

# Mark and Matthew II

Edited by  
EVE-MARIE BECKER  
and ANDERS RUNESSON

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament  
304*

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

# Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber/Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber/Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)

James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

304





# Mark and Matthew II

Comparative Readings:  
Reception History, Cultural Hermeneutics,  
and Theology

Edited by  
Eve-Marie Becker  
and  
Anders Runesson

Mohr Siebeck

EVE-MARIE BECKER, born 1972, Studies of Theology in Marburg and Erlangen; 2001 Dr. theol.; 2004 Habilitation; since 2006 Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the University of Aarhus, Denmark.

ANDERS RUNESSON, born 1968; Ph. D. (2001); Docent (2002), Lund University; since 2003 Professor of Early Christianity and Early Judaism, McMaster University, Canada.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-152-546-9

ISBN 978-3-16-152545-2

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2013 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen using Minion typeface, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

## Preface

This book presents the outcome of the second of two international collaborative efforts to develop a new comparative approach to the study of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew. The project began with a conference at Aarhus University, Denmark, in 2008 (published in 2011; WUNT 271), and continued with a second conference at McMaster University, Canada, in 2009. Together, the two volumes represent the teamwork of thirty-one scholars active in thirteen countries on four continents. The first volume focused on comparative analysis of the earliest Gospels in their first-century settings. In the present volume, contributors have worked on the reception of Mark and Matthew in numerous settings, from the first to the twenty-first century (Part One), as well as on specific issues raised by the diverse, culturally embedded hermeneutics involved in the production of meaning in different social, religious, political, and economic contexts (Part Two). We would like to express our gratitude to all contributors for their interest in the overall project, their collegiality, and their willingness to work on the specific topics suggested to them. The success of the project as a whole is dependent first and foremost on the contributors' efforts and inspiration.

The McMaster conference was made possible through a generous grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), as well as from contributions by the Office of the Vice-President of Research, McMaster University, and Mohr Siebeck; we are very grateful for and encouraged by this strong support for what we believe is an important step forward in the study of the earliest Gospels. We also want to acknowledge our deep gratitude to doctoral student Ralph Korner, McMaster University, who provided invaluable assistance with the many details involved in the organizational procedures related to the conference. His exceptional administrative skills, as well as his unwaveringly cheerful attitude throughout the event were highly praised by the attendees and contributed greatly to the convivial and collegial atmosphere of the conference. The event took place at the McMaster University Club; we are especially grateful to Jennifer Brewer, Assistant Club Manager, for the excellent service and leadership that she provided.

As everyone who has edited a book knows, a lot of painstaking work at several stages goes in to the production of a volume. For much appreciated assistance with the editorial procedure, we would like to extend our sincere thanks to Dr. Jeremy Penner (Catholic University, Leuven) and doctoral student Nick Meyer (McMaster University). Their careful eye for detail, including their language editing, has greatly enhanced the quality of the volume. We are likewise grateful to doctoral student Jacob Mortensen (Aarhus University) who has prepared the indices for this volume with great precision. Finally, we would like to thank Prof. Dr. Jörg

Frey, the editor of WUNT, for accepting the volume in this series, and – last but not least – Dr. Henning Ziebritzki and Tanja Idler at Mohr Siebeck for their support and encouragement as this project was brought to completion.

December, 2012

Anders Runesson, Hamilton,  
and Eve-Marie Becker, Aarhus

## Table of Contents

Preface .....	V
---------------	---

*Anders Runesson and Eve-Marie Becker*

Introduction: Reading Mark and Matthew Within and Beyond the First Century .....	1
---	---

### Part I

#### Reception and Cultural Hermeneutics: Reading Mark and Matthew From the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century

*Eve-Marie Becker*

The Reception of “Mark” in the 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Centuries C. E. and its Significance for Genre Studies .....	15
--	----

*Petri Luomanen*

From Mark and Q to Matthew: An Experiment in Evolutionary Analysis ...	37
--	----

*Benedict Thomas Viviano, O.P.*

Who Wrote Q? The Sayings Document (Q) as the Apostle Matthew’s Private Notebook as a Bilingual Village Scribe (Mark 2:13–17; Matt 9:9–13) .....	75
--	----

*René Falkenberg*

Matthew 28:16–20 and the Nag Hammadi Library: Reception of the Great Commission in the <i>Sophia of Jesus Christ</i> .....	93
---	----

*Peter Widdicombe*

The Patristic Reception of the Gospel of Matthew: The Commentary of Jerome and the Sermons of John Chrysostom .....	105
--	-----

*Joseph Verheyden*

Reading Matthew and Mark in the Middle Ages: The <i>Glossa Ordinaria</i> .....	121
--	-----

*Martin Meiser*

Protestant Reading of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew in the 20 <sup>th</sup> Century	151
---	-----



*Detlev Dormeyer*

A Catholic Reading of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century 169

*Anders Runesson*

Judging the Theological Tree by its Fruit: The Use of the Gospels of Mark and Matthew in Official Church Documents on Jewish-Christian Relations 189

## Part II

### History, Meaning, and the Dynamics of Interpretation

*Adela Yarbro Collins*

Mark and the Hermeneutics of History Writing ..... 231

*Stephen Westerholm*

Hearing the Gospels of Matthew and Mark ..... 245

*Mogens Müller*

The Place of Mark and Matthew in Canonical Theology:  
A Historical Perspective ..... 259

*Janice Capel Anderson*

Mark and Matthew in Feminist Perspective: Reading Matthew's Genealogy 271

*Hans Leander*

Mark and Matthew after Edward Said ..... 289

*Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele*

Re-Assembling Jesus: Rethinking the Ethics of Gospel Studies ..... 311

*Michael P. Knowles*

The Interpretation of Mark and Matthew in Historical Perspective:  
The Transfiguration as a Test Case ..... 335

Bibliography ..... 357

List of Contributors ..... 397

Index of References ..... 399

Index of Subjects ..... 413

# Introduction

## Reading Mark and Matthew Within and Beyond the First Century

*Anders Runesson and Eve-Marie Becker*

### 1. Comparative Readings: Between Reader, Text, and Context

Sustained comparative Synoptic studies do not stand alone methodologically in the humanities. Such approaches, which elaborate on an individual author or text by means of comparison, belong to a more general trend within cultural studies as well as in the humanities more broadly, such as in, e.g., literary studies and philosophy.<sup>1</sup> Engaging in textual interpretation involves approaching specific texts composed more often than not by individual authors. In these texts, however, are embedded a myriad of conscious and unconscious relationships to historical and contemporary events, people, and other texts likewise connected historically and contemporaneously. In-depth understanding of a text evolves, therefore, almost by necessity from multi-perspectival comparative approaches rather than from readings taking a more isolated focus as point of departure. Indeed, all understanding, even in its most basic forms, is, arguably, in its very nature based on comparison; what we perceive is always the result of instant mental processes aimed at making sense of the space and time in which we move, and/or which we imagine, in relation to already acquired experience and knowledge. The Mark and Matthew project, of which the present study is the second volume, aims at taking seriously such more general insights and applying them to the earliest Gospels in order to stimulate new research and a deeper understanding of these two texts individually and as parts of a common discursive setting.

In the first volume, published in 2011, we outlined aspects involved in and insights to be won from a comparative approach to the earliest Gospels in their first-century settings.<sup>2</sup> An international group of scholars engaged the Gospels from the perspectives of history of research, text criticism, linguistics, date, genre, socio-religious location, conflict, violence, and community building. A final con-

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, it is hardly accidental that a philosopher like Ernst Cassirer tried to make best sense of Rousseau, whose birth 300 years ago is celebrated in 2012, by approaching him on the basis of comparative readings (Rousseau – Kant – Goethe): Ernst Cassirer, *Über Rousseau* (Hg. und mit einem Nachwort von G. Kreis; Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2012).

<sup>2</sup> Eve-Marie Becker and Anders Runesson, “Introduction: Studying Mark and Matthew in Comparative Perspective” in *Mark and Matthew I, Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in their First Century Settings* (ed. E.-M. Becker and A. Runesson; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011) 1–10.

tribution provided notes from the conference aimed at encouraging further discussions. We are pleased to see that reviewers of volume I so far have appreciated its innovative impact.<sup>3</sup> In the present volume, maintaining the comparative perspective, our goal is to expand our approaches to Mark and Matthew through taking on questions relating to reception, cultural hermeneutics, and theology, covering a time-span from the first to the twenty-first century. Doing so, one aspect of the interpretive endeavor that we wish to highlight is the fact that the texts are silent until we, their readers, give them voice; that meaning and use happen in the interplay between history and the present, residing never in one place alone, but rather in the dynamic space embracing both text and reader.

In order to address such questions, we have brought together seventeen scholars, teaching at universities in nine countries, who approach the texts from a variety of viewpoints utilizing different methodologies and applying them to specific periods in time, from the very beginnings of the history of the texts up to our own day. This in-depth and focused collaboration between scholars has produced, we believe, a fascinating combination of detailed studies of particular themes and time periods on the one hand, and, on the other, an intriguing overall impression, emerging from the volume when read in its entirety, of the elastic and vigorous nature of the interpretive enterprise.

As we planned the two conferences and the volumes that have followed from them, we have been keenly aware of the fact that current developments in Gospel research tend to challenge many central and long-held consensus within the study of each of the Gospels. Addressing this situation in a creative way needs to involve, in our view, several parameters. The field is currently in a position in which we must address a very wide variety of concerns as they relate to the study of the earliest Gospels. It is essential, therefore, to be as comprehensive as possible in our selection of topics and themes to be dealt with, both within and beyond the more traditional approaches that we apply to our texts. Radical diversity of opinion with regard to almost each and every one of these approaches in turn leads to a desire for an overview of exegetical developments over time, to put things in perspective; a 'time-line' of sorts, providing us with case studies which, when connected, generate a sense of our own relative place in a two-thousand year old chain of interpreters. Involved in such an endeavor, if it is to be launched effectively, are several aspects relating to us – and by "us" we mean both contemporary and historical individuals – as interpreters, as political, social, and religious beings in different parts of the world, not least the simple fact that we relate to history from our respective vantage points. We need, in other words, to address issues like history, meaning, and the dynamics of understanding.

---

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g. Helen K. Bond, review of E.-M. Becker and A. Runesson (eds), *Mark and Matthew I, Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in their First Century Settings*, JSNT 45.5 (2012) 38–39; Jeff Jay, review of E.-M. Becker and A. Runesson (eds), *Mark and Matthew I, Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in their First Century Settings*, *Early Christianity* 3 (2012) 259–64.

In order to implement such a strategy with the aim of creating an expanded platform for the study of the earliest narrative witnesses to Jesus of Nazareth, a platform which has the potential of opening up new ways of thinking about these texts – and of ourselves and others as readers – scholars from different interpretive ‘guilds’ and academic cultures need to work together in a concerted effort to move beyond that which happens to be familiar in one particular place. In the past, researchers within various such interpretive ‘guilds’ have, unfortunately, tended to work in isolation from each other, and interaction has often been limited, to the detriment of the wider field of Gospel studies. The two Mark and Matthew volumes thus far produced aim at taking some initial steps towards overcoming such isolation and opening up a shared space in which different perspectives can meet and inspire rather than clash and lead to estrangement. In a constantly shrinking world, such efforts seem more important now than ever before, as we realize the relativity of our own interpretive efforts in the larger context of both culture and history.

The present volume has a distinct focus on the reception of Mark and Matthew in comparative perspective, from the earliest period onwards. With ‘the earliest period’ we include the first century, since ‘reception’ is a rather elusive concept involving also the production of the texts themselves. Accepting Markan priority, the creation of the text is evidence of a specific form of reception of parts of the oral Jesus traditions transmitted and circulated in the first century, as well as, possibly, some earlier written forms of these traditions, the latter also being part of the reception of previous oral traditions. These oral traditions, out of which Mark’s Gospel was carved, continued to exist as such alongside Mark, as Mark’s own textual reception history took form in Matthew’s Gospel and elsewhere. Matthew, while utilizing Mark’s Gospel, also textualised other versions of the same traditions as Mark had used, as well as traditions transmitted beyond the reach, or liking, of Mark. For scholars accepting the theory of a written Q source, this source was also, along with oral tradition, merged together with the other sources in the highly structured matrix that has come down to us as the Gospel of Matthew.<sup>4</sup> Then, later, Matthew’s Gospel exercised influence on the reception of Mark’s Gospel, as the ending of that Gospel was augmented by traditions partly gleaned from Matthew.<sup>5</sup> The constant presence of oral tradition alongside the written documents complicates any theory aiming at exact descriptions of the intricate web of interconnections between Mark and Matthew. In these processes of overlapping receptions that led to the genesis of the earliest gospels that have been preserved

---

<sup>4</sup> Q, according to some scholars, was also part of the material known to Mark, who used it sparingly. Thus, the analysis of the production of Mark, in such theories, needs to take into account a specific form of Q reception. For a recent overview of the origin and structure of the Gospel of Matthew, see Anders Runesson, “Matthew, Gospel According to,” in vol. 2 of *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Books of the Bible* (ed. M. D. Coogan; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 59–78.

