

MIECZYŚLAW MIKOŁAJCZAK
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza
Wydział Teologiczny

On Pilgrimages to the Temple. The Theology of Mark 11-13

O pielgrzymowaniu do świątyni. Teologia MK 11-13

The Gospel according to St. Mark is an echo of the early Kerygma least influenced by subsequent interpretations. The original Gospel preaching of Jesus Christ has been enriched only with the reminiscences of Peter – the eye witness and observer of Jesus deeds and words, which seems to promise a rather unelaborated theology¹.

The Gospel according to St. Mark does not present a fully homogeneous theology. For obvious reasons, evangelical theology will always have the person of Jesus Christ, i. e. his evangelical image, in its centre. Looking closer at the story of evangelical Jesus, His *verba et gesta*, we notice a very significant and interesting theme of the theology of the temple in the Gospel according to St. Mark.

The theme, I admit, is not evident right away and perhaps not easy to be noticed in the content of St. Mark's evangelical account from chapter 11². The *house of God* (Mk 2,26) mentioned in the pericope on *plucking the ears of corn* (Mk 2,23-28) refers rather to a question of the sanctity of the Sabbath³. So it does not address directly and primarily the relationship between Jesus and his community, i. e. the disciples and the Temple. The evangelist presents this relation only in the final chapters of his account – from Mk 11 – *the activity of Jesus in Jerusalem* (Mk 11,1-13,37) till *the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* (Mk 14,1-16,20).

¹ S. Gądecki, *Wstęp do ewangelii synoptycznych*, Gniezno 1992, p. 44.

² I mean that the theme of the Temple is not noticeable for the reader right from the beginning of the second synoptic Gospel.

³ Cf. H.H. Langkammer, *Ewangelia według św. Marka. Tłumaczenie, wstęp i komentarz*, Lublin 1997, p. 40.

1. PILGRIMAGES TO JERUSALEM ACCORDING TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

According to Deut. 16,16 every Jewish male was obliged to make a pilgrimage to the Temple three times a year: for the Feast of Unleavened Bread, the Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Tabernacles. On these days appointed by the Law tens of thousands of pilgrims would gather in the Temple. But realization of this duty was quite arduous for the Israelites. It is hardly conceivable that every Jew was able to observe so onerous a commandment. In my opinion this obligation was too difficult to fulfil for the faithful.

When we study the theme of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem up till the New Testament times⁴ we notice that the commandment to make pilgrimages for the Feasts of Unleavened Bread, Weeks and Tabernacles was not observed very strictly. The commandment itself was considered as rather vague. By „vagueness” I mean that though it was obviously a very important Jewish practice which boosted up their religious and cultic vital forces and gave them hope. But in the physical sense the pilgrimage was seen as an imposed duty and treated as a cumbersome obligation. The commandment of going on a pilgrimage to the Temple three times a year in a very strict and ascetic sense was only fulfilled by people desiring special spiritual growth. There are certain biblical characters who went to Jerusalem once a year or even once in several years only. We know e. g. that it was a custom of Maria and Joseph to go once a year to the Jerusalem Temple in accordance with the Law (Lk 2,41). And there is no doubt whatsoever that they have been presented by St. Luke as good and godly Jews, faithful followers of JHWH observing His Law (Lk 2,41).

But even if we agree that this was the state of affairs concerning the duty of going on pilgrimages, that for many followers of JHWH it was impossible to fulfil the commandment of Deut. 16,16, I still believe that we can use the lexeme *the Jew* interchangeably with the phrase *the one who makes a pilgrimage to the Temple in Jerusalem*. Because for every follower of God – JHWH the Temple in Jerusalem had always been the holiest place in the world, in particular for those living in exile (Babylonian captivity), i. e. in a foreign land even after the Temple had been demolished⁵.

This spiritual tie with the Jerusalem Temple had its roots in the history of the Chosen People. It was King David who made Jerusalem the depositary of the ancient Jewish tradition. He brought the Arc of Covenant back to the capital of Israel. David also received a prophecy from God JHWH by the prophet Nathan.

