

College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University

DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU

School of Theology and Seminary Faculty
Publications

School of Theology and Seminary

2013

'Our Opinion Is in Accordance with the Eucharist': Irenaeus and the Sitz im Leben of Mark's Gospel

Charles A. Bobertz

College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University, cbobertz@csbsju.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/sot_pubs



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bobertz, Charles A. 2013. "Our Opinion Is in Accordance with the Eucharist': Irenaeus and the Sitz im Leben of Mark's Gospel." In Papers presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held In Oxford 2011, edited by Markus Vinzent, 13:79-85. Leuven: Peeters.

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Theology and Seminary Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csbsju.edu.

College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University

DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU

School of Theology and Seminary Faculty
Publications

School of Theology and Seminary

2013

'Our Opinion Is in Accordance with the Eucharist': Irenaeus and the Sitz im Leben of Mark's Gospel

Charles A. Bobertz

College of Saint Benedict/Saint John's University, cbobertz@csbsju.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.csbsju.edu/sot_pubs



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [Liturgy and Worship Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bobertz, Charles A. 2013. "Our Opinion Is in Accordance with the Eucharist': Irenaeus and the Sitz im Leben of Mark's Gospel." In Papers presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held In Oxford 2011, edited by Markus Vinzent, 13:79-85. Leuven: Peeters.

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Theology and Seminary Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@CSB/SJU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@csbsju.edu.

STUDIA PATRISTICA

VOL. LXV

Papers presented at the Sixteenth International Conference
on Patristic Studies held
in Oxford 2011

Edited by
MARKUS VINZENT

Volume 13:
The First Two Centuries
Apocrypha
Tertullian and Rhetoric
From Tertullian to Tyconius



PEETERS

LEUVEN – PARIS – WALPOLE, MA

2013

Table of Contents

THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES

William C. RUTHERFORD, Houston, USA Citizenship among Jews and Christians: Civic Discourse in the <i>Apology</i> of Aristides	3
Paul HARTOG, Des Moines, USA The Relationship between <i>Paraenesis</i> and Polemic in Polycarp, <i>Phi-</i> <i>lippians</i>	27
Romulus D. STEFANUT, Chicago, Illinois, USA Eucharistic Theology in the Martyrdom of Ignatius of Antioch	39
Ferdinando BERGAMELLI, Turin, Italy La figura dell’Apostolo Paolo in Ignazio di Antiochia.....	49
Viviana Laura FÉLIX, Buenos Aires, Argentina La influencia de platonismo medio en Justino a la luz de los estudios recientes sobre el <i>Didaskalikos</i>	63
Charles A. BOBERTZ, Collegeville, USA ‘Our Opinion is in Accordance with the Eucharist’: Irenaeus and the <i>Sitz im Leben</i> of <i>Mark’s</i> Gospel.....	79
Ysabel DE ANDIA, Paris, France Adam-Enfant chez Irénée de Lyon	91
Scott D. MORINGIELLO, Villanova, Pennsylvania, USA The <i>Pneumatikos</i> as Scriptural Interpreter: Irenaeus on 1 <i>Cor.</i> 2:15 ..	105
Adam J. POWELL, Durham, UK Irenaeus and God’s Gifts: Reciprocity in <i>Against Heresies</i> IV 14.1...	119
Charles E. HILL, Maitland, Florida, USA ‘The Writing which Says...’ <i>The Shepherd</i> of Hermas in the Writings of Irenaeus	127
T. Scott MANOR, Paris, France Proclus: The North African Montanist?.....	139

István M. BUGÁR, Debrecen, Hungary Can Theological Language Be Logical? The Case of ‘Josipe’ and Melito.....	147
Oliver NICHOLSON, Minneapolis, USA, and Tiverton, UK What Makes a Voluntary Martyr?.....	159
Thomas O’LOUGHLIN, Nottingham, UK The <i>Protevangelium of James</i> : A Case of Gospel Harmonization in the Second Century?	165
Jussi JUNNI, Helsinki, Finland Celsus’ Arguments against the Truth of the Bible	175
Mirosław MEJZNER, Warsaw (UKSW), Poland The Anthropological Foundations of the Concept of Resurrection according to Methodius of Olympus.....	185
László PERENDY, Budapest, Hungary The Threads of Tradition: The Parallelisms between <i>Ad Diognetum</i> and <i>Ad Autolycum</i>	197
Nestor KAVVADAS, Tübingen, Germany Some Late Texts Pertaining to the Accusation of Ritual Cannibalism against Second- and Third-Century Christians.....	209
Jared SECORD, Ann Arbor, USA Medicine and Sophistry in Hippolytus’ <i>Refutatio</i>	217
Eliezer GONZALEZ, Gold Coast, Australia The Afterlife in the <i>Passion of Perpetua</i> and in the Works of Tertullian: A Clash of Traditions	225

APOCRYPHA

Julian PETKOV, University of Heidelberg, Germany Techniques of Disguise in Apocryphal Apocalyptic Literature: Bridging the Gap between ‘Authorship’ and ‘Authority’.....	241
Marek STAROWIEYSKI, Pontifical Faculty of Theology, Warsaw, Poland St. Paul dans les Apocryphes.....	253

