

February 2020

Transducing Terror—Pacifying Jewish Religious Terrorism: A Classic Grounded Theory of the Gospel of Mark

Antony Last

M.A. Candidate (UNISA), B.A. Honours (UNISA),
B.A. (University of Biblical Studies), Company Secretarial Diploma (IAC),
Ministerial Diploma (Wesleyan Bible College)
Address: P O Box 1138, Somerset West, Cape Town, South Africa, 7129
Email address: antonylast@gmail.com

Introduction

The main concern of the writer of Mark is Jewish religious terrorism (zealotry) with which Judaism was replete in the first century CE. How this concern emerged is explained in the Method section below. Mark's way of resolving the main concern is by *transducing terror*, a specific way of pacifying Jewish religious terrorism, discovered through the application of the classic grounded theory methodology to the Gospel of Mark.

Jewish Terrorism

Jewish terrorism is an act of terror carried out by Jewish extremists motivated by nationalistic and religious beliefs (cf. Wikipedia. 2020a).

In 167 BCE, the Maccabees, a zealous Jewish family rebelled against the Greek rulers in Israel and after fighting for 20 years won Israel back for the Jews. Those who did not submit to their victory were killed. By 40 BCE, Rome had conquered Judea and installed the Herodian line of kings. Reaction to this came in the form of the emergence of Sicarii Zealots who continued the Maccabean struggle to bring Israel back under Jewish religious rule. Judas the Galilean, an apparent Maccabean descendant, started the Sicarii at the time of Jesus' birth and led a tax revolt in Israel against Rome in 6 CE (Atwill, 2011). The Sicarii specifically terrorized other Jews who refused to join them by killing them with concealed daggers. In 30 CE Jesus had at least two rebels in his group, Judas Iscariot (a Sicari) and Simon the Zealot (Mk. 3.18-19). Jesus was crucified for a Zealot's claim to Kingship of the Jews (Mk. 15.1-2) along with two other Zealots often referred to as robbers (Josephus, 75CE; Mk. 15.27). Two of Judas the Galilean's sons were also crucified after another revolt in 46 CE, and a third son became the Sicarii leader. In 66 CE the Zealots drove the Romans from Judea; Rome retaliated by sending Vespasian and then Titus his son to conquer Israel again which they completed in 73 CE (Atwill, 2011; Wikipedia, 2020b). Then the gospel of Mark was written.

Tens of thousands of Jewish rebel captives after 73 CE could become followers of Jesus the 'real Messiah' when they considered how wrong they had been in their understanding of the true nature of the Jewish Messiah; psychologically they would

have been suffering deeply from a type of Stockholm Syndrome (Valliant, 2019; Lalitha, 2019), and their conversion to the new way would be a result of the *transduction* of their *terror*. Mark attempts to transduce their terror by demonizing their leaders, eschatology, and beliefs, and nobilizing the leadership, eschatology, and beliefs of Jesus and his followers.

Classic Grounded Theory

Getting to the root of a problem and working out how it is solved is the *forte* of classic grounded theory (CGT). As a method of conceptualizing data and sorting concepts and conceptual explications, it is a powerful way to make sense of what is actually happening in the data (field of interest). In this manner also, it has an uncanny knack of laying bare vested social fictions and showing them for surprisingly what they really are—sometimes something completely different from what was originally believed (cf. Glaser, 2007b). CGT helps you put your preconceived ideas aside and to allow the data to speak for itself, informing the researcher, instead of the researcher informing the data (Glaser, 2007a). For all these reasons and more, I chose classic grounded theory to analyze the gospel of Mark, letting the words, phrases, and paragraphs tell their own conceptual story of why the gospel was written and how the writer achieved his apparent goal.

Transduction

Transduce means ‘to convert (as energy or a message) into another form; essentially sense organs transduce physical energy into a nervous signal’ (Merriam-Webster, 2020). It comes from the Latin verb *transducere* in which *trans* means ‘across’ and *ducere* means ‘lead’. Therefore, *transducere* literally means to ‘lead across’. Thus, as above, for example, the physical energy of sound waves is ‘led across’ or transduced by the aural system of the ear into a nervous signal that the brain can register. Metaphorically, then, in the Gospel of Mark, the terrorism based on the leadership, eschatology, and beliefs of the first century CE Jewish nation in general and Zealots in particular is transduced or led across into completely different and peaceful forms of leadership, eschatology, and beliefs as represented by Jesus and his followers. *Transducing terror* accordingly refers to the pacifying of Jewish terrorism.

Method

Preconception and Paradigm Forcing

Prior to embarking on this study, I had systematically over a period of 7 years up to my twenty-second birthday read the entire Old Testament 3 times through and the New Testament 5 times. This meant that I had by then read the gospel of Mark at least 5 times. Subsequent to that, I have probably read Mark another 6 to 8 times in its entirety and certain passages upwards of maybe 20 to 25 times. Thus, has been my exposure to Mark. From my early twenties (40 years ago) I basically espoused the Messianic approach of Dr. Hugh J. Schonfield, inherited from my late

father, towards my understanding of Jesus. More recently, I am inclined to entertain possibilities of gospel provenance along the lines of Robert Eisenman, Robert Price, James Valliant, Joseph Atwill, and Derek Lambert. I carefully disciplined my thinking and bracketed my prior knowledge and possible expectations (cf. Glaser, 2009a; Elliott & Higgins, 2012) in approaching Mark for this study. The fact that the core variable (*transducing terror*) only emerged after 1355 open codes had been conceptualized is testimony, I believe, to that. If I had been looking for something along the lines of, for example, a Roman Provenance of Mark, there had been ample opportunity to force this on the data. For example, as stated below ‘hearing’ was a popular theme in the codes occurring for a final total of 24 times prior to core emergence. I could have run with that concept and contorted that *people’s ignorance* was Mark’s main concern and that *spiritual hearing or listening* was the resolution which Mark achieves by making his gospel less accommodating of Judaism and more accommodating of gentile Rome. But it was left up to the data to have the core variable *cleansing the wicked (murderers and thieves)*, equivalent to *cleansing Zealots* or *transducing terror* naturally emerge in the incidents of Mark 7.1–23.

Analysis, Open Coding, Constant Comparison, and Sorting

Over a period of 21 days, I open coded in a Google Sheet every phrase in Mark up to Chapter 7, totaling 870 codes, constantly comparing data and codes with each other in the process. For example, the first code conceptualized was *proclaiming good news* (Mk. 1.1). By the 870th code, I sorted the data by open code to see if any main categories or concerns were emerging. ‘Hearing’ (Mk. 2–6) had been coded 17 times, and ‘listening’ once, but both, obviously related, seemed to be significant. I continued open coding over the next 4 days in blue, so that when sorting, the fresh concepts would be clearly identifiably interspersed within the previous, and any progressive influence on emergent categories could be easily noticed.

Core Variable Emergence

At code 1355, I changed to red, and sorted the blue within the previous codes. Now ‘defiling’ (6 occurrences; cf. Mk. 7.14–16) and ‘cleaning’ (4 occurrences; cf. Mk. 7.19) emerged as radically significant polar processes related to hearing and listening. *Cleaning*, in the context of Mark 7.17–23, Jesus changing Judaism by pronouncing all foods clean, emerged as *cleansing Judaism* of ‘murders, thefts, covetings, wickedness, deceit [and] pride’ (Mk. 7.21–22) much of which went on amongst the troublesome Jewish Zealots of that era (Josephus, 75CE). Although Jesus spoke of murder, thefts, wickedness, etc. in general terms, it must be assessed in terms of Mark’s knowledge of the ever-present terror of the Zealots upon the people, that it also referred to the Zealots, if not primarily to them. Even if this would be viewed as an effective silence on Mark’s part, it is submitted that is it a strategic ideological silence, which after all could well be the main concern, as it must be remembered that *silence is data* (Glaser, 2007a). Thus, a core variable of *changing or remaking Judaism*, or at least *purging, cleansing, or pacifying zealotry* seemed to be emerging. *Defiling* was simultaneously emerging as the main concern,

i.e. Judaism’s defilement of society through its zealotry, equivalent to Jewish religious terrorism. By the following day, the core conceptualization of *changing Judaism* had become *transducing terror*.

