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### d) Gospel of Luke

### aa) The profiling of the author

Strikingly, we have no information from Papias about Luke's authorship of a Gospel, but for this (or perhaps because of it) the Gospel is preceded by a prologue which provides some information (Lk 1:1-4):

"1 Many have undertaken to draw up an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, 2 just as they were handed down to us by those who from the first were eyewitnesses and servants of the word. 3 With this in mind, since I myself have carefully investigated everything from the beginning, I too decided to write an orderly account for you, most excellent Theophilus, 4 so that you may know the certainty of the things you have been taught."

Matthias Klinghardt has rightly pointed out that this prologue of Lk, which is closely connected with the prologue of Acts and links both books, could only have been introduced at the editorial stage, when Lk, as part of the collection of four Gospels, was linked together with the further sub-collection of the Praxapostolos (Acts and Catholic Epistles). But this had not yet happened, as far as we know from witnesses, when Marcion compiled his "New Testament". It is therefore not surprising that Lk - as already in Marcion's criticism - is only compiled together with the other three later canonical Gospels and is thus found in one of the sub-collections of Irenaeus's larger collection, but is not connected with Acts in any papyrus or codex. The latter is always found with the Catholic Epistles, even when the Praxapostolos is found directly connected with the sub-collection of the Gospels, i.e. not separated by the sub-collection of the Pauline Epistles.[[1]](#footnote-1)

As first shown by David Trobisch, and as argued above, the sub-collections and the order of the writings they contain do not derive from organic or random growth, but owe their origin to a (or, perhaps, stages of a) redaction, which Trobisch has called the "canonical edition".[[2]](#footnote-2) Matthias Klinghardt adds:

“This thesis has far-reaching consequences for the emergence of the canonical

collection. For our analysis of the relationship between Luke and \*Ev, it

constitutes a decisive new methodological insight: it proves that the patristic

reports about Marcion’s Bible attest to the only truly alternative edition of the

canonical New Testament. Crucially, it included – next to ten Letters of Paul –

the Gospel without Acts. Our premise of \*Ev-priority reveals therefore – as a

first and critical conclusion for the Lukan redaction – that through the editorially

supplemented prologue, Luke and Acts constitute two interrelated volumes of

one work. Because of the allocation of both writings to different collections

units, this could have only happened in very close temporal as well as objective

proximity to the final redaction of the canonical edition."[[3]](#footnote-3)

Next, it can be inferred from the prologue that the author does not simply follow the anonymous \*Ev, but wants to personalise the Gospel through the stressed "I" (ἔδοξε κἀμοί, Lk 1:3), which is "quite unusual in the Gospel tradition",[[4]](#footnote-4) without, however, lending his name to it.[[5]](#footnote-5) He thus moves away from anonymity without claiming pseudonymity,[[6]](#footnote-6) perhaps because the Gospel according to Luke (like the other three) was accused by Marcion of pseudepigraphy - that is, the subsequent pseudonymous attribution of an authorial figure.

The same phenomenon occurs in the corresponding prologue of Acts, which is addressed to the same addressee "Theophilus" (1:1). Reference has been made to the parallel phenomenon in the last verse of Jn, where an unnamed scribe also first speaks in the first person singular (21:25). In addition, Jn then uses the generalising "we", as in Lk 1:1-2.[[7]](#footnote-7) Both Trobisch and Klinghardt consider these anonymous personalisations not to be coincidental correspondences, but indications of the canonical redaction of the collection.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Now the author of the prologue does not only set himself apart from one particular older narrative (διήγησις), but from several such attempts - he does not call these "gospel".[[9]](#footnote-9) He also makes it clear that these earlier narratives were not written by “eyewitnesses” or "servants of the word" themselves, but already represent an intermediate stage of tradition, when their authors in turn "handed down” the traditions of those who were “eyewitnesses and servants of the word from the beginning" (οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου). Now what did these "traditions" look like is not clear, but they were probably not narratives, and the plural could indicate oral traditions.[[10]](#footnote-10) The author sees the necessity of the new version in his endeavour – highlighting what he misses from those previous attempts at gathering traditions – that he "carefully investigated everything from the beginning" and that he wanted to write it down "an orderly account" to convince the readers "the certainty of the things you have been taught". He was therefore concerned on the one hand with completeness, which obviously concerned the beginnings in particular, with the correct order of what was presented, but also with a correction of the content of the older reports.

If one compares this announcement with the previous findings, it is easy to see that the author is speaking of a similar procedure as we have encountered in Mk and Mt with regard to \*Ev. The author of the prologue - here at the stage of editing the collection with the Praxapostolos - could thus well be referring to \*Ev, Mk, Mt and an older, still prologue-less version of Lk. Tertullian's commentary on \*Ev speaks of its criticism of Mary's pregnancy, Jesus's human birth, the swaddling clothes, etc.[[11]](#footnote-11) which testifies that Lk taken note of by Marcion and co-labelled by him as plagiarism already possessed the infancy narratives, even if the prologue itself was added only in the last stage of redaction, i.e. the prologue writer could really have referred to the more detailed beginning of the narrative, which just at the beginning not only supplements \*Ev with the birth and infancy narratives criticised by Marcion, but also offers material to the attempted corrections of Mt and especially Mk that the latter lack in comparison. The authorisation by the name "Luke" was also already known to Marcion, like that of the other three Gospels; he had seen it, like them, as pseudepigraphically added names of apostles (Matthew, John) and disciples of apostles (Mark, Luke) and as attempts to credit authority to these plagiarisms.[[12]](#footnote-12) As far as the right order of transmission is concerned, only so much can be established that indeed Lk in individual cases changes the order of narration compared to the other Gospels. But the correction of content seems to be the decisive moment addressed in the prologue. In this respect, as we shall see, Lk has indeed certainly not made fewer changes in content than Mt, but even more significant ones than the other two plagiarists, despite close literary fidelity to the parallel parts in \*Ev.

Since we have no information about Luke from Papias, Irenaeus of Lyons is the first witness to Luke after the Prologue. After describing Mark, he reports about Luke: "Luke also, the companion of Paul, recorded in a book the Gospel preached by him."[[13]](#footnote-13) In fact, Irenaeus could refer to Gal 2:2 ("I presented to them the gospel that I preach among the Gentiles") and l Thes 2:9 ("… we preached the gospel of God to you"), and for Luke's closeness to Paul speak Phlm 24 ("And so do Mark, Aristarchus, Demas and Luke, my fellow workers") and 2 Tim 4:11 ("Only Luke is with me. Get Mark and bring him with you, because he is helpful to me in my ministry"). In addition, according to 2 Tim 1:17 this letter was written by Paul from Rome, so the letter proves both Paul and Luke to have been in Rome.[[14]](#footnote-14)

Now it has already been noticed that here twice not only Luke but also Mark is mentioned.[[15]](#footnote-15) Of course, it could well have been the other way round, that the editors in the circle of Irenaeus first established these two references. 2 Tim was not included in Marcion's collection of Pauline letters and thus not in his "New Testament", and for the last verse of Phlm we have no attestation for Mark. This does not imply any certainty that this verse was not included in his Pauline epistle, but the fact that only Irenaeus knows about this connection of Luke to Paul rather speaks for the fact that we are dealing here with an editorial intervention in a Pauline epistle, which was intended to achieve two things: on the one hand, it was intended to establish a connection to the added 2 Tim and at the same time to the Gospel according to Luke, and on the other hand, it was intended to clarify the inner coherence of the extended collection. This is all the more evident in that in both passages we are not only dealing with the mention of Luke, but both times Mark is also mentioned, i.e. both names by disciples of the apostles that were assigned to Gospels.

As already seen above concerning Mark, it is precisely also Irenaeus who, in the same place where he deals with Mark and Luke and introduces Mark as Peter's interpreter and Luke as Paul's companion, foreshadows that both Peter and Paul preached the Gospel and founded the Church in the same place in Rome and at the same time.[[16]](#footnote-16) And, as shown, 2 Tim 1:17 confirms with 4:17 that Luke is in Rome with Paul. Even more, the last sentences of Acts, read against the background of 2 Tim, reveal that Luke, Paul's faithful companion, is the narrator of Acts (28:30-31):

" 30 For two whole years Paul stayed there in his own rented house and welcomed all who came to see him. 31 He proclaimed the kingdom of God and taught about the Lord Jesus Christ—with all boldness and without hindrance!"

Accordingly, the constructed history also includes the multiple editing of Paul's letters, to which not only were assigned new, pseudonymous writings, but in the process the existing letters were also subjected to a thorough revision. Through the new Pauline letters, the revision of the existing ones and the connecting lines drawn between both, Luke's name as the author of the Gospel is no longer a surprise. Acts being introduced and portrayed as a second book written by the same author as the Gospel of Luke, the information in Acts that link it to the Gospel and the Pauline letters, we can see, how the canonical redaction works – it is a web that has been created to connect older, but revised texts with novel additions.[[17]](#footnote-17) After Luke was promoted to be the author not only of the Gospel, but also of Acts by the prologues of Lk and Acts, the readership learns from this Acts that Luke had travelled with Paul from Troy in Asia Minor to Philippi in Greece (Acts 16:10-17) and from Philippi back to Miletus in Asia Minor (Acts 20:5-15), from there to Jerusalem (Acts 21:1-18), and together with Paul during his long last journey from Caesarea in Palestine to Rome (Acts 27:1-28:16).[[18]](#footnote-18)

Who would have been better predestined than Luke for the writing of a Pauline Gospel and equipped with its information?[[19]](#footnote-19) The starting point for the entire Luke configuration could possibly have been his mention in Col, where, however, he is not yet described as Paul's co-worker, but as "the beloved physician" close to him (Col 4:14), a passage that is attested for this letter in Marcion's Pauline letter collection.[[20]](#footnote-20) Be that as it may, "Irenaeus' message about the LkEv is poor in content".[[21]](#footnote-21) Nor do we learn more from Origen when he judges that the "third (Gospel) is the one for the Gentiles recognised by Paul after Luke".[[22]](#footnote-22)

The Canon Muratori, whose dating is still disputed today, writes in somewhat greater detail:[[23]](#footnote-23)

"The third Gospel book according to Luke. This Luke, the physician, when after Christ's ascension Paul had taken this scholar with him, wrote it in his own name according to the (general) opinion (?). But he did not see the Lord himself in the flesh, but described what he could trace, so he also began with the birth of John."[[24]](#footnote-24)

Although the wording is disputed in places, this entry clearly indicates the identification of Luke the evangelist and Luke the physician mentioned in Col 4:14, thus supporting the expressed assumption that the attribution of the Gospel to Luke and the figuration developed by Irenaeus and Tertullian took their starting point from this Pauline epistle, whether one wishes to date the Canon Muratori with research to the late 2nd or the 4th century. The text also shows that Luke was identified in it with Luke's companion, as suggested by Irenaeus. Moreover, the Canon sees already the need to explain, why Luke’s Gospel starts his narration not with the adult Jesus, but with John. Consistently, the Canon Muratori reports that

"... the records of all the apostles were written in a book. Luke summarises for the excellent Theophilus the individual things that took place in his presence, such as Peter's suffering and Paul's departure from the city when he left for Spain.”[[25]](#footnote-25)

This information is not without weight, for it shows that Irenaeus and Acts were read according to the editorial intention outlined above. Acts served the author of the Canon Muratori as a basis on which to build Luke's biography, to understand him as Paul's travelling companion and, following Irenaeus, to locate Peter and Paul in Rome. It is also excused that Acts does not speak of Peter's suffering and does not report what happened to Paul later.

As another witness we can consult Jerome, who also comments on Luke in the preface to his commentary on Matthew:

"As a third Luke, a Syrian physician of Antioch, whose praise is in the Gospel, who, as a disciple of the Apostle Paul himself, wrote his book in Achaia and Boeotia (or Bithynia), repeating another, and, as he himself declares in the prologue, describing what he heard more than what he saw."[[26]](#footnote-26)

In this brief description, Jerome gives further information about Luke that was previously unknown to us, such as that he was from Antioch in Syria, that he wrote the book while travelling with Paul in Achaia and Boeotia (or Bithynia according to some manuscripts), and, what Jerome takes from 2 Cor (8:18-19: "18 And we are sending along with him the brother who is praised by all the churches for his service to the gospel. 19 What is more, he was chosen by the churches to accompany us as we carry the offering, which we administer in order to honor the Lord himself and to show our eagerness to help"), that he is the brother not mentioned there by name who, together with Titus, was the one travelling companion of Paul who was the preacher of the Gospel. The latter is interpreted by Jerome as the written version of Lk.