⁴ Especially in Josephus Flavius, the New Testament and the apocrypha.

⁵ I am sure that this longing for the Temple in Jerusalem can still be seen and felt among the Jews nowadays.

We find it in the Second Book of Samuel (2Sam. 7,14ff). On behalf of God JHWH Nathan promised David that his dynasty would endure forever. The Second Book of Samuel is devoted to the idea of establishing a kingdom in Israel. The earlier Book of Judges presents a bleak situation of the Chosen People. We read: *In those days [there was] no king in Israel: every man did [that which was] right in his own eyes* (Judg. 21,25). The first king did not meet the expectations of God so his dynasty could not remain. The prophet Nathan describes the future kingdom without end and he presents his prophecy after David has decided to build the temple for JHWH. It ill befits for the king to live in a palace and God – JHWH to reside in a tent (as was the case during their wandering in the wilderness). David discusses his plans of building the temple with Nathan. According to the account of the First Book of Chronicles it was Nathan who wrote down the history of David and it probably became the source of the two books of Samuel. So the prophecy is also confirmed as historically credible.

God – JHWH rejects David's plans to build him a temple. David cannot build the temple because he has shed too much blood. It is the will of God for Solomon to erect the temple (2Sam. 7,13; 1Chron. 17,12;22,7-8). God himself will build an everlasting home (*bajit*) for David (2Sam. 7,12-16). There are three accounts of the Nathan's prophecy: one in 2Sam. as well as 1Chron. 17 and Ps. 89. Of the three the first one (2Sam. 7,12-16) is the earliest. The Chronicler and the Psalmist expand on the subject theologically.

The ties of the Temple and the city with the family of David, Messianic prophecies as well as the fact that Jerusalem was the political capital of the nation have made the Temple a place of higher importance than other sanctuaries. Also the subsequent religious reforms directed not only against pagan cults but also against smaller sanctuaries of God – JHWH decided about the centralization of the religious cult in Jerusalem. The fall of Jerusalem after the siege of Nebuchadnezzar, destruction of the Temple, the cessation of the two kingdoms and the exile did not weaken the position of Jerusalem and the Temple as the centre of Israel but reinforced it. The Jews in exile and in the Diaspora would always turn in prayer towards the land of their fathers, the holy city and the sanctuary (1Kings. 8,47b-49).

It proves the fact that the Jerusalem Temple was gradually being presented as the representation of cosmogony and cosmology. Jerusalem was established by God as the very centre of the nations (Ezek. 5,5). This representation is especially characteristic of the rabbinic literature. For example the *Kelim Mishnah* treatise enumerates ten levels of holiness which start with „all lands“⁶ and get gradually narrower until we come to Jerusalem, then to the Temple and finally to

⁶ Except the territory of Israel.

the Holy of Holies. Another treatise, *Midrash Tahumah* teaches that the creation of the world began with the formation of a rock. Then the temple was raised on that rock. Thus it is the geographical centre of the world and the cosmogonic beginning⁷. From a different text we learn that the Creator JHWH upholds the world through the Jerusalem Temple. The Jewish sanctuary is the heart of the whole world and a sign of God's presence in this world⁸.

In this context we should also mention the *Temple Scroll* which presents a view similar to the one presented above and comes from the Qumran community (so from the New Testament times). It describes the concentric architecture of the courts of the Jerusalem sanctuary which was reconstructed by Herod the Great. Each successive court is gradually holier until we come to the Holy Place and finally to the Holy of Holiest. So for the Jews this would be the place where everything had its beginning and from where everything is being upheld. Consequently, this is the holiest place in the world and its centre. And every Jew heads towards that place – the Jerusalem Temple – as a pilgrim.