<sup>5</sup> See James A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

through the centuries, we also see the birth of the reception of the genre of the gospels themselves, which develops significantly in the second century and onwards.

## 2. Reception and the Production of Meaning

Diverse types of concepts and theories can illuminate the literary shape of the gospel genre. On the basis of genre-studies, *Eve-Marie Becker* investigates Mark's primary impact on the further history of the gospel-genre "in its inventive power of creating a literary concept of a gospel-writing."<sup>6</sup> In its first successful decades, 'Mark' was considered to be a literary source rather than a 'stable text.' Although the Gospel's reception-history was not coherent as such early on,<sup>7</sup> the text must soon have been understood as a literary concept that opened up the floor for literary improvement, re-arrangement, and competition. Consequently, when considering the gospel-concept in relation to Mark, Matthew, and the Gospel of Peter, it should be noted that it was not only imitated but also developed extensively. It is clear that Mark opened up the doors for the development of early Christian literary activities since it functioned as an impetus for organizing Jesus-narratives in literary terms. More specifically, Mark initiated and stimulated the early Christian history of narrative literature to a large extent.

Borrowing ideas from evolutionary theory, the cognitive science of religion, and network analysis, *Petri Luomanen* proposes an evolutionary analysis of Mark, Matthew, and Q which explains why Mark and Matthew – and not Q – survived as literary documents. Moreover, in an evolutionary perspective, Mark, and particularly Matthew, seem to have a most "successful evolutionary profile," regarding formal, i.e. literary characteristics, network discourse, identity discourse, and ritual discourse. As Luomanen notes, "Q was the most likely to disappear as an independent document and Matthew the most likely to be the most successful."<sup>8</sup> Luomanen's study reinforces the fact that a comparative analysis of Mark and Matthew cannot escape the quest for and the analysis of 'Q'.

Keeping Q in the equation, *Benedict Thomas Viviano* offers an, in his own words, "positivistic" historical approach defined over and against postmodern convictions, as he presents a historical reconstruction of Q's origin and provenance. For Viviano, Q is "for the most part a collection of the aphoristic teachings and apocalyptic preaching of John the Baptist and Jesus, preserved in the private *notebooks* of a direct auditor of these two preachers"; the auditor is identified as Matthew Levi.<sup>9</sup> From here, Viviano moves on to a fresh comparative reading of Mark 2:13–17 and Matt 9:9–13, which underlines the continuous need for 'exploratory exegesis.' In

<sup>6</sup> P. 33.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. limited papyri-transmission; the variety of Markan endings; "Secret Gospel of Mark"; hypotheses on Deutero- and Proto-Mark.

<sup>8</sup> P. 71 and 73.

<sup>9</sup> P. 75.

this way, light is shed on the dynamic impact of historical hypotheses on textual interpretation.

As is well known, while Mark's Gospel enjoyed initial success and great influence on the production of gospels, Matthew soon achieved a standing unrivalled among the Gospels in church history, mirroring its position as the first text of the New Testament canon. Matthew's influence, however, reached beyond the circles that later came to dominate developments in the majority church as Christianity rose to political prominence in the late fourth century. It seems clear, e.g., that Matthew was favored and used by Jews who believed that Jesus was the Messiah, and who practiced a form of Christ-centered Judaism that became increasingly marginalized as non-Jewish forms of Christianity became politically empowered and anti-Jewish legislation was introduced in the Christian Empire.<sup>10</sup> But Matthew was also used by other, non-Jewish Christ-believing groups, which were part of the diverse scene involving beliefs and practices centered on Jesus as a Christ-figure, and which, in the end, were marginalized. Evidence of such reception is found in second-century texts from Nag Hammadi in Egypt. In order to shed light on some of these developments, the volume proceeds from the earliest period when Mark and Matthew were formed to analyses of the *Sophia of Jesus Christ* (SJC), which re-writes the so-called Great Commission (Matt 28:16–20), as well as of Jerome's commentary and Chrysostom's sermons.

René Falkenberg demonstrates how SJC, through incorporating Matthean motifs like the Great Commission, may have attempted to appear "as a continuation of the narrative in the Matthean epilogue. It has been suggested that the revelation dialogue was ... a continuation of that Gospel on a higher level."<sup>11</sup> Here, the idea of emulating Matthew's authoritative status seems to be predominant. Directing attention to interpreters who worked within what has remained since then the mainstream church, Peter Widdicombe's analysis of Jerome and Chrysostom not only indicates how these patristic exegetes have given more "theological weight" to Matthew than to Mark,<sup>12</sup> but also points to how both theologians differ in their reading of Matthew in literary (commentary and sermons) as well as in theological terms. The history of *interpretation* thus appears early on also as a history of individual *interpreters*.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Recent studies, from various perspectives, on these Jews and their beliefs and practices include Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik, *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007); Matt Jackson McCabe, ed., *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007); Edwin Broadhead, *Jewish Ways of Following Jesus: Redrawing the Religious Map of Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); Petri Luomanen, *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

<sup>11</sup> P. 104.

<sup>12</sup> P. 105.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. e.g. reflections on this in Eve-Marie Becker, "Was ein Text sein kann: Zur Beschreibung eines Text-Inventars," in *Was ist ein Text?* (ed. O. Wischmeyer and E.-M. Becker; Tübingen/Basel: Francke Verlag, 2001), 159–69; eadem, ed., *Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft: Autobiographische Essays aus der Evangelischen Theologie*, (Tübingen/Basel: Francke Verlag, 2003).

Once Christian culture, as shaped by the Catholic Church, was firmly established in European societies in the Middle Ages, the reading of Mark and Matthew developed in new ways. Although Mark remained in the shadow of Matthew for most of the time, there are some interesting cases when Mark and Matthew were commented upon in relation to one another. Few New Testament scholars work on biblical interpretation in the Middle Ages, and none, as far as we are aware, have produced a comparative study of the treatment of Mark and Matthew in the immensely influential 12<sup>th</sup> century scholarly masterpiece, produced with a layout quite similar to the Talmud, the *Glossa Ordinaria*.<sup>14</sup> Analysis of this learned work, which brings together quotes from commentaries by the Church Fathers and later writings, serves well the purpose of illustrating the significance of continuity and change as history moved from Late Antiquity into the Middle Ages. Despite some uncertainties regarding its composition history, *Joseph Verheyden* chooses the *Gloss* in order to show how “Medieval authors went about putting together a ‘commentary,’ not only on Matthew but also on that much neglected Gospel of Mark,” and how “Medieval commentators handled tensions between the gospels.”<sup>15</sup> Verheyden’s study thus builds a bridge between Synoptic exegesis in antiquity and exegesis in the modern period.

Among key moments in the development of the interpretation of Mark and Matthew, the Reformation period<sup>16</sup> and its later developments present us with a major interpretive shift, which is still dominant in the Western world today. Since Enlightenment ideals and insights developed and morphed into what we regard today as modern scholarship on the Bible, both Protestant and later on Catholic scholars have joined a common academic milieu in which discussions are nurtured through the application of agreed upon historical and other methodologies. Still, certain patterns of thought developed within as well as between Protestant and Catholic interpreters. In two contributions focusing on Mark and Matthew such patterns are analyzed as they apply to the quantitatively most productive century of Biblical as well as Synoptic studies so far, a period when the study of what was – and is – considered to be ‘holy texts’ by the church was taken on also by scholars of non-conformist religious leanings as well as researchers from other religious backgrounds or no religious affiliation at all: the twentieth century.

*Martin Meiser* presents an overview of the history of Synoptic studies that, until the 1970s, was predominantly based in Germany. On the one hand, Synoptic studies were still under the methodological influence of 19<sup>th</sup> century academic exegesis (source criticism and historical criticism). On the other hand, exegetes were affected by various streams of thought in different cultural as well as ecclesial milieus, as these developed before and after the Nazi period. Within such inter-

---

<sup>14</sup> For a general discussion of this work, see Lesley Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

<sup>15</sup> P. 144.

<sup>16</sup> Contributions to Synoptic exegesis during the reformation period will receive further attention in connection with the preparations for the reformation jubilee in 2017.



pretive contexts, Markan and Matthean passages that were adaptable especially to political readings became increasingly important. Thus, up to the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the academic relevance of either Mark or Matthew has a certain tendency to lie in their openness to socio-political application.

Catholic exegesis of that period was more clearly determined by the official church statements from 1893, 1943, and 1993, as well as by a concern for meeting ecclesial needs,<sup>17</sup> as *Detlev Dormeyer* points out. In a 'Literaturbericht,' Dormeyer discusses the results of exegetical studies of Mark and Matthew produced by Catholic scholars. He notes paradigm shifts within and beyond Synoptic exegesis, like the acceptance of Form- and Redaction-Criticism and the so-called Linguistic Turn, especially with regard to their impact on Markan and Matthean studies. Dormeyer also shows how certain types of contextual readings (e.g., liberation theology and feminist approaches) derive from Catholic exegesis more specifically.

Reading Meiser and Dormeyer comparatively may lead the reader to consider further certain, partly interrelated, historical, political, geographical, and academic developments with which Synoptic studies were confronted in the 20<sup>th</sup> century: the cultural crisis of a Western civilization marked by World War I and II; the loss of German-speaking academic dominance in the field of theology; the increase of politically oriented readings, primarily rooted in the so-called global south and frequently initiated by Catholic theology; the challenges to New Testament studies emerging from various fields within the humanities – the Linguistic Turn being only the starting point for an ongoing quest with regard to the problem of how to relate the New Testament writings to diverse hermeneutical shifts. Such developments prepared for the complex and intricate interpretive scene which we currently experience in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

As noted above, among the many historical processes of the 20<sup>th</sup> century one stands out more than others, also with regard to its deep effects on the church, Christian theology, and New Testament studies: the Second World War. More precisely, the Christian-Jewish relationship could not remain the same after the horrors of the Holocaust, as these events, atrocious beyond comprehension, were demonstrably related to specific forms of New Testament interpretation in the church. Struggling to understand its role not only in the Holocaust, but also in relation to international developments beyond this context involving the proliferation of interfaith encounters, the Second Vatican Council, convened from October 11, 1962 to December 8, 1965, produced documents that initiated profound reassessments of the church's theology of religions. With regard to Jewish-Christian relations, the *Nostra Aetate* (1965) of the Council was followed by two documents widely regarded as the most authoritative texts on the subject today: *Guidelines and Suggestions for Implementing the Conciliar Declaration Nostra Aetate* (n. 4)

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf., e.g., John L. Curran, "St. Irenaeus and the Dates of the Synoptics," *CBQ* 5 (1943): 34–46; 301–310; 445–457, esp. 37–38, where Curran discusses "modern Catholic Views."



(1975), and *Notes on the Correct Way to Present Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church* (1985).

In these documents, Biblical interpretation is at the center, as theology is (re-)formed and anti-Semitism combated. But in which ways are the Biblical texts used? What hermeneutics are involved, and which role, if any, does modern academic historical research play in these processes? Focusing on the reception of Mark and Matthew in these official church documents, *Anders Runesson* notes certain developments in interpretive approach that occurred between 1965 and 1985, highlighting how inter-subjective academic endeavors have come to contribute – ecumenically – to church theology in essential ways. He concludes that, while historical discourses have contributed significantly to the process of breaking down anti-Jewish stereotypes and theologies, some methodological inconsistencies surface as the documents use Mark and Matthew to make specific theological points. Ultimately, the potential of academic historical research to influence the dynamics of the production of church theology centers to a significant degree on its ability to generate historical voices religio-culturally divergent from contemporary politics. In this way academia is enabling the ancient texts to interact in new ways in the theological dialogue that also involves contemporary voices of people from all parts of the world.

### 3. The Dynamics of Interpretation

Bringing together analyses of Mark and Matthew from divergent time periods and cultural contexts in a conference setting – as well as between the covers of a book – raises profound questions relating to the problem of the interpretive engagement as such. While similar questions were addressed to a certain degree in the contributions to the first part of the present volume, in part two we want to bring attention to such issues in a more focused way. As with the first part of the volume, the strategy chosen has been to work from a wide-ranging perspective, but to have the wider spectrum concretized in the form of specific key topics, with the hope that others will expand such investigations in various directions in the future.

