### b) Gospel of Mark

###

### aa) Profiling the author

Reference has already been made above to the profile Papias of Hierapolis gave of the author of Mk, and also how Irenaeus corrected this profile in his sense. Eusebius, however, informs us that Papias knew the First Epistle of Peter where we find a mention of Mark. Hence, Papias could have already spun his information on Mark from this letter, which says: "Greetings to you from the fellow church in Babylon and Mark my son" (1 Peter 5:13). Likewise, 1 Peter could have been the source for Irenaeus, too, to interpret the passage in terms of Mark’s and Peter’s presence in Rome, equating Babylon with Rome.[[1]](#footnote-1) Karl Heussi, however, has pointed out that an apocalyptic "code name"[[2]](#footnote-2) is never used in New Testament letters, and that the name "Babylon" would be far too defamatory "and would stand in strange tension with the loyal attitude towards the Roman state that is expressed in 1 Peter 2:13-17".[[3]](#footnote-3) As Otto Zwierlein can show from the comparison with letters that are related to 1 Peter, namely Jas, 1 Clem. and 2 Cor, then also the Book of Daniel, the addressees are described as Christians living in the Diaspora. This means that also in 1 Peter the expression "Babylon" is rather to be understood metaphorically.[[4]](#footnote-4) However, since "Babylon" was put for "Rome" especially in apocalyptic literature,[[5]](#footnote-5) it is obvious that the apocalyptically oriented Papias probably understood this note of 1Peter from an apocalyptic perspective and drew from it Mark's connection and dependence on Peter at Rome.

We do not have any other early sources for a preaching activity of Peter and Paul in Rome.[[6]](#footnote-6) Neither 1 Clem. nor the Epistles of Ignatius - regardless of whether one looks at the Three Epistles Collection or the Seven Epistles Collection - speak of this. When Ignatius's Epistle to the Romans (IgnRom 4:3) says that "Peter and Paul" gave "instructions" to the Romans, which Ignatius does not want to give because he is not an apostle, this clearly refers to epistolary instructions. IgnRom thus recurs to the Pauline Epistles known to him elsewhere and perhaps to 1 Peter.

Peter's interpreter became Peter's disciple in Irenaeus.[[7]](#footnote-7) Moreover, the criticism voiced by Papias against Peter disappeared in Irenaeus' account. Like this image enhancement, the unhistorical assertion of the preaching activity and church foundation of Rome by Peter and Paul served the interest of enhancing Mark and Matthew as authors of their Gospels, too.[[8]](#footnote-8) Tertullian continues Irenaeus's thought by attributing Mk to Peter in the first place, just as it is (even today) "common practice (for) professors to commission collaborators to write articles for them ... which are then published in their (= the professors') name",[[9]](#footnote-9) Tertullian already voiced this opinion in the early third century: The Gospel "which Mark edited can be attributed to Peter, whose interpreter was Mark. It is probably right to attribute to the teachers what the students published".[[10]](#footnote-10) The effectiveness of this account of Irenaeus and Tertullian, which further extended the figuration[[11]](#footnote-11) of Papias, was subsequently increased by further embellishment of the stories related to Peter, and as such entered the Latin Bible of the West as the Prologue to Mk.

Jerome, the famous hermit of Bethlehem, opens his "Book of Illustrious Men" (*De viris inlustribus*) with the apostle Peter, who was most important to him (De inl. 1). Peter is followed by James, the brother of the Lord (De inl. 2), and Jerome then comes to speak of the first evangelist, Matthew (De inl. 3). Matthew is followed by Judas, the brother of James (De inl. 4), Paul (De inl. 5), Barnabas (De inl. 6), the evangelist Luke (De inl. 7), and then comes the evangelist Mark (De inl. 8). He is then followed by the fourth evangelist, John (De inl. 9). To gain an insight into how the presentation of authority, beginning with its first tangible beginnings, moves and refines from author to author, compare the following reports, which continue the above-mentioned comparison of Irenaeus and his source.

About Mark it is reported:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ca. 392/393 117 | ca. 310/320 | ca. 310/320 | ca. 200 | ca. 180 | ca. 140 |
| Hieron., De vir. inl. 8[[12]](#footnote-12) | Euseb. Caes., Hist. eccl. II 15,1-2 | Euseb. Caes., Hist. eccl. VI 14,5-7 | Clem. Alex.,Adumbr. ad 1 Peter 5:13[[13]](#footnote-13) | Iren., Adv. haer. III 1,1 (Euseb. Caes., Hist. eccl. V 8,3) | Papias, Exposition of the Sayings of the Lord, quoted in: Euseb. Caes. Hist. eccl. III 39,15 |
| Mark the *disciple* and *interpreter of Peter* *wrote a short gospel at the request of the brethren* at Rome, embodying what he had heard Peter tell.When Peter had heard this, *he approved it and published it under his authority to be read in the churches*,as Clement did in the sixth book of his Hypoty- posesand Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, record.Peter also mentions this Mark in his first epistle, in which he figuratively mentions Rome under the name of Babylon. "Greetings to you from the church in Babylon and from Mark, my son".[[14]](#footnote-14) So he took the Gospel he had composed himself, went to Egypt, and first preached Christ at Alexandria, where he founded a church so admirable in scholarship and continence in living that he constrained all followers of Christ to his example. Philo, the most learned of the Jews, seeing that the first church in Alexandria was in some respects still Jewish, wrote a book on their manner of life as something creditable to his nation, telling how, as Luke says, the believers had all things in common at Jerusalem, so he wrote down what he saw happening in Alexandria under the learned Mark. He died in the eighth year of Nero and was buried in Alexandria, Annianus succeeding him. | So greatly did the splendor of piety illumine the minds of Peter’s hearers that they were not satisfied with hearingonce only, *and were not content with the unwritten teaching of the divine preaching*, but with all sortsof entreaties they besought Mark, a *follower of Peter*, and the one whose Gospel is extant, *that he would leave them a written monument of the doctrine which had been orally communicated* to them. Nor did they cease until they had prevailed with the man, and had thus become the occasionof the written Gospel which bears the name of Mark2. And *they say* that Peter when he had learned, through a revelation of the Spirit, of that which had been done, *was pleased with the zeal of the men, and that the work obtained the sanction of**his authority for the purpose of being used in the churches*. Clement in the eighth book of hisHypotyposes gives this account, and with him agrees the bishop of Hierapolis named Papias.And Peter makes mention of Mark in his first epistle which they say that he wrote in Rome itself,as is indicated by him, when he calls the city, by a figure, Babylon, as he does in the followingwords: “The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you; and so doth Marcusmy son.” | 5. …The Gospel accordingto Mark had this occasion. As Peter *had preached the Word publicly* at Rome, *and interpreted the**Gospel by the Spirit*, many who were present requested that Mark, *who had followed him for a long time and remembered his sayings, should write them out*. And having composed the Gospel he gave it to those who had requested it. 7. When Peter learned of this, *he* *neither directly forbade nor encouraged it*. But, last of all,John, perceiving that the external facts had been made plain in the Gospel, being urged by hisfriends, and inspired by the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel.” This is the account of Clement. | While Peter *was publicly preaching the Gospel* in Rome before certain horsemen of the Emperor, and presenting many testimonies of Christ, Mark *was asked by them to write, as a memorial, the Gospel**called after Mark*, from what Peter had said, as Luke is recognised by style as the one who also wrote the Acts of the Apostles, and Paul as the one who set over the Epistle to the Hebrews. | Peter and Paul *were preaching* at Rome, and *laying the foundations of the Church*. After their departure, Mark, the *disciple and interpreter of Peter*, did also *hand down to us in writing what had been preached by Peter*. Luke also, the companion of Paul, recorded in a book the Gospel preached by him. Afterwards, John, the disciple of the Lord, who also had leaned upon His breast, did himself publish a Gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia. | This also the presbyter said: Mark, having become the *interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, though not in order, whatsoever he remembered of the things said or done by Christ*.For he neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterward, as I said, he followed Peter, who adapted his teaching to the needs of his hearers, but with no intention of giving a connected account of the Lord’s discourses, so that Mark committed no error while he thus wrote some things as heremembered them. For he was careful of one thing, not to omit any of the things which he had heard, and not to state any of them falsely. |