Starting Memos

At code 1373, *selling whatever you have* (Mk. 10.21), I wrote the first full memo (I had already written about 10 other shorter memos of less impressive import):

Writer of Mark encouraging a stealthy wealth-distribution mechanism in Jesus’ teaching. The more wealthy people could be encouraged to de-wealth themselves, the less poor in society there would be, and the less threat they could be to the elite—the really rich and wealthy, like the sponsors and writer/s of Mark?

Abstract Conceptualization

This led to conceptualizing the first 2nd level code, *redistributing wealth*, which is on a higher level of conceptualization, and which I placed next to the open code *selling whatever you have* in a fresh column. Then, with the creation of the following 5 open codes for Mark 10.21, several 2nd and one 3rd level (higher) codes quickly emerged, thus:

No.	3rd level code	2nd level code	open code
1373	nobilizing	redistributing wealth	selling whatever you have
1374	nobilizing	impoverishing yourself	giving to the poor
1375	nobilizing	anticipating afterlife	having treasure in heaven
1376		imitating leaders	coming (to Jesus)
1377		imitating leaders	following Jesus
1378	nobilizing	accepting hardship	taking up the cross

Selective Coding

From then onwards, I only 2nd and 3rd level coded sentences or paragraphs in Mark, not phrases any longer. Nothing was lost, as the concept of the sentence is secured by the code as it relates to the core. *Nobilizing* emerged as the first 3rd level code and *demonizing* quickly afterward as the second 3rd level code reached within 9 codes of 1378.

Constant Comparison and Delimiting

With still 6 chapters of Mark to code, I was doing a lot of constant comparison now, mostly with 2nd level codes. These chapters were completed within 2 hours, finishing at code 1510. I then made a duplicate of the sheet as a backup and re-sorted the coding numerically, 2nd level coding each paragraph from chapters 1 to 10; this took a few more hours. After that, I sorted the data by 3rd, 2nd, and open codes in that order of priority, resulting in 314 data bits each with their adjacent 3rd,

2nd, and open codes. This drastically reduced the ‘code load’ and made the data more manageable, for the most part, it is submitted, without losing any salient concept.

Main Categories

Nobilizing and *demonizing* appear to be two sub-core categories (main categories) for how the writer carries out the core of *changing Judaism (transducing terror)*, his main concern being *Jewish zealotry*. Several properties of *transducing terror* (4th level core code) were identified on the 3rd level which are primary operations for the *demonizing-nobilizing* process within *transducing terror*, such as *submitting to authority*.

Theoretical Codes

Several theoretical code (TC) families appeared relevant to the emerging theory, in different ways, namely, the paired, frames, representation, strategy, mainline, and structural families (Glaser, 1978, 1998, 2005). From these emerged a theoretical code combination of dichotomy, religion, politics, proscription, ploy, properlining, social control, and structural change. Different facets of the resolute interaction of the variables of the theory require different integrative theoretical coding.

Sorting to Outline

I arranged all codes in an outline and grouped them under *leaders*, *eschatology*, and *beliefs* (TCs: social structure, religion, politics), as these subcategories emerged across the main categories, *demonizing*, *transducing*, and *nobilizing* (TCs: dichotomy, proscription, ploy, properlining), creating implicit hypotheses. Here is a truncated sample of how my outline looked, showing only the first several properties of each sub-category:

transducing		
demonizing	----->	nobilizing
leaders		
approximating beliefs	acknowledging leaders	claiming superior knowledge
challenging precepts	espousing authority	conforming to ritual
confusing culpabilities	submitting to authority	emulating leaders
correcting leaders		exemplifying leaders
cretinising leaders		following leaders
eschatology		
adjusting eschatology	modifying belief & practice	anticipating afterlife
revolt becomes repent	submitting to authority	encouraging otherworldliness
outside-in		encouraging self-sacrifice
force becomes faith		fulfilling foretellings
heads vs. hearts		knowing esoterica
beliefs		
decrying disbelief	including outsiders	accepting hardship
decrying the rich	submitting to authority	admonishing loyalty
ingratiating the opposition		calling bluffs
extruding religion		impoverishing yourself
fighting the status quo		encouraging altruism

Memo Writing

I re-sorted the data bits within properties according to Mark’s chronology; for example, *accepting hardship* had 8 occurrences, corresponding to 8 data bits, namely Mark 8.34-38; 10.21; 10.38; 10.39; 14.32-34; 14.35-36; 14.37-38; 14.39-42. I then used the outline structure to guide the writing up of memos. Seventy-six memos covering the operation of the theory and interaction of the categories, properties, and core were written. These were used as the basis for writing up the theory.

Theoretical Saturation

I attempted to ensure the saturation of as many properties of the main categories as possible (Glaser, 1965), and where I was not sure, I sampled theoretically as explained below. Overall, most properties were well saturated with a number of indicators rendering redundancy under constant comparison.

Theoretical Sampling

The 16 chapters of the Gospel of Mark are all the data there is for a study delineated as: Trying to find the main concern of the writer/s of the Gospel of Mark. There can in essence be no other data. Thus, even theoretical sampling would strictly speaking only be possible within the given 'population' which is all the words of the gospel of Mark. Accordingly, I did theoretically sample within the data as I came across concepts that needed further illumination and found many additional concepts and properties, for example, the 4 sub-listed properties of *adjusting eschatology* in the above outline. Additional theoretical sampling was done outside of Mark among other 'participants', namely relevant literature pertinent to elaboration of aspects of the developing theory, such as the Old Testament and Josephus, only sparingly during write-up. I purposefully attempted not to refer to the other 3 canonical gospels, or any other gospel for that matter, so as not to skew the main concern of Mark, as each gospel manifestly has its own unique and quite different focus and concerns.

Theory

Transducing terror is a dichotomous religio-political proscriptive operation of ploy *demonizing* one ideology and properline¹ *nobilizing* another in an effort to discourage, socially control, and structurally change the former and encourage the latter.

Transducing terror is accomplished by *acknowledging leaders who espouse authority, include outsiders, modify belief and practice, and encourage submission to government*. These activities are implemented by systematically *demonizing* the rebellious, terror-driven sector of society and *nobilizing* a compliant, peace-loving way of life.

Demonizing the baddies includes *adjusting their eschatology, surreptitiously approximating their beliefs, challenging and disputing their precepts and rituals, projecting intent and culpability onto them, correcting, criticizing, cretinizing, defaming and resisting their leaders, imputing them with evil, and justifying their rejection*. It also involves *decrying the rich and disbelief, ingratiating the opposition, extruding religion, fighting the status quo, impugning rebels/zealots, predicting destruction, pretexting indictments, and replacing the unworthy*.

The goodies and the goodies-to-be (converted baddies) are *nobilized* by *anticipating an afterlife, encouraging otherworldliness and self-sacrifice, fulfilling foretellings, knowing esoterica, projecting prescience, predicting rescue, spreading the good news, and ransoming people*. Further they *claim superior knowledge, conform to ritual, emulate, exemplify, follow, imitate, popularize, and venerate leaders, rendering obedience*. Then, *reliance and belief are encouraged, miracles invoked, faith enjoined*

¹ Properlining (cf. Glaser, 1998) is when something is stated in a proper manner, i.e. in an individually, socially, or politically correct way, instead of in a more direct and truthful manner. It is stating how something ought to be rather than how it actually is.

and exemplified, altruism, commitment, discipline, stringence, humility and subservience encouraged, hardship accepted, the unworthy forgiven, wealth distributed, yourself impoverished, and loyalty admonished and exemplified. And, finally, bluffs are called, excess enjoined, actions paced, and symbols revered.

The religio-political process of *transducing*, accordingly, takes place across three main socio-structural strata: *leadership, eschatology, and beliefs.*

Leadership

Transducing dichotomously uses *acknowledging leaders* who *espouse authority to encourage submission to government* by ploy *demonizing* leaders of the baddies whilst properline *nobilizing* the leaders of the goodies.