As we can see from this namelessness, gaps in the tradition are always an invitation for the human imagination to fill these and to move from one imagination to further imaginations. We also read such an imagination in a prologue to Lk, which is found in multiple copies of Latin Bible manuscripts, but for which a Greek manuscript version also exists. The prologue has been critically edited by Otto Zwierlein in two versions, which are offered here in translation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Prologue to the Gospel of Luke (α-version)**[[27]](#footnote-27) | **Prologue to the Gospel of Luke (β-version)** |
| Luke, an Antiochian Syrian, a physician by profession, was, according to his writings, well versed in the Greek language. | A certain Luke, an Antiochian Syrian, physician by profession, |
| He was a disciple of the apostles, but later followed Paul until his confession. Serving the Lord blamelessly, who had no wife and never fathered children, he died at the age of 84 in Bithynia full of the Holy Spirit. Since the Gospels had already been written, namely by Matthew in Judea and by Mark in Italy, he wrote this Gospel under the impulse of the Holy Spirit in the regions of Achaia, which he had not only heard from the Apostle Paul, | He was a disciple of the apostles, but later followed Paul until his confession. Serving the Lord blamelessly, who had no wife and never fathered children, he died at the age of 84 in Bithynia, full of the Holy Spirit. Since the Gospels had already been written, namely by Matthew in Judea and by Mark in Italy, he wrote this Gospel under the impulse of the Holy Spirit in the regions of Achaia, |
| who was not with the Lord in the flesh, but first and foremost from the other Apostles who had kept company with the Lord, |  |
| and pointed out right at the beginning of this Gospel of his that others had been written before. And that from these apostles he heard his own, he himself makes clear with the words: As those have handed down to us who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of his word. Of him also the apostle says: We have sent with him the brother whose praise in the service of the Gospel goes through all the churches, and in the letter to the Colossians: Luke greets you, the one who has become exceedingly dear to me. So he wrote this Gospel as he had heard it himself. He pointed out at the very beginning of the same, | and pointed out at the very beginning  that others had been written before. |
| there was an urgent need to present the full truth of the Lord's deeds and the underlying order of salvation[[28]](#footnote-28) in his report to the Christians coming from paganism with the utmost care, so that they would not be captivated by Jewish mythology and the desire for the law alone, but also so that they would not be misled by heretical disputes about controversial issues and foolish diatribes. Therefore, right at the beginning, he introduced the birth of John as an extremely important event; for John is the beginning of the Gospel, the forerunner of our Lord Jesus Christ. He was an allied co-worker in the perfection of the people, as well as a co-worker in the introduction of baptism and a fellow-sufferer. In fact, an example of this providential-typological order of salvation is given by the prophet Malachias, one of the Twelve. | There was an urgent need to present to the Christians coming from paganism with the utmost care the order of salvation, so that they would not be captivated by Jewish mythology and the desire for the law alone, but also so that they would not be misled by heretical disputes about controversial issues and foolish diatribes.  Therefore, right at the beginning, he introduced the birth of John as an extremely important event; for John is the beginning of the Gospel, the forerunner of our Lord Jesus Christ. He was an allied collaborator in the perfection of the people, as well as a contributor to the institution of baptism and a fellow sufferer. In fact, an example of this providential-typological order of salvation is given by the prophet Malachias, one of the Twelve. |
| After this, Luke himself wrote the Acts of the Apostles in the city of Rome; after him, the evangelist John wrote the Apocalypse on the island of Patmos, then his Gospel in Asia Minor. | After this, Luke himself wrote the Acts of the Apostles in the city of Rome; after him, the evangelist John wrote the Apocalypse on the island of Patmos, then his Gospel in Asia Minor. |

As already noted above with regard to the prologue of Mk, which is also available in two versions, I am also sceptical here about Zwierlein's judgement that the α-version is the older one, even if the β-version can be improved text-critically by some formulations of the α-version. The scepticism is particularly nourished by the doublet with which the author of the α-version, after the insertion ("and pointed out right at the beginning of this Gospel"), begins again with the same formulation ("He pointed out at the very beginning of the same ..."). This stylistic awkwardness alone shows the inferior quality of the α-version at this point, which Zwierlein wanted to remedy with his translation that deviates from the first formula without good reason. In this way, however, he concealed the awkwardness, which increases the scepticism towards this version.

In terms of content, too, the textual excesses of the α-version stand out as a further stylisation of Luke's biography. Right at the beginning, Luke is praised because "according to his writings, well versed in the Greek language" - a judgement that was obviously made by a versed writer, presumably not the author of the older prologue.

In general, it is noticeable that the other additions refer mainly to the prologue of Lk (Lk 1:1-4). The first addition makes it clear that Luke heard "not only" Paul, "who was not with the Lord in the flesh", but "first and foremost from the other Apostles who had kept company with the Lord". So there is a further safeguard that goes beyond praise to give authority to the Gospel, while the β-version rather shows the opposite tendency, namely to simply refer to its content from this Luke prologue, when it says that Luke points out right at the beginning that he is not the first evangelist, but "that others (here one must probably think of Gospels) had been written before". The next addition is also clearly secondary, which is already made clear by the connection "And" ("Et”), but also by the safeguard we already know from Jerome, namely 2 Cor 8:18, which is supplemented here with another from Col 4:14, the passage suggested above (see p. xxx) as the oldest anchor for safeguarding Luke's authority. Moreover, the β-version reads more argumentatively stringent: Other Gospels have already been written, but there is an urgency for a special Gospel for the "Christians coming from paganism".

Be that as it may, the entire prologue offers a wealth of new biographical information that the readership did not know before. Now they learn about the place where Luke came from and where he practised medicine, Antioch, the metropolis of Syria. We hear about the confession, i.e. the martyrdom of Paul, whom Luke followed as a disciple of the apostles. This could be meant in a purely literary sense, which is supported by the fact that Luke died of old age in Bithynia at the age of 84, but the information was also read to mean that he was declared a martyr.[[29]](#footnote-29) We hear that he was unmarried and childless. Moreover, the places of origin of the various Gospels are distributed over the globe at that time, Matthew to Judea, Mark to Italy, Luke to the Greek Achaia, to the northern Peloponnese. Moreover, Lk acquires an anti-Jewish, antigovernmental and anti-Heretical orientation. Until now, it has been overlooked that the latter is connected precisely with the prefixing of the Baptist tradition. John the Baptist is thus linked even more closely than ever before with Jesus, for John is not only regarded as the "forerunner", but as an "allied co-worker in the perfecting of the people" (Lk 1:17), as a "co-worker in the introduction of baptism" and even as a "fellow-sufferer" of Jesus, because he was murdered like Jesus. All this had already been made clear by way of "providential-typological" order, “given by the prophet Malachi” (Lk 3:4). Luke is also credited with the writing of Acts, which is now transferred to Rome. John is only briefly mentioned as the author who, after Luke and his writing of Acts, wrote his Apocalypse on Patmos and then his Gospel in Asia Minor. The tendency of the prologue is clear - the writings of the evangelists are spread out from Asia Minor to Rome (actually, only Egypt, North Africa and Spain are missing for the Mediterranean region, whereby the latter is still included by Paul's journey, which, as shown above, is mentioned elsewhere).

As already noted about the other evangelists, it is also true for Luke that the casual mention in a letter of Paul to the Colossians, which today is considered a pseudonymous writing, led to an increasingly wild elaboration of his biography, the beginnings of which, however, already seem legendary and which can hardly claim historical validity. Of importance for the next section, however, is that reference is made to the Baptist tradition in Lk, according to which John is understood as a bridge between the people of Israel and the Christians.

### bb) John the Baptist, Jesus and Peter

As already indicated, Lk is, according to the extensive literal parallelism between Lk and \*Ev, the one of the later canonical Gospels that follows \*Ev most closely; Epiphanius even speaks of a mirror relationship between the two writings, even if, as he states, Marcion’s Gospel has "holes like a moth-eaten shirt" in comparison with Lk.[[30]](#footnote-30) On the other hand, as we shall see, Lk, compared with Mk and Mt, moves even further away from Marcion in terms of content than those.

(1) This distancing movement already begins with the opening. After the prologue, which, as shown before, can also be read in an anti-Marcionite way, Luke opens his Gospel with a detailed birth and childhood story, which is much more detailed and longer than that in Mt, and which both overlap only in some central elements.

While John the Baptist, as we have seen, is absent from Mt's childhood story of Jesus and only appears, parallel to the Gospel opening in Mk, with the narrative beginning of the adult Jesus, the author of Lk not only finds a place for the Baptist in the childhood story, but he even places him at the beginning of his Gospel, immediately following the preface.[[31]](#footnote-31)

Lk begins the birth story of Jesus's forerunner by telling the story of the Baptist's parents, his father Zechariah and his mother Elizabeth:

"5 In the time of Herod king of Judea there was a priest named Zechariah, who belonged to the priestly division of Abijah; his wife Elizabeth was also a descendant of Aaron. 6 Both of them were righteous in the sight of God, observing all the Lord’s commands and decrees blamelessly. 7 But they were childless because Elizabeth was not able to conceive, and they were both very old. 8 Once when Zechariah’s division was on duty and he was serving as priest before God, 9 he was chosen by lot, according to the custom of the priesthood, to go into the temple of the Lord and burn incense. 10 And when the time for the burning of incense came, all the assembled worshipers were praying outside. 11 Then an angel of the Lord appeared to him, standing at the right side of the altar of incense. 12 When Zechariah saw him, he was startled and was gripped with fear. 13 But the angel said to him: “Do not be afraid, Zechariah; your prayer has been heard. Your wife Elizabeth will bear you a son, and you are to call him John. 14 He will be a joy and delight to you, and many will rejoice because of his birth, 15 for he will be great in the sight of the Lord. He is never to take wine or other fermented drink, and he will be filled with the Holy Spirit even before he is born. 16 He will bring back many of the people of Israel to the Lord their God. 17 And he will go on before the Lord, in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the parents to their children and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous—to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.”"

Whoever reads this text not only as a "legend",[[32]](#footnote-32) but as a response to \*Ev, understands this opening as its programmatic correction to \*Ev. First, Lk proclaims John, even before his birth, as the one who will " bring back many of the people of Israel to the Lord their God … with the spirit and power of Elijah" (1:17). John is determined to become Jesus’s forerunner not only by Jewish prophecy, but by God himself through the angel. Even though John is called "great" "in the sight of the Lord", Jesus is nevertheless called "Lord", even the "God" of the people of Israel. Thus there is an exaltation on both sides, of the forerunner as well as of his successor. Moreover, the author of Lk anchors both of them firmly in the Jewish-priestly temple tradition, which he obviously knows and reproduces accordingly.[[33]](#footnote-33) John's father is a "priest"[[34]](#footnote-34) at the temple belonging “to the priestly division of Abijah".[[35]](#footnote-35) His wife also belongs to the Jewish lineage of Aaron, and is therefore of priestly origin.

Now Aaron was not entirely uncontroversial in Jewish scripture.[[36]](#footnote-36) He is said to have been Moses's brother, three years older than him (Ex 7:7), and he is regarded as his support (Ex 4:14, 30). Yet it was Aaron who also spearheaded the creation of the Golden Calf, while Moses received the Law from God (Ex 32:1-35; Deut 9:20; Acts 7:20). Aaron also denies the primacy of Moses (Num 12), but he is chosen by God because his staff is the only one to flourish out of twelve that represent the tribes of Israel. It is the flourishing staff of the Levites that even bears his name (Num 17:16-28). Consequently, Aaron is considered a Levite for some scriptures (Ex 6:16-20), indeed the Levites are later considered the only legitimate priests (1 Chronicles 6:34; 23:13). Even "the Hasmonean priesthood of the Maccabees (traced itself) genealogically to.... Aaron" (1 Makk 2:54).[[37]](#footnote-37) Aaron, after all, is regarded as the one with whom God made an everlasting covenant and to whom he gave the commandments (Sir 45:6-22).

Thus, by introducing John and linking his birth story to that of Jesus, Lk does not only establish the connection of Jesus to the lineage of the priests, to the temple of Jerusalem, but also to God's covenant with the Jews and to the Jewish law.[[38]](#footnote-38) As with Zechariah, it is also an announcement of God himself, according to which Aaron and his sons will be appointed priests (Ex 28:1; 29:1), an idea that is also found in Heb 5:4. Now, however, John is not ordained a priest, but is set on a prophetic-ascetic course to lead "the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous—to make ready a people prepared for the Lord". Thus Luke already has in mind from the beginning of his Gospel the scene with which Jesus' adult life is introduced in Mk and Mt, Jesus's encounter and baptism by John. John preaches the "wisdom of the righteous".

Not only the Baptist theme thus forms the prelude, but also that of "righteousness", already emphasised in Mt as a response to Marcion's critique of justice, is taken up in Lk. Indeed teaching righteousness is regarded as what the angel calls "evangelising" (Lk 1:19: εὐαγγελίσασθαί σοι ταῦτα) - that is, not a prophet-critical, angelic message in the sense of Marcion's gospel, which opposed Jesus's message to the law and the prophets, but an angelic message that connects Jesus with the law and the prophets that did announce Jesus and lead the people to him.

Zechariah is made speechless in the Lucan narrative, perhaps also because the tight connection between Jesus and the Jewish heritage was perplexing for many readers of that time and this text, which is only introduced here as a Gospel. The people waiting outside the temple interpret Zechariah's silence and think that he "had a vision in the temple" (Lk 1:22: ὀπτασίαν ἑώρακεν ἐν τῷ ναῷ). This gives the narrative with its statements a similar authorisation that Paul had given himself with his "revelation" (Gal 1:15-16; 2 Cor 12:1-7).

Lk links the story of John's birth and that of Jesus so closely together that he comes to speak of Jesus even before telling the story of John's birth (Lk 1:26). At the same time, however, he also makes clear the differences between the two stories and the characters who appear. While Elizabeth is an old, Aaronite, married, no longer fertile wife of a stone-faced priest, Mary is introduced as a virgin betrothed to a Davidic Joseph (Lk 1:27).[[39]](#footnote-39) Not to her fiancé, but to herself an angel appears (Lk 1:28). Like Zechariah, she receives the angelic message characterising her future son:

"32 He will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High. The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David, 33 and he will reign over Jacob’s descendants forever; his kingdom will never end … So the holy one to be born will be called the Son of God.” (Lk 1:32-33, 35)

The expression "Son of the Most High" is unusual for the 1st century BC and CE, though it does occur in the Book of Daniel (7:13-27),[[40]](#footnote-40) possibly alluding to what was laid down there:

"13 “In my vision at night I looked, and there before me was one like a son of man, coming with the clouds of heaven. He approached the Ancient of Days and was led into his presence. 14 He was given authority, glory and sovereign power; all nations and peoples of every language worshiped him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion that will not pass away, and his kingdom is one that will never be destroyed. 15 “I, Daniel, was troubled in spirit, and the visions that passed through my mind disturbed me. 16 I approached one of those standing there and asked him the meaning of all this. “So he told me and gave me the interpretation of these things: 17 ‘The four great beasts are four kings that will rise from the earth. 18 But the holy people of the Most High will receive the kingdom and will possess it forever—yes, for ever and ever.’ 19 “Then I wanted to know the meaning of the fourth beast, which was different from all the others and most terrifying, with its iron teeth and bronze claws—the beast that crushed and devoured its victims and trampled underfoot whatever was left. 20 I also wanted to know about the ten horns on its head and about the other horn that came up, before which three of them fell—the horn that looked more imposing than the others and that had eyes and a mouth that spoke boastfully. 21 As I watched, this horn was waging war against the holy people and defeating them, 22 until the Ancient of Days came and pronounced judgment in favor of the holy people of the Most High, and the time came when they possessed the kingdom. 23 “He gave me this explanation: ‘The fourth beast is a fourth kingdom that will appear on earth. It will be different from all the other kingdoms and will devour the whole earth, trampling it down and crushing it. 24 The ten horns are ten kings who will come from this kingdom. After them another king will arise, different from the earlier ones; he will subdue three kings. 25 He will speak against the Most High and oppress his holy people and try to change the set times and the laws. The holy people will be delivered into his hands for a time, times and half a time. 26 “‘But the court will sit, and his power will be taken away and completely destroyed forever. 27 Then the sovereignty, power and greatness of all the kingdoms under heaven will be handed over to the holy people of the Most High. His kingdom will be an everlasting kingdom, and all rulers will worship and obey him.’" (Dan 7:13-27)

Now we know from Tertullian's commentary on \*Ev that the one introduced here in the Book of Daniel as the "Son of Man" and equated with the Son of the Most High, the Holy One of the Most High, was a designation that is not only found in Lk, for instance immediately in one of the first examples, the healing of a paralytic (Lk 5:17-26), but had also played a central role for Marcion. It shows that Marcion with his Gospel wanted to connect to the idea of a Son of Man quoted here from Daniel, who is subject to change feast times and law, but who, in contrast to Daniel’s understanding of this Son of Man, does not come to destroy, not to overthrow kings, and above all not to hold court or pass judgement. Therefore this Son’s power will remain, but not as power over kingdoms, but on the contrary through devotion and martyrdom. We will return to Marcion's linkage to and deposition of Daniel’s interpretation of the Son of Man below in chapter 3, when it comes to placing it in contemporary history and dealing with questions of war, retribution and forgiveness. Here it is sufficient to point out that Lk has both the Baptist and Daniel traditions in mind from the beginning of his narrative and attempts to correct the Marcionite interpretation of them.