Jerome's report explicitly mentions two sources, Clement of Alexandria with the sixth book of his Hypotyposes[[15]](#footnote-15) and Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis. The comparison shows, however, that Jerome omits here his main source, Eusebius of Caesarea, from whom he even took the two source references. But Jerome has not only taken over the already embellished and uncertain - he writes: "they say" (φασι) - of the two versions given by Eusebius,[[16]](#footnote-16) according to which Peter had "approved" Mark's Gospel as "to be read in the churches",[[17]](#footnote-17) while the same Eusebius in the same work admits elsewhere[[18]](#footnote-18) that Peter had neither directly forbidden nor encouraged it. But neither the first account nor the second one follows from Clement or Papias, as we can see. Nevertheless, Jerome asserts Peter’s support for this Gospel, although he has evidently also accessed the account of Papias transmitted by Eusebius, from which he has taken the title of "interpreter of Peter" for Mark. These nuances show a deliberate alteration and shaping of the tradition that Jerome inherited and handed down according to his own likes.

The assumption that Mark was also a "disciple" of Peter can only have been taken from Irenaeus, whose passage on Peter was also transmitted by Eusebius. Again, Jerome adopted this thought.

As can be seen, Jerome takes from the various sources gathered from Eusebius the decorative elements from which he builds the image of his famous evangelist Mark. This also includes that he takes over from Eusebius the information[[19]](#footnote-19) obtained by the latter from Origen that Peter refers to Mark when he symbolically speaks of Rome in the first of his letters. To this he can then add from his own sources or his own imagination, perhaps following Irenaeus's cliché of the Roman church foundation of Peter and Paul, that Mark had not only published the Gospel on his own authority (i.e. probably under his own name) and authorised it to be read out, as he previously noted, but also preached it in Egypt, beginning in Alexandria. Jerome sees the report on Mark confirmed by the learned Jew Philo of Alexandria, who, as Jerome believes, had based himself on Luke's Acts and described the life of the Alexandrian Christian community founded by Mark. Finally, he also knows the year of Mark's death and that he died in the 8th year of Nero, i.e. in 62 CE, and was buried in Alexandria.

Of course, we are dealing here with an achronological conglutination, in which Philo of Alexandria, who died around 50 CE and who had written about Therapeutes, a group of ascetic Egyptians of the 1st century BC (!), is said to have made use of Acts, which, according to older research, was written towards the end of the 1st century CE, but probably, as we will show, only emerges under Irenaeus at the end of the 2nd century CE. From the comparison above, we can learn, however, that the power of imagination in the configuration of these authoritative figures is not constraint by chronological impossibilities, but becomes wilder and wilder the further we move away from the events of the 2nd century and come further in history.

The oldest witness is the not uncritical account by Papias, which itself seems to be a constructed account. Yet, this short note was made into a biography of Mark, the evangelist, disciple and interpreter of Peter and church founder. This, however, does not bring us to the end of this journey of imaginations and fictions, but we can add two more accounts, the second in particular having implanted itself in the minds and hearts of the reading public by its insertion in the copies of the New Testament of the Latin Church.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Here follows the first account, found in the preface to Jerome's Commentary on Matthaeus:

"... Next comes Mark, interpreter of the apostle Peter and first bishop of the church in Alexandria, who did not see the Lord and Saviour himself, but who narrates what he had heard in the preaching of the Teacher, more concerned with the reliability of what had happened than with the order."[[21]](#footnote-21)

While the theme of the "order" of the narrative and the "reliability of what has happened" clearly echoes Papias, the passage from De vir. inl. 8 quoted just before also shines through. Moreover, we learn from what has been quoted something that we did not know before: for while Mark was previously described as the founder of the Church of Alexandria, here he becomes its first bishop. Probably in order to cushion Papias's criticism somewhat as far as the order of narration is concerned, Jerome emphasises only here that Mark "did not see the Lord and Saviour himself".

The following account we can set parallel to the text just discussed because of its close proximity to Jerome:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The Prologue to Mk[[22]](#footnote-22)** | **Hier, De vir. inl. 8** |
| Mark, who was also called stubby-fingered because his fingers were too short compared to his other considerable height, this Mark was a *disciple and interpreter of Peter*. Following him, *he wrote this short Gospel* in the region of Italy *at the request of the brothers in Rome, just as he himself had heard him preach it*. | Mark the *disciple and interpreter of Peter wrote a short gospel at the request of the brethren at Rome, embodying what he had heard Peter tell*. |
| *When Peter heard it, he approved it and, by virtue of his authority, determined that it should be read in the churches.* | *When Peter had heard this, he approved it* and published it *under his authority to be read in the churches*, as Clement did in the sixth book of his Hypotyposes and Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, record. Peter also mentions this Mark in his first epistle, in which he figuratively mentions Rome under the name of Babylon. "Greetings to you from the church in Babylon and from Mark, my son".[[23]](#footnote-23)  |
| But after the death of Peter he took this Gospel, which he had written himself, went to Egypt and, appointed the first bishop of Alexandria, preached Christ and founded a church there. He was of such learning and moderate self-control in the conduct of life that he committed all followers of Christ to the example of his person. | So he took the Gospel he had composed himself, went to Egypt, and first preached Christ at Alexandria, where he founded a church so admirable in scholarship and continence in living that he constrained all followers of Christ to his example. Philo, the most learned of the Jews, seeing that the first church in Alexandria was in some respects still Jewish, wrote a book on their manner of life as something creditable to his nation, telling how, as Luke says, the believers had all things in common at Jerusalem, so he wrote down what he saw happening in Alexandria under the learned Mark. He died in the eighth year of Nero and was buried in Alexandria, Annianus succeeding him. |

As we can see from the comparison here and also with Eusebius's reports before, both reports are to some extent parallel in content and even wording. And yet, the comparison also shows differences between the Markan prologue and Jerome on the one hand and between these and Eusebius. Even though "almost all the news" of the Markan prologue "are taken from Eusebius's Church History",[[24]](#footnote-24) the differences must also be taken into account. In this respect, Mark's prologue is even more imaginative than Jerome's account of Mark, which suggests that it may have been written even later than Jerome's work. The earliest attestation of the Prologue of Mark is in the 9th century.[[25]](#footnote-25)

In the prologue, we not only learn of a physical peculiarity of Mark, for he is called "stubby-fingered" because of particularly short fingers, but the subsequent reference to the "short Gospel", also found in Jerome, may offer the reason for this editorial addition. Obviously, the author of the prologue wanted to provide an explanation - even if not immediately convincing for readers today - for why the Gospel was so short compared to the other canonical ones. Of course, just like Marcion’s Gospel, it lacked the stories about Jesus’s birth in Bethlehem, had no youth stories either and in some of the manuscripts even the ending with appearances of the Risen one is missing. We will come to the presumably deeper reason below when we look at the more detailed and clearer prologue on Luke. The prologue to Mark has the further indication, in defence and safeguarding of Mark, that he was not only Peter's pupil and interpreter, but also that he wrote "following him".