That is why Jerusalem was the very heart of the religious life of Israel. Nowadays the site where the Temple used to stand reminds of a huge terrace in a shape of irregular trapezium (which measures 491 m along the west, 462 m along the east, 281 m along the south, 310 m along the north). Only the external walls remain of the former Jewish temple. Today it is called *Haram ash Sharif – the Noble Place*. In the past the place was known as Mount Moriah. According to Jewish tradition it was a mount sanctified by the unfulfilled Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22,2.12; 2Chron. 3,1).

Four thousand years ago a patriarch of the Chosen People, Abraham, travelled along the road from Hebron with his son Isaac. He was accompanied by his servants who lead a donkey with a load of wood on its back. They descended into the Kidron Valley leaving behind Urushalim populated by the Canaanites. And it was there, on the Noble Place, that Abraham was about to sacrifice his son Isaac (Gen. 22,9-10). But God did not desire a bloody human sacrifice. He only tested Abraham's faith and presented His will written down later in the Torah (Lev. 8,21).

At the time when the Chosen People settled down in Canaan and King David subdued Jerusalem Mount Moriah belonged to Araunah, a Jebusite. He built a threshing-floor on the top of the mountain. And it would have remained a threshing – floor, if it weren't for David's vision at the time of plague which was decimating his people. On Mount Moriah David saw an angel raising his hand over Jerusalem to kill its inhabitants. But God stopped the angel. Advised by the prophet Gad

⁷ Cf. Tanhuma, Qedoshim, 10.

⁸ Cf. Zohar, Shlach Lecha, III 161b.

David bought Araunah's threshing-floor *and David built there an altar unto the Lord, and offered burnt offerings and peace offerings. So the Lord was intreated for the land, and the plague was stayed from Israel* (2Sam. 24,25). David planned to build a temple on the Araunah's threshing – floor but finally it was built by his son, Solomon. He ruled over many lands and wanted to bring them together not only by a uniform administration but also by a centralized cult of God.

The first Temple in Jerusalem was a huge building, ca. 1500 m in perimeter. The Temple's measurements, objects, ornaments and furnishings had a very important symbolic meaning. A catechism of the Old Testament was hidden in it, recognizable even for people who did not know the Scripture.

The second Temple built by Zerubbabel after the destruction of the first one in 587/86 B.C. was erected according to the same design. The third Temple of Herod the Great was even more grandiose than the second one.

Except for the remnants of the walls and rocks riddled with holes there are no traces left of the three Temples. The Solomon's edifice must have been magnificent. In the Bible we find detailed descriptions of the process of Temple building and of Temple furnishings (1Kings 6,1-38; 2Chron. 3,1-17; Ezek. 40-42;46,19-24) as well as the ritual of bringing the Arc of Covenant in (2Chron. 5,1-10). Recent archaeological excavations prove how precisely biblical and extrabiblical sources depict this exceptional ancient sanctuary.

Since the third millenium B.C. ancient temples had been considered to be *houses of deity* and consequently they were designed like human abodes. This belief of the ancient East peoples also influenced the shape of the Solomon's Temple. It was not a palace chapel but a true *House of the Lord*. Even God respected this kind of thinking by revealing the exact plans of His House to David (1Chron. 28,11ff).

As I have mentioned earlier King David started gathering building materials for the Jerusalem Temple. His contacts with the Sidonians and Tyrians indicate that he drew on their experience in building. Solomon continued his father's plan employing Fenician workers who were considered best in the Semitic world (2Chron. 2,1-17).

Construction of the first Temple on Mount Moriah lasted seven years. Thousands of workers took part in its building. It had been decided that the central part of the Temple – the altar – was to be placed on the very rock on which Abraham was supposed to sacrifice his son Isaac. After seven years of intensive work the new Temple rose up over Jerusalem. From the east it was supported by the walls on the steep slopes of the Kidron Valley and from the west it leaned on gentle hillocks of the Tyropoeon Valley. The Temple formed a self-contained whole with the king's palace which joined the city on the south. This magnificent Temple was – as it has been already mentioned – destroyed in 587/586 B.C.