Acknowledging leaders. In the first words of Mark, Jesus is appelled ‘Christ, the Son of God’ and is acknowledged as a leader worthy of ‘the Good News’ (Mk. 1.1). He is also called ‘the Son of God’ by unclean spirits (Mk. 3.11; 5.7). Peter tells him, ‘You are the Christ’ (Mk. 8.29). Mark refers to him as ‘the Son of Man’ (Mk. 8.31; Dan. 7.13–14). On the mount of transfiguration, Jesus is further acknowledged as a leader when Moses and Elijah appeared and talked with him and ‘a voice came out of the cloud, “This is my beloved Son”’ (Mk. 9.4, 7; 15.35, 36). Jesus referred to himself as ‘Christ’ (Mk. 9.41). Jesus acknowledges God as the ultimate good leader (Mk. 10.18; 15.34). The superscription on Jesus’ cross, although intended ironically, acknowledges him as a prominent royal leader, ‘The King of the Jews’ (Mk. 15.26), which his followers evidently believed (Act. 17.7). The chief priests and scribes mockingly called Jesus ‘the Christ, the King of Israel’ (Mk. 15.32). By reverse psychology, this induces sympathetic belief in Jesus’ God-ordained leadership (cf. MacDonald, Nail, & Harper, 2011). The Roman centurion who saw Jesus die, said, ‘Truly this man was the Son of God!’ (Mk. 15.39). Many follower women watched Jesus on the cross (Mk. 15.40, 41). Finally, Jesus’ leadership is further acknowledged by ‘Joseph of Arimathaea, a prominent council member who also himself was looking for God’s Kingdom’ arranging with Pilate to remove Jesus’ body and entomb it (Mk. 15.43–46). Thus, the acknowledging of God and Jesus as leaders is posited by the writer of Mark as a mechanism to encourage submission to leadership or authority, which indirectly but conceptually includes the government of the day (the Romans), by the rebellious Zealots, and their espousal of a worthy Messianic leader (Christ) in the form of the God-sent Jesus.

Espousing authority. Jesus espouses the authority to forgive sins on earth (Mk. 2.10) and equates himself with or at least as a functionary of ‘the Lord’ (Mk. 5.19). This *espousal of authority* combines powerfully with the *acknowledgement of his leadership* to encourage submission to his leadership and by exemplificatory implication that of other worthy authorities such as the Roman government of Judea.

Submitting to authority. Jesus actively promotes submission to government by his direct support for paying the Roman tax when he says: ‘Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s...’ (Mk. 12.17).

Demonizing leaders. *Transducing terror* uses *acknowledged authoritative leadership promoting submission to government by demonizing opposition leaders and nobilizing a leadership ideal*. Again, opposition leaders are demonized by *surreptitious approximation of their beliefs, challenging and disputing their precepts and rituals, projecting intent and culpability onto them, correcting, criticizing, cretinizing, defaming and resisting them, imputing them with evil, and justifying their rejection*.

Approximating beliefs. Mark relates that when ‘the son of Timaeus, Bartimaeus, a blind beggar...heard that it was Jesus the Nazarene, he began to cry out and say, “Jesus, you son of David, have mercy on me!”’ (Mk. 10.46–47). In this manner Mark presents Jesus as a Nazarene or Nazirite, emphasizing his commitment to the God of Israel, and confirms his kingly lineage of the house of David. This approximates the Zealots’ belief in complete dedication to God and Messianic expectation from the line of David, yet it is surreptitious in that Jesus is unlike the militant holy man the Zealots expected the Messianic King to be. Thus, by repositioning, the Zealots’ Messianic concept is *demonized* and counterposed with a *merciful* son of David.

Challenging precepts. Mark presents the Pharisees as challenging Jesus on the issue of divorce, and Jesus *demonizes* them by saying that Moses allowed divorce because of their hard hearts, but that God does not actually allow it (Mk. 10.2–9). So, Jesus *transduces terror* by chipping away at the Mosaic law and placing the Jewish leaders in an ignorant light albeit unjustly, but the aim is to loosen the Zealots’ foundation which is the Jewish religion based on Torah adherence.

Disputing rituals. Mark has Jesus dispute with the Pharisees and scribes the ritual of hand washing before eating bread (Mk. 7). Jesus’ conclusion is that nothing that goes into a man can defile him, so eating with unwashed hands is in order. This is obviously wrong, as it goes against germ theory² and much evidence that unwashed hands can lead to all sorts of defiling diseases³. But Jesus’ stance is used to justify dismissing the purity laws of kosher food in the Torah (cf. Lev. 11), again a *demonizing* of Jewish leadership and their laws to *transduce* the Zealot from questioning Torah-orthodoxy into forsaking their *terror*.

Projecting intent and culpability. Mark writes ‘The chief priests and the scribes heard it [Jesus’ upset in the temple], and sought how they might destroy him. For they feared him, because all the multitude was astonished at his teaching’ (Mk. 11.18). How exactly did Mark know that the chief priests and the scribes were apparently jealous of Jesus, feared him, and intended to do away with him? It seems unlikely that he could have known. These appear to be assumptions. Is it not storytelling by an all-knowing author? Mark projects evil intent onto the Jewish leadership, again as a way to *demonize* the religious society in which the Messianic rebels had their root. After Jesus’ arrest, ‘the chief priests and the whole council sought witnesses against Jesus to put him to death’ (Mk. 14.54); the high priest

² https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Germ_theory_of_disease

³ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hand_washing

asked Jesus, ‘Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?’ (v. 61); Jesus answered ‘I am. You will see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of the sky’ (v. 62); ‘the high priest tore his clothes and said, “What further need have we of witnesses? You have heard the blasphemy! What do you think?” They all condemned him to be worthy of death’ (vv. 63–64). Mark creates Jewish culpability for Jesus’ death by making the Sanhedrin condemn him to death for a Messianic claim, which were a dime a dozen in Jesus’ day and prosecuted only by Roman authorities; but Mark initiates the process of confusing culpabilities, by having Jesus make an obscure comment about the Son of Man which may not even have been referring to himself and for which the Sanhedrin did not ask clarity, but merely pronounced judgement; the process seems artificial, part of a fictive narrative designed to *demonize* Jewish leadership. It does, however, stand as a signal to would-be Messiahs to rather not risk misunderstanding and a possible death sentence.

Correcting, criticizing, cretinizing, defaming, and resisting leaders. Throughout Mark, the Jewish leaders are *demonized* as incorrect, unthinking, resistible, and worthy of ridicule. Jesus corrects the Sadducees’ misapprehension concerning marriage in the resurrected state by conflating the non-marriage of angels with the fact that God is the God of the living not of the dead, using Torah to justify this *non sequitur* (Mk. 12.18–27). Hence, Jesus misapplies Torah and concludes that the Sadducees are mistaken, but it nevertheless sounds good to Mark and puts Jewish leadership in their place. In his teaching of the people, Jesus directly criticizes the scribes for their sanctimonious, lavish, and deceitful hypocrisy (Mk. 12.38–40). Mark subtly cretinizes Jewish leadership by making their questions concerning Jesus and his disciples’ fasting, infringement of the purity laws, and breaking of the Sabbath sound petty, although they were mostly valid issues (Mk. 2.15–26); the query of Jesus’ authority and his refusal to clarify based on the chief priests, scribes and elders’ declared ignorance concerning John the Baptist’s authority, makes them look stupid (Mk. 11.27–33). Jesus’ exasperated refusal to give the Pharisees a sign defames them (Mk. 8.10), as does his warning to the disciples concerning the ‘yeast of the Pharisees’ (Mk. 8.15). Jesus tells his disciples that ‘the chief priests and the scribes... will condemn him to death, and will deliver him to the Gentiles. They will mock him, spit on him, scourge him, and kill him’ (Mk. 10.33–34); this pre-defames Jewish leadership with a careful balance of Gentile complicity, so as again to confuse culpability, but coming out on it being the Jews’ fault mostly as they are shown to initiate the process. ‘Two days before the Passover...the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might seize him [Jesus] by deception and kill him (Mk. 14.1); Mark outrightly defames the leaders by fictive narrative. There is a general undercurrent of resistance to and *demonization* of Jewish leaders throughout Mark, again illustrated by Jesus’ parable of the vineyard and tower which presents them as conspiratorial treacherous murderers (Mk. 12.1–12).

