquired honor when he respected the tradition of the elders, by putting himself under the system of the temple and the law. According to Jesus, this dishonored a person, because by doing so he would not be serving the new household of God. According to Jesus, one could thus also acquire honor when he/she served the household, and not only the temple.

Also, in terms of corporate honor (see again section 4.2.1), because Jesus as the head/broker of this new household was honored, so was his 'extended family', the new household of God. Jesus thus redefined the pivotal values of honor and shame of his

society: The one who was ashamed of Jesus and his words and deeds, and thus of the Patron, the father of the kingdom, will also be shamed in the future (see Mk 8:38). Honor in the new household was thus acquired by being obedient to the broker, to repent from the official lines and boundaries and to become part of the new household. This would make one honorable, and he would also be honored by the Patron (cf Mk 8:38).

That honor was acquired in the new household in a radically different manner than in the 'official kingdom', is also very clear from Mark 3:31-35. In this description of Jesus' family, we read in Mark 3:21 Jesus' private family wanted to seize him because he was 'out of his mind'. This action by Jesus' private family reflects a primary anxiety for their honor, because Jesus, by his actions and behavior, was dishonoring them³³. Or, in the words of Derrett (1973:39-40): 'What deeds one commits or omits in the context of the family reflect back on the family'. The family's concern thus stemmed from the potential devaluation of their ability to function normally in a society which demanded a good name for the daily transactions of life (May 1987:85; cf also Crossan 1973:112; Lambrecht 1974:258; Best 1976:317 who have more or less of the same opinion).

Because Jesus' private family could be shamed by him, the narrator depicts them as not personally confronting him (see Mk 3:32), but using the crowd (most probably expendables) to mediate between them and Jesus. In terms of the way honor and shame worked in first-century-Mediterranean society, it would be expected of Jesus to give them an answer, otherwise he would dishonor them even further (May 1987:86). But this is exactly what Jesus did, by replying to the people inside the house that his real brothers and sisters are those who are with him, in the house, those who do the will of God. Or, to put in a different way: His real brothers and sisters are those who are not worried by honor as practiced outside the new household, but are being honored in this new household by doing 'God's will' (Mk 3:35). I, therefore, understand the notion of doing God's will mentioned here by the narrator as the refusal to be organized or to submit oneself to honor as practiced by the 'official kingdom', namely, that of the temple and its laws. Honor was acquired by being part of the new household and not by subjecting oneself to boundaries and lines which created hierarchical status and exclusivism.

To conclude: The narrator of Mark uses the different controversies between Jesus and his adversaries to not only indicate that Jesus, as the official broker of the kingdom, had more honor than the scribes and Pharisees, but it also gave Jesus the opportunity to redefine honor in terms of the new household of God. In the new household, honor was acquired not by serving the temple or by adhering to its boundaries and lines (see Mark 7:5, 11-12), but by serving the new household of God, the

kingdom of which Jesus was the broker. Anyone outside this new household, and for that matter, inside, who were ashamed of what the broker of this household was doing, will also be shamed by the Patron of this household (Mk 8:38). To be honored in terms of the socially defined rules of the temple was therefore to be shamed by the new household. But to be honored in the new household was also to be honored by its Patron.

6.4.8 Dyadic personality

As was indicated in section 4.2.3, people in the first-century Mediterranean world would always see themselves through the eyes of others. After all, honor required a grant of reputation by others (see again section 4.2.1), and therefore what others tended to see was all important. Furthermore, such an individual needed others for any sort of meaningful existence, since the image he had of himself was to be indistinguishable from the image of himself held and presented to him by his significant others in the family or village. In this sense, a meaningful existence depended upon the individual's full awareness of what others thought and felt about him, along with his living up to that awareness (cf Malina 1979:128; 1981:51).

From this it is clear that the first-century Mediterranean person did not at all share or comprehend our (modern and Western) idea of an 'individual'. Instead of individualism, what we find in the first-century Mediterranean world is what can be called 'dyadism'. A dyadic personality is one who simply needs others continually in order to know who he or she is (cf Foster 1961:1184; Selby 1974:113). What this means is that the person perceives himself or herself as always interrelated to other persons. They need to test their interrelations, moving the focus of attention away from their own egos and toward the demands and expectations of others who can grant or withhold reputation and honor. Dyadic persons, therefore, would expect others to tell them who they are. Persons in first-century Mediterranean society can thus best be described as strong group persons (Malina & Neyrey 1991c:73-74).

From this perspective, the responsibility for morality and deviance was not placed on the individual alone, but on the social body in which the individual was embedded. It is because something was amiss/wrong in the functioning of the social body that deviance sprang up (see section 4.2.5). The main objective of first-century Mediterranean societies, therefore, was to keep the family, village or fictive group sound, both corporately and socially.

First-century Mediterranean persons were also anti-introspective (Malina 1979: 132-33; Malina & Neyrey 1991c:78-79), that is, they were not psychologically minded at all. Rather, disturbing or abnormal internal states were blamed on persons, either human ones or non-human ones. Thus, in such a society an abnormal person would

have been described by saying he/she was 'a sinner', 'submitted to Satan' or 'was possessed by a spirit/demon'. Such a person was in an abnormal position because the matrix of relationships in which he/she was embedded were abnormal. Also, certain people (like deformed children) were labelled by others as being demon-possessed as legitimization of exploitation (Van Aarde 1992b:442). The problem thus was not within a person, but outside of a person, in faulty interpersonal relations over which a person usually had no control.

With what was previously said as background, Malina, in a recent article, looked at the first-century Mediterranean personality from the perspectives of *control* and *responsibility* (see Malina 1992:66-87). By using a theory developed by Sue et al (1981:81-93), and explained by Augsburgers (1986:95-105), Malina defines the aspects of control and responsibility as follows:

The categories of the model ... look at two qualities: first control: to what extent does a person believe s/he is in control or controlled in the process of living; and then responsibility: to what extent is a person worthy of praise or blame for what occurs in his or her life.

(Malina 1992:77)

The question of control looks to who governs, dominates, regulates, manages, supervises, that is, who is in command or in charge (Malina 1992:77). Responsibility, on the other hand, is about accountability, liability, obligation and thus asks who is answerable, who deserves praise or blame, reward or punishment (Malina 1992:78).

When this model is applied to the first-century Mediterranean personality as described in the beginning of this section, as well as in section 4.2.3, Malina (1992:77-78) is of the opinion first-century Mediterranean personality can be described in terms of *external* control and *external* responsibility. For the first-century Mediterranean person, control lay outside the person, in the form of cosmic forces (e.g. deity(s), change, luck or fate), or in social forces such as the family, fictive family or community. As an example, Van Aarde (1992b:436) has indicated that in Matthew's narrative world Jesus is portrayed as born from despised outcasts, but being adopted as Son of Abraham, Son of David, and Son of God. The latter, clearly, is also the case in Mark (cf. again Mk 1:9-11). This belief in external control always led to an attitude of trying to fit into the social and physical environment, greater ingroup involvement and greater value placed on rewards for social compliance (see Malina 1992:77).

External responsibility, on the other hand, was situation-centered responsibility. Such external responsibility correlates with:

(1) emphasis on the power of political, religious, economic, and kinship institutional forces; (2) belief that success or failure is attributable to the surrounding situation; (3) belief that there is a strong relationship between group standing and success in society; (4) belief that enduring problems point to something wrong with the system, or within the situation, with the condition of the group or society.

(Malina 1992:78)

First-century Mediterranean persons thus tended to externalize responsibility, in that responsibility was immediately deferred to any external factor in self-protection. 'This ploy provides an effective strategy to deflect attack from the offended party, to prevent loss of face or evade shame, and to account for luck, fate, or change' (Malina 1992: 78). The first-century Mediterranean person's experience of society thus was an experience of personal powerlessness and system-blame. They believed their lives were controlled by forces beyond their grasp (*external control*), and there was extremely little they could do about it since it was the will of God, of fate or fortune, which was responsible for their situation (*external responsibility*). Furthermore, there was equally little one could do (*external control*) in face of the pressures of one's position or station in life, or in breaking free of the powers which determined things, whether overwhelming traditional expectations or other forces (*external responsibility*).

When one reads Mark in terms of these two aspects of external control and responsibility, many examples can be given of the ways in which the characters in the text understood themselves as determined by external control and responsibility: The leper in Mark 1:40 understood himself as unclean because of external control, and the paralytic in Mark 2:1-12 believed it was because of his sins he was a paralytic. A very good example is Mark 7:1-23: The Pharisees believed things outside the person could defile him. These are all examples of external control. The control comes from the outside, from the social structure of the society. The forgiving of sins or being called clean thus also had to come from society, as did rewards (i.e. external control). If society said someone had honor, he had, and vice versa. The same can be said of external responsibility, of which Mark 6:35-44 and Mark 8:1-10 are two good examples: When the disciples were ordered to feed the crowds they said it is impossible because they were in a deserted place. This was external responsibility. Nothing was someone's own fault, it was always the system or the circumstances.

This also was changed by Jesus. In the new household, Jesus asked for people to break with the belief in external control and external responsibility. He asked them to realize praise or blame for behavior was their own; they had to seek reward from the Patron rather than live with the expected rewards of men. This can first be seen in

Jesus' own activity. His main aim as the broker of the new kingdom was to be obedient to God (see Mk 3:35). He did not look for praise from men which is clear from all his controversies with his adversaries on Galilean soil. His honor lay in the fact he was doing the Patron's will (Mk 8:38).

This can also be seen in Jesus' call for conversion/repentance. As was indicated in section 6.4.4.4, Jesus called people to repent, to denounce the external control by the purity systems of their day. He also stated 'there is nothing outside a person that by going in can defile, but the things that come out are what defile' (Mk 7:15). He thus asked his disciples, and those part of the new household, to break with the belief in external responsibility, to realize praise or blame for behavior was their own. Those who wanted to save their lives by believing in external control would lose it, and those who were willing to lose their lives for his sake (i.e. to repent), would save it. Someone was not unclean because society said so, but rather became unclean in terms of the misuse of his own responsibility, that is, by believing in external responsibility. Responsibility in the new household meant to do what Jesus was doing: Declare people clean, heal their illnesses, that is, show people their lives were not controlled by external control, but by accepting the presence of the Patron. In other words, Jesus taught the members of the new household responsibility lay within; the choice for the new household had to be made by oneself. It was a personal responsibility and a personal choice.

Thus, Jesus not only redefined control and responsibility, but also first-century Mediterranean personality as such, and by doing this, he redefined society. Society was no more to be controlled by external boundaries, and individuals were not to be controlled by society. In the new household, individuals controlled themselves, there acts were their own responsibility, and if one lived in this way, he was praised by the Patron (Mk 8:38).

6.4.9 Summary

In sections 6.2.2 and 6.3, it was postulated Jesus' baptism in Mark 1:9-13 can be understood as a status transformation ritual, a ritual in which Jesus' status is transformed to that of being the broker of the kingdom of God (Mk 1:15). With this as point of departure, two further postulations were made: First, the concept kingdom of God is used by the narrator of Mark as a symbol for the actual sphere of access to God's (the Patron's) saving presence. Second, the sphere of God's presence is that of the household. Because of this, it was suggested Jesus' brokerage of the kingdom can be understood in terms of his restoring of the household. Or, to put differently: By restoring the household, Jesus also restored/brokered the kingdom of God. The new household can thus be seen as a symbol of the kingdom. Kingdom and house(hold) go together: The kingdom is the household and the household is the kingdom.

To substantiate this argument, an analysis was done of Jesus' brokerage on Galilean soil (section 6.4). This analysis yielded the following results: The dominant setting and immediate cause for Jesus' exorcisms and other healings were that of household or kinship relationships. Almost every instance of Jesus' exorcisms and other healings in Mark have to do with transforming unclean people back to their proper functions in the context of kinship or household relations. It is also interesting in many of the exorcisms and other healing narratives in Mark the family and the fictive kin of the person to be healed is shown as to be effected and involved by his/her illness. Jesus' healings are thus employed by the narrator *inter alia* to indicate that Jesus is restoring the new household, and therefore the kingdom of God.

It was also indicated that the narrator uses not only Jesus' exorcisms but also other healings to create a relationship between house and kingdom in the narrative: Our analysis of Mark 3:20-30 (section 6.4.6), as well as the analysis of the relationship between Mark 1:15 and Mark 6:12 also indicated this close relationship between house and kingdom in Mark's story of Jesus (see section 6.4.6). According to the narrator, the relationship between house and kingdom in Mark is therefore clear: They go together.