After returning from the Babylonian captivity the Jewish people decided to erect a new temple. It was erected on the ruins of the Solomon's Temple. Construction began under the supervision of Zerubbabel and the high priest Joshua in 520 B.C. (Ezra 4,3). The Temple was finished in four years and in 515 B.C. it was consecrated.

This new Temple was called the Zerubbabel's Temple. The Scripture mentions the building of the Temple quite often (Ezra 3,10;4,5.24; Neh. 3,30; 1Macc. 4,38.48;6,7). The Zerubbabel's Temple was stripped of its riches and holy objects by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (1Macc. 1,23.57) and then by Antiochus V Eupator. Premature death of Alcimus prevented him from a similar devastation of the Temple (1Macc 9,54ff;12,36)⁹.

Herod the Great undertook the task of rebuilding the Zerubbabel's Temple. He did it because he wanted to immortalize his name and win over the Jews. The Bible seldom mentions it but there is more on the subject in Josephus Flavius¹⁰ and *Nishna* in the *Middoth* tractate.

The Jerusalem Temple consisted of two parts. One of them was a spacious court accessible to everyone. The second part was a sanctuary open only to the Jews (Acts 21,28). The former was called the Court of the Gentiles and it resembled a common public square. It was surrounded with porticos. To the east of the court there was the Portico of Solomon (Jn. 10,23). The columns in the portico were 11 m high. People could walk there (Matt. 26,55; Jn. 7,14). Sacrificial animals could be purchased there (Mk 11,15) and money could be exchanged for the Jewish coins indispensable for the payment of the Temple tax. From the centre of the court through the Gate Beautiful (Acts 3,2) one would enter the Court of the Women which had a shape of a square with the sides of 65 m each. This is where were the Temple collecting boxes stood (Mk 12,41), near the treasury. Then there was the Court of the Israelites devoted exclusively for men. It surrounded the Court of the Priests. In the centre of the Court of Priests there was an altar for burnt offerings. Inside the Temple building there were two rooms; the first one was called the Holy place (Lk 1,9) with the incense altar, the golden candlestick and the table with shrewd bread; the second one was the Holy of Holiest. Separated with a double curtain from the Holy place, it was empty in the time of Jesus (Hebr. 9,3).

When we study the history of the Temple in Jerusalem we notice that it was not a common temple like many other in the pagan world. It was a unique place; a place where God would meet with a man, where every object and measurement had its peculiar meaning.

⁹ Cf. Józef Flawiusz, *Starożytności żydowskie*, 13,5.11.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 15,11,1-7.

2. PILGRIMAGE TO THE TEMPLE – ACCOUNTS IN THE FOUR GOSPELS

According to synoptic accounts Jesus visited Jerusalem only once, i. e. after three years of his public activity. Since the moment of his baptism in the Jordan River he was planning to culminate his Messianic ministry in the Holy City. From the John's narrative we can infer that Jesus visited Jerusalem more than once. Numerous scientific commentaries, especially the commentaries to the synoptic Gospels unanimously agree that the chronological and historical criteria of the synoptic authors are less probable than the account of the fourth Gospel.

In my opinion the synoptic authors expounded their own structure of the Gospel account. I would call this formal editing a *synoptic reduction of the public life of Jesus*. They presented the life of Jesus as one long journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. I believe that there is still plenty to be discovered and researched in the synoptic narratives in this respect. Modern exegesis can be carried out comprehensively – of the whole synoptic account or it can be narrowed down – as in the present monograph – to one aspect only (i.e. the theology of the temple in the Gospel of Mark).

In our research we can make a theoretical assumption that synoptic narrative is the result of two traditions: a Galilean one focused on the preaching of the Kingdom of God and the Jerusalem one, presenting the drama of the Passion of Jesus since its first announcement. But the sequence Galilee – Jerusalem is probably neither a literary device nor a historical testimony but a result of the theological – catechetical stylization. The binominal Galilee – Jerusalem succinctly presents the beginnings and the dramatic ending of the mission of King Jesus, the Messiah. I have already pointed out in my earlier research on the theology of the temple in the two works of Luke that this polarity can be found in several speeches especially in Acts 10,37-39. So it is possible that here we come across some old, traditional catechetical formula. It can be also said that it has inspired the general structure of the synoptic Gospels.