Thus proceeding, it is of importance, as we see it, not to leave out certain hermeneutical paradigms that contribute to defining our theological and/or historical approach to Mark and Matthew, such as the quest for the ‘earliest voices’ and ‘potential intentions’ of the authors and their audiences. What did they want to achieve, and how did they go about working towards those goals? What hermeneutics were involved in the first-century settings in which the texts were shaped, and how was meaning produced and re-produced in ongoing debate and dialogue? Such discussions shed important light on other types of approaches to the texts, in diverse and later settings. In this context, *Adela Yarbro Collins* addresses recent discussions of Mark and history writing. She begins with an audience-oriented analysis of the term ἀρχή (Mark 1:1) and concludes that it “seems likely that those

readers familiar with Greek and Latin historical writings took the use of this word as a cue, a signal, that they should understand Mark as a historical work.” Yarbrow Collins’ overall interpretation of Mark’s narrative concept leads to a fundamental insight with regard to what the gospel genre as a literary model implies: “Mark ... created a narrative that allows its readers to relive the past – the teaching and activities of Jesus.”<sup>18</sup>

While Yarbrow Collins offers a literary understanding of Mark’s Gospel, *Stephen Westerholm* reflects upon the origin and nature of Mark and Matthew much more in theological terms. As reconstructed from the hearers’ perspective, Westerholm addresses the textual propositions and kerygmatic impact by which the aim of the gospel writings is generated: “On the whole, the story of Jesus in the Gospels seems intended to inspire faith, allegiance, obedience, and worship more than imitation.”<sup>19</sup> Certainly, Yarbrow Collins would agree with the claim that “Mark intended his readers to hear a foundational story from the past.”<sup>20</sup> However, while Westerholm moves on to a kerygmatic reading that may point to a canonical perspective, Yarbrow Collins limits her textual analysis to the aims and purposes of literary interpretation.<sup>21</sup> Here we encounter two different modes of approaching Mark’s and Matthew’s narrative concept, models which may inspire further discussion.

Throughout most of the reception history of Mark and Matthew – contrary to modern historical-critical approaches – the New Testament as canon has played a vital role and its various parts have been allowed to interpret each other. This phenomenon generates further questions relating to canonical theologies and the role of Mark and Matthew in such theologies. None of the Gospels were intended as one contribution among others to a collection of sacred writings. What happens to meaning and function as such texts are incorporated into a larger inter-textual interpretive matrix, the canon, meant to be authoritative for large groups of people?<sup>22</sup> This is the topic of *Mogens Müller’s* study. Müller proposes a “canonical theology,” within which the fourfold Gospel may find a place and where matters of narrative inconsistency and needs for harmonization lose their importance. At the same time, Müller notes how Matthew, as a “new edition of Mark,”<sup>23</sup> as well as Mark itself, ultimately serves ecclesial needs and purposes in worship settings. Through such processes, the Gospels’ pluriformity may function as a factor stimulating diversity rather than unity, if unity is understood as uniformity (cf. Ernst Käsemann). As the present collection of essays indicates repeatedly, when Mark

<sup>18</sup> P. 244 and 238.

<sup>19</sup> P. 252 f.

<sup>20</sup> Westerholm, p. 257.

<sup>21</sup> Westerholm, p. 257: Mark “also wrote his Gospel, as early Christians proclaimed the gospel, in the confidence that God would address his hearers through his words, so that, in receptive hearts, those words would bear fruit.”

<sup>22</sup> Regarding recent discussion of canonization and de-canonization, cf. *Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion: Kanonisierungsprozesse religiöser Texte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart – Ein Handbuch* (ed. E.-M. Becker and S. Scholz; Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2012).

<sup>23</sup> P. 264.

and Matthew are studied comparatively the focus continuously shifts back and forth between considering the literary history of each Gospel narrative on the one hand, and the canonical setting in which more than two Gospels generate a spectrum of meaning that affects the individual texts on the other. In the end, the canonical perspective is an important part of that larger interpretive frame which urges scholars to engage in continuously renewed attempts to apply a comparative perspective in their analysis of the Gospels.

No exegesis or interpretation is neutral, especially when conceptualized programmatically as a 'reading.' A multitude of factors are activated,<sup>24</sup> consciously or unconsciously, as human beings of flesh and blood encounter and engage a text. There is a constant reciprocal dynamic between readers and the text on the one hand, and readers of the text and the society in which the reader lives on the other hand, a continuous interaction that involves and effects change, including the type of change that is entangled in processes attempting to uphold an interpretive status quo.<sup>25</sup> In this regard, feminist scholarship has contributed greatly to the study of the New Testament and our Gospels, and has done so from a variety of perspectives. As *Janice Capel Anderson* notes, there is not one feminism, but several feminisms, which makes definition difficult.<sup>26</sup> Referring to bell hooks and Linda Martín Alcoff, Anderson suggests a wide approach to defining feminism as "a common resistance to all the different forms of male domination," and "our right and our ability to construct, and take responsibility for, our gendered identity, our politics, and our choices." Exploring several readings of Matthew's genealogy along historical and cultural spectra with a special focus on the women mentioned therein, Anderson notes the importance of frames and the social location of interpreters, as well as the text's ambivalence in that it may support both oppression and liberation. The unexpected presence of five women in a patrilineal genealogy, she concludes, challenges the readers "to read both with and against the grain."<sup>27</sup>

As discussed by Anderson, certain strands of feminism are closely related to, and intertwined with, postcolonial analysis. For postcolonial studies, political

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Lexikon der Bibelhermeneutik: Begriffe – Methoden – Theorien – Konzepte* (ed. O. Wischmeyer, et al.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009).

<sup>25</sup> The idea of something or someone supporting a 'status quo' should be treated with some caution. Nothing is immovable and that which is ostensibly made to 'stand still' in fact, as a result of this very act, moves, since its location in relation to its surroundings, and thus in relation to its interpreters, is constantly changing. Form should not be confused with content. In other words, any attempt to preserve is, in reality, an attempt to change, just as much as change may aim at preservation; any 'preservation' is inevitably done within a complex web of constantly moving parameters, in relation to which a perceived 'preservation' ceaselessly changes in as much as it relates to social, political, economic, and cultural realities at any given historical moment. Change is all-pervasive and unending; the real question is, fundamentally, about direction, which is a subjective and political issue.

<sup>26</sup> Anderson, p. 272, mentions, e.g., Western liberal feminism, cultural feminism, womanist feminism (which, as she notes, developed from African American feminism), and postcolonial feminism.

<sup>27</sup> P. 272 and 287.

issues related to colonialism, hegemony, and power relations stand at the center of investigations, which in turn may take different forms: historical, contemporary, methodological, and theoretical.<sup>28</sup> Recent postcolonial scholarship has called attention to various problems in traditional Western exegesis, unveiling how hegemonic aspects of the academic world are part of a wider postcolonial reality, and, further, how this has affected and still affects interpretations and methods used. Revealing the racializing tendencies of 19<sup>th</sup> century biblical scholarship and how such scholarship related to the colonial mindset prevalent in Europe at the time, *Hans Leander* warns against the risk of such colonial heritage becoming reproduced in contemporary research. Leander rejects the distinction in New Testament textbooks – and in many scholars’ minds – between ‘ordinary exegesis’ and ‘exegesis with a special focus,’ the latter meant to categorize approaches like feminism, postcolonialism, African American, and queer perspectives. Such distinctions prioritize Western forms of exegesis as ‘normal,’ and therefore also as more relevant in terms of the scientific and purportedly non-biased status of the historical and linguistic results produced. Reading Mark and Matthew with 19<sup>th</sup> century commentators reveals that far from being ‘neutral’ these exegetical discourses were intertwined with and dependent on racialized discourses of modernity, related specifically to the field of orientalism. In addition, Leander shows how scholarship on Mark and Matthew was linked to discourses of Protestant mission and its relationship to European colonialism. Ultimately all exegesis, Leander concludes, is best described as ‘exegesis with a special focus.’

Leander’s study sheds light on the fact that New Testament exegesis is in the process of becoming truly global. Not only are voices from other parts of the world now beginning to be heard in their own right by mainstream Western scholarship; that very scholarship is challenged at its methodological and theoretical core. Such intellectual encounters between sometimes radically different points of view, followed by reciprocal interaction and engagement in discussions of not least methodological and theoretical questions, may contribute significantly to new ways of understanding both ‘the other’ and ourselves as culturally embedded readers, as we begin to decolonize universalizing definitions of exegesis. As *Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele* note, in such processes we have to recognize that the comparative approach itself may be relativized when understood from a different theoretical perspective. Synoptic comparison, they argue, has tended to proceed with a set of assumptions and embedded values that are fundamentally modern. While comparing Matthew and Mark may seem like a value-neutral and methodologically objective enterprise, a different orientation to Gospel Studies challenges us to rethink our own assumptions and values and how those are shaped by and also shape the comparative process. The reader is invited by Penner and Vander

---

<sup>28</sup> For a presentation and analysis of postcolonial approaches, see Anna Runesson, *Exegesis in the Making: Postcolonialism and New Testament Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

Stichele to consider the proposition that we encounter ourselves in our own methods long before we encounter something other in the text.

From a different angle, *Michael Knowles* investigates modern scholarship on Mark and Matthew in relation to earlier forms of exegesis, with special emphasis on Late Antiquity on the one hand and the modern and post-modern periods on the other. In this way, light is shed on the wider perspective in which we may understand the current interpretive moment. Focusing on the transfiguration (Mark 9:2–10; Matt 17:1–8), which is portrayed in similar fashion in both Gospels, Knowles explores various forms of reception of this tradition in apologetics, homiletics, liturgy and lectionary, hymnody, iconography, and theology, including the theological interpretation of Scripture. Finding connection-points between the pre-modern and the post-modern periods in the diverse reception of the transfiguration, the modern approach to reading biblical texts is relativized as a rather limited strategy for understanding texts; such interpretive boundaries stand in contrast to the universalizing claims it produces.

Knowles' contribution, which completes the volume, emphasizes the role of the many and diverse voices in the church for the interpretive outcome, so that the "different voices and perspectives (those of the academy providing only a small part) contribute to an ongoing, richly multi-layered symphony of scriptural exposition, explanation, and appropriation."<sup>29</sup>

It is our hope that the present volume, read together with the first volume of the Mark and Matthew project (WUNT 271, 2011), will provide a stimulus for increased interaction within and between the various scholarly paradigms, or 'guilds,' in which we tend to work, as we strive towards greater understanding of the earliest narrative portraits of Jesus and, by implication, ourselves as interpreters and partners in the production of meaning in various cultural and hermeneutical settings. What began as two texts with an intertwined history entangled in the realities of the first-century Mediterranean world has come to generate innumerable responses within and outside the churches and the academic world throughout history and around the globe. Understanding Mark and Matthew comparatively in these countless contexts is a fascinating – and unending – task, which requires cooperation and encourages interdisciplinarity within the larger fields of the humanities, the social sciences, and theology. If the Mark and Matthew volumes show that such cooperation between sometimes radically different, even opposing, perspectives and approaches is not only desirable but also possible, stimulating, and fruitful, our efforts have not been in vain.

---

<sup>29</sup> P. 355.

*Part I*

Reception and Cultural Hermeneutics:  
Reading Mark and Matthew From the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century



# The Reception of “Mark” in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Centuries C. E. and its Significance for Genre Studies

*Eve-Marie Becker*

The Markan Gospel was at its literary height early on. As far as we can see “Mark”<sup>1</sup> was immediately spread, read, and used, eventually by John, in any case by Matthew and Luke, who are its earliest readers and transmitters. Thus, we can guess that the Markan Gospel was successfully circulated already between 70–90 C. E. And according to Eusebius,<sup>2</sup> Mark’s Gospel also received an early attribution of apostolic authorization: it was Papias of Hierapolis who called Mark the interpreter of Peter (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15)<sup>3</sup> and thus, in the first half of the second century, associated Mark with apostolic traditions.<sup>4</sup>

Nevertheless, we also get the impression that Mark’s reception-history did not continue – at least, not consistently – during the second century. Such an impression is based on various facts and observations which we will look at now. It will become evident here that in the second century C. E. we basically have to deal with phenomena like textual inconsistency and literary diversity of Mark. These observations will force us to re-define what we actually mean when investigating Mark’s early reception-history (s. 1.). In order to understand these phenomena more comprehensively and to discuss Mark’s literary ‘success’ we will then have to enter the field of *genre studies* and literary history (s. 2.).

## 1. Defining and Re-defining “Mark”

We start with the recognition that there is no strong material evidence for the early reception of Mark on the level of manuscript-transmission.<sup>5</sup> While the first

---

<sup>1</sup> When we talk about the “Markan Gospel” we basically mean here and later on the canonical gospel-writing as we find it in Nestle-Aland<sup>27/28</sup> (pp. 88–147/102–76).

<sup>2</sup> For further patristic references to Mark, the Evangelist, cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.8.3; 2.15; 3.24.7; 5.14.6; 6.25.4 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. W. C. van Unnik, “Zur Papias-Notiz über Markus,” *ZNW* 54 (1963): 276–7.

<sup>4</sup> The reception of the Markan Gospel is partly affiliated with the reception of the figure of John Mark also (cf. 1 Pet 5:14) who, especially in relation to Barnabas (Acts 12:25; 15:36 ff.), plays an important role up to the end of the fifth century – e.g. as the author of the *Acts of Barnabas* (2.2.292–302). Cf. F. R. Prostmeier, “Barnabas-Literatur,” in *LACL* (ed. S. Döpp and W. Geerlings; 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Freiburg etc.: Herder, 2002), 107–8.