The narrator also uses Jesus' exorcisms and other healings to depict him as having the authority to be the new broker of the kingdom (i.e., to make people part of this new household) and as having more authority than the scribes and Pharisees. As a consequence, Jesus also has authority over the temple and society as a whole. Therefore, Jesus also has the authority to set and patrol the boundaries of the new household. In this regard Jesus is also pictured by the narrator as a ritual elder who has the authority to transform the status of so-called 'ill' people from being unaccepted in society to being accepted and welcomed in the new kingdom (section 6.4.5). Jesus not only received this authority during his own status transformation ritual (when he was appointed by the Patron as the official broker of the kingdom), but also because of the reaction of the crowd(s) in regard to his teaching and healings. It is to him they bring the ill to be cleansed (section 6.4.5). Our analysis thus also made it possible to identify Jesus' main target, namely the expendables in society. To this we will return in section 7.2.

The way in which Jesus understood the organization and inner structure of this new household (and of the kingdom) became clear in the way he ate (i.e., with whom, when, what, how and where; section 6.4.3), and the new household's relation to the outside world became clear from the way Jesus interpreted the purity rules of his day as advocated by the temple and its extensions (section 6.4.2). The startling element of the way Jesus ate was the principle of open commensality. His meals were inclusive; the place where 'nobodies' met and became somebodies in the kingdom. In terms of the food

that was eaten and the seating arrangements at these meals, it was clear in the new household there is neither hierarchical status nor class. It was a situation of egalitarian commensality. Jesus' meals also symbolized the availability of the kingdom and the Patron. The sharing of food in an egalitarian situation where everyone was welcome thus symbolized something of the normal household of the extended family in everyday life: Reciprocal relations, solidarity, hospitality, humility and service. Jesus, therefore, not only understood the kingdom in terms of the new household, but the inner structure of this fictive household was also based on the characteristics of the normal household of the extended family known in his time. Jesus' meals, however, in a certain sense were not ceremonies, but rituals: By taking part, people were transformed from nobodies to members of the new household (see again section 6.4.3).

Because of the inclusivistic tendency of the new household Jesus interpreted the purity rules of his day negatively, since they were exclusivistic in tendency, divided the kingdom, and made the Patron unavailable. Because everyone was welcome in the new household, including the Gentiles, new and broader lines had to be drawn, lines which would make it possible for sinners, the possessed and the unclean to be also included. These new lines made the old ones obsolete, as well as the purity system of the temple (see again section 6.4.2). Jesus' interpretation of the purity laws was an indication of the new household's external relations with those on the 'outside': There were no 'fences' around the new household; it was open and available to all, especially because the broker and the patron had mercy (cf Mk 5:19; 6:34), and the broker's main aim was to make the Patron's saving presence available to all.

In this new household, Jesus also redefined the pivotal values of honor and shame, as well as the first-century individual's understanding of dyadic personality. In the new household, honor was not acquired by socially proper attitudes nor was behavior perceived by others. Honor was not acquired by reproducing the ideals of society. Furthermore, honor was also not acquired by serving the temple's understanding of the boundaries and lines in society, but by serving the household in terms of equality, humility and hospitality. By doing this, honor was acquired from the Patron. The only way in which one could be shamed was by an action of the Patron, and this would only happen if someone in the new household was ashamed of the words and deeds of the broker. Hence, to be honored in terms of the socially defined rules of the temple was to be shamed by the new household. But to be honored in the new household was also to be honored by its Patron (see section 6.4.7). In terms of dyadic personality, Jesus asked for people to break with the belief in external control and external responsibility (section 6.4.8). Praise or blame for behavior was their own. They were no longer controlled from the outside, and responsibility related to personal choice.

Finally, Jesus also defined the new household's relationship with society. Members of the new household had to understand themselves as healed healers, they were people who knew what it meant to experience the saving presence, as well as the availability, of the Patron. They therefore also had to go, as did the broker, and make this new household available to others. They had to eat what was put before them and accept others by healing their illnesses and casting out demons/unclean spirits (section 6.4.4.4). They, however, also had to repent and ask others also to do the same (Mk 1:15; 6:12), because by repenting, one not only disallowed the purity rules to organize society, but also individuals: If one had repented, there was no possibility that he could be labelled unclean or being possessed (cf Mk 3:20-30). Rather, in the new household, one was free to experience the saving presence and availability of the Patron.

It is even possible to say Jesus also redefined the common understanding of patron-client relationships in his day. In section 4.2.2, it was indicated patron-client relationships were held together by reciprocity within a structure of great inequality between patron and client when it comes to resources and power. Because of this, patrons and brokers (who had resources and power) not only had many clients, but also amassed debt. Jesus, however, was a broker without any clients who owed him, the broker something. Jesus' healings and exorcisms can serve as examples to substantiate this argument: Of all Jesus' exorcisms and other healings, in only two cases did there seem to be a hint of reciprocity, namely in Mark 1:29-31 and Mark 10:46-52. In the other healing micronarratives, we even read Jesus sent healed people back to their homes (see especially Mark 5:19). Instead of reciprocity, Jesus asked of his followers to serve as he has been serving. They had to be healed healers, that is, give to others what they had received from the Patron via the broker. Jesus thus used his broker-client relationships to remedy the inadequacies of the social structure of his day, that is, to cushion the vagaries of life for social inferiors, the expendables. Jesus thus acted as broker without any expectations of reciprocity, and by doing this, he removed the power aspect from the patron-broker-client relationships in the new household. In the kingdom, social relations therefore functioned on the basis of an equal status as fictive kin in God's household, differences in resources notwithstanding. It was a radical departure from a situation in which wealth, status and power determined social relations (see Mk 10:41-45).

To summarize: In the Galilean section of the Gospel (Mk 1:16-8:26), the narrator pictures Jesus' main activity as that of restoring the household, the kingdom of God. He received the authority to do this from the Patron, authority which was attested by the crowds. Because Jesus had the authority as the official broker of the kingdom, he

also had the authority to define the character of the new household, as well as its relationship with society outside the household, that is, its inner structure and external relationships. The inner structure was that of an egalitarian community which lived in the presence of the Patron, the external relations were that of inclusivity.

6.4.9.1 Jesus and the household on his 'way' to Jerusalem

When one looks at Mark 8:27-10:52 (the way-section of the narrative), it is clear the theme of the new household/kingdom is also central to this section of the narrative. In section 5.2.4.2.1.3, it was indicated the main activity of Jesus while on his way to Jerusalem, can be seen as trying to make the disciples to understand what he did on Galilean soil. If our emic reading in the section just named is combined with our etic reading thus far in this chapter, Jesus' activity, while on the way to Jerusalem, can be described as follows: In Mark 8:27-10:52 Jesus, because of the disciples' misunderstanding in terms of what he did on Galilean soil (cf Mark 6:35-44; 8:1-10; 8:27; see again section 5.2.4.2.1.3), tried to reiterate to the disciples what the new household entails. Or, stated differently: On his way to Jerusalem, Jesus taught the disciples the right and wrong way to live in the household of God³⁴. In this regard the following examples can be mentioned:

In Mark 9:33-37, we read the disciples argued on the way with one another over the question of who was the greatest. This was clearly a status and class related question. Because everyone in the new household was equal as Jesus indicated in the way he ate (i e, with whom, how, when, what and where) while in Galilee, Jesus answered them by saying in the new household, the one who wants to be first should be willing to be the servant of all. In the new household, no one was allowed to lord over others, but rather to serve.

In Mark 9:36-37, as well as in Mark 10:13-16, Jesus used a child for an example of the new household. Not only does the example of a child again refer to a household setting, but it should also be remembered in first-century Palestine, a child was seen as a nobody (see Crossan 1991a:267-270; Van Aarde 1991a:685-715;). '[T]o be a child was to be a nobody, with the possibility of becoming a somebody absolutely dependent on parental discretion and parental standing in community' (Crossan 1991a:269). In the kingdom, therefore, one should be willing to also accept 'nobodies' (Mk 9:27), people without any status. But, one also had to be willing to become a nobody, to denounce all status, to become part of the kingdom (Mk 10:13-16).

Another example: In Mark 10:1-12, Jesus was tested by the Pharisees on his interpretation of divorce. The Pharisees' question in Mark 12:2, and their subsequent answer to their own question in Mark 12:4, clearly indicated the way divorce worked in

first-century Palestine: Only men were permitted to initiate divorce, and therefore the dignity of a woman was not easily guarded (Kloppenborg 1990:195). Divorce was 'the basis for the dehumanization of women [and] children' (Kloppenborg 1990:196). For Jesus this meant only one thing, namely households were broken up. In Jesus' answer, he, therefore concentrated on the survival of the household: What the Patron (God) has put together, no one is allowed to separate (Mk 10:9). For Jesus, the unity of the household was the most important thing, and therefore a man had leave his parents and became one with his wife in their new household. Divorce was therefore not allowed, since the most important aspect was to keep the household intact. As Van Aarde (1992:443-344) has noted, mixed marriages was not allowed in terms of a politics of holiness as advocated by the temple system and its extensions. The Pharisees, for example, argued that on the basis of the Mosaic law, divorce was permitted for purification from mixed marriages (cf Mk 10:1-10; Van Aarde 1992b:443). When a child was born from such a 'impure' marriage, it normally led to a situation where the 'impure' wife and her oldest were ostracized from the community (Van Aarde 1992b: 443). According to Jesus, however, the new household had to be more important than anything else (Mk 10:17-31), albeit it might bring persecution (cf Mk 10:30). The one who was willing to leave everything for the new household would receive many more brothers, sisters, and houses.

From these few examples, it is clear when Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem, the new household can also be seen as his main concern. Because of this, he tried to teach his disciples in the new household status was of no importance. To be part of the household, one had to be willing to become a nobody, serve as a nobody, and also welcome other nobodies. By doing this, one however became a somebody, that is, part of the new community which enjoyed the presence of the Patron.

6.4.9.2 Jesus and the temple on Galilean soil

From what was said thus far in this chapter, it has become clear from Mark 1:16 to 10:52, the household can be seen as the central focus of Jesus' activity. Throughout the teaching and healing activity of Jesus, the household served as the most apposite sphere and symbol of social life for illustrating features of life under the reign of God. In this connection, the institution of kinship and family based on consanguinity and affinity, provides a model for a community of fictive kin united by the bonds of mercy, egalitarianism, humility, open commensality and the serving of one another. The boundaries of this symbolic family or household of God were expanded to include the marginalized, the possessed and unclean, the nobodies, and the Gentiles. In this household/kingdom, the Patron was experienced as an available, merciful and forgiving 'father' (cf Mk 5:19; 6:34; 8:38). People who became part of this household, became

brothers and sisters of one another (cf Mk 10:28-31). In this kingdom, Jesus was the broker, and the meals over which he presided, the way he served and to whom, were all signs of the inclusiveness, fellowship, status reversal and reciprocal service of the life in the kingdom/household of God.

Among the households in the villages on Galilean soil, including Gentile ones, the good news of a new holiness and wholeness available to all, made its initial and sustained advance. According to Malina (1991b:229), in first-century Mediterranean society household organization was determined by the structure and roles of the family and regulated by the traditional customs and codes of family life and kinship relations. These domestic structures and codes thus supplied Jesus as the broker of the new household with the basic models and symbols for illustrating what the relations and conditions of life in the kingdom of God should be like. Biological kinship and its attending roles, relationships and responsibilities served as the model for Jesus to conceptualize the new household as the new (fictive) family of God. This new fictive family, however, was not necessarily based on biological kinship.

Jesus' understanding and creation of the new household of God on Galilean soil, however, was nothing other than a critique of the temple itself. With his exorcisms and healings, sometimes even in the synagogue itself, Jesus set his power above that of the temple. For Jesus as broker, the resources of his father had to be available to everyone, and therefore the purity maps had to be ignored. To ignore these purity maps was to subvert them at the most fundamental level. And to subvert was a calculated attack on that which was subverted (Crossan 1991a:263). By denouncing the purity rules, Jesus thus was making extremely subversive claims about who defined the community, who patrolled its boundaries, who controlled its entries and exits, in other words, who was in charge.

Those who were labelled by the scribes and Pharisees as unclean, Jesus declared clean. He entered their social space and dislodged them from their status as the official and authoritative guardians of society. Or, as put by Seeman ([1992]:6): 'The power to exorcize is...not something that is concomitant upon neutral or specialized knowledge or skill, but rather it depends upon honor and the ability to shame opponents both physically and symbolically in an agonistic context'. Jesus also became the new official ritual elder of the crowds in society. These expendables could not defend their own honor. To them, Jesus acted as broker and made them honorable in the new household. Because of this, he was honored by them, and the official guardians of society were not. He declared things clean which were rendered unclean by the scribes and Pharisees. He also forgave sins, and thus broadened the sacrificial system of the temple. He showed God was available also outside the temple. The saving presence of God and his mercy was to be found in the house(hold), and not in the temple.