So the journey of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem has been presented in a form of a cultic act – a pilgrimage. In the canonical texts of four Gospels I have noticed the following verb form: ἀναβαίνω¹¹.

3. THE PILGRIMAGE OF JESUS TO JERUSALEM AND THE TEMPLE IN MK 11-13

Analysing Mark's evangelical account of the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem and the Temple I have come to a conclusion that before the seventh chapter

¹¹ It is a technical verb denoting the road to Jerusalem and the Temple which occurs in the second Gospel and is not rarer there than in other synoptic Gospels or in St. John's.

of the second Gospel it was Jerusalem that made pilgrimages to Jesus. St. Mark presents Jesus' mission as fairly successful (Mk 3,7-8). The evangelist mentions that the populace accepted Jesus' teachings and put great trust in him. So much so that we read about crowds of people coming to him from different places, also from Jerusalem (Mk 3,7b-8)¹².

It is worth stressing that even the Scribes were coming to Jesus. They did not have convincing evidence to negate Jesus' rule over demons, so perversely they claimed that Jesus was given his power by Beelzebub (Mk 3,22)¹³. It is also interesting that the Scribes and the Pharisees also criticised the disciples of Jesus who allegedly opposed the tradition and heritage of their forefathers. These Scribes and Pharisees were not the local religious leaders but came from Jerusalem, the heart of orthodoxy (Mk 7,1)¹⁴.

So in the first part of the second Gospel it was Jerusalem that was coming to Jesus but from chapter 10 Jesus starts his journey towards the holy city – the capital of Israel (Mk 10,32-34). Jerusalem is still the seat of Judaism and of the religious leaders. They will soon start opposing Jesus not only in words but will translate their words into action and reveal their deep hatred towards the Messiah. Finally they will have him killed, first inflicting suffering on him. The disciples of Jesus, though they had been forewarned of the need of his suffering, perhaps overwhelmed with fear and anxiety, seemed to lag behind Jesus. But Jesus leads them with determination. The time is coming near when Jerusalem will become the city of suffering of the Son of Man – Jesus, the King and Messiah. This is how Mark depicts the last stage of Jesus' pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the Temple – in very a dynamic and expressive way. Carrying out orders of their Master the disciples do not think of what is going to happen in Jerusalem.

In Mk 11,1 the author of the second Gospel describes the moment when Jesus and his disciples see the city for the first time. Jesus gives them orders to prepare a procession which will lead him into the city among joyous messianic proclamations.

According to Mark's narrative Jerusalem reacts with indifference to the coming and activity of Jesus. The inhabitants of Jerusalem are not moved by the coming of their King and Messiah¹⁵. Only the people accompanying him in a procession applaud loudly, expressing their joy of the fact that Jesus enters the city.

¹² Cf. H.H. Langkammer, *Ewangelia według św. Marka. Tłumaczenie, wstęp i komentarz*, Lublin 1997, pp. 41-43; cf. also: Matt. 4,23-25;12,15ff; Lk 6,17-19.

¹³ Cf. also: Matt. 12,24-29.31ff; Lk 11,15-22.28-29;12,10.

¹⁴ Cf. H.H. Langkammer, *Ewangelia według św. Marka*, p. 74; cf. also Mk 15,1-9.

¹⁵ According to Matthew the whole city has been shaken and asking questions about the identity of Jesus. The crowds recognized him as a prophet coming from Nazareth in Galilee (Matt. 21,10-11); cf. also Lk 19,29-40; Jn. 12,12-19.