<sup>5</sup> For the (early) reception history of the Markan Gospel, cf., recently, B. D. Schildgen, *Power and Prejudice: The Reception of the Gospel of Mark* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1999), esp. 35–62.



and only *papyrus*-manuscript documenting Mark is P<sup>45</sup> (third century),<sup>6</sup> we do have much more and even older *papyri* for Matthew. These document the rich material evidence for the Matthean Gospel during the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries.<sup>7</sup> It is only in the important *codices* of the fourth and fifth century, like *Sinaiticus* (Ⲱ 01), *Vaticanus* (B 03), *Alexandrinus* (A 02) and *Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (D 05), that the broad material evidence for the Markan Gospel is available to us. Interestingly, here Mark indeed is delivered in its entirety, i.e. in its full length. It seems hardly accidental<sup>8</sup> that the Gospel of Matthew is much better witnessed than Mark in the second and third centuries. This might rather tell us something about the specific character and the early reception-history of the Markan Gospel also. Consequently, Dieter Lührmann started his commentary on Mark by problematizing the slim textual basis which we have for Mark and its consequences for Markan exegesis.<sup>9</sup> And Harry Gamble has pointed to the fact that there is indeed a relationship between material evidence, reception-history, and the gain of textual consistency: “In the absence of controlled transmission, an ancient text acquired stability not in proportion to the extent of authority lodged in it, but by the broad circulation of enough copies to establish and sustain a consistent, self-reinforcing textual tradition.”<sup>10</sup> But this means, in other words, that if we can prove in Mark’s case that there is textual inconsistency in the second century, then the weak material evidence can have significance for Mark’s early reception-history also. And, in fact, there are different types of indications for questioning Mark’s early textual consistency. By considering these indications we will, however, get beyond Gamble in that we will detect how textual inconsistency and literary diversity are interrelated.

(a) The Markan ending in 16:8 is still under dispute. Even if we follow Kurt Aland and others in assuming that the original ending of Mark is in place in 16:8<sup>11</sup> – as documented, e.g., in *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* – and that this ending

<sup>6</sup> Some parts of Mark 1 and 16:9 are documented in Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3.10.6); cf. also E.-M. Becker, “Dating Mark and Matthew as Ancient Literature,” in *Mark and Matthew I, Comparative Readings: Understanding the Earliest Gospels in their First Century Settings* (ed. E.-M. Becker and A. Runesson; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 123–43, 127 f., esp. n. 24.

<sup>7</sup> These *papyri* date from ca. 200, the second/third century (P<sup>64, 77</sup>), or the third century (P<sup>1, 37, 45, 53, 70</sup>).

<sup>8</sup> Of course, we cannot be sure whether the history of the textual transmission of Mark is to a large degree contingent: it could be that the number of early *papyri*-manuscripts containing Matthew is simply higher because of chance. On the other hand, even if we can neither exclude factors like coincidence nor be certain about whether all early remaining manuscripts of Mark have as yet been found, we are also working with comparative indicators like probabilities, and parameters like average.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. D. Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 1–3. In this context, he also points to the various concrete implications for exegesis: he reflects, for instance, on the consequences for textual criticism of Markan texts: “Die Textkritik hat grundsätzlich derjenigen Lesart den Vorzug zu geben, die als nicht von Parallelversionen der anderen Evangelien beeinflusst zu erweisen ist” (2).

<sup>10</sup> H. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1995), 126.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the resumé in E.-M. Becker, *Das Markus-Evangelium im Rahmen antiker Historiographie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 238–9.

is intentional, we cannot, however, avoid admitting that several additions to the text, such as the Freer-Logion in Codex W (fourth / fifth century C.E.), the shorter ending, and the longer ending, are obviously meant as later attempts to complete the Markan Gospel literarily.<sup>12</sup> Such supplementations<sup>13</sup> had possibly been put into the manuscripts already during the second century.<sup>14</sup> In other words, in comparison to Matt 28:9–20, Luke 24:13–53, and John 20:11–21:25, the original ending of

<sup>12</sup> For an overview, cf., e.g., J. Gnllka, *Das Evangelium nach Markus: 2. Teilband Mk 8,27–16,20* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.; Zürich/Düsseldorf: Benziger Verlag, 1999), 350–8, or A. Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 802–18.

<sup>13</sup> Dibelius called them disconcertingly 'wilde Überlieferungen,' what presupposes a firm and distinct type of transmission: M. Dibelius, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Herausgegeben v. F. Hahn* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1975), 47 ff. He meant Jesus-traditions that were probably orally delivered, either before being affiliated to already existing texts (cf., e.g., John 7:53–8:11) or before being transformed into a written text individually (cf., e.g., *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* 840). I refer here and later to Dibelius because already in 1926 he approached the apocryphal gospels programmatically by means of a *literary history*. Concerning the remains of Papyri of Apocryphal materials in general, cf. D. G. Martinez, "The Papyri and Early Christianity," in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. R. S. Bagnall; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 590–622, 598 f. Concerning the 'Oxyrhynchus Scholars' in particular: W. A. Johnson, "The Ancient Book," in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, 256–81, 270–7. Parts of the secondary ending of the Markan Gospel, e.g. the *Freer Logion*, might also fit to that category of 'wilde Überlieferungen.' More carefully, J. Frey, "Zu Text und Sinn des Freer-Logion," *ZNW* 93 (2002): 13–34: "Das Freer-Logion ist ein ... singulärer, vielleicht von einem einzelnen Schreiber in die Textüberlieferung eingetragener Einschub in den langen Markus-Schluß" (34). For the theological tendencies of the so-called Freer-Logion, cf. J. Dochhorn, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie: Der eschatologische Teufelsfall in Apc Joh 12 und seine Bedeutung für das Verständnis der Johannesoffenbarung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 284–93. For textual criticism and Codex W, cf. T. R. Shepherd, "Narrative Analysis as a Text Critical Tool: Mark 16 in Codex W as a Test Case," *JSNT* 32 (2009): 77–98. Today, we might thus better speak of *Einzelüberlieferungen* (individual traditions), where we subsume the so-called *agrapha* as well as separately preserved Jesus-traditions.

<sup>14</sup> The following datings are suggested: the general *terminus ad quem* for the Freer-Logion is Jerome (*Dialogus adversus Pelagianos* 2.15); nevertheless, scholars tend to think that it had already been formed during the second century: J. Jeremias, "Freer-Logion," in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.; ed. W. Schneemelcher; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990), 204–5, says: "das Stück erweist sich "als altertümlich" (204). Differently, P. Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1975), 681 f., who discusses the role of the Freer-Logion within the group of texts which are called 'Dialogues of the risen Christ with his disciples,' and does not think that it represents the oldest version of that kind of literature. In accordance to Kurt Aland ("Der Schluß des Markusevangeliums," in idem, *Neutestamentliche Entwürfe* [München: Kaiser, 1979], 246–83) some scholars have tended to date the shorter as well as the longer ending to the second century C.E. (cf. Lührmann, *Markusevangelium*, 268). In the case of the longer ending the *terminus ad quem* is Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3.10.5 f.) and even Justin (1 *Apol.* 45); cf. J. Marcus, *Mark 8–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2009), 1088, and Gnllka, *Evangelium*, 354. J. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 157 ff. and 473 ff. even tries to show that the longer ending was composed by an individual author between the first half and the midst of the second century C.E. The *terminus ad quem* for the shorter ending would be the longer ending itself, because otherwise the shorter ending would have been suppressed and would not have been transmitted further on; cf. Gnllka, *Evangelium*, 351.

Mark in 16:8, which does not refer to any epiphany of the risen Jesus, must have been understood as insufficient and incomplete. And yet some manuscripts like Sinaiticus and Vaticanus do prove that Mark 16:8 had in some cases been understood as a reasonable ending. Thus, additional endings were optionally appended to it. Interestingly, textual inconsistency and a multiplication of literary versions go hand in hand: as a consequence of defining Mark's ending, there was thus not only an increase of textual inconsistency but there was also multiplication of various literary versions of "Mark."

There is additional evidence for assuming that literary diversity and textual fluidity are interconnected. (b) If we should hold that Clement of Alexandria's reference to a "Secret Gospel of Mark" is authentic,<sup>15</sup> we do not only get insight into a specific literary adaption of Mark in the second half of the second century in Alexandria,<sup>16</sup> but rather also into continuing 'heretical' attempts of the so-called Carpocratians (cf. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.25.1–6) to utilize the Markan Gospel by yet further enlarging and extending it.<sup>17</sup> In this letter, Clement even tells the story of at least three different versions of the Markan Gospel that were known to him comprehensively: he mentions first "an account of the Lord's doings" (ἀνέγραψε τὰς πράξεις τοῦ κυρίου), that was composed by Mark in Rome; secondly, he speaks of "a more spiritual Gospel" (συνέταξε πνευματικώτερον εὐαγγέλιον), i.e. the "secret Gospel" (τὸ μυστικὸς εὐαγγέλιον) that was composed by Mark after his coming to Alexandria; and thirdly, he refers to a "polluted" (καὶ ἐμίανε) version of this gospel-account, arranged by a certain Carpocrates.<sup>18</sup> Finally, Clement tries to defend the "secret Gospel"-version against the Carpocratian interpretation. We will not discuss here Clement's intentions with authorizing the "Secret Gospel" of Mark.<sup>19</sup> It is rather more interesting to see how natural it obviously was up to the end of the second century to think of diverse literary versions of *one* gospel-writing such as Mark while its textual character was not yet fully consistent.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. M. Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), esp. 448–52.

<sup>16</sup> For the beginnings of Christian theology and literature in Alexandria, cf., in general, A. Fürst, *Christentum als Intellektuellen-Religion: Die Anfänge des Christentums in Alexandria* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2007); M. Clauss, *Alexandria: Eine antike Weltstadt* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2004), esp. 202–12.

<sup>17</sup> E. Rau, "Zwischen Gemeindechristentum und christlicher Gnosis: Das geheime Markusevangelium und das Geheimnis des Reiches Gottes," *NTS* 51 (2005): 482–504; idem, "Das Geheimnis des Reiches Gottes: Die esoterische Rezeption der Lehre Jesu im geheimen Markusevangelium," in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen: Beiträge zu außerkanonischen Jesusüberlieferungen aus verschiedenen Sprach- und Kulturtraditionen* (ed. J. Frey and J. Schröter; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 187–222.

<sup>18</sup> Folio 1, recto, line 16 until folio 1, verso, line 10. Text and translation in Smith, *Clement*, 446f. and 448–50.

<sup>19</sup> For the whole spectrum of discussion, cf., e.g., P. Jeffery, *The Secret Gospel of Mark Unveiled: Imagined Rituals of Sex, Death, and Madness in a Biblical Forgery* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2007); S. G. Brown, *Mark's Other Gospel: Rethinking Morton Smith's Controversial Discovery* (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2007).

What we see so far is that there obviously was an interdependency of a limited amount of copies available and textual inconsistency as well as the development of diverse literary outlines. The processes of transmitting differing literary versions of the Markan gospel-account during the second century C. E. obviously were dynamic for various reasons: these could be either matters of literary completion and creativeness or matters of specific, viz. 'heretical,' teaching which finally led to the production of a variety of Markan gospel-versions, in fact possibly without producing a bulk of manuscript-copies. As I will argue in this contribution, the reason for these processes could point back already to the last third of the first century C. E.: the Matthean Gospel, in fact, as an inclusion or 'incorporation' of Mark, was an early literary re-shaping of Mark's gospel-outline. Literary diversity was initiated here. The argument might then support the insight that already at that time literary variety and textual inconsistency go hand in hand.

(c) Here, we can take into account that there were probably various textual versions of Mark existent around, and possibly before, Matthew's time. Such an assumption is based on the observation of the so-called *minor* and *major agreements* that exist between Matthew and Luke against "Mark" while using him: accordingly, some scholars have made a proposal on grounds of *Literarkritik* that there was either a 'Deutero-Mark' or a 'Proto-Mark' that was used by Matthew and Luke and that differs significantly from the Markan version that is known to us.<sup>20</sup> We cannot discuss those hypotheses in detail here. More importantly, we need to start from various observations on the fact that the "Markan Gospel" as a textual entity is neither unchanging nor stable. It is obvious that the nature of the gospel-writing as a *literary* concept is such that it provokes and shapes further literary plurality and diversity from the very beginning. We are thus dealing here with *generic* questions. By saying this we are close to Werner H. Kelber's insights regarding the differences between the "Oral and the Written Gospel" (1983).<sup>21</sup> This means that Mark's reception history can best be approached from the point of view of literary-history.

(d) When considering the literary dynamics that are implied in the written gospel-concept, we should go back to Papias<sup>22</sup> and read more carefully what his witness on the Markan Gospel actually means: Papias' valuation of Mark as a literary

<sup>20</sup> Cf. again the resumé in Becker, *Markus-Evangelium*, 29f.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. W. H. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983). Here Kelber has emphasized the shift to an alternative mode of conceptualizing gospel-traditions as it was initiated by the shape of a 'written gospel.' The concept of a 'written gospel' was soon imitated, modified, and multiplied: "Nowhere in early Christianity is it more obvious than in the gospel of Mark that preservation of oral tradition is not a primary function of writing ... Both in form and content the written gospel constitutes a radical alternative to the oral gospel ... Mark's massively reflexive reconstruction of Jesus' past is his form of demythologizing the orally perceived presence of Jesus" (207 and 210).