Imputing evil. The pervasive negating of leaders in Mark is confirmed by repeated imputation of evil motives. After Jesus healed a withered hand on the Sabbath, ‘The Pharisees... immediately conspired with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him’ (Mk. 3.6). His friends call him insane and the scribes

call him demon-possessed (Mk. 3.21-22); this is a reversive literary technique to impute the antecedents with evil, as the expected indignant response implied is, 'Ha! How can Jesus be insane and demon-possessed? His accusers are!' The puerile, spiteful justification that Mark gives for Jesus equating this demon-possession accusation with unforgivable holy spirit blasphemy reveals the writer's desperation to knock the Jewish leaders and *demonize* them at any expense: Jesus said this 'because they said, "He has an unclean spirit"' (Mk. 3.30). 'Tit for Tat! 'You say Me evil! Well! You evil! You Unforgivable! I Win!' Jesus also could not do miracles in his hometown because of the leaders' unbelief/evil (Mk. 6.5-6). Better for the Zealot to identify with Jesus' disdain for the evil Hellenized Jewish leadership than to go up against it in riot.

Justifying rejection. The Jewish leaders, including the Zealots and indeed most of the Jewish nation, unbelieving in Jesus, are rejected by God because they were rejecting Jesus (Mk. 12.10-11). This, of course, they can remedy by simply accepting him which they should hastily do if they want to be built into the wall of God next to Jesus, the cornerstone. Again, this is tit for tat, but it is powerful reasoning by Mark's Jesus using the Psalms (118.22-23) as the justifying text.

Thus, Mark *demonizes* the Jewish leaders of the first century in attacking the very foundation of Torah-orthodox zealotry/terrorism by simultaneously approximating yet rejecting them and their precepts and rituals, ascribing bad motives to them, pretexting their guilt, and generally casting them in a bad light.

From here, Mark *transduces terror* via acknowledged authoritative leaders encouraging submission to authority (government), by *nobilizing* a 'far better' leadership ideal.

Nobilizing leadership. Claiming superior knowledge, conforming to ritual, emulating, exemplifying, following, imitating, popularizing, and venerating leaders, and rendering obedience, are interwoven into Mark's narrative by way of transducing Jewish religious terror into a noble form of leadership which hopefully most would want to follow, thus eliminating or at least reducing the violence and contrariness of zealotry.

Claiming superior knowledge. Jesus is portrayed as having superior knowledge by way of constantly teaching in parables (Mk. 3.23-27), reveling in the fact that people had to catch his meaning (Mk. 4.1-9; Schonfield, 1955, p. 12), and cleverly answering the announcement of his mother asking for him with the retort 'whoever does the will of God is my... mother' (Mk. 3.31-35). Some of what Jesus says is disjointed and illogical (Mk. 4.21-25), almost as if the writer is combining separate but purportedly related sayings, probably due to the paucity of source material, or is it an attempted literary device to sound profound though in essence being nonsensical? You can imagine Mark thinking: 'It's sure to bemuse the reader, so it's good, we'll keep it in!' Mark makes Jesus claim to know that Jairus' daughter is still alive although pronounced dead (Mk. 5.35-39) and that the prophet Elijah had already indeed come again (Mk. 9.11-13). The rejecting people of Jesus' hometown are at the same time astonished at his wisdom (Mk. 6.1-3). *Claiming superior*

knowledge for Jesus is Mark's attempt to *transduce zealot terror* based on 'foolish' Jewish leadership into a noble, admirable form of leadership exemplified in Jesus.

Conforming to ritual. When Jesus cleanses the leper, he instructs him to go show himself to the priest and make the Torah-prescribed sacrifice (Mk. 1.41-44). Jesus and his disciples celebrated the Feast of Unleavened Bread and Passover (Mk. 14.12). When it suits Mark, Jesus may be Torah-observant, but when not, Torah is dispensed with, as already illustrated above. This pulls bad Jewish leadership through the transducement die from which it emerges free of legal encumbrance with just enough of a smattering of ritual to scam it into thinking it is still itself, meanwhile, back at the ranch, it has been extruded into a 'nobler' way of thinking.

Emulating, exemplifying, following, imitating, popularizing, and venerating leaders. Jesus is represented as specifically arranging time off and away from everyone else so that he can spend time alone in prayer (Mk. 6.46), thus setting a singularly emulatable action which would mold the lives of millions of aspirants. John the Baptist exemplifies complete dedication to a good, peaceful calling (Mk. 1.4-8), which allows zealous Jews to rethink commitment to their cause, transducing them over into pacifistic endeavors. Simon and Andrew, James and John, and Levi (Matthew) all instantly drop their doings and follow the outstanding leader Jesus when he calls them (Mk. 1.16-20; 2.13-14); even the blind immediately jump up and go to him (Mk. 10.50-52); is this not the preferred mystical manner in which the Zealots should come to and follow peace-loving Jesus rather than their own violent leaders? They do not even have to actually follow Jesus *per se*, as long as they are not against him and his followers (Mk. 9.38-40). All Jesus' followers, including Zealots and Sicarii, should imitate the twelve apostles in going out and promulgating a peaceful message, helping and healing others (Mk. 3.13-19; 6.6-11). Jesus came to serve; his followers should imitate him by being servants of all (Mk. 10.42-45); they may even imitate Jesus' controlled specific anger at a fig tree as long as it does not hurt any person (Mk. 11:12-14). Beneficiaries of Jesus' kindness are actually expected to popularize him among the people, solidifying and sealing their pacifism and goodwill (Mk. 1.41-45). Good, holy men like John the Baptist are venerated by worldly leaders like even Herod, showing 'the better way' to promote religion than zealotry (Mk. 6.14-20).

Rendering obedience. A dutiful follower of 'the new way' follows arrangements and instructions to the T (Mk. 11.4-6), implicitly contrasting contrariness, violence, and disorder as undesirable.

Thus, Jewish religious terrorism (first century zealotry) is transduced by Mark into a more appealing, more noble, superior spiritual knowledge, conforming only somewhat to Jewish ritual, acknowledging peace-loving leadership, and celebrating submission and obedience.

Eschatology

Transducing also dichotomously uses modifying belief and practice to encourage submission to authority (government) by ploy *demonizing* the baddies' eschatology and properline *nobilizing* the eschatology of the goodies.

Modifying belief and practice. Mark portrays Jesus as an acknowledged leader who espoused a high level of authority, respecting civil and religious law, but modifying that law and its practical application just sufficiently so as to mark partial agreement with Rabbinic doctrine, such as the precept of the Sabbath being made for man (Schonfield, 1955, p. 9). Mark also unhinges other aspects such as kosher diet, which would be hard to maintain in the cultivation of a wider groundswell of including outsiders in his gospel message (Mk. 2.27-28; 7.14-23). Mark's hope is that his audience will buy his presentation of viewing the Jewish religion as liberating in a truer nobler way, especially as it pertains to *eschatology*.

Demonizing eschatology. Mark also implicitly takes the overt eschatological beliefs of the Zealot in terrorizing the people into revolt, slaying the enemy, and victorious Davidic Kingship, and massages them into a new eschatology consistent with submission to authority (government). In presenting a contrary Messianic eschatology, he highlights certain comparatives.

Revolt becomes repent. Josephus (75-99CE) mentions 4 Zealots and 7 anti-Zealots from Jewish first century CE all named 'Jesus'. Mark might have had one or more of these Jesuses in mind when he wrote 'Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the Good News of God's Kingdom, and saying, "The time is fulfilled, and God's Kingdom is at hand! Repent, and believe in the Good News"' (Mk. 1.14-15). Either way, Mark was positing a heretofore unheard-of conception concerning the imminent arrival of God's Kingdom through peaceably repenting and believing the good news of its arrival.

Outside-in. Jesus declares that only his followers have the inside knowledge of the true nature of the Kingdom of God, whereas outsiders (the Zealots, Jewish leaders and sinners) still need to catch his meaning through his parables; but he implies that the outsiders too can become part of the Elect (Schonfield, 1955, p. 12).

Force becomes faith. The forceful terrorizing methods of the Zealots are not conducive to God's Kingdom. The Kingdom comes and matures through silent, peaceful means of believing in the true God and allowing that belief to grow (Mk. 4.26-29).

Heads vs. hearts. Hot-headed zealotry is out of fashion now. It does not work. See how better if leaders help people and give their hearts hope (Mk. 8.25-26).

Rejection leads to victory. A Messianic rejection by the Jews with a spiritual raising from the dead is God's actual victorious presentation of his Kingdom on Earth (Mk. 8.31-33). Jesus' Messianic vision was initially rejected; many Zealots' Messianic aspirations had been rejected; so too should the Zealots reject their own

destructive Messianic goals in favor of victory in a spiritual Kingdom of God; that should be their ultimate aim.