However, it was only by inference, not by an explicit claim, Jesus' Galilean ministry challenged the temple and its authority. The direct attack would only come later when Jesus entered Jerusalem. To this we shall now turn our attention.

6.5 JESUS' BROKERAGE IN JERUSALEM

As was indicated in sections 6.2.1 and 6.4.9, the following analysis of Jesus's brokerage in Jerusalem will concentrate on two aspects of Jesus' ministry in the Jerusalem-section of the narrative, namely his action in the temple, and his arrest, trials and crucifixion. The reasons for concentrating on these two aspects of Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem are as follows: In section 6.4, it was indicated Jesus' brokerage on Galilean soil can be seen as, *inter alia*, an indirect attack on the temple institution in Jerusalem. In section 6.5.1, it will be indicated Jesus' temple action should be understood not as a destruction of the temple, but as a restoration thereof. It will also be indicated Jesus' temple action should be understood in terms of what Jesus did in Galilee, the restoring of the household of God. Understood as such, Jesus' temple action should be seen as a replication of his brokerage of God's kingdom in Galilee.

Second, the reason for analyzing Jesus' passion has, in a certain sense, already been given in section 6.2.1. There, it was indicated the prologue of the narrative should not only be seen as a proleptic program of Jesus' itinerary in the rest of the narrative, but also as a proleptic program in regard to his passion as the second status transformation ritual he would undergo in the narrative. In section 6.5.2, it will be indicated the narrator uses this second transformation ritual of Jesus to further highlight the opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark's story of Jesus. Jesus' first status transformation resulted in him receiving honor from the crowds and having more authority than the 'official' religious leaders of his day. Jesus' second status transformation ritual, however, led to him being dishonored by the crowds, as well as losing his authority over the religious leaders of his day. It will thus be indicated the narrator uses Jesus' second ritual of status transformation to create irony in the narrative: According to the scribes, chief priests and elders, Jesus 'lost' his honor, and they regained theirs. However, the outcome of Jesus' transformation ritual is portrayed by the narrator in such a manner that just the opposite is true.

6.5.1 Jesus and the temple in Jerusalem

Jesus' act in the temple in Jerusalem has received a large amount of attention from many New Testament scholars studying the gospels. In past and recent New Testament scholarship, there are more or less ten main interpretations given in regard to what Jesus really did, or tried to do, in the temple.

The older and most common understanding of Jesus' act in the temple, and the one which still predominates, is that he 'cleansed' the temple (see Edersheim 1936:370; Abrahams 1967:87). According to Roloff (1969:95), the action of Jesus in the temple was 'a prophetic sign which intended to bring about the repentance and return of Israel in the last days'. Jesus thus charged Judaism with its own recognition of the holiness of the temple as the place of the presence of God and demonstrated its practice stood in contradiction to that holiness. Jesus' action constituted a requirement of the absolute maintenance of the holiness of the existing temple. There was thus an interior holiness which was being besmirched by the actual conduct of the temple's affairs, and that 'besmirching' was 'cleansed by Jesus'.

A second interpretation of this act is that he pointed to the inadequacies of the temple establishment. Trautmann (1980:120-122), for example, argues that Jesus objected to the Sadducean priesthood for combining politics and economics with the temple. He also opposed their theology of atonement by means of sacrifice and the cult. Because Jesus did not believe in atonement through sacrifice, his deed in the temple therefore was not only an attack on the temple, but especially an attack on its leaders. In the same vein Schmid (1968:209), argues that Jesus' deed in the temple simply pointed to the burning zeal of a rural puritan reformer for the honor of his Father. Jesus thus attacked the entrenched temple establishment which was money making in their orientation (cf also Evans 1989:522-539; see also Eisler 1931:48-510)³⁵.

A third interpretation of Mark 11:15-19 is that Jesus attacked the economic oppression the temple symbolized. In this regard, Jeremias (1971:145) proposed the cleansing was directed against the priestly class because '[t]hey misuse their calling ... by carrying on business to make profit'. Similarly Aulén (1976:77) remarked that '[t]o transform the court of the temple to a market place — and for their own profit — was a violation of the law concerning the holiness of the temple'. We may also cite Trocmé's view: The action in the temple was 'in defense of the honour of God, (Trocmé 1973:118). Harvey (1982:15) speaks of 'the abuse of Jewish institutions' which Jesus attacked and characterized the action as a prophetic one which represented 'the divine judgment on a particular use which was being made of the temple' (cf also Eppstein 1964:42-58; Hamilton 1964:365-372; Hengel 1971:15-17).

This is also the point of view of Belo (1981:180-181), Myers (1988:299-304) and Waetjen (1989:181-184). According to Belo (1981:180), it was because money from commerce was connected to the temple that it did not bear fruit. 'If we recall that this trade was controlled by the chief priests, we can conclude that they and this trade are the ones being challenged by the subversive practice of Jesus' (Belo 1981:181). Myers

(1988:299-304) argues in the same vein: Jesus' temple action should be 'viewed as the centerpiece in Mark's unrelenting criticism of the political economy of the temple. Jesus attacks the temple institutions because of the way they exploit the poor' (Myers 1988:299). According to Myers (1988:300), it should be noted commercial activity was an entirely normal aspect of any cult in antiquity, so this is not what Jesus was against. He was against the ruling-class interests who were in control of the commercial enterprises in the temple market. By his temple action, Jesus called for an end to the entire cultic system, symbolized by his overturning of the tables of the money changers and the seats of those who sold doves. 'They represented the concrete mechanisms of oppression within a political economy that doubly exploited the poor and the unclean' (Myers 1988:301). What Jesus therefore did was to shut the temple and its operations altogether (Myers 1988:303). This is also more or less the point of view of Waetjen: Jesus' temple action should not be seen as an act of reformation intended to eliminate business activities from the observance of the cult or to separate trade and commerce from the worship of God. 'Jesus is not 'cleansing the temple' ... he is closing it down' (Waetjen 1989:182). By ending the sale of doves and terminating all activity in the sacred precinct, Jesus signified the end of the cult and its hierarchy and the tributary mode of distribution both which it maintained. Jesus' closing down of the temple also marked the termination of its power and privilege, but especially its oppression and dispossession of the Jewish masses (Waetjen 1989:183). Furthermore, the cancellation of the temple also abolished the dehumanizing pollution system which it maintained to the advantage of the ruling elite (Waetjen 1989:183).

Fourth, Jesus' temple action is seen by some scholars as a military action of a political revolutionary character. According to Carmichael (1962:131-133), Jesus entered Jerusalem with a group of armed men and forcibly seized the temple. Johnson (1960:189) has more or less the same point of view. Brandon (1967:35-38), on the other hand, argues the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, the arming of the disciples and the temple action of Jesus pointed to 'a carefully planned demonstration by Jesus of his assumption of messiahship after the manner of Judas the Galilee' (Brandon 1967:35)³⁶.

To these four interpretations discussed above, still others can be added: Jesus' temple action was dictated by an anti-cultic attitude on his part (see Caldecott 1923:84; Hoskyns & Davey 1940:194; Nineham 1963:300-301; Moule 1981:21-25)³⁷, he wanted the trade to be moved entirely outside of the temple precincts (Davies 1974:350), or he was concerned with the status of the Gentiles who were excluded from the temple (Davies 1974:351-353)³⁸. An increasingly popular view is that Jesus was not only in conflict with the major institutions, but he rejected them, especially the temple (see Horsley 1987:285-300; 1989c:130-132). Recently, the view has also been

proposed that the incident shows the tension between city and country (village), that is, between the economic practices of urban Jerusalem and their Galilean agrarian poor in first-century Palestine (cf Theissen 1978b:47-48; Freyne 1988:178-190). And finally, some scholars are of the opinion Jesus' temple action should be interpreted from a post-Easter perspective: According to Braun (1979:12), this action expressed the opposition of the early church to the temple cultus, or, according to Suhl (1965:143), it represented 'the present power of the raised [Christ] in the confession of the post-Easter community'.

According to Sanders (1985:63), all these explanations given above (except for maybe the last example) more or less point to the same understanding of Jesus' action in the temple, namely, Jesus 'cleansed' the temple. This understanding however, according to Sanders, is not correct for the following reason: '[It] implies a prior profanation or contamination, and this profanation has been readily found in the conducting of trade in, or around, the temple precincts' (Sanders 1985:63). Sacrifices were integral to the function of the temple and the religion of Judaism, and because sacrifices were needed, so were the money-changers. Sanders (1985:69) therefore wants to understand Jesus' action in the temple as 'a symbolic destruction'. Jesus knew what he was doing when he overturned the tables of the money changers and those who were selling doves. Like others, he regarded the sacrifices as commanded by God, and he knew making a gesture towards disrupting the trade represented an attack on the divinely ordained sacrifices (Sanders 1985:70). Therefore, Jesus' temple action can only be understood as a symbolic act of destruction which was aimed at restoration:

Thus we conclude that Jesus publicly predicted or threatened the destruction of the temple, that his statement was shaped by his expectation of the arrival of the eschaton, that he probably also expected a new temple to be given by God from heaven, and that he made a demonstration which prophetically symbolized the coming event.

(Sanders 1985:75)

From the above citation, Sanders' interpretation of Jesus' temple action is clear: The cleansing of the temple should be interpreted as a symbolic act signifying the destruction of the temple: '[He] (Jesus — EvE) intended ... to indicate that the end was at hand and that the temple would be destroyed, so that the new and perfect temple might arise' (Sanders 1985:75). In other words, Jesus proclaimed the restoration of the temple and of Israel. Like the prophets of old, he proclaimed the plan of God which consisted of destruction and restoration. This would all happen on the arrival of the new eschaton, the eschatological kingdom of God³⁹.

Crossan (1991a:355-360) also interprets Jesus' action in the temple in more or less the same vein as Sanders (excluding their difference in regard to the eschatological-symbolical meaning of Jesus' act in the temple). According to Crossan (1991a:357), Jesus' temple action 'is not at all a purification but rather a symbolic destruction'. He agrees with Sanders (1985:63) there was nothing wrong with any of the buying, selling or money-changing operations conducted in the outer courts of the temple. No one was stealing, defrauding or contaminating the sacred precincts. Those activities were the absolutely necessary concomitants of the fiscal basis and sacrificial purpose of the temple (see Van Aarde [1993]b:18 who differs from Sanders and Borg in this regard). Jesus' attack on the temple should therefore not be seen as a physical destruction of the temple, but as 'a deliberate symbolical attack. It 'destroyed' the temple by 'stopping' its fiscal, sacrificial, and liturgical operations' (Crossan 1991a:357-358).

There is, however, a main difference between the interpretations of Sanders and Crossan just described, namely their understanding of the concept of the kingdom of God. Where Sanders sees Jesus' understanding of the kingdom as eschatological, that is, to come in the near future (see Sanders 1985:75), Crossan (1991a:283) understands it as referring to something that is here and now: 'What is needed, then, is not the insight into the Kingdom as future but a recognition of the Kingdom as present. For Jesus, [the] Kingdom ... is a Kingdom of here and now ... a Kingdom performed rather than just proclaimed' (Crossan 1991a:283, 292). This then is also the manner in which the concept kingdom of God was interpreted and understood in section 6.4. At his baptism Jesus was appointed by the Patron as the official broker of his kingdom. This made the kingdom a present reality, a reality brokered by Jesus, for example, in the way he 'ate' (section 6.4.3), healed (section 6.4.4), and interpreted the purity rules of his day (section 6.4.2).

Since it has become clear from the above discussion that one's understanding of Jesus' temple action is closely related with that of the concept 'kingdom of God', let us look to the latter in a bit more detail. In section 6.3, it was argued that the narrator's usage of the kingdom should be understood in terms of a symbol of God's saving presence and availability. It was also argued the household should be seen as a symbol of the kingdom: By restoring the household Jesus restored the kingdom. Also, the kingdom was to be found in the household, because the household was the kingdom, or, a symbol thereof.

Recent scholarly discussion has also emphasized the phrase 'kingdom of God' can be seen as a *symbol* in the teachings of Jesus, not a *concept* (Perrin 1976:30). In reading the phrase 'kingdom of God' as a symbol, Perrin (1976:29-33) distinguishes between a *tensive symbol* and a *steno-symbol*: A steno-symbol represents something

else in a one-to-one way and may thus be translated into its referent without loss, whereas the meaning of a tensive symbol is not exhausted by any one referent. In regard to this distinction, Perrin (1976:33) argues the kingdom of God was understood by Jesus as a tensive symbol. In the mouth of Jesus, the phrase pointed to something beyond itself and was not an idea or a 'shorthand' for an idea, for example, the imminent end of the world. Rather, the function of a symbol is to evoke a *myth*, that is, to the extent a symbol is shorthand at all, it is a shorthand for a myth, not an idea (Perrin 1976:33)⁴⁰.