The proximity between Mark and Peter thus becomes ever closer, the younger the accounts are, hence the reference to the fact that this Gospel was still written "in the region of Italy". It is also interesting that Peter is the one who, on the basis of his authority, "determines" that the Gospel is read in the churches, while Jerome attributes the publication of the Gospel to Peter, not Mark. On the other hand, the Prologue to Mark makes Mark the first bishop of Alexandria, which Jerome does not mention here, although Jerome asserts this elsewhere,[[26]](#footnote-26) whereas "the great Christian Alexandrians of the early period, Clement and Origen, know nothing of the evangelist Mark's legendary sojourn in Egypt".[[27]](#footnote-27) Certainly, the prologue is not directly dependent on Jerome, and Zwierlein seems to be correct in assuming a common source, but it transpires that broadens the description beyond what was available to Jerome.

### bb) Law and prophecy as heralds of the Gospel - John the Baptist and Jesus

(1) In many ways different from \*Ev, Mk begins, even though its opening is immediately reminiscent of \*Ev. It is the only Gospel of the later canonical ones to apply the term "Gospel" coined by Marcion to its own text. Right in the opening we read: "Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Son of God".[[28]](#footnote-28) Like the Marcionite Megethius who thought that the gospel was authored by Christ, in Mk this Gospel is not regarded as the text of anybody else, but of Jesus Christ, whereby Megethius was already reproached for the ambiguous genitive that leaves open whether “of Christ” is to be interpreted as Christ being the protagonist of the Gospel or its author. The same syntactical and semantic ambiguity also exists in Mk 1:1. Matthias Klinghardt therefore assumes that Mark took the title "Gospel" from \*Ev, perhaps even with the ambiguity of attributing the Gospel to Jesus Christ.[[29]](#footnote-29) In contrast to \*Ev, in Mk the term "Gospel" is repeatedly encountered,[[30]](#footnote-30) and already in its opening leads to the exposition of its programme (Mk 1:2-9):

"2as it is written in Isaiah the prophet: ‘I will send my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way’ – 3 ‘a voice of one calling in the wilderness, Prepare the way for the Lord, make straight paths for him.’ 4 And so John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness, preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. 5The whole Judean countryside and all the people of Jerusalem went out to him. Confessing their sins, they were baptized by him in the Jordan River. 6 John wore clothing made of camel’s hair, with a leather belt around his waist, and he ate locusts and wild honey. 7 And this was his message: ‘After me comes the one more powerful than I, the straps of whose sandals I am not worthy to stoop down and untie. 8 I baptize you with water, but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit.’ 9 At that time Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan.”

Mk has not only borrowed from \*Ev its title “Gospel”, it also takes up the main challenge of \*Ev, namely the separation of law and prophecy on the one hand and the gospel on the other, illustrated in \*Ev by the figure of John the Baptist. In opening Mk with John, the author rejects this Marcionite antithesis.The reason why this Gospel does not start with the description of Jesus' life, but introduces John first is to state from the beginning that John is no sign post for the break between Christ’s message and the Jewish law and prophecy, but rather holds them together.

Surprisingly, research hardly gives an answer to the question why Mk begins with John instead of Jesus. Usually scholars assume a "spiritual and historical kinship" of the two protagonists, "which goes deeper than a mere temporal-spatial proximity".[[31]](#footnote-31) In particular, historical explanations are developed on the basis of the accounts in the Synoptic Gospels on John. It is said that "only because Jesus received baptism from John the Baptist and paid highest reverence to his teacher, ... the Gospels have taken up Baptist material and handed it down to us".[[32]](#footnote-32) The most important reason given for the historicity of John is the implied shadow that John baptizing Jesus throughs on Jesus. As John’s baptism is one of “repentance”, it presupposes a sinful baptisant, and the claim goes that putting Jesus in this negative light could hardly be invented by the Gospel writers.[[33]](#footnote-33) One wonders, however, to what extent this argument is based on later christological views that had not yet been developed during the first two or three centuries. Sometimes, scholars simply state the fact that "from the beginning, the Baptist was part of the initial proclamation of Jesus … (and it becomes apparent) that he has a lasting significance within the Christian tradition", because of "the indisputable fact ... that the religious-historical origins of the movement gathering around Jesus, the preacher of the Kingdom of God, and its post-Easter reconstitution, the steadily growing original congregation, showed manifold links to the influential Baptist movement in terms of content and persons right from the beginning".[[34]](#footnote-34) Other scholars stress the traditions on which Mk relied when writing his Gospel: "The evangelist Mark makes use of sources and complexes of tradition available to him, e.g. the story of the Passion (Mk 14-16). He puts these sources together and tells a coherent story that begins with the appearance of the Baptist in the wilderness (Mk 1:4) and ends with the announcement of the appearance of Jesus in Galilee (16:1- 8)."[[35]](#footnote-35)

Another speculative theory states:

"Since all four NT Gospels feature JB [John the Baptist] at the beginning of Jesus’s ministry, it seems reasonable to infer that JB was accepted as a favorable, possibly even flattering, association for Jesus. The evangelists would not be expected to include, let alone begin their works with, a figure who dulled, checked, or stifled the subsequent narration of Jesus. That said, the association with JB has certain undeniably negative implications."[[36]](#footnote-36)

Rothschild's study elaborates that the picture of John in the Fourth Gospel not only "deliberately duplicates, omits, supplements, adapts, and corrects Synoptic Baptist traditions", but even replaces "the contradictory and perplexing presentation of the relationship between JB and Jesus in the Synoptics with a categorically negative one” of John.[[37]](#footnote-37)

Finally, attention has been drawn to the greatest “paradox in the story of how Christianity began", “the origin and meaning” of Jesus’ baptism:

"The ritual of baptism was the rite by which people made their association with the Jesus movement. And yet, Jesus was apparently not the source of this practice. The original baptizer was another prophet – John. In the Synoptic accounts of John’s baptism, John claims to baptize with water, but the coming one, Jesus, will baptize with the Holy Spirit. Then, John baptizes Jesus with water and the Holy Spirit. Jesus goes forth and baptizes no one."[[38]](#footnote-38)

The various attempts at a solution to the question of why the Gospels do not begin with Jesus, but with John the Baptist, seem to merely confirm that scholarship is at a loss in answering the question. So far, it has been unable to make any real sense of this literary construct. Only the synoptic synopsis of the four Gospels to which is added the Gospel of Marcion may provide a plausible answer. Since Marcion had made use of John the Baptist representing the last of the Jewish prophets and linked the Jewish law and the prophets to form the anithetical background against which he saw the great prophet, Jesus Christ, the later canonical Gospels argued against such separation of Jewish and Christian traditions and, instead, tried to introduce the Baptist as the connecting figure to hold the Jewish heritage and the novel Christian movement together, making John the forerunner of Jesus.