Internal - external Messiah. Jesus said, ‘there are some standing here who will in no way taste death until they see God’s Kingdom come with power’ (Mk. 9.1). This refers to the messianic purge of Jerusalem and inauguration of peace by Vespasian and Titus in 67–73CE (Josephus: War, 75CE, 6.312–313). Post-war Zealots could vicariously lick their wounds and pacify into accepting political domination (by Rome) as spiritual victory which is what Mark was offering in Jesus. Yahweh had in any event previously used a non-Jewish external Messiah in the person of the Persian king, Cyrus the Great, to be the benefactor and liberator of the Jews (Is. 45.1). Vespasian brought societal peace; Jesus brought spiritual peace.

Son of Man - rising and conquering. Mark fully extinguishes zealotry’s concept that they would represent Israel as the Son of Man in conquering the Romans (cf. Dan. 7:13), by making Jesus represent the Son of Man as a rising Savior (Mk. 9.9–10, 31) and Vespasian/Titus represent the Son of Man as the Jewish Messiah⁴.

See no evil - do no evil. Only the spiritually pure will enter God’s Kingdom. Terrorists, who do way more evil than causing ‘one of these little ones who believe in me to stumble’ (Mk. 9.42), would naturally have no place in God’s Eternal Messianic Kingdom, because they see and do wrong which receives God’s eternal punishment (Mk. 9.43–48).

Guilt vs. innocence. The guilt of the Zealot would prevent him from entering the Kingdom of God, as you have to innocently receive the Kingdom like a child in order to enter (Mk. 10.13–15).

Eternal life vs. life on earth. The Zealots’ zeal for the Davidic King in charge of Israel and the world was so outmoded. With Jesus, eternal life was now the thing of real importance (Mk. 10.17). Jewish fundamental Messianism of life on earth was being turned on its head, *demonized*, for a *nobler* never-ending life of the soul.

Nobilizing eschatology. Having illustrated some basic ‘flaws’ in zealot eschatology, Mark presses home the nobler eschatology by anticipating afterlife, encouraging otherworldliness and self-sacrifice, fulfilling foretellings, knowing esoterica, predicting rescue, projecting prescience, ransoming people, and spreading the good news.

Anticipating afterlife. Ideally you should sell everything, give the proceeds to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then you should follow Jesus, shouldering any and every hardship that you might subsequently encounter (Mk. 10.21, 30, 40). The Zealots were to thoroughly understand that being zealous for God was not militant achievement in this life but building up benefits for the afterlife.

⁴ cf. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Josephus>

Encouraging otherworldliness and self-sacrifice. Rich people can only just-just be saved, as their earthboundness makes it almost impossible (Mk. 10.24-27); otherworldliness is encouraged which may be embarked towards by such self-sacrificial practices as praying and fasting (cf. Mk. 9.29).

Fulfilling foretellings. Jesus and his ministry fulfil so well the Old Testament prophecies and writings (e.g. Mk. 1.2-3; 14.27), that it should be clear to any Zealot that Jesus is the promised Messiah and God's Kingdom is a spiritual one. Apocalyptic eschatological victory of the Zealot over Rome failed in 70 CE, with the fulfilment of Jesus' Son of Man prophecies by Vespasian/Titus, and it was therefore no longer a valid aspiration.

Knowing esoterica. The Zealots would have to become followers of Jesus to know the real hidden secrets of God and to see new types of visions for their spiritual enlightenment (Mk. 4.33-34; 8.13-21; 9.2-10, 30-32).

Predicting rescue. Jesus' anti-Zealot followers would be rescued through their faithfulness, watchfulness, praying, and fleeing from any calamities brought on by the Zealots (Mk. 13.32-37). Zealots turned anti-Zealot could likewise escape future conflagration by these means.

Projecting prescience. Jesus appears to presciently lay out his course of action as he enters Jerusalem on a donkey and has his disciples prepare for the Passover meal (Mk. 11.1-3; 14.13-16). Such mind power is impressive and was sure to transduce any hardened Zealot into at least contemplating the astuteness of Jesus in planning for the glorious Jerusalem entry of which all Zealot Messiahs dreamt. The difference: Jesus entered Jerusalem peacefully and awaited God's cataclysmic intervention, which never came, but it did not deter him as he was receiving confirmation of what he suspected all along—God wanted him to be the suffering Messiah instead—and he was up to it.

Ransoming people. Mark makes Jesus declare that his life is given as a ransom for many (Mk. 10.45); many Zealots may accept Jesus' life as the ransom for their souls, far more valuable than mere monetary ransom with which they were all too familiar (Ex. 21.30; 30.12). Jesus flips the generally accepted ransom rule on its head: 'The wicked are a ransom for the righteous' (Pr. 21.18). Jesus is a ransom for the Zealots. The righteous for the wicked. How marvellous is this new Spiritual Messiahship! 'We, Zealots, can all be Messiahs in the Spiritual Kingdom of God! Through Jesus' vicarious Ransom! And we don't have to go through Violence and Upheaval, but can be at Peace and live with God's Law in our Hearts and Minds!' (cf. Jer. 31.33).

Spreading the good news. 'For any real Zealot, let that Zealot be zealous for the Good News of God's Spiritual Kingdom of Love and Peace.' Zealots should be spreading the good news of God's Kingship through his given Messiah, Jesus, just as the released demoniac and the disciples did (Mk. 5.20; 6.12; 13.10).

Thus, Mark emphasizes otherworldliness, self-sacrifice, and esoterica as preparation for the afterlife, and promises rescue and prescient ransoming for the Zealot in spreading the Good News of a Spiritual Kingdom. The Zealot's entire outlook and expectation of militant Messianism is transduced by Mark into a 'better' *nobilized* eschatology.

Beliefs

Finally, *transducing* dichotomously uses *including outsiders* to encourage submission to authority (government) by ploy *demonizing* the baddies' beliefs and properline *nobilizing* the beliefs of the goodies. *Outsiders* include the violent Zealot, the strict Pharisee, the hedonistic Sadducee, the militaristic Essene, the common person—Jew, Roman, Greek, and Gentile.

Including outsiders. Mark makes Jesus reluctantly include outsiders (non-Jews) in his mission (Mk. 7.24-29). This extrusion is forcing Judaism into a new shape for accepting Gentiles. It is an attempt by Mark at subtle transducement of separatist zealotry to consider the possible attendant glory for them as vicarious Spiritual Messiahs of all nations being blessed through their instrumentality (Gen. 12.3). To achieve this, Mark *demonizes* the belief-world of the Zealot and *nobilizes* the beliefs of 'the way of God' (Mk. 1.3; 12.14).

Demonizing beliefs. Mark negatively literacizes disbelief and wealth, ingratiating the opposition, extruding religion, fighting the status quo, impugning rebels/zealots, predicting destruction, pretexting indictments, and replacing the unworthy.

Decrying disbelief and wealth. Jesus vehemently condemns the whole contemporary generation in Israel for their exorcistic unbelief (Mk. 9.18-19) and decries the wealthy essentially for their stinginess (Mk. 12.41-44). Hence, the implied emphasis is again on equalizing assets and on the need to believe in the spiritual power of removing demons. The latter theme, pervasively in Mark, targets the cleansing of the Zealots who are viewed as demons (Atwill, 2011).

Ingratiating the opposition. Even when a person was spot on with their spiritual belief in God and love for his neighbor, Jesus would not concede that he would enter the Kingdom of God; such a person was merely close to ('not far from') the Kingdom (Mk. 12.28-34). In other words, those who would enter the true Messianic Kingdom were subtly demonized if they were not fanatically dedicated to Jesus' pacifistic way in contradistinction to any other notion. Ingratiating those who approximate Jesus' beliefs, however, sparks the transducement process which can ultimately carry over into full blown Jesusmania.

Extruding religion. Jesus extrudes Mosaic divorce into something far more stringent than it could ever have been intended to be (Mk. 10.11-12), but such Markian fabrication is patently exposed by Matthew's edition to nullify the adulterous aspect on the grounds of infidelity (Mt. 5.32). Nevertheless, Mark is

propagating a fanatically strict view of the Law which could well be subliminally attractive to Torah-orthodox Zealots, whilst demonizing the Pharisees for their ‘hardness of heart’ (Mk. 10.5).