Myth is therefore a story about the relationship between the two realms of the sacred and the profane, the real and the visible real, between the *Noumenon* and the *Phenomenon*, in Kantian terms (see again section 3.3.6). Myth is the language for speaking about the 'other realm' and its relation to this realm (Perrin 1976:32). In other words, a symbol functions linguistically to evoke a myth. A symbol thus points to a particular way of seeing and relating to Reality mediated by a myth (Perrin 1976:32)⁴¹.

According to Borg (1986:92), as fruitful as Perrin's work is, it needs to be taken one step further in order to understand Jesus' action in the temple in relation to his understanding of the kingdom. A myth, Borg argues, can be seen as a root metaphor, a way of imagining reality. Essential in understanding a myth as a root metaphor are two central claims: First, in addition to the visible material world disclosed to us by ordinary sense perception, there is another level or layer of reality, that of the 'other world'. Second, the 'other world' is not simply an article of belief, but an element of experience. It is not merely believed in, but known (Borg 1986:92-93; see also again section 3.3.6).

The phrase kingdom of God was for Jesus a symbol of the experience of God's presence and power; it was a symbol/myth to express something of Jesus' own experience of God. And because Jesus experienced God as being present, the kingdom for him was also a present kingdom (Borg 1984:258). Or to use Borg's own words: 'But if the symbol (i.e. the kingdom of God — EvE) points here to the experience of God, then the saying means in effect, 'God is near, at hand, accessible to human experience'' (Borg 1984:258). The kingdom should therefore not be seen as referring to temporal futurity, but to something that is a present reality⁴² (cf also Schüssler Fiorenza 1985:120; Horsley 1989b:11). In terms of what have been said previously in regard to the house as being the symbol of the new household, it is clear that I therefore would like to agree with Borg.

Now that we have made the point the kingdom of God should be seen as a present reality, let us get back to our main argument: According to Borg (1984:171), Jesus' action in the temple, if the kingdom is seen as a present reality, should be seen as 'a

prophetic or symbolic act ... [against] the role of the Temple's ideology of holiness' (Borg 1984:170, 174). Jesus' action thus was against the temple's quest for separation which generally excluded Gentiles (Borg 1984:175). This is also the reason why Jesus expelled the merchants: Their presence on the temple mount was to protect the holiness of the temple 'by exchanging profane coinage for 'holy' coinage, by providing sacrificial doves guaranteed free from blemish' (Borg 1984:176). Their activity served and symbolized the quest for holiness understood as separation, and according to Jesus, that understanding of holiness was wrong (Borg 1984:167-177). Jesus' action therefore was a dramatic appeal to the nation to abandon their quest for holiness as expressed by the temple and follow a different religious policy, a policy in which God's holiness was understood as being inclusive (Borg 1984:177). Or stated differently: Jesus' understanding of the kingdom was that it was a symbol for God's presence and power. Jesus spoke of the kingdom as a reality which could be entered or possessed in the present (Borg 1984:256). The kingdom was the community which knew the embracing mercy of God which included Gentiles. This was holiness, namely to experience the merciful presence of God, and not a quest for separation (Borg 1984:256). Therefore Jesus had to attack the temple's understanding of holiness, as well as the merchants who symbolized that understanding. As the kingdom was a symbol for the experience of God, so was Jesus' action in the temple: It expressed in a symbolic manner the way in which Jesus experienced God's mercy and presence.

This then is more or less the stand of the current debate in regard to the interpretation of Jesus' action in the temple in previous and recent New Testament scholarship. It is my opinion that all of these interpretations have one shortcoming in common: Jesus' temple action is interpreted as an isolated passage in the gospel(s), and not connected with or interpreted in relation to his other words and deeds in the gospel(s). Or, in terms of Mark: Jesus' temple action in Jerusalem is analyzed without taking into consideration what Jesus previously did on Galilean soil. This is, in my opinion, a very important shortcoming in previous scholarship, especially if one takes into consideration the conclusions reached thus far in our own analysis of Jesus' words and deeds in the Gospel of Mark. Let us summarize some of our previous conclusions in short in terms of their importance to an understanding of what Jesus did in the temple in Jerusalem.

In section 5.2.4, the emic reading of the text resulted in the conclusion that the narrator, in terms of his ideological perspective on the topographical level of the text, opposes Galilee with Jerusalem and the house(hold) with the temple. Because of this, I would like to argue Jesus' temple action in Jerusalem cannot rightly be understood if it is not analyzed in relation to what Jesus did on Galilean soil, and more specifically, what Jesus did and said in relation to the household in Galilee. In section 6.3, it was

argued Jesus became the broker of God's kingdom because his kingdom was brokerless. The way the temple officials, both in Jerusalem and on Galilean soil, brokered God's kingdom, resulted in the unavailability of God's kingdom and presence. On Galilean soil, Jesus changed all of that. In the way he interpreted the purity laws he not only broke down all the boundaries which excluded so-called sinners, possessed and unclean people, but also laid down new boundaries, boundaries that made God's kingdom available to all. Exclusiveness was replaced by inclusiveness (see section 6.4.2). The way Jesus ate was described as open commensality. His meals were the place where nobodies met, and became somebodies, participants of the new household of God. Classes, sexes, ranks and status were mixed up together. His meals were inclusive. Everybody was welcome, even the Gentiles (see section 6.4.3)

In the way Jesus healed, he challenged the authority of the 'official brokers' of the society. His healings took place either in the context of, or for the benefit of, households and household relationships. The result of this was that Jesus not only gained control over the temple and its officials, but also over society. Jesus now was the one who controlled society, patrolled its boundaries and guarded its entrances and exits (see section 6.4.4). Because of this authority the crowd(s) appointed Jesus as the new ritual elder who had the authority to declare unclean people clean (section 6.4.5). When Jesus was labelled by the scribes from Jerusalem as being from Beelzebul, he answered them by saying it is they who are breaking up the household of God, and not him (section 6.4.6). The narrator thus pictures a Jesus who, when he enters Jerusalem, has authority over society. He is the one who has honor, the power to be the broker of the new kingdom, the authority to patrol the boundaries of the kingdom and to make God's kingdom available to all, including the Gentiles⁴³.

With this as background to Jesus' temple action, let us look first at Jesus teaching in the temple just after the episode of the turning over of the tables in the temple precincts. Jesus' teaching in the temple, namely Mark 11:17, reads as follows:

17 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ πεποιήκατε αὐτὸν ληστῶν.

(Mark 11:17)

Two aspects of this saying of Jesus are of importance here for our discussion: First, Jesus refers to the temple as 'ὁ οἶκός μου' (my house), and second, this house (the temple) must be a house of prayer for πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (for all nations).

Let us first look at Jesus' reference to the temple as being 'my house'. In Mark, we find the narrator uses the word temple twelve times (cf Mk 11:11, 15 [two times], 16, 27; 12:35; 13:1, 3; 14:49, 58; 15:29, 38). Of these twelve occurrences the narrator

uses the word *ἐσὸς* nine times (see the first nine references listed above) and the word *νάος* three times (cf Mk 14:58; 15:29, 38). However, when Jesus refers to the temple in Mark 11:17, he uses the word *οἶκος* (house). In my opinion, this should be interpreted as follows: On Galilean soil Jesus was appointed by the Patron as the broker of the kingdom. Jesus had to make the kingdom available, and this he did by restoring the household. By the way Jesus restored the household he gained authority as the new official broker of the kingdom, not only in terms of the new household, but also in terms of society as a whole, which included the temple.

By calling the temple 'his house', Jesus thus indicated he, as the official broker of the kingdom, also had authority to restore the temple. And by calling the temple 'my house', Jesus also indicated in which manner it had to be restored: It had to become like the house(hold) on Galilean soil. Or, to put it differently: *What Jesus did in the temple is what he already did in Galilee.* On Galilean soil, Jesus restored the kingdom by creating a new household with no exclusiveness and purity rules. He made God available to all. This he also was now doing with the temple. It had to become a house where everyone was welcome, or rather, it had to become part of the household of the new kingdom.

Jesus' remark that his house must be a house of prayer for all nations more or less interprets itself: On Galilean soil Gentiles were invited to become part of the new household of God. And if the temple was also part of that house, the Gentiles also had to be welcome. As has been noted above, on this point I therefore agree with Borg and disagree with Sanders. It was indicated earlier, according to Sanders (1985:68), Jesus did not seem to make a definite gesture in favor of including the Gentiles as people who should have access to the temple when he acted in the temple. According to Borg, however, Jesus' action in the temple was *inter alia* against the temple's quest for separation which generally excluded Gentiles (Borg 1984:175). That the Gentiles were one of Jesus' main concerns in Mark is clear: Jesus understood the temple as part of his new household of which he was the official broker. The household was open to all on Galilean soil, therefore in the temple it had to be also the case.

The above interpretation of Jesus' saying in the temple also makes it possible to understand what he meant when he overturned the tables of the money changers and those who were selling doves. As Borg (1984:167-177) indicated, their activity served and symbolized the quest for holiness understood as separation built on the purity regulations of the temple. By turning over the tables, Jesus thus, as he did in Galilee, put an end to the boundaries and lines which excluded people from the kingdom. Jesus' action in the temple should be understood as a symbolic act that ended purity boundaries and lines that made God unavailable.

To conclude: When Jesus' action in the temple is understood in terms of the narrative world of the Gospel, that is, in relation to his brokerage on Galilean soil, it is clear what Jesus did in the temple in Jerusalem was not something 'new': It was exactly the same as what he has been doing in Galilee in the first part of the Gospel. The Pharisees replicated the temple to the bed and board of the Jew in Galilee. Jesus did just the opposite: *He replicated the house(hold) of Galilee in the temple in Jerusalem.* For the Markan Jesus, the temple was part of the kingdom, and because Jesus had the authority in the kingdom, he also had authority over the temple. And because the temple was part of the kingdom, it had to be like the household: Open to all, Gentiles included. The temple officials made the kingdom unavailable, in the temple and on Galilean soil. Jesus, however, made it available in Galilee and in the temple. Understood as such, Jesus' temple action should be seen as an extension of his brokerage on Galilean soil. This is also the point of view of Crossan (1991a:360):

I think it quite possible that Jesus went to Jerusalem only once and that the spiritual and economic egalitarianism he preached in Galilee exploded in indignation at the temple as the seat and symbol of all that was nonegalitarian, patronal, and even oppressive on both religious and political level. [He] ... *simply actualized what he had already said in his teachings, effected in his healings, and realized by his mission of open commensality.*

(Crossan 1991a:360; my emphasis)

Jesus' temple action should therefore not be seen as a symbolic act which was intended to put an end to the temple, but to restore it to that what it was intended to be, namely to broker God's presence and availability to all. And to achieve that, Jesus replicated the new household of Galilee in the temple. Van Aarde (1991d:59-60), in a study of the relativity of the metaphor 'temple' in Luke-Acts, made the following remark in regard to Jesus' attitude towards the temple in Luke-Acts, which is also relevant to Mark:

The Pharisaic replication of the temple community in everyday life had the religious implication that social ostracism was legitimated with divine alienation. Like the Pharisees, *Jesus also considered that the temple community should be extended to everyday life. Jesus, however, opposed social-religious ostracism.* Unlike his Pharisaic opponents, He associated himself with a specific trend which is evident in the Old Testament (and intertestament literature) This is the fact that the initial *exclusivity* with regard to the access of the temple structure had become more relaxed, so that one could speak of a *broadening* of the temple.

(Van Aarde 1991d:59-60; my emphasis)

That Jesus' temple action should be understood as a replication of the household on Galilean soil, that is, a restoration or broadening of the temple, is also clear from Mark 12:37. From this verse it can be deduced Jesus was teaching the crowd in the temple. As argued above, the crowds which followed Jesus most probably were *inter alia* the expendables in society. If this was the case, it would mean in Mark 11:27-12:44 Jesus was teaching expendables in the temple, that is, people who would not have been permitted in the temple under normal circumstances. However, since Jesus has restored the temple, since its boundaries were broadened also to include the expendables, the women and Gentiles, they were now welcome in the temple. The question can therefore be asked that if Jesus' temple action was aimed at destruction of the temple, that is, at closing it down, and not at restoration, why would Jesus have taken the trouble to go back to the temple the following day, most probably with the crowds following him, to teach in the temple. If Jesus had 'closed down' the temple the previous day, he would not have gone back to the temple.

Above it was indicated Myers (1988:301) and Waetjen (1989:182) interpret Jesus' temple action as the closing down of the temple. However, Schüssler Fiorenza (1985:120) also concurs with my interpretation that Jesus only intended to restore the temple to its rightful and intended meaning:

The Jesus movement in Palestine does not totally reject the validity of Temple and Torah as symbols of God's election but offers an alternative interpretation of them by focusing on the people itself as the locus of God's power and presence.