 That this explanation seems more convincing than those mentioned historicizing attempts can be seen from the opening of the Gospel of Mk. Immediately, he not only writes about John and him baptizing Jesus, but strengthens the connection between John and the Jewish prophets.

He does so, by referring to and quoting the prophet Isaiah. Jewish listeners of that time who were well versed in the Jewish Scriptures, must have noticed, however, that the reference to Isaiah first introduced another quote by the minor prophet Malachi (Mk 1:2 = Mal 3:1, "I will send my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way"), before adding Isaiah (Mk 1:3 = Is 40:3, ("a voice of one calling in the wilderness, ‘Prepare the way for the Lord, make straight paths for him'"). Mk reads these quotes to identify the voice in the wilderness with that of John the Baptist. With this opening, especially with the prophetic word from Malachi, which we have already encountered in \*Ev 7:24-28, Mark responds to\*Ev in a number of ways:

* Contrary to Marcion’s claim that the prophets were ignorant of the coming of the Christian messiah, Mk holds that these prophets announced him as the “Lord”.
* John the Baptist was already co-announced by the same prophets to become the messenger and voice in the wilderness who will prepare the way for this Lord.
* Mk paves the way to read and interpret the wilderness "as a mythic-historicisable space ... (that is) already long predestined by prophecy, i.e. the writings of Israel. The Marcan discourse on the desert thus always has intertextual reminiscences of Old Testament desert metaphors, especially Isaiah’s concepts of space".[[39]](#footnote-39) Mk sets the wilderness as the space that connects Jewish prophecy, the Baptist and Jesus before indicating the differences between the two protagonists, the Baptist and Jesus.
* The Baptist’s clothing with camel's hair, i.e. with "non-plant material", one of the "first unclean animals mentioned in Lev 11:4",[[40]](#footnote-40) does not - unlike in Mt 3:4 – references the Jewish prophetic garment, but makes John appear to be critical of purity[[41]](#footnote-41) and thus brings him closer to Jesus. The addition of the leather belt confirms the Baptist’s prophetic relation to Elijah (2 Kings 1:8),[[42]](#footnote-42) thus contradicting Marcion’s criticism of the law and the prophetic tradition.
* The Baptist tradition (Mk 1:2-6) and the Jesus tradition (Mk 1:9ff.) are arranged in parallel, which is meant to show their mutual connectedness.[[43]](#footnote-43)
* At the same time, the traditional hierarchy between the prophet and "the sons of the prophet", i.e. between prophet and disciples, teacher and disciple, is reversed by making the prophet John the forerunner of Jesus.[[44]](#footnote-44)
* That Jesus undergoes John's baptism is "a clear signal ... that there had been a more intense connection between the two persons rather than a random brief act of baptism which Jesus underwent".[[45]](#footnote-45)
* The separation between a supreme or best God and a judgemental God is contradicted by the Lord who is announced by the prophets and whose way is prepared by the Baptist, for in Malachi judgement is explicitly mentioned: "Behold, I send my messenger … So I will come to put you on trial" (Mal 3:1.5).

Consequently, the Baptist is portrayed in the opening scene of Mk as performing a baptism of repentance.[[46]](#footnote-46) John’s asceticism brings him close to Marcion’s emphasis on self-restraint, chastity and fasting. More important, however, is Mark’s first statement on Jesus reads: "At that time Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee and was baptized bz John in the Jordan" (Mk 1:9). Marcion had not mentioned a baptism of Jesus by John, even though the two Gospels share the information that Jesus’ first association with a town was Nazareth. Likewise, Mark had been able to glean the information about John's baptismal activity, his discipleship, his imprisonment and his beheading by Herod from \*Ev (\*Ev 7:17-28; 9:19-28; see Mk 1:15; 6:14-29). In contrast to Marcion who set John and Jesus in antithesis to symbolise the antithesis of "law/prophecy" and "gospel", that of the “judgemental god” and the "best God", that of the political messiah of the “judgemental god” and the universal saviour of the “best God”, Mk makes Jesus be the son of the God of the prophets (Mk 1:11: "You are my Son, whom I love; with you I am well pleased"; Ps 2:7 – taken as words of the prophetic David: "You are my son; today I have become your father"). In Mark Jesus does not come from heaven as in \*Ev - his appearance is conspicuously not even discussed - but Mk reports: "10 Just as Jesus was coming up out of the water, he saw heaven being torn open and the Spirit descending on him like a dove. 11 And a voice came from heaven: “You are my Son, whom I love; with you I am well pleased.” (Mk 1:10-11). The descent of Jesus in Marcion is thus replaced by Jesus coming up out of the water and his adoption by the heavenly voice. Marcion’s identification of the "Great Prophet" with the "Best God" in \*Ev gives way to an adoptive sonship of Jesus in Mk.

In a next narrative step in Mk, Jesus lives in the wilderness, sharing the living conditions of the Baptist for 40 days. Jesus becomes exposed to Satan's temptations, even though it is reported that the angels minister to Jesus. The end of this period is again determined by John when it is said that "after John was put in prison, Jesus went into Galilee, proclaiming the good news of God" (Mk 1:14). The account of Jesus' beginnings and especially his preaching of the Gospel of God is consequently linked to John, to the appearance of the Baptist, to Jesus' encounter with him, his baptism by him and John being delivered to Herod, who is not mentioned by name here. Only after this preparation by the Baptist as an eschatological herald[[47]](#footnote-47) does Jesus begin with his own proclamation of God's Gospel. Even Jesus's first message is closely related to John's call to repentance: “The time has come,” he said. “The kingdom of God has come near. Repent and believe the good news!” (Mk 1:15) Yet the distance between the two is palpable. John never explicitly acknowledges Jesus as Messiah or refers to him as such.[[48]](#footnote-48)

Those who read \*Ev as the Vorlage of Mk understand why Mk has designed its programmatic opening scene as a "brief hagiographical account" about the Baptist.[[49]](#footnote-49) The story is not a reflection of historical facts, but an apologetic response to its pre-text, from which Mk wants to distance himself in a very decisive point.[[50]](#footnote-50)

(2) The apologetic intention of Mk also becomes clear with the first reappearance of John and his disciples in this Gospel. As in parallel \*Ev, Mk also comes to discuss the relationship between new and old (Mk 2:18-22). Surprisingly, Mark has widely adopted this passage, merely reversing the arrangement of the two examples (wine, garment). As we saw above regarding \*Ev 5:33-37 (p. xxx), there is recognition of Jewish tradition in the garment metaphor. It is not surprising, then, that Mark begins with it, which softens the scene as a whole somewhat in its antithetical statement. However, the narration also makes clear how important the opening passage in Mk was, which first places Jesus close to John and his discipleship, so that the questioning of Jesus in the present story does not immediately become a fundamental challenge, as Tertullian reads this story in \*Ev. Mark has omitted any allusion to the common prayer practice of John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees, which within \*Ev (as we have seen) played a central role in the Lord's Prayer as an alternative prayer to that of John's disciples. Here Mark is even more consistent, not only deleting the prayer theme in the present passage, but leaving aside the passage with the Lord's Prayer altogether.[[51]](#footnote-51)