When we look at the account of St. Mark from a slightly different perspective it seems that he is not interested in the city as such. Some of the verses of the eleventh chapter testify to that. Jerusalem is mentioned only in connection with the Temple (Mk 11,11). So probably his intention was to present Jerusalem as subordinate to the Temple. In my opinion in the Gospel according to St. Mark there are two fulfilments of place and time. The evangelist does not present Jerusalem and the Temple as two synonyms to be used interchangeably but intends to indicate progress. I have noticed that St. Mark uses the second object, i. e. the Temple as more important or even the most important. It specifies the first. And that is why St. Mark speaks more often of coming up to the Temple and not so much of coming up to Jerusalem. Later Jesus leaves the Temple and does not go to any other place in the city but leaves it¹⁶.

St. Mark does not present Jesus as someone despising the city and scolding it even though Jesus expresses sorrow and weeps over the city¹⁷ or asks with reproach why it kills its prophets and emissaries of God¹⁸.

Analysing the text of the Mark's Gospel and the chapters about Jesus' activity after his coming to Jerusalem in particular we notice that the capital, its inhabitants and even other holy places outside the Temple are not important to St. Mark. Generally speaking the Temple is most important and the city plays a secondary role of the background.

St. Mark mentions Jerusalem for the last time in the context of events after the death of Jesus (Mk 20,41)¹⁹. The evangelist refers to people accompanying Jesus in his public activity and pilgrimage to the holy city. He lists several women who followed him in Galilee serving him. They also witness his death on the cross.

So we can conclude that for St. Mark Jerusalem is a complex entity. As the capital of Israel it showed some interest in Jesus perceived as a prophet from Galilee. Jerusalem is also a fortress of traditional Judaism. Jerusalem is the city of the Temple as well. And finally Jerusalem is the place of death of the Son of Man. All these aspects are presented in relation to Jesus and interpreted accordingly. The attitude of the disciples to Jerusalem is also varied. And a general conclusion from our research is that for St. Mark it is a different thing to go up to the city and to make a pilgrimage to the Temple.

¹⁶ He leaves the city to go to Bethany (Mk 11,11b.19) or to Mount Olive (Mk 13,1-3).

¹⁷ Cf. the text of the third synoptic Gospel (Lk 19,41-44) with the announcement of the fall of Jerusalem.

¹⁸ Cf. the text of the first synoptic Gospel (Matt. 23,37-39), and especially Matt 23,31-32; cf. also: J. Homerski, *Ewangelia według św. Mateusza. Tłumaczenie, wstęp i komentarz*, Lublin 1995, pp. 132-133.

¹⁹ Cf. H.H. Langkammer, *Ewangelia według św. Marka*, p. 146; cf. also: Matt.27,55-56; Lk 23,49.

4. JERUSALEM AND THE TEMPLE IN THE GOSPEL OF MARK

Let us study then what it means for the Jew *to go up to Jerusalem* and *to go up to the Temple* according to St. Mark. On the basis of the previous research my conclusion is that these two expressions are synonymous. In my attempt to explain the meaning of the phrase *to go up* in the Gospel of Mark I compared it with the texts of St. Luke and St. John. They both use the verb ἀναβαίνω without any noticeable distinction²⁰. Whereas St. Mark uses the verb ἀναβαίνω only in reference to *going up to Jerusalem* and always in the plural number (Mk 10,32-33). In Mk 10,32 Jesus goes up to Jerusalem accompanied by other people but goes before them as the evangelist remarks ἦσαν δέ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Mk 10,33 contains the third announcement of the death and resurrection of Jesus and predicts precisely what is going to happen to the Son of Man in Jerusalem. In this context the verb occurs in the plural number: ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα²¹.

It is obvious that in the whole evangelical account of St. Mark the verb ἀναβαίνω is not only a verb of motion connected with Jerusalem. Analogical verbs of motion used in the second Gospel with the goal of the Holy City almost always occur in the plural number.²² These other verbs are: ἐγγίζουσιν (εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) which occurs in Mk 11,1 and two ἔρχονται (εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) from Mk 11,15.27. The only exception is εἰσηλθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (...) which informs about Jesus going into the city (Mk 11,15.27).