David M. REIS, Bridgewater, USA Peripatetic Pedagogy: Travel and Transgression in the <i>Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles</i>	263
---	-----

Charlotte TOUATI, Lausanne, Switzerland A 'Kerygma of Peter' behind the <i>Apocalypse of Peter</i> , the <i>Pseudo-Clementine Romance</i> and the <i>Eclogae Propheticae</i> of Clement of Alexandria	277
--	-----

TERTULLIAN AND RHETORIC (ed. Willemien Otten)

David E. WILHITE, Waco, TX, USA Rhetoric and Theology in Tertullian: What Tertullian Learned from Paul	295
---	-----

Frédéric CHAPOT, Université de Strasbourg, France Rhétorique et herméneutique chez Tertullien. Remarques sur la composition de l' <i>Adu. Praxean</i>	313
--	-----

Willemien OTTEN, Chicago, USA Tertullian's Rhetoric of Redemption: Flesh and Embodiment in <i>De carne Christi</i> and <i>De resurrectione mortuorum</i>	331
---	-----

Geoffrey D. DUNN, Australian Catholic University, Australia Rhetoric and Tertullian: A Response	349
--	-----

FROM TERTULLIAN TO TYCONIUS

J. Albert HARRILL, Bloomington, Indiana, USA Accusing Philosophy of Causing Headaches: Tertullian's Use of a Comedic Topos (<i>Praescr.</i> 16.2)	359
---	-----

Richard BRUMBACK, Austin, Texas, USA Tertullian's Trinitarian Monarchy in <i>Adversus Praxean</i> : A Rhetorical Analysis	367
--	-----

Marcin R. WYSOCKI, Lublin, Poland Eschatology of the Time of Persecutions in the Writings of Tertullian and Cyprian	379
--	-----

David L. RIGGS, Marion, Indiana, USA The Apologetics of Grace in Tertullian and Early African Martyr Acts	395
Agnes A. NAGY, Genève, Suisse Les candélabres et les chiens au banquet scandaleux. Tertullien, Minucius Felix et les unions œdipiennes.....	407
Thomas F. HEYNE, M.D., M.St., Boston, USA Tertullian and Obstetrics	419
Ulrike BRUCHMÜLLER, Berlin, Germany Christliche Erotik in platonischem Gewand: Transformationstheoretische Überlegungen zur Umdeutung von Platons <i>Symposion</i> bei Methodios von Olympos.....	435
David W. PERRY, Hull, UK Cyprian's <i>Letter to Fidus</i> : A New Perspective on its Significance for the History of Infant Baptism	445
Adam PLOYD, Atlanta, USA <i>Tres Unum Sunt</i> : The Johannine Comma in Cyprian.....	451
Laetitia CICCOLINI, Paris, France Le personnage de Syméon dans la polémique anti-juive: Le cas de l' <i>Ad Vigilium episcopum de Iudaica incredulitate</i> (CPL 67°).....	459

**‘Our Opinion is in Accordance with the Eucharist’:
Irenaeus and the *Sitz im Leben* of Mark’s Gospel**

Charles A. BOBERTZ, Collegeville, USA

ABSTRACT

This article explores Irenaeus of Lyon’s 2nd century understanding of Eucharist in relation to a historical and theological reading of *Mark’s* Gospel, specifically the feeding narrative cycles (*Mark* 6:30-52; 8:1-21). Irenaeus contends, most particularly in books IV and V of *Adversus haereses*, that the union of divine spirit and flesh in the humanity of Jesus and its replication in the Eucharistic bread serves as primary refutation of docetic heretics. Jesus was, and his Eucharistic body is, fully a part of creation in contrast to only a spiritual entity. Similarly *Mark’s* understanding of Eucharist linked to the *body* of Christ and its instantiation in the Christian ritual gathering (*Mark* 6:52; 8:21) is perhaps the controlling theology of his narrative presentation of Jesus.

In many of its historical judgments, classic historical critical scholarship of the 19th and 20th centuries posited a radical disjuncture between the theological and doctrinal understanding present within the canonical New Testament and theological formulations present within ‘early Catholic’ (*Frühkatholizismus*) literature.¹ Yet the obvious fact that a general ancient and eastern Mediterranean world-view would have been shared by all early Christian groups in the first five or so centuries should prompt scholars to look for shared theological sensitivities and expression in the entire scope of early Christian literary production. The goal of this paper is to investigate a major theological concern shared by both the Gospel of *Mark* and Irenaeus, namely, the connection between the bodily incarnation and resurrection of Christ and the expression of that physical reality in the early Christian ritual meal. In both *Mark* and Irenaeus this theological idea and its expression within ritual practice takes place within a world marked by the widespread intellectual influence of Hellenistic dualism, an