(Schüssler Fiorenza 1985:120)

Jesus, therefore, did not close down the temple. It was restored to make place for the new household of God. Jesus' creation of the new household of God can therefore also be understood as a broadening of the kingdom, and the temple.

To conclude: In Galilee, Jesus, only by inference, not by an explicit claim, challenged the temple and its authority. The direct and explicit attack occurred in the temple itself. However, both in Galilee and in the temple itself, Jesus' aim was the same: To broker the kingdom of the Patron in such a manner that it was available to all, whatever the result or opposition would be. To that result we now turn our attention.

6.5.2 Jesus' arrest, trial[s] and crucifixion: A ritual of status transformation

Our emic reading in chapter 5 enabled us to discern the interests of both the protagonist and the antagonists in the narrative of Mark. It also was indicated that the crowds (including expendables) can be seen as the target of the protagonist. The etic reading

of the text in section 6.4 enabled us to define this target of the protagonist in more specific terms: Jesus' main target most probably was the expendables in society, those people who were not able to defend their honor. In terms of the expendables, Jesus practiced a politics of holiness, like the Pharisees, scribes and chief priests. His politics of holiness, however, was not a politics of holiness in terms of separateness, but a politics of mercy/commensality (cf Mk 5:19; 6:34) and inclusiveness.

Because of these activities of Jesus, some Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem came down to Galilee to protect their interests (cf Mk 3:22; 7:1). Their interest, as indicated above, was a practice of the politics of holiness in terms of separateness. According to them, the virtuous man in first-century Palestine did not mix with people of certain despised positions, especially in terms of their politics of holiness, that is, the purification prescriptions regarding what was clean and unclean. Or, in short, observant Jews did not mix with people from the expendable class. In terms of the Pharisees' interests, it was indicated above that they replicated the temple community in everyday life to the bed and board of the observant Jew. The implication of this was that social ostracism was legitimated with divine alienation. The results, however, of both the scribes' politics of holiness and the Pharisees' replication of the temple to everyday life were the same: People were declared as living 'outside' the presence of God. Because God was holy and whole, and they were not, it was impossible God could be merciful towards them and impossible that they should be themselves living in the presence of God.

Jesus' ministry to the expendables, however, was the total opposite to that of the scribes and the Pharisees. He defended the expendables' honor by acting as the broker of the Patron's presence and availability. Jesus' compassion to these people, therefore, was experienced as an anomaly by the scribes and the Pharisees. And as a result of this, they came down to Galilee to protect their interests. The way in which they tried to do this was to label Jesus as a the leader of the demons, that is, as an anomaly in society and therefore, a dangerous person. It can therefore be concluded that Jesus' ministry of compassion to the expendables (and Gentiles) in society, should be seen as the main reason why some of the interest groups in Jerusalem came down to Galilee to protect their interests.

By going to Jerusalem, Jesus thus was doing what the interest groups in Jerusalem did when they came down to Galilee. They came to protect their interests, and Jesus was now also going to Jerusalem to protect his interests also. Understood as such, it was argued in section 6.5.1 Jesus therefore went to Jerusalem to replicate, *inter alia* in the temple, what he was doing in Galilee in the first part of the narrative. In Galilee the interest groups of Jerusalem came into conflict with Jesus' interests, and now Jesus will come into conflict with their interests in Jerusalem.

In regard to Jesus' temple action, there are scholars who would like to argue that this action should be seen as the immediate cause for his consequent arrest, trial[s] and crucifixion (cf inter alia Sanders 1985:339; Crossan 1991a:360, McLaren 1991:99). The question can, however, be asked if Jesus' temple action should be seen as the only reason for his subsequent death. Regarding this question, five texts in Mark are of importance, namely Mark 11:8-11, Mark 11:18, Mark 12:12, Mark 12:37 and Mark 14:2. From these texts it is clear the crowds, which were the Markan Jesus' target in Galilee, also followed him into Jerusalem. It was the crowd who honored Jesus in Galilee, and now the crowd was honoring him again in Jerusalem. This, of course, was a main threat to the honor of especially the scribes, chief priests and elders in Jerusalem. To try to regain their honor, they first sent some Pharisees and Herodians to ask Jesus if one should pay taxes to the emperor (Mk 12:13-17). Jesus was also confronted by the Sadducees on the question of the resurrection (Mk 12:18-27), and by a scribe on the question of the first commandment (Mk 12:28-34; the respective relationships between these different interest groups will be discussed in section 7.3.3). It is, however, clear Jesus' ministry of compassion to the crowds in Galilee, his temple action in Jerusalem, as well as the crowds who followed him in Jerusalem, should be seen as the reasons for his subsequent arrest and crucifixion. For the religious leaders in Jerusalem, it was clear Jesus stood for a basic change in the very structure of society. On Galilean soil, some of the interest groups tried to eliminate him, either by killing him (cf Mk 3:6), or by labelling him as a deviant (cf Mk 3:20-30). Now, Jesus was in Jerusalem and was making the same claims. Their natural response of course, was to liquidate him.

As was indicated in section 6.2, this 'liquidation' of Jesus will be studied as Jesus' second ritual of status transformation in Mark's story of Jesus. While Jesus' first ritual of status transformation (during his baptism) was depicted by the narrator as a positive transformation of status, Jesus' status transformation during his arrest, trial[s] and crucifixion is portrayed by the narrator as a negative status transformation, at least from the point of view of the interest groups in Jerusalem, mainly the scribes, chief priests and elders. It will also be indicated the narrator thus uses these two status transformations of Jesus to further highlight the opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem in the Mark as the two focal spaces of interest.

6.5.2.1 Jesus' second ritual of status transformation in Mark's story of Jesus

As was indicated in section 4.2.4, rituals have two aspects, that of the ritual process (i.e., separation, liminality-communitas and aggregation), and the ritual elements, namely the initiand, ritual elder(s) and the ritual elements. According to the narrator, Jesus' separation, the first step of the ritual process, started in Mark 14:3-9. According to McVann (1988:97), Jesus' separation started during his arrest. It is, however, clear

Jesus' separation already starts in Mark 14:3: The narrator depicts Jesus as being gradually separated first from the crowds (Mk 14:3), then from a smaller part of the crowd (Mk 14:3-9), then he is alone with his disciples (Mk 14:12-25), then Judas Iscariot started to look for a way to betray Jesus (Mk 14:10-11), later Jesus is deserted by his disciples (Mk 14:50), and finally Peter also denied he knew Jesus (Mk 14:72).

After his first status transformation in Mark 1:9-12, he called some of his disciples (Mk 1:16-20) and after his first public deed as the new broker of God's kingdom, his clientele started to grow. As the narrative develops, Jesus called some more disciples (cf Mk 2:14), and also appointed the Twelve (cf Mk 3:13-19). Jesus' clientele on Galilean soil, however, consisted of the crowds. The reader was first introduced to the crowd(s) as a character in the narrative in the synagogue in Capernaum (cf Mk 1:21-29). However, after Jesus' healing of the man with the unclean spirit in Mark 1:21-29, and subsequent healings and teaching in the neighboring towns, the crowds became constant followers of Jesus (cf e.g. Mk 1:45; 2:13; 3:7-10, 20, 34; 4:1, 35; 5:12; 6:53-56; 8:1). Sometimes the crowds were so large and followed Jesus in such a constant manner that he did not even had time to be alone and rest (cf e.g. Mk 1:45; 6:30-33). When Jesus entered Jerusalem, the crowds⁴⁴ were still following him, and after Jesus' action in the temple, he taught them in the temple. During Jesus other activities in Jerusalem the crowds were also his constant followers (cf Mk 11:18, 12:12, 37; 14:2).

However, from Mark 14:3 the narrator depicts just the opposite. The last time the reader is informed the crowds were with Jesus is in Mark 14:2. After this, Jesus' status transformation started with a gradual separation from his followers. First, in Mark 14:3-9 in the house of Simon the leper, Jesus is portrayed as being with only a part of the crowd. In Mark 14:12-25, further separation took place, when Jesus was having the Passover meal with only his disciples. During this meal, even further separation took place, in that Jesus forecasted one of his disciples would betray him, and that after his betrayal, all of his disciples would desert him (cf respectively Mk 14:18 and Mk 14:27). A certain pattern in Jesus' separation, as depicted by the narrator, can therefore be discerned: First, Jesus was with the whole crowd and the disciples, then with only a part of the crowd. Jesus then is depicted as being only with the disciples and then foretells one of his disciples, and finally, all of them, including Peter, would desert him. In the end, when Jesus is crucified and dies, only the women stood at a distance as onlookers (cf Mk 15:40-41).

After the Passover meal, Jesus and his disciples, without Judas Iscariot, went to Gethsemane. Further separation, therefore again takes place. While in the garden, Jesus went aside to pray, but his disciples could not stay awake. According to the narrator, they therefore already started to desert Jesus. However, Jesus' final separation took place when he was arrested (cf Mk 14:49). After this arrest, all of his disciples

deserted him and fled (Mk 14:50). Then Peter finally denied he knew Jesus (Mk 14:72). Jesus' arrest, therefore, can be seen as the beginning of Jesus' state of liminality-communitas.

That Jesus entered the second stage of the ritual process after his arrest, the state of liminality-communitas, is clear when Jesus' attitude just after his arrest is compared with his attitude when he was brokering the kingdom on Galilean soil. Previously in the narrative, Jesus was assertive (cf e.g. Mk 1:15, 38, 41; 2:13), confident of his own authority (cf e.g. Mk 2:8-11; 25-28; 3:3-6, 34-35; 5:31), and defiant, even contemptuous of the established religious authority of the scribes and Pharisees (cf e.g. Mk 7:5-12; 11:33; 12:11, 38-40). Jesus' arrest, however, signalled an abrupt and unexpected reversal of this well-established pattern in the narrative (see McVann 1988:97). Jesus now submitted unconditionally to his arrest (cf Mk 14:42, 46-49). What he predicted in Mark 8:31, 9:31 and 10:32-34, namely, that he would be betrayed, would suffer and be put to death, be resurrected, and finally rise from the dead, was now being fulfilled: His betrayal has occurred. This led to his separation. He would also suffer and be put to death. This will be his period of liminality-communitas. But he will also be resurrected from the dead, which will be his aggregation.

Jesus' arrest can thus be seen as the inauguration of his period of liminality-communitas, where he is marked off from the world in which he previously had a positive role and standing. Before this, Jesus was the new official broker of the Patron, now he was a nobody, a non-person without any status or identity. This is also clear when Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin is looked at more closely (Mk 14:53-65). From Jesus' trial it is clear the high priest, the chief priests, scribes and elders acted as the ritual elders during Jesus' second ritual of status transformation. During his first ritual, it was John the Baptist. John the Baptist was the one who called for repentance, that is, not allowing the purity maps to organize and divide society. However, the people who were advocating these maps, were now Jesus' ritual elders. That Jesus, in his state of liminality communitas, was a nobody is clear from the way in which the Sanhedrin looked for a testimony against him to put him to death. Ironically, however, no one was able to relate who Jesus was (cf Mk 14:55-59). To them he was a nobody. During his state of liminality-communitas, Jesus was the model initiand (McVann 1988:98). When he was directly confronted by the high priest, Jesus did not answer (Mk 14:61).

After Jesus answered the high priest's second question in a positive manner, some started to spit on him and he was also blindfolded and struck by some of those who were present. In section 4.2.1, it was indicated spitting in a persons face was a common social sanction which defiled and degraded people and rendered them unclean and socially unacceptable. Such a person would also have no honor. When Jesus was captured, he was already shamed and lost his honor (see section 4.2.1). However, now

again he was shamed because some of the Sanhedrin and the soldiers spat on him (cf Mk 15:19). Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin is thus portrayed by the narrator in a very ironical manner. In Galilee, Jesus received grants of honor because he defended the honor of the unclean. Now, Jesus was losing his honor because he was rendered unclean. In Galilee, Jesus used his own saliva to heal a blind man (Mk 8:22-26), now his was made unclean by the saliva of others.

When Jesus was handed over to Pilate, his liminality intensified even more. First, Jesus as a Jew, was interrogated by Jews, now he was brought before a Gentile. During his trial before Pilate, after being stirred up by the chief priests (Mk 15:11), the crowd who previously honored him, decided to let Barabbas go and let Jesus be crucified. On Galilean soil, Jesus defended their honor, now they were the cause for him losing his honor. To them Jesus was a nobody, with Barabbas having more worth. After Jesus was flogged, thus being dishonored once more (see again section 4.2.1), Pilate handed him over to be crucified. Before Jesus was led out to be crucified, he was struck on the head with a reed, thus shamed even further.