The interweaving of Jesus's descent with that of John already represents such a correction. Lk even brings the two pregnant women together (Lk 1:39-45), which leads into the hymn of Mary:

“My soul glorifies the Lord  
**47**    and my spirit rejoices in God my Savior,  
**48**for he has been mindful  
    of the humble state of his servant.  
From now on all generations will call me blessed,  
**49**    for the Mighty One has done great things for me—  
    holy is his name.  
**50**His mercy extends to those who fear him,  
    from generation to generation.  
**51**He has performed mighty deeds with his arm;  
    he has scattered those who are proud in their inmost thoughts.  
**52**He has brought down rulers from their thrones  
    but has lifted up the humble.  
**53**He has filled the hungry with good things  
    but has sent the rich away empty.  
**54**He has helped his servant Israel,  
    remembering to be merciful  
**55**to Abraham and his descendants forever,  
    just as he promised our ancestors.” (Lk 1:47-55)

What sounds harmless can also be read against the background of the vision of Daniel as both a link to it and a distancing from it. If it is said in Dan 8:23-25 that someone will come who will "subdue … kings", destroy or make them “obey him”. Now, such a show of power is attributed by the author of Lk to God, the Mighty One, not, as in Daniel, to a ruthless and deceitful king who even leads the people to destruction.

And yet, the visions of Daniel are in the background, whereas the message of the Magnificat is different, it aims at mercy, dispersion of arrogance, exaltation of the lowly, gifting of the poor and an eternal promise to the fathers. This Lord is the one who takes care of "his servant Israel". The story of Jesus is profoundly the one conveyed in the Jewish scriptures. This purpose is clarified by the further hymn that the Lk puts into Zechariah's mouth as a prophecy (Lk 1:67-80), anticipating even more explicitly the beginning of Jesus's ministry, as Zechariah concludes by quoting Isa 9:1:

"Because of the tender mercy of our God /

by which the rising sun will come to us from heaven,

to shine on those living in darkness and in the shadow of death, /

to guide our feet into the path of peace",

the very words that Mt had added to Mk as a prophetic foreshadowing of the first appearance of Jesus, which was connected with the delivery of the Baptist:

" 12 When Jesus heard that John had been put in prison …

16 the people living in darkness

have seen a great light;

on those living in the land of the shadow of death

a light has dawned." (Mt 4:12-17)

From this quotation from Isaiah, as from the first sections of Lk in general, we can read how intensively the first chapters of Lk are understood and developed as an extension of the John-Jesus connection. With great effort, which still goes far beyond those of Mt and Mk, Lk follows the track laid by the latter, bringing John and Jesus, antithetically juxtaposed by Marcion, together not only genealogically and through the Jewish-prophetic tradition, but also through the priesthood and the law, and then trying to interweave them genealogically through a historical narrative even before their actual birth.[[41]](#footnote-41) That we are also dealing with intentional apologetics in this case becomes evident when we read Lk as well as Mt and Mk against the background of the \*Ev.

Through the hymn of Zechariah - contrary to the position of Marcion - the God of Israel is praised, David is praised, it is emphasised that God has spoken through the mouth of his holy prophets so that his holy covenant may be remembered. Holiness is linked to righteousness, again emphasising a central keyword from the antitheses of Marcion. John is considered "the prophet of the Most High" after Zechariah (Lk 1:67-76). The passage on John concludes with an outlook on his appearance in the wilderness, which is again not a historical but a narrative statement, or how else was it possible that "the child grew and became strong in spirit” (alone or in a family, which is not mentioned) "and lived in the wilderness until he appeared publicly to Israel" (Lk 1:80)?

After this introduction, the focus in Lk switches to Jesus, to the census, to Joseph who goes from Nazareth to Bethlehem, the city of David in Judea, and to Mary (Lk 2:1-7). And again it is an angel who brings the good news to the frightened (Lk 2:10: εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην), announcing the birth of "the Saviour" or "Redeemer", "Christ", the "Lord".

Even though the last two designations for Jesus are already prefigured by \*Ev, "Saviour" or "Redeemer" (σωτήρ) is missing there. The title “Saviour/Redeemer” is rare in the New Testament, and its appearance, as will be seen in a moment, is significant. While it was encountered shortly before in Lk in the hymn of Mary (Lk 1:47), in all the later canonical Gospels it appears only in Jn 4:42 in the mouth of the Samaritan woman ("the Saviour of the world"). In the genuine letters of Paul, too, it is found only in one place, Phil 3:20 ("For our citizenship is in heaven. And we eagerly await from there [Jesus] Christ, [the Lord and Saviour]". However, the bracketed parts are not attested for the Pauline text of Marcion’s collection. In addition, there are the pseudo-Paulines: Eph 5:23 ("For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church, [his body, of which he is the Saviour]". Here, the bracketed part for the Pauline text is unattested for the letter in Marcion’s collection. 1 Tim 1:1; 2:3 and 4:10 ("Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the command of God our Saviour and of Christ Jesus our hope"; "This is good, and pleases God our Saviour"; "we have put our hope in the living God, who is the Saviour of all people, and especially of those who believe"), 2 Tim 1:10 ("… it has now been revealed through the appearing of our Saviour, Christ Jesus"), Titus 1:3-4; 2:10, 13; 3:4, 6 ("3 … he has brought to light through the preaching entrusted to me by the command of God our Saviour, 4 … Grace and peace from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Saviour"; "… they will make the teaching about God our Saviour attractive … the appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ"; "the kindness and love of God our Saviour … whom he poured out on us generously through Jesus Christ our Saviour"). It is also found in 2 Peter 1:1, 11; 2:20; 3:2, 18 ("through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ … you will receive a rich welcome into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ"; "they have escaped the corruption of the world by knowing our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ"; " the command given by our Lord and Saviour … the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ"), 1 Jn 4:14 ("the Father has sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world") and Jud 25 ("to the only God our Saviour be glory, majesty, power and authority"). Finally, the Saviour title is found twice in Acts, once in the mouth of Peter, then of Paul (Acts 5:30-31). (Peter:) "30 The God of our ancestors raised Jesus from the dead—whom you killed by hanging him on a cross. 31 God exalted him to his own right hand as Prince and Saviour that he might bring Israel to repentance and forgive their sins"); 13:23 in a passage reminiscent of Lk, (Paul:) "... From this man’s descendants God has brought to Israel the Saviour Jesus."

The finding on the title "Saviour" could hardly be clearer: it goes back to Lk's redaction, and on the editorial level where the Praxapostolos (the Acts and the Catholic Epistles) as well as the so-called Pastoral Epistles were connected to the Pauline Epistles. The Saviour or Redeemer title is one of the standard refrain-like statements in the Pastoral Epistles and in the Catholic Epistles (with the exception of 1 Petr, Jas, 2/3 Jn),[[42]](#footnote-42) which is all the more striking since some of these epistles are quite short. This title is put into the mouths of the main authorities of Acts, Peter and Paul. In the Pauline Epistles, as Marcion testifies to us, there is no evidence of this title, which is probably no coincidence, but the title "Saviour" will also have been entered in Phil and Eph only when these letters were not only expanded but also edited for inclusion in the expanded collection of Irenaeus.

That this editing belongs to a specific situation and discussion towards the end of the 2nd century becomes immediately obvious when one looks at the work of Irenaeus. There we first encounter the title "Saviour" (*lytrotes*,[[43]](#footnote-43) *soter*) as the typical Valentinian expression for Jesus.[[44]](#footnote-44) However, Irenaeus also adopted this title himself, as is shown, for example, by the confession at the beginning of Book III of his work "Against the Heresies" when he believes

"in one God, the Creator of heaven and earth, and all things therein, by means of Christ Jesus, the Son of God; who, because of His surpassing love towards His creation, condescended to be born of the virgin, He Himself uniting man through Himself to God, and having suffered under Pontius Pilate, and rising again, and having been received up in splendour, shall come in glory, *the Saviour of those who are saved, and the Judge of those who are judged, and sending into eternal fire those who transform the truth, and despise His Father and His advent*."[[45]](#footnote-45)

And in the same book a little later we read:

"For Christ did not at that time descend upon Jesus, neither was Christ one and Jesus another: but the Word of God-who is the Saviour of all, and the ruler of heaven and earth, who is Jesus, as I have already pointed out, who did also take upon Him flesh, and was anointed by the Spirit from the Father-was made Jesus Christ."[[46]](#footnote-46)

With Valentinus he takes up the concept of the Saviour both times, but against the Valentinians he holds fast to the one Christ,[[47]](#footnote-47) and, turned against Marcion, he speaks explicitly of the Judge. In support of the "Saviour concept" he quotes John 4:41.[[48]](#footnote-48)

In Irenaeus we find the confession not only of the "Saviour" but also of the "Lord", a designation which, Irenaeus claims, his Valentinian opponents had deliberately rejected,[[49]](#footnote-49) which is why, however, he insists on both designations:

"For He fulfils the bountiful and comprehensive will of His Father, inasmuch as He is Himself the Saviour of those who are saved, and the Lord of those who are under authority, and the God of all those things which have been formed, the only-begotten of the Father, Christ who was announced, and the Word of God, who became incarnate when the fulness of time had come, at which the Son of God had to become the Son of Man."[[50]](#footnote-50)

In this case, however, Irenaeus took up a designation that \*Ev had already used for Jesus when it not only referred to him as "Lord" in the common sense because he is set before someone,[[51]](#footnote-51) but also speaks in a prominent place of the "words of the Lord": "Heaven and earth will pass away, but the words of the Lord[[52]](#footnote-52) will not pass away" (\*Ev 21:33).[[53]](#footnote-53)

What becomes clear from the comparison of the designations: Jesus named by Marcion as "Christ" and "Lord", who is not called "Lord" but "Saviour" or "Redeemer" by the Valentinians, was given by Irenaeus the designation "Saviour", which was familiar to him; he also defends the title "Lord", and it is precisely these titles which are found in Acts, also in the Catholic Epistles, and also in the textual additions of the Pauline Epistles[[54]](#footnote-54) as well as in Lk, which speaks for the fact that these writings or rather additions are of one and the same redaction. This suggests that these writings or additions belong to one and the same redactional stage, which is closely related to Irenaeus in terms of language and content.

However, the Lucan infancy story must already have been present in the revision of \*Ev before this redaction, since Marcion responds to it in his preface to his New Testament. Tertullian, in fact, reports at length that Marcion set himself apart from the birth story by "complaining endlessly, with all the shrewdness of which he was capable, about nothing but the birth [of Christ] and his infancy, and even about the unworthiness of Jesus' body".[[55]](#footnote-55)

This information suggests that we are dealing with at least a double redactional stage of Lk as well - similar to Klinghardt's assumption of two stages of the other Gospels (Mk, Mt, Jn) -, i.e. a first textual stage in which the four later canonical Gospels each reacted to \*Ev individually and without already belonging to a collection (partly with knowledge of the others).[[56]](#footnote-56) It is this form that Marcion knew, correctly seeing that in this form Lk represented a textual adaptation of his Gospel. Finally, the Gospels Marcion attacked in a bundle are offered once again in a second form, which represents their editing to fit into Irenaeus's collection when the further sub-collections of Paul's Epistles, the Praxapostolos and the Revelation of John were added to them.