¹ Irony abound here. Enlightenment scholars such as John Toland (1670-1722) argued for the arbitrary nature of canonical selection while Protestant scholars focused on the indelible uniqueness of the biblical books, see David Laird Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem* (New York, 1999) 287; 313. In many modern graduate programs there exists a split between the study of the New Testament and [other] early Christian literature.

influence which militated against any notion of physical redemption through bodily incarnation and resurrection.²

Irenaeus' understanding of the Eucharistic meal plays a central role in his refutation of various forms of Gnosticism in the *Adversus haereses*.³ Gnosticism, as Irenaeus came to understand it through reading and experience, was rooted in a dualistic understanding of the superiority of the spiritual over the material world. Gnostics were therefore utterly skeptical about the idea of redemption within the created order manifest in bodily incarnation and resurrection.⁴ In response Irenaeus asserts boldly that God joined himself with created man in order to redeem the creation from within creation itself.⁵ According to Irenaeus, the original creation of Adam by God resulted in a primeval harmony between the Creator God and the Creature Adam, a harmony damaged by the event of Adam's disobedience to God. Yet even at creation itself God foreknew this result as well as the remainder of the story of fallen creation. Hence the sin of Adam in effect created history, a time in which fallen humanity could be prepared to receive its redemption in the incarnation of the second Adam, Jesus Christ. This period of mankind's preparation is the story of biblical Israel told in the Scriptures. In Irenaeus' teaching of 'recapitulation', the incarnation of Christ captures fully, or consummates within itself, the entirety of the first pristine creation and the history created by the subsequent fall of Adam.⁶ The spirit of God infusing the material body of Jesus, received from the Virgin Mary,⁷ at incarnation again established the original harmony of the Adamic creation. Yet this time, instead of the disobedience of Adam there is the obedience of Christ. The story of Jesus Christ in the gospels is the story of humanity this time in obedience and harmony with God. Still the debt of the old Adam had to be paid, sin had come into the world through the disobedience of Adam and so sin had to be taken from the world through the obedience of the second

² An extensive survey of this influence, rooted in ancient Platonism, is forthcoming in Stephen J. Patterson's Hermeneia commentary on the *Gospel of Thomas*. There he cites useful surveys by Jan Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton, 1983); W.C.K. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion* (revised; New York, 1966); Franz Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism* (New York, 1959); and Gregory Riley, *Resurrection Reconsidered* (Minneapolis, 1995), 7-68.

³ The syncretistic origins of Gnosticism continue to be explored by scholars: see, e.g., Bentley Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation* (San Francisco, 1987), though its central tenant of dualism between the spiritual and material world is well established: Birger A. Pearson, *Ancient Gnosticism: Traditions and Literature* (Minneapolis, 2007), 15-9; Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston, 1963), 32. Citations to *Adversus haereses* are taken from the *Sources Chrétiennes* edition: *Contre les hérésies: Irénée de Lyon. Édition critique d'après les versions arménienne et latine*, sous la direction de Adelin Rousseau avec la collaboration de Bertrand Hemmerdinger, Louis Doutreleau et Charles Mercier (Paris, 1965).

⁴ Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* III 7.

⁵ *Ibid.*: 'et facere ut et Deus assumeret hominem et homo se dederet Deo...'

⁶ *Ibid.* IV 38; V 21.1.

⁷ *Ibid.* V 1.2; for virgin Mary's reversal, through obedience, of the disobedience of virgin Eve, see, *Adv. haer.* V 19.

Adam Christ. In Jesus Christ's fully human obedience, even unto death on a cross, the original creation is restored, the restoration demonstrated in the bodily (*i.e.* creation) resurrection of Jesus Christ.⁸ As a result the bodily resurrected Christ is now the full original harmony between God and God's Creation, the entire story of which was foreknown and foreordained from God from the very beginning of creation itself.

Most important for the present study, however, is the manner in which Irenaeus understands the ritually gathered community, the Church, to be the *body* of Christ. This dramatic equation of Christ with Church emerges from Irenaeus' close reading of the gospel narrative. Irenaeus reads the episode of the last supper wherein Christ affirms the bread to be his body (*'panem suum corpus esse confitebatur'*) and mixed cup to be his blood (*'temperamentum calicis suum sanguinem confirmavit'*)⁹ to provide the proper understanding of the events of the passion within his overall understanding the story of Christ as recapitulation. Above all Jesus Christ in the gospels must be understood to be a body with flesh and blood (*i.e.* creation itself). In a direct refutation of a gnostic reading of the same story, Irenaeus claims that Jesus could not have been a man 'in appearance' (*quasi homo*) because water and blood flowed from his side at his execution and, more important, he was laid in a tomb and his body was raised from the dead.¹⁰ So in the depiction of the final meal of Jesus with his disciples when Jesus claims that the bread is his body and confirms the mixed cup to be his blood he is asserting the bodily or created nature of the elements infused with the Spirit of God. Just as Jesus himself must be a body infused by Spirit, the original creation in harmony with God, so must the ritual elements, bread and wine, be part of the created order, a body, that is, they are the original creation in harmony with God.¹¹

It is here, however, that the key connection between the elements of the ritual meal (the *body* of Christ), and the gathered assembly (the present church) is made. For Irenaeus understands the ritual elements, the body of Christ, also to be the gathered community, the church assembled as the body of Christ. Hence for Irenaeus the Church as the *body* of Christ in the world is all that the story of Christ is in the gospels, namely, the recapitulation of the original creation within the world. And just as with the gospel story of Christ, the Church as the body of Christ redeems the world through its obedience. The Cross of Christ in the gospels is now Christian martyrdom. The incarnate body, the Church, must enact the obedience of Christ on the Cross, in ritual performance of the passion in liturgy and proper manner of life and in so doing become the entire story of Creation and Redemption in the world.¹²

⁸ *Ibid.* V 19.