<sup>22</sup> However, we should keep in mind also that Papias as a patristic author was controversial (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.11–13; Irenaeus, *Haer* 5.33.4): Cf. E. Schulz-Flügel, "Papias von Hierapolis," in *LACL*, 545–6.

concept needs to be seen against the background that he prioritizes oral traditions over written texts (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.4). From here, we can more particularly understand what he had in mind when stating that there is a lack of *τάξις* in Mark which results from the deficit of not being affiliated directly to the group of Jesus-disciples (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.15). It seems that Papias himself rather maintains a critical attitude towards Mark's gospel-concept than a strong support for it. In any case, he documents certain difficulties and insufficiencies regarding the early reception of Mark in the first half of the second century C. E. His note on a literary deficiency might indeed to some degree be seen parallel to the receding of Mark in the textual tradition.<sup>23</sup> For obvious reasons of textual stability, Papias has privileged processes of oral transmission. It is not accidental then that Justin Martyr around the middle of the second century C. E. was referring to the gospel's literacy (= 'Literarizität')<sup>24</sup> as well as to its plural and manifold appearances (1 *Apol.* 66; cf. *Dial.* 10.2; 100.1).<sup>25</sup> Literacy and literary plurality again seem to be two sides of the same coin. This is why literacy generates canonization, i.e. the formal definition of textual entities as well as collections of texts.<sup>26</sup>

So, how should we envisage best this interrelation of literacy, literary multiplicity, textual inconsistency, and reception-history? I will suggest this to be a literary and/or generic phenomenon first of all. Accordingly, we should approach these potential relationships on the basis of *literary-history*. In this contribution I will thus raise the question: how can we best reconstruct the early reception of Mark up to the pre-canonical collection of the 'Four Gospels' (*Vierevangelienkanon*), including Mark, is shaped between ca. 170 and 180 C. E.,<sup>27</sup> as Irenaeus documents (*Haer.* 3.1.1.) – a process which possibly developed in controversy with Marcionite 'heresy'<sup>28</sup>? So far, I have referred to the variety of textual versions of Mark that had been shaped during the second century and that are out of proportion to the number of manuscript-copies. Such a variety of texts points to the fact that during this period of time "Christian scriptural texts were still relatively fluid and subject

<sup>23</sup> In difference to this, Eusebius, ca. 200 years later than Papias, is mostly interested in depicting a strong apostolic authority for the four gospel-writings, including Mark, and hereby reflects how the gospel-writings are received in the early fourth century.

<sup>24</sup> 'Literature' and 'literacy' can to a certain degree be understood synonymously; cf. S. Greenblatt, *Was ist Literaturgeschichte? Mit einem Kommentar von C. Belsey. Aus dem Englischen von R. Kaiser/B. Neumann* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2000), 19 with reference to R. Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), 151.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. also Marcion, who names his redaction of Luke as 'gospel'; e.g., Tertullian, *Marc* 4.2.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. E.-M. Becker, "Antike Textsammlungen in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion: Eine Darstellung aus neutestamentlicher Sicht," in *Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion: Kanonisierungsprozesse religiöser Texte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart – Ein Handbuch* (ed. E.-M. Becker/S. Scholz; Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2012), 3–31.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. T. K. Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 30. Heckel distinguishes between a "Vierevangelien-sammlung," that was shaped first, and a "Vierevangelienkanon" – only regarding the latter can a positive and a negative concept of canon be used.

<sup>28</sup> Cf., e.g., H. Freiherr von Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1968/Nachdr. 2003), 201–2.

to revision,"<sup>29</sup> and that textual inconsistency and literary diversity are interrelated. By being aware of the multiplicity of textual versions, we thus get in touch with the literary dynamics by which the Markan Gospel as a narrative concept was received and transmitted: from early on "Mark" was obviously less important as a stabile text meeting certain social needs than as a literary "source" (cf. Luke) or *Vorlage* (cf. Matthew)<sup>30</sup> – in any case, as a *literary concept* that could be continued as well as improved. From here we can better understand how various textual as well as literary versions or re-writings of "Mark" came into being.<sup>31</sup> Considering the number of different literary versions of Mark and the simultaneous rise of apocryphal gospel-writings in the second century C. E. we should then conclude that literacy during this period of time widely stimulated creativity and multiplicity in the field of narrative prose.<sup>32</sup>

In what follows, I will try to explain by means of *genre studies* (s. 2.) how the first ca. 100 years of Mark's reception history might have looked and what we can deduce from this for the early history of Christian literature: it will become evident then that it was the Matthean attempt of incorporating Mark, rather than suppressing Mark (s. 2.1.), that initiated further literary creativeness by which other gospel writings – the so-called "apocryphal gospels" – appeared on the scene (s. 2.2.). In the end, we can understand the gospel-writing best as a literary concept that implies the shape of literary plurality in early Christian narrative literature (s. 3.). Accordingly, the Markan Gospel could also hereby assert its position in the long run.

## 2. Genre Studies (Gattungsgeschichte)

Let us begin with some remarks on definition. It is *genre studies* (*Gattungsgeschichte*)<sup>33</sup> that – as a field of *literary history* (*Literaturgeschichte*)<sup>34</sup> – can give us relevant

<sup>29</sup> Gamble, *Books and Readers*, 125 f.

<sup>30</sup> We need to take into account here and later that Matthew and Luke vary technically, i.e. heuristically in their usage of Mark: while Luke considers Mark to be a historical source in that it is a preliminary narrative attempt of which he can make use, Matthew obviously understands Mark as a *Vorlage* in that he incorporates most of Mark in a material sense.

<sup>31</sup> In this regard we have to discuss critically Martin Dibelius' idea concerning early Christian literary history: he thought that "literaricity leads to deadness" ("Buchwerdung bedeutet hier ... Erstarrung des Lebendigen"); Dibelius, *Geschichte*, 48.

<sup>32</sup> Orality rather tends to oblige memorization; cf., e.g., A. Kirk and T. Thatcher, eds., *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005). Cf. E.-M. Becker, "Literarisierung und Kanonisierung im frühen Christentum: Einführende Überlegungen zur Entstehung und Bedeutung des neutestamentlichen Kanons," in *Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion*, 389–97.

<sup>33</sup> Terminology and methodology can rarely be translated into other languages and transferred to corresponding academic spheres with satisfaction: there hardly exists an equivalent term to *Gattungsgeschichte* in the Anglo-American exegesis (for *Gattungsgeschichte*, cf., e.g., K. Berger, "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament," in ANRW II.25.2 [1984]: 1031–1432 and 1831–85; A. Wagner et al., "Gattung[en]," in *Lexikon der Bibelhermeneutik: Begriffe – Metho-*



insights into how the gospel-*genre* as a specific literary concept (*genre*)<sup>35</sup> has been established and how it was received: it might help us to explain how the gospel-*genre* has been imitated and modified in early times and how different gospel-writings hereby promote literary creativeness and serve various *literary strategies* or concepts of authorization.<sup>36</sup> *Genre studies* are thus focused on a descriptive valuation of how the gospel-*genre* functions as a literary concept.<sup>37</sup> By “gospel”-writing we understand a certain literary form that is primarily coined by its content: it designates the literary form in which we find the narration of Jesus’ life, mission, and death.

---

den – Theorien – Konzepte [ed. O. Wischmeyer, et al.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009], 189–91; S. Trappen, M. Rösel, and D. Dormeyer, “Formen/Gattungen,” in RGG [ed. H. D. Betz et al.; 8 vols.; 4<sup>th</sup> ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998–2007] 3:185–96). Therefore, we have to deal with *genre studies* – and not *genre criticism* – here: while *genre criticism* primarily is concentrated on a comparative survey of literary characteristics (cf., e.g., D. E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* [Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1988], 22–3), *genre studies* focus on the investigation of how literary forms and *genres* developed within a historical frame. This is what *Gattungsgeschichte* implies: “Gattungen haben Geschichte ... Im Rahmen einer Gattungsgeschichte gibt es Vorstufen, Entstehen, Vergehen und Neu-Lokalisieren von Gattungen,” K. Berger, *Einführung in die Formgeschichte* (Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 1987), 38. At the same time such a shift in terminology (*Gattungsgeschichte* and “genre studies”) enables us to develop the approach of “literary history” even further. Today, *genre studies* play an important role again in cultural studies also, where they are frequently related to discourses on emotions and emotionality; cf., e.g., B. Meyer-Sickendiek, *Affektpoetik: Eine Kulturgeschichte literarischer Emotionen* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005): “Eine Affektpoetik geht davon aus, daß sich spezielle literarische Gattungen als von den menschlichen Affekten geprägte und von den Affekten erzählende Formen begreifen lassen” (9).

<sup>34</sup> This is a field of studies in literature that already dates back to antiquity itself: e.g., Quintilian, *inst or* 10; Suetonius, *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. For modern New Testament studies, cf., already, R. G. Moulton, *The Literary Study of the Bible: An Account of the Leading Forms of Literature Represented in the Sacred Writings* (Boston/London: Heath/Isbister, 1896); R. Bultmann, “Literaturgeschichte. II. Urchristentum,” in RGG (ed. H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnack; 6 vols.; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927–32) 3:1675–7 and 1680–2.

<sup>35</sup> For the recent discourse on *genre* in literary sciences, cf. P. Wenzel, “Gattungstheorie und Gattungspoetik,” in *Grundbegriffe der Literaturtheorie* (ed. A. Nünning; Stuttgart/Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2004), 73–8.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. J. Hartenstein, “Autoritätskonstellationen in apokryphen und kanonischen Evangelien,” in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen*, 423–44. By raising these questions, the quest for the Sitz im Leben could also be relevant – especially when approached on the basis of indications given by papyriology and codicology (cf. C. Marksches, “Was wissen wir über den Sitz im Leben der apokryphen Evangelien?” in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen*, 61–90) rather than by means of *Formgeschichte* where the social and religious setting of the audience(s) was considered to be an important ‘agent’ (*wirkende Kraft*) as, for instance, Walter Bauer once thought: W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1909), 520–41.

<sup>37</sup> For this discussion from the point of view of apocryphal gospels, cf., e.g., J. Hartenstein, “Das Petrus-evangelium als Evangelium,” in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Text, Kontexte, Intertexte* (ed. T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 159–81, 160: “Als Evangelien bezeichne ich diejenige frühchristliche Literatur, die vom irdischen Wirken Jesu berichtet und damit den Lesenden heilsrelevante Informationen geben will.” Cf. also J. A. Kelhoffer, “‘Gospel’ as a Literary Title in Early Christianity and the Question of What Is (and Is Not) a ‘Gospel’ in Canons of Scholarly Literature,” in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen*, 399–422.

In terms of chronology and genealogy the Markan Gospel – as far as we know – represents the proto-type of this kind of a literary concept.<sup>38</sup>

Against this background, comparative studies in Mark and Matthew are the initial basis for reconstructing descriptively how the history of early Christian gospel-literature came into being and how it developed rapidly thereafter. Matthew's use of Mark is illuminating much beyond questions of literary dependency: it can reveal to us how and why the earliest gospel-writing ("Mark") was not simply copied and preserved, i.e. considered as a concise textual outline. To the contrary, it was rather more imitated, enlarged, modified, and – tentatively – substituted. Matthew basically is a re-shape of Mark. From here, we can also get a better impression of how the apocryphal gospels as legitimate successors of the written gospel-concept came into being in the second century C. E. Or to put it the other way round: we can hardly grasp the dynamics that are implied in various literary concepts of the apocryphal gospel-writings, such as the Gospel of Peter, without considering how it was already Matthew who had to relate to Mark. In this context we will, of course, also discuss whether there is a qualitative difference between how Matthew follows Mark and how the Gospel of Peter succeeds Mark and Matthew.

Hereby, we are primarily *not* raising questions of literary dependency, as, for instance, the extent to which the Gospel of Peter depends on earlier gospel-writings, such as Mark and Matthew. Those questions are still very much under dispute.<sup>39</sup> In contrast to this, we will only presuppose the fact *that* later authors were familiar with gospel-writings as a certain type of Christian literature<sup>40</sup> – as later letter-writers were familiar with predecessors (cf. Ignatius and Paul). By employing *genre studies*, we will thus figure out how different gospel-authors choose a common literary model or type, and how and for what literary purpose they fill it with substance and strategy. I will start by summarizing our state of knowledge concerning the literary concept behind the earliest gospel-writing: Mark.

### 2.1 From Mark to Matthew

In terms of chronology and genealogy the "Markan Gospel"<sup>41</sup> is a proto-type, or a 'literary model' for what gospel-literature implies in early Christian times. What do we know about Mark's literary intentions and ambitions? The author of the Markan Gospel composes a prose-narrative shortly after 70 C. E. that has – as far

<sup>38</sup> Cf. E.-M. Becker, "Evangelium, Evangelienliteratur I. Neutestamentlich," in *Lexikon der Bibelhermeneutik*, 164–5.

<sup>39</sup> Cf., e.g., J.D. Crossan, "The Gospel of Peter and the Canonical Gospels," in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus*, 117–34, 118 ff.; T. Nicklas, "Das Petrus-evangelium im Rahmen antiker Jesustraditionen," in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen*, 223–52.

<sup>40</sup> Here, I would agree to similar ideas mentioned by T. Nicklas, "Petrusevangelium," 251: "das Petrus-evangelium setzt bereits vorliegende Jesuserzählungen voraus."