Fighting the status quo. Jesus’ violently zealous attack on the moneychangers in the temple (Mk. 11.15-17) would have gone down well with any Zealot who heard Mark’s good news. The status quo of complacent unengaged Jewry was the constant target of Zealots in trying to rouse them to active rebellion. But Jesus’ version of violence was different. It focused on instruments of evil (tables, moneyholders, etc.), not ‘evil’ people on which the Zealots focused. Thus, Mark double-demonizes the beliefs of the status quo—moneychangers and Zealots.

Impugning rebels/zealots. The Sicari Zealot Judas is cast as Jesus’ betrayer (Mk. 14.10-50), exemplifying the ultimate futility of the Zealot movement as this leads to Jesus, the true Messiah, surviving the cross to usher in the Spiritual Kingdom of God.

Predicting destruction. Jesus predicts the destruction of the temple and Jerusalem (Mk. 13.1-30) a dire reminder to every Zealot of the abysmal failure of their revolt in 66-73CE, and just how wrong their violent Messianic beliefs were.

Pretexting indictments. Mark offers pretexts for Jesus’ indictment by the Sanhedrin. None of the statements made by Jesus for which Mark makes the Sanhedrin condemn Jesus to death are in fact valid as blasphemies under Jewish law. Thus, Mark has the Sanhedrin pretextually indict Jesus, running a fine line for the Zealot audience who would notice the injustice but acknowledge the possible abuse of power of the Jewish authorities in any given situation; they might be induced to sympathize with Jesus, knowing how vulnerable Messiahship claims made them and had led to many of their number being executed in past years albeit directly by the Romans. This is Mark’s strategy, demonizing the beliefs of the Jewish authorities and subtly massaging the rebel from his zealotry over into pacifism—*transducing terror*.

Replacing the unworthy. Jesus’ message to the rebels who disrupt and kill is that God is replacing you with other good, peace-loving people. The parable he uses to demonize them, that of the vineyard and tower (Mk. 12.1-9), is based on the vineyard-tower prophesy of Israel’s destruction in Isaiah (Is. 5.1-7), which every orthodox Zealot would know and should now realize that it was time to espouse peace, quiet, and righteousness (Is. 5.7) or forever be replaced as unworthy.

Demonizing the beliefs of unbelievers, the wealthy, the Torah-observant, the secular, and the rebels has, as captive audience, just about all sectors of Jewish society, who will be replaced if they do not pull themselves together. Better to choose Jesus’ beliefs and way and avert Yahweh’s wrath.

Nobilizing beliefs. Mark fills his gospel with expressions and exemplifications of a nobler set of beliefs for first century Jewry, which characterizes Jesus and his followers. Self-denial, putting others before yourself, and unswerving loyalty are

all placed on a pedestal for emulation. The Zealot will find a great deal of self-fulfillment and anticipated reward in espousing these fresh beliefs and letting go of the old. The Era of Goodness of the Soul has come!

Accepting hardship. Mark lets Jesus explain that self-denial, bearing burdens, and expending your life, especially for him and his good news, will spiritually preserve one's life; but selfishly trying to preserve your life and avoiding hardship will result in you losing your life; is it worth the Zealot gaining the whole world by fighting, if he loses his life in the process? (Mk. 8:34-37). Jesus displays a very noble and self-sacrificial acceptance of hardship when he faces his destiny of death on the cross in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mk. 14.32-36).

Impoverishing yourself. Jesus emphasizes de-wealthing yourself in this life so you can help others and accumulate riches in heaven (Mk. 10.21-25). Rich Zealots were to sell their possessions and share with the poor as a way of establishing God's Kingdom on Earth and preparing for the Everlasting Kingdom in the Sky.

Redistributing wealth. Involved also in Jesus injunctives to impoverish yourself is the corollary principle of wealth redistribution (Mk. 10.22). Rich Zealots were being transduced by Mark to admire and emulate the nobler way of creating God's Kingdom on Earth by reducing any wealth they might have in favor of their neighbors. From a governmental perspective (Mk. 12.17), diluting the wealth of the Zealot and uplifting the poor meant a reduction in military spending and welfare. A self-financing ideologically-induced redistribution of wealth by demonizing the rich and nobilizing mega-sharing was a clever ploy in Mark's strategy.

Encouraging altruism. The whole of Jesus' life and ministry are positioned as altruistic. This is all well and noble, but it is suggested that altruism is a fallacy, as the mere preference of others over oneself seems to be motivated from the selfish desire for either recognition or satisfaction or both. But because Jesus 'achieves' altruism, and so do his disciples (Mk. 10.49b), its nobility is alluringly portrayed by Mark and shown to be eminently attainable by any Zealot willing to follow the Master.

Forgiving the unworthy. Jesus said that when you pray you should 'forgive, if you have anything against anyone' otherwise God will not forgive you (Mk. 11.25-26). Note that it is not a matter of if someone has done you any wrong, but if you hold anything against someone; the Zealot would be pondering how that he is enjoined to nobly forgive his oppressor and begin to live in harmony with him, particularly now that he is enslaved or has lost everything.

Encouraging commitment. Jesus is represented as, early in the morning rising up in the dark, going out to a deserted place, and praying there (Mk. 1.35-37). Now the Zealot could also become a peace-loving devotee in the Spiritual Kingdom of God (Mk. 1.15).

Encouraging discipline/stringence. Jesus believed in strict control of individual behavior, not looking at or doing anything that could even make another person

stumble morally (Mk. 9.42-49); the Zealot could likewise reflect and realize how morally wrong he had been in his misplaced zealotry and strive to strictly control his future behavior.

Encouraging humility/subservience. The disciples wanting to lord it over each other is anathema to Jesus' serving philosophy (Mk. 9.33-35), and childlike humility is the only way to enter God's Kingdom (Mk. 10.13-16). The Zealot would have to learn to serve instead of incite, and humble himself instead of assert.

Encouraging reliance. The blind man's plea to see (Mk. 10.51b) exemplifies tongue-in-cheek nobilizing, as reliance and beseeching would most likely have been a sign of weakness in the Zealot's world. Yet there is an element of seductive mindplay here which could autosuggest an ironic nobility to relying on and beseeching your leaders—Jesus and God. Isn't this after all what so many narcissistic religious do, purporting to be great followers of the Way?

Encouraging belief. Jesus encourages sincere, steadfast, spiritual belief through his parable of the sower in which he contrasts it with stumbling, choking, and becoming unfruitful (Mk. 4.13-20). If a Zealot believed correctly, he could achieve anything (Mk. 9.23), but it must come from peaceful sowing and reaping or a loving expression of compassion, not violence.

Enjoining and exemplifying faith. So, Jesus teaches that God will give whatever the Zealot asks if he has enough faith, but it must be done with pure motive (Mk. 11.22-26). It is one's faith that has the spiritual power to change things (Mk. 10.52); in other words positive thought impels and creates constructive consequences; how magnificent could the Zealot's peaceful Kingdom of God be if they only exercised true faith.

Invoking the miraculous. Mark makes Jesus into a miracle man. Jesus can exorcise demons, chase fevers, heal diseases, cleanse leprosy, enervate paralysis, restore withering, control wind, calm sea, stop hemorrhaging, raise the dead, multiply bread, walk on water, cure deafness and blindness, remove speech impediments, wither trees, and rise from the dead (Mk. 1-9; 11; 16). Better to emulate and practice healing craft than to hurt people in zealous rebellion, riots, and fighting.

Calling bluffs. Mark lets Jesus' friends call him crazy and the scribes call him demon-possessed, expecting a unified opposite reaction of empathy towards Jesus asserting his sanity and goodness. This is terror transduction by characterisative bluffing to, in effect, nobilize Jesus and his belief-system.

Enjoining excess. Jesus encourages limited expressions of appropriate excess for significant occasions, such as his head massage (ointment anointing; Mk. 14.3-9), which means amidst the stringency of self-sacrificial living, his followers, including erstwhile Zealots, could maybe have something like one icecream a fortnight?

Pacing actions. The evening before Jesus routed the temple he went inside and looked around and then left (Mk. 11.11), as if to say he had made a mental note of his strategy, but would wait for it to busy-up in the morning. This illustrates the importance of belief in shrewd thinking and planning for all meaningful events in life, and such pacing could be a valuable lesson to the volatile and impulsive Zealot.