⁹ *Ibid.* IV 33.2.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* IV 33.2.

¹¹ *Ibid.* IV 18.5.

¹² *Ibid.* III 18.5; IV 33.9.

The Eucharist, therefore, plays the same role as Adam and Christ in the story of both Creation and Redemption. The Spirit of God inhabited the creation, the Body of Adam prior to Sin, and so also inhabited the Body of Jesus Christ at the incarnation. As both Adam and Christ consisted of two parts, the flesh and the spirit, so the Church gathered with the Eucharistic elements consists in two parts, the flesh and the spirit.¹³ The understanding of the Church's liturgy, therefore, stands as a direct refutation of the Gnostics who deny the possibility of flesh (creation) animated by the Spirit of God for the purpose of a life in harmony with God.¹⁴ For Irenaeus' opponents here, creation, by definition corrupt and decaying, is not the object of salvation but rather that from which the Spirit of God must escape. For these Christians the idea of an eternal body, a *resurrected body*, is utterly objectionable. But for Irenaeus this is precisely what the Eucharist manifests, for as the *body* of Christ in the world it is an eternal body, enacting the presence of Christ, the restored creation, within the world. The meal therefore serves as nourishment of the bodies that partake of it, transforming their present corruption of the body to the state of incorruption by itself being spiritual food. The Eucharist, in other words, is already the harmony of God's spirit with creation which, through ritual eating and drinking, transforms the present body of the Christian by the infusion of Spirit into the eternal body of the Resurrection. The Eucharist itself is the demonstration of the resurrection body of Christ in the world, the restoration of creation and redemption enacted by Christ.¹⁵

Moreover the Church, as the body of Christ fed by the body of Christ, has been harvested from the rest of humanity.¹⁶ It stands in the midst of the world as what the world was meant to be from the very beginning of time. Not only does the Christian find herself or himself through the nourishment of Eucharist, transformed to an incorruptible resurrection body, but she or he is joined to the restored creation itself. Creation and the human community within it are once again animated by the spirit of God in an original and intended harmony. Within the world but not of the world, the Church manifests what the world should and will come to be.

¹³ *Ibid.* IV 18.5: '*quemadmodum enim quiescit ad terra panis est percipiens invocationem Dei jam non communis panis est sed Eucharistia ex duabus rebus constans terrena et caelistic.*' There is also a Greek fragment that confirms the sentiment here.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* V 2.2: '*eum calicem qui est creatura suum sanguinum confessus est ex quo auget nostrum sanguinem et eum panem qui est a creatura suum corpus confirmavit ex quo nostra auget corpora.*'

¹⁵ *Ibid.* V 2.3: '*sic et nostra corpora ex ea nutrita et reposita in terram et resoluta in ea resurgunt in suo tempore Verbo Dei resurrectionem eis donante in gloriam Dei Patris qui huic mortali immortalitatem circumdat et corruptibili incorruptelam gratuito donat.*'

¹⁶ Joel R. Kurz, 'The Gifts of Creation and the Consummation of Humanity: Irenaeus of Lyons' Recapitulatory Theology of the Eucharist', *Worship* 83 (2009), 112-32, 123.

We are now in a position to summarize the basic features of Irenaeus' Eucharistic theology which will be important in understanding the theologically driven narrative of *Mark*: First, Jesus Christ at his incarnation is the restoration of the original (Adamic) creation intended by God; second, in his ministry Jesus Christ recapitulates the story of Adam's sin and the subsequent history of Israel with the difference that this time Jesus Christ (Adam) is fully obedient to God; in the obedient death Christ re-establishes the harmony between creation and God and the *body* of Jesus is raised, animated by the Spirit of God, as an eternal resurrected body; third, Jesus establishes the Eucharist as his *body*, creation animated by the Spirit in harmony with God; fourth, the Church, as the *body* of Christ, is joined with Christ in baptism and nourished by the Eucharist to become the resurrected body,¹⁷ that is, its role is to gather people abundantly, as the seed brings forth great harvest,¹⁸ who will recapitulate the story of Christ, and so become Israel nourished and on its way to full gospel obedience in both life and martyrdom.¹⁹