<sup>41</sup> In what follows I indeed choose as an initial point for the "Markan Gospel" the version that is presented to us in Nestle-Aland.



as we can see – no forerunners and no contemporaries.<sup>42</sup> This type of literature is named after the *incipit/initium* in Mark 1:1/1:1–3 as a gospel-writing (εὐαγγέλιον). Mark shapes a *proto-type* of a writing, which does have immediate (Matthew and Luke) and later (apocryphal gospels) successors. Because the Markan Gospel deals with a sequence of a ‘history of events’ that is related to the activity of a specific person (Jesus of Nazareth) and his mission, it might in terms of its macro-*genre* best be placed in the broader frame of ancient historiographical writings in which it appears more precisely as a ‘person-centered pre-historiographical account.’<sup>43</sup>

The conceptual and literary performance of what the author is doing here becomes evident on different levels, mainly on a technical, on a structural, and on an interpretative level: on a *technical* level, Mark has combined different types and strands of traditions like ‘sayings’ and narrative traditions (miracle-stories, passion narrative)<sup>44</sup>. We might assume that those traditions can partly be contextualized in Jerusalem (esp. passion narrative), partly in Galilee (popular miracle traditions),<sup>45</sup> perhaps partly in Judaea.<sup>46</sup> By composing his narrative, Mark, however, does not only stick to the topographical defaults; he rather shapes his own topographical as well as a chronological frame where he subsumes these traditions. The *topographical* frame is based on Jesus’ move from Galilee to Jerusalem – a conceptual idea that is worked out extensively in the Lukan Gospel (Luke 9:51 ff.). The *chronological* frame consists of a short period of time, perhaps even only one month, in Jesus’ life (Mark 2:23; 14:1),<sup>47</sup> where Jesus’ ministry is situated in a hasty sequence of events (εὐθύς). On a *narrative and on an interpretative* level Mark thus does not only serve processes of transmission; he rather more creates a comprehensive literary concept, i.e., a gospel-writing in which the diverse sequences of Jesus’ ministry are connected topographically and chronologically (= *story*) as well as logically (= *plot*).<sup>48</sup> On that level Mark also gives his theological clue to interpreting the gospel-narration (cf., e.g., Mark 3:6; 8:31–33; 15:39). By creating the ‘written gospel’ Mark thus does not only appear as a conservative collector of traditional material

<sup>42</sup> Q could at the most only be understood as a fragment of a gospel: Cf. C. Heil, “Einleitung,” in *Die Spruchquelle Q: Griechisch und Deutsch* (ed. C. Heil and P. Hoffmann; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002), 7–28, 17–9.

<sup>43</sup> The Markan gospel-concept thus stands for a *genre sui generis*, i.e. a micro-*genre* of a narrative that can be best related to the huge field of ancient pre- or sub-historiographical types of prose-literature; Cf. Becker, *Markus-Evangelium*.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Dormeyer, “Formen / Gattungen,” 192–4; G. Bornkamm, “Formen und Gattungen II. im NT,” in *RGG* (ed. K. Gallig et al.; 6 vols.; 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957–62), 2:999–1005. Cf., in general, R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition: Mit einem Nachwort von G. Theissen* (10<sup>th</sup> ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1971).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. G. Theissen, *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992).

<sup>46</sup> Cf., e.g., Becker, *Markus-Evangelium*, 383–96.

<sup>47</sup> Mark 2:23 refers to a month in spring, probably March or April, when the grain is ripe.

<sup>48</sup> Concerning the distinction between ‘story’ and ‘plot,’ cf. M. Martinez and M. Scheffel, *Einführung in die Erzähltheorie* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.; München: C. H. Beck, 2003), 109 f., with reference to E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (repr.; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966).

and does not only act as a redactor or interpreter of those traditions either. Rather more, he acts also as a literary author who comments on the story several times by interpreting (Mark 7:19b) or illustrating it (Mark 9:2, 3b).<sup>49</sup> Therefore the Markan Gospel is much more than a contingent collection of traditions:<sup>50</sup> its author is the inventor of the written gospel-concept, which finally serves the gospel-proclamation in a peculiar sense.<sup>51</sup>

The Gospel of Matthew is *ca.* 20 years later than Mark, basically confirming Mark's approach: Matthew again focuses on telling Jesus' Galilean ministry and the passion events in Jerusalem within a narrative account. By joining Mark's gospel-outline, Matthew in fact does two overarching things. *On the one hand*, he continues the Markan gospel-concept quite steadily.<sup>52</sup> In contrast to Luke for whom earlier reports (διήγησις) on the gospel-story serve as preceding concepts which he can either use as a historical "source" or which he can consider as literary works he will compete with (Luke 1:1–4), Matthew uses Mark as a literary *Vorlage* in that he restricts himself to the Markan outline:<sup>53</sup> as far as we know, Matthew – in contrast to Luke and John – takes over most of the Markan material and keeps the topographical as well as the chronological order behind the basic parts of the gospel-story (Galilee-Jerusalem; one-year-ministry). We could speak here of an 'enlargement'<sup>54</sup> or better a *literary inclusion or incorporation* of the Markan Gospel. Possibly, the so-called Gospel of the Nazareans (*Gos. Naz.*),<sup>55</sup> which is generally counted among the so-called Jewish-Christian Gospels (JE),<sup>56</sup> for its part relates

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 421. Cf. also Becker, "Dating Mark and Matthew as Ancient Literature," 138–40.

<sup>50</sup> A substantial critique towards such a literary undervaluation of Mark can already be found in, e.g., E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums: In drei Bänden. Erster Band. Die Evangelien* (Stuttgart/Berlin: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1924), 121.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. W. H. Kelber, "Narrative and Disclosure: Mechanisms of Concealing, Revealing, and Reveiling," *Semeia* 43 (1988): 1–20, who argues that the narrativization finally serves the unveiling of the gospel-proclamation. I would like to thank Erin J. Wright (Aarhus) for this reference.

<sup>52</sup> In Matthew's case questions of literary dependency can thus nearly be solved.

<sup>53</sup> Further distinctive work on terminology ("source," *Vorlage*) is needed here beyond E.-M. Becker, "Art. Quelle(n) II. Neutestamentlich," in *Lexikon der Bibelhermeneutik*, 472–3.

<sup>54</sup> Cf., e.g., U. Luz, "Intertexts in the Gospel of Matthew," *HTR* 97 (2004): 119–37, 125.

<sup>55</sup> Concerning the problems of reconstructing *Gos. Pet.* and relating it to *Gos. Heb.* or to another, no longer known gospel, cf. H.-J. Klauck, *Apocryphal Gospels: An Introduction* (London/New York: T & T Clark, 2003), 43.

<sup>56</sup> The identification of the so-called Jewish-Christian Gospels (JE) is complicated since the so-called church-fathers – beginning with Irenaeus until Cyril of Jerusalem (cf. P. Vielhauer and G. Strecker, "Judenchristliche Evangelien," in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I*, 114–47, 116–27) – do not provide clear or uniform references to what they mean by JE. By mentioning the JE they do not refer to specific gospel-writings either (cf. Vielhauer and Strecker, "Judenchristliche Evangelien," 115: "Unsicher ist ... die Zahl der JE ..., unsicher ist ferner die Identifizierung der einzelnen Fragmente, unsicher schließlich der Charakter und das gegenseitige Verhältnis der einzelnen JE"). On these problems of interpretation, cf. already Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 251–63 (in discussion with Adolf von Harnack and Theodor Zahn); cf., recently, J. Frey, "Zur Vielgestaltigkeit judenchristlicher Evangelienüberlieferungen," in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen*, 93–137. Thus, Vielhauer and Strecker and lately Hans-Josef Klauck tend to speak

to Matthew in the similar way of incorporating him.<sup>57</sup> Compared to Matthew, *Gos. Naz.* has at least a secondary literary character,<sup>58</sup> regardless of whether individual traditions in *Gos. Naz.* pre-date Matthew.<sup>59</sup>

On the other hand Matthew yet feels himself free to re-arrange his Markan *Vorlage* and to move significantly beyond it. By doing so he demonstrates that the written gospel-concept – even though read and used as a *Vorlage* – does not function as any kind of normative text but rather more as a literary concept that can be re-defined in its narrative outline so that it is re-arranged and tentatively even substituted. Accordingly, Matthew completes, varies, and/or modifies the Markan gospel-story. Those modifications can, again, mainly be observed on a technical, on a structural (topographical/chronological), as well as on a narrative or interpretative level.<sup>60</sup> On a *technical* level, Matthew completes the Markan outline by including more strands of tradition known to him, namely Q and M. The inclusion of these materials, however, is not only due to reasons of conservation but rather meets Matthew's narrative interests of broadening the view on Jesus' life and, especially, on Jesus' teaching.

On a *structural* level, Matthew varies the Markan narration topographically and chronologically: by presenting the birth-story (Matt 2) and reporting the resurrected Jesus' return to Galilee (Matt 28:16–20) the *topographical* outline changes now to Judaea-Galilee-Jerusalem-Galilee. Parallel to this the Gospel's *chronological* frame is modified: the Matthean gospel-story starts *ca.* 30 years earlier (cf. Matt 1:18 and Mark 1:4) and also runs at least some hours or days longer (Matt 28:16 and Mark 16:8) than the Markan narration does. On a *narrative and on an interpre-*

---

of three types of JE-literature: the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (*Gos. Heb.*), the *Gospel of the Nazareans* (*Gos. Naz.*), and the *Gospel of the Ebionites* (*Gos. Eb.*) (cf. Vielhauer and Strecker, "Judenchristliche Evangelien," 128; Klauck, *Gospels*, 36–54). Even if the contextualization of the JEs in the history of early Christian theology is still problematic, we find in some of these texts – *Gos. Heb.* might be an exception – a tendency of continuing and supplementing the Matthean Gospel (esp. *Gos. Naz.*; *Gos. Eb.*). This is specifically true in the case of *Gos. Naz.*

<sup>57</sup> There are, for instance, several indications for assuming that the *Gospel of the Nazareans* (*Gos. Naz.*) is an attempt at incorporating, perhaps preserving or even substituting Matthew. I will name some examples here: The *Gos. Naz.* presents variant readings to Matthew (e.g. Matt 6:11 and *Gos. Naz.* frg. 5) or references to scriptural quotations (e.g. Matt 23:35 and *Gos. Naz.* Frg. 17). It offers additional information to the gospel-story (e.g. Matt 12:13 and *Gos. Naz.* frg. 10). Those textual variants or additions to the Matthean text can also be found in sections of M-material (see above; e.g. Matt 27:65 and *Gos. Naz.* frg. 22), so that *Gos. Naz.* *de facto* seems to presuppose the comprehensive reading and perception of Matthew. Similar to how Matthew doubles narrative sequences from the Markan *Vorlage* (cf. Matt 20:29 ff. and Mark 10:46 ff.), *Gos. Naz.* doubles the Matthean narrative again (cf. Matt 19:16–24 and *Gos. Naz.* frg. 16). So *Gos. Naz.* is sometimes considered to be a Semitic *Nebenform* or a *Weiterbildung* of the Greek Gospel of Matthew (Vielhauer and Strecker, "Judenchristliche Evangelien," 129 and 133) that basically follows the narrative outline of the Matthean Gospel.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. J. Frey, "Die Scholien nach dem 'jüdischen Evangelium' und das sogenannte Nazoräer-evangelium," ZNW 94 (2003): 122–37; Frey, "Vielgestaltigkeit," 128.

<sup>59</sup> Questions of *Traditionsgeschichte* hardly lead us further here.

<sup>60</sup> The following observations presuppose the Two-Source-Theory which is still the most probable hypothesis for explaining the origins and the rise of the Synoptic Gospels.

tative level it becomes evident that Matthew goes much beyond the Markan outline and prefigures here what can be found in later gospel-writings much more extensively: (1) Matthew does pick up a Markan impetus (Mark 4; 13) when he presents Jesus as a teacher. According to Matthew, however, Jesus appears frequently and continuously as such, as a comprehensive speaker and teacher (Matt 5–7 etc. until chs. 23–25) whose teaching retains ongoing significance beyond Jesus' life and mission (Matt 28:20). In other writings, the 'speaking Jesus' is even chosen as the basic paradigm of literary conceptualization.<sup>61</sup>

(2) Matthew has the resurrected Christ appear and speak to the women at the empty tomb on the Easter morning (Matt 28:9–10). According to Matthew, Jesus even reveals himself to his disciples by teaching them and giving them missionary instructions (Matt 28:16–20). These passages, based on the traditions of post-Easter-epiphanies (cf. 1 Cor 15:5–8), will pre-figure later epiphany-narratives<sup>62</sup> as well as revelatory dialogues.<sup>63</sup> (3) Matthew includes unique narrative sequences especially in the pre-history of his gospel (Matt 1–2) as well as within the passion narrative (Matt 27–28).<sup>64</sup> Those sequences in general derive from M and tend to give a 'legendary' coinage to the gospel-story.<sup>65</sup> The inclusion of these traditions pre-figure what is either worked out in later so-called infancy-gospels (e.g. *Prot. Jas.*) or what can be found in those gospel-writings that focus on the narration of passion-events.<sup>66</sup>

(4) By including the so-called rock-*logion* (Matt 16:18–19), Matthew not only emphasizes Peter's role and position, but also attaches legitimating personal traditions to the gospel-story that go much beyond the Markan *Vorlage* (cf. Mark 8:29–33). Thereby he prepares for later attempts of shaping a literary focalization on certain apostolic figures.<sup>67</sup> (5) Finally, by including single sayings or parables (cf., e.g., Matt 13:24–30, 36–52; 25:1–13, 31–46) Matthew multiplies the amount of sayings-material significantly. At the same time he arranges and conceptualizes these materials in an innovative way (speech-concept, s. above).