The climax of Jesus' ritual came at his crucifixion. Symbols of shame are most heavily concentrated while Jesus hung on the cross: He was stripped of his clothes (Mk 15:24), and was also insulted and taunted (Mk 15:25-32). However, when Jesus died, he reached the climax of his state of liminality-communitas: He died without being in the presence of the Patron (Mk 15:34). By depicting Jesus as dying without the presence of the Patron, the narrator finally indicates how ironic Jesus' second status transformation ritual was: People who stepped over boundaries and lines were ostracized by legitimating such ostracism with divine alienation. Since they could not defend their honor, Jesus as broker accepted them as his clients and made the Patron's presence available to them. Now Jesus was hanging on the cross without being in the presence of the Patron, without any honor. This was the result of defending the honor of the expendables by making the Patron present in their lives.

However, Jesus' aggregation during his second transformation ritual in the narrative, is just as ironic. According to the scribes, chief priests and elders, they have succeeded in removing Jesus, an anomaly, from society. Jesus' aggregation is described by the narrator in three steps: First, after Jesus died, a Roman soldier attested that he was truly the Son of God, that is, the broker of the new kingdom. In section 6.2.2, it was indicated that Jesus, when he became the broker of God's kingdom, was also attested by the Patron as being his 'Son, the Beloved'. The second phase of Jesus' aggregation took place during his resurrection (Mk 16:1-6). The ritual elders, therefore, did not succeed in eliminating him. Because he was the Son of God, the broker of the Patron, he was raised up. In Mark 16:7, Jesus' aggregation is completed: Jesus is again going back to Galilee. There his healed healers would find him, and there they again would start to make the Patron available to all.

6.5.3 Jesus' brokerage in Jerusalem: Summary

In the prologue of the narrative of Mark, Jesus underwent a status transformation ritual and became the broker of the kingdom of the Patron. In brokering the Patron's presence to those in society who lost their honor, Jesus received honor. He was the new ritual elder who transformed the status of expendables to the status of being part of the new household. By doing this, he dislodged the 'official' brokers of God's presence from their social space, and also stripped them of their honor. In Jesus' second status transformation ritual the narrator, however, turns this situation upside down: Jesus now was the one who was losing his honor, the one who lived outside or without the presence of the Patron. In Galilee he was honored by the crowd; during his second transformation ritual he was shamed by them. In Galilee he had power over society, now society had power over him. The narrator therefore uses Jesus' two rituals of status transformation to further highlight the opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark's story of Jesus.

6.6 ETIC READING OF MARK'S STORY OF JESUS: SUMMARY

The above etic interpretation of Mark's story of Jesus yielded the following results: Jesus' baptism in Mark 1:9-13 can be understood as a status transformation ritual, a ritual in which Jesus' status is transformed to that of being the broker of the presence and the new kingdom of God (Mk 1:15). The concept *kingdom of God* is used by the narrator of Mark as a symbol for the actual sphere of access to God's (the Patron's) saving presence, a sphere which is that of the household. Because of this, Jesus' brokerage of the kingdom can be understood in terms of his restoring of the household: By restoring the household, Jesus also restored/brokered the kingdom of God. The new household can thus be seen as a symbol of the kingdom. Kingdom and household go together: The kingdom is the household and the household is the kingdom.

To substantiate this argument, an analysis was done of Jesus' brokerage on Galilean soil (section 6.4). This analysis yielded the following results: The dominant setting and immediate cause for Jesus' exorcisms and other healings were that of household or kinship relationships. Almost every instance of Jesus' exorcisms and other healings in Mark have to do with transforming unclean people back to their proper functions in the context of kinship or household relations. The narrator of Mark, however, also uses Jesus' other healings to create a relationship between house and kingdom in the narrative (see especially the relationship between Mk 1:15 and Mk 6:12, as well as the interpretation of Mk 3:20-30 in section 6.4.6). The narrator also uses Jesus' exorcisms and other healings to depict him as having the authority to be the new broker of the kingdom (i.e., to make people part of this new household), and as having more authority than the scribes and Pharisees. As a consequence, Jesus also has

authority over the temple and society as a whole. As such, Jesus is pictured by the narrator as a 'ritual elder, who has the authority to transform the status of so-called ill people from being unaccepted in society to being accepted and welcomed in the new kingdom (section 6.4.5). This analysis made it possible to identify Jesus' main target, namely the expendables in society. To this we will return in section 7.2.

The way in which Jesus understood the organization and inner structure of this new household (and of the kingdom) became clear in the way he 'ate' (section 6.4.3), and the new household's relation to the outside world became clear from the way Jesus interpreted the purity rules of his day as advocated by the temple (section 6.4.2). The startling element of the way Jesus 'ate' was the principle of open commensality. His meals were inclusive; the place where 'nobodies' met and became somebodies in the kingdom. In terms of the food that was eaten and the seating arrangements at these meals, it was clear in the new household there is neither hierarchical status nor class. It was a situation of egalitarian commensality. Jesus' meals also symbolized the availability of the kingdom and the Patron. The sharing of food in an egalitarian situation where everyone was welcome thus symbolized something of the normal household of the extended family in everyday life: Reciprocal relations, solidarity, hospitality, humility and service. Jesus, therefore, not only understood the kingdom in terms of the new household, but the inner structure of this fictive household was also based on the characteristics of the normal household of the extended family known in his time. Jesus' meals, however, in a certain sense were not ceremonies, but *rituals*: By taking part, people were transformed from nobodies to members of the new household (see again section 6.4.3).

Because of the inclusivistic tendency of the new household Jesus interpreted the purity rules of his day negatively, since they were exclusivistic in tendency, divided the kingdom, and made the Patron unavailable. Because everyone was welcome in the new household, including the Gentiles, new and broader lines had to be drawn, lines which would make it possible for sinners, the possessed and the unclean to be also included. These new lines made the old ones obsolete, as well as the purity system of the temple (see again section 6.4.2). Jesus' interpretation of the purity laws was an indication of the new household's external relations with those on the 'outside': There were no 'fences' around the new household; it was open and available to all, especially because the broker and the patron had mercy (cf Mk 5:19; 6:34), and the broker's main aim was to make the Patron's saving presence available to all.

In this new household, Jesus also redefined the pivotal values of honor and shame, as well as the first-century individual's understanding of dyadic personality. In the new household, honor was not acquired by socially proper attitudes nor was behavior

perceived by others. Honor was not acquired by reproducing the ideals of society. Furthermore, honor was also not acquired by serving the temple's understanding of the boundaries and lines in society, but by serving the household in terms of equality, humility and hospitality. By doing this, honor was acquired from the Patron. The only way in which one could be shamed was by an action of the Patron, and this would only happen if someone in the new household was ashamed of the words and deeds of the broker. Hence, to be honored in terms of the socially defined rules of the temple was to be shamed by the new household. But to be honored in the new household was also to be honored by its Patron (see section 6.4.7). In terms of dyadic personality, Jesus asked for people to break with the belief in external control and external responsibility (section 6.4.8). Praise or blame for behavior was their own. They were no longer controlled from the outside, and responsibility related to personal choice.

Finally, Jesus also defined the new household's relationship with society. Members of the new household had to understand themselves as *healed healers*, they were people who knew what it meant to experience the saving presence, as well as the availability, of the Patron. They therefore also had to go, as did the broker, and make this new household available to others. They had to eat what was put before them and accept others by healing their illnesses and casting out demons/unclean spirits (section 6.4.4.4). They, however, also had to repent and ask others also to do the same (Mk 1:15; 6:12), because by repenting, one not only disallowed the purity rules to organize society, but also individuals: If one had repented, there was no possibility that he could be labelled unclean or being possessed (cf Mk 3:20-30). Rather, in the new household, one was free to experience the saving presence and availability of the Patron.

Jesus also redefined the common understanding of patron-client relationships in his day. Patron-client relationships were held together by reciprocity within a structure of great inequality between patron and client when it comes to resources and power (section 4.2.2). Because of this, patrons and brokers (who had resources and power) not only had many clients, but also amassed debt. Jesus, however, was a broker without any clients who owed him, the broker, something. Instead of reciprocity, Jesus asked of his followers to serve as he has been serving. They had to be healed healers, that is, give to others what they had received from the Patron via the broker. Jesus thus used his broker-client relationships to remedy the inadequacies of the social structure of his day, that is, to cushion the vagaries of life for social inferiors, the expendables. Jesus thus removed the power aspect from the patron-broker-client relationships in the new household. In the kingdom, social relations functioned on the basis of an equal status

as fictive kin in God's household, differences in resources notwithstanding. It was a radical departure from a situation in which wealth, status and power determined social relations (see Mk 10:41-45).

In regard to Jesus' brokerage in Jerusalem, it was argued that Jesus' temple action should be understood in terms of the narrative world of the Gospel, that is, in relation to his brokerage on Galilean soil (see section 6.5.1). Seen from this perspective, Jesus' action in the temple was not something 'new': It was exactly the same as what he has been doing in Galilee in the first part of the Gospel. The Pharisees replicated the temple to the bed and board of the Jew in Galilee. Jesus did just the opposite: *He replicated the house(hold) of Galilee in the temple in Jerusalem*. For the Markan Jesus, the temple was part of the kingdom, and because Jesus had the authority in the kingdom, he also had authority over the temple. And because the temple was part of the kingdom, it had to be like the household: Open to all, Gentiles included. The temple officials made the kingdom unavailable in the temple, and the Pharisees did the same on Galilean soil. Jesus, however, made it available in Galilee and in the temple. Understood as such, Jesus' temple action should be seen as an extension of his brokerage on Galilean soil. Jesus' temple action should therefore not be seen as a symbolic act which was intended to put an end to the temple, but to restore it to that what it was intended to be, namely to broker God's presence and availability to all. And to achieve that, Jesus replicated the new household of Galilee in the temple.

Jesus' arrest, trial[s] and crucifixion were the result of his restoration of the household on Galilean soil, as well as his restoration of the temple. In section 6.5.2 Jesus' arrest, trial[s] and crucifixion were analyzed as his second transformation ritual in Mark's story. In the prologue of the narrative, Jesus underwent a status transformation ritual and became the broker of the kingdom of the Patron. In brokering the Patron's presence to those in society who lost their honor, Jesus received honor. He was the new 'ritual elder' who transformed the status of expendables to the status of being part of the new household. By doing this, he dislodged the 'official' brokers of God's presence from their social space, and also stripped them of their honor. In Jesus' second status transformation ritual the narrator, however, turned this situation upside down: Jesus now was the one who was losing his honor, the one who lived outside or without the presence of the Patron. In Galilee he was honored by the crowd; during his second transformation ritual he was shamed by them. In Galilee he had power over society, now society had power over him. The narrator therefore uses Jesus' two rituals of status transformation to further highlight the opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem in Mark's story of Jesus.

¹ From this definition, it is clear Aristotle is of the opinion plot can be defined in terms of its *causality*. In this regard, he is supported by scholars like Scholes & Kellogg (1966:207), Kenney (1966:14), Muir (1968:177), Ricoeur (1980: 167), Vorster (1980a:126) and Senekal (1985:83). There are, however, literary scholars who define the concept plot differently: First, Forster (1927:121-134) and Friedman (1967a:154-156) surmise plot should be defined in terms of *characterization* (cf also Matera 1987b:235; see also Culpepper 1983:80 where he interprets Forster incorrectly in this regard). Second, scholars like Booth (1961a:126), Kermode (1966:167) and Crane (1967:144) see *time* as the constituent element of the plot. Third, the *emotional effect* which the plot has on the reader is seen by Dipple (1970:67), Abrams (1971:127) and Egan (1978:470) as the most important aspect which constitutes the plot. Finally, Chatman (1978: 43), Petersen (1980a:151-166) and Genette (1980:33-85) are of the opinion the study of plot should consist of the distinction between *story time* and *plotted time*, or, in terms of Russian Formalism, the distinction between *fabula* and *suzjet* (cf Tomahovsky (1965:67). See also Van Eck & Van Aarde (1989:779-782) for a more extensive study.

² It may be noticed this division is not the same used in chapter 5, namely Mark 1:1-15, Mark 1:16-10:54 and Mark 11:1-16:8. It must, however be remembered this division used in chapter 5 was made in relation to the narrator's ideological use of space on the topographical level of the text.

³ The choice for only concentrating on these two aspects of the beginning of Mark's gospel is a practical one, that is, a choice made in relation to the aim of this study. Many other important aspects of the beginning of Mark's narrative can be indicated. Standaert (1983:42), for example, asserts from a dramatic point of view, the prologue functions as a 'avant-jeu' which is formally separated from what follows and provides the reader with information unknown to the characters of the story. Hooker (1983:6), for example, understands Mark's prologue as follows: '[H]ere Mark is letting us into secrets which remain hidden, throughout most of the drama, from the great majority of the characters in the story'. Lane (1974:7) notes the prologue 'suggests the general plan of the work by anticipating the crucial points in history he relates'. Matera (1988:6-9) sees the three main aspects of the prologue as giving information to the reader regarding the relationship between Jesus and John the Baptist, the identity of Jesus as the Messiah, and the confrontation between Jesus and Satan. Finally, Waetjen (1989:63-74) uses Mark 1:2-3 to indicate not only Mark 1:1 can be seen as the title of the Gospel, but also to indicate '[t]he beginning determines the end, for the end is already present in the beginning' (Waetjen 1989:74).