However, the importance Mark attaches to the relationship between Jesus and John, and the extent to which he extends his narration to John over \*Ev in a later passage as well, becomes clear in the passage parallel to \*Ev 9:7-9, 18-22, Mk 6:14-29; 8:27-31, as we will see:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **\*Ev 9:7-9, 18-22** | **Mk 6:14-29; 8:27-31** | **Josephus, Antiquitates XVIII 5,2 §116-119**[[52]](#footnote-52) |
| 7 But when King Herod heard about what happened, he became perplexed because some said “John has been raised from the dead”, | 6:14 King Herod heard about this, for Jesus’ name had become well known. Some were saying, “John the Baptist has been raised from the dead,  |  |
| .8 and others “Elijah has appeared”, and yet others said, “One of the ancient prophets has arisen”. 9 But Herod said, “I beheaded John. Who is this man about whom I hear such things? And he sought to meet him. | and that is why miraculous powers are at work in him.” 15 Others said, “He is Elijah.” And still others claimed, “He is a prophet, like one of the prophets of long ago.” 16 But when Herod heard this, he said, “John, whom I beheaded, has been raised from the dead!” |  |
|  |  | Some Jews were of the opinion that the destruction of Herod's army was only due to the wrath of God, who had demanded just punishment for the killing of John the Baptist.  |
|  | 17 Herod had John arrested and thrown into prison. Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip, whom he had married, was to blame. 18 For John had said to Herod, "It is not lawful for you to have your brother's wife as your wife. 19 Herodias did not forgive him and wanted to have him killed. But she could not enforce it,  | Herod had the latter executed, |
|  | 20 for Herod was afraid of John, because he knew that he was a righteous and holy man. That is why he protected him. | although he was a noble man who urged the Jews to strive for perfection by exhorting them to practise righteousness towards one another and piety towards God and thus to come to baptism. Then, he proclaimed, baptism would be pleasing to God, because they would only use it to sanctify the body, but not to atone for their sins; for the soul had already been atoned for by a righteous life.  |
|  | When he listened to him, he was greatly embarrassed and yet he enjoyed listening to him. | Since, as a result of the wonderful attraction of such speeches, an enormous crowd flocked to John, Herod feared that the reputation of the man, whose advice seemed to be universally followed, might drive the people to revolt, and therefore thought it better to get rid of him in good time than to be in danger when things took a turn and then,  |
|  | 21 One day a favourable opportunity arose for Herodias. On his birthday, Herod invited his court officials and officers, together with the most distinguished citizens of Galilee, to a banquet. 22 Herodias' daughter came and danced, and she pleased Herod and his guests so much that the king said to the girl, 'Ask what you like of me; I will give it to you.' 23 He even swore to her, 'Whatever you ask of me, I will give it to you, even if it is half of my kingdom.' 24 She went out and asked her mother, What shall I ask? Herodias answered, 'The head of John the Baptist. 25 Then the girl ran in to the king and demanded, 'I want you to have John the Baptist's head brought to me immediately on a bowl. 26 Then the king became very sad, but because of the oaths and the guests he would not refuse her request. 27 So he ordered an executioner to go immediately to the prison and bring the Baptist's head. The executioner went and beheaded John.28 Then he brought the head on a dish and gave it to the girl, and the girl gave it to her mother. 29 When John's disciples heard this,  | when it was too late, to have to feel remorse. |
|  | they came and took his body and laid it in a tomb. | On the basis of this suspicion, Herod had John put in chains, taken to the fortress of Machaerus, which I mentioned above, and executed there. His death, however, was, as I said, according to the conviction of the Jews, the reason why Herod's army had been destroyed, since God  |
| 18 And it happened, when the disciples were together with him alone, he asked them, saying, “Who do the people take me for, the Son of Man?” 19 And the disciples said, “for John the Baptist, others for Elijah or one of the prophets.” 20 But he said to them, “But who do you (take me for)?” But Peter answered, saying, “You are the Christ, the Son.” 21 But he berated them and demanded to tell this to no one, 22 saying, “It is necessary that the Son of Man suffers much and be killed, but after three days raised again.” | 8:27 Jesus went with his disciples to the villages near Caesarea Philippi. On the way he asked the disciples, "Who do people think I am? 28 They said to him, Some are John the Baptist, some are Elijah, and some are other prophets. 29 Then he asked them: But who do you take me to be? Simon Peter answered him, "You are the Christ! 30 But he told them not to say anything about him to anyone. 31 Then he began to teach them: The Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected by the elders, the high priests and the scribes; he must be killed and after three days rise again. | in his wrath had inflicted this punishment on the tetrarch. |

The two story parts, which in \*Ev 9 are interrupted by \*Ev 9,10-17, the return of the apostles and the feeding of the five thousand, are held together by the question "who is this one". Mark follows these two parts to a large extent, but extends the first part of the narrative considerably. He recapitulates the story of the Baptist's imprisonment, which he has already briefly mentioned in Mk 1:14 as the time of the beginning of Jesus' preaching activity in Galilee, and especially the account of his cruel murder. The

"seemingly legendary narrative ... comes to stand in the narrative sequence exactly where, in the author's opinion, it belongs historically: the Baptist, as the herald of Jesus' ministry, dies only after the first successful sending forth of Jesus' disciples (Mk 6:7-13) and is imprisoned at the beginning of Jesus' ministry (funeral fast: Mk 2:18-22)."[[53]](#footnote-53)

Mark shares some elements with the account of Josephus, which makes it seem possible that he did know of it when writing his own, unless the testimony of Josephus represents a later, Christian interpolation[[54]](#footnote-54). At the very least, both express the view that Herod acted unjustly towards John out of fear of him, and this despite the fact that he knew (Mk 6:20) or at least was aware (Josephus) that John was "a just and holy" (Mk 6:20) or a "noble man" (Josephus).

At the decisive moment in the story, however, Mark deviates from Josephus. While Josephus gives as the reason for Herod's arresting John and sentencing him to death for fear of the Baptist being a political leader of "sedition", Mark personalises the conflict and refers to John's criticism of Herod's decision to marry his brother's wife. While Josephus’s explanation sounds more plausible, both narratologically and historically, Mark’s account carries an ethical message geared towards the reader of his Gospel that fleshes out John’s ascetic profile and underpins his characterisation as a “righteous” and “holy man”. Dormeyer puts it more drastically:

"The evangelist models the Baptist's exitus on the court stories of Caligula, Messalina and Nero. However, he does not do justice to the historical Herod Antipas with this exaggeration ... Herod Antipas is a clever, prudent tetrarch who, however, also accepts judicial murders to secure his power."[[55]](#footnote-55)

In this example, too, we can see how an entire story about the end of John's life is knitted out of a short note according to which Herod was "at a loss" and "beheaded" John, in order to shape a Jewish, but above all also anti-Marcionite figure. With the emphasis on John's righteousness, he is given a moral-ethical profile that Marcion had rejected, but which Mk claims as a basis for John and thus for both Jews and Christians.