These examples show *how* Matthew moves clearly beyond his *Vorlage*. This fact might lead us to some conclusions: Matthew does not limit himself to the reproduction of Mark but rather develops literary creativity by enlarging the literary *Vorlage* delivered to him and giving a revised concept to his account. Here, it becomes evident that Matthew has certain literary intentions himself when writing his gospel-narrative: his technique of incorporating Mark can only partly be understood as a *preservation-strategy*. He indeed sticks to what he gets from

<sup>61</sup> *Gos. Thom.* (NHC II:2); *Gos. Eg.* [Gr] (?).

<sup>62</sup> *Ep. Apos.* 10:21–12:23; cf. also e.g. John 21.

<sup>63</sup> *Ep. Jas.* (NHC I:2); *Ep. Apos.* 13:24 ff.; *Gospel of Bartholomew*; *Letter of Peter to Philip* (NHC VIII:2); cf. also Mark 16:15–16.

<sup>64</sup> Matt 27:3–10; 27:19, 24–25; 27:51–53; 27:62–66; 28:2–3, 9–10; 28:11–15.

<sup>65</sup> Cf., e.g., Matt 27:3–10; 27:19, 24–25; 27:51–53; 27:62–66; 28:2–3, 9–10; 28:11–15.

<sup>66</sup> Cf., e.g., *Gos. Pet.* 4:10–8:33; *Gos. Nic. / Acts Pil.* To infancy-gospels s. latest: *Infancy Gospels: Stories and Identities* (ed. C. Clivaz et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

<sup>67</sup> Peter: e.g. *Gos. Pet.* 14; James: e.g. *Gos. Heb.* Frg. 7 (= Jerome, *de vir inl* 2).

Mark but he is not limited to the materials found there. In that Matthew does not only incorporate Mark, but rather enlarges, broadens, and re-defines the Markan gospel-narration he obviously intends to replace the Markan Gospel, while at the same time to uphold the tradition of this literary concept.<sup>68</sup> Thus, Matthew's technique of a literary incorporation finally seems to serve a *replacement-strategy*. Hereby, Matthew might be seen to differ significantly from what Luke as well as what John probably intended to do.<sup>69</sup>

From here, we can also draw some conclusions regarding Mark's early reception-history. Before Irenaeus' time – i.e. before Mark's entry into a proto-canonical collection of gospel-writings, by which its textual entity was secured for the future – the overall 'literary success' of Mark's literary invention could only become evident *sub contrario*: in that the Markan Gospel is gradually upheld or even suppressed by others and in that textual inconsistency and literary multiplicity correspond, Mark's impetus for shaping a gospel-account as a current narrative conceptualization and interpretation of Jesus-traditions finally gains an objective. Thus, the Markan gospel-outline moves into a history of success precisely because Mark's successors will indicate how that narrative concept works, how far it is useful, and where it possibly needs to be improved or focalized.

## 2.2 From Mark and Matthew to the Gospel of Peter

The literary creativity behind gospel-writing becomes even more evident when we move into the second century and analyze such types of 'Jesus-literature'<sup>70</sup> that consist of *narratives and/or sayings-material* and, thus, basically follow up Mark's literary concept.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>68</sup> Cf. D. Sim, "Matthew: The Current State of Research," in *Mark and Matthew I*, 33–51.

<sup>69</sup> Matthew does not seem to be willing to compete with his forerunner's work in the sense of ancient *aemulatio*. Luke, however, chooses such a methodological approach to the 'written gospel-concept' that he indicates his literary distance to his sources as well as to his own narrative (Luke 1:1–4) and, thus, relates his story more evidently to the macro-*genre* of ancient historiography. So Luke's strategy might be a *competition-strategy*. The Gospel of John, however, is obviously neither interested in a preservation-strategy, nor in a replacement- or competition-strategy: we do not know whether John presupposes Mark and possibly Luke. But we might assume that he was in any case familiar with the gospel-*genre* as a literary type of writing. His narrative concept mainly serves a specific theological idea that is based on a pre-existence-Christology (see John 1:1) and that intends to stress the revelatory aspects of Jesus' mission (John 1:1–14; chs. 14–17). So John might have a *focalization- or interpretation-strategy* that aims at conceptualizing the gospel-story genuinely – on the basis of a theological, viz. Christological, idea (John 1:14). He does not seem, however, to be willing to substitute his forerunner's works.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Aune, *The New Testament*, 68 ff.

<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, the so-called 'gospels' in the Nag Hammadi-library (e.g. *Gospel of Philip*; *Evangelium veritatis*) cannot be excluded from our investigation because they do continue certain ideas of gospel-writing also. Differently: Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 614: "In den Zusammenhang der apokryphen Evangelien gehören nur Texte, die aus Jesus-Traditionen, sei es Wort- oder Erzählstoff bestehen, gleichviel ob sie expressis verbis den Titel Evangelium aufweisen oder nicht."

*Jewish Christian Gospels:*<sup>72</sup>

*Gospel of the Nazareans*

*Gospel of the Ebionites*

*Gospel of the Hebrews*

*Gospel of the Egyptians*<sup>73</sup>

*Gospel of Peter*<sup>74</sup>

*So-called Infancy Gospels,*<sup>75</sup> e.g.:

*Protevangelium of James*<sup>76</sup>

*Gospel of Bartholomew*<sup>77</sup>

*Gospel of Gamaliel*<sup>78</sup>

In all of these non-canonical gospel-writings it is obvious that some authors tend to re-shape the gospel-concept. This is partly done by *focalizing* in their gospel-account, for instance, on birth stories.<sup>79</sup> Partly they leave or re-define the gospel-concept in a generic sense nearly completely when they stick to sayings material exclusively or when they conceptualize revelatory dialogues of the resurrected Christ. Accordingly, we find gospel-material that only consists of a sayings-sequence (*Gos. Thom.*), or that is brought into a letter-form (e.g. *Jas.*; *Ep. Apos.*). Other materials are put instead into the frame of *acta*-literature with strong novelistic elements (*Gos. Nic.*; *Acts Pil.*).<sup>80</sup> How should we evaluate these processes of transforming or re-defining the gospel-*genre*? We will best understand them as processes of an ongoing literary creativeness in which the varying and merging of various traditions led to a variety of narrative accounts also. This happened in a period of time where the phenomenon of literacy already was regarded as a stimulating factor in shaping various forms of prose-literature.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Vielhauer and Strecker, "Judenchristliche Evangelien," 114–47; C. Moreschini and E. Norelli, *From Paul to the Age of Constantine* (trans. M. J. O'Connell; vol. 1. of *Early Christian Greek and Latin Literature: A Literary History Translated*; Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2005), 56–63.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. W. Schneemelcher, "Ägypterevangelium," in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I*, 174–9; Moreschini and Norelli, *Literature*, 63–64.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. C. Maurer and W. Schneemelcher, "Petrusevangelium," in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I*, 180–8; Moreschini and Norelli, *Literature*, 71–74.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. O. Cullmann, "Kindheitsevangelien," in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I*, 330–72; Moreschini and Norelli, *Literature*, 148–153.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Cullmann, "Kindheitsevangelien," esp. 334–8.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. F. Scheidweiler and W. Schneemelcher, "Bartholomäusevangelium," in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I*, 424–40.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. M.-A. van den Oudenrijn, "Das Evangelium des Gamaliel," in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I*, 441–2.

<sup>79</sup> According to Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 651 f. the "'Vorgeschichten' waren überhaupt ein fruchtbarer Boden für Wachstum und Wucherung der Legenden." Something similar can also be demonstrated in regard to Luke's impact on later gospel-stories; e.g. Luke 2:41–52 and the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* = *Inf. Gos. Thom.*

<sup>80</sup> Cf. F. Scheidweiler, "Nikodemusevangelium: Pilatusakten und Höllenfahrt Christi," in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen I*, 395–424. Cf. O. Ehlen, *Leitbilder und romanhafte Züge in apokryphen Evangelientexten: Untersuchungen zur Motivatik und Erzählstruktur (anhand des Protevangelium Jacobi und der Acta Pilati Graec. B)* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004).

<sup>81</sup> By assuming the latter we recall one of Franz Overbeck's (1882) ideas about the meaning of



In this context, the so-called *Gospel of Peter* (*Gos. Pet.*) is of specific interest. The most important version of the text<sup>82</sup> is documented by PCair 10759, a parchment codex found in Akhmîm in 1886/1887,<sup>83</sup> which saw its *editio princeps* in 1892 (U. Bouriant).<sup>84</sup> This codex also contains the *Apocalypse of Peter*<sup>85</sup> and, thus, already functions as a small pre-collection of Petrine writings. This fact is interesting because in patristic times the Petrine writings, as a particular group of texts, had been subject to extensive discussion concerning their literary and theological validity, as for example Eusebius indicates (*Hist. eccl.* 3.3.2; 3.25.6). It is generally stated that *Gos. Pet.* had been written in the second half of the second century C.E.<sup>86</sup> According to Dibelius, the work belongs to a group of traditions or testimonies (*Reste der apokryphen Evangelien*) which give evidence of the existence of diverse written gospels as comprehensive literary texts (e.g. also *Gospel of the Nazareans*).<sup>87</sup> But what are the literary characteristics of *Gos. Pet.*, and how do we meet literary creativeness here that goes beyond the Markan as well as the Matthean narrative outline?

(1) What we find in *Gos. Pet.* programmatically is a literary shape of Peter as author, viz. narrator, of the gospel-account (esp. 14:58, 60). To make Peter act as a *literary author* who is even legitimated to write in the first person singular, however, presupposes him being already established as an apostolic authority in a literary sense. There are two factors in the early history of apostolic traditions that might have prepared for such a literary authority. *First*, Peter is not only named

---

the apocryphal gospels, which are certainly true: "An ihrem Teile also dient die apokryphe Literatur nur der Behauptung zur Bestätigung, daß Evangelien, Apostelgeschichte und Apokalypse Formen sind, die schon zu einer Zeit, wo, was sich als christliche Literatur am Leben erhalten hat, zu existieren eben nur begonnen hatte, aufgehört haben, darin noch möglich zu sein"; F. Overbeck, *Über die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1983), 24.

<sup>82</sup> Cf., according to D. Lührmann, "Die Überlieferung des apokryph gewordenen Petrus-evangeliums," in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus*, 31–51; eventually also: POxy 2949; POxy 4009; PVindob G2325. Cf. also, in general, Klauck, *Gospels*, 82 f. For a critical view on Lührmann, cf. P. Foster, "Are there any Early Fragments of the So-called *Gospel of Peter*," *NTS* 52 (2006): 1–28. More carefully: T. J. Kraus, "Die Sprache des Petrus-evangeliums? Methodische Anmerkungen und Vorüberlegungen für eine Analyse von Sprache und Stil," in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus*, 61–76, 63 f.; T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas, in *Das Petrus-evangelium und die Petrus-apokalypse: Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung* (ed. T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter: 2004), 5–7 and 55–68.

<sup>83</sup> For a description of the codex, cf. P. van Minnen, "The Akhmîm *Gospel of Peter*," in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus*, 53–60.

<sup>84</sup> For a recent edition of the Akhmîm-Codex (P Cair 10759): *Das Petrus-evangelium und die Petrus-apokalypse*, 32–49.

<sup>85</sup> Cf. O. von Gebhardt, *Das Evangelium und die Apokalypse des Petrus: Die neuentdeckten Bruchstücke: Nach einer Photographie der Handschrift zu Gizeh in Lichtdruck herausgegeben* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1893). For a recent critical edition: A. E. Bernhard, *Other Early Christian Gospels: A Critical Edition of the Surviving Greek Manuscripts* (London/New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 49–83.

<sup>86</sup> Concerning the *terminus ad quem*, cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.12.3–6 (Serapion); Origen, *Comm in Mt* 10.17. Cf. recently, *Das Evangelium nach Petrus*.

<sup>87</sup> Dibelius, *Geschichte*, 51 ff.

as an *apostolic authority* in the history of early Christianity (cf. 1 Cor 15:5; Gal 2; Acts) but also literarily styled as such an authority. In texts like Mark 8:29 par.; Matt 16:18–20; Luke 24:12; John 21 we furthermore see that this tendency has been increased already from Mark to Matthew. *Secondly*, the first person singular concept (*Gos. Pet.* 7:26 f.; 14:60) that is significant for *Gos. Pet.*, in fact, already derives from 1 Peter as a literary concept of apostolic authority and specifically from a text like 2 Pet 1:16–18, where we find an important reference to the transfiguration scene (cf. Mark 9:2–8 par.) displayed as a kind of 'authentic' Petrine report. Such a significant overlap between *Gos. Pet.* and the Petrine letters is also visible in regard to the *motif* of Jesus' preaching in the *Hades* (cf. *Gos. Pet.* 10:41 and 1 Pet 3:19 f.).<sup>88</sup> The *Gospel of Peter* was therefore written in a period of time where the concurrent reading of gospel- as well as letter-literature needs to be presupposed.