The *Sitz im Leben* of *Mark's* Gospel

There can be no doubt that Irenaeus derives some of this Eucharistic theology from his reading of the gospel narratives, most especially the narrative of the Last Supper in the Synoptics. Yet it can also be shown that the gospel narratives, in this case the Gospel of *Mark*, are marked by theological motifs quite similar to those of Irenaeus but which show no sign of having directly influenced Irenaeus' understanding of the Eucharistic ritual. In other words, it is my contention that one can read closely Irenaeus' understanding of the Eucharist and *discover* a theological understanding of the Eucharist within the ancient Christian religious and philosophical context that forms a principal backdrop for understanding both *Mark's* narrative theology and Irenaeus' more developed theology expressed in *Adversus haereses*. Irenaeus' theology of Eucharist is not entirely derivative from the Gospel narratives, rather it emerges from a theological position already influencing the narratives of the first century, especially the narrative theology undergirding the Gospel of *Mark*.²⁰

Mark's theological understanding of Jesus Christ can be discerned from the fact that he begins his narrative with a story of ritual baptism. John's baptism in the Jordan in the wilderness (*Mark* 1:4-5, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ... ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 129; for baptism as re-creation see *Adv. haer.* I 21.1.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* V 2.3.

¹⁹ See note 15 above.

²⁰ To show fully this relationship would take more explanation than I can provide here; I refer the reader to my forthcoming book, *A Liturgical Reading of the Gospel of Mark*, to be published by Baker Academic Press.

ποταμῶ) brings us into the story of Israel, both Exodus (*Ex.* 14:16-29) and the Crossing to the Promised Land (*Josh.* 3:17), and demonstrates that a theology of recapitulation is already undergirding the narrative presentation. The story of Israel will again be played out in Jesus' ministry in the time of the narrative, but this time obedience will be complete.

So it is that the purpose of the ritual cleansing of baptism depicted here is for 'the forgiveness of sins' (*Mark* 1:4), precisely the reversal of the original state of Adamic sin. In *Mark* therefore the opening ritual description immediately points the reader to the plot of the narrative, the story of Jesus Christ's obedient death on the Cross, but also reflects the first readers' experience of being baptized into that same death (*Rom.* 6:3). Indeed *Mark* explicitly connects the narrative story of the baptism of Jesus to the later passion of Jesus: John the Baptist is deliberately described as Elijah²¹ and Elijah shows up as the key figure in the crucifixion (*Mark* 15:35-7). John states that Jesus 'will baptize you with the Holy Spirit' (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, *Mark* 1:8) while on the cross Jesus gives forth the Spirit (ἐξέπνευσεν, *Mark* 15:37). At the baptism scene the skies are torn asunder (σχίζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς), the Temple curtain is torn in two (ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο, *Mark* 15:38).

The connection of the initial baptism of Jesus into his own death, readily identifiable as an understanding of recapitulation, also explains a theological conundrum often noticed by commentators: if John's baptism is for the forgiveness of sin then why would Jesus, supposedly without sin, have to be baptized?²² In the logic followed by both *Mark* and Irenaeus, Jesus in the gospel will enact the story of Israel, the Exodus and Crossing to the Promised Land, in full obedience and thereby reverse the history of Adam's and Israel's disobedience.²³ Put differently, Jesus' Baptism in the narrative begins the story with an enactment of his own obedient death on a Cross. The incarnate one will enact and reverse the story of Adam's and Israel's disobedience in his death and thereby restore creation: thus Jesus 'rises' from the waters of John's baptism (death), is infused with the Spirit of God and declared to be in filial relationship with God (*Mark* 1:10-1). In the narrative which follows Jesus is this figure, the

²¹ For a detailed analysis see Frank J. Matera, 'The Prologue as the Interpretive Key to Mark's Gospel', *JSNT* 34 (1988), 3-20. *Mal.* 3:1 indicates that Elijah comes to 'prepare the way' (*Mark* 1:3) while John in fact is depicted in the clothes of Elijah (*2Kings* 1:8).

²² Attempts to explain this conundrum are many: see, e.g. James R. Edwards, *The Gospel According to Mark* (Grand Rapids, 2002), 34; Augustine Stock, *The Method and Message of Mark* (Wilmington, 1989), 52; Morna Hooker, *The Message of Mark* (London, 1983), 10; Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8* (New York, 2000), 164; C.E.B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark. An Introduction and Commentary* (Cambridge, 1959), 52.

²³ This is clearly indicated by *Mark* 1:13: the successful outcome of the temptation in the wilderness (after the story of the Exodus/Baptism) reverses the episode of Israel's disobedience in that same wilderness. *Matthew* actually reads *Mark* in this same way, declaring the baptism to 'fulfill righteousness' (*Matth.* 3:15) while the Q version of the temptation in Luke expands as well the basic theme of reversal (*Luke* 4:1-13).

resurrected Christ, Adamic creation in right relationship with God. The narrative task of Jesus now will be to 'teach' the Church to become what He is already. The Eucharistic assembly of Jews and Gentiles, men and women, must enact the obedient story of Christ that ends in the Cross. In the narrative the Eucharist will create the Church that becomes Christ in the world.²⁴

Mark's narrative moves from the baptismal scene to the first feeding narrative (*Mark* 6:30-41) with a rapid pace.²⁵ It begins with the recruitment of four fishing disciples, the first two of whom (Peter and his brother Andrew) are commanded to become 'fishers of people'.²⁶ Key to this section of the gospel is Jesus' encounter with the extraordinary faith of Gentiles and their admission to discipleship, the 'family' of Jesus.²⁷ The parables speak to the miraculous growth of the Church, the 'word' having been planted on amenable soil, an unmistakable reference to the success of the Gentile mission (*Mark* 4:8).