Mark thus tries to save John for telling the story of the beginnings of Christanity without detaching it from Judaism, in order to beat Marcion with his own weapons. How much Mark also uses the John passage to correct Marcion’s antithesis of John and Jesus is shown by the possible interpretations he lists in his text: (1) Jesus is regarded to be John, risen from the dead (Mk 6:14, 16), so that one has spoken of him as a "John redivivus",[[56]](#footnote-56) (2) Jesus is regarded to be Elijah (Mk 6:15a), which still indicates the proximity of Jesus and the prophet, and (3) "Jesus is identified with one of the prophets" (Mk 6:15b)[[57]](#footnote-57) - thus highlighting in all three cases the proximity of both, Jesus and John with Jewish prophetism, which precisely counters Marcion's attempt at dissociating the Jewish prophet from the Christian prophet.

(3) In order to grasp Mark’s way of correcting \*Ev even better, reference will be made here to the scene of the transfiguration in which Elijah is mentioned again.[[58]](#footnote-58) The scene was spun by Marcion perhaps based on \*Paul's indications in \*2 Cor. 3:18 and 4:6[[59]](#footnote-59) and the intervening radical questioning of the law:

"7 Now if the ministry that brought death, which was engraved in scripture on stone, came with such glory, so that the Israelites could not look steadily at the face of Moses because of its glory, transitory though it was, 8 will not the ministry of the Spirit be even more glorious? 10 For what was glorious has no glory now in comparison with the surpassing glory. 11 And if what was transitory came with glory, how much greater is the glory of that which lasts and which will not be removed" (\*2 Cor 3:7-11)

The vers „9 If the ministry that brought condemnation was glorious, how much more glorious is the ministry that brings righteousness!“, is missing in \*2 Cor, while while the last passage in vers 11 (“and which will not be removed”) is missing in 2 Cor 3:11. Irenaeus, just like the redaction that leaves aside this clause, smoothens the difference between the old covenant and the new one. While Marcion stressed that the old one has passed away, he insists that the new one will not be removed, different from Irenaeus and the canonical redaction that takes the Greek term καταργέω no longer in its harsh sense of “remove”, but in the softened one of render transient (see also Rom 9:4).

These verses read like a drastic announcement of the end of the divine covenant with Israel. In contrast, Irenaeus just like the canonical redaction corrects this view – it cuts out the last clause of \*2 Cor 3:11 and explicitly states in Rom 9:4 and 11:27, verses which are missing from Marcion’s \*Rom, that "there is no doubt that God's covenants with Israel remain". The permanency of Israel’s covenant is defended against Marcion’s \*Paul who speaks of it as something disappearing. \*Paul grants the old covenant a glory, but he sets as glory of death and of the old Torah – inscribed as characters in stone – against the other service of spirit – Christ’s Torah – and though he had granted Moses’s Torah to be one of glory, this one is transient, while the glory of Christ’s Torah is one that remains, superimposed on the old one. Only the covenant of the Spirit is thus worthy of an unchanging God. If, on the other hand, one takes the version of Paul's letters as is found in the larger collection of Irenaeus, one must rightly conclude: "The new covenant is not an alien covenant, but is the old covenant in a transformed form, more conformable to God".[[60]](#footnote-60) In contrast, Marcion’s collection of \*Paul states the opposite. The new covenant has been absolutely unknown to people, it is not an old one simply renewed or transformed.

Marcion then illustrates this idea of the incomparability and incompatibility between the new and the old covenant developing the scene of the transfiguration, which because of this antithesis caused headaches for some of his readers who, in response, formulated their counter-stories of the transformation on the basis of Marcion’s Gospel:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lk 9:28-36** | **Mt 17,1-8** | **Mk 9,2-8** | **\*Ev 9,28-36** |
| 28 About eight days after Jesus said this, he took Peter, John and James with him and went up onto a mountain to pray. 29 As he was praying, the appearance of his face changed, and his clothes became as bright as a flash of lightning. 30 Two men, Moses and Elijah, appeared in glorious splendor, talking with Jesus.  | 1 After six days Jesus took with him Peter, James and John the brother of James, and led them up a high mountain by themselves. 2 There he was transfigured before them. His face shone like the sun, and his clothes became as white as the light. 3 Just then there appeared before them Moses and Elijah, talking with Jesus. | 2 After six days Jesus took Peter, James and John with him and led them up a high mountain, where they were all alone. There he was transfigured before them. 3 His clothes became dazzling white, whiter than anyone in the world could bleach them. 4 And there appeared before them Elijah and Moses, who were talking with Jesus. | 28 But it happened about eight days after these sayings that he took Peter and John and James with him and ascended the mountain. 29 And while he prayed, it happened: the appearance of his face changed, and his clothes became dazzling white. 30 And see, two men spoke with him, Elijah and Moses 31 in glory. |
| 31 They spoke about his departure, which he was about to bring to fulfillment at Jerusalem. 32 Peter and his companions were very sleepy, but when they became fully awake, they saw his glory and the two men standing with him. 33 As the men were leaving Jesus,  |  |  |  |
| Peter said to him, “Master, it is good for us to be here. Let us put up three shelters—one for you, one for Moses and one for Elijah,” without knowing what he said. | 4 Peter said to Jesus, “Lord, it is good for us to be here. If you wish, I will put up three shelters—one for you, one for Moses and one for Elijah.” | 5 Peter said to Jesus, “Rabbi, it is good for us to be here. Let us put up three shelters—one for you, one for Moses and one for Elijah.” 6 He did not know what to say, they were so frightened. | 33 Peter said to Jesus: “Teacher, it is good that we are here. And we want to put up three tents here, one for you, and for Moses one, and for Elijah one - without knowing what he said. |
| 34 While he was speaking, a cloud appeared and covered them, and they were afraid as they entered the cloud. | 5 While he was still speaking, a bright cloud covered them,  | 7 Then a cloud appeared and covered them,  | 34 But while he was saying this, a cloud emerged, overshadowing them. But they were frightened when they entered into the cloud. |
| 35 A voice came from the cloud, saying, “This is my Son, whom I have chosen; listen to him.” 36 When the voice had spoken, they found that Jesus was alone. The disciples kept this to themselves and did not tell anyone at that time what they had seen. | and a voice from the cloud said, “This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased. Listen to him!” 6 When the disciples heard this, they fell facedown to the ground, terrified. 7 But Jesus came and touched them. “Get up,” he said. “Don’t be afraid.” 8 When they looked up, they saw no one except Jesus.9 As they were coming down the mountain, Jesus instructed them, “Don’t tell anyone what you have seen, until the Son of Man has been raised from the dead.” | and a voice came from the cloud: “This is my Son, whom I love. Listen to him!” 8 Suddenly, when they looked around, they no longer saw anyone with them except Jesus.9 As they were coming down the mountain, Jesus gave them orders not to tell anyone what they had seen until the Son of Man had risen from the dead. 10 They kept the matter to themselves, discussing what “rising from the dead” meant. | 35 And a voice (came) from the cloud: “This is my Son and my beloved; listen to him!“ 36 And when the voice had faded, Jesus was found alone. And they kept silence, and in those days told no one what they had seen. |

Here Elijah is again encountered as the representative of the prophetic tradition, appearing together with Moses, who is consequently the representative of the Torah[[61]](#footnote-61) - gathered on a mountain on which Jesus had climbed together with Peter, John and James. The precise location and name of the mountain remains unmentioned.[[62]](#footnote-62) As can be seen from Mark's adoption, he chose this setting and also preserved the description of the transfiguration from \*Ev 9:29 and even heightened it: Jesus's appearance had changed, his garment turned white, and Mark adds: "whiter than anyone in the world could bleach them". Matthew and Luke also follow Mark's model and elaboration with only slight modifications, although only Matthew makes a vision out of this story (Mt 17:9),[[63]](#footnote-63) thus raising it to the (competing) level of Paul's "revelation" (Gal 1:1516; 2 Cor 12:1-7).

