

tradition history."⁵⁴ Although Papias' account about the relation of the author to Peter is on these grounds useless, his information that the author of Mk was named Mark could still be correct. Of course, Papias is the only independent witness for this information, since the other reports about Mk as "the recollections of Peter" (Just, *Did.* 106. 3) and about the circumstances that occasioned Mark's writing down the preaching of Peter⁵⁵ are all dependent on Papias and have no independent value as testimony. The Latin prologue to Mk, in the past often dated in the second century, according to which Mk, Peter's interpreter, wrote his Gospel in Italy after the death of Peter, is now shown by more recent research to be in no case earlier than the Vulgate; i.e., not before the fourth century (see below, §35).

The Mark who is named by Papias as the author of Mk is surely identical with the John Mark frequently mentioned in Acts.⁵⁶ He was the son of a certain Mary, in whose house in Jerusalem a part of the primitive community came together (Acts 12:12). His cousin Barnabas (Col 4:10) and Paul took him to Antioch after the collection journey (Acts 12:25) and had him with them on the so-called first missionary journey (Acts 13:5). Because of him Barnabas later separated from Paul and went with Mark to Cyprus (Acts 15:37 ff.). Later Mark again belonged to the Pauline circle: in Phlm 24 Paul names Mark among his co-workers; in Col 4:10 he recommends him to the community at Colossae to be received as a guest; and according to II Tim 4:11, Timothy is to bring Mark with him to Rome. In view of the pseudonymity of I Pet, it is impossible to say how the mention in I Pet 5:13, *Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου*, is related to these reports of occasional collaboration of Mark with Paul. On the other hand the conclusion of the sentence about Mk contained in the Muratorian Canon (*quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit*: "on some [occasions] he was nevertheless present and thus set down [a record]") can be readily understood as saying that Mark was present at some of the events which he narrates. Mark presumably grew up in Jerusalem and lived there during the time of Jesus' activity and death there, even though he was not a follower of Jesus.

⁵⁴ Niederwimmer, 185.

⁵⁵ Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome (texts in Huck-Lietzmann, *Synopsis*, VIII ff, and Aland, *Synopsis*, 535-39 f, 546.

⁵⁶ It is scarcely possible that *Marcus* is the name of an otherwise unknown Roman Christian (F. C. Grant), or that the author is indeed named Mark, although he is not identical with John Mark (Schweitzer).

As justification for the tradition attested by Papias that John Mark is the author of Mk, one can adduce the fact that obviously the tendency to attribute the Gospels to personal followers of Jesus arose quite early, even though in Papias' time we can prove this for Mt alone (see below, §7.4). Consequently the secondary attribution of Mk to a non-apostle and non-disciple would simply not suggest itself, and for this reason the great majority of scholars consider it certain that John Mark was the author of Mk.

Yet the considerations against this assumption carry weight.⁵⁷ The author obviously has no personal knowledge of Palestinian geography, as the numerous geographical errors show.⁵⁸ He writes for Gentile Christians, with sharp polemic against the unbelieving Jews. He does not know that the account of the death of the Baptist (6:17 ff) contradicts Palestinian customs. Could a Jewish Christian from Jerusalem miss the fact that 6:35 ff and 8:1 ff are two variants of the same feeding story? The tradition that Mk was written by John Mark is therefore scarcely reliable. The reference to I Pet 5:13 ("The elect in Babylon and my son Mark also greet you")⁵⁹ does not account for the tradition, but only the subsequent linking up of the author of Mk with the preaching of Peter. Accordingly, the author of Mk is unknown to us.⁶⁰

4. Place and Time of Writing

That Papias asserts that Mk was written in Rome can be deduced from Eusebius only with great uncertainty (HE II. 15. 2), but Clement of Alexandria (Eus., HE VI. 14. 6) unambiguously attests this tradition, which is followed today by the majority of scholars. In support of this tradition the use of many Latin words is pointed to: e.g., *μάδος* 4:21; *Λεβίαν* 5:9, 15; *σπεκουλάτωρ* 6:27; *δυναβών* 6:37; *ἑξήτης* = *sexarius* (Jug) 7:4; *κῆνος* = *canis* 12:14; *φραγελλῶν* = *flagellate* 15:15; *κεντηρῶν* 15:19, 44 ff; the explanations *Λεπτά δῖο, ὁ ἔστω κοδράντης* (quadrans) 12:42; *ἀνῆψ, ὁ*

⁵⁷ Thus Johnson; Heard, Marxsen; F. C. Grant, Beach, Niederwimmer; G. Bornkamm, RGG II, 761; E. Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu*, 1966, 8; Schulz (see n. 19), 9.

⁵⁸ Cf. 5:1; 7:31; 10:1; on this see Niederwimmer, 178 ff.

⁵⁹ Thus Marxsen, *Int.*, 143; Moreau; Haenchen (see n. 57); J. Regul, *Die antimarcionitischen Evangelienprologe*, 1969, 96.

⁶⁰ The wholly groundless conjecture of Trocmé (202 f) that Philip is the author of Mk 1-13, collapses with the undemonstrable assumption that Mk 14-16 is a secondary supplement, attributed to Mark, added to the original Mk, which lacked a passion narrative (*ibid.*, 193 f). Mason (115) has rightly stressed that the passion story belongs of necessity to Mk 13.