To place this drama in terms outlined by Irenaeus' understanding of the Eucharist, the narrative is simultaneously about 'Jesus', what he says and does as he recapitulates the story of Israel, and the Church as it recapitulates the story of Jesus in its experience of the reality of the Gentile mission in the years after Jesus' execution. It is also for *Mark* what the Church ought to be as the presence of Christ in the world, that is, that it ought to accept and nourish the Gentile mission, and the persecution which follows from that mission (*Mark* 13:9-10), as part of the plan of God for the redemption of humanity and creation. As in Irenaeus' understanding, Jesus is simultaneously himself and the 'body of Christ', that is, the physically gathered Church in the world.

Perhaps this sense of how *Mark* operates as a narrative created by a distinctive Eucharistic theology becomes most evident in the recounting of the two feeding narrative cycles in *Mark* 6:30-56 and 8:1-21. Two characteristics of the Markan text in these episodes especially reflect his shared theological relationship with Irenaeus: First, the physicality, and therefore full humanity, of the resurrection of Christ corresponds to the physicality of the ritual meal. Second, the elements of the ritual meal, specifically the bread (loaf), is equated with the gathered community of Jews and Gentiles in the Church. Here we can only lay out these two characteristics schematically.

²⁴ A theology of recapitulation informing *Mark's* narrative helps us to understand the dynamic opening of the narrative as well as the subsequent unfolding of 'biblical' events in the story of Jesus with his disciples – an oft noted and thoroughly described feature of the narrative of *Mark*. See, e.g., Joel Marcus, *The Way of the Lord* (London, 2004); Rikki Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (Grand Rapids, 2000).

²⁵ The narrative moves in almost staccato like transitions marked often by καὶ εὐθὺς (immediately).

²⁶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων, *Mark* 1:17.

²⁷ Two key pericopes in this sequence are the healing of the paralytic who appears to be a Gentile (he is carried to Jesus by *four* men, a number which seems to indicate Gentiles in *Mark* (*Mark* 2:1-11; cf. 8:9) and the admission that those who have come to discipleship are to be the 'family' of Jesus (*Mark* 3:34-5).

Mark 6:47-52 is the dramatic scene of Jesus walking on the water. Many scholars have noted that the pericope is most likely a misplaced resurrection narrative, here having been placed into the middle of the Markan narrative as opposed to the end. The elements of dominating chaotic opposition in the form of turbulent seas as well as the epiphanic statement, 'it is I' point to the general form critical category of resurrection appearance.²⁸ Many scholars also interpret Jesus' words here, 'take courage, it is I, have no fear' (Θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε, *Mark* 6:50) to indicate both fear inspired by the apparition and the high Christology of *Mark*. These scholars would understand the 'it is I' statement to be a reiteration of God's self disclosure to Moses on Sinai (*Ex.* 3:14): Jesus is God.²⁹

Reading *Mark* with the theology undergirding Irenaeus' *Adversus haereses*, however, leads to an entirely different interpretation of the episode. In the *Adversus haereses* the issue at stake with respect to the resurrection of Christ is whether there is resurrection of the physical body and further what this has to do with an understanding of the Eucharist. Irenaeus' response to the Gnostics couples an understanding of the incarnation, that the Spirit came to dwell in the fully human (creation) Jesus, with the physicality of the Eucharistic elements: the Spirit of God inhabits the created order in the Eucharistic elements themselves.

So also I have noted how *Mark* shares Irenaeus' understanding of the incarnation, the Spirit comes to dwell in the fully human Jesus who is immediately faced with Adam's original temptation to turn against God. So it stands to reason that *Mark's* purpose in depicting Jesus' walking on water is to show that the resurrected Christ is the fully human and physical Christ, the Christ who at once is the redeemer of the fallen creation and the manifestation of the restored creation.³⁰ In that case the words of Jesus at *Mark* 6:50, 'take courage, it is I, have no fear' would not be a statement of high Christology but rather a statement about the identity of Jesus Christ as a physical body. After all, the following action of Jesus is to 'get into the boat with them' (καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, *Mark* 6:51), a demonstration that he is indeed the physical Jesus. Moreover, it is only then, *after* the demonstration of his physical nature, that the wind physically calms down (καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος).

²⁸ Joel Marcus, *Mark 1-8*, Anchor Bible Commentary (New York, 1999), 433. The more generally accepted manuscript ending of *Mark* 16:8 has no formal resurrection narrative.