⁴ In regard to Jesus being a carpenter (cf Mk 6:3), the narrator does not give the reader much information. From Mark 6:3, it can, however, be deduced that, according to his townsfolk in Nazareth (most probably Jesus' extended family), Jesus should be a carpenter, but now has wisdom and is doing deeds with great power which do not fit the role of a carpenter. From Mark's portrayal of Jesus' as previously being a carpenter, it can therefore also be deduced something must have happened, and because of this, Jesus was no longer able to fulfill the role of a carpenter. To this question we will return in section 7.3 when first-century Mediterranean society will be discussed as an example of an advanced agrarian society.

⁵ I prefer to translate *εἰς τὴν ἔρημον* in Mark 1:12 and 1:13 as 'a lonely place' and not as desert or wilderness. The reason for this choice is that the same word is also found in Mark 1:35; 6:31 and 35, and in each case it refers to a lonely place, a place where other people are not present. It is also not impossible that Mark uses the word as a symbol for loneliness.

⁶ Although not using a cross-cultural theory of rituals, Waetjen (1989:69) also interprets Jesus' baptism as a ritual of status transformation. By using the sociology of millennialism (as understood by Burrige 1969), Waetjen understands Jesus' baptism as an eschatological death. Wholly unobliged to the *status quo ante* (the pollution system of Jewish Palestinian society), Jesus arises from his baptism as God's new viceregent, the New Human Being, who will now inaugurate God's transformation of the world, and will reorder power in such a way that all injustice, exploitation and dispossession will be destroyed. Waetjen's understanding of Jesus' baptism also concurs with Alexander's understanding of a ritual, that rituals act as a form of protest against the existing social structure and contribute to social change (see Alexander 1991:1).

⁷ Regarding the relationship between Jesus and John the Baptist, Crossan (1991a:237) asserts that the Gospel of Thomas 78 and Q (Lk 7:24-26/Mt 11:7-9) attest that Jesus, in submitting himself to John's baptism, eventually must have also accepted John's apocalyptic expectation of the kingdom. However, according to Crossan (1991a:237-238), the Gospel of Thomas 46 and Q (Lk 7:28/Mt 11:11) can be seen as contradicting the above mentioned relationship between Jesus and John. On the grounds of the latter two texts he argues Jesus changed his view of John's mission and message, because he came to see himself as already being 'in the kingdom'. In this regard the point of view Hollenbach (1982a:203) is also worth mentioning here:

Jesus started his public life with as serious commitment to John, his message and his movement, and ... Jesus developed very soon his own distinctive message and movement which was very different from John's.

(Hollenbach 1982a:203)

⁸ The fact that the narrator of Mark is depicting Jesus as the broker of God's kingdom can also be detected from his usage of ἡγγικεν in Mark 1:15. The verb is in the perfect, a tense in Greek which refers to an *Aktionsart* of 'what happened in the past but continues to be of relevance for the present' (cf Kelber 1974:11). Also, in modern semantics, the *Aktionsart* of the perfect is seen as 'static', that is, it relates to a factual state of affairs. If this interpretation of ἡγγικεν is seen as correct, it can be deduced from Mark 1:15 the narrator is telling the reader that Jesus, because of the voice from Heaven, understood God was appointing him as his broker. The kingdom has thus already started, Jesus is 'in the kingdom' and now he must broker it to the house of Israel. It is also interesting that Mark 1:15 is a distinctively Markan statement, as it is reformulated in Matthew 4:17 and omitted by Luke (see Crossan 1991a:345).

⁹ This term is taken over from Crossan (1991a:225-416).

¹⁰ All three Synoptics refer to the episode where Jesus is asked about the commandment that should be seen as the most important (cf Mk 12:34; Mt 22:34-40; Lk 10:25-28). In all three instances, the question is asked by a scribe, and in Mark and Matthew Jesus, answers the question himself, while in Luke the scribe answers the question himself after a counter-question from Jesus. What is interesting, however, is the fact that only in Mark Jesus begins his answer by using the first part of the *Shema* (cf Mk 12:29). In section 4.9.1, it will be indicated that Jesus, by doing this, was reinterpreting the common understanding of the second great commandment of the Sadducees, scribes and Pharisees of his day.

¹¹ That the high priest was the person with the most influence in the temple can clearly be seen in Mark in that only when Jesus is brought before the council (Sanhedrin; see Mk 14:53-65), the high priest is referred to in the narrative. During Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin, it is the high priest who gets Jesus 'accused' after the other members of the Sanhedrin were not able to do so, and it is on the basis of his interpretation of Jesus' answer in Mk 14:62, the others decide to condemn Jesus as deserving the death. It is also the high priest's slave whose ear is cut off when Jesus is arrested (Mk 14:47), which indicates he knew of the plan of the priests, scribes and elders to kill Jesus. In using Lenski's social stratification of agrarian societies (see Lenski 1966:214-296), Duling (1991a:1-29) places the high priest among the ruling classes, the people who had the most power and privilege in first-century biblical Palestine. The high priest in Jesus' time most probably was Joseph Caiaphas.

¹² In following Lenski (1966:284), Saldarini (1988:41-42) and Fiensy (1991), Duling (1991a:1-29) is of the opinion religious leaders like the chief priests, the scribes and the elders can be seen as part of the *governing and retainer class*, retainers who served the needs of the ruler and the governing class. They consisted of perhaps five percent of the population and, in a certain sense, shared the life of the elite, but not in its direct power. As a group, they had great impact on society and cul-

ture, as can especially be seen in the trial[s] of Jesus. They gained the most power when the governing class ceased to be effective rulers, or, in the case of Palestine (and especially Jerusalem), they gained power because they had control over the temple. According to Saldarini (1988:154-155), this becomes clear when Mark tells the reader it is the chief priests who went to Pilate because they were the dominant group in Jerusalem, especially in dealing with the Romans and the larger political and social issues of the Jewish community. They objected to Jesus' large following among the crowds and their resultant loss of control over the community as a whole. Their concerns were mainly political and they were joined by the elders, probably the traditional leaders of the community who were senior members of prominent families, and by the scribes, who were recognized teachers in the community. This interpretation of the identified retainer class of Lenski by is used *inter alia* by scholars like Myers (1988:), Waetjen (1989:7-8), Crossan (1991a:44-46) and Fiensy (1991:156-170).

¹³ The sources regarding the Sadducees gives so little information that great care and restraint is needed in characterizing them (Saldarini 1988:298-308). Most treatments of the Sadducees and the first century assume that all the chief priests and the leaders in Jerusalem were Sadducees. However, Josephus does not say all Jewish leaders were Sadducees, but only that those who were Sadducees came from the governing class. Duling (1991a:1-29) is also of the opinion that only a few Sadducees were part of the ruling class, and the rest were part of the governing and retainer classes. This concurs with the point of view of Van Aarde ([1993]a:26-27): According to him, the Sadducees most probably were prosperous, part of the retainer class and sometimes also part of the governing class. Because of this, they can be portrayed as a voluntary group who, on the surface, stood for the maintenance of the *status quo*. On the subjacent level, however, they were a non-voluntary group who evolved out of the Hasmonean aristocratic families and, therefore, strived to keep the control of the temple and the Sanhedrin in the hands of the elite/aristocratic families. According to Josephus, the Sadducees were religiously conservative and rejected the believe in the afterlife as well as the new customs being developed by the Pharisees. They therefore wished to retain the status quo, as Jewish life was organized by the temple. The Sadducees occur only once in Mark (cf Mk 12:18). We have to suppose, in following Saldarini (1988:154), that they were part of the temple structure and were opposed to Jesus because his customs diverged from the traditional.

¹⁴ It is easy to discern the priestly aristocracy was controlled by the Roman governor, because Herod appointed high priests who would enhance his power or at least would not be a threat to it (Saldarini 1988:308). Herod also made them wealthy by granting them large parts of land (Fiensy 1991:160). From Mark we get the same impression, because the high priest had, according to the narrator, many servant-girls and slaves (cf Mk 14:47, 66).

¹⁵ When Mark refers to the council (Mk 14:53: 15:1), it should be supposed he refers to the Sanhedrin. According to Mark, the Sanhedrin consisted of the high priest, chief priests, the scribes and the elders (cf Mk 14:53: 15:1). In a recent study, McLaren (1991:188-225) has tried made a case that there never was an institution like the Sanhedrin. Crossan (1991a:367-390), however, is of the opinion that Jesus never was tried by the Sanhedrin.

¹⁶ The scribes must not be understood as cultic officials, but rather the official interpreters of the Mosaic law. According to Saldarini (1988:272-275), the title scribe covered many roles in society and was used for individuals in several social classes and contexts. In terms of biblical literature, scribes had an effect on wisdom writing and the Pentateuch. They did not seem to have formed a unified class or organization in the canonical gospels, though groups of scribes might be characterized as belonging to a given class and status, mainly the governing and retainer classes (see Duling 1991a:1-29). In Mark, they are associated with Jerusalem and the chief priests and as such can be seen as part of the governing and retainer classes. Because their teachings are referred to in an off-hand way suggests they were recognized as authoritative teachers of Jewish law and custom (cf Mk 1:22).

¹⁷ In his book *From politics to piety: The emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*, Neusner (1973) argues that the Pharisaic disillusionment with the Hasmoneans, and therefore with their definition of Israel as fundamentally a politically autonomous state, led them to appropriate the cultic code of scripture for the informal assembling of the faithful in the home or a gathered small group. Thereby, they transferred the code from sanctuary to the setting of table fellowship (see Neusner 1973a:45-96). This transition from being a political interest group to that of a religious interest group is described by Van Aarde ([1993]a:24-25; in following Neusner 1973:45-78;) as follows: The rule of Hyrcanus, Janneus and Salome Alexandra in the Hasmonean period (142-37 BCE) is portrayed by Josephus as a struggle for power between the governing and retainer classes. During the rule of Hyrcanus, the Pharisees strived for (political) power. During the rule of Salome Alexander, the Pharisees, in a certain sense, 'ruled' over the Jews. After the rule of Salome Alexander, however, they lost much of their power. According to Van Aarde, this portrayal of the Pharisees by Josephus fits agrarian society's accommodation of political groupings and social factions. The Pharisees are portrayed as being part of the retainer class in relation to the governing class. The governing class tended to select other groups in society which could serve their own rule the best, and in the time of Salome Alexandra, it was the Pharisees. During the Herodian period (40 BCE-70 CE), the Pharisees still played an important role, especially in regard to the Sanhedrin. At certain times they were loyal supporters of Herod, for example, Samaïas and Pollion, just before the fall of the temple in 70 CE. Later, however, they formed a coalition with Feroras and because of this, were hated by Herod. During this time, Josephus typifies the Pharisees as consisting of six thousand members. In the period after the fall of the temple, Josephus refers to the Pharisees especially in regard to incidents during which the Pharisees would not accept gifts from the ruler of the day. From this it can

be deduced that during the time after the fall of the temple the chief priests, some elites and also the Pharisees most probably were part of the governing class. As a group, the Pharisees, however, still did not have any real political power. According to Neusner (1973a:3-12, 45-80), the dominant features of the Pharisees were the following: 1) The Pharisees were a sect of pious laymen who sought to extend into the day-to-day living of ordinary Jews the concerns of ritual purity usually associated only with priests and the temple; 2) The Pharisees were especially known for their ritual purity rules which organized and classified times, persons and things. It was integral to their sense of separateness to know or to determine what is permissible or proscribed, clean or unclean; 3) Pharisaic purity concerns were especially focused on agricultural rules which specified not only what one may eat, but also out of which dish or vessel and with whom; and 4) Pharisees developed traditions which either clarified and specified the Old Testament laws or which amplified the law's principles, making them applicable to new situations. Their tradition extended a fence around the law (see Neusner 1973a:3-12, 45-80). According to Saldarini (1988:282-285), the Pharisees probably sought a new, communal commitment to a strict Jewish way of life based on adherence to the covenant. By doing this, they sought to capitalize on popular sentiment for rededication to or reform of Israel. The Pharisees also should not be seen as a simple group with a limited, concrete goal, but a long lasting, well connected and voluntary corporate organization which sought to influence Jewish society and entered into many mutual relationships to accomplish their aims. Seen as such, they can be typified as forming part of the retainer class.