To grasp the redaction process a little more precisely, compare the following versions in which the birth story of Jesus is handed down, which, by the way, is the place where Lk and Mt also come closest to each other. However, we must also add a scripture whose dating is uncertain, but which also touches the present Gospels at this point, the so-called "Ascension of Isaiah":

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mt 1:18-25** | **Lk 2:1-7** | **Jn 1:1-18** | **Ascensio Isaiae 11** |
|  | 1 In those days Caesar Augustus issued a decree that a census should be taken of the entire Roman world. 2 (This was the first census that took place while Quirinius was governor of Syria.) 3 And everyone went to their own town to register. 4 So Joseph also went up from the town of Nazareth in Galilee to Judea, to Bethlehem the town of David, because he belonged to the house and line of David. | 1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. 2 He was with God in the beginning. 3 Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made. 4 In him was life, and that life was the light of all mankind. 5 The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it. 6 There was a man sent from God whose name was John. | 3. And he came into his own. |
| 18 This is how the birth of Jesus the Messiah came about: His mother Mary was pledged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together, | 5 He went there to register with Mary, who was pledged to be married to him and was expecting a child. 6 While they were there, the time came for the baby to be born, | 7 He came as a witness to testify concerning that light, so that through him all might believe. | And when she was betrothed, she was found with a child, and with Joseph the carpenter, |
| she was found to be pregnant through the Holy Spirit. 19 Because Joseph her husband was just, and yet did not want to expose her to public disgrace, he had in mind to divorce her quietly. | 7 and she gave birth to her firstborn, a son. She wrapped him in cloths and placed him in a manger, because there was no guest room available for them. | 8 He himself was not the light; he came only as a witness to the light. 9 The true light that gives light to everyone was coming into the world. 10 He was in the world, and though the world was made through him, the world did not recognize him. | who wanted to part with her. |
| 20 But after he had considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, “Joseph son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary home as your wife, because what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. 21 She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins.” 22 All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: 23 “The virgin will conceive and give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel” (which means “God with us”). 24 When Joseph woke up, he did what the angel of the Lord had commanded him and took Mary home as his wife. 25 But he did not consummate their marriage until she gave birth to a son. And he gave him the name Jesus. |  | 11 He came into that which was his own, but his own did not receive him. 12 Yet to all who did receive him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God— 13 children born not of natural descent, nor of human decision or a husband’s will, but born of God. 14 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. 15 (John testified concerning him. He cried out, saying, “This is the one I spoke about when I said, ‘He who comes after me has surpassed me because he was before me.’”) 16 Out of his fullness we have all received grace in place of grace already given. 17 For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. 18 No one has ever seen God, but the one and only Son, who is himself God and is in closest relationship with the Father, has made him known. | 4. But the Spirit appeared in the world, and after that Joseph did not separate himself from her, but kept Mary and revealed this to no one. 5. And he did not approach her, but kept her as a holy virgin, though with child. 6. And he did not live with her for two months. 7. And after two months, when Joseph was in his house, and Mary his wife, yet every man for himself, 8. it came to pass, when they were alone, that Mary looked straightway with her eyes, and saw a little babe, and she was astonished. 9. And after she was astonished, her womb was found just as it was before she had given birth. 10. And when her husband Joseph said to her: 'What makes you marvel?' his eyes opened and he saw the child and praised God, for God had come into his own. 11. And a voice sounded to them: Tell no one of this apparition!  12. And the tidings of the child spread throughout Bethlehem.  13. And some said, The virgin Mary bare a child two months before she was married. 14. And many said, She bare no child, neither went out a midwife unto her, neither heard we cries of woe. And they were all blinded him concerning, and they all knew of him, though they knew not whence he came. 15. and they took him and went to Nazareth in Galilee. |

As already noted, \*Ev did without the birth and childhood story of Jesus because it states that Christ came directly from above, "from heaven", as Tertullian notes, "grown up at once, perfect at once, without delay Christ, Spirit, power and God".[[57]](#footnote-57) For Marcion, creation was the product of a creator god with whom Christ had nothing in common.[[58]](#footnote-58) The fact that Christ appeared on earth immediately and without human birth, just as he disappeared from it again after death and resurrection, were thus only consequences of this approach. The versions of the birth story of Jesus compared here are directed against the separation of Christ's God and the Jewish creator god as well as the rejection of the human birth of the saviour. However, we will notice how much the Marcionite Gospel shines through as a model even in narratives for which there was no direct narrative Vorlage in \*Ev.

First we have to ask where the authors got the idea of a human birth of the Messiah from. Was it merely an attempt to counter the appearance of Christ from heaven in \*Ev with a human origin?

As far as we know, the motif of the birth of the Messiah was not a common one in Jewish tradition, rather we find the Messiah usually coming from heaven, being sent by God, while childhood and youth of such Messiah figures were of no particular interest,[[59]](#footnote-59) i.e. in this respect \*Ev represented the common Jewish position better than the above quoted texts.[[60]](#footnote-60) The same is true with regard to the family of the Messiah, who plays no special role in Jewish messianic tradition.[[61]](#footnote-61)

In contrast, Mt and Lk offer what must have sounded rather unusual to Jewish ears - difficult for us to understand today because we have become so accustomed to this story and imagery over centuries. Lk in particular develops a

"detailed narrative, the painting of a paradise ... in a very particular, pseudo-Biblical style, packed with allusions and scriptural quotations, psalm verses interspersed, which are themselves treasures of biblical poetics. This style of writing, which at times seems somewhat artificial, does not, however, recur in the later part of the Gospel, with the exception of a few isolated passages, and precisely in those which are not attested for Marcion's Gospel."[[62]](#footnote-62)

If we read the four versions given above against the background of \*Ev, it becomes clear to what extent they build on this Gospel and at the same time represent counter-histories to it, whereby Mt drafts the shortest counter-history, on which Lk builds the greater narrative elaboration and Jn develops a Stoic philosophical form of it. The Ascensio, on the other hand, sticks close to Mt but, like Lk, extends the narrative lines further in some directions and also takes a clear position vis-à-vis Lk.

Mt came to the development of his birth story as a logical consequence of his genealogy of Jesus, which immediately precedes it as the opening of his Gospel. With it, the author of Mt attempts to root Jesus as the "son of David, son of Abraham" and descendant of the patriarchs in the Jewish tradition, including the priestly tradition (Zadok is mentioned), as well as in the history of Israel in general[[63]](#footnote-63) (Mt 1:1-17).[[64]](#footnote-64) He also succeeds in this by separating the place of birth, the city of Bethlehem, from Jesus's hometown, Nazareth.

The fact that the birth must take place in Bethlehem is derived by Mt from the Davidic tradition and the prophetic predestination of this place. It is so important to him that he mentions Bethlehem five times in 16 verses.[[65]](#footnote-65) For Bethlehem was considered the birthplace of David. It was here that David was anointed king of Judea by Samuel (1 Sam 16:1), and, as Matthew gives us Mic 5:2, 4, we read the “chief priests and teachers” answering Herod’s question, “where the Messiah was to be born, as follows:

"5 “In Bethlehem in Judea,” they replied, “for this is what the prophet has written:

6 “‘But you, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah,

are by no means least among the rulers of Judah;

for out of you will come a ruler

who will shepherd my people Israel.”

7 Then Herod called the Magi secretly and found out from them the exact time the star had appeared. 8 He sent them to Bethlehem and said, “Go and search carefully for the child. As soon as you find him, report to me, so that I too may go and worship him.”" (Mt 2:5-8)[[66]](#footnote-66)

Jesus's sonship of David was of the greatest weight for Mt, as he already makes clear in the title of his narrative (Mt 1:1: Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ).[[67]](#footnote-67) Hereby Mt directly opposes the notion of \*Ev 20:41-44, a passage in which Jesus "rejects the view of the scribes that Christ would be the son of David".[[68]](#footnote-68) Consequently, Mt erases "unvaryingly removes the designation of Jesus as ὁ Ναζαρηνός insofar as this correlation was prescribed to him through \*Ev or Mark".[[69]](#footnote-69)

Jesus’s family flees from Bethlehem to Egypt out of fear of Herod. But from there they are called back by a prophet's word: "For it was to be fulfilled which the Lord had spoken by the prophet" (Mt 2:15).[[70]](#footnote-70) Nazareth thus becomes the natural place where Jesus grows up.

Surprisingly, the family tree leads through Joseph, who, according to the narrative that then unfolds, is not Jesus's biological father. In this respect, Mt sides with \*Ev by emphasising the special, spiritual character of Jesus from the beginning and thus shares Marcion's ascetic and encratic position. This is made particularly clear by the fact that, according to Mt, Joseph does not have premarital intercourse with his betrothed, but that the generation of the Son is attributed to the working of the “Holy Spirit" (Mt 2:18).

With Joseph being "just" (δίκαιος ὤν) we again encounter an important anti-Marcionite keyword, here connected with the idea that Joseph does not want to expose Mary,[[71]](#footnote-71) but is thinking of secretly separating from her. Once again it is the appearance of an angel that brings about the turning point. Joseph is now called "son of David", he is to accept a wife and child.[[72]](#footnote-72) Now there is an interesting parallel in the 2nd Book of Enoch, a work that cannot be dated more closely, in which the Melchisedek legend is found, in which a child is adopted into the priestly line.[[73]](#footnote-73) Whether this story draws from Mt or, conversely, whether Mt borrows from this text or its argumentative background, the parallel makes it clear that the author of Mt also assumed that Jesus would be incorporated into the Davidic-priestly tradition through adoption by Joseph.[[74]](#footnote-74) This would illustrate the difference between this and \*Ev's concern to remove Christ from the Jewish tradition. This difference is further underpinned by the fact that the virgin birth is a fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy, thus alluding to the same authority upon which the entire text of the Ascensio Isaiae is based.

In the past, various historical backgrounds for the Matthean narrative have been sought, referring in particular to the journey of Tiridates to the Emperor Nero in 66 CE, which he undertook together with magi,[[75]](#footnote-75) but Klinghardt rightly judges:

"Assuming such influences is not necessary for understanding Matt 2,1ff. Matthew could have also invented these elements himself based on general, cultural knowledge. Much more important is the observation that Matthew, using Herod’s attempt to remove the newly born king, created a compositional structure[[76]](#footnote-76) that extended an arc all the way to Matt 28. Jewish rulers try to remove Jesus, but they fail. In the end, the chief priests (and Pharisees), who want

to have the tomb guarded (Matt 27,62-66) but bribe the guards to make a false report (Matt 28,11-13), are making themselves guilty of the betrayal they supposedly want to prevent (Matt 27,64). Within the larger narrative composition, Matthew narrates how the attempt at preventing Jesus’ ἐξουσία failed (Matt 28,18)."[[77]](#footnote-77)

Let us compare Lk, who responds to both \*Ev and Mt.[[78]](#footnote-78) He follows \*Ev in that, like Marcion, he ties in with the Roman imperial calendar and mentions Emperor Augustus at this point. The tax entry also anchors the story to the Roman administration - and perhaps also represents a small dig at the wealthy Marcion who, as a ship owner (*naukleros*), belonged to the group of those who had tax exemption privileges both on their ships and in cities.[[79]](#footnote-79) At this point, the author of Lk does not initially substantiate the Davidic story of Joseph genealogically - he will do this later in Lk 3:23-38 by taking up, expanding and reshaping Matthew's genealogy[[80]](#footnote-80) - but by immediately indicating Bethlehem, the city of David, as Joseph's homeland, even if he does not substantiate this further with a prophetic word.[[81]](#footnote-81) He thus joins Mt in separating the birthplace of Jesus from his homeland. In stating Nazareth as the home of Jesus, however, both follow - as before them already Mk 1:9; 6:1-6 - \*Ev, which had expressly declared Nazara to be the home of Jesus (πατρίς; \*Ev 4:23).

Lk likewise takes over from Mt the idea of Jesus's sonship of David, and he inserts it in various places in his revision of the \*Ev.[[82]](#footnote-82) Mk had still followed \*Ev in this regard.[[83]](#footnote-83) Nevertheless, Jesus - as already in Mt - is considered superior to David (Lk 1:26-38), an argument that is taken up again in Acts (2:29-36). Klinghardt summarises:

"This reconstruction of the tradition history indicates not only the development of christological aspects; it makes apparent that the decisive innovation of the Matthean redaction became central. Matthew’s interest in Jesus’ sonship of David is recognizably greater than that of Luke. Above all, Matthew created the essential conditions for transferring the title ‘son of David’ to Jesus: the Bethlehemite birth."[[84]](#footnote-84)

Mt also laid the foundation for Lk's narration, even if it was further developed independently in Lk. Such a development proves to be a greater distancing of Lk from \*Ev, which still leads beyond Mk and Mt. For example, Lk speaks explicitly of Mary's childbearing and mentions nothing extraordinary, neither a begetting by the Holy Spirit nor does he call Mary a virgin; in contrast, the mention of "wrapping … in cloths", the "manger" and the "guest room" lends the narrative a certain realism which, as noted, had been criticised by Marcion. Consequently, one is not wrong when here Lk clearly sets itself apart from Mt, which had leaned towards Marcion's encratism.

Let us compare Jn, which differs strikingly from the other three canonical Gospels in the way it builds on \*Ev. First, like \*Ev, Jn places the origin of Christ in the divine realm, and it also follows its basic concern, according to which this world as darkness does not grasp the light, does not recognise it and does not receive it. When it goes on to say that "a man" appeared, "sent from God", this reads almost like the opening of \*Ev and yet already at this point a difference from Marcion sets in, for here it is not Jesus who is spoken of, but John, who is soon described as the one who baptises (John 1:31), even though the title of “Baptist” is not given to him in Jn. The fact that it is not Jesus but John who is spoken of here, however, means that John shares the unmediated appearance with Jesus. Julius Wellhausen said that John "snowed into eternity unawares".[[85]](#footnote-85) In this respect, Jn already tries to counter the Marcionite antithesis between Jesus and John in the very first appearance.[[86]](#footnote-86) This opposition to \*Ev through bringing together Jesus and John is finally "also explicitly confirmed and dealt with in detail in the conversation and speech sections Jn 3:26-36 and 5:31-39 first in the mouth of" John "and then in the mouth of Jesus himself".[[87]](#footnote-87)

Referring to the "Word", the "Logos" or "the true light", it is then said that it came "into that which was his own". This home coming contrasts with Marcion's doctrine of the appearance of God who is foreign to the world, a God who went into a foreign land in order to redeem man out of it.[[88]](#footnote-88)

"John, however, does himself put this matter beyond all controversy on our part, when he says, "He was in this world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not. He came unto His own [things], and His own [people] received Him not." But according to Marcion, and those like him, neither was the world made by Him; nor did He come to His own things, but to those of another."[[89]](#footnote-89)

It is not insignificant that Irenaeus reads Jn at this point as a correction and a response to Marcion that excludes any misinterpretation.[[90]](#footnote-90)

As in the other three Gospels, it is thus again the figure of the Baptist in whom proximity and difference to \*Ev can be read. In Jn, the Baptist becomes a witness for the light and for "the Word" who has "become flesh" and was "dwelling among us". In order not to derive any pre-ordination of John from the witness position, the "Baptist" in Jn insists that "he who comes after me ... has surpassed me because he was before me" (Jn 1:15). This means that the opening, which locates the Word in God, was also written with the motivation of clearly placing Jesus as the forerunner of his witness John. This reads like a critique of the other three Gospels and leads to a certain closeness to \*Ev, which is especially exacerbated by the following differentiation between law and grace: "For the law was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (Jn 1:17). Marcion could hardly have formulated the antithesis more sharply. Even if in this context it is excluded that anyone has ever seen God except Jesus Christ, this sounds like a positive reception of Marcion’s antitheses. We will return to the position of Jn below.