²⁹ *Ibid.* 432; John Donahue and Daniel Harrington, *The Gospel of Mark*, Sacra Pagina (Collegeville, 2002), 213; Morna Hooker, *The Gospel According to Saint Mark* (Peabody, 1991), 170.

³⁰ The physical nature of resurrection has already been established by *Mark*: Peter's mother-in-law is 'grasped by the hand' and then resurrected by Jesus (ἤγειρεν αὐτὴν κρατήσας τῆς χειρός, *Mark* 1:31); Jairus' daughter is also grasped by the hand and resurrected, followed by eating (καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρός τοῦ παιδίου ... ἔγειρε). The disciples' amazement over the physical resurrection of the girl matches the scene of Jesus walking on water (καὶ ἐξέστησαν [εὐθὺς] ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ, *Mark* 5:41-2).

The embodied Christ, incarnate and resurrected, orders primeval Chaos and restores creation. The disciples' fear is then noted with certain emphasis (καὶ λίαν [ἐκ περισσοῦ] ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο) and therefore may in fact be directed at the claim which the Markan narrative very likely is countering: that Jesus is indeed an apparition, a spirit. In such a case the disciples would be tempted to misunderstand the nature of the redemption of the created order in the incarnation and resurrection of Christ. Put simply, the fear of the disciples here is a depiction supplied by the Markan narrator/author in the face of early Gnostic or docetic Christology; just as with Irenaeus there may have been an assumption, located in a common dualism, that Jesus was not fully human and that resurrection was not of the body.

The further substantiation for this reading of the episode is *Mark's* characterization of the disciples' response to the entire event of Jesus walking on water: 'For they [the disciples] did not understand about the loaves but their hearts were hardened' (οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία πεπωρωμένη, *Mark* 6:52). At first glance a *non-sequitur* forces the reader to contemplate the connection between the first feeding narrative of five loaves and two fish that has just taken place (*Mark* 6:30-44) and Jesus' walking on water. Here many scholars again read *Mark* as moving toward a high Christology: Jesus works the miracle of the loaves and miraculously walks on water, therefore *Mark's* claim centers on the divinity of Jesus.³¹ Yet to read with Irenaeus one would read *Mark* to be claiming that an understanding of the ritual meal as the body of Christ should lead one to an understanding of the full humanity of Christ, that is, the incarnate and resurrection *body* of Jesus. To understand the loaves is to understand the ritual *gathering* of the community, the twelve baskets of bread fragments (κλάσματα, *Mark* 6:43), as the body of Christ, restored Israel and creation, in the world.³² Hence *Mark's* emphasis on the *eating* by *everyone* gathered (καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἔχορτάσθησαν, *Mark* 6:42), nourishment that signals the physical nature of the ritual elements, creation which has been ritually placed by Jesus into proper relationship with God (ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν, *Mark* 6:41). *Mark's* further claim, and one which I cannot expand upon here, is that the gathered physical community consists of Jews and Gentiles, bread and fish, the Eucharistic body of Christ in the world.³³

³¹ For the scholarly discussion, see Marcus, *Mark* (1999), 421-35; Donahue and Harrington, *Gospel* (2002), 216.

³² Again the peculiar wording lends itself to this interpretation – the twelve baskets contain the bread pieces (κλάσματα) – with the fish added (καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων), thus the Gentiles have been included within the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel.

³³ The narrative correlation between the elements of the ritual meal, bread and fish, begins with the opening recruitment of the fishermen disciples to become 'fishers of men' (*Mark* 1:16-20). Thus they are to gather 'fish' which is precisely what happens immediately preceding the first feeding narrative: they go out and bring in *whomever* accepts their message (*Mark* 6:7-13),

The narrative movement toward the second feeding narrative in *Mark* also suggests that *Mark* shares Irenaeus' theological understanding. After the first feeding narrative in which the Gentiles have been included in the Eucharist as the physical restoration of Israel and creation, and Jesus as the resurrected Christ has physically walked upon the water, Jesus challenges Jewish food laws (*Mark* 7:19) and moves into the Gentile lands of Tyre, Sidon and the region of the Decapolis (*Mark* 7:24,31). Here in a Gentile place Jesus literally fulfills the prophecy of *Isaiah* 35:5, 'the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped', in two cures on either side of the second feeding narrative and boat crossing.

The boat crossing following the second feeding narrative again has Jesus challenging the disciples about their understanding of the Eucharist. Not apparent in standard English translations of *Mark* 8:10-21, which cannot distinguish easily between the singular and plural of bread (ἄρτος; ἄρτους), is the word-play of *Mark* that centers on the distinction between loaf (bread) and loaves (bread plural). The scene opens with Jesus getting into a boat with his disciples and finally arriving at the intended destination of the previous boat crossing in *Mark* 6:47-52, Dalmanutha. Pharisees then arrive seeking a sign, ironically at a moment in *Mark* when the sign has just been given, namely, the feeding of the four thousand people. Jesus' pronouncement that a sign shall not be given to this generation applies directly to the inquiring Pharisees: they will not be given the sign of the Eucharist.