(2) As far as we can see on the basis of the textual fragments, *Gos. Pet.* is focused on the passion narrative and the Easter events.<sup>89</sup> This focus, again, is not accidental, but rather due to *Gos. Pet.*'s affiliation to the 'Peter'-figure: Peter's specific involvement in the passion (*Gos. Pet.* 7:26 f.) and Easter events (*Gos. Pet.* 14:60) already derives from earlier traditions, which are mainly documented by Paul (cf. 1 Cor 15:5) as well as the canonical gospels (cf. Mark 14:66–72 par.; Mark 16:7 par. Luke 24:12) and the later ending of John (John 21). How can we thus contextualize *Gos. Pet.* in the literary-history of the gospel-writings? I think *Gos. Pet.* is a good example for demonstrating how an apocryphal gospel does stand in line with the earlier gospel-narratives but at the same time re-defines the gospel-concept significantly: it shortens the gospel-story's focus to the passion and Easter events and includes much additional, viz. legendary, material to this specific outline. This, again, I would primarily call a *focalization-strategy*, even if aspects of preservation can also be found: there are, for instance, traditions used that equal the synoptic material nearly verbally (*Gos. Pet.* 11:45; cf. Mark 15:39).<sup>90</sup> These observations lead us to the question how *Gos. Pet.* possibly upholds the gospel-outline according to Mark and Matthew in a textual, viz. material, sense.

(3) The *Gospel of Peter* presents certain *motifs* which have literary parallels in the canonical gospels. We can at least distinguish between four types of material. (3.1)

<sup>88</sup> For this motif, cf. also the *descent of Christ* in *Gos. Nic. / Acts Pil.* 17–27; *Gos. Bar.* 1:9 ff.

<sup>89</sup> If POxy 4009 which "recounts the sending of the disciples by Jesus ... derives from the Gospel of Peter (and this is not clear), this would suggest that this gospel originally included pre-passion material"; J. B. Green, "Gospel of Peter," in *Encyclopedia of Religious and Philosophical Writings in late Antiquity: Pagan, Judaic, Christian* (ed. J. Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck, et al.; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), 145–6, 145.

<sup>90</sup> *Gos. Pet.*: ἀληθῶς υἱὸς ἦν θεοῦ; Mark: ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν. I do not think, however, that the relation of *Gos. Pet.* to the canonical gospels can be analyzed by means of *Literarkritik*, as, for instance, Theodor Zahn (1893) once suggested; cf. T. von Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Petrus: Das kürzlich gefundene Fragment seines Textes* (Erlangen: Deichert, 1893). For a literary-historical approach to passion narratives, cf. also, F. Herrmann, *Strategien der Todesdarstellung in der Markusp passion: Ein literaturgeschichtlicher Vergleich* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010).



There are certain *motifs* which are already known from the Markan passion narrative (cf. *Gos. Pet.* 5:15 and 5:20 and Mark 15:33 par. and 15:38 par.). (3.2) We know a relatively large group of *motifs* that occur in *Gos. Pet.* only from M otherwise (cf. Matt 27:62–66 and *Gos. Pet.* 8:28–33; Matt 27:52 f. and *Gos. Pet.* 6:21). Thus, we could assume that the Matthean Gospel functions as a basic literary frame for *Gos. Pet.*<sup>91</sup> (3.3) We also find parallels to the Lukan passion narrative that derive from L (cf. Luke 23:6–12 and *Gos. Pet.* 1:1–2; 2:3–5; Luke 23:39–43 and *Gos. Pet.* 4:13). (3.4) Additionally, we could discuss whether *Gos. Pet.* even evidences knowledge and use of John 21 (cf. *Gos. Pet.* 14:60). Today, it is still under dispute whether these *motifs* and parallels point to an author who really made use of the so-called canonical gospels in a comprehensive sense.<sup>92</sup>

(4) At the same time, *Gos. Pet.* presents material that is *de facto* not known from the field of canonical gospels at all. The valuation of this material, however, remains ambiguous. *On the one hand*, *Gos. Pet.* offers scriptural interpretations of Jesus' passion that avoid explicit quotation-formulas (cf. *Gos. Pet.* 3:7; 5:18) and, thus, seem to be older than scriptural interpretations found in the canonical gospels. Therefore, Dibelius has called these elements 'archaic material.'<sup>93</sup> *On the other hand*, *Gos. Pet.* contains many legendary *motifs* (e.g. 8:31; 9:35–49) that point to a late stage of passion narratives. Can we explain this ambiguity by assuming that *Gos. Pet.* has used the canonical gospels *via* memory and concurrently was influenced by oral-kerygmatical, possibly old and valid traditions, as Dibelius and Philipp Vielhauer once thought?<sup>94</sup> We can hardly reconstruct satisfyingly enough the process of composing *Gos. Pet.* according to matters of *Traditionsgeschichte* or *Literarkritik*. Therefore I would rather understand *Gos. Pet.* as an individual member of gospel-literature that continues the basic concept of a written gospel-genre by making use of a *focalization-strategy*<sup>95</sup> in particular.

### 3. Conclusions and Prospects

What can we finally gain from these observations for the quest for Mark's early reception-history as well as for the study of literary history and the study of the gospel-genre in particular? I will formulate some concluding remarks and after-

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 645: "Als Basis der erhaltenen Erzählung dient der Mt-Bericht."

<sup>92</sup> Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu*, 497 f., e.g., argued clearly in favor of such a literary dependency. Much more careful is Nicklas, "Petrusevangelium," and see above.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. also Vielhauer, *Geschichte*, 646.

<sup>94</sup> In recent days the concept of "cultural memory" is being used in a similar way in order to explain *Gos. Pet.*'s relation to the canonical gospels; cf. A. Kirk, "Tradition and Memory in the Gospel of Peter," in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus*, 135–58.

<sup>95</sup> "Focalization" is here and earlier (s. above) understood rather in the general sense of a narrative concentration than in a sense of narrative theory as is suggested by M. Bal (*Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* [2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997]) and applied to the interpretation of Mark by Herrmann, *Strategien*, or to *Gos. Pet.* by Hartenstein, "Petrusevangelium," 165–7.

wards give a short prospect on how studies in the apocryphal gospels can profit also from a comparative approach to Mark and Matthew.

So far, the comparative approach could help us to illuminate Mark's early reception-history in a literary dimension: by comparing Mark's and Matthew's gospel-outline, we could see that Mark's primary impact on the further history of the gospel-*genre* obviously lies in its inventive power of creating a literary concept of a gospel-writing that is soon imitated and modified. It is the Markan Gospel that opens up the floor for a creative conceptualizing of the gospel-story on the literary level rather than for a reception of the text that would have provided textual consistency and literary conservatism. Matthew approves and confirms that idea by using and continuing, but also by broadening Mark's outline – in any case by not limiting himself to his *Vorlage*. The result of this was quite successful: on the basis of textual evidence it seems that Matthew would quickly overshadow the Markan outline in the second century. This happened because of the incorporative character of his writing as well as the comprehensiveness of the material included. The Matthean gospel-narrative could thus appear as a much more thorough gospel-version so that it obviously also functioned much better than Mark as a material point of departure for later gospel-writings, following either perception- or focalization-strategies. In other words, Matthew could have been understood as a legitimate climax of Mark.

Nevertheless, the Markan Gospel could also make its own way. In the middle and up to the end of the second century C.E. there must have taken place a literary as well as a theological reversion to "Mark" that was probably due to its affiliation with apostolic authority (cf. Papias): Justin, Tatian, and Irenaeus reflect the increasing meaning of a 'Four Gospel-collection,' and also Clement Alexandrinus – from his point of view – indicates that there was a tremendous need for defining and securing the "Markan" text. As a consequence of this, a search for textual consistency must have been started, by which nevertheless the plurality of literary versions could not be blanked out entirely, as the *codices* W and k (Bobinensis) document. And yet we might assume that it is in fact a 'canonizing interest' that finally put an end to textual inconsistency<sup>96</sup> and literary creativity by which various literary versions and re-shapings of Mark – including Matthew – had been produced still during the second century. So it is precisely between *ca.* 70 and 170 C.E. that there hardly existed a well-defined book named the "Gospel of Mark" but rather only a tested literary concept. In other words, the gospel-*genre* was still 'in the making' during this period of time. And the reception-history of the Markan Gospel reflects this process paradigmatically. Partly by chance, partly because of quality and authority or textual variety that has raised questions of definition also, but certainly because of its strong conceptual impact, this literary concept, which we call "Mark," could achieve a firm place in the formation of the early Christian library, the New Testament canon.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Gamble, *Books and Readers*, e.g. 125–7.

From here we might finally get fresh ideas for further studies in the gospel-literature of the second century. Hereby, it seems as if we need to reconsider our methodological approach to the apocryphal gospel-writings when taking into consideration the literary dynamics by which gospel-literature was shaped and re-shaped already in earliest times. So the literary-historical approach to Mark's reception-history even provides crucial insights into the rise and the further development of the apocryphal gospels. We thus should adjust our academic interest in the apocryphal gospels correspondingly – an interest that is not at all new, but rather dates back to 16<sup>th</sup> century protestant theology (Michaelis Neander Soraviensis, 1564/67)<sup>97</sup> and that has continued since,<sup>98</sup> up to our most recent debates.<sup>99</sup>

There can be no doubt that from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards, the discussion reached a new quality and brisance since various new fragments and portions of apocryphal texts, such as *Gos. Pet.*, were found. Thus, the so-called apocryphal gospels were now analyzed with even higher expectations and played a prominent role in Patristics, Classics, and academic arts,<sup>100</sup> as well as in New Testament studies<sup>101</sup> and canon history (*Kanongeschichte*).<sup>102</sup> They are available to us in a

<sup>97</sup> Cf. M. N. Soraviensis, "Apocrypha: hoc est, narrationes de Christo, Maria, Joseph, cognitione et familia Christi, extra Biblia etc.," in *Catechesis Martini Lutheri parva, Graeco-latina* (Basiliae, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1567). Reference to this in R. Hofmann, *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen im Zusammenhange aus den Quellen erzählt und wissenschaftlich untersucht* (Leipzig: Friedrich Voigt, 1851), XIV; E. Hennecke, ed., *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904), 6. Hennecke starts his overview on the history of research (5–9) by mentioning Jacobus Faber Stapulensis (1498), who edited, e.g., the letters of Polycarp and Ignatius (5).

<sup>98</sup> Cf. R. Hofmann, *Leben Jesu*. He bases his reconstruction on "Protevangelium Jacobi minoris ..., Evangelium de nativitate S. Mariae ..., Historia de nativitate Mariae et de infantia Salvatoris ..., Historia Josephi fabri lignarii ..., Evangelium infantiae Servatoris ..., Evangelium Thomas Israelitae ..., Evangelium Matthaei ..., Evangelium de pueritia secundum Thomam ..., Syngramma Thomae ..., Evangelium Nicodemi ..." (XI–XIV). He also gives an overview on more contemporary interpretation of the apocryphal writings, up to his time, e.g., ca. 1850. Cf. programmatically, Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu*.

<sup>99</sup> Cf., e.g., P. Foster, *The Apocryphal Gospels: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Klauck, *Gospels*; J. Frey and J. Schröter, eds., *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen*.

<sup>100</sup> Cf., e.g., J. Geffcken, *Christliche Apokryphen* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1908). On these expectations and their relevance in the field of early Christian art, cf. G. Stuhlfauth, *Die apokryphen Petrusgeschichten in der altchristlichen Kunst* (Berlin/Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1925), 1–3.

<sup>101</sup> For the immediate reactions on the findings of the *Gospel of Peter*, cf. P. Foster, "The Discovery and Initial Reactions to the So-Called Gospel of Peter," in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Text, Kontexte, Intertexte* (ed. T. J. Kraus and T. Nicklas; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 9–30.

<sup>102</sup> The aim then is to testify to what degree these boundaries are built 'reasonably' by the church fathers or if those boundaries as well as the factor of canonicity should rather be widened or even ignored; cf., e.g., H. Koester, "Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels," *HTR* 73 (1980): 105–30; J. K. Elliott, "The Apocryphal Gospels," *ExpTim* 103 (1991): 8–15. Cf., recently, S. Luther and J. Röder, "Der neutestamentliche Kanon und die neutestamentliche apokryphe Literatur: Überlegungen zu einer Verhältnisbestimmung," in *Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion*, 469–501; J. Schröter, "Die apokryphen Evangelien und die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons," in *Jesus in apokryphen Evangelienüberlieferungen*, 31–60. The hermeneutical discourse on the boundaries of the New Testament canon is partly related to the controversies about how