Let us turn to the "Ascension of Isaiah".[[91]](#footnote-91) The "Ascension" is the first text of the four in our comparison to take up the idea found in Jn, according to which the Saviour comes into his own, not into a foreign world. The proximity to Mt and Lk is unmistakable with the reference to Bethlehem, also to the fact that Mary was betrothed to Joseph, even if Mary becomes the subject here. There are clear, albeit different, parallels to Mt and Lk. The idea that Joseph wants to separate from Mary and that the Spirit appears is parallel to Lk. On the other hand, it is precisely the ascetic and encratic Marcionite elements supported by Mt that are found in the “Ascension”. In it is explicitly stated that Joseph did not approach his wife sexually, but that he kept "her as a holy virgin". The birth of the child itself is not mentioned, but seems to be portraid as a supernatural event that took place in an instant. Testimony to this extra-naturalness is Mary's "womb", which was found "just as it was before she had given birth". Perhaps precisely because of the encratic closeness of this passage and its proximity to Marcion, who had also taught the coming down of Jesus as something unexpected, the "Ascension" emphasises that it does not mean to refer to everything physical and to the world as something alien, but adds that "God had come into his own". This ambiguity becomes clear from the combination of Mary's childbearing and her intactness, an indeterminacy that the "Ascension" also reflects at once.

The “Ascensions” reports about different reactions to the birth, which refer to the question of whether Mary really gave birth or not. One side claims that Mary gave birth two months before her wedding, while the other side denies this because no midwife and no cries of pain were heard. The conclusion of the "Ascension" emphasises that it is precisely this ambiguity that points to the lack of knowledge about Jesus's origin.

The "Ascension" also takes up the theme of the Davidic prophetic tradition in a later passage:

"And indeed I saw a woman of the family of David the prophet, named Mary the virgin, and she was betrothed to a man named Joseph, a carpenter, and he also was of the seed and family of righteous David of Bethlehem in Judea." (AscI XI 2)

With this statement, the text clearly positions itself vis-à-vis \*Ev and follows the lines of the Synoptic Gospels, but now again emphasises Mary's own position. She is no longer only incorporated into the Davidic tradition as Joseph's wife, but is herself considered to belong to this tribe.

In the further course of the "Ascension", the text pursues a double strategy. On the one hand, it continues to show a closeness to Marcion's ideas, according to which Jesus's arrival remained hidden from everyone. However, it names him as "Saviour", and it is precisely the prophet Isaiah who alone receives knowledge of this Saviour. All the other prophets, indeed "all the heavens and rulers and gods of this world missed this event" (AscI XI 16). But like Lk, the "Ascension" emphasises a certain realism, not of the birth, but of the time afterwards, when it speaks of the baby sucking at the breast (AscI XI 17). The image, however, does not serve to prove this event historically, but quite Marcionite like, to conceal its true nature (AscI XI 17). Only to the adult does it attribute the miracle-working in Israel and Jerusalem (AscI XI 18). It is all the more astonishing that the "Ascension" is completely silent about the appearance and earthly life of Jesus. Instead, the text moves towards a description of the cosmic drama against Jesus's adversary, who incites the children of Israel against him, so that he was "delivered to the king, who crucified him, so that he went into Hades" (AscI XI 19).

We note that Marcion's model did not play an insignificant role in the aforementioned birth narratives. It was creatively dealt with, in some ways borrowing from \*Ev, in others using the birth story to differentiate itself from it, but the greatest difference between the Synoptic Gospels and the "Ascension" is that in the latter the relationship between Jesus and John plays no role. John has been replaced by the prophet Isaiah, who is considered the sole prophetic authority.

( 2) To come back to Luke and his handling of this John-Jesus relation: John is only encountered again where he is also found in the other two synoptic gospels, at the public appearance of the adult Jesus:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **\*Ev 3:1a↑4:31-35↓36-37** | **Lk 3:1-3:22** | **Mt 3:1-17** | **Mk 1:1-10** |
|  |  |  | 1 The beginning of the good news about Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God, |
| 3:1 In the 15th year of the reign of Emperor Tiberius, when Pilate was prefect of Judea | 3:1 In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar—when Pontius Pilate was governor of Judea, Herod tetrarch of Galilee, his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and Traconitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene— 2 during the high-priesthood of Annas and |  |  |
|  | Caiaphas, the word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the wilderness. 3 He went into all the country around the Jordan, | 1 In those days John the Baptist came, |  |
|  | preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. | preaching in the wilderness of Judea 2 and saying, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near.” |  |
|  |  |  | 2 as it is written |
|  | 4 As it is written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet: | 3 This is he who was spoken of through the prophet Isaiah: | in Isaiah the prophet:  “I will send my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way” |
|  | “A voice of one calling in the wilderness, ‘Prepare the way for the Lord, make straight paths for him. | “A voice of one calling in the wilderness, ‘Prepare the way for the Lord, make straight paths for him.’” | 3 “a voice of one calling in the wilderness, ‘Prepare the way for the Lord, make straight paths for him.’” |
|  | 5 Every valley shall be filled in, every mountain and hill made low. The crooked roads shall become straight, the rough ways smooth. 6 And all people will see God’s salvation.’” |  |  |
|  |  | 4 John’s clothes were made of camel’s hair, and he had a leather belt around his waist. His food was locusts and wild honey. 5 People went out to him from Jerusalem and all Judea and the whole region of | 4 And so John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness, preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. 5 The whole Judean countryside and all the people of Jerusalem went out to him. Confessing their sins, they were baptized by him in the |
|  | 7 John said to the crowds coming out to be baptized by him, | Jordan. 6 Confessing their sins, they were baptized by him in the Jordan River. | 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 But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to where he was baptizing, he said to them: |  |
|  | “You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the coming wrath? 8 Produce fruit in keeping with repentance. And do not begin to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our father.’ For I tell you that out of these stones God can raise up children for Abraham. 9 The ax is already at the root of the trees, and every tree that does not produce good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire.” | “You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the coming wrath? 8 Produce fruit in keeping with repentance. 9 And do not think you can say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our father.’ I tell you that out of these stones God can raise up children for Abraham. 10 The ax is already at the root of the trees, and every tree that does not produce good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire. |  |
|  | 10 “What should we do then?” the crowd asked. 11 John answered, “Anyone who has two shirts should share with the one who has none, and anyone who has food should do the same.” 12 Even tax collectors came to be baptized. “Teacher,” they asked, “what should we do?” 13 “Don’t collect any more than you are required to,” he told them. 14 Then some soldiers asked him, “And what should we do?” He replied, “Don’t extort money and don’t accuse people falsely—be content with your pay.” 15 The people were waiting expectantly and were all wondering in their hearts if John might possibly be the Messiah. 16 John answered them all, |  |  |
|  | I baptise you with water. | 11 “I baptize you with water for repentance. |  |
|  | But one who is more powerful than I will come, the straps of whose sandals I am not worthy to untie. | But after me comes one who is more powerful than I, whose sandals I am not worthy to carry. | 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. |
|  | He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. 17 His winnowing fork is in his hand to clear his threshing floor and to gather the wheat into his barn, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.” | He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. 12 His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor, gathering his wheat into the barn and burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire.” | 8 I baptize you with water, but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit.” |
|  | 18 And with many other words John exhorted the people and proclaimed the good news to them. 19 But when John rebuked Herod the tetrarch because of his marriage to Herodias, his brother’s wife, and all the other evil things he had done, 20 Herod added this to them all: He locked John up in prison. |  |  |
|  | 21 When all the people were being baptized, Jesus was baptized too. | 13 Then Jesus came from Galilee to the Jordan to be baptized by John. 14 But John tried to deter him, saying, “I need to be baptized by you, and do you come to me?” 15 Jesus replied, “Let it be so now; it is proper for us to do this to fulfill all righteousness.” Then John consented. 16 As soon as Jesus was baptized, he went up out of the water. | 9 And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptised of John in Jordan. |
|  | And as he was praying, heaven was opened 22 and the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form like a dove. And a voice came from heaven: “You are my Son, whom I love; with you I am well pleased.” | At that moment heaven was opened, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and alighting on him. 17 And a voice from heaven said, “This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased.” | 10 And straight away, when he came up out of the water, he saw that the heavens were torn open and the Spirit descended on him like a dove. 11 And a voice from heaven said, 'You are my beloved Son, in you I am well pleased. |

This first direct textual comparison of \*Ev and Lk (extended with Mt and Mk) shows how, on the one hand, the original and the copy are literally identical, and on the other hand, how they differ in nuances of semantics and content as well as structure. Klinghardt sees correctly here too:

"Luke not only supplemented the beginning of \*Ev but interpreted it by rearranging 4,16-30 before 4,31-37. Furthermore, the attestation of the text of \*4,16-30 has a considerably different form than in Luke who editorially expanded \*Ev giving it a new dimension of meaning."[[92]](#footnote-92)

A central element of this reorientation lies in the inclusion of the John tradition, which the author of Lk knew from Mk and Mt, and with which he directly refers back to the infancy story he formulated. That is why he already mentions "John, son of Zacharias" in verse 3:2. But before that, Lk literally follows \*Ev, with whose verse 3:1a Lk opens Jesus's adult life. Here it is noticeable that Marcion, as far as we can grasp the historical circumstances, gives accurate details, but Lk uses historical fictions.

What do Tiberius and Pilate stand for in \*Ev, taken up again in Lk? Tiberius was Roman Emperor in the years 13/14 to 36/37 AD, stepson and successor of the Emperor Augustus, though he never achieved his fame.[[93]](#footnote-93) He was a great military leader and diplomat of Rome, but Pliny the Elder describes him as the "saddest man" (*tristissimus ... hominum*).[[94]](#footnote-94) He was known for his anti-Pharisaic stance, especially with and because of Pilate, also mentioned by \*Ev and Lk. Herod's son Antipas, who occupied "an important place" in Tiberius's circle of friends,[[95]](#footnote-95) founded the city of Tiberias "on the west coast of the Sea of Galilee", which he named after the emperor, "created according to the plan of Hellenistic cities as the first city in this region intended for Jews."[[96]](#footnote-96)

At first it seems unclear from which year \*Ev and Lk calculate the "15th year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius", for one could count from the death of Augustus (on 19 August of the year 767 since the foundation of Rome = 14 CE), or from the time when Tiberius "became joint ruler together with Augustus", i.e. the year 764/beginning of 765 = 11/12 CE).[[97]](#footnote-97) Opinions in research are divided because of the difference in testimonies: Tacitus and Suetonius tend to suggest the earlier date, since Tiberius was co-ruler but never co-emperor and, when Augustus died, Tiberius did not see himself as emperor and was not seen as such by others,[[98]](#footnote-98) \*Ev and Lk following \*Ev speak of "reign" (ἡγεμονία), not of monarchy (μοναρχία) which makes it more likely that the co-rulership of Tiberius is hinted at, thus there is an argument for the second and earlier date.[[99]](#footnote-99)

No matter, however, which date we choose, the entry in \*Ev (and the re-entry in Lk) betrays its historiographically and legally precise mode of expression, especially when compared with the rather daring statements of Philo of Alexandria.[[100]](#footnote-100) If \*Ev had based the reference only on Josephus, it would not have arrived at the precise definition of Pilate as prefect (ἡγεμονεύοντος) as done through Philo,[[101]](#footnote-101) yet Josephus referred to him as "procurator" (ἐπίτροπος, *procurator*). While the prefecture was the military office of a Roman military officer,[[102]](#footnote-102) the title of "procurator" was that of a civil administration, which did not yet exist in Judea at the time of Tiberius, but was only introduced by Emperor Claudius.[[103]](#footnote-103) Had Marcion not possessed better sources and a corresponding interest in the middle of the 2nd century, the correct description would hardly have been possible for him. Lk joins Marcion here and adopts the precise title.

Pilate, whose epithet (*nomen gentilicium*) Pontius may not have been mentioned by \*Ev, was in fact the fifth prefect of the Roman province of Judea, successor to Valerius Gratus in 26 CE. He remained until the year 36 or 37 CE, when he was recalled by Tiberius. However, he did not see the emperor again, since he had already died before Pilate's arrival in Rome.[[104]](#footnote-104) If we ask why Tiberius and Pilate are mentioned at the beginning of the \*Ev, this seems to have had not only historiographical and political, but also socio-religious reasons and is connected with a theological confession[[105]](#footnote-105) - in any case, the opening was evidently understood as such also by those who used his text.

When Herod I died in 4 BC, he had divided his kingdom among his three sons, Archelaus, Herod Antipas and Philip, in his will, which had been confirmed by Emperor Augustus.[[106]](#footnote-106) Archelaus, like Herod Antipas, a son of Herod and his Samaritan wife Malthake, became ethnarch of Samaria, Judea and Idumea (he was also given jurisdiction over the land of Salome), which constituted the greater part of Herod's kingdom.[[107]](#footnote-107) Even before Archelaus was officially installed, he had become involved in the fierce struggle between Pharisees and Sadducees. The Pharisees pressed him to replace the Sadducee high priest Joezer from the Boethus family and Herod's former advisors, who were responsible for the martyrdom of the Pharisaic scholar Judas the son of Sipporai, and Mattathias ben Margalot, and their companions, because they were murdered by Herod's order for removing the Roman eagle from the temple gates.[[108]](#footnote-108) Because Archelaus took his time in responding to this case, resentment arose against him among the Jewish people, and when they began to throw stones at the soldiers, Archelaus ordered the riot to be ended by force, a clash in which about 3,000 people are said to have died in Jerusalem's temple precincts.[[109]](#footnote-109) Archelaus, on the other hand, was not someone who liked the Sadducees either, as he was responsible for removing several high priests from office for financial reasons. He made the concession to the Pharisees that he did not have his face stamped on coins, but he had entered into a marital relationship that the Pharisees considered incestuous when, after his divorce, he married Glaphyra, the widow of his stepbrother Alexander, by whom she had children (Lev 18:16-18, 20:21).

It is not clear from Josephus's account who was involved in the delegation to Rome that eventually led to Archelaus's replacement, but it seems that it was a joint effort by his own family and the leaders of Judea and Samaria. As a result, Archelaus was removed from office in 6 CE and the province of Judea was placed under direct military rule, headed by a prefect. According to Josephus, Pilate's installation occurred at the time when the Census was being conducted under Quirinius, supported by the Sadducee high priest Joazar.[[110]](#footnote-110)

As this background information proves, Marcion begins his Gospel with a reference to Tiberius and Pilate not without a point against Pharisees and perhaps also Sadducees, while on the other hand we know of cooperations between the client king of the Idumeans, then also the Sadducees and Samaritans, appointed by Rome.