The narrative scene at *Mark* 8:13 is crucial: Jesus had apparently gotten out of the boat to confront the Pharisees about their understanding of the Eucharist and now gets back into the boat with the disciples and *they* also will not understand the sign of the Eucharist. *Mark* tells us that they had neglected to bring loaves with them but they had one loaf with them in the boat.³⁴ The loaves in question here must be the seven loaves of the just completed feeding narrative, the Eucharist. Jesus then tells them not to misunderstand the Eucharist as the pharisaic opponents had just misunderstood the Eucharist. The disciples confused response here, 'we have no loaves' is exactly correct: they have one loaf and not the seven loaves of the feeding episode. Jesus now responds by telling them they have misunderstood the sign of the Eucharist by claiming that they have no loaves. The fact that they do not have the seven 'loaves' with them is

presumably both Jews and Gentiles. The odd series of movements at *Mark* 6:32-4, the disciples and Jesus come to the wilderness by boat while the 'large crowd' arrives 'by land', indicates another enactment of the story of the Exodus, the domination of the waters of Chaos in the boat while Israel crosses on dry land. In this case both Jews and Gentiles cross on 'dry land' to the wilderness (*Ex.* 14:22) to be taught by Jesus (Moses). Hence there is the 'discovery' of the two fish along with the five loaves, that is, Gentiles have been 'found' to be part of the restored Israel (12 baskets are collected).

³⁴ Καὶ ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους καὶ εἰ μὴ ἓνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, *Mark* 8:14.

not the point; what *is* the point is that they have the 'one loaf' with them. It is the sign of the 'one loaf' that they must understand: in the first feeding episode they gathered twelve baskets, the restoration of Israel on Jewish soil inclusive of some Gentiles, and in the second feeding episode they gathered seven baskets, the restoration of the Genesis creation on Gentile soil and inclusive of Gentiles on their own terms (without food laws). The final challenge of Jesus here, 'what do you not yet understand?' therefore refers again to the sign of the one Eucharistic loaf they have with them, that it constitutes the singular restoration of the twelve tribes and the creation itself within the context of the gathered community and ritual meal.³⁵

The entire movement of the Markan narrative up to this point is now summarized: the gathered community first of Jews but then of some Gentiles with the Jews, has moved into the world beyond Israel and ritually established the new creation, enacted in the ritual and made physically present in the one loaf of Eucharistic practice. Gentiles have become part of the story of Israel as that story has been recapitulated in the story of Jesus and the early Church.

Conclusion

Mark therefore understands the relationship between the story of Jesus, the Eucharistic ritual and its elements in the same way that Irenaeus does; only *Mark* explicates his understanding of this theology in narrative form while Irenaeus develops it more systematically. In both Jesus himself is understood to be fully human, part of creation itself, and joined to God through the incarnational Spirit of God. Therefore the flesh and creation stand as the object of God's restoration and redemption. Jesus is fully human at both incarnation and bodily resurrection. The Eucharist is the physical embodiment of Christ in the Church, the incarnation and resurrection in the world. The opposition to the idea of the full humanity of Jesus, and therefore bodily incarnation and resurrection, is reflected in the polemical context undergirding both Irenaeus and *Mark*. The direct challenge of the Gnostics is the immediate context of Irenaeus text, while similar ideas of Hellenistic dualism lie behind the specific narrative formation of *Mark*.

In both Irenaeus and *Mark* the Eucharistic elements are the particular liturgical enactment of the incarnation and resurrection in the life of the gathered ritual assembly. As such the liturgy is the direct refutation of the denial of the incarnation and resurrection. For *Mark* this ritual assembly, created by baptism into the death of Christ, is the surprising inclusion of both Jews and Gentiles into the one loaf, the restoration of both Israel and Creation itself.

³⁵ This is of course the 'one loaf' that Jesus declares to be his body at the Last Supper, *Mark* 14:22.

In both Irenaeus and *Mark* the story of the gathering and formation of the assembly is integral to the story of Jesus because the incarnate assembly, the body of Christ, itself recapitulates the story of Jesus' passion in its new context, the ever present circumstances of apostasy and martyrdom.³⁶ The denial of the bodily resurrection of Jesus is to deny that the body and creation is the object of redemption; it is the assertion that the bodily suffering of the disciples and martyrs in the churches of *Mark* and Irenaeus is for naught.

Irenaeus, therefore, does not derive his theology from *Mark*; rather *Mark* shares in the same theology that gave rise to both early Christian writings. From the earliest formation of Christian literature there was a theological impulse, sensitivity about the importance of bodily incarnation and resurrection and its connection with Eucharist that eventually came to define ancient orthodox Christianity. This is the guiding theology behind these two seminal Christian writings.³⁷

³⁶ One notes the importance of the story of Judas at the final Eucharistic meal in *Mark* 14:18-21.

³⁷ I wish to thank St. John's University for a faculty development grant that made this article possible and also Mr. Shawn Powers for his valuable editorial assistance.