Mark already saw a first weighty reason for making his changes, and in his wake the other two evangelists followed suit, because in \*Ev it says that Elijah and Moses spoke with Jesus "in glory". Even though Marcion's idea of Jesus's glory may have been inspired or at least supported by \*1 Cor 2:8,[[64]](#footnote-64) this assertion met with disapproval by the other evangelists. Mark and Matthew omit the expression "in glory", while Luke takes pains to state that this expression "in glory" also refers to Elijah and Moses (Lk 9:30: "Moses and Elijah, appeared in glorious splendor"). Not only does Jesus now no longer appear in the Synoptics as the solely exalted in contrast to Elijah and Moses, that is, in contrast to the Jewish prophet and the Jewish law, he shares with them the one and same light of glory that Jesus alone possesses in \*Ev.

Thus the three Synoptic evangelists had immediately recognised what the whole story in \*Ev was designed to do, namely, as in the examples of the wineskin and the patch, to set out the antithesis between Jesus's appearance and message, contrasting it with the Jewish tradition. Both the omissions of “in glory” in Mk and Mt, and even more clearly the correction in Lk, were intended to eliminate the Marcionite antithesis. In addition, Lk clarifies Jesus's link with the Jewish law and prophecy by having Elijah and Moses speak about Jesus's "departure, which he was about to bring to fulfillment at Jerusalem". As Marcion insisted that the Jews law and prophets did not know and, hence, could not reveal anything about Christ, the Messiah of the unknown God, including his fate in Jerusalem, Lk contradicts Marcion head on. Moreover, with the next addition, Lk sets the stage for the Peter-Jesus dialogue by reporting that "Peter and his companions were very sleepy" and were just waking up when they saw Jesus “saw his glory and the two men standing with him". Luke then has Elijah and Moses leave the scene before the Peter-Jesus dialogue begins (verse 33).

This Peter-Jesus dialogue is about Peter's desire to build three shelters on the mountain, i.e. that Torah, prophecy and Jesus's message can be housed together on one mountain. But the message in \*Ev is drastic and clear: Peter asked the question "without knowing what he was saying". Again, the attempts at correction this criticism of Peter in the other gospels are impressive. Mark tries to soften the sharpness by referring the statement not to the content, but to the awkward surprise that befell Peter, for he and the disciples were "so frightened". Matthew evidently found the statement of the \*Ev so offensive that he deleted this criticism of Peter except for the suggestion that something had been said. Luke did not need to change the wording, since he had narratively "built ahead" in the sense that Peter was rebuked because he had obviously just woken up and was not yet in his right mind - he was thus excused by way of circumstance, similar to Mark. More significantly, however, Lk had changed the setting for the following voice from the cloud. While according to \*Ev Elijah and Moses were still present, the voice from the cloud meant that not Elijah and Moses, but "this one" is the "beloved Son" the disciples alone should listen, thus making the statement that they should no longer follow Elijah and Moses. That is why it is only after this criticism of Torah and prophecy in \*Ev that it is said that "Jesus was found alone" when "the voice had faded". The distinctive antithesis of John and Jesus, i.e. of Jewish Torah and prophecy, which we have already met in the antithesis between John and Jesus could hardly have been expressed more clearly. Luke makes Elijah and Moses disappear from the scene, before the heavenly voice speaks which deprived the narration its antithetical character as it was no longer a statement that singled out the one out of three, but purely addressed Jesus – the sense was moved away from an antithesis to a statement of belief.

While the three Gospels have thus largely retained the story of the transfiguration, they have changed it in the most important places, so that the anithetical story has been changed into its opposite. In Mk it is deformed into a Christological confession with only a measured critique of Peter, in Mt even this critique of Peter has been removed by emphasising the confession of Christ and the fear of the disciples towards Jesus, and in Lk, which is again closest to \*Ev linguistically, the story is turned on its head by including Elijah and Moses in the glory of Jesus and, before the voice from the cloud is heard, has them both step away from the scene. Jn does not offer the story at all, although it does (as perhaps only the resurrection appearances do) highlight Jesus' divine nature and would have been consistent with the story’s basic purpose. Instead, the theme is incorporated into the prologue of Jn right at the beginning, probably because of its outstanding importance. In Jn 1:14 we read:

"The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the one and only Son, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth."

The combination of “dwelling”, “glory”, “only Son” has led scholars to see the connection with the story of the transfiguration,[[65]](#footnote-65) even reading this verse as an "echo" of the story of the Transfiguration.[[66]](#footnote-66) Reference should also be made to 2 Peter 1:16-21, since here the reversal of the story is spun further:

“16 For we did not follow cleverly devised stories when we told you about the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ in power, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty. 17 He received honor and glory from God the Father when the voice came to him from the Majestic Glory, saying, ‘This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased.’ 18 We ourselves heard this voice that came from heaven when we were with him on the sacred mountain. 19 We also have the prophetic message as something completely reliable, and you will do well to pay attention to it, as to a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts. 20 Above all, you must understand that no prophecy of Scripture came about by the prophet’s own interpretation of things. 21 For prophecy never had its origin in the human will, but prophets, though human, spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit.”

In the passage quoted here, the transfiguration scene is even transformed into a proof of Peter's honour and glory (and implicitly in the "we" also to that of James and John[[67]](#footnote-67)) by the divine voice, i.e. "the voice from heaven heard on the holy mountain that authorises the preaching of the apostles".[[68]](#footnote-68) For the passage is at the same time a defence that still makes the historical layer to shine through. Peter and the apostles had not followed "cleverly devised stories", but that through the divine voice "the prophetic message” was given “as something completely reliable". The latter were not interpreted arbitrarily, nor were they deliberately produced by men. Moreover, "the transfiguration is first and foremost in the service of defending the expectation of the parousia", i.e. the still hoped-for imminent return of the Lord.[[69]](#footnote-69) In this way, the author of the text sets himself apart from unnamed opponents, whereby one is reminded of the criticism of Justin and Irenaeus. Justin resists the accusation against his (fictitious?) interlocutor Tryphon that he had not followed "vain myths or unprovable doctrines",[[70]](#footnote-70) and Irenaeus criticises his opponents (Valentinus and Valentinians, Marcion and Marcionites) for telling "old wives' tales".[[71]](#footnote-71) The question was thus virulent to what extent the testimonies of the life of Jesus - and according to 2 Petr this obviously included the narrative of the transfiguration - were simply inventions of the human mind, but claimed to be reliable accounts. To confirm the trustworthiness of such accounts like the transfiguration story, 2 Petr uses the personal authority of Peter who, with regard to the scene of the transfiguration, places himself in the circle of those who were “eyewitnesses of his (scil. Christ's) majesty".