Josephus cites a story that sheds light on both Tiberius and Pilate and further illuminates for us why Marcion begins his Gospel with this historical setting:

"2 Pilate, being sent by Tiberius as procurator to Judaea, introduced into Jerusalem by night and under cover the effigies of Caesar which are called standards. This proceeding, when day broke, aroused immense excitement among the Jews; those on the spot were in consternation, considering their laws to have been trampled under foot, as those laws permit no image to be erected in the city; while the indignation of the townspeople stirred the countryfolk, who flocked together in crowds. Hastening after Pilate to Caesarea, the Jews implored him to remove the standards from Jerusalem and to uphold the laws of their ancestors. When Pilate refused, they fell prostrate around his house and for five whole days and nights remained motionless in that position.

3. On the ensuing day Pilate took his seat on his tribune in the great stadium and summoning the multitude, with the apparent intention of answering them, gave the arranged signal to his armed soldiers to surround the Jews. Finding themselves in a ring of troops, three deep, the Jews were struck dumb at this unexpected sight. Pilate, after threatening to cut them down, if they refused to admit Caesar’s images, signalled to the soldiers to draw their swords. Thereupon the Jews, as by concerted action, flung themselves in a body on the ground, extended their necks, and exclaimed that they were ready rather to die than to transgress the law. Overcome with astonishment at such intense religious zeal, Pilate gave orders for the immediate removal of the standards from Jerusalem."[[111]](#footnote-111)

Josephus, himself of Sadducee descent but later belonging to the Pharisee group, reported this tumult and created from this tragedy a representation of Jewish heroism for law-keeping. In contrast, Herod and some Sadducees evidently showed little reluctance to use human effigies and Roman iconography.[[112]](#footnote-112)

Against this historical background, the mention of Tiberius and Pilate acquires a certain pre-Roman and anti-Pharisaic profile, while Idumeans, Sadducees and Samaritans appear in a better light.[[113]](#footnote-113) Marcion certainly not only had to prove himself to his disciples and the community after his arrival in Rome, he also had to take a position within the Roman environment. His Gospel probably served both groups of addressees as an identity card after he settled in Rome immediately after the end of the second Jewish war, the so-called Bar Kokhba revolt. It thus also constituted the political announcement of a Jewish teacher who renounced a Judaism of revolt against Rome, promoted a renewed cult community of peacefulness and thus offered the necessary prerequisite for a successful start of a new schoolhouse in Rome. With the Gospel, he showed that his new Jewish cult was ascetic, priestly, pure and messianic in orientation and represented the opposite of that messianism of a creator god who set his sights on revenge, rebellion and revolt. Below in chapter 3 we will go into more detail about the political message and the contemporary historical background of Marcion's Gospel and his collection of the "New Testament".

Back to the comparison of the \*Ev to Lk, Mt and Mk. \*Ev only briefly outlines the historical and political cartography. It mentions Rome with Emperor Tiberius, Judea with Pilate and Galilee with Jesus's first place of ministry, Capernaum. Rome is consequently mentioned first, not unusual for an author who teaches in Rome and wants to make himself understood in Rome, looking back to Judea, the land of the Jews, and choosing Galilee as the beginning of the events to be narrated.

In view of what has been said about Tiberius and Pilate, it is not surprising that the author of Mk mentions neither the one nor the other Roman name in the opening of his Gospel. Instead, he introduces John, who forms the bridge between the Jewish tradition and Jesus. In general, we find in Mk that Pilate is drawn more negatively in his later appearance than in the \*Ev or the other three Gospels. According to Mk, Pilate willingly serves the crowd and delivers Jesus to them (Mk 15:15). Mt mentions at this point the dream of Pilate's wife who informs her husband of Jesus's innocence (Mt 27:19), so that a little later Pilate reluctantly and only under pressure from the crowd gives in and speaks of his own innocence (Mt 27:24). According to Mt, the sentence on Jesus is passed by "all the chief priests and the elders of the people" (Mt 27:1). But it is Marcion who has Pilate inquire about the region from which Jesus comes in order to secure jurisdiction before he is handed over to Herod, who was responsible for Galilee and is a witness to Jesus's fame (\*Ev 23:8; Lk 23:8). As in the opening of the Gospel, Marcion is at pains to give historically accurate information.

This is in marked contrast to Lk, which here supplements Marcion's information about Tiberius and Pilate with the addition that this happened at the time when Herod was “tetrarch of Galilee, his brother Philip tetrarch of Ituraea and Traconitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene", "during the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas" (Lk 3:2). Now these details show not only that Lk also wants to bring in the Jewish environment at this point, namely both the politically not uncontroversial one of the Idumeans, but also the authority of the high priests. Moreover, research has long established that these additional details are not historically reliable, even anachronistic.

Firstly, the term "tetrarch" is problematic at this point. While the title originally referred only to "the ruler of a fourth part", it was used more unspecifically as "ruler ... of a small tract of land".[[114]](#footnote-114) However, after Herod's death, there were only three brothers considered in the Testament, but Lk speaks of four, perhaps, as Luke scholar François Bovon believes, "because Luke had not understood the meaning of the term Tetrach and believed it to be a four-part reign, which is why he added Lysanias as Tetrach of Abilene".[[115]](#footnote-115) The discrepancy between \*Ev’s historically accurate statements and Lk’s unhistorical addition is indicative of the posteriority of the latter or, conversely, of the priority and independent authorship of \*Ev. This assessment is further supported by the anachronistic and inaccurate addition of the two high priests: on the one hand, Lk "uses the singular, but names two persons: When Annas was high priest and Caiaphas (ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἅννα καὶ Καϊάϕα)".[[116]](#footnote-116) Klinghardt provides the following historical background:[[117]](#footnote-117)

"Both had carried out the office successively: Hannas from 6-15 CE (Jos., Ant. XVIII 26.33-

35), his son-in-law Kaiaphas from 18-36 or 37 CE (Jos., Ant. XVIII 35.95; cf. John 18,13). That Hannas was in office as chief priest at the beginning of Jesus’ teaching is thus impossible; Jesus was ‘about 30 years old’ in the 15th year of Tiberius’ principate (Luke 3,23). However, the many nominations and removals of officiating chief priests, particularly at the time of the Jewish prefecture (6 CE) have led to a series of former priests being awarded special status based on their administration.[[118]](#footnote-118) For this reason, the New Testament references the chief priests (οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς) almost always as an influential group. Even Josephus occasionally mentions (by name) a number of chief priests.[[119]](#footnote-119) Hannas-Ananos may have played a special role among these former chief priests, since at least five of his sons have succeeded him in office."[[120]](#footnote-120)

Klinghardt draws the right conclusion:

"The mentioning of Hannas as high priest in the 15th year of Tiberius is thus erroneous[[121]](#footnote-121) even though the assumption is readily understandable. \*Ev did not identify the high priests by name and neither did Mark. Matthew was the first to specify Caiaphas as chief priest in whose palace ‘the chief priests and the elders of the people’ conceived the plot to kill Jesus (Matt 26,3) and where the nightly interrogation with the false witnesses against Jesus took place (Matt 26,57). Going beyond Mark 14,60ff, Matthew was the first to identify Caiaphas as the one who issued the unjust verdict against Jesus (Matt 26,62ff)."[[122]](#footnote-122)

We thus encounter in Lk the same imprecision in this specification of the high priests as in the tetrarchs, which shows that the author of Lk probably edited from a due distance and with less historical interest than Marcion wrote, whereas the latter provided the historically reliable Vorlage for Lk. It was more important for Lk to include the priestly authority at the beginning of the Gospel, immediately followed by the prophetic authority of John the Baptist precisely to counter the position taken in \*Ev.

By stating that John is the "son of Zacharias", Lk refers back to the childhood story of Jesus. Lk joins both Mt and Mk in calling John's baptism a "conversion" and in judging with Mk that it represents a "forgiveness of sins". How closely he adheres to these two specifications is evident in the quotation of Isa 40:3, by which Lk too places John in the prophetic tradition. Like Mt, Lk also omits the opening part of the quotation that Mk had taken from Mal 3:1 ("I will send my messenger ..."), but instead Lk extends the quotation from Isaiah (Isa 40:4-5).

The claim that "every valley" (πᾶσα φάραγξ) shall be filled (Lk 3:5 quoting further Isa), underlines the bridging function attributed to John, as well as clarifying the universal character of the message of salvation, which includes Israel through the message from the mouth of Isaiah. As little as the author of Lk showed interest in historical accuracy, so little is he interested in the description of John's person, in terms of his clothing and food, which his two models offered him. The composition of the crowds who come to John is also unspecific, whereas Mt had described them as "Pharisees and Sadducees".

However, Lk takes over from Mt the threatening sermon of John with the reference to the "wrath" of God and a little later the separation of wheat and chaff, in which he sees precisely the function of the "gospel", the "good news". Whereas Mt refers to specific addressees, Lk refers to the multitudes, and even has them ask how they can escape judgement, to which Lk gives his own answer, which is not found in any other evangelist:

“Anyone who has two shirts should share with the one who has none, and anyone who has food should do the same.” 12 Even tax collectors came to be baptized. “Teacher,” they asked, “what should we do?” 13 “Don’t collect any more than you are required to,” he told them. 14 Then some soldiers asked him, “And what should we do?” He replied, “Don’t extort money and don’t accuse people falsely—be content with your pay.” 15 The people were waiting expectantly and were all wondering in their hearts if John might possibly be the Messiah.“ (Lk 3:11-15)

It is clear that Luke's editing is primarily interested in narrative moments, in clarifications of the content that are addressed to a larger audience, and he also links some of the additions with each other - such as the reference back to Zechariah and the tetrarch Herod. In connection with the threatening judgement, Lk already mentions the rebuke of the tetrarch Herod because of his marriage (Lk only speaks of a shameful deed here) to his brother's wife, as a clear preview of the future. For he already reports the imprisonment of John by Herod, although he subsequently tells of Jesus being baptised by John. In scholarship, this early reference to the capture has been interpreted as if Lk wanted to assign the Baptist to the "time of the law and the prophets", but John P. Meier sees more precisely that Lk places him neither completely inside nor outside the core of the story which has been rendered from a Christian perspective. In this story Jesus is the centre, he provides the connection and the parenthesis between the time of the law and the prophets and the time of Jesus.[[123]](#footnote-123)

As for the baptismal scene itself, Lk shortens the narrative by omitting John's objections and reporting directly Jesus's prayer and the descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove. The aim was thus to reproduce the dictum offered to him by his two models, Mt and Mk. Lk abruptly follows the story of Jesus's baptism with the genealogy of Jesus, and the continuation of the baptism story, which then leads to the story of the temptation, follows just as unmediated.

It can be seen from all this that the author of Lk was not a skilled writer when it came to narrative structures and narrative threads.[[124]](#footnote-124) Even if he does not simply copy from his models, some elements seem like set pieces. It reflects the image of a redactor who is not above copying his main template \*Ev word for word, then also inserts elements he finds in other Vorlagen, yet without applying to much effort to create a coherent narrative. This is also evident in the rearrangement of the two pieces of text Lk 4:16-30 and 4:31-37, which are found in \*Ev in reverse order. That \*Ev offers the original order has already been noted, because of the reference back in Lk 4:23 to the Capernaum scene, which, however, is found in Lk only afterwards (4:31-37), whereas it is found correctly in \*Ev, so that the reference back functions as such. Klinghardt - and not he alone - speaks of a "break in narrative logic" in Lk.[[125]](#footnote-125)

Lk reversed the order of the two stories so that he has Jesus appear first in Nazareth, his hometown, and to have him deliver a programmatic speech there.[[126]](#footnote-126) Without discussing this in detail, it should only be noted that Jesus, who according to \*Ev and Lk describes himself as a prophet not accepted in his hometown, in Lk refers in his sermon in Nazareth to the prophetic tradition of Isaiah and in Capernaum to that of Elijah and Elisha, while this appearance in Nazareth is read differently in \*Ev: According to \*Ev, Jesus - as one would not expect otherwise for the Jesus of Marcion - speaks only from himself, without any reference to the prophetic tradition.

(3) After this, the Baptist is encountered in Lk again in the story of the wineskins and the patch, the parallels of \*Ev, Mt and Mk that we discussed before, but to which we add Lk here:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lk 5:33-38** | **Mt 9:14-17** | **Mk 2:18 -22** | **\*Ev 5:33 -38** |
| 33 And they said to him, “*The disciples of John* fast steadily and carry out prayers just like the *Pharisees*, but yours eat and drink.” | 14 *Then John’s disciples came and asked* him, *“How is it that we and the Pharisees fast often, but your disciples do not fast?”* | 18 *Now John’s disciples and the Pharisees* were fasting. Some people *came* and *asked Jesus, “How is it that* *John’s disciples* *and* the disciples *of the Pharisees* are fasting, *but yours are not*?” | 33 And they said to him, “*Why do the disciples of John* and the disciples *of the Pharisees* fast steadily and carry out prayers, but yours eat and drink.” |
| 34 *Jesus*, however, said to them: *Can the wedding guests* possibly fast *as long as the bridegroom is with them*? | 15 *Jesus answered, “How can the guests of the bridegroom* mourn *while he is with them*? | 19 J*esus answered, “**How can the guests of the bridegroom* fast *while he is with them*? They cannot, so long as they have him with them. | 34 *Jesus* said to them: *Can the wedding guests* possibly fast *as long as the bridegroom is with them*? |
| 35 *But days will come,* and *when the bridegroom is taken away from them, then they will fast in those days*. | *But the time will come when the bridegroom will be taken from them; then they will fast.* | 20 *But the time will come when the bridegroom will be taken from them, and on that day they will fast.* | 35 *But days will come,* and *when the bridegroom is taken away from them, then they will fast in those days*. |
| 36 He told them this parable: |  |  |  |
| 37 “*No one sews a piece of unshrunk cloth onto an old cloak. But if so, it all tears,* and it will be of no use for the old. 37 *New wine is not poured into old wineskins. But if so, the new wine will burst the skins, then the wine is lost and also the skins.* 38 *Instead, new wine is poured into new wineskins.* 39 And no one after drinking old wine wants the new, for they say, ‘The old is better.’” | 16 “*No one sews a patch of unshrunk cloth on an old garment, for the patch will pull away from the garment*, *making the tear worse*. 17 Neither *do people pour new wine into old wineskins. If they do, the skins will burst; the wine will run out and the wineskins will be ruined. No, they pour new wine into new wineskins,* and both are preserved.” | 21 “*No one sews a patch of unshrunk cloth on an old garment. Otherwise, the new piece will pull away from the old, making the tear worse*. 22 And *no one pours new wine into old wineskins. Otherwise, the wine will burst the skins, and both the wine and the wineskins will be ruined. No, they pour new wine into new wineskins*.” | 37 “*New wine is not poured into old wineskins. But if so, the new wine will burst the skins, then the wine is lost and also the skins. 38 Instead, new wine is poured into new wineskins.* And both remain preserved. ↑36b And *no one sews a piece of unshrunk cloth onto an old cloak. But if so, it all tears,* and it will be of no use for the old. *For it will result in a larger tear*."↓ |

Like Mk, Lk avoids linking the scene and the two parables with the disciples of John, as happens in Mt. The fact that the author of Lk follows \*Ev more closely in this opening can also be seen in the takeover, that the story is not only about fasting, but also about the performance of prayers as in \*Ev. The latter will gain in importance once again, when we discuss the Lord's Prayer (see below p. xxx).