I would like to point out a very interesting means of expression used by St. Mark in the aforementioned verses of Mk 11,11.15.27: first in Mk 11,11 the usage of a compound word εἰς-ἔρχομαι in the singular number, and then ἔρχομαι (ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) in Mk 11,15, in the plural number. These three verses are almost identical in the Mark's account. They apply respectively to going up to Jerusalem in Mk 11,11 (cf. Matt. 21,1-11; Lk 19,29-40; Jn. 12,12-19) and to Jesus returning to the Holy City on consecutive days in Mk 11,15.27 [(cf. Matt 21,12-17;21,23-37; Lk 19,45-48;20,1-8) – Mk 11,11: καὶ εἰσηλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (...); Mk 11,15: καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ εἰς-ἔρχομαι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (...); Mk 11,27: καὶ ἔρχονται (...) εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦατος αὐτοῦ (...)].

²⁰ ἀναβαίνω is used indiscriminately of *going up to Jerusalem* (cf. Lk 18,31;19,28; J 2,13;5,1;11,55; Acts 24,11) as well as of *going up to the temple* (Lk 18,10; J 7,14; Acts 3,1).

²¹ The phrase ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα in Mk 10,33 (i.e. *Behold we go up to Jerusalem*) can be compared with the phrase from Matt. 20,17 καὶ ἀναβαίνων ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (*going up to Jerusalem*). In some manuscripts the verb in Matt. 20,17 is in the singular number. Also in the third synoptic Gospel, i. e. in Lk 19,28 we find the phrase ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα (*And when he had thus spoken, he went before, ascending up to Jerusalem*).

²² We can compare them with other parallel verbs in synoptic Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke which express the motion of Jesus towards Jerusalem and they occur in the singular number (cf. Matt. 16,21a;21,10; Mk 8,31ff; Lk 9,22;9,51;13,22;19,28).

Thereby the only exception²³ in Mk 11,11 is explained by parallel accounts of Mk 11,15.27. St. Mark introduces a differentiation between Jerusalem and the Temple. It is an interesting stylistic device of St Mark: while talking about Jerusalem (εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) he uses ἔρχομαι in the plural number but discussing the Temple (εἰς τὸ ἱερόν) he utilises the compound word εἰσ-ἔρχομαι in the singular number, i.e. εἰσῆλθεν – περιπατοῦατος. It is a very remarkable and unique device: after all many people go up to Jerusalem (ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) but only one goes up to the Temple (εἰσερχομαι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν).

I would also like to add that in Mk 11,15.27 both objects depend on the verb used either in the plural or singular number in Mk 11,11. So they are both used with reference to εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα and εἰς τὸ ἱερόν. St. Mark uses only this one verb in reference to the Temple in a sense of „going up to the Temple” (εἰσ-ἔρχομαι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν). St. Mark does not use any other phrase like for example „ascend” or just „go”. Thus we can draw a justified and valuable conclusion: because the verb (εἰσ-ἔρχομαι) occurs in the singular number, of the two objects εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα and εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, the latter is more important. Jesus is the subject of the sentence, the verb εἰσ-ἔρχομαι is used in the singular number and the object is the Temple.

Another conclusion of the study of the Gospel according to St. Mark is his consistency in using verbs while talking about the Temple (ἱερόν) and Jerusalem (Ἱεροσόλυμα). Whenever St. Mark writes about ἱερόν he does not take into consideration other people accompanying Jesus (even if they are there and we know it from the context). The verb is always used in the singular number and the subject is Jesus alone. For example in Mk 11,15.27 Jesus goes to Jerusalem with a group of people (καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) but it seems that it is only him who goes up to the Temple [Mk 11,15: καὶ εἰσ-ἔρχομαι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν (...); Mk 11,27: καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ (...)]. St. Mark underscores the fact that Jesus is the only one who acts there [Mk 11,15 ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν (...) κατέστρεψεν; Mk 11,16: καὶ οὐκ ἦφιεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ]. This is also where Jesus stays: (Mk 11,27b: καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦντος) and teaches (Mk 12,35a: καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄΙησοῦς ἔλεγεν διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ; Mk 14,49: καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με· ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί). In an analogical way St. Mark informs the readers about the fact that Jesus leaves the Temple using a verb in the singular number καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ (...) (Mk 13,1)²⁴. Therefore we can conclude that writing about Jesus entering or leaving the Temple St. Mark uses the singular number of verbs intentionally to

²³ The verb εἰσ-ἔρχομαι (εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα) used only once in the singular number in the Gospel of Mark in reference to motion, i. e. Jesus going up to Jerusalem.