Revering symbols. Jesus' stipulation that the bread and wine represent his body and blood (Mk. 14.22-24) are powerful symbols of imbibing the very essence of who and what he was and believed. It might seem a reach to see Zealots accepting this practice, but after all, the bread and wine could not possibly have been his actual body and blood, so as a symbolic practice it did indicate sympathy for and oneness with him. Accepting this symbolism would have been the point of no return in the Zealot's transduction of terror from killers to identifying with the killed.

Exemplifying and admonishing loyalty. Peter's overt expressions of loyalty and his denials of Jesus (Mk. 14.29-72) would reverberate within the heart and mind of every Zealot who would have experienced conflicting loyalties as he jostled for recognition, influence, and power in terrorizing the people and leading riots and skirmishes. The fact that Jesus forgave Peter for his treachery (Mk. 16.7) boded well for the Zealot's potential sense of acceptance within the framework of Jesus' noble beliefs and God's Spiritual Kingdom. Even if the Zealot is hated, beaten, or killed for his espousal of Jesus' Way, he should not be anxious, because 'he who endures to the end will be saved' (Mk. 13.9-13).

Thus, does Mark utilize the religio-political process of *transducing terror* by alternately demonizing and nubilizing leadership, eschatology, and beliefs to discourage the rebellious and encourage the peaceful.

Literature

The literature was sparingly accessed after core variable emergence for theoretical sampling purposes of elaborating certain properties. Josephus, Schonfield, Glaser, Genesis, Exodus, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Acts were referenced about 20 times in total.

Now the literature will be reviewed to determine which of the above theoretical concepts and connections appear elsewhere in the literature, how those occurrences might elucidate the theory, and how the theory and its concepts contribute to the extant literature.

Transducing and Pacifying

Transducing in general and in the literature is primarily used to denote the transport of extraneous DNA into a biological cell; this can be part of healthy development in vertebrates (Ingham, 1998). This alone creates a vivid metaphor for the transportation of the Zealot and his beliefs into the spiritually healthy new world of Jesus and his beliefs. Pacifying is used variously in the literature in

connection with, among other things, neonates (Field & Goldson, 1984), education (Thyne, 2006), the military (Ruddick, 1983), monogamy (Lagerlöf, 2010), and politics (Baumgold, 1993). The latter comes close to our theme but it deals mainly with seventeenth-century contract theory.

Transducing Terror

The core variable of this theory, *transducing terror*, or other forms thereof, such as *transducing terrorism* and *transducing terrorist*, do not appear in either a Google Search (general) or a Google Scholar Search (academic). The same applies to *transduce terror*, *transduce terrorism* or *transduce terrorist*, and surprisingly even *pacify terror*, *pacify terrorism* or *pacify terrorist* are nowhere seen. Thus, it must be concluded that they are not to be found in the literature.

Transducing leaders. The concept is not found in GS or GSS. Neither is *pacifying leaders*.

Acknowledging leaders. A general search provided one article in which ‘acknowledgement of leaders’ is cited in passing as a feelgood mechanism for showing appreciation to employees (Biro, 2013). An academic search yields also only one article about ‘acknowledging the leadership role’ of technology coordinators with an emphasis on instruction and analysis (Sugar & Holloman, 2009). Mark’s pivotal acknowledgement of the leadership of Jesus and God also has strong analytical and instructive elements, as the distinctions of Son of Man, Son of David, Son of God, the Christ, King of the Jews, and King of Israel show (Mk. 1.1; 3.11; 5.7; 8.29, 31; 9.4, 7; 15.26, 32, 39).

Espousing authority. This concept is not found in the general or academic literature as *espousing authority*, but it does appear as *assuming authority* (e.g. Moran, 2012) although not in any strong sense of bolstering the standing of a leader like Jesus (Mk. 2.10; 5.19) in order to exemplify the negation of bad leaders and the nobility of good.

Acknowledging leaders who espouse authority is the starting point of the transduction of terror leaders which in turn transduces terror. Modifying belief and practice transduces terror eschatology, transducing terror.

Transducing eschatology. This concept is not found in the general or academic literature.

Modifying belief and practice. In the general literature, modifying belief is represented by many articles on how to change your beliefs (Google Search, 2020a). Gary van Warmerdam (2018) writes that ‘changing core beliefs’ involves ‘identifying the package of beliefs’ and adding ‘a little bit of awareness and a shift in perspective’. Mark has Jesus do all of this, when he identifies the Sabbath and kosher beliefs, makes his audience aware of their paradoxical complexity, and shifts their perspective to tolerance and reasonableness (Mk. 2.23–28; 7.1–23). In the academic literature, modifying belief appears in concepts like ‘modifying health

beliefs' (Haefner & Kirscht, 1970) and 'modifying delusions' (Chadwick, Lowe, Horne, & Higson, 1994). The latter study shows that 'verbal challenge' reduces 'belief conviction'. In both Markian incidents concerning the Sabbath and kosher beliefs, Jesus makes strong verbal argument and conclusions (Mk. 2.23-28; 7.1-23), in full alignment with the results of modern research (Chadwick et al., 1994). Jesus' modification of practice flows from his belief modification. When you understand the belief, the true essence of Sabbath and kosher observance, a change (modification) in practice will result. No literature was found which directly addresses the concept of *modifying practice*.

Transducing beliefs. This concept is not seen to exist anywhere in the literature.

Including outsiders. Only one item of literature was found with this concept (Garay, 2010). María Candelaria Garay argues that *including outsiders* in social benefits expansion in Latin America was driven by electoral vote competition and informal sector mobilization. The latter pressurized incumbents to include outsiders in healthcare and other programs, much like the Syrophoenician woman pressured Jesus into including her as an outsider in his demon-expulsion healthcare program (Mk. 7.24-30). This was a part of the transduction of the Israel exclusivity belief (which led to zealotry) into the inclusion of outsiders.

Including outsiders transduces terror beliefs which in turn transduces terror.

Submitting to authority transduces terror leaders, eschatology, and beliefs, effectively foundationalizing the transduction of terror.

Submitting to authority. The whole of the gospel of Mark is predicated on this concept. Jesus, his disciples, the leaders, the people all variously submit or are challenged to submit to the authority of Jesus, God, Caesar, and the Son of Man (Vespasian/Titus - Josephus, 75CE; e.g. Mk. 12.17). Likewise, the other gospels and the rest of the New Testament are peppered with this concept. The writer of the first letter of Peter enjoins people for God's sake to submit themselves to every human authority, like a king or governor, because God put them there to maintain justice (1 Pe. 2.13-14). The Apostle Paul instructs everyone to submit to the governing authorities because they are appointed by God (Ro. 13.1-8). Hebrews (13.17) commands to obey the leaders and submit to them, because they look after you. Titus (3.1) says to be reminded to submit to authorities, always ready to do good. Submitting to authority only appears once in the title of an academic article (Pingle, 1997). It deals with 'its effect on decision-making'. Unfortunately, the article sells for \$35.95 so it could not be accessed in full. However, from the abstract we can garner that deciding to submit to authority is a function of the quality of the subject matter, punishments for disobedience, and 'the decision-making environment'. To this it can be asserted that the subject matter of Mark is an intense, well-structured and compelling narrative about the 'real' Messiah, the punishments for disobedience are great (Mk. 9.42-49), and the decision-making environment of riot, murder, unnecessary bloodshed, and disappointment for every Zealot is conducive to finally submitting to the authority of benevolent leaders like Jesus and Caesar. Thus, again, the sound, albeit devious, psychological basis of the

strategic ploys (Glaser, 1978) found in Mark are borne out in modern empirical literature.

Demonizing

The word demonizing originally referred to the ascription of non-monotheistic gods to deceiving demons (Wikipedia, 2020c). Jesus ascribes the Jewish leaders' and Zealots' narrow conception of God to their being wicked and unbelieving (Mk. 7.22; 8.38); thus, he demonizes them.

Demonizing leaders. Jesus uses the same principle when he ascribes the hypocrisy, arrogance, and lack of insight of the Jewish leaders and Zealots to an 'adulterous and sinful generation' (Mk. 8.38). Demonizing leaders does not appear as a concept in the literature.