However, as we can see here in one moment, it is not "only" about fasting and prayers, but about the question of the law in general, since this passage provides the introduction to two examples of the (according to \*Ev: deliberate) transgression of the Sabbath commandment by Jesus's disciples and by Jesus himself and the transmission of the new Torah acquired from the mountain. It is about "Christ's Torah"[[127]](#footnote-127) as disclosed in the field sermon (Lk 6:1-46). The passage seeks to answer two questions, firstly, whether or not the Jewish Torah continues to apply and, secondly, whether Christ's Torah is to be added to, incorporated into the Jewish Torah, or whether Christ's new commandment is an entirely new foundation and needs an entirely new framework, i.e. is independent of the Jewish Torah.

To both questions \*Ev had given a clear answer: The new "Torah of Christ" belongs into a new framework - only in this way do both remain - and it cannot be added to the old Torah or also poured into it, otherwise both perish. We had seen above how Mt and Mk tried to deal with this clear central Marcionite statement. But only the author of Lk dared to contradict Marcion and interpret the parables against their literal sense by adding (Lk 6:39): "No one after drinking old wine wants the new, for they say, ‘The old is better.'"

It was certainly a clever rhetorical move by the author of Lk to beat Marcion with his own rhetorical weapons by taking up the example of wine, shifting it in content from new, fermenting wine versus old, from young wine versus mature wine, and linking the simile with the well-known wisdom that mature wine tastes better than young wine. At the same time, on the level of content, this meant rejecting Marcion’s view of Christ's Torah being an explosive product, a novel commandment that would be watered down, even perish along with the old Jewish tradition if it became a part of it. Instead, the author of Lk insists that the tradition of Jewish law forms the framework in which the maturing of the wine happened. It is not by chance that he chooses for the term "mature/varnish" (Greek χρηστός), which could also be translated as "wholesomeness", for it is the same term that also means "Messiah" and "Christ".

The Jewish tradition of the Torah consequently offers the audience "Christ", but not inversely is it Christ who offers a new Torah that sets aside the old one. Those who feed on the Jewish Torah do not want young, immature, and above all, half-baked commandments. Finally, this also means that Lk is against understanding the message of Christ as something so new that it would need its own form; rather, it is connected and part of the Jewish legal and prophetic tradition.

The whole discussion and Lk’s solution underline that Tertullian in his commentary has got the core of this passage from \*Ev right and interpreted it correctly. Tertullian highlights that Marcion understood \*Ev as a new literary form that was to compete with the Jewish Torah of old, while the author of Lk understood the Gospel - which is probably why he also avoids this name - rather as a writing that is to be included in the Jewish literary production, with which the Torah is to be perpetuated. The eating and drinking of Jesus's disciples and their Sabbath transgressions as well as the field speech do not serve to antithetically distance themselves from John's disciples and the Jewish tradition, but to reshape the Jewish past, welcome its Messiah with the further interpretation of the old Torah.

(4) On the same strategic line lies the treatment of the next passage where John is again encountered in the text and which we had already read above as a parallel of Mt and \*Ev. Here we extend the comparison again to include Luke:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lk 7:17-28; 16:16-17** | **Mt 11:2-13** | **\*Ev 7:17-28; 16:16-17** |
| 7:17 And this news about him spread throughout Judea and all its surroundings, even to *John* the Baptist. | 2 When *John*, who was *in prison* | 7:17 And this news about him spread throughout Judea, even to *John* the Baptist. |
| 18 And his disciples made a report of all this unto John: | *heard* about the *deeds* of Christ, | 18 When he *heard* of his *deeds*, |
|  |  | he took offence. |
| and John summons two of *his disciples* and sends these to the Lord, saying, Go, say to him, *Are you the one who comes, or shall we wait for another*? 20 But when the men came to him, they said, John the Baptist has sent us to you, saying, Are you the one that comes, or shall we wait for another? | he sent *his* *disciples*, 3 to ask him, “*Are you the one who* is to *come, or should we expect someone else*?” | And he summons two of *his disciples*, saying, Go, say to him, *Are you the one who comes, or shall we wait for another*? 20 But when the men came to him, they said, John the Baptist has sent us to you, saying, Are you the one that comes, or shall we wait for another? |
| 21 At that very time Jesus cured many who had diseases, sicknesses and evil spirits, and gave sight to many who were blind |  |  |
| 22 And he *answered*, and said to them: *Go and tell John what* your eyes *have seen* *and* your ears *have heard*: *The blind see again, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor are proclaimed good tidings.* | 4 Jesus *replied*, “*Go back and report to John what you* *hear* *and* *see*: 5 *The blind receive sight, the lame walk, those who have leprosy are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the good news is proclaimed to the poor*. | 22 And he *answered*, saying to them: *Go and tell John what* your eyes *have seen* *and* your ears *have heard*: *The blind see again, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor are proclaimed good tidings.* |
| 23 And *blessed is anyone who does not stumble on account of me*.” | 6 *Blessed is anyone who does not stumble on account of me*.” | 23 *And blessed are you if you take no offence at me!* |
| 24 *When John's messengers had gone*, he *began to speak to the crowds about John*: *What did you go out into the wilderness to behold? Perhaps a reed shaken by the wind*? 25 *Or what then did you go out to see? Perhaps a man covered in soft robes? See, those who live in festive clothing and in luxury are in the palaces!* | 7 *As John’s disciples were leaving*, Jesus *began to speak to the crowd about John*: “*What did you go out* *into the wilderness to see*? *A reed swayed by the wind*? 8 *If not, what did you go out to see?* *A man dressed in fine clothes*? *No, those who wear fine clothes are in kings’ palaces.* | 24 *When John's messengers had gone*, he *began to speak to the crowds about John*: *What did you go out into the wilderness to behold? Perhaps a reed shaken by the wind*? 25 *Or what then did you go out to see? Perhaps a man covered in soft robes? See, those who live in festive clothing and in luxury are in the palaces!* |
| 26 *What then did you go out to see? Perhaps a prophet?*  *Yes, I say to you, and even more than a prophet!* | 9 *Then what did you go out to see? A prophet? Yes, I tell you, and more than a prophet*. | 26 *What then did you go out to see? Perhaps a prophet?*  *Yes, I say to you, and even more than a prophet!* |
| 27 *He is the one about whom it is written, See, I am sending my messenger before your face, who will prepare the way for you*. 28 Truly I tell you, *among those born of women there has not risen anyone greater than John. But the least in the kingdom is greater than he*. | 10 *This is the one about whom it is written: “‘I will send my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your way before you.’*  11 Truly I tell you, *among those born of women there has not risen anyone greater than John* the Baptist; *yet whoever is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.* | *For among those born of women there is no prophet as John*. 27 *He is the one about whom it is written, See, I am sending my messenger before your face, who will prepare the way for you*. 28 *But the least in the kingdom is greater than he*. |
| 16:16 The *Law and the Prophets were prophesied until John*. Since then the kingdom of God is being proclaimed, and everyone is forcing their way into it. 17 Heaven and earth pass away faster than even a single stroke of the law. | 12 From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven has been subjected to violence, and violent people have been raiding it. 13 For all *the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John*. | 16:16 The *Law and the Prophets were prophesied until John*. Since then the kingdom of God is being proclaimed. 17 Heaven and earth pass away faster than even a single stroke of the words of the Lord. |

In this comparison, as in the previous one, we will see that Lk, despite all the literal adoption from \*Ev, intervenes editorially in the text at decisive points against Marcion and his antithetical position:

The first change comes with the addition of "[Judea] and all its surroundings", belonging to the tendency of the Lucan redaction already noted, according to which the narrative and the message are directed indefinitely towards a wider circle of listeners.[[128]](#footnote-128) Crucial is the omission in Lk 7:18 of the sentence central to \*Ev, according to which John “took offence" at Jesus when he heard of his deeds. The author of Lk deletes this affront because it is the only way he can avoid the antithetics of John (\*Ev adds the "Baptist") and Jesus. Lk places the innocuous sentence that "his [John’s] disciples" "made a report of all this unto John" - and names no other reaction than that of curiosity, with which John wants to have the reports checked by two of his disciples. Certainly, in the naming of the number of disciples lies an implicit admission that the reports are to be examined for their truthfulness with the minimum number of witnesses, but this is a restrained implementation of the clear announcement of the \*Ev. The imputation of Jesus to John in \*Ev is weakened in Lk by the explicit reference to the factuality of Jesus's acts of salvation (Lk 7:21), even if this passage interrupts the narrative ductus, which is only resumed with Lk 7:22. What Jesus now has reported is not only his assertion, as in \*Ev, but, as is confirmed in Lk 7:21, what actually happened.

The further change in content, which seems small but which, together with the important correction mentioned above, changes the aim of the whole passage, occurs in Lk 7:23. Whereas \*Ev takes up vers 18 (“taking offence”) and the reproach, which Tertullian and Epiphanius had already noticed as being directly targeting John the Baptist (therefore the emphatic second person plural in vers 23), Lk as already Mt, turns it into a more general statement (“anyone who does not stumble …”), then includes Jesus's acts of salvation, even if this succeeds only with difficulty in terms of language and content. For while Jesus previously reported his actions, Lk 7:23 merely offers Jesus's generalised wish that nobody should take offence at him. Such narrative inconsistencies betray the hand of an editor for whom the statement is more important than consistency and narrative wholeness.

Let us turn to the passage directly connected in Mt (11:13: “For all the Prophets and the Law prophesied until John”), where the parallel passage in Lk says: "The Law and the Prophets were prophesied until John. Since then the kingdom of God is being proclaimed" (Lk/\*Ev 16:16). It has already been explained above that this was the central passage for Marcion, with which he wanted to explain that John belongs entirely on the side of the Jewish Law and the Jewish Prophets, to which the preaching of Jesus Christ about the reign of God is antithetically opposed. This is made clear by the statement in \*Ev 16:17 that heaven and earth "pass away faster than even a single stroke of the words of the Lord", namely Christ. The author of Lk has understood this "of the Lord", Christ, correctly and has also understood the antithesis in his Vorlage, and, therefore, makes a rigorous change. Lk first takes up the idea of violence from Mt, but modifies it to a "forcing their way into it", which he contrasts with the effortless passing away of heaven and earth and contrasts this with the single "stroke of the law". In this novel context, then, the antithesis of \*Ev between "the Law and the Prophets” to which John belonged versus "the kingdom of God” that is proclaimed and which is equated with the “the Words of the Lord" of which no “single stroke” will pass away, is being lost. Lk removed it by keeping the first clause ("The Law and the Prophets were prophesied until John. Since then the kingdom of God is being proclaimed" and altering “a single stroke of the words of the Lord” into “a single stroke of the law”. With his insertion (“everyone is forcing their way into it”) and his alteration of the text, Lk has broken off the antithetical point of \*Ev and turned the text against Marcion in such a way that the very opposite comes to light.[[129]](#footnote-129) In this case, too, the main statement of the story, as present in \*Ev, has been removed with the story in Lk now hardly making sense. Another time, the redaction is shown to have worked economically, removing what was most offensive, while following almost slavishly the Vorlage with the result of a little satisfying narrative result.

(5) The next encounter with the Baptist in Lk leads us to a comparison we have already made above, Lk 9:7-9, 18-22 with Mk 6:14-29; 8:27-31 and Mt 14:1-12; 16:13-20 (adding Josephus, Antiquitates XVIII).[[130]](#footnote-130) Luke here again remains very close to \*Ev, only changing the title of Herod by taking over Mt at this point and speaking of the "tetrarch". Likewise, in Peter's confession he comes closer to Mt when, instead of \*Ev 9:20 (so also Mk 8:29), he speaks not only of "Christ" (ὁ Χριστός), but of the "Christ of God" (Lk 9:20).

More significantly, the Baptist, or rather his disciples, appears in Lk’s introduction to the Lord's Prayer (Lk 11:1-13). As noted above regarding this passage in \*Ev, the disciples had asked Jesus to teach them a prayer:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Lk 11:1-13** | **Mt 6:5-8** | **\*Ev 11:1-2** |
| 1 And it happened as he was praying at a certain place. And after he finished, one of his disciples said to him, “Lord, teach us pray as John also has taught his disciples.” 2 But he said, |  | 1 And it happened as he was praying at a certain place. And after he finished, one of his disciples said to him, “Lord, teach us pray as John also has taught his disciples.” 2 But he said, |
|  | 5 “And when you pray, do not be like the hypocrites, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and on the street corners to be seen by others. Truly I tell you, they have received their reward in full. 6 But when you pray, go into your room, close the door and pray to your Father, who is unseen. Then your Father, who sees what is done in secret, will reward you. |  |
| when you pray | 7 And when you pray, do not keep on babbling like pagans, for they think they will be heard because of their many words. 8 Do not be like them, for your Father knows what you need before you ask him. | “When you pray, do not stammer like the others. For some think that they shall be heard if they talk a lot. |
| speak as follows. | 9 “This, then, is how you should pray … | Instead, when you pray,  say. |

This passage gives us important further clues as to how the various redactors dealt with their model \*Ev. For, as already pointed out above concerning \*Ev, Jesus's Prayer presents an alternative to the way of praying taught by John to his disciples, which \*Ev had criticised as "stammering" and "making many words" to arouse admiration by their audience.