²⁴ It is typical of Mark to use this grammatical and syntactic device suggesting that it was only Jesus who left the sanctuary.

contrast it with the plural number signifying going to Jerusalem. We can also see a consistent usage of the plural number like in Mk 11,11b μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα to mark the exit from the Temple which for St. Mark also means leaving the city (cf. Mk 11,19). In Mk 11,12.20 we notice another example of the plural number denoting a morning walk of Jesus and his disciples from Bethany (Mk 11,12; cf. Matt 21,18; Mk 11,20 cf. Matt. 21,20ff). So this perceived consistency in using one grammatical form allows us to conclude that in his Gospel St. Mark utilises a special „ἱερὸν language” reserved for Jesus only.

Other synoptic authors St. Matthew and St. Luke have a more flexible and more positive concept of the Temple. In their Gospels the Temple is not just a place of clash between Jesus and Judaism. The apostles feel at home there; it is their house of prayer. According to Matthew’s narrative the blind and the lame enter the Temple to plead Jesus for miraculous healing. St. Matthew also writes about the children praising Jesus and shouting: *Hosanna to the Son of David* (Matt. 21,14-15).

St. Luke finishes his evangelical narrative in the Temple and writes that the Apostles *were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God* (Lk 24,54; cf. Mk 16,19; Acts 1,2-10). So for St. Luke the goal of Jesus and his followers is Jerusalem and not the Temple. For St. Luke the motif of heading towards Jerusalem which is the pivotal element of his Gospel is embedded in the Jewish tradition of making a pilgrimage to the Temple. But according to St. Mark the Son of Man leads his disciples to Jerusalem because of his coming Passion and crucifixion and that is why Jesus goes to the ἱερὸν alone. But he does not go to the ἱερὸν as a pilgrim. The fact that Jesus preached good news and fulfilled his mission astounding the zealous and godly members of the Galilean synagogues (Mk 1,27;6,2-3) makes his presence in the Temple very special.

STRESZCZENIE

Ewangelia według św. Marka nie prezentuje całkowicie jednorodnej teologii. Wiadomo, że aby mówić o teologii, wynikającej z idei pielgrzymowania do świątyni w świetle Mk 11-13, trzeba mieć u podstaw Osobę Jezusa Chrystusa – Jego ewangeliczny obraz. W takim kontekście autor artykułu w sposób szczególny uwzględnił historię Jezusa ewangelicznego, szczególnie w Mk 11-13, aby uzyskać właściwe wyniki badań. Owe wnioski końcowe zostały wydobyte z przeprowadzonych badań naukowych nad źródłowym tekstem Mk 11-13, szczególnie w kontekście problematyki odnośnie do pielgrzymowania do świątyni – w ST i ewangelii czteropostaciowej w ogólności. Uzyskane wyniki badań są niezwykle interesujące, realizujące wytyczony w punkcie wyjścia cel badawczy. Można je uznać jako potwierdzające istnienie Markowych idei teologicznych – w kontekście odnośnie do pielgrzymowania do świątyni – szczególnie w świetle Jego ewangelicznej relacji w Mk 11-13.

Słowa kluczowe:

pielgrzymowanie, świątynia, Jerozolima, teologia, Izrael – Izraelici, Prawo – Tora, Stary Testament, Nowy Testament, ofiara, Ewangelie, Ewangeliczy: Mateusz, Marek, Łukasz, Jan