¹⁸ In section 5.2.4.2.2, it was indicated that the narrator, with his ideological perspective on the topographical level of the text, is contrasting house and synagogue in the Galilean-section of the narrative (Mk 1:16-8:26). From what has been said above it is clear the synagogue can be seen as an extension of the temple on Galilean soil. It is because of this then that house and synagogue are opposed in the Galilean-section of the narrative. In a certain sense, therefore, this opposition can also be seen as an opposition between Galilee and Jerusalem and house and temple. The specific relationship between house and synagogue will be elaborated on in section 6.4.

¹⁹ When it is taken in consideration that of the pericopes mentioned, Mark 1:35-39 refers to a summary of Jesus' activities in Galilee, Mark 4:1-45 is the so-called parable-discourse and Mark 6:14-29 refers to the death of John the Baptist, the pericopes in the Galilean-section of the Gospel which do not relate in one way or another to purity are only five in total.

²⁰ The important place of exorcisms in the structure of Mark's narrative could be taken as evidence of its centrality in the practice of Jesus (Myers 1992:3). It occurs in virtually every generic or summary description of Jesus' ministry in Mark. Also, the two 'inaugural' healing acts of Jesus in Mark's two cycles of ministry on Jewish and Gentile turf are exorcisms (Mk 1:21-29 and Mk 5:1-20). Furthermore, Jesus' first parable (Mk 3:23-29) concerns the practice of exorcism, as does his last healing act (Mk 9:14-29).

²¹ Peasants in first-century Palestine indeed were economically exploited (see Horsley & Hanson 1985:52-63; Oakman 1986:57-77). The primary obligation of the Jewish peasantry were the traditional tithes (Horsley and Hanson 1985:53) to which they themselves added the bringing of the first fruits of each year's harvest (Horsley & Hanson 1985:54). Under the Persian and Hellenistic rule the whole society also had to pay a certain amount of tribute to the imperial administration. It is probable this was raised by taxation in addition to the basic tithes and sacrifices. Under the Seleucids, the total tribute was one third of the grain and half of the wine and oil (Horsley & Hanson 1985: 54). Under the Romans, the Roman tribute was superimposed on the tithes and other taxes owed to the temple and priesthood. According to Horsley & Hanson (1985:56), the peasants were now subjected to a double taxation, probably amounting to over forty percent of their production. Oakman (1986: 72) pictures an even darker picture. According to him, the peasants had to pay taxes, except for the tithes and tribute to Rome, to Herod and the procurators also, as well as rent to the large landowners. When one adds these taxes to other social expenditures and the replacement fund (the grain the peasants had to keep for the following year's harvest), it only left them with one-fifth of their initial harvest (Oakman 1986:72). In terms of this sketched situation, it thus clear the peasantry, and therefore especially those on Galilean soil, were exploited economically to a large extent.

²² See again endnote 36, chapter 4.

²³ Palestine under Herod was seen by the Romans as *ager publicus populi Romani*, property of the Roman state and fully 'available' for intensive exploitation (Oakman 1986:67). Although the Romans, in a certain sense, respected the Jewish landed arrangements and recognized Jewish views on patrimony, exploitation and expropriation was the order of the day. Large amounts of lands were bought and leased for personal income as well as for the maintenance of the Roman military expeditions. Also Theissen (1978a:33-77) is of the opinion that the situation of Palestine in the first century was that of oppressive 'colonialism'.

²⁴ Regarding this, Crossan (1991a:305) makes the following remark:

[M]agic (i.e. exorcism or healing — EvE) is to religion as banditry is to politics. As banditry challenges the ultimate legitimacy of political power, so magic challenges that of spiritual power.

(Crossan 1991a:305)

This means Jesus, especially when he exorcised demons/unclean spirits in the synagogue (e.g. Mk 1:21-28), challenged not only the religious authority of the scribes, but also that of the temple.

25 Except for the role Pilate plays in the crucifixion of Jesus, the only other two instances where the Romans are mentioned in the Gospel is in Mark 3:6 and Mark 6:14-29. In the case of the latter, John the Baptist is the main focal point of the passage. In the case of Mark 3:6, the Herodians are mentioned in planning to kill Jesus, a plan, however, which does not realize itself in the Gospel. Because of this, I argue that in the narrative world of Mark, Roman politics do not play a big role.

26 In this regard it can be noted that of the four pericopes in Mark that deals directly with an exorcism of Jesus, namely Mark 1:21-28, 5:1-20, 7:24-30 and 9:17-29, it is only in Mark 1:21-28 and 5:1-20 in which the demon(s) address Jesus directly.

27 When one looks at the way in which these questions are answered by Crossan himself (see Crossan 1991a:303-355), it is clear he answers them all positively, although he seems to be tentative in drawing final conclusions. I am, however, of the opinion that when the narrative of Mark is looked at from a narratological point of view, these questions can be answered very positively. In a previous article, Van Aarde and I (by using the insight of Tannehill) indicated in the plot of Mark two lines of action, namely that of the Jesus-mission and that of the disciple mission (see Van Eck & Van Aarde 1989:782-787). Tannehill (1980:60-62) describes these two narrative lines in Mark as follows:

The Gospel of Mark is the story of the commission that Jesus received of God and what Jesus has done (and will do) to fulfill his commission (as broker of the kingdom — EvE) Although Jesus' commission is central in Mark, many other commissions and tasks are suggested In 1:16-20 Jesus calls four fishermen to follow Him. This establishes the disciples' commission and start a sequence of events.

(Tannehill 1980:60-62)

Understood as such, a narratological reading of the text makes it clear what Crossan is suggesting, is indeed the case. In section 5.2.4.2.1.3, it was also indicated in 'the way'-section of the narrative (Mk 8:27-10:52), the narrator depicts Jesus as trying to make his disciples understand what he did in Galilee they also must do in the future, namely to follow him although it may bring suffering. This aspect of Mark will also be attended to in more detail in section 6.4.9.1.

28 The fact that Jesus, in Mark 6:7-13, orders the disciples to go and heal as he has healed is clear when Mark 6:13 and 8:22 are taken into consideration: In Mark 8:22 Jesus uses saliva as a healing medium, and in Mark 6:13, the disciples use oil (see Crossan 1991a:344).

29 One should, therefore, be cautious to not understand the concept of repentance in Mark anachronistically as referring to the modern concept of repenting, that is, repenting as the confessing of individual and personal sin like stealing, adultery and the like. In the first-century Mediterranean world, one was labelled as a sinner when one was perceived as a deviant, that is, when one

constantly transgressed the maps and boundaries of purity. The reference to repentance in Mark 1:15 and 6:12 thus clearly relates to an attitude where one does not allow the purity laws to be the norm from which society is to be interpreted and organized. According to Mark, repentance therefore, means a refusal to accept the purity laws as the main organizational factor in society.

³⁰ For other studies in Mark that read Jesus' healings as status transformation rituals, see inter alia Schersten LaHurd (1990:154-160) for the analysis of Mark 5:1-20.

³¹ In regard to rituals, it will also be very interesting to look at Jesus' relationship with his disciples in Mark as a ritual of status transformation. Because such a study is not our main point of interest here, only a few remarks regarding this will be made here. In terms of the ritual process, the disciples' separation would be their calling to follow Jesus (Mk 1:15-20; 2:13-14; 3:13-19). Their state of liminality-communitas will especially be Jesus' teachings in Mark 4, as well as his exorcisms and healings. Their aggregation will be Mark 6:7-13, but also Mark 6:35-44 and 8:1-10, and for that matter, Mark 8:27-14:50. If one, however, understands the relationship between Mark 14:28, Mark 16:7 and Mark 13 from a narratological point of view (see Van Eck 1984, 1988, 1990, 1991b), it will be possible to indicate Jesus succeeded as ritual elder to make them follow him the way he wanted.

³² The phrase, ἀμὴν λέγων ὑμῖν, used by Jesus in Mark 3:28, was a typical phrase of honor in the first-century Mediterranean world (May 1987:84). By using this phrase, Jesus is thus referring to himself as having more honor than the scribes. This phrase is also used by Jesus in Mark 8:12; 9:1, 41; 10:15, 29; 11:23; 12:43 and Mark 14:9, 18, 25 and 30.

³³ My interpretation of the meaning of Mark 3:21 is, therefore, in opposite to that of Bowman (1965:126) and Lane (1974:139). According to the latter, Jesus' family wanted to restrain him for his own good, and, according to Lane (1974:139), Jesus' family came to get him because they received reports he failed to care for his needs. These are but two examples which indicate the disadvantage of not reading biblical texts with the aid of cross-cultural theories.

³⁴ In this regard it is interesting that in the 'way'-section of the narrative we find two healings of Jesus: The healing of a boy with an unclean spirit (Mk 9:14-29) and the healing of the blind Bartimaeus (Mk 10:46-52). In the case of the first, the boy can not speak, and in the case of the latter the man can not see. The narrator probably uses these two healings as a metaphor in terms of the disciples' inability to speak in the right manner of the kingdom, and their inability to see what Jesus is trying to teach them about the new household.

³⁵ According to Sanders (1985:69), Jesus would have attacked the temple hierarchy directly if his temple action was in protest to the way the temple officials were running the temple. He, however, can find nothing in Jesus' action outside and inside the temple in Mark 11:15-19 which gives any indication Jesus' temple action was leveled at the temple officials.

³⁶ Judas the Galilean attacked Sepphoris in 4 BCE, seizing arms and other possessions, and then went on to attack the rich among the elite Jewish families (see Horsley & Hanson 1985:111-114; Crossan 1991a:199-200). Judas was also seen by his followers, who were mainly peasants, as a charismatic king (Horsley & Hanson 1985:114).

³⁷ In this regard I agree with Sanders (1985:68) that, if Jesus' temple action was dictated by an anti-cultic attitude on his part, he would have selected a place more directly connected with the preparation of the sacrifices, or even the Priests' Court, for his action.

³⁸ According to Sanders (1985:68), Jesus did not seem to have made a definite gesture in favor of including Gentiles as people who must have access to the temple when he acted in the temple. Here, I would like to disagree with Sanders: Our analysis of the way Jesus ate on Galilean soil (see section 6.4.3) clearly indicated that according to Jesus, Gentiles were also welcome to be part of the kingdom. Also, when one takes into account Jesus' teaching in the temple ('[m]y house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations'; Mk 11:17), it is clear one of his main concerns indeed was the inclusion of the Gentiles in the kingdom, and consequently, that they should also have access to the temple.

³⁹ This interpretation of Sanders (1985:72), regarding the eschatological aspect of the kingdom, concurs with that of Vorster (1991a:52; 1991b:531-534). According to Vorster (1991a:52), the kingdom of God in Mark should be seen as a metaphor for the apocalyptic manner in which God will rule in the future. Jesus was probably an eschatological prophet, who proclaimed the imminent coming of the kingdom (cf also Hengel 1981:63-83). See also Vorster (1991b:531-534) for a concise and clear presentation of the development of the concept kingdom of God from Weiss through to Schweitzer and Dodd.

⁴⁰ Myth is used here by Perrin (1976:29-33) in the way it is articulated by Eliade (1963:19-20). According to Eliade, myths are stories about the other reality and its relationship to this one. In the modern world, Eliade argues, we tend to contrast myth and reality (Eliade 1963:19). We should rather, according to him, understand myth as the way one speaks about reality, about that which is 'most real', namely the 'other world' (Eliade 1963:20).

⁴¹ In section 3.3.6, I have argued that, in terms of the sociology of knowledge's distinction between the symbolic and the social universe, the social universe can be seen as the result of a certain reflection on the symbolic universe. Understood as such, it was argued that myths or

symbols can be seen as the language counterpart of inter alia the symbolic universe. Or, in the words of Perrin: A symbol points to a particular way of seeing and relating to Reality mediated by myth (Perrin 1976:32). If this Reality is God, it would mean Jesus' understanding of the kingdom of God can be seen as a specific understanding of God himself, the Patron for whom Jesus was the broker.

⁴² In this regard it is also important to remember that first-century Mediterranean persons; on the one hand, emphasized *doing* over being, and, on the other hand, were primarily orientated towards the *present* time. The first-century Mediterranean person, therefore, most probably would have understood a concept like the kingdom of God as a present reality.

⁴³ This is especially clear from Mark 11:1-11 where the narrator describes Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem. In a certain sense, the honor Jesus received when he entered Jerusalem can be seen as a result of his words and deeds in Galilee. Note also the narrator depicts Jesus as immediately going to the temple to inspect it. This also, according to my opinion, indicates that the narrator pictures Jesus as having the authority to do so.

⁴⁴ The crowds that followed Jesus in Galilee, and the crowds that followed him into and in Jerusalem should not necessarily be seen as the same people. However, it should be remembered that the narrator treats the crowds in Galilee, and those in Jerusalem, as the same character in the narrative.