This time, Mk and Jn get around the problem of avoiding the antithesis between John’s disciples and those of Jesus by omitting the entire passage. This is notable given the importance of this prayer in early Christianity, since it even found its way into the oldest Christian catechetical writing we know, the Didache.[[131]](#footnote-131) Mt redirects \*Ev's criticism of the practice of John and his disciples and turns it against the "pagans" not specified here in his Gospel, even if this target group comes across as an awkward change in the framework he sets, which is about "hypocrites" who "love to pray standing in the synagogues and on the street corners". Lk, on the other hand, is more radical by deleting the criticism of John altogether - but again the repeatedly not quite careful editor betrays himself by leaving the adversative "but" in the final sentence, which has no reference in his introduction ("But he said to them", Lk 11:2).[[132]](#footnote-132)

(6) After the already discussed passage Lk 16:16 -17 the Baptist is mentioned again in Lk 20:1- 8:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lk 20:1-19** | **Mt 21:23-46** | **Mk 11:27-33; 12:1-12**[[133]](#footnote-133) | **\*Ev 20:1- 8. 19** |
|  |  | 11:27 They arrived again in Jerusalem, |  |
| And it happened, as he was teaching the people in the temple on one of the  Days and preaching the good news, that the chief priests and the scribes got up with the elders, 2 and spoke, saying to him, “Explain to us, by  what authority are you doing these things, and who has given you this  authority!” | 23 Jesus entered the temple courts, and, while he was teaching, the chief priests and the elders of the people came to him. “By what authority are you doing these things?” they asked. “And who gave you this authority?” | and while Jesus was walking in the temple courts, the chief priests, the teachers of the law and the elders came to him. 28 “By what authority are you doing these things?” they asked. “And who gave you authority to do this?” | And it happened, as he was teaching the people in the temple on one of the  days, that the Pharisees got up 2 and spoke, saying to him, “Explain to us, by  what authority are you doing these things, and who has given you this  authority!” |
| 3 But he answered, saying to them, “I will also ask you a question which you shall answer me: | 24 Jesus replied, “I will also ask you one question. If you answer me, I will tell you by what authority I am doing these things. | 29 Jesus replied, “I will ask you one question. Answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I am doing these things. | 3 But he answered, saying to them, “I will also ask you a question which you shall answer me: |
| 4 Was the baptism of John from heaven or of men?”  5 But they deliberated and said to one another, “If we say, ‘from heaven,’ he will say, | 25 John’s baptism—where did it come from? Was it from heaven, or of human origin?” They discussed it among themselves and said, “If we say, ‘From heaven,’ he will ask, | 30 John’s baptism—was it from heaven, or of human origin? Tell me!” 31 They discussed it among themselves and said, “If we say, ‘From heaven,’ he will ask, | 4 Was the baptism of John from heaven or of men?”  5 But they deliberated and said to one another, “If we say, ‘from heaven,’ he will say, |
| ‘Why then did you not believe him?’: 6 But if we say, ‘of men,’ all of the people will stone us because they are convinced that John is a prophet.” 7 And they answered that they knew not from where it came. 8 And Jesus said to them, “Neither will I tell you by what authority I am doing these things.” | ‘Then why didn’t you believe him?’ 26 But if we say, ‘Of human origin’—we are afraid of the people, for they all hold that John was a prophet.” 27 So they answered Jesus, “We don’t know.”  Then he said, “Neither will I tell you by what authority I am doing these things. | ‘Then why didn’t you believe him?’ 32 But if we say, ‘Of human origin’ …” (They feared the people, for everyone held that John really was a prophet.) 33 So they answered Jesus, “We don’t know.” Jesus said, “Neither will I tell you by what authority I am doing these things.” | ‘Why then did you not believe him?’: 6 But if we say, ‘of men,’ all of the people will stone us because they are convinced that John is a prophet.” 7 And they answered that they knew not from where it came. 8 And Jesus said to them, “Neither will I tell you by what authority I am doing these things.” |
|  | 28 “What do you think? There was a man who had two sons. He went to the first and said, ‘Son, go and work today in the vineyard.’ 29 “‘I will not,’ he answered, but later he changed his mind and went. 30 “Then the father went to the other son and said the same thing. He answered, ‘I will, sir,’ but he did not go. 31 “Which of the two did what his father wanted?” “The first,” they answered. Jesus said to them, “Truly I tell you, the tax collectors and the prostitutes are entering the kingdom of God ahead of you. 32 For John came to you to show you the way of righteousness, and you did not believe him, but the tax collectors and the prostitutes did. And even after you saw this, you did not repent and believe him. |  |  |
| 9 He went on to tell the people this parable: “A man planted a vineyard, rented it to some farmers and went away for a long time. 10 At harvest time he sent a servant to the tenants so they would give him some of the fruit of the vineyard. But the tenants beat him and sent him away empty-handed. 11 He sent another servant, but that one also they beat and treated shamefully and sent away empty-handed. 12 He sent still a third, and they wounded him and threw him out. 13 “Then the owner of the vineyard said, ‘What shall I do? I will send my son, whom I love; perhaps they will respect him.’ 14 “But when the tenants saw him, they talked the matter over. ‘This is the heir,’ they said. ‘Let’s kill him, and the inheritance will be ours.’ 15 So they threw him out of the vineyard and killed him. “What then will the owner of the vineyard do to them? 16 He will come and kill those tenants and give the vineyard to others.” When the people heard this, they said, “God forbid!” 17 Jesus looked directly at them and asked, “Then what is the meaning of that which is written: | 33 “Listen to another parable: There was a landowner who planted a vineyard. He put a wall around it, dug a winepress in it and built a watchtower. Then he rented the vineyard to some farmers and moved to another place. 34 When the harvest time approached, he sent his servants to the tenants to collect his fruit. 35 “The tenants seized his servants; they beat one, killed another, and stoned a third. 36 Then he sent other servants to them, more than the first time, and the tenants treated them the same way. 37 Last of all, he sent his son to them. ‘They will respect my son,’ he said.  38 “But when the tenants saw the son, they said to each other, ‘This is the heir. Come, let’s kill him and take his inheritance.’ 39 So they took him and threw him out of the vineyard and killed him. 40 “Therefore, when the owner of the vineyard comes, what will he do to those tenants?” 41 “He will bring those wretches to a wretched end,” they replied, “and he will rent the vineyard to other tenants, who will give him his share of the crop at harvest time.” 42 Jesus said to them, “Have you never read in the Scriptures: | 12:1 Jesus then began to speak to them in parables: “A man planted a vineyard. He put a wall around it, dug a pit for the winepress and built a watchtower. Then he rented the vineyard to some farmers and moved to another place. 2 At harvest time he sent a servant to the tenants to collect from them some of the fruit of the vineyard. 3 But they seized him, beat him and sent him away empty-handed. 4 Then he sent another servant to them; they struck this man on the head and treated him shamefully. 5 He sent still another, and that one they killed. He sent many others; some of them they beat, others they killed. 6 “He had one left to send, a son, whom he loved. He sent him last of all, saying, ‘They will respect my son.’ 7 “But the tenants said to one another, ‘This is the heir. Come, let’s kill him, and the inheritance will be ours.’ 8 So they took him and killed him, and threw him out of the vineyard. 9 “What then will the owner of the vineyard do? He will come and kill those tenants and give the vineyard to others. 10 Haven’t you read this passage of Scripture: |  |
| The stone the builders rejected has become the cornerstone? | “‘The stone the builders rejected has become the cornerstone; | “‘The stone the builders rejected has become the cornerstone; |  |
| [18 Everyone who falls on that stone will be broken to pieces; anyone on whom it falls will be crushed.] 19 The teachers of the law and the chief priests looked for a way to arrest him immediately, because they knew he had spoken this parable against them. But they were afraid of the people. | the Lord has done this, and it is marvelous in our eyes’? 43 “Therefore I tell you that the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a people who will produce its fruit. [44 Anyone who falls on this stone will be broken to pieces; anyone on whom it falls will be crushed.”][[134]](#footnote-134) 45 When the chief priests and the Pharisees heard Jesus’ parables, they knew he was talking about them. | 11 the Lord has done this, and it is marvelous in our eyes’?” |  |
|  | 46 They looked for a way to arrest him, but they were afraid of the crowd because the people held that he was a prophet. | 12 Then the chief priests, the teachers of the law and the elders looked for a way to arrest him because they knew he had spoken the parable against them. But they were afraid of the crowd; [so they left him and went away.] | 19 And they sought to lay hands on him, but they were afraid. |

We had already pointed out the critical attitude of \*Ev towards the Pharisees. Mk had repurposed this scene with the temple personnel as addressees, the high priest, the scribes and the elders. Mt had partially followed him (he speaks of the high priests and the elders of the people), while Lk follows Mk more closely. Klinghardt points out that from the same editorial tendency the author of Lk elsewhere, too,

" keeping the Pharisees (since Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem) from partaking in the plot against Jesus. Regarding the question about paying taxes to the emperor 20,20-26, Luke also mentions those ‘who pretended to be righteous’ (ὑποκρινόμενοι ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι) instead of the Pharisees cited in Matt 22,13 || Mark 12,13."[[135]](#footnote-135)

As already stated in the first comparison of this scene, the question of John's baptism is central, namely whether it is a heavenly or a human work. But the story is also about the fact that according to \*Ev, which is followed by all three Gospels, the people consider John to be a prophet, so Jesus's interlocutors cannot simply dismiss his baptism as a human act. According to both \*Ev and Lk, Jesus refuses to give information about the origin of his own authority because the Pharisees do not take a stand for fear of the people. Nevertheless, the story suggests that of their own volition they might very well have wanted to take John for nothing other than a man. This, however, is followed by the criticism of any belief in prophecy on the part of the people, with which \*Ev connects the antithesis between Jesus, whose authority actually has a heavenly origin, and John, to whom this heavenly authority is only attributed by the people, whether out of ignorance of the people or out of fear on the part of the Pharisees. Out of the same fear, the Pharisees finally want to lay hands on Jesus.

None of the three synoptic gospels leaves it at this antithesis, so they insert a parable (Mk, Lk) or even two parable speeches (Mt) which shift the direction of the whole passage.

As can be seen in Mk already at the beginning, the same interlocutors of Jesus are addressed. The parable here is not a particular literary gem and is more like a simple narrative that expresses a divine threat of judgement with little allegory and at the same time offers a Scripture-based[[136]](#footnote-136) confession of the Jesus sent by the Lord. Narratively, the parable stands in contrast to the final sentence taken from the \*Ev, according to which Jesus does not want to explain the origin of his authority. Here, however, this authority is explained, albeit in a somewhat clumsy way. At the same time, Jesus is presented as the son and heir of the one who wants to collect from the tenants what is due to him at the time of the ripening of the grapes. They, the listeners, are even called murderers and desecrators of the right heir, his Son. The result is also an antithesis, but one that differs considerably from that in \*Ev. Here the vinedresser, who are destroyed by the Lord and whose tenure is given to others, are contrasted with the one who was rejected and killed by the vinedresser, but who has become the cornerstone of a new building.

Mt adopts the same pattern from Mk, but introduces a slight transition at the beginning, probably because he notices the narrative contradiction in Mk between Jesus's refusal to make a statement about the whence of his authority and the fact that an answer is nevertheless given, albeit in a parable. Consequently, in Mt 21:28 Jesus asks, "What do you think?" Moreover, Mt turns on another parable (of the two sons of the vinedresser), a parable unique to Mt: Two sons are called by their father to work in the vineyard. The first son initially refuses but later goes out of repentance, the second son agrees but does not go. Here the interlocutors readily answer Jesus's question, "which of the two ... has fulfilled his father's will". Jesus interprets the hesitating son as "the tax collectors and the prostitutes" who enter the kingdom of God rather than the temple authorities. The high priests and the elders of the people are consequently compared to the son who seems to obey the father but does the opposite.

Mt uses the example of John, who came in "the way of righteousness" but who was not believed. This is an interpretation of the previous question, which does not quite do justice to the Pharisees, for they had merely not answered Jesus's question as they would have liked to out of fear, and that is why they remained silent in the first place - disobedience, rebelliousness and unbelief can hardly be deduced from this. Mt probably did not feel the problematic nature of the first parable, for he inserted it precisely because the next parable of the tenants emphasises disobedience or stinginess, but not their unbelief.

The second parable ends even more clearly in Mt than in Mk with Jesus's statement that "the kingdom of God will be taken away” from the listeners and “given to a people who will produce its fruits" (Mt 23:43). The next sentence is even more drastic, although it is missing from a number of the so-called Western textual witnesses, and Klinghardt therefore assigns it to the later redaction of Mt, when it was included in the larger collection of Irenaeus.[[137]](#footnote-137) Here it is said that the cornerstone - Jesus - is the one on whom the high priests and Pharisees will shatter, indeed, Jesus will "crush" them. Even more strongly than before in Mk, Jesus is assimilated to John, the preacher of judgement, which is made clear with the last sentence, according to which the crowd also considered him "a prophet".

Lk, who only takes over the parable of the tenants of the vineyard and borrows from both Mk and Mt, expands the circle of listeners right at the beginning - a strategy of generalisation already familiar to us, which here also wants to smooth out the obvious contradiction between Jesus's refusal to answer and the parable speech that follows. Contradictory, or at least in tension with this, is the fact that Lk mentions the scribes and the high priests at the end. First of all, Jesus addresses the "people" with this parable. Lk makes no concessions to the drastic nature of the parable; and even in his case, the verse taken up for the redaction of Mt seems possibly to belong to the stage of editing when Lk had found its way into the larger collection of Irenaeus.

In summary, this last appearance of the Baptist in the three later canonical Gospels is taken as an occasion to repurpose the John-Jesus antithesis formulated by \*Ev with Pharisees as the target group. This is done by placing Jesus on John's side and positioning both as threatening and judicial prophets towards the temple staff and the people of Israel. This intention is combined with a continuous reference to \*Ev, which as a template provides the main inspiration. It is widely followed except for typical Marcionite features such as the antithetics of Jewish law, prophecy and Johannine threat of judgement on the one hand and Jesus's commandments, prophetic claim and Jesus’s forgiveness on the other.
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