Consequently, at the time, when the Gospels were compiled together with 2 Petr, the redactors still seem to have known about doubts that were raised against Gospel narratives. They were suspected to be nothing more than cleverly concocted stories, and that the prophetic words were mere human products. To contradict such views, 2 Petr refers the Gospels to the apostles as eyewitnesses and guarantors as well as to the divine voice as highest source of authority for both, the Gospels and the prophets (there is no mention of the Law).[[72]](#footnote-72) Thus this letter asserts exactly the opposite of what Marcion wanted to state using the transfiguration, namely demonstrating the disconnection between Jesus on the one side and on the other Elijah and Moses on the other, the new Torah and the Jewish Torah, the Christian prophet and the Jewish prophets. Against such antitheses, 2 Peter states: "I want you to recall the words spoken in the past by the holy prophets and the command given by our Lord and Savior through your apostles." (2 Peter 3:2).

Our interpretation of \*Ev is confirmed by Tertullian in his commentary on this passage of \*Ev. In the introduction to the story of the transfiguration in \*Ev, he states that Marcion made Jesus to encounter Moses and Elijah in this story solely, in order to destroy these two Old Testament figures.[[73]](#footnote-73) The voice from heaven had no other meaning than to emphasise that "this is my beloved Son, listen to him, so no longer listen to Moses and Elijah".[[74]](#footnote-74) In this way, "Christ wanted to separate their words and writings from his gospel" and "thus show them as strangers" to it.[[75]](#footnote-75) If one reads the further commentary, one realises that Tertullian also had in mind the corrections that the other Gospels made to the narrative and the statement of \*Ev (such as the importance of the presence of Elijah and Moses until the end of the narrative, the sharing of the light of glory, etc.).

(4) Let us return to the passage we dealt with before embarking on the transfiguration of Jesus (see above pp. xxx):

Mark provides the parallel to \*Ev 6:18-22 in a somewhat later place in Mk 8:27-31, also reproduces it largely verbatim, only sharpening at the end here too, when in addition to mentioning Jesus’s suffering he speaks of him being killed by the elders, chief priests and scribes.

These three groups of authorities are also found in Mark's next encounter with John the Baptist (Mk 11:27-33). Above all, Mark had already introduced the chief priests and scribes shortly before in the scene of the cleansing of the temple (Mk 11:18), to which the further pericope with John the Baptist refers. For while the parallel passage in \*Ev 20:1-8 discussed above dealt with the subject of Jesus's teaching authority, Mark relates the story here to the preceding cleansing of the temple with the passage he inserted about the withered fig tree and therefore does not emphasise the confrontation between Jesus and the Pharisees at this point, as in \*Ev, but to "chief priests, scribes and elders". We will go into this passage in more detail below on Matthew and again on Luke.

Another important omission from Mark should be noted. As was seen above in the comments on \*Ev, the scene with the spreading of the news about Jesus "as far as John the Baptist" (\*Ev 7:17-22) represented a central passage, for in it Marcion explicitly documented that John had taken "offence" at Jesus. Conversely Jesus answered the disciples of John in the same passage: **"**Blessed are you if you take no offence at me!" The antithesis between the Baptist and Jesus could not be formulated more clearly. The whole passage is understandably missing in Mark, which is no surprise after what has been explained before, since Mark has positioned John as a mediator between Jesus and the Jewish prophets, not as a border between Jewish prophecy and Jesus, as he found in his model, \*Ev.
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Herrmann, L. o. (1970), Chrestos. Témoignages pai͏̈ens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle (Bruxelles).
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56. E.-M. Becker, Der früheste Evangelist. Studien zum Markusevangelium (2017), 388. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Ibid. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Rev 11 reads like a critique of Marcion’s understanding of the transfiguration scene. If so, it fits the interpretation of both Elijah and Moses, as given by T. Witulski, Apk 11 und der Bar Kokhba-Aufstand. Eine zeitgeschichtliche Interpretation (2012), 78-87. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. \*2 Cor 3:18: „Already we all, who with unveiled faces contemplate Christ, are being transformed into his image with ever-increasing glory, which comes from the Lord of the Spirits.“ (see the canonical version of 2 Cor 3:18: „And we all, who with unveiled faces contemplate the Lord’s glory, are being transformed into his image with ever-increasing glory, which comes from the Lord, who is the Spirit.“); \*2 Cor 4:6 (= 2 Cor 4:6): „For God, who said, ‘Let light shine out of darkness,’ made his light shine in our hearts to give us the light of the knowledge of God’s glory displayed in the face of Christ.“ [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. K. Berger, Paulus (2002), 51. Marcion’s interpretation of this passage can also be found in M. Kleinert, Andere Klarheit. Versuch über die Verklärung in Kunst, Religion und Philosophie (2021), 27. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. So J.B. Bernardin, The Transfiguration (1933), 181. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. On the history of identifaction of the mountoun see M. Kleinert, Andere Klarheit. Versuch über die Verklärung in Kunst, Religion und Philosophie (2021), 37-43. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. B.G. Bucur, Matt 17:1-9 as a vision of a vision: A neglected strand in the patristic reception of the transfiguration account (2010), 17. Bucur also refers to the Patristic tradition according to which Christ offers this vision to Elijah and Moses (see Irenaeus, Tertullian, Ps.-Leo of Rome, Ps.-Ephrem, Anastasius Sinaites, John of Damaskus, Cosmas of Maiouma). [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. See the link that is made to 1 Cor 2:8 by J.B. Bernardin, The Transfiguration (1933), 181. In the *Ascensio Isaiae* 10:7-11:32 Jesus removes his glory more and more during his decent through the seven heavens, in order to appear unrecognised on earth, not being recognised by good and evil spirits. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. Already ibid. 187. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. R.E. Brown, The Gospel according to John. Introduction, translation and notes (1971), 34. The potential correctness of this statement is asserted by D. Wenham and A.D.A. Moses, 'There Are Some Standing Here....': Did They Become the 'Reputed Pillars' of the Jerusalem Church? Some Reflections on Mark 9:1, Galatians 2:9 and the Transfiguration (1994), 153. Even though there are no direct links between the transfiguration and John, the theme of “glory” is prominent in John and might be reminicent of the transfiguration scene, see F.C. Grant, Was the Author of John Dependent upon the Gospel of Luke? (1937), 291. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. Thus, the message entered the imagination of the painter Raffael who in his “Transfiguration” sees Christ, saint John and saint Peter appear in glory, see J.M. Greenstein, How Glorious the Second Coming of Christ (1989), 51. See on further works of art, and writings in philosophy and religion on the transfiguration in M. Kleinert, Andere Klarheit. Versuch über die Verklärung in Kunst, Religion und Philosophie (2021). [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
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