Approximating beliefs. Only one reference to this concept was found in the literature which deals with optimal belief approximation in physics (Leike & Enßlin, 2017) and is beyond any practical application here. In our theory, we see Mark approximating the people's beliefs in extreme dedication and Messianic expectation by referring to Jesus as a Nazarene (Nararite) and Son of David both of which concepts they would have appreciated and made them transducible into starting to follow Jesus (Mk. 10.46-47).

Approximating beliefs, then correcting leaders by challenging precepts, sets the stage for incompetent confusion of culpabilities, all of which demonize leaders and allows for their transducement through the prism of authority acknowledgement and submission into the noble image of superior spiritual leadership.

Challenging precepts. The only study concentrating on this concept is about challenging precepts of established family-centered care in hospitals (Galvin, Boyers, Schwartz, & Jones, 2000). The highest-rated item in the questionnaire was 'feeling welcome when I come to the hospital' (p. 625). It is revealing that in social settings humans desire above all else to feel welcome and at ease. Mark has Jesus artfully use this same strategy in his challenge of the Pharisaic divorce precept, stimulating a welcome sense of camaraderie with the Zealot, the latter often regarding the Pharisee as messianically lethargic (cf. Rohr, 2014).

Confusing culpabilities. Alexander & Ferzan (2013) use this concept in a philosophical discussion of tort law. No other use of the concept was found in the literature. Apart from the fact that the article is inaccessible, the abstract does not indicate relevance for the present theory.

Correcting leaders. No academic literature focuses on this concept.

Limitation and Scope

The above literary comparisons provide a preliminary exemplification of integration of the theoretical concepts of this study with extant literature. Further analysis is beyond the scope of this paper and could be pursued in future research.

Although this study is termed a ‘classic grounded theory’, its limitation as such is fully acknowledged. The criticism will be levied by CGT adherents that this paper is more a description of codes illustrating concepts. That is acceptable. The raw data underlying the concepts have been purposefully laid out as this is thought to be of more value to readers than mere high-level conceptual interactions. Thus, for the most part, theoretically, this study may be viewed as thin, and rightly so, but it is not so much intended to be a CGT as it was to utilize CGT analytical principles in discovering the main concern of the writer or Mark, how he/she resolved it, and for producing usable concepts for illustrating the process. That is where CGT ended in this study. The present researcher might, or another could, take it further and turn it into a full-blown CGT.

Note

Quotations from the Bible are taken from The World English Bible and may be viewed here: <https://ebible.org/web/index.htm>

References

- Alexander, L., & Ferzan, K. K. (2013). Confused Culpability, Contrived Causation, and the Collapse of Tort Theory. *Philosophical Foundations of the Law of Torts* (2014), 13-114.
- Atwill, J. (2011). *Caesar's Messiah: The Roman Conspiracy to Invent Jesus: Flavian Signature Edition*.
- Baumgold, D. (1993). Pacifying politics: resistance, violence, and accountability in seventeenth-century contract theory. *Political Theory*, 21(1), 6-27.
- Biro, M. M. (2013). *5 Ways Leaders Rock Employee Recognition*. Forbes Media LLC. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/meghanbiro/2013/01/13/5-ways-leaders-rock-employee-recognition/#1a58534a47ca>
- Chadwick, P. D., Lowe, C. F., Horne, P. J., & Higson, P. J. (1994). Modifying delusions: The role of empirical testing. *Behavior Therapy*, 25(1), 35-49.
- Elliott, N., & Higgins, A. (2012). Surviving Grounded Theory Research Method in an Academic World: Proposal Writing and Theoretical Frameworks. *Grounded Theory Review*, 11(2).
- Field, T., & Goldson, E. (1984). Pacifying effects of nonnutritive sucking on term and preterm neonates during heelstick procedures. *Pediatrics*, 74(6), 1012-1015.
- Galvin, E., Boyers, L., Schwartz, P. K., & Jones, M. W. (2000). Challenging the precepts of family-centered care: testing a philosophy. *Pediatric Nursing*, 26(6), 625.
- Garay, M. C. (2010). *Including outsiders: Social policy expansion in Latin America* (Doctoral dissertation, UC Berkeley).

- Glaser, B. G. (1965). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Social problems*, 12(4), 436–445.
- Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory*. Mill Valley.
- Glaser, B. G. (2007a). All Is Data. *The Grounded Theory Review*, vol.6, no.2.
- Glaser, B. G. (2007b). Naturalist inquiry and grounded theory. *Historical Social Research, Supplement*, (19), 114–132
- Glaser, B. G. (2009a). The Novice GT Researcher. *The Grounded Theory Review*, vol.8, no.2.
- Glaser, B. G. (2009b). Theoretical Writing. *The Grounded Theory Review*, vol.8, no.3.
- Google Search. (2020a). *Modifying belief*.
<https://www.google.com/search?q=Modifying+belief&oq=Modifying+belief&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i59j69i60l2.5920j0j8&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>
- Haefner, D. P., & Kirscht, J. P. (1970). Motivational and behavioral effects of modifying health beliefs. *Public Health Reports*, 85(6), 478.
- Ingham, P. W. (1998). Transducing Hedgehog: the story so far. *The EMBO journal*, 17(13), 3505–3511.
- Josephus: War. (75CE). Josephus, F., Niese, B., & Rogers, P. (2016). *The War of the Jews*.
<http://www.biblical.ie/page.php?fl=josephus/Greek%20Texts>
- Josephus: Antiquities. (93CE). Josephus, F., Niese, B., & Rogers, P. (2016). *The Antiquities of the Jews*. <http://www.biblical.ie/page.php?fl=josephus/Greek%20Texts>
- Josephus: Against Apion. (97CE). Josephus, F., Niese, B., & Rogers, P. (2016). *Flavius Josephus Against Apion*. <http://www.biblical.ie/page.php?fl=josephus/Greek%20Texts>
- Josephus: Life. (99CE). Josephus, F., Niese, B., & Rogers, P. (2016). *The Life of Flavius Josephus*. <http://www.biblical.ie/page.php?fl=josephus/Greek%20Texts>
- Lagerlöf, N. P. (2010). Pacifying monogamy. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 15(3), 235–262.
- Lalitha, R. (2019). Stockholm Syndrome. *TNNMC Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 7(1), 37–39.
- Leike, R. H., & Enßlin, T. A. (2017). Optimal belief approximation. *Entropy*, 19(8), 402.
- MacDonald, G., Nail, P. R., & Harper, J. R. (2011). Do people use reverse psychology? An exploration of strategic self-anticonformity. *Social Influence*, 6(1), 1–14.
- Merriam-Webster. (2020). *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Merriam-Webster, Incorporated
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/transduce>
- Moran, R. (2012). *Authority and estrangement: An essay on self-knowledge*. Princeton University Press.
- Pingle, M. (1997). Submitting to authority: Its effect on decision-making. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 18(1), 45–68.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0167487096000463>

- Rohr, R. (2014). *ZEALOTS AND PHARISEES: 3rd Core Principle: The best criticism of the bad is the practice of the better. Oppositional energy only creates more of the same.* Center for Action and Contemplation.
https://cac.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/CP-3_Zealots-and-Pharisees.pdf
- Ruddick, S. (1983). Pacifying the forces: Drafting women in the interests of peace. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 8(3), 471–489.
- Schonfield, H. J., ed. (1955). *The Authentic New Testament*. Dennis Dobson Ltd.
- Sugar, W., & Holloman, H. (2009). Technology leaders wanted: Acknowledging the leadership role of a technology coordinator. *TechTrends*, 53(6), 66.
- Thyne, C. L. (2006). ABC's, 123's, and the golden rule: The pacifying effect of education on civil war, 1980–1999. *International Studies Quarterly*, 50(4), 733–754.
- Valliant, J. S. (2019). *The New Testament Was Used To Pacify The Rebels & Unite Israelites & non Israelites.* MythVision Podcast by Derek Lambert & Dr. Luther G. Williams. YouTube.
<https://youtu.be/w0ECPnmS7Go>
- van Warmerdam, G. (2018). *Changing Core Beliefs.* PATHWAY TO HAPPINESS LLC
<https://pathwaytohappiness.com/about/gary-van-warmerdam/>
- Wikipedia. (2020a). *Jewish religious terrorism.* Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jewish_religious_terrorism
- Wikipedia. (2020b). *Zealots.* Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zealots>
- Wikipedia. (2020c). *Demonization.* Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demonization>